
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW VOLUME OF THE "CHURCH'S OUTLOOK SERIES."

Now ready, in crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

VITAL RELIGION:

Or, The Personal Knowledge of Christ. By Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Principal of Bede College, Durham.

"The keynote of this interesting and beautiful book is the thought that religion is essentially the life of friendship and intimacy with God revealed in Jesus Christ. We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily recommend it to all thoughtful readers, especially to those who lament the 'decay of experimental religion.' The present volume is a solid contribution to the solution of the problem how 'to find a basis for faith in an actual experience.'"—*Guardian.*

Bound in cloth, gilt lettered, and profusely illustrated, price 7s. 6d. net.

CHRIST LORE:

The Legends and Traditions, Myths, Symbols, Customs and Superstitions of the Christian Church. By FREDK. WM. HACKWOOD, F.R.S.L.

[Shortly.

In crown 8vo., tastefully printed and bound, with two photographic illustrations, price 2s. 6d. net.

THE

TRUE GROUND OF FAITH.

Five Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church of Bangor. By the Rev. R. S. MYLNE, M.A., B.C.L.

THE TITLES OF THE SERMONS ARE: The Word of God; The Cross of Christ; Divine Worship; The Primitive Church; The Faith of Christ.

In demy 8vo., tastefully printed and bound in cloth gilt, and very fully illustrated, price 5s.

DOUBLY IN CROWN SERVICE

The Life-Story of Colin Watson.
Chiefly compiled from his own diary by K. Y. WATSON.

In crown 8vo., cloth gilt, illustrated, price 5s.

HE DIED FOR ME.

A Story of English Schoolboys and Tamil Coolies. By the Rev. ARTHUR LE FEUVRE, C.M.S. Missionary.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

EDUCATIONAL.

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching. Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium, Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy naturally reducing Fees.

For Prospectus apply: REV. H. JOHNSON, *Head Master.*

"Those in any department of teaching who may occasionally be at a loss for the wherewithal to point a moral or adorn a tale will find this book a boon."—*Star.*

TWELFTH EDITION. Handsomely printed and bound in cloth, price 5s.

TOOLS FOR TEACHERS.

Compiled and arranged by WILLIAM MOODIE.

A COLLECTION OF

Anecdotes, Illustrations, Legends, etc.,

FOR THE USE OF THE

CLERGY, TEACHERS OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS, BIBLE CLASSES,

AND GENERALLY

ALL ENGAGED IN THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING OF THE YOUNG.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

The Churchwoman.

EDITED BY **G. M. IRELAND BLACKBURNE and H. P. K. SKIPTON.**

A WEEKLY ILLUSTRATED PAPER

For Churchwomen and others of wide and Catholic views, at home, and for sending to the Colonial and Missionary Staffs abroad.

THE CONTENTS DURING THE PAST HAVE INCLUDED:

"Reasons Why."
By the late MISS CHARLOTTE M. YONGE.

"The Average Girl."
By MISS M. BRAMSTON.

"The Blessed Life."
By the REV. JESSE BRETT.

Hymns.
By MISS ELLEN BLUNT, the REV. F. W. ORDE-WARD, and others.

Articles
By MRS. BENSON, MRS. JEROME MERCIER, MISS M. E. CHRISTIE, MISS CHRISTABEL COLERIDGE, MISS CHRISTIAN BURKE, MRS. E. M. FIELD, MRS. ROMANES, the VERY REV. PROVOST BALL, and other Writers of note, while the general contents include a Devotional Kalendar and Teaching, Leaders and well-informed Notes on Current Topics, Reports of Church Meetings and Charitable Work, A Young People's Page, Articles on Needlework and Women's Work generally, Reviews of Books, Competitions, and Correspondence.

THE CHURCHWOMAN

Is Published every Friday. Obtainable through any Bookseller. **Price 1d.; or 6s. 6d. per annum, post free, from the Office.**

SPECIMEN COPIES POST FREE UPON APPLICATION.

PUBLISHING OFFICES: 2, EXETER STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

THE MORAVIAN MISSIONS.

(ESTABLISHED 1732.)

Oldest Protestant Missions to the Heathen—First to the Lepers.

About **one in sixty** members is a Missionary. There are gathered under their care from darkest heathenism nearly 100,000—*i.e.*, more than **three times as many** as the Parent Church.

To help those devoted people whom God so blesses, and who, in the preponderating proportion of their Missionaries, are so largely doing the work of other Churches,

THE LONDON ASSOCIATION IN AID

Was formed in 1817. The following are some of many **pressing needs** for which

Earnest Prayer and Support are Sought.

FOR GENERAL FUND—largely increased annual help of at least **£4,000** if existing Missions are to be maintained and Deficiency averted.

FOR THE LEPER HOME, Jerusalem, where Inmates have doubled in number, funds are still urgently wanted to defray the cost of the New Water Reservoir, etc.

FOR LABRADOR, hitherto self-supporting, but crippled for a time in its resources, **£2,000 annually is required** for a few years, until the Mission can be re-established. For this need, and **to avert loss to the General Fund,** an **ADDITIONAL Fund** is being raised.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE THANKFULLY RECEIVED

and information given by the **REV. W. WETTON COX,** at the Offices of the **LONDON ASSOCIATION, 7, New Court, Lincoln's Inn, LONDON, W.C.,** who will also gladly arrange for Meetings, Sermons, Lectures, etc.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

The Bishop of Durham writes: "Long have I known and honoured the Evangelical Alliance. It is a grand means for the promotion of the spiritual sympathy and co-operation of Christians of many lands, and a powerful agency for the practical aid of the weak and oppressed, which God has largely used."

The Rev. Preb. Webb-Peploe writes: "Very heartily do I commend the Evangelical Alliance to the Christian public. It binds together the Christians of different denominations, and where brethren have been suffering for Christ's sake it has done a remarkable work. **I earnestly commend the Alliance to the attention of Christians, in the hope that they will support it liberally with their gifts and prayers."**

Address:

THE SECRETARY,
EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE,
7, ADAM STREET, STRAND, W.C

THE ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL,

HAVERSTOCK HILL and HORNSEY RISE.

Founded 1758.

PATRONS { HIS MAJESTY THE KING.
HER MAJESTY QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

TREASURER: HORACE B. MARSHALL, Esq., J.P., D.L., Sheriff of London.

MAINTAINS and Educates **Five Hundred** Fatherless Children, varying in age from **Infancy** to **Fourteen Years.** An Undenominational Institution supported by Voluntary Contributions.

Help for the "Fatherless and the Widow in their affliction" is urgently needed. Contributions will be thankfully received and all information given by

ALEXANDER GRANT,
Secretary.

OFFICE: 73, CHEAPSIDE, LONDON, E.C.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The OLDEST Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.
The ONLY Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.
Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent
Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Secretary.
Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.
Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

Funds are Urgently Needed.

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE

Is the OLDEST Society

Which has for its object the UNION OF ALL PROTESTANTS in maintaining the Scriptural Principles of the Reformation against Ritualism and Romanism. It is

The ONLY Society

Having an ILLUSTRATED Protestant Monthly Paper, post free to Members. A copy of the current issue will be sent GRATIS on application.

Contributions in support of the general work of the Protestant Alliance will be thankfully received by
S. W. BRETT, SECRETARY, 430, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

URGENT DISTRESS; WRECKS AND LOSS OF LIFE.

"There is sorrow on the sea."

THE SHIPWRECKED MARINERS' SOCIETY

(WITH OVER 1,000 AGENCIES)

Has relieved more than Half a Million Persons since 1839.

The rescued sailor, fisherman, instantly cared for on the spot and sent home; the widow, and orphan of the drowned immediately sought out and succoured; the distressed seafarer of every grade at once charitably assisted.

CONTRIBUTIONS EARNESTLY APPEALED FOR.

Patron—H.M. THE KING. *Chairman of Committee*—Admiral E. S. ADEANE, C.M.G.
Secretary—G. E. MAUDE, Esq., 26, Suffolk Street, Pall Mall East, S.W.

[Telegrams—"SHIPWRECKED, LONDON."]

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1902.

ART. I.—RECENT LITERATURE IN RELATION TO THE WITNESS AND WORK OF ST. PAUL[1]—I.

IF this lecture takes the form of a criticism of various books and writers I must ask your indulgence—

1. Because there seems at the present time abundant material and need for such criticism.

2. Because in a single lecture I have been obliged to put a restraint upon myself, and to exclude some points which may seem to my hearers of more value than those which I have selected.

Behind the witness and the work of St. Paul there stands one great historical fact upon which both witness and work depend—his conversion. No recent criticism has availed to explain away its significance or the New Testament references to it. The remarks of Professor Ramsay are not a whit too strong: "The slight variation in the three accounts of Paul's conversion do not seem to be of any consequence; the spirit and tone and the essential facts are the same" ("St. Paul," p. 379). And in dealing with the narratives in Acts no one has helped more than Dr. Blass in his famous Commentary, or the Frenchman Sabatier in the third chapter of his "L'Apôtre Paul," to explain their relative fitness and essential agreement.

So far as St. Paul's own references to his conversion are concerned, we are met with the same phenomenon which is so

[1] This paper is printed in the form in which it was delivered in the early part of the year to the London Branch of the Society for Sacred Study. No notice therefore is taken of Dr. Chase's Hulsean Lectures, or of Dr. P. Ewald's article, "Lukas der Evangelist," in the new edition of Herzog, or of more recent articles in English Encyclopædias. Reference may also be made to a notice by Mr. Gayford in the July number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* on Professor Weber's theory as to the date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

characteristic of many recent attacks upon the historical facts of Early Christianity—viz., that the same objections against them are brought forward again and again as if they had never been answered.

Thus the American writer, Dr. Orello Cone, in his "Paul: the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher" (1898), p. 59, quotes 1 Cor. ix. 1, "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" and says that there is no cogent reason for applying this passage to the conversion. The Apostle may have "seen" the Lord in one of the visions mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 1: "I must needs glory, though it is not expedient, but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord."

But, as a matter of fact, the passage in 2 Cor. helps us to draw a hard-and-fast line of demarcation between the heavenly visions and revelations vouchsafed to the Apostle from time to time, and the "seeing" the Lord to which he refers in 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8.

The opening words of 2 Cor. xii. show us the Apostle speaking with evident reluctance and reserve, and as he proceeds, it is not too much to say that his reluctance becomes a positive aversion, that not even the insolence of his adversaries shall tear away the veil which hides the depths of his spiritual life; no longer will he boast or parade himself, lest his relation of equality with his converts should be at an end. But if the Apostle was thus so reserved in disclosing the experiences of his inner life, if he was in danger of becoming "foolish" in doing so, how can we account for the different tone of 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8? If the "seeing" of the Lord there referred to differed in no respect from the "visions and revelations" mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 1, there remains a strange paradox in the fact that St. Paul should have made it his loudest boast, that he should have regarded it as the basis of his claim to the Apostolic office, and that he should have placed it in the foreground of his preaching. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (see Paret, "Paulus und Jesus," and Sabatier, *ut supra*, p. 45). Or if, again, this "seeing" was of the same nature and kind as the later spiritual and apocalyptic visions of Christ, then it is difficult to understand what intelligible force or meaning can be attached to the Apostle's affirmation "last of all He was seen of me also" (1 Cor xv. 8). The sole justification for the words is surely to be found in the belief that he draws a hard-and-fast line between those appearances of which the series was closed, and all subsequent visions and revelations such as those referred to in 2 Cor. xii.

It is quite true that Dr. Cone does not hesitate to identify

Paul's "thorn in the flesh" with epilepsy, and to affirm that his "visions and revelations" were the result of abnormal physical conditions. So, too, Jülicher does not hesitate to inform us that the Apostle became an epileptic.

There is no doubt a plausibility about such statements, and at all events their repetition is easy; but amongst his many services we owe to Professor Ramsay the following remarks in his recent Commentary on the Galatians (427):

"The theory that Paul's disease was epilepsy deserves a word. Appearances are at first sight in its favour—the example of Julius Cæsar, Napoleon, Cromwell, all epileptics—the fact that the nervous system when working at its highest pressure is nearest to breaking down. "But," he continues, "if we take epilepsy as St. Paul's trial, then we must accept the medical inferences from it. It follows inexorably that his visions were epileptic symptoms, no more real than the dreams of epileptic insanity." "The theory is seductive," he admits; "but," he adds, "are we prepared to accept the consequences? Paul's visions have revolutionized the world. Has the modern world with all that is best and truest in it been built upon the dreams of epileptic insanity? Is reason the result of unreason, truth of falsehood?"

On this passage Professor Schmiedel calmly remarks that this is the judgment not of an historian but of a theologian. But why should not a theologian be an historian? Has Dr. Schmiedel forgotten amongst his own countrymen the honoured name of Neander, to take one instance only of such a combination? And if Neander's famous words are true, "It is the heart which makes the theologian," the historian no less than the theologian has often cause to remember that there are facts which appeal for discernment not merely to the critical faculty, but to the moral and spiritual side of human nature.

Professor Schmiedel's name has been brought into what some of us may venture to call very undue prominence in England, but there is no reason to suppose that he, or those whom he represents, are the sole or most honoured representatives of German thought. Apropos of this particular subject with which we are dealing, it is at least significant that Dr. B. Weiss, the Nestor of German theologians, to whom we owe one of the most able and erudite of the many modern Lives of Jesus, has added this remark to the latest edition of his "Introduction to the New Testament"—viz., that Paul places the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him, and to which he appeals as the ground of his apostolate, not on a level with the visions and revelations of which he unwillingly boasts in 2 Cor. xii., but he considers it as the last in the

series of the appearances vouchsafed to the older disciples of the Risen One.

Nor is it without interest to turn to the article "Jesus Christus" in the edition of Herzog's "Encyclopædia," now in course of publication, where we find Professor Zöckler insisting that in 1 Cor. xv. the dominant thought of the passage is not of an appearance or a vision of Christ, but of His rising from the dead, a fact which the Apostle emphasizes by the stress which he lays upon the actual burial of the Lord.

Space forbids us to linger longer over a tempting theme, but amongst recent writers we may well be thankful to Dr. Findlay, who has dealt so fully with the various theories which seek to minimize the historical fact of St. Paul's conversion in vol. iii. of Hastings's Bible Dictionary, whilst it will always repay us to turn to the articles of Dr. Beyschlag in the "Studien und Kritiken" for 1864, 1870, and to his "Leben Jesu," vol. i., 1887.

Dr. Beyschlag's name has become well known in England, and his recent death is a grievous loss to us no less than to his own countrymen; but his articles referred to anticipate many current objections, and not only anticipate, but also answer them.

But the whole trend of recent literature is marked by a more positive and indisputable gain when we pass to a consideration of the "witness" contained at length in St. Paul's own Epistles.

And here, perhaps, we may best notice the valuable contribution made by Dr. Deissmann, now Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Heidelberg, to the better understanding of St. Paul's language, by illustrations from the papyri extending over several centuries B.C. to the third century A.D. No contribution to New Testament literature has been marked by greater freshness, and in this case our gratitude may fortunately anticipate favours to come, as in addition to his article on "Epistolary Literature" in the "Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii., the third volume is to contain an article from his pen on the papyri and their value.

