

hated foreigners. Their belief in one God, which, to the spiritual, was a proclamation of universal blessing and brotherhood, was to the unspiritual a means of extravagant pride, presumption, and cruelty. Israel was proud of her God rather than true to Him—and there is a vast difference between these states of soul. This contemptuous attitude of Israel towards foreigners was vigorously opposed by the noblest of her prophets, who ‘gradually extended Israel’s home mission into a foreign mission.’ But before the prophets’ day precursors of their movement had appeared. A few solitary and picturesque figures of foreigners in whom good was found flit across the stage. Such were Naaman and the widow of Sarepta, and such was this queen. These are known to history as persons who *appreciated*. In the time of each of them, Israel was neglecting and undervaluing her own spiritual treasures, and the appreciation shown by these rebuked her.

The emphatic thing in the story of the text is the enormous distance travelled by the queen, for she lived at the bounds of the known world. It was at least a thousand miles of camel-journey, involving several weeks of very dreary travelling. And the question which is at once suggested is, ‘What was it that she travelled to gain?’ The answer is ‘wisdom,’ and we are reminded of those mediæval scholar-pilgrims who were once so famous in Europe and the East. Jewish tradition takes a low view of the kind of wisdom that she sought, but Scripture warrants us in taking a higher view. ‘Three things,’ says Edersheim, ‘are beyond question. She was attracted by the fame of Solomon’s *wisdom*; she viewed that wisdom in connexion with the *name of Jehovah*; and she came to *learn*.’

In the text, Jesus Christ contrasts this apprecia-

tive queen with His own unappreciative generation. Infinitely more worthy of men’s regard than Solomon, he received, in comparison, almost none. ‘Solomon was wise, but here is wisdom’—and yet he is ‘despised and rejected of men,’ and ‘when they see him there is no beauty that they should desire him.’

Yet, great as this contrast is, there is a striking similarity between the two cases. The Jewish legends show that what had impressed the Jews most in Solomon’s grandeur was its show, its curious and wonderful riddles, its reported magic; the queen was most impressed with its revelation of Jehovah. In Christ’s day the Jews still sought after signs in the same trivial spirit, and it was of Gentiles that He said more than once, ‘I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.’ This difference of spirit was, in Christ’s estimation, all-important. He longed to be appreciated for His own sake, as the revelation to men of the divine love and of the divine truth. To those who thus appreciated Him, whether the centurion or the disciple, the Syrophenician woman or the sinful Jewess, His heart went out in readiest response.

To-day our Christian lands, with their indifference to the divine love and truth, and their curiosity concerning every external of religious history and ritual and personage, are rebuked by every heathen and by every outcast whose heart melts under a sense of the love and truth he finds in Christ. And the lesson for each one is, that all other matters are unimportant; differences of race, birth, education, endowment, wealth, are of no importance at all. One thing is needful, and that is, to value Christ,—to value Him for the supply of our deepest needs; to appreciate in Him the power of God, and the truth of God, and the love of God.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Van Hoonacker on Israel’s Return from Exile.¹

PROFESSOR VAN HOONACKER of Louvain is well known for his studies on the chronology and the

¹ *Nouvelles Études sur la Restauration Juive*. Par A. van Hoonacker. Paris, E. Leroux; Edinburgh and London, Williams & Norgate.

history of the period that followed the Exile in Babylon. With the late Dr. Kuenen he was engaged in controversy on this subject at the time of the Leyden professor’s death, and it now appears as if Dr. Kusters, who succeeded Kuenen in his chair, had fallen heir also to the controversies of his predecessor. A considerable sensation was caused by the appearance of Kusters’

Het herstel van Israël in het perzische tijdvak, which tended to revolutionise the traditional conception of the course of events described in Ezra-Nehemiah. The conclusions of the author have been substantially accepted by scholars like Cheyne, Van Manen, and Wildeboer, while they have been criticised more or less adversely by Wellhausen, Elhorst, and others. The important work of Van Hoonacker, which forms the subject of this notice, is intended mainly as a reply to Kusters. As it would be manifestly impossible, within the space at our disposal, to give anything like a detailed account of the arguments on either side, it may suffice to state succinctly what are the chief points at issue, in the hope that readers will be thus led to study both the authors in question.

