

THE SAMARITANS AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY THE RIGHT REV. E. A. KNOX, D.D.

THE word "Samaritan" does not occur in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it is found eight times. In St. Matthew x. 3 the disciples on their mission are forbidden to enter into any city of the Samaritans. In St. Luke ix. 56 we read of the village of the Samaritans which refused hospitality to our Lord—I take it an unexpected act of discourtesy—and as we shall see later one out of keeping with the character of the Samaritans. In the two other places where they are mentioned by St. Luke, first, a Samaritan shows compassion which Priest and Levite had failed to show, and secondly a Samaritan leper shows gratitude not shown by his Jewish companions in misfortune. In St. John's Gospel, though we are told that the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans, not only does our Lord speak to the Samaritan woman, but the disciples seek and easily obtain food from the Samaritans, and they show wonderful readiness to receive our Lord's teaching, St. John iv. 9. On the other hand, the Jews elsewhere in the same Gospel in contempt of our Lord give vent to the utterance, "Say we not well that Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil" (St. John viii. 48). In the Acts of the Apostles we read of the successful mission of St. Philip the Evangelist not only to Samaria but also to many villages of the Samaritans. (Acts viii. 25.)

The distinction between Jews and Samaritans is expressed thus: (1) The Samaritan woman makes it to consist in rivalry of places of worship, but our Lord rests it on superiority of religious knowledge. "Ye worship ye know not what. We know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews." Yet it is to this poor woman that He definitely proclaims Himself to be the Messiah in terms more distinct and categorical than He ever used to His own disciples—and His choice of a Samaritan as the type of true neighbourliness in one of the greatest of His Parables cannot be regarded as a mere accident. When, after His Resurrection, He was commissioning His disciples, the plan of campaign marked out for them places Samaria immediately after the Jewish world and before the heathen, but also before Galilee: Jerusalem, Judæa, Samaria, and the rest of the world. That is the order.

While the New Testament view of the Samaritans is unfavourable we find there no charge of idolatry brought against them. The most severe words concerning their religion are those of our Lord, "ye know not what ye worship." Yet their readiness to receive Him as the Messiah, and their swift response to the teaching of Philip indicate a spirit more accessible to the truth than we find among ordinary Israelites. The New Testament evidence may be supplemented from the Talmud, for the Talmud is distinctly less hostile to the Samaritans than the attitude of Josephus could have

led us to expect. Within the compass of this paper it is impossible to attempt more than a scanty summary of the Talmud legislation, but on some points this summary will be quite decisive.

(2) The Samaritans are never denied entire devotion to the Law of Moses. Even their falsifications of that law pass unnoticed ; while Rabbi Simon Gamaliel, who died about A.D. 165, says : " Every command the Samaritans keep they are more scrupulous in observing than Israel." They were more rigorous than the Jews about circumcising on the eighth day ; more punctilious in keeping the Sabbath ; their unleavened bread could be accepted by a Jew, and a Jew might say Amen to the benediction of a Samaritan. On ethical questions the references to them are honourable to their memory. They observed carefully the distinction between clean and unclean food. We have even the explicit statement that " the land of the Kuthim (i.e., Samaritans) is clean, the gatherings of their waters are clean, their roads are clean." There was no reason why Jews should not pass through Samaria, so far as the law was concerned. In fact, the more closely contemporary evidence is examined, the more certain does it appear that as far back as our Lord's time the Samaritans were neither heathen nor semi-heathen, but were what they are to-day, a sect, the oldest sect of Israel. Their general type of physiognomy is distinctly Jewish. They are Hebrews of the Hebrews. The distinctive features which separate them from the rest of the Hebrew race are these : (1) They hold that Gerizim is the place chosen by Jehovah for His sanctuary, and have expressed this teaching in their Tenth Commandment, which is long, and elaborately compiled from different parts of the Torah ; (2) They reject the whole of the Old Testament except the Pentateuch. They have a book of Joshua, but great as is their reverence for Joshua, they do not count that book a sacred book. Other peculiarities will call for mention presently, but these are emphasized here that it may be understood that no explanation of the origin of the Samaritans can be satisfactory which does not make room for their existence as a strict sect of Judaism at the opening of the Christian era.