Take, *e.g.*, the striking parallels between the magic formulæ inscribed on the Egyptian papyri, and the phraseology used in Acts xix. of the Jewish exorcists and of Ephesian superstition, or the use of the familiar word *plēthos* for the Christian Church in Antioch (Acts xv. 30), a word which, as the papyri show, was technically employed to designate the totality of the members of a religious association, or the use of the legal term *apologia*, Phil. i. 7, a word which may help in this forensic sense to throw light upon the date of the Epistle, united as it is with another legal term "in the confirmation

and defence of the Gospel," *bebaiôsis.* Or, again, the use of the term for adoption, so familiar in Romans and Galatians, so frequent in the pre-Christian inscriptions of the Islands of the Ægean, always in the formula, A son of B, but by adoption son of C; with which we may compare the somewhat similar formula which occurs several times in the inscriptions with reference to the adoption of daughters. Fortunately, these two volumes on "Bible Studies" are now placed within the reach of English readers.

We realize more and more in these volumes the simplicity, the naturalness, the charm of St. Paul's language, and the truth of the famous saying that, although he was a Paul, he was also a man. But it is not only the naturalness of the Apostle's language which has received illustration from recent literature, but also its relation, or, I will say, its contrast, to contemporary Jewish ideas. And for this we have to thank not only Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam in their "Romans," but also Mr. H. St. John Thackeray in his "Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought."

Mr. Thackeray's book is probably only of a preliminary character, but no one can doubt that it is upon right lines, and that further research must prove of inestimable value.

In Germany, of course, the great work of Dr. Dalman, of Leipzig, now in process of publication, the first volume of which has dealt with the words of Jesus, has already given fresh interest to and material for the study.

It is easy, indeed, to mark the hits, but it is not always so congenial to record the misses; it is easy enough for Pfleiderer and others to assure us how much there is in Rabbinic phraseology, which is akin to that of St. Paul—it could hardly be otherwise, considering the nationality and the schooling of the Apostle; but it is often forgotten that with all this apparent nearness St. Paul and the Rabbis are poles asunder, and that the Apostle's theology, whilst "so Jewish in its foundations," is "so anti-Jewish in its results."

But this subject demands our attention from a somewhat different point of view. A learned and distinguished Jew of our own day, Mr. C. J. Montefiore, has recently blamed, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* of January last year, one or two English writers, or, rather, St. Paul himself, for an utter misunderstanding of the power and spirituality of the Jewish religion in the days of Christ.

He contends that it is most unfair to derive our views of the Jewish religion solely from our own New Testament, and to concentrate our attention upon some specimens of Rabbinical literature to the entire exclusion of others.

I fully admit that passages of Rabbinical literature should

be used with the greatest caution, because they are so often given to us without any attempt to assign a definite date to them.

But there seems to me a strange omission in Mr. Montefiore's article. There is not a single reference in it to any of those Apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical books, with which we have recently become so familiar in England, chiefly through the continuous labours of Dr. Charles, of Dublin. I take three of these books, all written by Jews—all, it is not unfair to say, contemporary with our Lord and His Apostles, or, at least, with the writings of the latter.

"The Assumption of Moses," probably dating soon after A.D. 6—the date assigned to it not only by Dr. Charles, but by Mr. Burkitt in Hastings's Dictionary—is written by a Pharisaic Quietist. He has to protest—it is, in fact, the very object of his writing—against the secularization of the Messianic idea, and the growing political corruption of the Pharisaic party, against the notion so common, at all events, in the middle of the century, that works were the means of salvation.

"The Apocalypse of Baruch," the work of several authors, Pharisaic Jews, dating from 50-100 A.D., and containing portions to be assigned to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem, again shows us the prevalence of a carnal and sensuous view of the Messianic kingdom, and, in its dependence for salvation upon works, the need of the preaching of a St. Paul.

If we take the passages bearing upon works and justification, it is not too much to say of them that: "With every position here maintained Christianity is at variance, and Rabbinic teaching in full accord."

"The Book of Jubilees," dating, according to Dr. Edersheim, about 50 A.D., and according to Mr. Headlam in Hastings's Dictionary probably 50-60 A.D., but according to Dr. Charles as early as before 10 A.D., is an attempt of a pious Jew, and evidently a popular and widely-read attempt, to describe the creation and the successive events in the history of Israel from the standpoint of the writer's own time.

In doing this the writer severely condemns the laxity of his countrymen with regard to the keeping of the Sabbath, but at the same time he shows us how rigid were the requirements of an orthodox Jew, and, quite apart from the Gospels and St. Paul, what a fatal danger the spirit of Rabbinism might become.

Whoever drew water or lifted a burden on the Sabbath was to die; whoever did any business, made a journey, attended to his cattle, kindled a fire, rode any beast, travelled

by ship; whoever fasted or whoever made war on the Sabbath, was to die (chap. l.).

As we read such regulations, can we wonder that people turned from a religion which might become so mechanical and so devoid of spirituality to the teaching of Jesus? or that St. Paul saw in such a spirit a burden too grievous to be borne, and in the law and liberty of Christ a more excellent way?

But, further, there is much in recent literature which may help us to appreciate not only the language, not only the thought of St. Paul, but also his doctrine, his distinctively Christian doctrine—*e.g.*, in relation to the Divine Person of our Lord. In this connection a remarkable testimony comes to us from a somewhat unexpected quarter.

Professor Jülicher, in his article "Colossians" ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. i., p. 864), after speaking of the alleged development in the Colossian Epistle of the dignity of Christ in the direction of the Alexandrian-Logos doctrine, answers that it can hardly be denied that the Epistle in question does exhibit a new development of Pauline Christology.

But, he asks, why should not Paul himself have carried it on to this development in view of new errors which demanded new statements of truth?

The fact is, he continues, that in some cases, probably, St. Paul has simply appropriated and applied to Christ formulæ which the false teachers had employed with reference to their mediatory being; and he concludes that none of the Gnostic systems of the second century known to us can be shown to be present in Colossians, whilst the false teachers with whom the epistle makes us acquainted could have made their appearance within the Christian Church in the year 60 A.D. as easily as in 120.

In France the same truth is insisted upon no less strongly by Sabatier, who points out that the word *logos*, although not actually used by St. Paul in Colossians, seems almost to rise to his lips.

In our own country we are not likely to forget the striking passage in his famous article, "Jesus Christ" (Hastings's Bible Dictionary, vol. ii.), in which Dr. Sanday supposes for a moment that a thick curtain falls over the Church after the Ascension.

The curtain is lifted, and what do we find? St. Paul and his companions give solemn greeting, in 1 Thess. i. 1, "To the Church of the Thessalonians, which is in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

"An elaborate process of reflection, almost a system of theology," adds Dr. Sanday, "lies behind those familiar terms."

In Germany the corresponding article, as we may call it, "Jesus Christus" in the new edition of Herzog, by Professor Zöckler, draws special attention to the fact that while on the one hand St. Paul's Epistles emphasize the Davidic origin of Christ according to the flesh, they contain, on the other hand, testimonies to the divine Sonship and eternal pre-existence of Christ which are quite like echoes of the statements of St. John. And he instances such passages as 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15-18; Phil. ii. 5. You will observe that all these passages are taken from epistles which we may now claim beyond all reasonable doubt as the work of St. Paul: 1 Thess., Phil., Col., no less than 1 and 2 Cor.

Quite apart from any other argument, the admission of the exquisite little note of St. Paul to Philemon carries with it an acknowledgement of the authentic nature of the Epistle to the Colossians, "and if," says Dr. Harnack, "we are convinced of the authenticity of Colossians, and this conviction," he adds, "gains rightly more and more adherents, then a considerable portion of the doubts raised against Ephesians at once falls to the ground."

It is a significant fact that Dr. Deissmann in his article, "Epistolary Literature" ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii.), frankly admits as genuine all the letters which bear the name of St. Paul, with the exception of the Pastorals, in which, however, he thinks that parts of genuine letters of the Apostle may be found.

I am quite aware that some objections have been made of late years even against the four Epistles, which we have been so accustomed to regard as undisputed — Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal.—and these objections have become popularized in England in the *Expository Times* by the Dutch theologian Van Manen, who is their chief supporter.

It might be sufficient to observe that not only are these attacks practically ignored as worthless by great "conservative" critics like Dr. Weiss and Dr. Zahn, but that they are dismissed contemptuously or ably refuted by advanced critics like Dr. Holtzmann and Dr. Clemen.

It is satisfactory, however, to be able to cite one more defender on this occasion on the "conservative" side. In his article "Galatians" ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii.) Schmiedel insists that from the point of view of *internal* evidence the four Epistles, while they stand and fall together, as is admitted on all hands, are full of such strong individuality, and are so personal, that we are really entitled to draw the conclusion, so often, as he thinks, illegitimate, that they could not have been invented, and that their genuineness,

moreover, is sufficiently attested by the *external* evidence; the Epistle of Clement of Rome alone would be proof enough (probably 93-96); the Epistle (47) cites 1 Cor. by name as a writing of Paul, and transcribes, without giving a name, Rom. i. 29 and even Heb. i. 1. It is surely of interest to note that this same passage from St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians is cited by Paley, "Horæ Paulinæ," as a proof that our 1 Cor. was not only extant at Corinth, but was known and read at Rome within some forty years of the date which we claim for it.

It is a long way from Paley to Dr. Schmiedel, but the closely similar use of the same passage from St. Clement by both writers may help to remind us that even the most modern attacks are very often old ones in a new guise, and that they may often be defeated by an employment of the same weapons.

R. J. KNOWLING.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. II.—THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT.

A MEDITATION FOR A CHRISTIAN CONGRESS.

"I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."—EPHES. iv. 1.

IN these verses St. Paul passes to explain the practical working of the great truths which he had been declaring in previous chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The account of the tumult at Ephesus, in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, affords a vivid illustration of the strange religious contrasts which were presented by that city in the Apostle's time. The city was known, as the town clerk reminded the people, as specially devoted to the great goddess Diana and to the image which fell down from Jupiter. But it contained a society of Jews, who were the worshippers of the one God of heaven and earth; while St. Paul had founded in it a Christian Church, which aroused equal opposition from both Jews and Pagans. His preaching at length produced a violent explosion, in which the adherents of those two faiths appear as much in antagonism to one another as to the Christians. The moment a Jew came forward to

preach to the people, "all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out: 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians!'" In the face of these violent antagonisms, St. Paul preached a Gospel which announced that all division between Gentiles and Jews was to be abolished, and that they were to be united in one society—the society of the Church. "Now," he declares, "in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ; for He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in His flesh the enmity . . . for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace." "Now, therefore," he says to the Ephesian Gentiles, "ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom each building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Compare this description with the scene of violence and antagonism just recalled to you, and what a marvellous vision it seems! No wonder that St. Paul should speak of it as a mystery, specially revealed to himself, "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel." He was proclaiming his message in a world in which the most violent religious and national antagonisms were at work, yet he confidently declared that they were to be merged in one great unity, that Gentiles and Jews and Christians would cease to be in antagonism, and would form one body in the Church.

Accordingly, he proceeds, in the fourth chapter, to depict in the most enthusiastic manner the nature of the great Society in which all were destined to become one. It is a society in which all the members have their various gifts and offices, and are intended to render mutual services to one another. The ultimate object is that we should "all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and that, "speaking truth in love, we may grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love." This is St. Paul's revelation of the purpose of the Church of God. It is intended to be a society composed of

men of the most different characters and races, and professing, before they join it, the most various faiths, but all united in allegiance to Christ, and in union with Him, each contributing his particular part to the welfare of the whole, and thus forming a well-compacted body, in which every member has its proper office and function.

In his use of the term "body" to describe such a society, St. Paul uses language which the science of our day ought to render more intelligible to us than it could be to those whom he first addressed. To the conception of the men of those days the human body was one continuous physical whole, and it was a strong image to compare with such a physical unity the congregation in a society of a mass of separate individuals. But we know now that our physical bodies, though to the naked eye they appear as one continuous mass of matter, are in reality composed of an infinite number of distinct and separate atoms. It is really by an ocular illusion that they appear united in continuous flesh and blood. Just as the solar system is composed of a number of vast bodies, as they appear to us, held together in mutual relations by one great law, so the physical constitution of each man or woman is composed of a vast number of what, to our eyes, are small cells; and each cell is composed of a vast number of still smaller molecules or atoms, held together by that mysterious and unknown law which we call life. The soul resides in this marvellous house of our tabernacle, and uses its various members, powers, and functions for its own purposes, until the law of life gives place to death, and the building crumbles away into its original atoms. Similarly, St. Paul's conception, or rather revelation, of the ultimate form of human society in the Church is that of multitudes of men and women, whom no man can number, organized into one vast body, under the controlling influence of the Lord of life, each individual being actuated and used by the living spirit of that living Lord.

This is what we are all meant for. Not merely to live our individual lives, and find our individual salvation in heaven hereafter, but to be brought into union with Christ, to be united in Him with all other individuals who, by faith in Him, become parts of his body, and to be moulded, by His Spirit, to serve the great purpose of God, that by Him may be "glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages." That is the ultimate goal, and we can only expect to approximate towards it here on earth. St. Paul's vision has, indeed, already received a fulfilment which, considering the circumstances amidst which it was revealed, may well be deemed marvellous. The Church of Christ, and still more the Spirit of

Christ, has, in the course of history, brought together men of the most various races and claims. It has established over a great part of the world a form of civilization distinct from all others, which we rightly call Christian civilization, and has made those various races feel that they have common interests and common duties. Imperfect as that civilization is, there are beyond question Christian laws and a Christian spirit permeating and controlling the various nations which combine to form that great branch of the human family which we call the Christian world. The vision, however dimly, is yet really before the eyes of the Christian nations, and uncontrollable impulses are pressing them onward to its realization.

But there is one practical conclusion to be drawn from this review of St. Paul's revelation, and that is that the promotion of unity ought to be a paramount object among Christian men. A survey of the Christian world—a survey of the religious condition of our own Church and nation—might, indeed, well suggest to us that Christians have but little apprehension of this truth. The Church of Christ—"the body of Christian men dispersed throughout the whole world"—which, in St. Paul's view, was intended to be a society in which this unity should be realized, is broken up into numerous bodies, in some measure directly antagonistic to one another, and in still greater measure separated in sympathy and communion. The spiritual life of one of these communions is to a grievous extent separated from the spiritual life of the others. This division might be illustrated in a striking and painful degree by the manner in which the religious thought and life of these various communions, as expressed in their literature, is practically unknown to the others. By whatever errors each may be marked, there are treasures of Christian experience and Christian devotion in each, which it is lamentable should not be imparted to the rest. But even here in England the various bodies of Nonconformists, and to far too large an extent the various schools of thought in the Church, live their own lives and develop their own tendencies very much by themselves, and are not duly balanced and supplemented by contributions from the thought and life of the others. There is even a temptation, sometimes avowed, to regard this state of division as inevitable, if not desirable, as though it were, on the whole, more advantageous that distinct bodies of Christians should develop, in entire freedom and independence, their own views and tendencies without being checked by organic relations with their fellows.

There are, indeed, it may be hoped, increasing signs that Christian men of all communions are recoiling from such

views. There is a tendency for the various divisions of English religion to combine more and more into larger masses, and at least to form unions, if not to seek a complete unity. But it is to be feared that there is not yet among Christian men an adequate realization of the fact that all divisions of Christian men into separate communities, not united into one organic whole, are contrary to the design of Christ, contrary to the purpose of His Church as revealed emphatically by His Apostles, a grievous violation of His will, and therefore a grievous sin. The very ideal of the Christian Church is "that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another; and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now, ye," says St. Paul, "are the body of Christ and members in particular."

