THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

So difficult is it to find a meaning in the Transfiguration of our Lord, a meaning at all correspondent with the strangeness of the event itself, that one welcomes any independent effort to render it intelligible. Such an effort has been made by Miss Evelyn UNDERHILL.

Miss UNDERHILL has written a large volume on mysticism, giving it the title of *The Mystic Way* (Dent; 12s. 6d. net). It is a volume of sufficient importance to make it rank with the volumes of Baron Friedrich von HÜGEL and Professor Rufus M. JONES, as one of the three great popular expositions of mysticism of recent years. Its claim to originality rests on the fact that it is, above all else, an exposition of the mysticism of the New Testament.

But its originality is also its weakness. The New Testament is discovered to be full of mysticism. The apostles are mystics, one and all, and little else. Even our Lord Himself is represented as passing through all the stages of mystical experience. And every mystical experience is explained psychologically. There is nothing in the miracles of the New Testament that cannot be expressed in terms of modern psychology.

Among the rest the Transfiguration is explained psychologically. No attempt is made to find its place in the life of Jesus, to measure its influence on His mind, or to estimate its importance for His work. It is treated simply as one of a group of incidents, prominent in the Synoptics, which have their parallels in the lives of the saints. These incidents are examples of the foreknowledge of events, such as the announcements of the Passion, of the betrayal of Judas and the denial of Peter; or they are cases of clairvoyance, as when it is said 'Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves'; or they are instances of levitation, such as the walking on the sea. The Transfiguration is a case of ecstasy.

'The kernel of this story—no doubt elaborated by successive editors, possessed by that passion for the marvellous which Jesus unsparingly condemned—seems to be the account of a great ecstasy experienced by Him in one of those wild and solitary mountain places where the soul of the mystic is so easily snatched up to communion with supreme Reality.' Such ecstasies, says Miss UNDERHILL, were probably a frequent feature of those nights of prayer which supported the active life of Jesus. This was the way in which His communion with the Father expressed itself. The only difference is that those ecstasies were experienced in solitude, this in the presence of Peter, James, and John.

To Miss Underhill, therefore, the vital fact is that the Transfiguration took place while He was praying, although that fact is recorded by Luke alone. By 'prayer' she understands 'profound and deliberate absorption in the Divine Life.' That absorption was the immediate cause of the transfigured bodily state. The three disciples had just heard the testimony given to His Messiahship. One of them had uttered that testimony. The atmosphere was charged with wonder and enthusiasm. In such an atmosphere the human brain is at a hopeless disadvantage. Moreover, they were on the verge of sleep. How inevitable that their minds, steeped in Old Testament imagery, should body forth just such a vision as is described, the moment that their Master's ecstasy in prayer was perceived by them.

But are we not told that Moses and Elijah appeared talking with Jesus? To the disciples they did so appear. Not to Jesus. There is no suggestion that Jesus Himself saw the patriarch or the prophet. But how natural that the disciples should believe that they saw them. 'As the devout Catholic is sure that the saint in ecstasy talks with Christ and the Virgin, so these devout Jews are sure that their Master talks with the supreme lawgiver and supreme seer of the race.'

That is the vision. After the vision, the audition. 'There came a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son: hear ye him.' The voice tells them nothing new. It simply affirms, in almost identical language, the fact of 'divine sonship' which Jesus Himself had experienced at His baptism, and no doubt communicated to His friends. Then Miss Underhill concludes. And she concludes by saying that the whole narrative is natural. 'Given the fact of a collective consciousness, developed in its lowest form in all crowds, and often appearing upon higher intellectual and moral levels in mystical and religious societies, this episode should offer no difficulty to the psychologist.'

What are the things that are essential to the making of a good missionary? They are these three—Sending, Suffering, Sympathy. The Rev. Cuthbert McEvoy, M.A., has written a book on the growth of Christianity, calling it *The Great Embassy* (James Clarke & Co.; 1s. net). In the beginning of the book he gives these three as the contents of that easily uttered word 'Missionary'—sending, suffering, sympathy.

First, Sending. For that lies in the etymology of the word. A mission is a sending, a missionary is one sent. Now sending is motion; it is motion outwards. And as motion involves an origin and a goal, Mr. McEvoy discovers that the missionary is sent by God, and he is sent to God.