It will be convenient to work backwards, and without attempting a history of the Samaritans to mark certain salient features. The Jewish Canon of the Old Testament was definitely formed 150 B.C., and since it included the prophetic, historical and wisdom books and Psalms, it stamped those who denied the authority of these books as heretics. We are therefore not surprised to find acute hostility between Jews and Samaritans going so far as the destruction of the Samaritan Temple on Gerizim by John Hyrcanus, 128 B.C. ; and before that, of fierce rivalry between the two sects as to their respective Temples. Indeed, some think that the question of the destination of Temple dues collected in Alexandria by the two sects for their respective Temples led to the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek by both, each trying to prove to their Hellenic rulers that theirs was the true word of God. In any case, both sects are found in Egypt as clamorous

rivals, and so we go back to the pre-Hellenic period. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah reveal bitter hostility between the remnant of the two tribes returned from Babylon to Jerusalem and "the people of the land." We find the "people of the land" desirous of assisting in the building of the Temple. When their offer is repulsed, they apply to the Persian Court for an injunction to stay the building, and apply for a time successfully. In the end they are defeated, and a crusade against intermarriage with them is vigorously prosecuted at Jerusalem, even though such intermarriage had spread as far as the ranks of the Priesthood. Who then were these people of the land?

In the 4th chapter of Ezra they describe themselves as inhabitants of Palestine whom Esarhaddon, King of Assyria, brought up. But in the same chapter, in a letter to Artaxerxes, they speak of themselves as those "whom the great and noble Osnappar brought over." Osnappar is identified with Ashurbanipal, and nine races, besides others not mentioned, claim to have been brought over by him. Not one of these is the same as the five races introduced by Esarhaddon. The importation of fourteen whole races into Northern or Central Palestine cannot be intended. Certainly importations on this scale would make no room for such depopulation as would bring about an invasion of lions. We must therefore envisage the garrisoning of Palestine by the two monarchs above named, and this accords with Sargon's own account of his victories. Sargon, in a contemporary document, records the deportation of 27,290 Israelites, adding that the rest he allowed to keep their property and set a governor over them. These garrisons would correspond to the English settlements in various conquests of Ireland. That they did not extirpate the Israelites is certain, for Hezekiah would never have invited heathen or semi-heathen to his Passover. In the same way we find Josiah destroying high places in Israel, but there is no mention of his destroying heathen temples. It would seem then that the mixed worshippers of 2 Kings xvii. were the imported garrisons, as a careful reading of the passage suggests, nor is it at all improbable that some of the garrisons were recalled and replaced by others. Behind them were no doubt Israelites as indomitable as the Irish were, strictly preserving their own faith, winning over to it by intermarriages their conquerors, and as the English settlers became, in quite a short time, *Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores*, so may some of the imported races have become *Israelitis Israelitiores*.

A natural question arises. Are we not told of the utter demoralization of Israel? had not the Ten Tribes become idolaters past all remedy? No doubt this was true of the upper classes, and probably of a great mass of the people. But we must remember that when Elijah thought that he was the only worshipper of Jehovah left, there were nevertheless 7,000 in Israel who had never bowed the knee to Baal. The extraordinary tenacity of the Samaritans through ages of devastating persecution in the Christian era lends probability to the supposition that the same tenacity

characterized the remnant in Israel through centuries of idolatry that preceded the captivity.

Such allegiance to Jehovah does not, of course, fit in smoothly with the belief that the Pentateuch was incomplete even in the days of Ezra. On the other hand, it does explain in the simplest manner how one sect of Judaism recognized the Torah only. On the assumption that the other books of the Old Testament were later than the Torah, it is perfectly natural to think of a stubbornly conservative body clinging to the law which Joshua had transmitted to it from the hand of Moses. I forbear to press here the arguments on these lines which you may find for yourselves in Thompson's *Samaritans* and Gaster's *Samaritans*. I only note that neither Dr. Kidd for the Society of Sacred Study nor Dr. Peake could inform me of any serious attempt that has been made in England to answer either of these books, which have behind them a formidable mass of palæographic study. Dr. Cowley—a learned Samaritan scholar—in his *Aramaic Papyri* suggests a notable modification of the Higher Critical teaching, while he adheres to the substance of that teaching. He writes: "The strength of Ezra's moral appeal . . . lay in his insistence that the law had hitherto been neglected, and that this neglect was the cause of the national misfortunes, and that the only hope for the future was to be found in a return to the supposed faith of an ideal past. To have admitted that the Law was a new thing, invented even with the best objects, would have defeated his whole purpose. And perhaps it was not new. Various documents of different dates must, or may have been, in existence, from which the complete work was produced very much in the manner on which modern criticism insists—only that previously the documents had not been generally accessible, and that the final reduction took place at one definite time, and not as a gradual and rather undefined process." The truth is that the Samaritans are a serious stumbling-block to the theories of Higher Criticism. For there is no doubt that the acute hostility between Jew and Samaritan dates from the time when—according to the critics—the Samaritans accepted from the Jews the Pentateuch and the Pentateuch only as the Word of God. But that date is prior to the completion of the Pentateuch according to most of the critics.