What a grievous and disastrous contrast to such an ideal is the spectacle of bodies of Christians forming themselves into organizations which have no mutual communion, or even communication, unable to unite even on such an elementary but vital matter as the Christian education of children, and threatening great political convulsions respecting the position of the establishment of religion in the country! Even looking merely within the communion of the Church of England, what can be more contrary to such an ideal than the formation of party organizations, one of which necessarily calls into action another, until, to our shame and unhappiness, we hear the possibility discussed of the disruption of our own body? Such passages from St. Paul as we have been considering ought to touch our consciences deeply in the presence of such a spectacle, and ought to make us all resolve that we will for the future take more deeply to heart what is described in one of the prayers of our Church as "the great danger we are in from our unhappy divisions," and that we will endeavour better than we have hitherto done to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

Let us for this purpose carefully observe the method which the Apostle prescribes for carrying out this endeavour. It is to be observed in the first place that he implies that it needs earnest and active effort. The word translated in our Authorized Version "endeavouring" means more than an ordinary effort; it means giving diligence—constant and earnest diligence—to this great purpose. It is a work which requires at least as great effort as any other part of the Christian life, and we are bound to work with energy for this great ideal of unity. But what sort of energy and effort is required? It is very instructive to observe that the energy to which the

Apostle exhorts us for this purpose is simply a moral and spiritual energy—not an energy of the intellect, not an energy of controversy, not an energy even of statesmanlike or organizing capacity, but an energy of Christian meekness and Christian love. For this great purpose he exhorts the Ephesians to work worthily of the vocation wherewith they are called, "with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love." If Christian men are to be held together in communion and union, if the parties and the sects which are now unhappily divided are to be again brought together, the one method which St. Paul specifies is that of maintaining all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, and forbearing one another in love. It is unquestionable, and, alas! it is notorious, that the tendency fostered by the divisions and schisms we have been considering is a spirit the very opposite of these gentle graces. It is a spirit of the confident, if not proud, assertion of our own views, a spirit of impatience at their being controverted and contradicted, a disinclination to endure opposition, a lack of mutual love, and consequently of mutual forbearance.

We are apt to forget one truth, which is at the root of the whole matter, namely, that none but the greatest minds and the greatest hearts—and perhaps not even these unless they be assisted, like the Apostles, with Divine inspiration—can possibly grasp all the bearings and aspects of Christian truth and life. It is remarkable that in the fervid passage which immediately precedes, in which the Apostle prays that God will grant the Ephesians, "according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man," he adds the prayer that they "may be able to comprehend *with all saints* what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." It is only *with all saints*, in communion with all saints, by the mutual edification of all saints, by the interchange of their various experiences and thoughts, and by the union of their prayers, that the breadth and length and depth and height of the Christian revelation of the love and the will of Christ and of God the Father can be duly apprehended. Christian lowliness would teach us to believe that every true Christian brother can offer some contribution to the unity of the faith and to the perfection of the Christian life; and we should realize that the first necessity for our learning the truth is to listen to others in meekness, and even where we think them in error to forbear them in love. If we are to keep the unity of the Spirit—the unity, that is, of God's Spirit, the unity which God's Spirit designs for us, and which God's Spirit alone can produce in us—we can only do so in

"the bond of peace"—that is to say, by striving to remain bound up together in a mutual peace, refusing to be separated, resolving that, so far as in us lies, we will hear of no separation from our fellows, we will listen to no suggestions for separating ourselves from them; we will meet them in discussion, we will listen with deference and patience to their views, and in meekness and love we will communicate to them our own, and then we may hope that the God of love and peace will be with us, and will Himself by His Spirit bring us more and more into union and harmony with one another.

Such is the purpose of all gatherings of Clergy and Laity for mutual discussion, and the words of the text express the spirit and the purpose with which all who take part in them should be animated. Such discussions should be conducted "with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, diligently striving to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." In that Divine Spirit lies our only hope. If it were solely by our own discussions, our own wisdom, our own efforts, that we were aiming at unity we might well despair. But St. Paul reveals to us the Divine Lord and the Divine Spirit who in their own ways—ways far beyond our comprehension—are gradually working towards the creation of that great body which is the Church, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. The Church may seem almost without form and void, but we have the blessed assurance that the Spirit of God is moving upon the face of the waters, and we are privileged to believe that He will bring order and unity out of the apparent confusion. To Him let us commit ourselves, and so let us join in that noble prayer of our Liturgy that, "as there is but one Body and one Spirit, and one Hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

HENRY WACE.

Art. III.—OUR LORD'S TEACHING CONCERNING HIMSELF—III.

II. Our Lord's Teaching concerning His Mission.

OUR Lord laid great emphasis upon His mission. Again and again He describes Himself as sent forth from God. "I came forth," He says, "and am come from God; for neither have I come of Myself, but He sent Me." "The living Father sent Me." And generally, where it is expressly affirmed that the Father sent the Son, the word used—ἀποστέλλειν—conveys the idea that the Son is the delegate, the envoy and representative of the Father. Our Lord, as Westcott notes, "presents His own mission as the one abiding mission of the Father." Moreover, Christ's mission is grounded in His Person. He is not the Son of God because He is sent, but He is sent because He is the Son of God; and in order to fulfil His mission He became Son of man. As Son of God He is qualified to be the representative of the Father, and as Son of man He makes the Father accessible to us.

In our Lord's mission three distinct, but correlated, functions may be distinguished—Revelation, Redemption, and Judgment.

(1) *Revelation.*

Our Lord declares that He came into the world to bear witness to the truth. He is Himself the Truth. His coming was the coming of the Truth. By the Truth is meant the expression of God's thought and will and character. Christ explained God to us. He shows us the Father. "No one," saith St. John, "hath ever yet seen God." God had indeed manifested Himself in His works; He had spoken by the prophets; in visions and theophanies and angelic splendours they had caught glimpses of His glory; but God Himself no one had ever yet seen. Then at last appeared the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, in a transcendent fellowship of life and love with the Eternal; He declared, interpreted God to men. "He that hath seen Me," saith Jesus, "hath seen the Father."

Compare with the testimony in St. John our Lord's declaration in the Synoptics: "No one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth anyone know the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."

Observe it is not knowledge about the Father or the Son that is meant, but knowledge of each as a personal, intimate,

essential knowledge of the very Being Himself. Of this knowledge there are four things to be noted:

First, it is not mere human knowledge, of however extraordinary character; it is not knowledge which man as man could possess. Secondly, it is not mutual knowledge merely, but commensurate knowledge. Our Lord asserts His knowledge of the Father to be equal to the Father's knowledge of Him. Thirdly, our Lord's knowledge of the Father is not the outcome of a remembrance He has of a former fellowship with Him; it flows out of a present fellowship, out of His unbroken community with the Father. Jesus insists upon His personal connection with the Father. His message was drawn directly and continually from the Father as the message of no prophet could be. "The only-begotten Son *which is in the bosom of* the Father," He declared Him. Then, fourthly, the revelation of God in and through Christ is a living and personal revelation. The Divine life and being are expressed in the terms and under the conditions of human life in the obedience, purity, goodness, love, and self-sacrifice of Jesus. The Fatherhood of God is manifested in the well-beloved Son. "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father."

I must pass by with the merest mention one of the most debated questions of the day—the relations of our Lord to the Old Testament. He honoured it, He appealed to it; and His appeal is the more remarkable standing as it does side by side with His own unparalleled self-assertion. He claimed to be the goal and subject of the Old Testament. He affirmed its inviolability. He corrected misinterpretations and rebuked additions to it. He discriminated what was temporary in it, but He accepted it as stamped with irrefragable Divine authority, and assured men of the certainty of its fulfilment.

Our Lord knew the Old Testament as no one else ever did or could know it. Not only was He a profound student of the Old Testament, not only did He declare Himself to be its supreme subject, but He is Himself the Mediator through whom its revelations were given. Surely, then, He must have known not only its substance and contents, but the real form and manner in which its revelations were given. He must have known, for example, whether the facts of the sacred history were as the Jews of His day believed, and as the whole Christian Church has since believed, or whether they were what a prevalent school of Old Testament criticism affirms, when it reverses the whole history of Israel, as well as the literary history of the Scriptures.

Is it conceivable that our Lord could be in ignorance of the real character and origin of the writings which He received and stamped with His authority as God's own Word to men?

If our Lord were so ignorant in regard to the former revelations of God, what guarantee have we that His claims to be Himself the supreme revelation of the Father are not vitiated by the same ignorance? The extreme critics find here no difficulty, because their view of our Lord's Person is on the same low level as their view of the Old Testament. But those who are attempting to hold fast to their faith in Christ as Incarnate God, while they accept the destructive theories of recent criticism, must face the tremendous issues raised, for these theories impugn either the character of our Lord, or His competency and capacity as the revealer of God.

(2) *Redemption.*

The mission of Jesus was distinctively a mission of salvation. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." "God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world should be saved through Him." In the Synoptics this salvation is described as the kingdom of God; in St. John as the gift of eternal life. In St. John the two are conjoined in our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus, where the birth from above is declared to be the condition of entrance into Christ's kingdom, as in Mark x. 15 it is declared that one must enter the kingdom as a little child. In the expression "kingdom of God" (of heaven) our Lord takes the Jewish expectation of Messiah in its carnal, materialized form, and uplifts it into the inward and spiritual. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . the kingdom of God is within you." To enter into the kingdom and to have eternal life are synonymous in John (iii. 3, 5, 15, 16), and both from different standpoints set forth the Messianic salvation.

With this salvation the death of Christ is specifically connected. It is true that the object of His death is not different from the work of His life. All is of a piece. Whatever Christ taught, or wrought, or endured was for us men and for our salvation. His whole work of revelation was a work of redemption. But His revelation of the Father would have been far from complete without His death, which was the crowning manifestation of God's character and will, the supreme demonstration of His love. But it is much more. Christ's death was not a gratuitous exhibition of Divine love; there was a Divine necessity which required it. Without it man's salvation was impossible.

The thoughtful reader cannot fail to notice how large a place in the Gospels is occupied by the death of Christ. The shadow of the cross lies athwart His whole ministry. From its very outset His death is ever before Him as its predestined

goal. In the case of the prophets and saints of the Scriptures their death is but an incident, merely mentioned, rarely described, and that in briefest form. But in the case of our Lord His death is the great event to which His whole life leads. It does not intervene as an accident or an interruption; on the contrary, it is the consummation of His mission, towards which He deliberately and voluntarily advances. At first He speaks of it with a measure of reserve and in parables. The temple of His body is to be destroyed, and He will raise it up again. He is to be lifted up like the serpent in the wilderness. He is to give His flesh for the life of the world. The disciples will fast when the bridegroom is taken away from them. The good Shepherd will lay down His life for the sheep. By His death He will draw all men unto Him. He will be as the seed cast into the ground, which dies to bear much fruit. By His death He will give the crowning proof of His love for His friends.

Upon three notable occasions He foretold in plainest terms to His disciples, as they were able to bear it, His death and resurrection: after St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi, after the transfiguration, and on His last solemn progress towards Jerusalem. St. Mark prefaces His account of the third announcement with a remarkable description. The Lord walks before; the disciples follow; they are filled with fear. There is that in the Lord's demeanour, His solemnity and air of determination, that impresses them with a strange awe. His face was steadfastly set to meet the great ordeal of sacrifice and suffering by which alone His mission of salvation could be consummated.

Three great truths in regard to His death are emphasized by our Lord. First, His death was voluntary. "I lay down My life," He says. "No one taketh it away from Me, but I lay it down of Myself." Secondly, His death was a necessity. "The Son of Man must suffer." His death was an act of obedience to the Divine will, the fulfilment of the Divine plan. "Behoved it not," He demanded of the doubting disciples on the way to Emmaus—"behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things?" And He repeated it on the evening of the same day: "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer and rise again." And, thirdly, His death was a substitution, an expiation. He gave His life a ransom for many—*a* λύτρον, price of redemption—the one instead of the many. He laid down His life for the sheep. He applied to Himself Isaiah's portraiture of the suffering servant of Jehovah, who took our infirmities and bore our diseases, upon whom the Lord laid the iniquity of us all. And when Jesus instituted sacred signs as pledges of His love, it was

His death that they proclaimed and commemorated. "This is My body which is given for you. . . . This cup is the new covenant in My blood which is shed for you." "This is My blood of the new covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

The death of Jesus, as He viewed it, was not merely a revelation of the Divine love and a disclosure of the Divine holiness and antipathy to sin; it was a representative and vicarious death—a death of expiation by which sin is put away and the sinner redeemed and saved.

(3) *Judgment.*

The function of judgment seems, perhaps, incompatible with Christ's mission of salvation. He Himself said that He "came not to judge the world, but to save the world." And yet He says, "For judgment came I into this world." He came, indeed, not to execute judgment, and yet judgment is the natural and inevitable result of His coming.

1. There is a *continuous* judgment effected in and by Christ's work of revelation and redemption. The light which reveals must judge the thoughts and characters of men. The truth tests and tries those to whom it is presented. The message of salvation divides men as they receive or reject it. The manifestation of Christ to the world separates it into two great classes. "He that believeth on Him is not judged; but He that believeth not is judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only-begotten Son of God. And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil."

2. The process of judgment which is continually going on will *culminate in a crisis of judgment* at the close of this world-period—"the last day"—when "all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgment."

The last judgment is frequently represented by our Lord in parabolic form. The tares and the wheat, after they have long grown together, are finally separated; when the net is drawn up, the bad fish are culled out from the good; in the solemn gathering of the nations the sheep and the goats represent the two great divisions in which they are placed. Again and again the Son of man is described as coming in His glory for the great ordeal of the final separation. And in one place He is described as King, for judgment has always in the East been regarded as a royal prerogative.

In all these representations the final state of men is determined by their relations to Christ. Not only is He the standard by which men's characters are judged, but He Himself will determine the destiny of each. The Father "hath committed all judgment unto the Son," to the end that "all may honour the Son even as they honour the Father."

It is significant that the three prerogatives which our Lord claims correspond to His threefold office as the Christ. Revelation is the work for which the prophet is set apart. Salvation is effected by sacrifice, to make which is the function of the priest. To judge is the royal prerogative. The validity and completeness of the Messianic mission of Jesus is thus attested. Jesus is the Christ—the anointed Prophet, Priest, and King.

Moreover, these three prerogatives—to reveal, to redeem, to judge—belong to our Lord, both as Son of man and as Son of God.

On the one hand, they belong to him as Son of man. There could be no revelation of the Father accessible to us except through One who possessed our nature and lived our life, and in that nature and life showed us the Father.

No redemption could be achieved for us except by One who stood in our stead as our representative. To seek and to save the lost the great Seeker must come in the form of a servant and be made in the likeness of men; and thus only can He serve and suffer for our redemption.

And we are expressly told that it is "because He is the Son of man that the Father hath given Him authority to execute judgment." The Judge, as Westcott says, must share the nature of those who are brought before Him. He knows what is in man—all his infirmities and temptations. He has a fellow-feeling with us, and will be a merciful as well as a righteous Judge.