He is sent by God. That is his origin. 'Ye are not your own'; 'Not I, but Christ that liveth in me'; 'Paul, an apostle (it is the word missionary) not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.'

And he is sent to God. 'From the great deep to the great deep he goes.' Mr. McEvoy again quotes the Apostle Paul: 'This one thing I do. . . . I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'

Next, Suffering. This idea is not in the word etymologically. It has been imported into it. Experience has so closely associated suffering with the missionary that it has come to be part of the word's connotation. For the missionary is invariably one who is sent from conditions of ease to conditions of hardship. 'The missionary spirit prays in Father Damien that the comfortable priesthood of Louvain may be exchanged for the leper island of Molokai. It drives F. W. Crossley to leave the pleasant suburb for the squalor of Ancoats. The missionary spirit quits the Throne in order to bear the Cross.

Lastly, Sympathy. The courier and the trader may be sent, they may be sent into suffering. It

is the combination of three that makes the missionary; and of the three the greatest is sympathy.

It is sympathy with the message. The courier carries his message in his dispatch-box; the missionary carries his message in his soul. When the courier delivers his message he delivers something quite apart from himself. But when the missionary delivers his message he pours out part of himself and yields up something of his own life. 'My little children, of whom I travail again in birth until Christ be formed in you.' When the courier has delivered his message he may go to his hotel and his dinner; he may spend the night in the ballroom or at the theatre. But when the missionary has delivered his message he keeps his body under lest when he has preached to others he himself should be a castaway.

It is also sympathy with the recipients of the message. This is the theme of a remarkable article which opens *The International Review of Missions* for April. The author of the article, who is simply called 'a Missionary on Holiday,' knows how exacting are the conditions attaching in modern times to the Christian ministry. But he has come to realize that the demands made upon the missionary are greater far than the demands made upon the minister. And the most exacting demand of all is this, that the missionary should be in sympathy with the recipients of his message.

Speaking as a missionary, he says, 'Ever and anon we ourselves are oppressed by the sense of failure. Some one has said that "missions would be a very wonderful achievement if it were not for the missionaries," and even if our own hearts have never brought us to so bitter a confession, the judgments we are sometimes tempted to form of a reasonable proportion of our brethren suggest that there is a great truth in the saying, a truth which perchance should suggest certain judgments upon ourselves. The great tragedy in life is that most men's work is spoilt, not by others, but by their own hand.'

Whereupon he recalls what Mr. A. G. BRADLEY says in his lectures on *Shakespearean Tragedy.* And there is tragedy in the very recollection. 'We find,' says Mr. BRADLEY, 'that the comparatively innocent hero still shows some marked imperfection or defect, irresolution, precipitancy, pride, credulousness, excessive simplicity, excessive susceptibility to sexual emotions, and the like. These defects or imperfections are certainly, in the wide sense of the word, evil, and they contribute decisively to the conflict and catastrophe. And the inference is obvious. The ultimate power which shows itself disturbed by this evil and reacts against it, must have a nature alien to it. *Indeed its action is so vehement and relentless that it would seem to be bent on nothing short of good in perfection, and to be ruthless in its demand for it.*'

'How true,' says this nameless missionary—nameless that he may speak for all missionaries—'how true,' he says, 'those words are of the men we know! How many of us know them to be true of ourselves! In our service there are just such instances of "marked imperfections or defects." In our case, too, the result is tragedy, and often the result seems out of proportion to the cause. We notice sometimes that in a curious way the first are last and the last first: men to whom every human judgment awards the palm of victory are failures in the Christian service of a foreign nation. Just as the microbes that produce cholera or sleeping-sickness seem absurdly small to cause so far-reaching a disturbance of the human body, so our work is often ruined in whole or part by imperfections we do not dignify enough to reckon, much less to extirpate. Meanwhile the ultimate power "would seem to be bent on nothing short of good in perfection."'

Now that form of weakness or imperfection which more than any other seems to this mission-

ary to be the cause of failure, is inability to enter into complete sympathy with the life of another race. Nor does he think that there has been progress in this matter as there has been in other matters which touch the missionary's life and work. He is not so ignorant as to blame the missionary. Send any minister or other Christian into the place of the missionary and he would behave exactly as the missionary does. Two things he names as the occasion of it, race pride and temptation.