Permit me now to turn your thoughts in an entirely different direction. My reading about the Samaritans suggested to me the possibility that the Epistle to the Hebrews might have been written to Samaritan Christians. The Samaritans do not indeed call themselves Hebrews, but their position, as the Christian Church formed itself, compelled them to lean to the Jewish rather than to the Gentile branch of the Church. Conversion to Christ ideally blotted out nationality. But the realization of the ideal must have been gradual. The Samaritan convert could not be either a Gentile or a Jew. But the term "Hebrew" would place him in right relation to both sections of the infant Church. There were strong settlements of Samaritans, prosperous communities in Rome and in Alexandria as well as in Samaria. At all events the term

“Hebrews” is in marked contrast with St. Peter’s “to the twelve tribes who are of the dispersion.” We must not, of course, forget that the title is not part of the Epistle. But the fact remains that in some way the Epistle secured for itself an unusual designation.

Does the main tone of the Epistle, it may be asked, accord with its being addressed to what must have been comparatively a small circle? Dr. Nairne in his *Epistle of the Priesthood* says (p. 10): “Let the first readers be ‘a little clan,’ and let that little clan be no church, not even the church at so-and-so’s house with its complement of numbers from various classes, but understood to be a group of scholarly men like the author,” and again (p. 20): “that he wrote to a little company of friends who had been brought up in Judaism.” This suggestion needs modification for “them that had rule over you” (xiii. 4) unquestionably implies a church, but the “little clan” would certainly suit the Samaritan Christians. Their position between Jew and Gentile gave them precisely that position in the Christian world.

This “little clan,” Dr. Nairne suggests, was under pressure of temptation to forsake its new “synagogue” and to return to the old in defence of their ancient creed. They were inclined to give up their new faith at the call of patriotism. Such a call came in the year A.D. 67 “when the mad fury of the Jews infected the Samaritans with its contagion, and dragged a large body of them deceived by apocalyptic frenzy to a like destruction with the Jews” (Montgomery, p. 86). Over 11,000 perished in this rising. It did not infect the whole Samaritan community, but only the more fanatical members of the sect. We have here an appeal to a comparatively small circle, but a very urgent appeal uttered at a moment when apocalyptic hope was pervading the Christian as well as the Jewish world. The Christian leaders who discouraged violence would be counted as lukewarm traitors. This would be the moment for an appeal from those leaders to the more thoughtful; for their influence might restrain the hot-headed advocates of a national rally to the cause of the Messiah. There could not, of course, be any denial of Messianic hope. On the contrary, “yet once more I will make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven” (xii. 27). Only “ye have need of patience, that having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise. For yet a very little while, He that cometh shall come and shall not tarry” (x. 36). But the way to prepare for His coming is not to throw off your Christian hope, and to cast in your lot with zealots. Bear yet awhile the miseries incident to your membership of a *religio illicita*. For “my righteous one shall live by faith, and if he shrink back my soul hath no pleasure in him. But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition” (x. 38, 39). Yield not to the temptation to cut short your persecution by rallying to the standard of a false Messiah.