On the other hand, it is only because He is Son of God that He is able to exercise these high prerogatives, to discharge the great functions of His mission. Only He who is in the bosom of the Father, who knows God even as He knows Himself, can give us a true and adequate revelation of the eternal. Only because He is the Son of God could it be just to substitute Him the innocent for the guilty, or could value be given to the ransom which He paid. Only the Son of God could truly judge His fellows, could read the hearts of men, trace out unerringly their motives, and weigh the merit or the demerit of every act and thought. Such searching and unerring judgment is beyond the powers of man. Only He who made us can thus know and weigh us and determine justly our destiny.

What, therefore, our Lord teaches concerning His *mission* confirms what He teaches concerning His *Person*. Together they make one magnificent and irresistible presentation of His claims. In them He repeats to us His great question, "Whom say ye that I am?" What answer can we give? What answer can be given by anyone who has humbly and sincerely sought to receive and understand His words? Is any other answer possible than that attested by the Christian consciousness through nineteen centuries? Other answers have been attempted. The first denial of His deity came from Arius, who apparently went so close to the Christian creeds that only an iota separated them. He exalted Jesus to the highest pinnacle of creaturehood, far above angels and archangels, one like unto God, but not God. And in doing this he stripped the Son of His true humanity, as well as of His deity. But Arianism could not live. It proved but a revived heathenism with its demigod. It passed away for ever.

Next came the answer of Socinus: Jesus is man, but man supernaturally born and endowed—the Virgin's Son. But the miraculous birth must go. Modern Unitarianism makes Jesus man, no longer physically supernatural—a perfect, sinless man. "I know not," said Channing, "what can be added to the wonder, reverence, and love that belong to Jesus." But a sinless man is a miracle. How shall this miracle be got rid of? Few have dared even to hint that Jesus was an impostor. Others say that He was a dreamer. Both answers are so crude, so self-contradictory, so preposterous, that unbelief stands confounded before the problem of Christ's character and claims. These claims are so tremendous that, if they are not true, He who made them falls far below the level of humanity. Dean Farrar truly says: "It should be definitely understood that if Christ were not sinless and Divine, He would be lower, not higher, than all who have lived holily on earth; for then His claims would be false, and His personality stained with the poor vice of self-satisfaction." Strauss admitted that if Christ really advanced the claims which are set forth in the Gospels he "should lose faith in his excellence as a man." These are remarkable words of Lessing: "If Christ is not truly God, then Mohammedanism was an undoubted improvement upon the Christian religion. Mohammed, on such a supposition, would indisputably have been far more veracious, more circumspect, and more zealous for the honour of God."

There is no escape from the great dilemma. Either we must cease to revere Christ as a good man or we must bow before Him in adoration and hail Him Lord of All. The

appeal has been—"Back to Christ." By this test we are prepared to abide.

When St. Peter, in answer to our Lord's challenge, made his great confession, his faith rested upon convictions to which he was "impelled by the facts of Christ's earthly life and the spiritual experiences it awakened" in him. As Dr. Forrest has ably demonstrated, there is no contradiction between the historical and the spiritual; the latter to be real must rest upon the former. The experience of the Christian Church would be worthless were it not founded upon the great redemptive facts recorded in the Gospels. On the other hand, it is only in the light of a genuine spiritual experience that the facts themselves can be truly apprehended. Our right position is at the feet of Christ. "Come to Me," He pleads; "learn of Me."

To the questioning Nathanael, Philip's answer—"Come and see"—presents at once the simplest and the profoundest apologetics. In a time of stress and conflict, when our Lord suggested "the possibility, yet the incredibility, of His desertion by the Twelve," it is St. Peter who replies, "To whom shall we go?" Admitting that there are difficulties, problems that perplex and confound us, to whom shall we carry them? Who will do more for us than Christ? Who will give us clearer guidance? As has been well said, "Simon Peter could stand with His Master in a minority. He accepts Christ, hard sayings and all. He looks at every hard saying in the light of Christ, not at Christ in the light of the hard saying."

Christ cannot fail us. Let us not fear to trust Him. "I am the Light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life." And that light, we know, "shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

J. P. Sheraton.

Art. IV.—"OUR UNHAPPY DIVISIONS"—VI.

THERE are not many true soldiers and servants of the Lord Jesus Christ, I believe, who are not becoming painfully conscious that the cause of their Master is being sorely hindered and weakened by the divisions and contentions among those who are called by His Name. We may not turn aside from the emphatic words of Holy Scripture, which bid us to be "of one accord, of one mind" (Phil. ii. 2), and to

make a point of keeping (σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν) "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. iv. 2).

But we are assured that the healing power must come not from earth but from heaven. Our expectation is from Him who has taught us not only to love one another, but to make the Truth of His Gospel known to the ends of the earth. If the argument of our two last papers is not altogether a mistake, we must aim at connecting our endeavours after unity with increasing efforts to promote a true missionary enthusiasm.

And let us thank God, not only that (though sadly feeble still) the missionary spirit is growing, but that with this, and it may be in consequence of this, prejudices are yielding, and hearts are being drawn together in the love of the truth.

At home there are indications that the strong feelings against Episcopacy are giving way, in some measure at least, even in communions where we might perhaps least have expected it. It is no small matter to be assured on good authority that "the prospects of Reformed Catholicism are brighter in Scotland at the present day than they have ever been before" (see CHURCHMAN of June, 1902, p. 489). Dr. Roberts, of St. Andrews, wrote in 1866: "Union on any basis seems hopeless, until the national conscience awakes to the sin of διχοστασίαι (Gal. v. 20). I do not myself believe that any form of Church government can claim a *jus divinum* in the strict sense of the words. But, of course, Episcopacy has the *prestige* of antiquity, and seems to me, in some important respects, the most expedient" ("Episcopate of Charles Wordsworth," p. 249). Another eminent Presbyterian divine, Dr. Campbell Fraser, wrote: "The Anglican branch of the Church has seemed to me the most likely *centre* for this unity—if it should ever come about—with the strong presumption of history and of most of Christendom in favour of its Episcopal constitution" (*ibid.*). And at an earlier date (1865-66) we are told that a correspondence with Bishop C. Wordsworth "brought out, among other things, Tulloch's willingness to allow Episcopacy to be an Apostolic institution, and one of great practical utility" (*ibid.*, p. 160). It is also said that Bishop Charles Wordsworth, in the personal society of good and able Presbyterian teachers, found them to be, or thought them to be, "ready to accept Episcopacy if the manner of its acceptance could be tempered so as to avoid subjecting them to humiliation" (*ibid.*, p. 222). Very thankfully do we learn of "a spirit of the warmest sympathy" with the aims of the "Christian Unity Committee," and of a day recently set apart in all the Episcopal churches and chapels, and in a large number of Presbyterian churches in Scotland, "for prayer

and intercession on behalf of unity" (see CHURCHMAN of June, 1902, p. 488).

It may be worth remembering also that an eminent Frenchman, and a Roman Catholic, has expressed himself to the effect that, if Christians are to approach one another, it is from the Church of England that the movement should proceed."[1]

Gladly also we are reminded of the interest which attached to discussions held in Switzerland about ten years ago, where two leading divines among the Methodists, Mr. Price Hughes and Dr. Stephenson, "declared themselves in favour of Episcopacy," and where Mr. Hughes said "he thought the Lambeth proposals most generous, liberal, and Christian, and that they had not yet received sufficient recognition from British Nonconformists" (see Archdeacon Sinclair's Charge, as reported in *Guardian* of June 4, 1902).

Abroad we may notice signs even more remarkable of a drawing towards something very like a primitive Episcopacy among Presbyterians.

The Rev. John Newton, the honoured American Presbyterian Missionary, put forward the following proposals (nearly forty years ago) as a basis of union among the branches of Christ's Church in India:

"1. A Creed, embracing only such points as pertained to the essence of Christianity.

"2. Rites and modes of worship left to the option of each Congregation.

"3. A Collegiate Presbyterial Pastorate, assisted by a Diaconate, in each Church.

"4. A body of Evangelists or Bishops, superior to Pastors, who, besides preaching to unbelievers and defending the faith against its enemies, would have a general oversight of the Church, with the power of Ordination.

"5. General Councils or synods composed of these Evangelistic Bishops and Pastors, and perhaps a body of lay representatives, as a bond of union for all the Churches of India" (*Church Missionary Intelligencer* for March, 1902, p. 201).

Certainly this is a very remarkable suggestion. We may thankfully set beside it the striking accounts which assure us of God's working in Japan and elsewhere in answer to united prayer and united effort of Christians not united in organization. To take an example: "The special united evangelistic efforts in Tokushima, Wakimachi, and other parts of the district have been much blessed. The lurking feeling of

[1] See the Archbishop of York's "Unity of Christendom," pp. 19, 20; S.P.C.K.

rivalry which used to exist between the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches was lost in the desire to bring glory to God and present a united front in the warfare against Satan" (see *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, April, 1902, p. 269).

And while we thank God for these signs of hope, let us take pains to make it evident that *our* aim is not at all to spread abroad anything like a stereotyped Anglicanism wherever we preach the Gospel, but to make known the truth and power of the Word, the Message, the Evangel, which is the Light of this dark world—the Light which, through God's mercy, was made to shine for us at the Reformation. It is not English, but primitive and Apostolic Christianity which we have to progagate. If we desire to take with us, as a centre of unity and order, an Anglican succession in our mission-fields, it is an Anglican Episcopate, only Anglican *qua* Apostolic. It is what we desire to promote as a bond of union, not as a bone of contention. And we desire this only in full subordination and entire subservience to the succession of Apostolic doctrine and Apostolic testimony—which we hold to be pre-eminently the true[1] Apostolic succession; the

---

[1] See the valuable remarks of Canon Robertson in his "Growth of the Papal Power," pp. 18-23. He observes: "Irenæus, then, in arguing against heretics, says that we may see the novelty and the falsity of their doctrines by having recourse to the tradition of the Apostles, as preserved in the Churches for which they had instituted Bishops, through which Bishops and their successors the original Christian doctrine had been handed down uncorrupt" (p. 18).

Dean Field says: "In this sort the Fathers were wont to reason from succession in the controversies of religion. First, they reckoned up the succession of Bishops from the Apostles' times; and then showed that none of them taught any such thing as was then called in question, but the contrary; and consequently that the Apostles delivered no such thing, but the contrary" ("Of the Church," book iii., ch. xl., vol. i., pp. 328, 329; E.H.S.). See especially Mason, "Vindiciæ Eccl. Angl.," p. 60; London, 1625.

"The true visible Church is named Apostolical, not because of local and personal succession of Bishops (only or principally), but because it retaineth the faith and doctrine of the holy Apostles" (Bishop Fr. White, "Reply to Fisher," p. 64; London, 1624).

Bishop Bilson wrote: "Irenæus limiteth succession after the same manner that we do, noting succession to be nothing worth unless sound doctrine and holy conversation be thereunto joined. . . . We commend succession to exclude ambition and dissension in the Church of Christ, and in that respect we detest such as invade the pastoral function without lawful vocation and election" ("True Difference," pp. 268, 269; Oxford, 1585).

A Jesuit divine has said: "Sine veritate doctrinæ successio pastorum est exigui ponderis" (Gretser, "De Verb. Dei," lib. iv., cap. ix.). See Gibson's "Preservative," vol. xvi., p. 333; London, 1849. See also vol. iii., p. 216.

Bishop John Wordsworth, speaking of the succession, has recently

testimony to God's gift of Eternal Life, which Life is in His Son, the doctrine of the Holy Sriptures, and the faith once for all delivered unto the saints; the truth of the Gospel for which our fathers were content to lay down their lives; the doctrine of the one way of salvation, and the one Saviour, Who is Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and all in subservience to that higher bond of true union of which Lady Jane Grey wrote: "There is no unity except where Christ knitteth the knot among such as are His."

"The true notion of a Church," says Dean Sherlock, "is the *cœtus fidelium*, or the company, of the faithful—of those who profess the true faith of Christ and are united to Him by baptism. . . . It is not a separation from one another, but only a separation from Christ, which is a separation from the Catholic Church" (quoted from Goode's "Divine Rule," vol. ii., p. 331). There is here, no doubt, truth most important, though it may need to be guarded against misapprehension or misapplication. We may not, of course, infer that there is no such thing as a visible Church, or that there is no sin in wilful schismatical separation from a visible[1] bond of unity; but it is in "holding the Head" that all the members are knit together in one Living Body, which groweth the growth of God (Col. ii. 19; *cf.* Ephes. iv, 15, 16).

When Latimer heard one harping on unity, he answered: "Yea, sir, but in verity, not in popery" (Ridley's Works, p. 121, P.S.). And so Ridley declared: "As for unity . . . I do believe it and embrace it, so it be with verity" (*ibid.*, p. 158). And so Bradford: "It [the Word] alloweth not unity, except it be in verity" ("Sermons," etc., p. 394, P.S.).

---

said: "Its objects are the maintenance of internal order in the communities, and of truth and of general unity in the Church at large; and these three are the permanent objects for which we ought to maintain the succession" ("Ministry of Grace," pp. 145, 146).

See especially Bishop Pearson's Minor Theological Works, vol. ii., pp. 307-310; edit. Churton, Oxford, 1844.

See also Laud's "Conference with Fisher," pp. 320-325 (Oxford, 1839), especially p. 322.

[1] "As those everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness belong to the mystical Church; even so, on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church in like sort is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end" (Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," book iii., ch. i., § 3; Works, vol. i., p. 339; edit. Keble).

"If they break the bond of unity, whereby the body of the Church is coupled and knit in one, as they do which wilfully forsake all external communion with saints in holy exercises purely and orderly established in the Church, this is to separate themselves by schism" (*ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 671).

And so Archbishop Sandys: "What a concord is that which is at strife with Christ? Unity must be in verity" ("Sermons," p. 95, P.S.). One of the ancient godly Fathers (not unfrequently quoted by the Reformers) says (they are words to be well pondered): "Speciosum quidem nomen est pacis, et pulcra est opinio unitatis: sed quis ambigat eam solam ecclesiæ et evangeliorum unitatem pacem esse, quæ Christi est?" He goes on to speak of those (he has in view Arian heretics): "Qui pace sua, id est, impietatis suæ unitate se jactant, agentes se non ut Episcopos Christi, sed Antichristi sacerdotes" ("Hilarii Pictavensis," Op. Col., 1263; edit. Ben., Paris, 1693).[1]

It was well said by the late Bishop Christopher Wordsworth in a treatise which may well be commended at this time to the study of English Churchmen: "Doubtless there is a unity when everything in Nature is wrapped in the gloom of night and bound with the chains of sleep. Doubtless there is a unity when the earth is congested with frost, and mantled in a robe of snow. Doubtless there is a unity when the human voice is still, the hand motionless, the breath suspended, and the human frame is locked in the iron grasp of Death. And doubtless there is a unity when men surrender their reason, and sacrifice their liberty, and stifle their conscience, and seal up Scripture, and deliver themselves captives, bound hand and foot, to the dominion of the Church of Rome. But this is not the unity of vigilance and light; it is the unity of sleep and gloom. It is not the unity of warmth and life; it is the unity of cold and death. It is not true unity, for it is not UNITY in the *Truth*" ("Union with Rome," pp. 78, 79, Longmans, 1899).