It is due, he says, to race pride, the race pride of the whole Western Christian world. And it is due to temptation. 'Many a missionary who wanted to be friendly passes through successive stages of surprise and disillusionment till in despair he abandons all hope of real friendship. The missionary most sympathetic to the people of the country in which he works must often have felt that he would give anything to be able as a native to protest against the carelessness, aloofness, and discourtesy which from the native side tend to alienate the incoming recruit.'

Is this the confession of one morbid missionary hiding himself and asserting ubiquity by the suppression of his name? He quotes the deliberate judgment of the Edinburgh Conference, expressed in the fourth volume of the official report: 'They felt a strange antipathy to colour, dirt, vermin, and ugly faces. Unintentionally they showed that antipathy in their manners. The alert-eyed natives saw it. Without at first saying anything disrespectful, they quietly gave them outward obedience. But they never gave them respect, never opened their hearts to them. The teachings of such missionaries fell flat. They filled a certain niche in the roll of station members, but they never had influence for good. Rather, some of them by their harsh words or curt manners brought only evil to the missionary name.'

Where is the remedy to be found? It is to be found, says this missionary, in the diligent study of Scripture and the following of Christ. Alongside the Edinburgh report he places Christ's intercessory prayer—'Neither pray I for these only,' and the new commandment—'that ye love one another'; he places 'love's condemnation of the want of love,' found in the opening of the hymn of love, in the thirteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians; and, above all, he places St. Paul's ideal for the Church in Colossians (3^{11}), 'Where there cannot be Greek or Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all and in all.' And then he comes to the example of Christ.

Christ our Master, he says, can teach us where we have failed to reveal Him, and one characteristic of the gospel story is especially relevant. It is His use of the title 'Son of Man.' 'Though all His life is full of rebuke and inspiration, there are few things recorded of Him that can teach us so much as His use of the title "Son of Man."'

'Our Lord was dealing with that Messianic expectation which represented for the elect of Israel the gateway of thought into a world of beauty, order and righteousness, where injustice was swept away and death had no sting. The promise and the centre of this transformed life was the Messiah. Hebrew thought in regard to the Messiah had been vivid and concrete from the outset, with the result that the Jews possessed in the rolls of their prophets many a rich and inspiring name for Him that was to come. How closely those terms were interwoven with the Messianic conception in the thought of the time is shown by the way in which the crowds were ready to use them to give point to their praises. Others of those titles were cited by the Apostles and taken up gladly by the early Church. Commentators returned to them again and again, and writers of hymns at every period of the Christian era founded their praises upon them: "Son of Jesse," "Son of David," "Emmanuel," and a score of others, we know them ourselves; for we love to use them

even though the Jewish history from which they spring lives for us no longer. But—note the importance of the suggestion—He used nothing for Himself but the title "Son of Man."'

There is an Old Testament title which we should have expected Him to prefer. He meditated much on the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. Would it not have been most fitting if He had adopted the name of 'the Servant of the Lord'? The deepest thought of the early Church found in that figure and the passages connected with it just the type of imagery in which its experience could most easily embody itself. Yet Christ Himself never claimed that name. 'Is it not significant,' says this missionary, 'of the all-roundness of His identification with man, and of that acceptance of the common joy of humanity revealed to us most clearly in His presence at the Galilean marriage, that He refused to summarize His relation to humanity in the figure of the marred and suffering servant? Plainly and without qualification He was the "Son of Man."'

In this title, then, this missionary finds the needful guidance in the difficulty before him. And he believes that the whole Church, at home and abroad, will find it. The home and foreign Church must be summoned to a corporate striving after the mind that was in Christ Jesus. He adopts the old Hebrew idiom and says that there are those who would be 'sons of £500 a year,' there are those who would be 'sons of fine raiment,' and there are those who would be 'sons of social position.' The true Christian must be ambitious enough to become a 'son of man.'

The Creation of the World was an act of love. We say, God so loved the world that He gave His Son to redeem it. We can also say, God so loved the world that He created it. For this is the one thing that we know of God absolutely and without any qualification: Everything He does is done out of love.