If this date A.D. 67 be accepted, we have the death of St. Paul A.D. 64 followed, may we suggest, by the liberation of Timothy, who may well have shared St. Luke’s companionship of the great

Apostle's imprisonment. "Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty" (xiii. 23). It is not a bold flight of historical imagination to draw to that prison Philip the Evangelist, the intimate friend of both Luke and Paul. Philip's home was Cæsarea, the capital of the united province of Judæa and Samaria, only a score of miles distant from Sichem. Philip was, of course, the evangelist of the Samaritans, and in closest touch with the growth of their infant Churches. He fits quite easily into the description required by chapter ii. 3, where the writer refers to "the salvation which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard, God also bearing them witness by signs and wonders and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Ghost." The words have a singular fitness for Philip, whose effective preaching does not seem to have been accompanied by "gifts of the Holy Ghost." These apostolic gifts, exercised by others, confirmed the word of salvation, which Philip had heard, but could not deliver as an eye-witness.

There would be very little in this suggestion, if it had no confirmation from within the Epistle. On the other hand, if the letter bears traces of arguments or other matter of a character distinctive of Samaritans and differentiating them from other Hebrews, our hypothesis will receive some corroboration.

The first hint that Hebrews might be Samaritans came to me in the study of St. Stephen's speech, in which there seemed to be suggestions of the Samaritan controversy. Among these I noticed the reference to Joshua and the Tabernacle. In our Bibles, outside the Pentateuch, these are the only two references to Joshua except the passage in the Book of Kings about the rebuilding of Jericho. Those two passages are in the 7th chapter of Acts and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Apocrypha Joshua is only mentioned three times, though fully enough in the 46th chapter of Ecclesiasticus. His name occurs fairly often in the Apocryphal books, that is, outside the accepted Canon of the Old Testament. Nowhere is he connected with any uncompleted work, with any entry into future rest or future glory. But in the 4th chapter of the Hebrews the argument is a sharp contrast between the unfinished rest achieved by Joshua the son of Nun, and the entry of Jesus the Son of God into heaven, "the sabbath rest of the people of God." That Joshua was held, and is held, in great honour by the Samaritans is well known. It has even been asserted that the Messiah or Taeb is to be Joshua himself. The following hymn, of a later date no doubt than the Hebrews, helps us to understand how a writer could pass from Joshua the Messiah to Jesus the Son of God, our Messiah and High Priest. "The advent of Taeb (Messiah) shall be in peace and his star shall shine in heaven. . . . He shall dwell upon the holy hill. Then shall be revealed the Tabernacle with all its furnishings, and the ancient ritual shall be restored in the full ministration of the Priesthood. Israel shall dwell in safety and security, and perform its solemn feasts in peace, and the Taeb shall have a perpetual Kingdom to the latter day" (Montgomery, p. 248). There

is certainly no passage in the O.T. that gives such a clue as this to the aspirations which undoubtedly lie behind the Epistle to the Hebrews.

So we are led on to the most distinctive contrast between Jews and Samaritans in respect of Messianic hope. The Jewish Messiah was to be a king descended from David. The Samaritans resting on the promise (Deut. xviii. 15) "The Lord Thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from amongst their brethren like unto thee," insisted that the Taeb could not come from any house but the house of Moses and Aaron. The Samaritans refuse to derive the promise of the Messiah from the prophecy of Balaam. The Taeb is to be a Teacher, a Restorer, but emphatically he is a priest. In this respect the Epistle to the Hebrews stands in marked contrast to the rest of the New Testament. There, both in the Gospels and in the Epistles, repeated stress is laid on our Lord's Davidic descent. The writer of the Hebrews does not hesitate to point out that such descent was a disqualification for priestly office. "It is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah, as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests" (vii. 14).

On the other hand, in this Epistle the Melchizedec Priesthood eclipses, and almost evacuates of its glory, the Priesthood of Aaron. How are we to account for this? There can be but one answer. The root quarrel between the Jews and Samaritans was as to the true line of Aaronic Priesthood. Rivalry between the descendants of Eleazar and those of Ithamar, the two sons of Aaron, has left its traces even in Old Testament history. As between Jews and Samaritans it was most acute. The Samaritans held that Eli of the Ithamar branch moved the Tabernacle from Shechem to Shiloh and so brought to an end the period of Divine favour. The Samaritan priests to this day trace their priesthood to Eleazar. This schism could not be continued in the Christian Church. It was a happy solution which used for this purpose the 90th Psalm, quoted by our Lord in connection with his Davidic descent. The same Psalm claimed for him the Priesthood of Melchizedec. The Samaritans were able to honour Melchizedec by making him King not of Jerusalem but of a Salem which is to the East of Shechem.