"That," says Hooker, "which linketh Christ to us is His mere mercy and love towards us. That which tieth us to Him is our faith in the promised salvation revealed in the Word of truth. That which uniteth and joineth us amongst ourselves, in such sort that we are now as if we had but one heart and one soul, is our love" (Sermon V., § 11; Works, vol. iii., p. 670; edit. Keble).

"S. Austen saith of the house of God, which is the Church, *It is founded by believing, erected by hoping, perfected by loving*" ("De Verbis. Apos. Serm. 22"): "noting these three to be the main parts in the building of God's house" (Bilson's "True Difference," p. 170, Oxford, 1585).

---

[1] Τηρεῖ τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ Πνευματος ὁ κατηρτισμένος τῷ αὐτῷ νοὶ, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας πρὸς τὸν πλησίον . . . τηρεῖται δὲ ἡ ἑνότης τοῦ Πνεύματος, τῆς ἀγάπης συνδεούσης τοὺς κατὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἑνουμένους, καὶ εἰς ἓν σῶμα αὐτοὺς συναγούσης τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Origen, in Cramer's "Catenæ," tom. vi., p. 165; Oxford, 1844

It is not for us to send men, under the conviction of sin and anxious about their souls and their salvation, to search diligently among ancient records to satisfy themselves as to doubtful or disputed links in a chain of Episcopal continuity, that they may join a communion in which they may certainly rest in assurance of sacramental grace received through duly ordained and validly consecrated channels. We are not supposing—we would not seem to suggest—that any would dare thus to deal with an awakened soul. God forbid! How could it be for those who know the grace of a personal, living, loving, exalted Saviour? But it may be well for us to be warned against the danger of seeming to point along the way that might lead towards any such an unhappy result.

The Church is no intermediary (save in the most subservient sense) between the soul and the Saviour. The minister of Christ is no mediator between God and man.

It is surely not without its significance that the first Apostolic injunction solemnly laid on one of the first Apostolic Bishops was to charge some that they teach no other doctrine, neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith (1 Tim. i. 4).

It is indeed true, and a truth which was recognised of old time, and needs to be fully recognised at this time, that the true Apostolic succession is primarily the succession of Apostolic doctrine and testimony, the testimony by which we may have fellowship with the Apostles in their fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ (1 John i. 2, 3).

If this is so, why should we shrink from giving our approval to the decision of Archbishop Ussher: "For the agreement or disagreement in radical and fundamental doctrines; not the consonancy, or dissonancy in the particular points of ecclesiastical government is with me (and I hope with every man that mindeth peace) the rule of adhering to, or receding from the Communion of any Church"? (See Elrington's "Life of Ussher," Appendix vii., p. cliii.)[1]

Nevertheless, it is not for us to make light of visible unity, or Apostolic ordering, or the reality of Apostolic commission. So did not St. Paul, who began his Epistle on the power of

[1] These words are taken from a private note-book written by Ussher, it appears, "not many months before his death." A previous clause in the same paper contains the words: "Yet, on the other side, holding as I do that a Bishop hath superiority in degree above Presbyters, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such Presbyters as have severed themselves from their Bishops, cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical" (see pp. clii, cliii, cliv).

the Gospel, by claiming for himself to be "called to be an Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God" (Rom. i. 1).

Let me venture here to draw attention to the "Memorandum" of the Church Missionary Society "On the Constitution of Churches in the Mission-Field" (Report for 1901, pp. 581-588), which may well be commended to the consideration of all whose thoughts are being exercised upon such subjects as these.

The following wise words are specially worthy of consideration: "It is desirable that the Episcopate of the future Churches should be characterized by the simplicity of the Primitive Church" (p. 583). "The welfare of the Church will be most effectually promoted by the corporate unity and co-operation of all its members, of whatever race, each race contributing of its national and spiritual gifts for the edification of the One Body" (p. 535).

"This Memorandum is necessarily based on the assumption that the Church of England will remain loyal to Holy Scripture and to Apostolic Christianity, retaining the position, at once Catholic and Protestant, to which, putting away medieval accretions, it reverted at the Reformation; and that its daughter Churches forming the Anglican Communion will, in close connection with the Mother Church, be kept equally faithful. At the same time, even within these limits, a great national Church, and still more a world-wide federation of sister and daughter Churches, is necessarily comprehensive; and in such a comprehensive Church there is certain to be diversity of opinion and even risk of error. With a view, therefore, to the firm maintenance of Scriptural doctrine, and of spiritual principles in ecclesiastical affairs, in the native sections of the existing Churches, and in the independent and predominantly Native Churches of the future, it is important that the Church Missionary Society should take its part, both at home and (by its representatives and missionaries) abroad, in all diocesan and other movements directed towards the development of the Church in its mission-fields, and thus be able to exercise its just influence, in a fair and Christian spirit, for the advocacy of the principles it holds dear. In like manner, while the missionaries should more and more be relieved from the pastoral care of converts, and be free to give themselves to their proper work of evangelizing the heathen, it is important that their personal influence—so distinct from official control—should not be lost to the Native Christians, but be earnestly and wisely exercised in fostering among them the same spiritual and evangelical principles. Important as is the ecclesiastical organization discussed in this Memorandum, the maintenance of the truth of the Gospel in the

Native Christian communities is of far greater importance; and the Church Missionary Society would be unworthy of the position in which, in the providence of God, it has been placed, if it did not do all in its power, at all times and in all circumstances, to foster among the Native Christians who are the fruit of its labours a watchful spirit against error in doctrine or life, and unswerving loyalty to the supreme authority of the Word of God" (p. 588).

We may thankfully recognise here, as it seems to me, not only words of godly counsel, but a faithful adherence to the principles of the English Reformation—principles which should guide us, not because they are Anglican, but because, as English Churchmen, we believe them to be true.

And we may fitly close this paper by citing the Articles adopted by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 as "supplying a basis" for reunion:

"1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as 'containing all things necessary to salvation,' and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

"2. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

"3. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

"4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church."

Assuredly we may ask that the hearts of the Lord's people may be united in prayer and supplication that, in obedience to the words "Go ye into all the world" and "Love one another," we may find in our missionary work at home and abroad, while we seek not the spread of Anglicanism, but the salvation of souls—remembering "Whatever He saith unto you do it"—that we shall have poured out upon us a blessing and a power—a Divine Power before which our unhappy divisions will break down, and our feet be so guided in the way of peace that men may look on and say, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

It is for the true sons of the Church of England thankfully to maintain and faithfully to defend our precious inheritance of primitive faith and Apostolical order. But we need not fear that we shall be laying down our Churchmanship or opening our hearts to too wide a sympathy if we learn to say: "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

It was to a Church sorely tempted and tried, and weakened by the working of a spirit of disunion, that the Apostle Paul wrote two Epistles of faithful and loving rebuke and exhortation, concluding with these words of encouragement: "Finally, brethren, farewell: be perfect (*καταρτίζεσθε*), be of good comfort, be of one mind (*τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε*), live in peace (*εἰρηνεύετε*), and the God of love and peace shall be with you" (2 Cor. xiii. 11).

N. DIMOCK.

ART. V.—"THE INTEGRITY OF SCRIPTURE."[1]

THE history of the world is the judgment of the world. The history of opinion is the judgment of opinion. "Securus judicat orbis terrarum." This is the truth that underlies a maxim which neither leads to the conviction of the infallibility of world-judgment nor yet to Rome. How often have we been told in the course of the present Old Testament controversy that it touched nothing, altered nothing, which a Christian holds, or ought to hold, dearer than his life? We can preach the Old Testament so much better. We breathe so much more freely in an atmosphere of pure truth. There is an old-fashioned ring about the assurance. It takes us back some years. "Strauss," we were told, "admitted the statements of the Gospel to be true; he only denied that they were historically true"—a distinction, of course, only of importance to the incompetent, the uncritical, the uncultured. Let us continue the quotation. "Strange as it may seem, it did not occur to Strauss that by such a theory he put himself beyond the pale of the Church. It did not occur to him that by the profession of such views he was called upon in honour to resign his office as a Christian minister. On the contrary, he endeavours to reduce to a minimum the difference between the historical believer and the mythical believer. His reasoning amounts to this: An evangelical preacher selects, perhaps, for the subject of his discourse the narrative of Christ walking on the sea. He begins by a reference to the outward circumstances of the case, and by a description of the scene, and an enumeration of the external incidents. Yet upon these, even the evangelical preacher does not long linger. He speedily passes on to derive suggestions from the outward picture, to spiritualize the narrative into practical lessons for every day, to

[1] "The Integrity of Scripture: Plain Reasons for Rejecting the Critical Hypothesis," by the Rev. John Smith, D.D., Broughton Place Church, Edinburgh. Hodder and Stoughton; 1902.

show that there is always an Infinite presence even amidst the sea of human trouble, and how, by surrendering our souls to that presence, there is always heard the still small voice, 'Peace, be still.' The mythical preacher proclaims the same Gospel, with this one difference, that what the evangelical minister calls practical lessons derived from the subject, the mythical preacher calls the subject itself. To him the spiritual influences of the passage are the primary truths. These truths are not derived from the history, it is the history that is derived from them; the outward incident is only a poetical representation of Eternal truth. And so the mythical preacher passes over the historical reference, on which his evangelical brother dwells so lightly, and, without adverting at all to the outward circumstances of his text, he proceeds at once to unfold its spiritual import."[1]

But the clear understanding foresaw the issue. The spiritual must have its basis in outward fact to be strong enough to resist the hard facts of life. Without this basis in fact, it vanishes without power and without comfort. The mythical theory was scientifically false. It handled cruelly the highest instinct of humanity, which is a thirst for the living God, which no revived and revised Gnosticism can satisfy. It was the broad road that led to intellectual destruction. And the clear understanding of Strauss was forced along this road. Hear the lucid words of his later pronouncement: "Things had not as yet come to such a pass, but it needed no extraordinary acumen to foresee that they soon would do so, when one gifted, perhaps, with but too much acumen, when Schleiermacher propounded his system of 'theology.' He resigned himself from the first to the possible necessity of yielding the point of the genuineness of the greater part of the Biblical writings, after having of his own accord surrendered that of the traditional conception of Jewish history, as well as that of primitive Christianity. For him, no less than for the Rationalists, the historical and dogmatic value of the Biblical account of creation, and the fall of man was null, and like them also, *only with rather better taste*,[2] he knew how, on purely rational grounds, to explain the miracles recorded in the Gospels, not excluding the cardinal one of the resurrection of Christ. Neither did he retain the original sense of the Christian dogmas, the difference consisting only in the greater ingenuity, but sometimes also the more artificial character, of his interpretations. Of one article of belief only did he keep firm hold, and that certainly the central dogma of

[1] "Aids to the Study of German Theology," 1874, p. 138.
[2] The italics are our own.

Christianity—the doctrine regarding the person of Christ. In this instance, the well-meaning, didactic, and itinerant rabbi of the Rationalists was almost too insignificant—I might say too prosaic—for him. He believed himself able to prove that Christ had played a more important, a more exceptional part. But whence obtain these proofs, if, after all, so little reliance could be placed on the Gospels ?"

And then comes the conclusion of all this in the clear, relentless understanding : " And now, methinks, we have reached the end. And the result ? Our answer to the question, Are we still Christians ? Shall I still give a distinct statement, and place the sum total of the foregoing in round numbers under the account ? Most unnecessary, I should say ; but I would not, on any consideration, appear to shirk even the most unpalatable word. My conviction, therefore, is, if we would not evade difficulties or put forced constructions upon them, if we would have our yea, yea, and our nay, nay —in short, if we would speak as honest, upright men—we must acknowledge we are no longer Christians."[1]

And these are his words upon his death-bed to his pious daughter : " What your father has done will live for ever, but his personality will for ever cease to be."[2]

This, then, is the end in a clear intellect of generations of sophistical ingenuity and one-sided elaboration. We are left once more " without God and without hope in the world." Only the darkness which closes in and can be felt is more cruel for the light shut out—Christ, our hope, expunged, eternal life gone.

We see from this instructive example the necessary path of the clear understanding, when we have paid, as, we have lately been told we must pay, the indemnity to a so-called science that, with the most praiseworthy diligence, saws away the branch on which it sits. Christianity has a body in fact, as well as a soul in spiritual reality. That this body is instinct and breathing with life (we are reminded by the powerful and useful book, which we are called upon to review), that this body is a living body is part of the true scientific proof of the reality of our religion. To say the soul will live after the body is dead is in this world to say nonsense. We Christians have a right, a historic, grave right, to say to those who play with a light heart with the instruments of a confessedly one-sided, biassed criticism, whither does all this tend ?

---

[1] " The Old Faith and the New : a Confession," by David Friedrich Strauss, 1874, pp. 47, 107.

[2] Quoted in Pierson's " Seed Thoughts," p. 109.

This question is no question of the academic reputation of scholars, be they great or be they small, our author again reminds us. Still less is it, we agree, in the least a matter for prosecutions or heated, narrow-minded partizanship. We have had too much of this, and suffer from its reactions. But it *is* an exceedingly grave issue that must be fought out. The whole Church, shaken and disturbed to its foundations, must judge. It is a question of the truth and certainty of the things wherein we have been instructed, wherein we instruct—for the parallel to which we have sought to call the attention of our readers does not stop where we left it. To use the words of Strauss just quoted: "A few years ago things had not as yet come to such a pass, but it needed no extraordinary acumen to foresee that they would soon do so." A few years ago we had no psalms of David in the Psalter; no intelligible influence of Moses on the law; the prophets without prophecy; Abraham and Moses receding into folk-lore; no fall, but an ascent of man; no work of God discernible to the clear understanding. But now, without a single protest from anyone, as leaders of the van of a victorious army, these intellectual stalwarts have advanced from the ruins of the Old Testament into the sanctuary of the New. We are told we have only a few sayings of our Lord in the Gospels to rest our hope upon, and why these? If it is a matter of mere critical acumen, and not historical fact, why these? Our Lord's priesthood "after the order of Melchizedeck" is "mere temporary rhetoric." "We possess no Epistles of Paul; the writings which bear his name are pseudepigrapha." We find from the less responsible murmurs of the rising tide that the Incarnation is uncertain, the Virgin birth is untenable or not to be pressed, the descent of the Spirit never took place at Pentecost, the baptismal covenant is a later invention.[1] And all this and the like fatuous nonsense is pressed upon us with scarcely any protest from any man in the sacred names of science and of truth. By whom? By clergymen of the Church of England, by ministers of religion. And when the working clergyman finds the power of his message evacuated in the name of religion, and its presentation impossible—when he feels himself ready to cry with the poet, "Quo, quo, scelesti, ruitis?"—he is told by those who have accepted the principle, but do not quite like all the inferences, or who are sitting on the hedge, that there is no place in this matter for his illiberal ignorance. All he has to do is to pay the indemnity and to leave to the fine intelligence of experts his spiritual direction.

[1] See, for instance, the "Encyclopædia Biblica," and "Contentio Veritatis," *passim*.

