the terminus ad quem 200 B.C. With canonical acceptance, "the Prophets" attained also to liturgical use, the Haphtarah or Lesson from the Prophets being now added to the Parashah or Lesson from the Law. Thus was concluded the second stage whereby the canon now contained "the Law and the Prophets."

The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (132 B.C.) refers to other writings besides the Law and the Prophets, but not in terms that justify us in concluding that its author knew the third group, the K'thuhim or "Writings" in a completed form. The collecting of the works that form the third canon was probably begun during the Maccabean period. Of the writings that had escaped destruction by Antiochus, those would be selected which had exerted the greatest influence on the spirit of devout Jews during the national rising and the humiliations that preceded it. The Psalter was the first to attain to canonical recognition. In part, at least, this had been long in use as the service-book of the Temple singers, but now it was finally revised and invested with canonical authority as the hymn-book of Israel (160 B.C.). At or about the same time were added Proverbs, Job, Ruth, Lamentations, Ezra, and Nehemiah, and very possibly Daniel. The "Antilegomena" (Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Esther) and Chronicles obtained far more tardy admission. Professor Ryle, as the result of a searching investigation, concludes that the third canon was practically closed, with its present contents, about 105 B.C., although its contents were not officially determined till the Synod of Jamnia, about 100 A.D. Since the beginning of the second century the only modifications that have taken place have been in the order of the books of the Hagiographa (the present order is due to mediæval Jews), and the subdivision as late as the sixteenth century of the Books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. Professor Ryle contends strongly that no apocryphal works ever found a place in the Hebrew canon; Ecclesiasticus and 1st Maccabees alone enjoying such favour as perhaps to lead to an attempt in some quarters to gain for them a place in the canon, an attempt, however, which was quite without success. The handling of this question and of the relation of the Septuagint to the Hebrew canon furnish almost the only instances in the book where we should venture to question some of Professor Ryle's conclusions, and to suggest that he is unduly conservative. Few additional materials for the history of the canon are supplied by the Talmud and by early Christian writers. The position of one book, Esther, long remained doubtful. It is even omitted in the list of canonical Scriptures given by Melito of Sardis so late as 170 A.D. The closing chapter on "The Arrangement of the Books" finds confirmation of the results that have been reached, in the tripartite division "The Law," "the Prophets," and "the Writings," and in the fact that the arrangement of the "Prophets" and the "Writings" is neither chronological nor according to subject matter, a fact which is explained only when we recognise the gradual expansion of the canon.

Such are the main positions of this work, whose appearance is so opportune. Finally, we may remark that the style and tone of Professor Ryle leave nothing to be desired. The reader's interest is never allowed to flag, and we feel that we are in the hands of one whose scholarship it would be presumption to praise, whose critical research is conducted in a reverent and cautious spirit, and whose conclusions give us a higher conception of the wisdom of Him who spake to the fathers "by divers portions and in divers manners."

---

Our Debt to German Theology.

BY REV. PROFESSOR J. S. BANKS, HEADINGLEY COLLEGE.

III.

We have spoken of the favourable change which has come over German theology; and something should be said of the leader in a religious revival, which was as wonderful in its kind as the one under the Wesleys in England. Schleiermacher, who died in 1834, gave the deathblow to the dreary, sapless Rationalism which was almost universal in Germany before his day. He did this, not by any direct refutation, not by systematic teaching or vindication of orthodox doctrine, for
he was not a systematic thinker, and he was himself far enough from orthodoxy, but by showing in effect that there are more things in religion than Rationalism dreams of. His genius runs over with new ideas and new points of view, which others have turned to account. In some respects, he was not unlike our Coleridge; in others, Maurice. Every theologian since has shown signs of his influence. Orthodox writers, like Dorner and Martensen, are constantly referring to him, and are deeply imbued with his spirit. He showed others the way which he failed to follow up. Like another Moses, he led the hosts of God to the border of the Promised Land without entering it himself. In truth, his teaching is full of conflicting elements. If now he speaks like a pantheist or Arian or Sabellian, at another time he uses language about Christ as the Ideal Man and the Redeemer of men, which involves much more than he himself held, and which leads directly to the immemorial faith of the Church. One of his earliest works, *Discourses on Religion*, contains, in outline, the whole of his teaching. Here appears his peculiar theory that feeling is the central element in religion, intellect being quite subordinate. He would thus attach little importance to definite creeds and uniform belief. All that reason has to do is to evolve the utterances of the Christian consciousness or Christian experience.