It should not be forgotten that there was a moment in Jewish history when the offices of prophet, priest and king met in the person of John Hyrcanus, the great enemy of the Samaritans. John Hyrcanus raised in his person Messianic hopes which came to a miserable end in his successors. He had claimed the title and rôle of "Priest of the most High God," but his successors had taken all the glory out of the name. It became hateful to the patriotic Pharisee, and singularly inappropriate in a letter to ordinary Jewish Christians. Here in our Epistle we might almost read between the lines: "That Melchizedec Priesthood, to which your great enemy John Hyrcanus falsely aspired, has found its fulfilment in Jesus, Whom the whole Hebrew race may acclaim as the true Prophet, Priest and King superseding both Aaron and David."

Before passing from the High Priest to the Tabernacle let me

call your attention to the characteristics of the High Priest on which our writer dwells. They may be summed up in the word "sympathy," the fruit of brotherly fellowship. In the Pentateuch this sympathy finds expression in the mention of the sins of Aaron and his sons, and in the constant need for atonement of such sins. But in the New Testament the collusion between the Priesthood and foreign powers has made the Priesthood very unpopular with the devout. With the exception of Zechariah, the father of John Baptist, I doubt if there is favourable mention of a single priest in the New Testament. The Priesthood are the persecutors of our Lord and of His Church. Not one of the Evangelists or Apostles mentions them with favour, still less is any spiritual lesson drawn from them. On the other hand the Samaritan Priesthood fell under no such disfavour. They were never supporters of a foreign dynasty. Their sympathy with the people, and close association with them in modern times, is abundantly testified by visitors, and it is not unreasonable to believe that the presentation of our Lord as the great High Priest would have been more acceptable to a Samaritan than to a Jewish Christian. Christian sacerdotalism has made it easy and natural for us to read the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is quite conceivable that to St. Paul it would have been difficult of acceptance. It follows a line of thought of which there is no trace in his writings.

From the Priesthood we pass naturally to the *Tabernacle*. Bishop Westcott (Hebr., p. 11) in suggesting reasons why our writer in spite of "the close connection of the early Church with the Temple (and) the splendour and majesty of its ritual," chose to dwell on the Tabernacle, says two things in which he most unconsciously confirms this Samaritan hypothesis. He says (1) that the writer "in order to lay his reasoning on the deepest foundation goes back to the first institution of the system. He shows how the original design of the priestly ritual of the Law . . . was satisfied by Christ." In other words, like a Samaritan he disregards all the post-Pentateuchal instructions as to the building of the Temple; (2) Bishop Westcott adds that "the Temple, like the Kingdom with which it was co-ordinate, was spiritually a sign of retrogression." Here we have an unconscious echo of St. Stephen's speech, which works up to the building of the Temple as the culminating act of Jewish apostasy. We may compare Stephen's "the Highest dwelleth not in hand-made buildings" with our writer's "Christ having become a High Priest . . . of the better and more perfect Tabernacle not hand made." (What? Is Philip echoing the dying words of his brother deacon?) We need not force this point. Whether the Gerizim Temple was standing at the beginning of the Christian era is very doubtful. But there are words in Montgomery's *Samaritans* (p. 230) which seem very apposite to our writer's treatment of the Mosaic ordinances as having a spiritual value far above the literal. Montgomery writes: "In general the control of the community has lain in the hands of the Priesthood, has not been usurped by lay doctors. Despite this fact Moses has

triumphed over Aaron, probably because of the enforced spiritualization of the Samaritan religion during its long suffering of persecution since the days of John Hyrcanus. The Samaritan theology is not interested in the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch. . . . A certain tone of spirituality marks Samaritan theology, so that it appears in a way as one of those numerous developments of Old Testament religion which were the forerunners of the spiritual worship of the synagogue and of Christianity. This stage may have been reached earlier than in Jerusalem, for the glory of Gerizim fell two centuries before that of Jerusalem." Montgomery's words help us to a right understanding of the Epistle. The writer is not arguing that the Aaronic Priesthood, with its Holy of Holies is a foreshadowing of a Christian Priesthood or that our High Priest is continually offering a memorial of His earthly sacrifice in Heaven, but that the whole Tabernacle with all its belongings was a figure of the eternal self-sacrifice of the Son of God. He is the true Holy of Holies, His flesh is the veil, by His blood, that is His death, the Veil is rent and His Godhead is revealed, by His one offering of Himself His people are for ever perfected. He is the altar and He is the burnt offering. "The Holy Tabernacle," say the Samaritans, "has disappeared, but it is only exalted, existing in some mystic fashion above the mount, but it will return with the Ark and all the sacred paraphernalia of worship to perfect the ritual of the Saints in the age of grace." (Montgomery, p. 239.) Was not this kind of thought in the back of our writer's mind? and belief of this kind was current among the Samaritans in the first century A.D.