We are glad that there are some, at least, like Dr. Smith, of Broughton Place Church, Edinburgh, who have the courage not to think so. This matter touches to the quick national life, the faithfulness and existence of the Church, the work of missions. It is no plaything for experts to build their reputation upon. Is this the time, we ask, as we look round upon the flock, and the lambs of the flock, and their hard, inevitable struggle—is this the time for those in high places, without protest, to weaken the power of religious convictions, to strike at the Divinity of the Commandments, to obscure the very person of Christ? If this is the truth, let it slay us. Let truth and reason prevail; let the Church and Christianity perish—perish with lamentation, but still perish. If we are without chart and compass still, adrift from all ancient moorings, cut away from the Catholic faith and the martyr's power, we say with our author and at once, if the truth compel it, let it be so. We will face the truth like men. But it is too late, with the fatal history of opinion before us, to say that we can still derive excellent sermons from the Old Testament, though it be only an unhistorical graft upon a natural development, and that the criticism at present accepted by many touches nothing, alters nothing, only improves. The clear understanding will never accept this proposition.

It is the great merit of Dr. Smith's work that he reasserts forcefully that the feeling of Divinity, which the Old Testament inspires and always has inspired, reinstates its historical worth. As Dr. Smith says so well, we do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. A Jahveh who at one time stood level with Chemosh, and was transmuted by the prophets, and later by the priests, into the God of heaven and earth, and clothed with a garment of fiction and a garniture of legend, is not, and cannot be, the Jahveh whose name rings true from the first page of the Old Testament to the last. There can be no natural development where there is a natural impossibility. The seed is of the same nature as the product. From gross, corrupt, superstitious idolatry no true Divinity ever can, nor ever did, proceed. History is the evidence. If all nations, as we are told, were advancing from the germ of foul and evil superstition to the fruit and bloom of the knowledge of God, why is it that nations better equipped with culture than little Israel never achieved it and never came near it? Why should a mission be imposed upon the Church? That God spake in many parts and many manners to the Fathers by the prophets, of whom Moses was one and Abraham another, and that the history of men and of thought moved on through a noble progression of increasing revelation to the Incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is as intelligible as it is

credible and interesting; but that the Creator slipped into the theology of Israel in the midst of fiction and legend, we don't well know how or when, is a criticism which we should contend is demonstrably untrue to the body of Hebrew history and literature, but which gives no rational account at all of the soul and spirit that palpably inspires its lowest levels.

We are told in a passage which Dr. Smith quotes from a critic of note that "For over a century, every relevant science, every temper of faith, and, one might add, almost every school of philosophy, have shot across this narrow field their opposing light, under which there has been an expenditure of labour and ingenuity greater than has been devoted to any other literature of the ancient world, or to any other period in the history of religion."[1] We answer, if this statement is intended to convey that all this labour is concentrated in one only direction, it is plainly misleading. Much of the labour has set on a steady foundation facts which are directly counter to the prevailing hypothesis. It is only those, who occupy a height of intelligence which is superior to recognising any labour which in the least contradicts or modifies the views they favour, who would affect to deny this. Much, again, of this labour has greatly cleared our understanding of the sacred record, and will remain useful to all time. But the labour directed to establish the hypothesis that pure, everlasting religion was grafted by a fiction upon a merely natural development has been exceedingly small, if any at all. Our author has well spent more labour on this than they all. This, which is the central point of the whole matter, is taken, as a rule, for granted at the outset without argument, or established by a sneer. Besides, labour is no criterion of truth.[2] The traditions of the Elders, which culminated in the Mishna, were built up by the stupendous labour of generations. The edifice of the scholastic philosophy, which stood in the way of true science for generations, was abundantly laborious, and was fortified by general consent. It were no reason that what has taken thousands of generations to build up into the fear and love of God could be pulled down in an hour by an epigram.

But though differing apparently in our understanding of the facts of this century of labour, we should like to cite the remarks of Dr. Smith which follow this quotation, with cordial agreement as to their spirit. "We do not wonder," proceeds Dr. Smith, "that there should be

[1] "The Integrity of Scripture," p. 110.

[2] A philological aptitude and an eminent capacity for cataloguing facts and opinions are no guarantee for a large-hearted lucidity of thinking.

a jealousy of the results of such enormous labour. And we hope that we shall never be left to ourselves to speak or write with any other feeling than that of respect for high character, extensive erudition, patient research, and an honest pursuit of truth, whatever our opinion of the results may be. On the other hand, the critics must not for a moment suppose that we are to accept blindly what they give. There is a tone manifest in their reference to the common Christian judgment which, in the interests of truth, not to speak of good feeling, cannot be too strongly reprobated. What the Christian people shall say, what the Christian people shall judge, is discounted for them beforehand by those whose work has to be pronounced upon, with a scarcely veiled contempt. In a sentence of his recent volume which is most likely to live, Professor G. Adam Smith allows the Church of Christ, with whom abides His Spirit, no liberty of judgment, but only the forced payment of the critically fixed indemnity. Again, when he has eliminated from the history of the patriarchs everything beyond the smallest 'substratum of actual personal history,' he flouts the conscience of myriads of believing men, to whom such statements raise many difficult questions not easy of solution, with light queries like these: 'But who wants to be sure of more? Who needs to be sure of more?' Canon Cheyne, too, is prone to lecture us on 'what Conservatives want, or ought to want.' In all this there is a misunderstanding of their position. The critics are the plaintiffs, not the judges, and they must learn to respect the bar at which they plead. Now that their case is drawn up and stated, there is legitimate and large room for practical consideration, not merely of their theory and its self-consistency, but of how it stands related to ordinary probability, the laws of evidence, and the character of the religion whose origins they would explain."

The volume before us has done this task well with regard to the whole field of that theoretical and biassed criticism, which at present it is sought increasingly to impose on us as victorious all along the line. The issue is shown to be grave; the historical view of the Old Testament held heretofore to be great, worthy, and steadfast; the critical explanation to be unnatural and impossible. "Could a revelation," it is asked, "which has searched generations of men with the fire of God, and has exposed, and still exposes, every form of unrighteousness, be itself a sham, pervaded by a self-witness which is a lie, built of legend, fancy, tradition, by art and man's device?"[1] We are persuaded that no Christian man of clear under-

[1] "The Integrity of Scripture," p. 144.

standing will in the end tolerate that the truth by which he lives is the unnatural and hybrid development which some criticism has presented.

We thank the author for the courage which prompted him to write this book; we hope that his example will stir up an increase of courage in others before it is too late. The victorious prevalence of these opinions means the sterility of the Church. The majority of men will not accept the imperious claims of a religion resting on such a basis. We greatly appreciate the large-minded tone and temper of this book; and we devoutly hope that in these troubled times many who have read one side, impressed by the glamour of a fascinating but pernicious theory, will in fairness read the other; and that those Christian men who have set themselves to be protagonists of the critical position may be induced to give a kinder and more serious consideration to so powerful a protest, lest at any time they should be found to have destroyed the work of God, and even the weak brother perish for whom Christ died. It was not a triumph when the world woke up to find itself Arian. F. Ernest Spencer.

Art. VI.—TIGLATHPILESER, KING OF BABYLON—THE KEY TO ISAIAH XIII. 1 TO XIV. 27.—I.

Of the different oracles concerning heathen nations, which form the third part of the Book of Isaiah, the Burden of Babylon is of especial interest, not only on account of the striking sublimity of the *māshāl* or "parable" contained in it, but also because of the problem which it presents as to authorship and the circumstances under which it was written; for if this "burden" can be proved to be from the pen of Isaiah, then something is done to substantiate the unity of authorship of the entire book, seeing that Isa. xiv. 1, 2 contains, as Delitzsch observes, chaps. xlvi. to lxvi. *in nuce*. I shall endeavour to show that the solution of this problem can now be obtained from the testimony of undoubted historical facts. All, indeed, is not clear nor can it be, so long as our knowledge of Babylonian history remains in its present fragmentary condition; but enough evidence has come to hand to enable us to credit the prophet Isaiah with a prophecy strikingly Isaianic in the terms employed,[1] enough to explain the main outlines of that prophecy, its fulfilment, and even the date of its composition.

[1] See additional note 1 at the close of this article.

Let me say at the outset that the solution which I am about to give is not original. So long ago as the year 1874 the late Sir Edward Strachey, in his work on "Jewish History and Politics in the times of Sargon and Sennacherib," expressed his belief that the King of Babylon against whom the "parable" of Isaiah (chap. xiv.) was hurled was a King of Assyria. Admitting the difficulty arising from the fact that in previous chapters Israel's oppressor is called the King of Assyria, whilst he is here styled the King of Babylon, Sir Edward observes that Isaiah's authority for any historical fact is as good as that of any other record of his times, and that the absence of direct confirmation ought not to throw doubt on the genuineness of the prophetic allusions to a fact probable in itself and uncontradicted.[1] It will be my part to show that the "direct confirmation" which was lacking at the time when Sir Edward Strachey wrote is now obtainable. The contemporary cuneiform inscriptions prove that at the very time when, from its position in his book, Isaiah may be supposed to have written this prophecy,[2] an event of great importance had happened in Western Asia—a mighty conqueror, who in the first instance had usurped the throne of Assyria, had just succeeded in establishing his power in Babylon, so that for the first time in the history of Assyria her King was the acknowledged master of the two thrones, and could, and did, hold his Court both at Nineveh and Babylon.

It will be necessary, however, in the first place to explain the position which Babylon occupied in the then political world. In Isaiah's days, as the cuneiform inscriptions show, there were, from a political point of view, two Babylons—a Chaldean Babylon and an Assyrian Babylon. The former of these was inclined to be friendly to Israel, the latter hostile. Chaldea itself—*i.e.*, the low country which stretches south-east from Babylon to the head of the Persian Gulf—was divided into several small kingdoms, and the possession of the ancient, sacred city was a much-coveted prize in the eyes of the Chaldean kinglets. These facts gathered from the contemporary inscriptions correspond exactly with the terms in which Babylon is described in Isa. xiii. 19—

> "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms,
> The beauty of the Chaldeans' pride"[3]—

---

[1] See "Jewish History and Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib," p. 166.

[2] On the chronological sequence of the earlier part of the Book of Isaiah see some remarks by the late George Smith in the *Transactions* of the Society of Biblical Archæology, vol. ii., p. 328.

[3] All quotations are from the Revised Version.

in which passage, as the parallelism suggests, the "kingdoms" spoken of are the petty Chaldean States. Further, when Babylon was not in the hands of the Chaldeans, it was in the hands of the Assyrians, until after one or two fluctuations it fell entirely under the Assyrians in B.C. 689, during the reign of Sennacherib, and remained under them till B.C. 625, when the Chaldeans again obtained the ascendancy in the person of Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, and remained masters of the sacred city down to the time of Cyrus, B.C. 540.[1]

Now, the great tyrant of Isaiah's "parable" was clearly no petty Chaldean King, but a world-ruler, before whom all opposing powers had gone down, a "man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof; that let not loose his prisoners to their home."[2] Supposing, then, the prophet to be writing in the days of Ahaz, as is suggested by the note of time at the commencement of his next "burden,"[3] and to have before his mind some ruler then living, it is clear that the only monarch who at all answers to the description given is the same great King, concerning whom he has already uttered several predictions in chaps. vi. to x.—viz., Tiglathpileser, King of Assyria. Let us inquire, then, how far the history of those times warrants such an identification.

Tiglathpileser III. was a usurper,[4] who mounted the throne of Assyria in B.C. 745, at a time when that great military empire was torn asunder by civil dissensions and was altogether at a very low ebb. The usurper's proper name was Pul.[5] The name Tiglathpileser was assumed by him after a great and powerful monarch, who had sat on the throne of Assyria half a century before the time of David. The first Tiglathpileser is described by Professor Sayce as "the central figure of the Old Empire, towering above his fellows on the Assyrian throne." By the assumption, then, of this name the usurper intended, doubtless, to ingratiate himself with his Assyrian subjects. To the Babylonians, however, the name could not be equally pleasing, for Tiglathpileser I. had defeated one of their Kings, Merodach-nadin-akhi, and had even captured Babylon. When, then, he presently became their master they preferred to call him by his original name, Pul.

---

[1] I hope in a subsequent paper to be able to show the truthfulness of the above description as to the position occupied by Babylon.

[2] Isa. xiv. 16, 17.

[3] *Ibid.*, 28.

[4] Hence in the Second Dynastic Tablet no dynasty is attached to his name, any more than to that of Sargon ("Records of the Past," New Series, vol. i., p. 18).

[5] On the Second Dynastic Tablet he is called "Pulu"; in Ptolemy's Canon, "Poros"; while Berosus styles him "Phulus, rex Chaldæorum."

Our usurper having seized the reins of power, the Assyrian Empire, under his vigorous and politic rule, at once started up into fresh life, and became active and aggressive, as was ever its wont in prosperous days. The new reign was only six months old when the Sovereign went on his first campaign "to the country of the rivers,"[1] *i.e.*, to Chaldea, which lies on the lower reaches of the Euphrates and Tigris and other smaller streams. This region was soon conquered and laid under tribute. Even Kardunias, the district round Babylon, was subdued; but the Assyrian King did not attempt to remove Nabonassar, the Chaldean Sovereign who then occupied the throne of Babylon. After this first campaign followed a career of uninterrupted conquest, chiefly in the North and West. Arpad fell after a three years' siege in B.C. 740. Hamath, which was in alliance with Azariah of Judah, was defeated and partially annexed in the same year. In B.C. 738 took place the expedition against Calno,[2] and in that same year Menahem of Samaria and Rezin of Damascus are mentioned as tributaries, along with the Kings of Hamath and Carchemish and divers other potentates. This was no doubt the result of the campaign referred to in 2 Kings xv. 19. The great King was not again in the West till B.C. 734, when he undertook the campaign described in the Chronicle as "to Philistia." On this occasion he carried his arms as far south as Gaza, on the confines of Egypt. About this time, or a little later, Pekah was slain, and Hoshea placed on the throne of Israel. Rezin of Syria was also slain, and in B.C. 732 Damascus was taken by the Assyrians after a two years' resistance. To this city Ahaz of Judah and several tributary Kings came in the same year to pay their homage.

Being thus master of the whole West country up to the very borders of Egypt, Tiglathpileser was now able to turn his attention to Babylon at a very opportune moment. Nabonassar had died in B.C. 733, and in the two short years which had elapsed since his death the throne of Babylon had changed hands three times, the present occupant being the ruler of the petty Chaldean State of Beth-Amukkan. Tiglathpileser saw and seized the opportunity. In B.C. 731 he overran three of the small Chaldean States "like a deluge wave, and reduced them to heaps and ruins."[3] The other three, including Bit-

[1] See the Assyrian Chronicle for the year B.C. 745, where the correct reading is: "On the thirteenth day of the month Iyyar Tiglathpileser seated himself on the throne; in the month Tisri he marched to the country of the rivers."

[2] See Isa. x. 9, and compare the Assyrian Chronicle for B.C. 738: "He captures the city of Kullani."

[3] Clay Tablet Inscription, line 25.