How could He love the world before He created it? The answer is easy. We ourselves are able to love those whom we have never seen, 'Whom not having seen, ye love.' 'Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' We can love those who never existed. We can love Colonel Newcome; we can love Jeanie Deans. It is Dickens that tells how in the very creation of his characters he lived with them and loved them. We can do it by the exercise of the imagination. The imagination of God is foreknowledge. They actually exist to Him although they have not yet been born. God so loved the world, the world of to-day, you and me, as to send His Son into it to save it two thousand years ago.

Moreover, God does not need to wait for times and seasons. His time is always ready. He is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever; and yesterday, to-day, and for ever are the same to Him. We love when the time comes and the person, not perhaps the first person that comes. The first person that comes may not carry the key. What does Anna Bunston say?

> O leave the lonely fortress of my heart,
> I cannot yield to thee;
> But merrily the gates had swung apart
> If thou hadst held the key.

But we all carry the key to God's heart, the first comer as well as the last. 'That whosoever believeth'—that was the reach of the love that brought about the Incarnation. That whosoever liveth, in all the ages of the world, that was the reach of the love that caused the Creation.

Now the actual Creation was the work of the Son of God. This is one of the most unexpected of all God's revelations. And it is the more extraordinary that we do not owe it to Christ Himself. We owe it entirely to the Apostles. Wherever they obtained it the Apostles have it with certainty. Take St. Paul—'who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; for by him

were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him' (Col 1[15, 16]). Take the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews—'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds' (He 1[1, 2]). Take St. John—'All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made' (Jn 1[3]).

How did they come by this unexpected knowledge? We need not hesitate to answer. By the Spirit interpreting to them their experience of Christ. They found by experience that He had power over nature; the winds and the waves obeyed Him. They discovered that Redemption is Creation, a new Creation. A second Creation involves a first, and there is a direct continuity of operation between the two. But above all things, they learned that the only expression of God to man is by the Son of God. 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' It was for that reason that they recognized the appropriateness of the title Logos or Word for Christ. St. Paul has it that the thought of the Creation is God the Father's, the carrying out of that thought the Son's: 'To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him' (1 Co 8[6]).

How should the Creation be described? There are two ways possible, the scientific and the artistic, or the way of the intellect and the way of the imagination.

The scientific way seems the more likely. But there are difficulties. If it is perfectly accurate it will be unintelligible. For if it is perfectly accurate, it will not represent the earth as the centre of the solar system, and it will not say it is flat. But who will persuade the ancient Israelites of these things, or even make them intelligible to them? Again, if the account of the Creation is intelligible and credible at the time of its first publication, how soon will it be out of date! There is no kind of literature that passes so quickly out of date as the literature of physical science. The writer had occasion recently to refer to one of the Bridgewater Treatises, and found he had not a copy. Immediately afterwards he saw the whole set of thirteen volumes offered in an antiquarian catalogue for a few shillings. He ordered them. What was his surprise to discover, on opening the parcel, that they were uniformly and most handsomely bound and as spotless as when they left the hands of the binder. For there is no demand for the Bridgewater Treatises now.

But the greatest difficulty in the way of a scientific account of the Creation is that it would leave out God. For science has to do only with material things. Let us make no mistake about that. And that we may make no mistake, let us quote the words of Professor TYNDALL: 'It ought to be known and avowed, that the physical philosopher, as such, must be a pure materialist. His inquiries deal with matter and force, and with them alone.' These words may be read on the 92nd page of his *Fragments of Science.*

The story of the Creation, then, must be addressed to the imagination. If it is addressed to the imagination and is true—true imaginatively—it will be true always and everywhere. We do not read the Bridgewater Treatises any longer, but we read Homer still, and Dante. And George Frederick WATTS is well within the mark when he says that a great painting should be a great painting two thousand years hence.

In any case, this is the way of telling the story of the Creation that has been chosen. It is a work of art. Who the artist was, or who the

artists were, we do not stay now to inquire. Those who have gone into this matter assure us that the account of the Creation which we have in Genesis, is a slow growth, that the imagination of many men, and men of more than one nation, has been at work upon it. But there it stands, a work of art, beautiful, wonderful, impressive, and true for all time. Let us listen for a moment to Haeckel.