The question naturally arises, Who is to represent this consciousness, and to speak for it? His early Moravian training makes itself felt here as well as in his glowing language about the life and character of Christ. "Religion is primarily a feeling, a sentiment, an intuition; it is the sense of the Infinite. To seek and find the Infinite in all that lives and moves, in all that becomes and changes: this is to be religious." While denying the miraculous conception and the personal pre-existence of Christ, he asserts, strenuously, that His moral and religious elevation above all other men was a miracle. "He is the ideal type of man. What exists in each man, only in the state of idea, was realised by Him in His person. Schleiermacher cannot give a direct proof of this fact, but he shows that the contrary hypothesis is inadmissible. The life and even the existence of the Christian Church would otherwise remain an enigma."  

1 Lichtenberger, *German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 67.  
2 Ibid. p. 153.
unsurpassed. His discussions of each topic in the
System—the Trinity, Creation, Revelation, Sin,
Christology, Atonement—are exhaustive treatises.
Each doctrine is viewed under three aspects—
Biblical, which is treated briefly, Ecclesiastical, and
then Dogmatic, where the author reasons out his
own position in masterly style. If Dorner is not
easy to read, the translators must bear part of the
blame.
It may be alleged that the influence of the
negative school of criticism is a heavy set-off to the
gain of our intercourse with Germany. I am too
little acquainted with the works of this school in
detail to be able to pronounce an opinion
on them; but it may be safely said that the last
word will not belong to those who take extreme
positions. No one questions the great ability and
learning of scholars like Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann,
Weizsäcker, Lipsius, Schürer, etc. On the other
hand, orthodox scholars are not slow to recognise
the rights of criticism, or to accept established
conclusions. Witness Delitzsch, Riehm, Von
Orelli, Strack, Kostermann, Weiss, perhaps even
Dillmann.

The Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of
Assyria and Babylonia.

By Theo. G. Pinches, British Museum.

Genesis ii. 4, 5:

These are the generations of the heaven and
of the earth... And no plant of the field was
yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet
sprung up.¹

The negative clauses of the non-Semitic account
of the creation may be regarded as corresponding
roughly with the above. They are as follows:—

1. The glorious house, the house of the gods,
in a glorious place had not been made;
2. A plant had not been brought forth, a tree
had not been created;
3. A brick had not been laid, a beam had not
been shaped;
4. A house had not been built, a city had not
been constructed;
5. A city had not been made, a foundation²
had not been made glorious;
6. Niffer had not been built, E-kura had not
been constructed;
7. Erech had not been built, E-ana had not
been constructed;
8. The Abyss had not been made, Ėridu had
not been constructed;
9. (As for) the glorious house, the house of
the gods, its seat had not been made—
10. The whole of the lands were sea.

¹ So the R.V.

The “positive clauses” corresponding with the
above, which describe the creation of the things
mentioned, is mutilated. The text runs, however,
as follows:—

31. Lord Merodach on the sea-shore raised a
bank.
32. . . . at first he made not;
33. . . . he caused to be.
34. [He caused the plant to be brought forth],
he made the tree;
35. . . . he made in its place.
36. [He laid the brick], he made the beams;
37. [He constructed the house], he built the city;
38. [He built the city], he made the founda-
tion glorious;
39. [He built the city Niffer], he built E-kura
the temple;
40. [He built the city Erech, he built E-a]na
the temple.

The text is here broken away, but it probably
went on to describe the creation of the other great
cities of Babylonia, with special reference, probably,
to Borsippa and its renowned temple-tower called
Ē-zida, to which the incantation on the reverse of
the tablet refers.

In the first of the two extracts given above, the
“glorious house of the gods,” in lines 1 and 9,
may be regarded as corresponding with the heavens,
where most of the gods of the Babylonians were