

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'GALILEE on the Mount of Olives' is the title of a booklet by Dr. Rudolph Hofmann of Leipzig, which is to appear very soon. It is announced as an attempt to explain the supposed discrepancies in the Gospel narratives of the appearances of the Risen Saviour. The author will endeavour to show that 'Galilee' is the name of one of the summits of the Mount of Olives, upon which in the time of our Lord, and for some centuries later, there was a hostel (Herberge) for Galileans; and in support of this opinion one of the earliest of the apocryphal Gospels and some of the oldest ecclesiastical writers will be quoted.

The curious coincidence by which nine leaves of the long-lost original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus were discovered in the Bodleian Library just at the moment when Mr. Schechter had identified the leaf brought from the East by Mrs. Lewis, is not likely to have been forgotten. The Clarendon Press is about to issue a critical edition of all the ten leaves. We are indebted to Professor Cheyne for drawing our attention to this forthcoming publication, and for enabling us to engage the Rev. H. W. Hogg, B.D., to prepare a scholar's estimate of the work for the next issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

The International Theological Library and the International Critical Commentary appear to have

given English theology a new position on the Continent. Mr. Selbie has already referred to the reception of Dr. Sanday's *Romans* (Dr. Sanday must forgive us, we know Mr. Headlam will, for naming him alone, it is only done for sound and brevity, signifying nothing). Dr. Rothstein, the distinguished Professor of Theology in the University of Halle, who has translated Professor Driver's *Introduction* into German, tells his readers that the work 'deserves the highest praise for its extremely practical arrangement, its rich contents, and especially for the prudent and calm judgment of the author on all critical questions.'

In the January issue of the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review*, Professor Peake of Manchester reviews the *Life and Letters* of the late Professor Hort. In an early issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES we hope to offer an estimate of Dr. Hort's personality and work from the pen of Professor Salmond; and we refer to the subject now to notice Professor Peake's opinion of the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort. It is well known that Messrs. T. & T. Clark have almost ready an entirely new Concordance of the Greek New Testament by Dr. Moulton of Cambridge (who has been greatly assisted by his son, Mr. James H. Moulton, M.A., late Fellow of King's College) and Professor Geden of Richmond. That Concordance, which will speedily be in all New Testament students'

hands, takes Westcott and Hort for basis. The readings unaccepted by Westcott and Hort will be acknowledged, but Westcott and Hort's New Testament will be recognised as the standard text. And it is well to notice that not only was this Dr. Hort's great work, but that in Professor Peake's judgment and in his words, 'with the materials at our command we are not likely to come much nearer to the text of the autographs, and it is improbable that any fresh discoveries will appreciably alter the text as he and Dr. Westcott have constructed it.'

Dr. J. P. Peters of New York contributes a paper to the current issue of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* on 'Christ's Treatment of the Old Testament.' In the progress of the article he comes upon the passage in St. Matthew (v. 21, 22) which contains our Lord's interpretation of the sixth commandment. The passage is given in the Revised Version in this way: 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgement: but I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire.'

Now it is not the uninstructed reader alone that finds in this passage three different degrees of punishment. Commentators of the highest reputation have always found the same. 'To unjust anger,' says John Lightfoot, 'the just anger and judgment of God, to public reproach a public trial, and hell-fire to that censure that adjudgeth another thither.' And Alford is most emphatic on 'the three degrees of guilt.' But all have missed the point. The crimes are only two, and the punishments are two to correspond with them.

First, there is the commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill,' and the Jewish punishment for its transgression, that 'whosoever shall kill shall be in

danger of the judgement.' To this Christ adds His own interpretation: Anger is murder, therefore 'I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement.' Then follows the other crime. It is a Jewish extension of the commandment, and the Jewish penalty for its transgression, 'Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council.' To which again Christ adds His own interpretation, 'Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire.' As before, it is an interpretation that is also a vast extension. 'Raca' is an epithet that is Jewish, local, temporary; 'thou fool' throws open the Jewish doors, and the crime and the consequence are universal.

And the point has been missed, says Dr. Peters, simply because our idiom differs from that of the evangelist. We take the words, 'and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca,' as the second part of Christ's interpretation. The evangelist gives it as another Jewish commandment. It is one of the traditions of the elders, one of the hedges by which they sought to preserve the Law from transgression. If we had been quoting it, we should have repeated the words at the beginning, 'It is also said,' or the like. St. Matthew does not repeat them, but leaves them understood.