'The Mosaic history of creation, since, in the first chapter of Genesis, it forms the introduction to the Old Testament, has enjoyed, down to the present day, general recognition in the whole Jewish and Christian world of civilisation. Its extraordinary success is explained, not only by its close connection with Jewish and Christian doctrines, but also by the simple and natural chain of ideas which runs through it, and which contrasts favourably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the ancient nations. First, God creates the earth as an inorganic body; then He separates light from darkness, then water from the dry land. Now the earth has become habitable for organisms, and plants are first created, animals later; and among the latter the inhabitants of the water and of the air first, afterwards the inhabitants of the dry land. Finally, God creates man, the last of all organisms, in His own image, and as ruler of the earth. Two great and fundamental ideas, common also to the non-miraculous theory of development, meet us in the Mosaic hypothesis of creation with surprising clearness and simplicity—the idea of separation or differentiation, and the idea of progressive development or perfecting.' So Haeckel, a quite unexpected witness.

There is no controversy therefore with science. And we are open to consider without prejudice what method Christ adopted in the Creation of the world. We are open to ask whether it was a single act, a series of acts, or a slow process. And when modern science tells us that it was a slow process, we are not disturbed. One thing only we demand; God must be acknowledged to be always present. We have God at the beginning: we must have God all through. Every step in the evolution or development must be taken with God's co-operation. We must be able to say to the plant and to the animal: 'Work out your own salvation, for it is God that worketh in you.'

Now, whatever the method employed in the Creation of the world may be, it is all due to one mind and one hand. Does St. Paul say that the plan is the Father's? then there is unity in that plan throughout. Does he say that the work is the Son's? then there is perfect harmony with the plan in every step of it. 'Earth's crammed with heaven,' says Mrs. Browning:

> Earth's crammed with heaven,
> And every common bush afire with God;
> But only he who sees, takes off his shoes,
> The rest sit round it and pluck blackberries.

Well, at least they know where they will find blackberries. They know that they must go to a blackberry bush for them. They know that the world is a cosmos, not a chaos, and that they can never gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles.

This 'uniformity of nature' is much studied in our day. And a strange use has been made of it. Because God is a God of order He is denied the name of God. If He had made things higgledy-piggledy no offence would have been found in Him. For then there would have been no 'laws of nature,' and God could have 'interfered' as much as He had a mind to. Whether He will 'interfere' or not is another matter. We may safely say that He will not 'interfere' except to bring order out of any disorder which we have wrought in the earth. But when the fulness of the time is come we must be prepared to allow the Creator of the world to 'interfere' with His world so mightily as to become man and live in it.

Christ created a world into which He should be

able to come. Did He also create a world into which He should *have* to come? We may be sure He did, for He is not short-sighted. But let us be perfectly clear about this, that it was not the fault of His Creation. What it was due to we know. It was due to the freedom of choice with which He endowed man in order that he might be man. And we know that the freedom of choice is the one insoluble mystery in the world. But when the world was created, God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.

It was very good. So said the Creator Himself. It is the way Christ spoke of His work when He was on earth. No mere man describes his work in that way. The greater the artist the less is he satisfied with his work. But Christ rejoiced in the perfection of His work at the beginning, and He rejoiced in its perfection all through. 'Consider the lilies,' He said on earth; 'consider the lilies of the field; Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.' And He Himself had made them.

No doubt there is evil in the world; there is suffering; and sometimes death is painful and prolonged. No doubt 'the whole creation groaneth.' It is the issue of choice. It is the one insoluble mystery. But it never destroys the fact that the Creation was an act of love, and that love will be met by love before the end comes.

Moreover, the Creation includes Christ. When He created the world He created it as a place to live in. More than that, He created it as a place to die in. He created His own body for the Cross. So every sorrow should recall Him, as Katherine TYNAN has it beautifully in her parable of the April evening. Every sorrow should recall Him, for He is in it, that by His own sorrow He may turn it into joy.

> All in the April evening,
>   April airs were abroad;
> The sheep with their little lambs
>   Passed me by on the road.
>
> The sheep with their little lambs
>   Passed me by on the road;
> All in the April evening
>   I thought on the Lamb of God.
>
> The lambs were weary, and crying
>   With a weak, human cry.
> I thought on the Lamb of God
>   Going meekly to die.