Jakin, the hereditary principality of Merodach Baladan, saved themselves by a timely tribute. Whether Tiglathpileser was actually master of Babylon in B.C. 731 is uncertain, but, in any case, he had achieved that position by B.C. 729, in which year we find him in the sacred city engaging in a solemn religious ceremony of great political importance, known as "taking the hands of Bel."[1] Bel-Merodach was the patron god of Babylon. By "taking the hands of Bel," the Assyrian Kings had their claim to be overlords of Babylon acknowledged by the powerful Babylonian priesthood. It was in this same year (B.C. 729) that the important inscription on the Clay Tablet from Nimrûd was written.[2] That inscription opens with the following list of titles: "Tiglathpileser, the great King, the mighty King, the King of nationalities, the King of Assyria, *the King of Babylon*, the King of Sumer and Accad" (*i.e.*, Southern and Northern Babylonia), etc. Now, with regard to this title *sar Babili*, "King of Babylon," which appears again on Slab Inscription No. 2, it is a remarkable fact that no other Assyrian King, as far as we know, ever ventured to assume it. Even the great Sargon, who in B.C. 709 also "took the hands of Bel," and his grandson Esarhaddon, the rebuilder of Babylon, who raised the city from a state of utter desolation, were both of them content with the more modest title *sakkanak Babili*, "Viceroy of Babylon," *i.e.*, Viceroy of the god Bel-Merodach. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the title *sar Babili* was borne by those Sovereigns, who, like Merodach Baladan, Samas-sum-ukin, the son of Esarhaddon, and the great Nebuchadnezzar, actually lived and reigned in Babylon. The presumption, then, is that Tiglathpileser not merely held his Court at Babylon for a short time, but that he actually took up his abode there during the closing years of his reign, or, at any rate, made it his southern Ecbatana, if one may so say. Such an inference is borne out by the short, significant statement, "the King took the hands of Bel," being repeated in the Assyrian Chronicle for the two successive years B.C. 729 and 728.[3]

Let us now imagine ourselves in the world of Western Asia at this eventful period. What is the great political feature that would fix itself on the mind of a statesman-prophet like Isaiah? Would it not be the towering ascendancy of this mighty usurper, who has achieved what no other Assyrian King had ever done before, viz., to make himself master of

---

[1] See the Assyrian Chronicle for B.C. 729.

[2] For the chief inscriptions of Tiglathpileser see note 2 at the end of this article.

[3] See "Records of the Past," New Series.

the two thrones—the throne of Assyria and the throne of Babylon.[1] So, then, when the prophet utters his sublime "parable" against this ambitious potentate, by what name shall he call him? Shall he call him "King of Assyria"? He doubtless would have done so in B.C. 734, but in B.C. 729 he will style him by his last and greatest achievement. On the Clay Tablet, indeed, brought from an Assyrian palace, the title "King of Assyria" naturally takes precedence of the title "King of Babylon"; but the world at large, and in all probability the usurper himself, would think most of the latter title, for Babylon was both the mother city and the sacred city, and as such enjoyed a prestige to which Assyria could lay no claim. Further, the throne of Assyria was not the hereditary patrimony of Tiglathpileser; to his ambitious mind it may only have appeared as a stepping-stone to the throne of Babylon. That early expedition "to the country of the rivers" is very suggestive, and seems to indicate that he had his eye on Babylon from the first, and designed to tread in the steps of Tiglathpileser I., whose name he had assumed. On these grounds, then, it seems to me most natural that Isaiah in his lofty "parable" should style the usurper "King of Babylon" rather than "King of Assyria." But when we note that this "parable" itself forms part of the Burden of Babylon, it at once becomes evident that the prophet could not have used any other title. In a prophecy uttered against Babylon it would clearly be most incongruous to address her monarch as "King of Assyria," even although that country were under his sway, and had witnessed the first rise of his power.

But though the usurper is very properly, and of necessity, styled "King of Babylon," there is yet a remarkable indication in the burden that he is in some way connected with Assyria. The "parable" which forms the close of the burden concludes with a twofold asseveration uttered in the name of "the LORD of hosts."[2] Then immediately, without any break or the mention of any fresh "burden," the prophet predicts a catastrophe presently to overtake the Assyrian in Jehovah's land, and upon His mountains, introducing into his prediction the same twofold asseveration, only in yet stronger terms:

[1] Paul Rost, in his valuable work "Die Keilschrifttexte Tiglatpileser's III.," speaks of this monarch as "The first Assyrian King who was also King of Babylon." Tukulti-Ninip, who reigned over Assyria *circa* B.C. 1275, and whose name, curiously enough, is an equivalent of the name Tiglathpileser (= my trust is in the son of the Sharra temple, *i.e.*, the god Ninip), did indeed hold Babylonia in subjection for seven years, but cannot be said to have occupied the throne of Babylon in the same sense as Tiglathpileser III.

[2] Isa. xiv. 22, 23.

"The LORD of hosts hath sworn," "The LORD of hosts hath purposed."[1] Thus, the tragic overthrow of the Assyrian in the Holy Land, which received its fulfilment in the destruction of Sennacherib's host, is, so to say, appended as a postscript to the downfall of the King of Babylon, a thing inexplicable unless there had existed at the time such a union of the thrones of Babylon and Assyria as that which I have just traced.

But what evidence have we that Isaiah's Burden of Babylon was uttered during that short period in which the usurper reigned in Babylon? The evidence is as follows: Immediately after the remarkable postscript at which we have just glanced, occurs another "burden," or oracle, against Philistia, introduced by a valuable note of time, "In the year that King Ahaz died was this burden. Rejoice not, O Philistia, all of thee, because the rod that smote thee is broken,"[2] etc. This oracle, then, was uttered in the death-year of Ahaz. Now, Ahaz must have died in B.C. 727, the same year as Tiglathpileser; for the fall of Samaria, which is known from contemporary sources to have happened in B.C. 722, took place in the sixth year of his successor, Hezekiah.[3] Further, this oracle of the death-year of Ahaz must have been uttered *before* the death of that King, otherwise it would have been dated the first year of Hezekiah. Who, then, was "the rod that smote" Philistia, and which is stated to be already "broken"? Clearly not Ahaz, for he was still living; but rather that great King, master of the two thrones, concerning whom the prophet declares in his parable, "The LORD hath broken the staff of the wicked, the sceptre," or *rod*—it is the same word as in xiv. 29—"of the rulers, that smote the peoples in wrath with a continual stroke."[4] But did Tiglathpileser smite Philistia? Yes; as noted above, the entry in the Chronicle for B.C. 734 is "To Philistia," and the great King tells us, in his sadly obliterated annals, how in that year Hanun of Gaza fled to Egypt before the Assyrian arms, and how his gods and his treasure were carried off to Assyria, and his land annexed. This was only a beginning of woes for Philistia, for in B.C. 720 this same Hanun was defeated by Sargon, and carried off captive to Assyria. Zedekiah of Ashkelon suffered the same fate at the hands of Sennacherib. Ashdod was taken by Sargon, Ekron by Sennacherib. Thus, all the four principal cities of Philistia—for Gath was now no more—were to suffer from the Assyrian scourge. The prophet, therefore, warns Philistia not to conclude that the trouble is all over, because

---

[1] Isa. xiv. 24, 27.
[2] *Ibid.*, 29.
[3] 2 Kings xviii. 10.
[4] Isa. xiv. 5, 6.

one tyrant "rod" is broken, for there are others about to spring up from that same masterful race, who will lay their strong hand upon her: "Out of the serpent's root shall come forth a basilisk, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent."[1] Thus, the oracle against Philistia, written in B.C. 727, points very clearly to the death of Tiglathpileser as having just taken place; and from its position immediately after the Burden of Babylon, as well as from the similarity of the matter with which it deals, viz., the breaking of the "rod," which smites Philistia just as it smites "the peoples,"[2] teaches us to assign that burden to a slightly earlier date, and to regard it as a prediction of the sudden end of the all-powerful tyrant, and of wrath presently to be poured out on that famous city in which he had fixed his second capital.

According to the tenor of both these prophecies, the Burden of Babylon and that against Philistia, the tyrant's end both was to be, and actually was, sudden; the "rod" was "broken," snapped short. All the glory came to an end in a moment, like the fall of a star from heaven.[3] Further, we gather from the "parable" that the end was to come on the field of battle, and that the usurper's body would be left amid the carnage, dishonoured, unburied. "All the kings of the nations, all of them, sleep in glory, every one in his own house. But thou art cast forth away from thy sepulchre, like an abominable branch, clothed with the slain, that are thrust through with the sword, that go down to the stones of the pit, as a carcase trodden under foot. Thou shalt not be joined with them in burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, thou hast slain thy people."[4] That Tiglathpileser died in battle is rendered probable by the entry in the Assyrian Chronicle for the year B.C. 727: "Against the city of . . .[5] Shalmaneser seated himself on the throne." In the Babylonian Chronicle the reign and death of Tiglathpileser are set down as follows: "Tiglathpileser sat upon the throne in Babylon. In his second year Tiglathpileser died in the month Tebet. For [eighteen] years Tiglathpileser exercised the sovereignty over Accad and Assyria; for two years he reigned legitimately in Accad. On the 25th day of the month Tebet Shalmaneser sat upon the throne in Assyria."[6] The Assyrian word for "died" in the above is literally "met his fate." It tells us

---

[1] Isa. xiv. 29. [2] *Ibid.*, 6.

[3] *Ibid.*, 12. Note that Isa. xiv. 29 witnesses to the fulfilment of the prediction in Isa. xiv. 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, 18-20.

[5] The name is illegible. See "Records of the Past," New Series, vol. ii., p. 126.

[6] "Records of the Past," New Series, vol. i., p. 23.

nothing as to the manner of death, being used both of a peaceful death in the palace, like that of Nabonassar, or of one in war, like that of Tirhakah.

C. BOUTFLOWER.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. VII.—THE DISCOVERY OF JEWISH "MOLTEN IMAGES" AT DAN (JUDGES XVII., XVIII.).

STANDING in a glass case by themselves, and placed in a prominent position in the Musée Guimet in Paris, is a small collection of bronze figures, which cannot fail to attract the attention of even the most casual observer. Seven of them are archaic statuettes of purely Semitic type, but most remarkable in detail; another is labelled "a Stryge," and is noteworthy for its complex form; while the last is an exquisite little Greek figure of Aphrodite from Sidon, a relic of Greek art grafted upon Phœnician civilization. These much-valued treasures have only recently been added to the possessions of the Musée Guimet, and of them the seven little statuettes are of priceless value to the archæological world, being the first and only specimens as yet found of Jewish gods.

They were found by M. Durighello, a well-known Italian archæologist, upon the site of the city of Dan, and are the result of fifteen years patient working and waiting. It may well be said that only those who try to pursue archæological researches in the Ottoman dominions know the meaning and value of the verb "to wait"; these can conjugate it in every mood and tense, and with every inflexion of meaning which it is possible to read into it. Upon Tel-el-Kâdi, "the Hill of the Judge," did Durighello set his mind to excavate many years ago, knowing that there, beneath the tangle of shrubs and wild plants with which it is now overgrown, lay the sites of two super-imposed cities, the one Jewish—Dan—and the other Phœnician—Laish—and feeling certain that, could he but dig down into them, he must assuredly find among the ruins of the one and the ashes of the other some traces of the lives of their former occupants.

Of their former history we have an outline given us in the Book of Judges (xvii. and xviii.); but, apart from this, we know that Laish was a Phœnician agricultural colony, and extremely fertile. Its inhabitants were a peaceable and peace-loving people, living entirely by their tillage of the soil; in

fact, so quiet were they that their government head-quarters was no nearer than Sidon, and they were evidently thoroughly unprepared for the warlike raid of the Danites, and succumbed for want of assistance. The country surrounding Laish is even now some of the most beautiful in Syria. The Tel-el-Kâdi rises up like the cup-shaped crater of some extinct volcano from the great plain north of Lake Huleh, better known as the "Waters of Merom," in the neighbourhood of which Joshua put the Canaanites to flight and smote Jabin, King of Hazor. Here the ground is dotted with great blocks of basalt, and stones bearing evident marks of fire lie about; while near the oak-trees—remnants of the southern boundary of the forest of Bashan—are numerous ruins, both ancient and massive. They mark, probably, the site of the temple raised by Rehoboam for the golden calf; in fact, Josephus assures us that they are in very truth the remains of that temple. At the foot of the western side of the hill rushes forth the great "fountain of the Jordan," the largest in Syria; another fountain springs up within the "tell," and the waters of the two, uniting below in the plain, where they are known as El-Ledân, wend their way southwards, marking their path by a rich green band of vegetation. The sides of the crater are made up of the walls of Dan, and are now completely overgrown by a dense mass of shrubs and jungle, rendering excavation a work of difficulty and patience.

Here Durighello, finding that well-nigh insurmountable obstacles were placed in his way, instilled into the natives a desire to hunt for "anteekas," and while work was thus proceeding, under the auspices of a neighbouring shêkh. the seven little images were found. They are of bronze, and represent Baal and Astarte; the type of face is unmistakably Semitic, while certain details of execution, the head-dress, etc., leave no doubt as to their Jewish *provenance*. Baal stands with the arms raised as if in the act of blessing, and Astarte has her hands folded across her breast. All the figures have small loops on the top of the head, by which they might be suspended.

Now comes the question, For what purposes were these little "molten images" made, and is it possible that they may be a survival of those used by Micah, if not the very images themselves?

It is quite clear that Micah, of Bethlehem-Judah, even if he were a follower of Yahveh, still clung to the teraphim and other talismans of his ancient Chaldean faith. Also he must have established in his household a sort of irregular priestly service, presided over by a Levite, whom he paid yearly to perform the necessary offices in his "house of gods." The

six hundred men of war from the tribe of Dan, when marching on Laish, had to pass by the dwelling of Micah. They there laid hands upon the teraphim, the molten images, and graven images, and took them, probably, as we should say, to bring them good luck, and they persuaded the Levite to come with them, saying that it was better to be priest to a tribe than to one man. So the priest and the images proceeded to Laish, which the invaders burnt to the ground—the proof of which lies in the calcined ruins around Tel-el-Kâdi—and there, in the new city of Dan, they were held in veneration, with an hereditary priesthood attached to them, until the Captivity. That it should have been possible to carry them off so easily they must have been small and of light weight and easily concealed. These images found at Dan are neither large nor heavy; the largest of them is only 37 centimetres in height. They are of bronze—that is to say, they are "molten," and they are also purely Jewish in their characteristics. Undoubtedly, therefore, we have before us some of the actual talismanic images which were in use among the Danites up to the time of the Captivity.

All through the history of the Hebrew people it is noticeable how impossible it was for them to break off entirely with the old superstitions and myths that they brought with them from their early home. They never, at any period of their history, seem to have completely freed themselves from the cult of their Chaldean ancestors. Over and over again do we find them being enjoined not to consult teraphim, nor look in the liver, nor practise necromancy, nor venerate any other deity save Yahveh, and equally often do we find them setting up asherahim, consulting oracles, and having a "house of gods." These little figures, made usually in the likeness of Baal and Astarte or some special deity, were hung up in the houses or placed below the thresholds to preserve the household from harm and to keep off evil generally. They were gravely consulted, even though the Jews were sternly warned that the teraphim would tell them lies and that witchcraft was an abomination. The fascination of practical magic had them so completely in its power from before the days when Rachel hid her father's images, that even the revelation of Yahveh and the legalizing of the Urim and Thummim in the Temple worship could not constrain them to put away their "gods."

M. Brodrick.

The Month.