There are few passages in which the margin of the Revised Version makes itself more an interpreter of Scripture than in the passage just referred to. But one of its notes can scarcely be helpful to the English reader, for whom it is written. At the fourth occurrence of the phrase, 'in danger of,' the note is added, 'Greek *unto* or *into*.' But 'in danger unto or into the hell of fire' is not very intelligible, even after 'hell' is explained as 'Gehenna.'

The Greek that stands for 'in danger of' is a single word. It occurs four times in the present passage. It is also used by the members of the Sanhedrin as they condemned our Lord to death. 'They answered and said, He is *guilty of death*,'

as our Authorized Version renders it both in Matt. xxvi. 66 and in Mark xiv. 64. In both these places, however, the Revisers give 'worthy of' in their text, and 'liable to' in their margin. It occurs also in a remarkable passage in St. Mark (iii. 29), in which our Lord describes the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost, not as 'in danger of eternal damnation,' as the Authorized Version gives it, but as 'guilty of an eternal sin.' Scarcely less remarkable is the passage in 1 Cor. xi. 27, in which St. Paul uses it, and says, 'Whosoever shall eat the bread, or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord.' It is the same word (*ἐνοχος*) that is translated *subject to* in Heb. ii. 15; and, finally, it is found in Jas. ii. 10, 'Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become *guilty of all*.'

Now this word *enochos* is used with various constructions. The tribunal is put in the dative as 'obnoxious to the Judgment or the Council.' When the crime is mentioned, the genitive is used, as in Mark iii. 29, 'In the power of an eternal sin.' So also when the punishment is given, as in our Saviour's condemnation, they said He was 'in the grasp of death.' And when this punishment is one that is almost too terrible to contemplate, the preposition *unto* is used with the accusative, 'gripped even to the length of the hell of fire.'

But now it is evident that if all these translations are right, even all the translations of the Revised Version, this word *enochos* has a wonderful elasticity of meaning. To be 'in danger of' seems a good long distance away from the judgment that is threatened; to be 'liable to' has come much nearer; to be 'subject to' is plainly within its grasp. But this 'within its grasp' is the only meaning of the word. From *en* 'in,' and *echo* 'to hold,' it is a kind of abbreviated participle, and is used of one who is 'held in' anything so that he is not able to escape.

Yet the only translation that seems quite inadequate is the one in the passage before us. And it is a pity that the Revisers did not alter it here, as they did in the passage in St. Mark, for the meaning of the phrase 'in danger of' was very different when the Authorized Version was made from the meaning it carries now. Connected through the French with *dominus* 'a lord,' danger was a great word in feudal England, for it signified the extent of a lord's jurisdiction, the range within which he could exercise his power. Hence, in the *Merchant of Venice* (iv. i. 180), Shakespeare makes Portia say—

You stand within his danger, do you not?

And Tindale shows us how strong the phrase was felt to be, when he translates Tit. iii. 3, 'For we our selves also were in tymes past unwyse, disobedient, deceived, in daunger to lustes,' where the phrase 'in danger to lusts' is in the Greek '*in slavery to lusts*.' So he who stands 'in the danger of hell fire' is surely too near to be comfortable.

'What is the Bible?' The readiest answer is that the Bible is the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. But that is just the answer that Canon Kingsbury finds rejected. A new quarterly magazine has appeared under the title of *Church and Synagogue*, and under the editorship of the Rev. G. H. Box, B.A. Its intention is to advocate the claims of the Parochial and Foreign Missions to the Jews. And it is in that magazine, appropriately, that Canon Kingsbury asks the question, 'What is the Bible?' and regrets to find this answer rejected.

For Principal Ottley, of the Pusey House in Oxford, has lately published a tract of which the title is, *The Church's Existence Earlier than that of the Bible*. Of course, Principal Ottley means earlier than the Scriptures of the New Testament, and we may presume he was not consciously thinking of the Old. But Canon Kingsbury does not believe that the thesis will do much good even then, and he stoutly protests against the use

of the word *Bible*, under any circumstances, to designate that which remains when the Old Testament has been left out.

And we may safely affirm that any attempt to exclude the Old Testament from the Bible, would be as hotly resisted now as in all the history of the Church. We have not the least hesitation in saying that, to-day, the Old Testament is more widely read, more carefully studied, more sincerely loved, than ever it was before. And not in this country only; in every civilised country in the world; certainly in every country to which the Reformation of religion has come.