One point Kusters concedes to Van Hoonacker which Kuenen would not yield—that it is necessary to reconstruct the chronology of the post-Exilic period to the extent of placing the work of Nehemiah *before* that of Ezra. Here, however, agreement ends between the two disputants, who are as far as possible from being at one regarding the date of Ezra's visit to Jerusalem.

The traditional position, as supported by the present form of the Book of Ezra, regarding the beginning of the post-Exilic history might be thus summoned up—Cyrus, immediately after his conquest of Babylon, issued a decree allowing the Jews to return. Many availed themselves of this permission, and, under the leadership of Zerubbabel, laid (in the second year after the return) the foundation of the temple. Operations had, however, to be suspended, owing to opposition from the Samaritans and others, until the second year of Darius, when, at the prompting of Haggai and Zechariah, they were resumed, and the temple was finished in Darius' sixth year.

Kusters, on the contrary, maintains that Ezra iii. has no historical foundation, that the building was not begun till the second year of Darius, and that *the temple was rebuilt not by returned exiles, but by Jews who had never been carried captive at all*. One of the chief points in dispute between him and Van Hoonacker concerns the interpretation of Hag. ii. 18 and Zech. viii. 9. According to Kusters, the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month in the former of these two passages gives the date alike of the prophet's exhortation and of the laying of the foundation of the temple; while Van Hoonacker will have it that the prophet

exhorts the people to look from the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month (the date of his utterance) to a date in the past when the foundation of the temple was laid. Both critics appeal with equal confidence both to grammar and to the context in favour of their interpretation. Here we must confess that Kusters seems, beyond all question, to be right, and we suspect that nothing but the supposed necessity to reconcile Haggai and Ezra would have led a scholar like Van Hoonacker to put such a strained interpretation upon the language of the prophet. In the September number of the *Th. Tijdschrift*, Kusters reiterates his opinion and defends his exegesis. On the other hand, Van Hoonacker appears to have more reason upon his side when he questions Kusters' assertion that neither Haggai nor Zechariah know anything of exiles that have returned, and that Zerubbabel was probably a native of Judæa, and not of Babylon. It may fairly be doubted whether such passages as Hag. i. 9; Zech. i. 12, ii. 6, vi. 15, will bear the weight of Kusters' inference. Regarding the history of the return in the time of Cyrus, Van Hoonacker does not hesitate to say that there is hardly a fact in the Old Testament better authenticated. He thus rejects totally the notion of Kusters, that the history has been reconstructed to suit the later notion that the Gola was the true Israel, and that as such it must be credited with the building of the temple. While, as has been said, the two disputants agree that the work of Nehemiah preceded that of Ezra, they differ regarding the date of the advent of the scribe,—Van Hoonacker interpreting the seventh year of Artaxerxes (Ezra vii. 8) to mean that date in the reign of Artaxerxes II. (B.C. 398), while Kusters rejects the seventh year, but assigns the coming of Ezra to the reign of Artaxerxes I., and about the time of Nehemiah's second visit (c. B.C. 432). Van Hoonacker defends the genuineness of the lists in Ezra ii. and Neh. vii. as really belonging to the time of Cyrus and Zerubbabel, while Kusters would assign these to the period when the Jewish community was formed by the puritanical methods of Ezra and Nehemiah. Finally, Van Hoonacker refuses to rearrange the history so as to make the great convocation of Neh. viii. form the climax of the work of the two reformers.

We are by no means yet at the end of the controversy. Meanwhile Van Hoonacker's work will serve admirably to place the student *au courant* of

all the questions that relate to the era of Israel's return from exile.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

The New 'Herzog.'

THE first volume of the new edition of the *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* is completed by the issue of Part 10, which contains the editorial preface. A brief statement is given of the principles which will guide Dr. HAUCK and his colleagues.

In the treatment of ecclesiastical questions, the aim will be to render service to Protestant Christendom, and not to any one Protestant Church; for beneath all the differences which divide the Churches of the Reformation, there is a fundamental unity to which only those can be blind who will not see. Opportunity will therefore be given to representative scholars of the various Protestant Churches to express their views. Nor will the writers on theological subjects be chosen in the interests of any particular school of thought. All articles will be welcome which show that the author's convictions are the result of mature thought and rest on scientific grounds; 'for true science destroys not, but edifies.'