Christ as Creator is the secret of all our interest in Christ. And it is the secret of all Christ's interest in us.

It is the secret of His interest in us, He created the world and knows it intimately. 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?' He had heard the seller cry his wares in the Galilean bazaars. 'Two for a farthing,' and He had made them! 'Two for a farthing': that was man's estimate. 'Not a sparrow falleth to the ground': that was God's. If He has this interest in the sparrow, He has as much interest as this in us.

He created man, man's body, the human hand; and He knew that He Himself would with such a hand still the sea and drive the traders out of the temple. He knew what the hand of man could do. He created man's hand, and He knew that the hand of man would drive the nails through His own.

He created the world and gave it its 'laws.' He knew that the time would come when He would submit to these laws. He would be hungry, thirsty, and tired; He would sleep; He would die. He had a great interest in the world when He came into it, for He had made it and called it 'very good,' and He came into it now to be crucified.

And our interest in Christ is interest in our Creator. We sometimes put the Cross before the Creation, but the Creation is first. A

certain man had two sons before any of them needed redemption. 'I will arise and go to my father' before he knew that his father would see him afar off and run and kiss him. More than that, the Cross depends on the Creation for its value. It is the Creator on the Cross that gives the Cross its value. The Cross is weakness, the Creation is strength. It is not weakness we cry for. It is weakness in strength.

'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for! my flesh, that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me,
Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: a Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!

A Recent Find of Jewish Measures.

By A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the University of Edinburgh.

In the absence of a single known specimen of the ancient Hebrew measures of length and capacity, students of the subject have hitherto been almost entirely dependent for the values of the measures mentioned in the Old and New Testaments on the equations of these with the better known measures of Greece and Rome found in Josephus and other early writers. A special interest accordingly attaches to a double series of actual measures of capacity discovered a few years ago by the Assumptionist Fathers in Jerusalem. A full account of all the finds is given by Père Germer-Durand, well known to readers of the *Revue Biblique*, in a lecture on 'Mesures de capacité des Hébreux au temps de l'évangile,' published with illustrations in a small volume entitled *Conférences de Saint-Étienne*, 1909–1910 (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte 90).[1]

The measures in question belong to two distinct sets, one used apparently for liquids, the other for grain, flour, and the like. The first set consists of four stone vessels found at various dates from 1889 to 1907, and standing to each other in the proportion of 1, 2, 3, 4. The largest of the four, which we propose to distinguish as A, is 'a large stone vase of conical form, furnished with two projecting ears,' and is said to measure 21·25 litres, which is 37·42 pints.[2] The measures, B, C, D, are, as has been said, respectively $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{1}{4}$ of A, and their content can be calculated accordingly.

The important question now emerges: Which of the known Jewish measures of capacity do these vases represent? There is no mark of identification, it should be said, on any of the four. Unfortunately Père Germer-Durand has gone for his identification to the Oxford *Helps to the Study of the Bible*, where the values are taken from a French work published as far back as 1859. The result is that the largest measure (A), although containing only 21$\frac{1}{4}$ litres, say 37$\frac{1}{2}$ pints, is identified with the bath, and B, C, and D with the fractional parts thereof.

But this is little more than one-half of the size of the bath, and of its equivalent dry measure the ephah, as given by modern metrologists. The latter, it is true, have been almost wholly guided, for the reason stated above, by the numerous indications of the values of the Jewish measures in terms of the Roman and Attic measures found in such writers as Josephus and Jerome, and in the treatises of early writers on metrology. By all

[1] A summary of the lecture, with illustrations of the measures, by Mr. Herbert Loewe appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* for August 16, 1912. Excellent illustrations without explanations were given in *The World's Work*, for December 1912.

[2] It should be stated at the outset that the quantities given by the lecturer cannot be those obtained in every case by actual measurement. No ancient measures ever constructed were so mathematically exact! The figures given clearly represent the *theoretical* values, deduced presumably from that of the largest measure. But even in this case the value is only given to the nearest large fraction of a litre. This method introduces an element of uncertainty as to the identification of the smallest measures mentioned below.