An instance is just to hand. Two new professors have recently been appointed to Knox College in Toronto. Mr. James Ballantyne has been appointed to the Chair of Apologetic, and Mr. G. L. Robinson to the Chair of Old Testament Literature. Both men are in the very springtime of life, and sensitive to the religious movements of our time. So when Professor Robinson was chosen to deliver the inaugural lecture at the opening of the College for the present session, he chose for his subject, 'The Place of Deuteronomy in Hebrew Literature,' and he began his lecture in this way: 'I accept of the chair to which you have called me because of my eagerness to teach, and my profound regard for Knox College. I choose the work of teaching the Old Testament because I am supremely interested in the Old Testament. It is with gratitude to God that through you I stand to-day on the threshold of my chosen life's work.'

Now there is not the most resolute opponent of the Higher Criticism who will deny that this interest in the Old Testament is full of encouragement, and that we owe it mainly to Criticism. It is this undeniable debt that has given the Higher Criticism its footing amongst us. The 'results' of the Higher Criticism are most distasteful still. For even if they were proved to be true, there is nothing that is more painful to an Anglo-Saxon

Christian than a revolution in thought, nothing more hateful than a revolution in religious thought. Even now if the Churches in our own land have passed from opposition into acquiescence, it is not because they believe in Criticism, it is because they see the good that Criticism has done.

But it seems to be possible to believe in Criticism, and yet reject the results of it. We have quoted a sentence from the inaugural lecture by Professor Robinson. The whole lecture is found, admirably reproduced, in an important new magazine published in Toronto, and entitled *The Westminster*. Let us quote a sentence further. 'I come to the Old Testament,' says Professor Robinson, 'as a believer in its historicity, and also in its essential inspiration. At the same time, I believe also in criticism. I believe that criticism, if scientifically conducted and kept within its own sphere, is a very important aid to knowledge.'

Now there is no 'result' of the Higher Criticism that is surer than the post-Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy. This, says Socin, is 'the one thing certain in criticism.' Says Dillmann, this is 'the conclusion upon which the dates of the other codes depend.' From this, adds Kittel, 'we can work both forwards and backwards.' 'The date of Deuteronomy,' continues Guthe, 'is no longer a hypothesis, but a fact.' And it is a fact, ends Bacon, which has long since 'acquired the force of an axiom.'

What are the reasons that have brought the critics to this axiomatic conclusion? First, the expression 'at that time,' which occurs fifteen times in the Book of Deuteronomy (1⁹. 16. 18. 2²⁴. 3⁴. 8. 12. 18. 21. 23. 4¹⁴. 5⁵. 9²⁰. 10¹⁻⁸), seems inappropriate in the mouth of Moses, speaking so soon after the events took place. But only seven of the fifteen refer to the events of the previous six months, the rest refer to the period before the departure from Horeb, and Professor Robinson thinks six months not too short for the use of the expression. Next, there is the formula 'unto this day,' which occurs six times (Dt. 2²². 3¹⁴. 10⁸. 11⁴. 29⁴. 34⁶). Two of

the six, however, belong to 'archæological notes,' the presence of which from a later hand Professor Robinson admits; one is found in the story of Moses' death, 'which is confessedly post-Mosaic'; two more refer to events of forty years previous; and the sixth accuses Israel of blindness of eyes and dulness of heart during all their desert wanderings 'unto this day'—an expression, says Professor Robinson, 'quite as appropriate as the accusation was just.' Lastly, there is the phrase 'beyond Jordan'; but it is admitted by critics of every school that 'beyond Jordan' is used of both sides of the Jordan, and is even used by the writer of the side of the Jordan where he stands. Not much, Professor Robinson thinks, can be made of that phrase either way.

More important, however, are the passages in Deuteronomy which indicate 'a reforming tendency,' and seem to demand a later date. They seem to demand a later date at least than Solomon. For it is the excesses of the later years of Solomon that the writer seems to have in mind. These passages are, first, the Law of the Kingdom (Dt. 17¹⁴⁻²⁰), which not only provides for the establishment of a monarchy in Israel, but makes certain definite provisions for that state, which seem ill-suited to the moment of entering the Promised Land. They are not to set a *stranger* over them as king; their king is not to multiply *horses* or *wives* to himself; and he is not to lead them down to Egypt. But not one of these provisions seems to Professor Robinson altogether unsuitable to the end of the wilderness wanderings. The aim of this section is to prevent a return to Egypt. And as for the multiplication of wives and horses, Solomon was not the only Oriental monarch who gloried in a great harem or a famous stud; this was the common ambition of kings, and the very point of the narrative is that the king of Israel must not do as the kings of the nations around him.