Apocalyptic Literature of the Jews.

In an article on this subject of rapidly-growing interest, BOUSSET of Göttingen speaks in terms of high commendation of the work of English scholars, and comments on articles published in English as well as German magazines during the present year. 'In 1895 the first trustworthy critical edition of the Latin Version of 4 Ezra was published by Bensly in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, and in 1896 R. H. Charles rendered accessible, by translating from the Slavonic, a new apocryphal writing of the highest possible interest,—*The Book of the Secrets of Henoch*,—which was published at Oxford.' Reference is also made to the collation by Mr. Conybeare, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, of the 'specially valuable Armenian translation' of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. Gunkel's work on 'Creation and Chaos' (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1894) is described as an epoch-making book,

although Bousset is of opinion that the attempt to trace the influence of Babylonian mythology and cosmology in the Old and New Testaments is unsuccessful.

The transition from the prophetic writings of the Old Testament to the apocalyptic is almost imperceptible, but the latter are distinguished from the former by the predominance of the thought of a coming age which is sharply contrasted with the present age. In general, the prophets speak of a good time coming, for which the present era is to some extent a preparation, but the apocalyptic writers fix their hopes on a new age which will entirely differ from that which it will follow and supersede. Closely connected with this fundamental conception is the expectation of the judgment of the world and of the resurrection from the dead. From the time when Daniel vii. was written these thoughts dominated Jewish literature, although 'in their complete purity and in their full ethical power they appear first in the Gospel.' The special features of apocalyptic writings are further—the adoption of ingenious devices for calculating the time of the end, and a dependence upon the older literature of Israel. For a thorough understanding of the apocalyptic writings of Scripture, a more complete survey of similar literature in the sacred books of other religions is necessary. The material for a final judgment is not yet available, but the imaginative element in these writings is not, Bousset thinks, to be ascribed to any excessive power of imagination possessed by their authors, but rather to the influence exerted upon their minds by some of the non-Jewish religions.

Apologetics.

A comprehensive and closely-reasoned article on this important subject is contributed by Professor LEMME of Heidelberg, the author of *The Principles of Ritschlian Theology and their Value*, and no unworthy successor of Hagenbach and Christlieb, who wrote on this same theme in the first and second editions respectively. The opinions of the principal German writers of the last century are discussed in detail, from Planck, whose 'Introduction' appeared in 1794, to Ritschl; the names of English theologians appear only in the Book Lists appended to each section.

The right of Apologetics to be regarded as a branch of Systematic Theology is vindicated against the views of Planck, who includes it under Exegetical Theology; of Schleiermacher, who makes it a department of Philosophical Theology; and of Delitzsch, who treats it as a subdivision of Practical Theology. The task of the exegete is the defence of the various biblical narratives, but in Apologetics the aim is rather to establish the truth of the Christian faith. Schleiermacher's position is now undefended, even by his own followers, and his philosophic treatment of Christianity could but have shown its relative superiority to other forms of faith; and its unique claim to the possession of absolute truth his methods of argument could never have established.

The views of those who, like Delitzsch, Hofmann, and Steude, treat 'Apologetics' as a branch of Practical or Pastoral Theology are discussed at greater length. The distinction between *Apologetik* and *Apologie* is carefully expounded. *Apologetik* is something more than a scientific account of the best methods of conducting arguments for the defence of faith, or of writing an *Apologia*; instructions on such topics, doubtless, do belong to Practical Theology, but the great task of Apologetics is to establish and to justify the Christian view of the world, it must therefore be regarded as a department of Systematic Theology.

'The scientific interest in Apologetics corresponds exactly to the practical interest in missions.' Hence in the systems of rationalistic theologians who surrender the claim of Christianity to be the absolute religion, the statement and exposition of the Christian faith is necessarily of greater importance than its defence. Hence, also, in the theology of Ritschl, there is no place for Apologetics, defined as the science which establishes the truth of Christianity as the absolute religion; for, according to this modern school, 'the religious view of the world is not an objectively trustworthy reflection of actual world-relations, but a subjective conviction of the human consciousness and will.' Religion has therefore no objective basis; but to say that religion is a purely subjective conviction, in order to secure its withdrawal from the battleground on which rival objective theories of the universe are contending, is not to place it in a position of greater safety, but to exclude it from

the living intellectual forces which are striving for the mastery.