Lack of space compels me to pass over many points on which I would fain dwell, such as the "effulgence of the Father's glory," the prominence given to the sabbath rest, the insistence on the new Covenant, the ashes of the heifer, and the extraordinary simplicity which remembrance of Philip's difficulties at Samaria imports into the well-known passage: "the word of the beginning of Christ, the foundation of repentance from dead works, doctrines of baptisms and laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment." I must content myself with one final passage where Samaritan reference solves many difficulties. In the 11th chapter our writer travels over the same ground as the 44th and following chapters of Ben Sira. In both a roll of Hebrew saints is unfolded. Common to both rolls are Noah, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Samuel and David. Joshua, though not named in Hebrews, is practically included in both. Of those whom our writer omits, we may notice especially Aaron and Phinehas, names that are redolent of controversy between Jew and Samaritan. Again he has no room for Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, but he includes (besides Jacob and Joseph, father of Ephraim), the Israelite Judges, Gideon, Barak, Samson and Jephthah, who are not named by Ben Sira. Of these by far the most remarkable is Samson. He is never mentioned in the Bible apart from the Book of Judges. His name does not occur in the indices of the Apocrypha or of the Apocalyptic books. How is it that he is found here among the heroes of faith? Westcott

points out that these judges overcame different enemies, and that "the writer passes no judgment on character"—yet the divorce between faith and character is not very convincing. Nairne does not even mention Samson, who has given many a preacher exegetical trouble. But when we turn to books on the Samaritans the difficulty vanishes. He was last of the Judges or Kings, and his reign was a landmark in Samaritan history. For it was in his time that Eli usurped the High Priesthood and moved the Tabernacle from Shechem to Shiloh. In his days the period of Divine favour came to an end and the present rule, the age of God's disfavour, was inaugurated. It may be open to question how far these Samaritan traditions go back. They come to us in chronicles of a later age. But I cannot doubt that the departures from the roll of Ben Sira are deliberate, and they certainly accord with our records of Samaritan tradition.

I am aware of weighty arguments on the other side—such as the free use of proof texts from books which the Samaritans did not regard as canonical. Especially adverse to my suggestion is such a passage as xii. 22: "ye are come to Mount Zion, and the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." But we cannot suppose that Samaritan Christians stood out against the belief of the rest of the Church either in the matter of canonical books or of the heavenly Jerusalem as equivalent to the City of God. They could not have accepted a suffering Christ on the basis of the Pentateuch only. I am far from pretending that my hypothesis solves all difficulties. But it does fit in with the growing sense of the importance of Cesaræa as a fountain of Christian tradition. It does provide for some survival of the mission to Samaria begun by our Lord Himself and continued on the death of Stephen. It does go a long way to remove the central difficulty of the Epistle, the appeal to the Priesthood of Christ and to the Tabernacle, not the Temple. Imagination carries me to St. Paul's prison, to Philip joining there his friends, Paul and Luke, to the drafting of this Epistle on the eve of Paul's martyrdom or after it, to its remaining in the Church of Rome along with the parchments of the great Apostle. I love to read it as a great manifestation of the reunion of Israel and Judah in the infant Church of Christ.

In *An Outline of the History of Christian Literature* (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 17s. 6d. net) Mr. George L. Hurst, B.D., seeks to give "guidance along an hitherto untrodden path." There is, he says, "no easily accessible work that tells the story of Christian Literature." Into a little over 500 pages he crowds brief references to writers of many lands, some of whom can scarcely be described as Christians. There is a full index, which will enable the reader to find the names of many who may not previously have been known to him. The writer shows himself an industrious collector of information, and it must have been a severe task of compression to embrace so large a number of authors.