THE health of the King, to the profound satisfaction of his subjects appears to be completely re-established. Immediately after the Coronation His Majesty was able to perform some important public functions, gratifying the Indian and Colonial forces who had been brought to this country for the occasion by personally reviewing them and distributing decorations among them. Since then he has consolidated his recovery by sailing in his yacht round the western shores of England and Scotland, and has given great gratification in various places, particularly in the Isle of Man, by landing and visiting the people. We may now have the happiness of regarding the life of the nation and the Empire as having resumed its regular course, with enhanced affection and confidence towards the King, whose suffering and recovery have been followed by all his subjects with deep sympathy and thankfulness. If, as is stated in some quarters, the King and Queen intend, after a procession through London, to attend a solemn service of thanksgiving in Westminster Abbey, they will unite their people with them once more by the strongest of all bonds—that of religious devotion. There is nothing so calculated to unite Sovereign and people as the sympathy in prayer and thanksgiving evoked by such solemn services.

The discussion on the Education Bill seems, unhappily, to become more embittered as it proceeds. The Nonconformists as a body, though there seem to be some honourable exceptions, are making it the occasion for a great rally of the Liberal party, and are denouncing it in language of extraordinary, if not absurd, exaggeration. When a man like Sir Joseph Pease can describe it as an attempt to revive the system of Archbishop Laud, one can only say that the opponents of the Bill must have lost their heads. As the Bishop of Rochester observed, this is "a strange description of a Bill which, dealing with schools that have hitherto been in numbers of cases conducted by clergy only, provides that henceforth they shall be managed by boards on which the clergyman's rule must be qualified by the votes of three of his laity . . . and invigilated, to use the mildest word, by two representatives of public authority, one of whom may very possibly be the Nonconformist minister." If the matter rested only with Parliament, these exaggerations would do the Nonconformist cause no good. But there are some indications that the constituencies may be inflamed by them, as in the recent election in the Sevenoaks Division of Kent, where the majority of a member of the Government who had to seek re-election was very ominously reduced. Dr. Joseph Parker, with characteristic violence of phrase, has declared in the *Daily News* that "the Bill is bad from beginning to end; its spirit is malicious and its aims are unpatriotic. Liberals now see this; hence their sane madness and their determination not to rest until this

priests' Bill has been handed over to the common hangman." In the face of an opposition of this character, the Government would be inconceivably weak if it did not stand firm on all the essential points of the Bill, and Churchmen would be extremely unwise and shortsighted not to suppress their minor differences of opinion and give the Ministry their cordial support. The Nonconformists have made it plain that their opposition is not based on questions of education alone, or even in the first instance. How they can be sincere in supposing that the Bill will strengthen the power of the Clergy, it is very difficult to understand. There are clergymen who doubt whether it will be worth while to retain their schools when the Bill has become law. But, at all events, it is clear that the Nonconformists are using the Bill as an opportunity for an assault on the position which the Church at present holds in national education, and it is announced that the Liberation Society will make this assault the starting-point of a new campaign. Against such a temper concessions are not likely to be of much avail, and the withdrawal or defeat of the Bill in such circumstances could not but be most injurious to the influence of the Church. Meanwhile, the Bishop of Worcester has done good service by directing the attention of Churchmen to two points—first, that these disputes would not arise, or would be overridden, if the heart of the people were really set on education for its own sake, if its importance were generally and adequately recognised; and, secondly, that the one thing on which the Church must insist is that it shall have the opportunity of training the children of the Church in accordance with the Church's methods and principles. It is for the Government, as the Bishop observed, to say how this is to be done; but "in one way or another, in a better way or a less efficient way, but in all circumstances, in each generation and time, there was the primary and indestructible duty of the Church to see to it that the children belonging to it were brought up to understand the meaning of the Christian religion in that ancient form in which the rudiments of the Christian faith had been fixed for all time." He added that, "desiring freedom for themselves, they further desired precisely the same freedom and liberty for all other religious bodies; and they further desired that inasmuch as the religious bodies were not all of them able, nor any of them fully able, to do this, the State should step in and supply the deficiency of religious education in a manner that could not be logical or satisfactory, but which was better than nothing." In other words, the Cowper-Temple clause is the only alternative where the religious bodies cannot themselves give the religious instruction. But no legislation can be acquiesced in by Churchmen which would impose anything like that clause as a sort of general Act of Uniformity. Dr. Guinness Rogers has repudiated any such intention on the part of Nonconformists, and the Bishop of Rochester has opportunely replied that if in that repudiation Dr. Rogers really speaks for the Nonconformists generally, the way is open for a compromise. But it cannot be said that at present there is any hope of such a result.

The Church Congress which is to be held next month promises some very interesting discussions; but deep sympathy will be felt with the Bishop of Peterborough in his enforced absence, and it will be a great disappointment to the members that his voice cannot be heard among them. The position of the Church is at the present moment a critical one in several respects. Questions of the greatest gravity in doctrine, in Biblical criticism, in discipline, and in education, have assumed a very urgent character, and will require the greatest wisdom and patience. All can pray, and ought to pray very earnestly, that this wisdom and patience may be granted to those who have to deal with such questions; and if they are approached in a spirit of charity, we may be sure that none of them are incapable of peaceful solution.

Reviews.

Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. iv. (completing the work). Edited by the Rev. J. HASTINGS, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Encyclopædia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary, etc., of the Bible. Vol. iii. (L–P). Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., and J. S. BLACK, LL.D. Adam and Charles Black: 1902.

OUR first duty is to congratulate the editor and publishers of the "Dictionary of the Bible" on bringing a noteworthy piece of work to a successful conclusion. The first volume of Dr. Hastings' "Dictionary" made its appearance in the spring of 1898, and the concluding volume has only recently been published. That a work comprising nearly 4,000 closely-printed pages, and contributed to by a number of divines, both English and foreign, should have taken but four years to see through the press is a tribute in itself to the laborious care that has been expended over it by editors, publishers, printers, and contributors alike. For it is to be remembered that the sheets of the work have not been allowed to be printed off and then lie by for months or years, as the case might be; in the majority of instances it will be found that the various articles have been so scrupulously edited as to be, in the best sense, "up-to-date"; the bibliographies—a sure test of the accuracy of a work of this kind—are, as a rule, thorough and complete, and the latest and best editions of the works of reference named in the articles are always, or nearly always, those utilized.

We have already, on three separate occasions, spoken of the methods adopted by the editor-in-chief in rendering the "Dictionary" an indispensable work of reference for all those interested in Biblical studies. There is, therefore, no need here to enter into particulars. The merits of Dr. Hastings' work are widely recognised; and, in general, the sobriety of the

work, and its scholarly completeness, are things to be thankful for. We cannot but regret that, in the main, the chief conclusions of the Higher Criticism have been adopted throughout the work; but the vagaries of modern criticism, the passion for something new at the expense of what is true, the tendency to upset the traditional view simply because it is traditional or in the interests of a rationalistic interpretation of religion—these things have been studiously avoided. Hence the book may be regarded as, generally, a trustworthy attempt to present the more moderate views of criticism in clear and orderly arrangement; and the reverential tone maintained in handling the sacred Scriptures will be appreciated by those to whom the cynical indifference or lightly-veiled hostility of some "modern critics" are little short of detestable.

The opening words of the Editor's preface to the final volume deserve quotation: "In issuing the last volume of the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' the Editor desires to record his sense of the goodness of God in enabling him to carry it through to the end, and to beseech His blessing on the use of it, that His Name may be glorified." The spirit evinced by these brief words is indeed welcome.

No less than 115 writers have contributed to vol. iv.; of these we note that four have died since their contributions were sent in—among them Dr. A. B. Davidson, one of the collaborators in the editing of the work. Only seven of the contributors are Continental; the rest are British or American. In this point Dr. Hastings' "Dictionary" compares, as we think, favourably with "Encyclopædia Biblica," to which a great number of Continental critics have contributed. Indeed, there does not appear to be any valid reason why, in an English work of reference, German and Swiss Rationalists should be invited to give expression to passing hypotheses, as though these constituted ascertained truths.

The first important article in vol. iv. is K. Budde's "Hebrew Poetry." His treatment of "parallelism" (better designated "correspondence") appears to us inadequate; and not a word is said of the work of the late Rev. T. Boys in this direction, though his "Tactica Sacra," "Key to the Psalms," and other books are obtainable. And yet Boys was a pioneer in the study of the structure of Hebrew poetry.

Passing on, we note an important doctrinal article (the "Dictionary of the Bible" is rich in doctrinal articles) on "Predestination," which, for an article on so worried a subject, appears singularly clear and free from bias; and the same may be said of Dr. Laidlaw's note on "Psychology." Professor W. Baudissin's long and elaborate "Priests and Levites" is full of learning; but the note on the literature of the subject, at the close of the article, is by no means complete; hardly any references to English works occur.

To the article "Psalms" one turns, naturally, with interest not unmixed with curiosity. The writer, Dr. W. T. Davison, while rejecting the traditional view as to authorship, etc., wisely declines to identify himself with the extreme position maintained by Cheyne. He holds that the probability is that David wrote many psalms, that it is very unlikely

that all were lost, and that some of those ascribed to him are appropriate enough in his lips; and concludes by thinking that from ten to twenty psalms may have come down to us from David's pen. As to whether any Maccabæan psalms appear in the Psalter, he believes that, in any case, the number cannot be large, but that the possibility that some psalms were included must be left open. Dr. Davison's bibliographical note is useful, but not complete; one is glad to note his commendation of Calvin's masterly exposition (1557).

The difficult and thorny subject of the "Book of Revelation" was entrusted to Professor F. C. Porter (Yale), and his discussion of the problems involved in a study of that supremely fascinating yet elusive book practically amounts to a treatise. The writer devotes considerable space to a consideration of Gunkel's epoch-making work (1895); but serious doubt must be felt as regards Gunkel's conclusions. It is curious to find so inadequate a "bibliography" at the end of so thorough a discussion; we may very well decline assent to the views of Futurist and Historicist alike in elucidating "Revelation," but at least the chief works evolved by these two schools deserve mention. Govett's "Apocalypse," E. B. Elliot's "Horæ Apocalypticæ," and the books of Mede and G. S. Faber, ought not to have been neglected. Dr. A. Robertson's article on the "Romans" is admirable, and among other articles dealing with Old Testament or New Testament books may be named Dr. Lock's "The Epistles to Timothy," and the "Epistles to the Thessalonians" by the same writer. A special note of admiration may be affixed to Professor Eb. Nestle's "Book of Sirach," an article which is characterized by exemplary learning and thoroughness. The same writer discusses the "Text of the New Testament" and the "Septuagint" with characteristic fulness. The article "Writing" has fallen to the lot of Mr. F. G. Kenyon, perhaps the most learned epigraphist we possess; it is a most instructive essay, learned, yet one which it is a pleasure to peruse. So far, we have merely mentioned a few of the longer articles, but a word of commendation is also due to the short articles and notes. There is no trace of scamped work here; and specially to be mentioned are the very useful notes (by the Editor) on words, rare or obsolete, that occur in the Authorized Version of the Bible. These notes serve the purpose of an elaborate glossary.

We may now pass on briefly to consider the third, and penultimate, volume of "Encyclopædia Biblica." And because it is pleasanter to praise than to censure, we may fitly begin by expressing our admiration of the mechanical methods adopted by the editors and printers to render this book a model work of reference. There is no work with which we are acquainted that is so perfect typographically; every device that could be thought of to economize space and the reader's time, as well as to secure ease of comfort in consultation, has been adopted. The maps, too, are a noteworthy feature; and in this respect "Encyclopædia Biblica" is far ahead of its rival, Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible." The pagination is not by volumes, but—in view of the fact that

the work is to be printed on thin as well as on thick paper, in order that it may be bound up in a single volume—the numbering is continuous and by columns. Thus vol. iii. (L–P) extends from col. 2689 to col. 3988.

The band of contributors to "Encyclopædia Biblica" is smaller in number than the contributors to Hastings' "Dictionary." In the case of vol. iii. there are sixty names registered ; of these, twenty-three are those of Continental scholars. Canon Cheyne is the most voluminous of the writers, being responsible for no less than twenty-one major articles ; next to him comes the late Professor Robertson Smith, who contributes ten ; and after him Dr. Benzinger and Mr. S. A. Cook, who contribute eight articles apiece. Taken as a whole, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the work is less a Dictionary of the Bible than a Dictionary of the Higher Criticism of the Bible—a widely different thing. It is not, we think, creditable that a man of Professor Cheyne's peculiar standing (he is an ordained minister of the Church of England, as well as a Divinity Professor at Oxford) should deem it consistent with his ordination vows to foist a work like "Encyclopædia Biblica" upon the English public, as though it were a trustworthy storehouse of ascertainable and verifiable information. The most casual inspection of the book will instantly reveal the bias which has guided the editors in their choice of contributors. Schmidt (of Zürich) has reduced the Gospel narrative to the merest congeries of unauthenticated stories, strung together in the interests of a religious preconception, leaving us with some half-dozen or so "authentic" sayings of Jesus Christ as the final result of the latest criticism of the words of "Him who spake as never man spake." In the present volume Professor W. van Manen, setting aside not merely the tradition of nearly twenty centuries, but the judgment of some of the best scholars of this generation, has thought fit to deny the Pauline authorship of *any* of the Epistles usually attributed to St. Paul ; Professor Cheyne, in his article "Psalms," goes so far as to deny the Davidic authorship of a single hymn in the Psalter, apparently denies the historicity of Moses (he speaks of him as "*to some extent* an historical personage," whatever that may precisely mean), scouts the idea that any such thing as the plagues of Egypt ever took place, and adopts a number of highly questionable positions that bid fair to become antiquated within a decade. Now, we would ask (in no carping spirit, however), Is this sort of thing fair ? Theological students have surely a right to expect in a Bible Dictionary, not the latest theory or the newest hypothesis on the facts of religious history (these theories may be left to adorn the pages of "advanced" magazines), but a well-ordered and well-digested mass of evidence ; of fact untempered with fancy ; of sound opinion, not of uncertain theorizings. But "Encyclopædia Biblica" is, in the main, rather in the nature of a vast collection of "tendenz-schriften" than a sober digest of what is known in the realm of Biblical study.

However, it is only fair to add that there are a number of purely historical and geographical articles scattered through this work that are of high value. To select a few, almost at random, one may name Professor

Meyer's "Phœnicia," Mr. H. W. W. Pearson on the "Flora of Palestine,' Professor Tiele's article on "Persia," and several articles by the Rev. C. H. W. Johns, of Queen's College, Cambridge, on such subjects as Nineveh and Nebuchadnezzar. Indeed, the Assyriological and Egyptological articles in "Encyclopædia Biblica" are generally of the utmost importance and interest. One notices the severely scientific method of handling the various subjects throughout the work; very rarely is a writer betrayed into enthusiasm or rhetoric.

It is somewhat surprising to find Canon J. Armitage Robinson's name figuring in the contributors' list; he writes on "Presbyter" and "Prophet" (New Testament). In connection with the latter subject, the careful reader is referred to the entire article "Prophetic Literature," of which Canon Robinson's contribution forms a subsection. This article—a composite performance, signed with the well-known initials T.K.C. and W.R.S.—is characteristic in many directions of the work of the authors of "Encyclopædia Biblica" as a whole, their great but often misapplied learning, their exuberant love of conjecture and hypothesis combined with careful antagonism to "traditional" views, their immense research, and their thinly disguised Rationalism.

E. H. B.