Amongst the articles of special interest in this volume—in addition to those to which attention has been called in these notes—may be mentioned: the Alexandrian School, the Apostles' Creed, and the Teaching of the Twelve (*Apostellehre*), by Harnack of Berlin; Superstition (*Aberglaube*), Accommodation, and the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, by Hofmann of Leipzig; the Apocryphal Books of the New Testament, by Schürer of Göttingen; the Anglican Church, by Kattenbusch of Giessen; Arabia, by Socin of Leipzig; and Biblical Archæology, by Kittel of Breslau. The article on 'The Devotional Life' (*Andacht*) is contributed by Professor Herrmann of Marburg, and contains an effective reply to those who depreciate religion by saying that devotional reverie is easier than doing good:—Reverie is not devotion; listless dreaming is as different as possible from true worship. In moments of communion the soul experiences its highest bliss; nevertheless, hours of devotion demand the utmost exertion of all its powers, in order that influences which are too often in the ascendant may be restrained and overcome. To pray aright we need to enter into our chamber, in order that we may be saved from wandering thoughts, but into the chamber a man of flesh and blood, and not a mere shadow of a man, must enter. A picture of our lives, conceived in all sincerity, and drawn with the utmost attainable accuracy, we must take with us when we desire to draw near to God. 'For the way to God lies through the conscience,' and in all true communion the will is stimulated. He who quietly listens to the revelation of God gains a clearer sense of his own duty, and contemplation issues in action. On the other hand, nothing is so morally enervating as 'devotions' which are nothing but stimulus and enjoyment. The concentration of thought which our daily work demands, instead of being a hindrance, should be a most important intellectual preparation for and aid to the devotional life, enabling us more easily to worship with that collectedness of mind which is essential to real communion. For 'he who cannot work will also be unable to pray.'

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Nestle on the Original Gospels and Acts.¹

THIS is a work of great importance and value. Dr. NESTLE is one of the best known of the scholars who at present are labouring to recover the Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) source which is supposed to underlie the present Greek text of part at least of the New Testament. He needs no introduction to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, who have recently had more than one specimen of his work brought under their notice. The present book is called forth by the sweeping condemnation passed by A. Meyer on some of our author's previous conclusions.

Dr. Nestle is at one with Dr. Blass regarding the importance to be attached to Codex D, of which we have lately heard so much. It is in quite a plaintive tone that he sets forth the wants that have hindered, and still hinder, the solution of the problem on which he is engaged—the want of a reliable synopsis, a complete, correct, and relatively cheap *apparatus criticus*, and a concordance giving for every Greek word of the New Testament its equivalent in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in the various Syriac recensions of the New. Without these ideal aids he has done his best, and we commend the *Philologica Sacra*, in which so many test passages are discussed, to the careful attention of all who are interested (and what biblical student is not?) in such questions.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

A Hebrew Grammar for Arabic-Speaking Jews.²

THIS excellent and unique work has to be judged according to its title—for Arabic-speaking Jews, who are in the peculiar position of speaking one language, and reading and writing another. The Jews of the East in social intercourse speak the Arabic of the streets, usually with a

¹ *Philologica Sacra*. Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte. Von Eberhard Nestle. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896, M. 1. 60.

² *Hebrew Grammar for Arabic-Speaking Jews*. By Abraham Kestin. (Alexandria, Egypt. 1s.)

vitiated accent, but are unable to read or write it. Hebrew is the language of the synagogue and Prayer-Book, and its characters are used in their book-keeping, but their knowledge of it is seldom grammatical. This grammar gives the explanation of the rules and the meaning of the words in Arabic, transliterated into the Hebrew alphabet according to a scheme in vogue among the Jews. Its purpose is to promote the study of Hebrew as a living language.

There is no attempt to offer a scholarly view of the philological affinities of the languages as in Wright's *Comparative Grammar*; it is simply to supply an immediate and temporary Jewish want. This accounts for peculiarities in the transliteration which secures equivalence of sound, but sometimes at the expense of obscuring facts of deeper equivalence, especially with regard to the letters *h*, *s*, *z*. The same reason may account for the Arabic of the title-page, which is a compromise between the correct and the colloquial. It will be a great gain in literary form when the spread of education, which has already created this demand for a provisional article, allows the author to print the Arabic Targum in Arabic characters, or to give the whole book in pure Hebrew. There are 140 well-filled pages, with about 120 lessons, dealing with Vowels and Accents; nouns classified as proper, common, abstract, of material and multitude; their inflections for number, gender, and pronominal suffixes; Adjectives, Prepositions, etc., with a full treatment of the Verb. The exercises are the result of many years' teaching of Hebrew in the Mission School of the Church of Scotland in Alexandria. While some are general, others are made specially interesting and instructive to children by dealing with quadrupeds, birds, insects, the human body, trees, divisions of time, etc., and these towards the end lead up to Bible extracts from the lives of Abraham, Joseph, Mordecai, and such tales from other sources as Samuel the Faithful, the King and the Peasant, etc., along with specimens of letters.

The book may be heartily recommended for Christian and Hebrew schools among the Arabic-speaking Jews; and especially for young men and adults who speak Arabic but cannot write or read it, and whose knowledge of Hebrew is superficial and confined to a fluent reading of the familiar passages in the Bible and Prayer-Book.

Beirut.

G. M. MACKIE.

Among the Periodicals. The Merenptah Inscription.

THIS inscription continues to engross the attention of biblical archæologists. It forms the subject of a study by Dr. BRANDT, of Amsterdam, in the *Theol. Tijdschrift* for September. The older narrative of the Exodus (JE) undoubtedly points to Ramses II. as the Pharaoh of the oppression. Whether it also considers him the Pharaoh of the Exodus, depends upon whether we assign Ex. ii. 23^a to the same source, JE, or reckon it along with 23^b, 24, 25 as belonging to P. On the first supposition, the Exodus took place under Merenptah; on the second, under Ramses. In any case, it is with Ramses' son and successor, Merenptah, that the new inscription has to do. The latter consists chiefly of a poetical description of the invasion and the defeat of the Libyans. The closing lines are what concern us. (A translation of these, by Professor Hommel, will be found in the October number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 16^b). In particular, we are attracted by the sentence, 'Israel is a *fk̄t* without fruit' (or 'seed'). What is *fk̄t*? There is an Egyptian priestly title, *fk̄ti*, which perhaps signifies 'bald,' and it is possible that the author of the inscription compares vanquished Israel to a bare land or a bare field, whose desolate condition would then be very fittingly described by the additional phrase, 'without fruit.' Unfortunately, however, the connexion of *fk̄t* with *fk̄ti* is uncertain, as well as the meaning of the latter term, and the difficulties of interpretation are aggravated by the circumstance that in other Egyptian texts the last word of the sentence has the meaning not only of 'fruit,' but of 'seed,' in the sense of 'offspring' (like the Greek σπέρμα).

Brandt considers that we cannot infer less from the inscription (and here he differs from Hommel) than that the King of Egypt, *in the course of an expedition to Palestine*, had inflicted a crushing defeat upon Israel. He holds, however (and here he differs from Steindorff, see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September, p. 54^b), that the inscription does not make it clear whether the Israelites were as yet settled in Palestine or not. The towns mentioned—Ashkelon, Gezer, Jenoaam—form, indeed, a chain from south to north, but we have only to cast a look on the other places that occur in the

text to convince ourselves that geographical order is not the ruling principle. It is quite possible that Merenptah had attacked Israel in the steppes outside the borders of Palestine. As little does the inscription decide whether the Exodus had taken place recently, or even whether Israel had ever been in Egypt at all. Winckler, as is well known, denies the traditional bondage in Egypt and the sojourning of Israel in the Negeb and at Kadesh. He maintains that the last-named district, the land of *Musri*, was occupied by the non-Israelitish clan of Caleb, while the Bene-Israel were a group of tribes settled in the north of Palestine, and referred to frequently in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence as the *Khabiri*. Brandt, like Steindorff, considers that this bold theory has rather gained than lost in probability since the discovery of Merenptah's inscription. What is referred to in the latter is no mere expedition to bring back fugitive serfs, such as is described in Ex. xiv.; rather must we think of a regular campaign undertaken for the purpose of maintaining the Egyptian supremacy (which had been established by the conquests of Seti I.) against an attempt on the part of certain Palestinian princes and tribes to shake off the yoke. The circumstance that the territory of their suzerain had been invaded by the Libyans may have emboldened them to make this effort. Merenptah, however, defeated the Libyans, and then turned his attention to the subjugation of his Palestinian vassals. The episode was one that often recurred in the history of the principalities of Palestine. We hear of successful expeditions of the Pharaoh to this country in the time of Solomon (1 Kings ix. 16), Hadad and Jeroboam were both supported by Egypt (1 Kings xi. 14 ff., 40), and Shishak is said to have invaded Judah in the reign of Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 25). The setting up of a rival kingdom may have been part of the punishment dealt out by the Egyptian monarch to his rebellious vassal, the son and successor of Solomon. We see the same policy at work on both sides when other powers, such as Assyria or Babylon, assumed the rôle formerly played by Egypt.

A Difficult Passage in St. James.

In the September number of the *Revue de Théologie*, M. BRUSTON discusses the *crux inter-*

pretum, Jas. iv. 4-6. While the whole passage presents difficulties to the translator, the correct rendering of verse 5 is particularly doubtful. A glance at the English Version is enough to prove this. The Authorized Version reads, 'Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, the spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?' Equally devoid of any apparent sense is the rendering of the Revised Version, 'Or think ye that the Scripture speaketh in vain? Doth the spirit which He made to dwell in us long unto envying?' That the Revisers were little satisfied with what stands in their text is evident from the alternative renderings they offer in the margin: 'The spirit which He made to dwell in us He yearneth for, even unto jealous envy,' or 'That spirit which He made to dwell in us yearneth for us even unto jealous envy.' The former of these alternatives is practically what Bruston adopts as the translation of the verse. The point of the reproach is suggested by the term of address in verse 4, 'Ye *adulteresses*' (R.V.; the additional words 'ye adulterers' of

A.V. lack MS. support), and the passage may be paraphrased thus: 'Know ye not that in seeking the friendship of the world, ye draw upon yourselves the enmity and wrath of God, as an adulteress renders herself liable to the just fury of her husband? Or think ye that the saying of the Scripture is vain, God desires (loves) with jealousy the spirit which He has placed in us? Nay, the saying is not vain; God's love will be changed into fury against the spirit created by Himself, if that spirit is unfaithful to Him.' The only real difficulty is that the words which appear as a scriptural citation are nowhere found in the Old Testament. This difficulty may, however, be met by the consideration that the two ideas embodied in the words are repeatedly expressed—(1) God is a jealous God (Deut. vi. 15, vii. 4; Josh. xxiv. 19, etc.); and (2) God has caused to dwell in man a spirit capable of knowing and loving Him (Gen. i. ii.; Ps. civ. 30; Job xii. 10, xxvii. 3, etc.).

Maryculter.

J. A. SELBIE.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

A HISTORY OF THE WARFARE OF SCIENCE WITH THEOLOGY IN CHRISTENDOM. BY ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, LL.D., L.H.D., Ph.D. (*Macmillan*. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. xxiii + 415, xiii + 474.) When the great Darwinian scare blew over,

And what gave rise
To no little surprise,
Nobody seemed one penny the worse,

we all resolved that we should never be scared by science again. And no doubt it is that resolution that has kept our heads so cool over the Higher Criticism.

What is it that makes the conflict between science and theology? Here is a book of two great volumes, and it is full of the controversy. From the infancy of scientific research these two have been doing battle together. No generation has escaped the conflict. What is the cause?

It seems to be either that science is not science, but falsely so called, and that side of the circum-

stance is somewhat ignored in these volumes. Or else it is that we have misunderstood our Bible. For, according to President White, the conflict of all the ages has been between science and a mistaken interpretation of the Bible. When Draper wrote his *Conflict between Science and Religion*, his very title showed that he misunderstood the matter. Between science and religion there never was and never could be any conflict; for God and Nature were never at strife. But between science and theology there may be conflict any day, and as a matter of fact there has been conflict always. And one reason is that the theology of the day misunderstood and misinterpreted its Bible.

Take an instance. Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, 'a man whose noble character and beautiful culture gave him very wide influence in all branches of the American Protestant Church,' detested slavery, but demonstrated that the Bible sanctioned it. Then came that tremendous rejoinder which echoed from heart to heart throughout the Northern