Next comes the explicit command, 'Thou shalt not set thee up a *mazzebah* (or pillar), which

Jehovah thy Lord hateth' (Dt. 16²²). That command seems to be in direct conflict with the prophecy of Isa. 19¹⁹: 'In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a *mazzebah* at the border thereof to the Lord.' But, says Professor Robinson, in the Pentateuch the word *mazzebah* is used in two different senses. Nine times it is used to denote a memorial or stone of witness, as Jacob's *mazzebah* at Bethel (Gn. 28^{18, 22}; so 31^{18, 45, 51, 52} 34^{14, 20}; Ex. 24⁴); and six times it is used to denote an image or pillar erected for idolatrous worship, as Ex. 23²⁴: 'Thou shalt break down their images'—the images of the Amorites, Hittites, and other heathen nations (and so Ex. 34¹³, Lv. 26¹, Dt. 7⁵ 12³). In Dt. 16²² the *mazzebah* is an idolatrous pillar; but in Is. 19¹⁹ it is simply a stone of witness unto the Lord.

Again, the allusion to star-worship (Dt. 4¹⁹ 17³) seems to bring the Book of Deuteronomy down to the time of Ahaz or Manasseh; for in the historical books from Judges to Kings there is no mention of star-worship until the reign of Ahaz (2 K. 17¹⁶). But Professor Robinson holds that absence, and absence of mention, are two different things. And, in any case, Deuteronomy lays little stress on star-worship, merely connecting it with the worship of the sun and moon.

But the chief historical reason for thinking that the Book of Deuteronomy had its origin in the time of the later kings is because its laws are so completely carried out in the reformation of Josiah. The story of Josiah's reformation we know. In carrying it out he followed, it is said, not the injunctions of Exodus or Leviticus, but of Deuteronomy only. The 'book of the law' that was found in the temple by Hilkiah could not, therefore, have been the entire Pentateuch (which indeed, says Kittel, Shaphan could never have read through twice in one day), but most probably the Book of Deuteronomy, or some portion of that book.

'Two or three considerations,' however, Professor Robinson finds in the way. First, the book was recognised as 'ancient.' Next, Josiah began his reformation before the book of the law was found. Then, in his treatment of the priests of the high places, Josiah contradicted the law of Deuteronomy, for in Deuteronomy (18⁶⁻⁸) these priests are allowed to come up to Jerusalem and there minister before the Lord; but according to 2 K. 23⁹, they did not come up to the altar in Jerusalem, but 'did eat unleavened bread among their brethren.' And, finally, Professor Robinson is not troubled with the statement that Shaphan read the whole book of the law twice in one day, for he only finds that stated by Kittel, and he does not think that Kittel is right.

Now, if the whole argument for the later date of Deuteronomy could be spread out all over the field in this way, and attacked in separate detachments, it would have come to nought long ago. But Professor Robinson knows very well that it is not so. Accordingly, in the second part of his lecture, he gathers 'other reasons why men think the Book of Deuteronomy is of late origin,' gathers them into a single principle, and deals with them as a single argument. The reasons themselves are these: (1) Deuteronomy emphasises the unity of the sanctuary, an idea which was an *innovation* in Josiah's age. (2) Deuteronomy insists upon the *exclusive* worship of Jehovah, and the oneness of Jehovah was first preached to Israel by the prophets of the eighth century. (3) The dominant theological ideas of Deuteronomy presuppose an advanced age of theological reflection. (4) Deuteronomy restricts the priesthood to the tribe of Levi. (5) The laws of Deuteronomy differ so completely from the laws of Exodus, that, in the interval, a complete social revolution has taken place. (6) The influence of Deuteronomy is seen on Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah, but not on Amos, Hosea, and the undisputed parts of Isaiah. (7) The style of Deuteronomy, especially its rhetorical fulness and breadth of diction, implies a long development of the art of public oratory.

Well, Professor Robinson thinks that all these reasons may be grouped under the head of one great principle, and he calls it 'the philosophy of history.' Now it may be stated at once that Professor Robinson has little faith in the philosophy of history. He holds that it is Hegelianism in disguise. And he has no faith whatever in Hegelianism. He says, in effect, that all these reasons may be reduced to this one reason: the philosophy of history demands a certain rude and unformed civilisation in the time of Moses, and a more developed form of civilisation in the time of Josiah; Deuteronomy fits the civilisation demanded for the time of Josiah, it does not fit that demanded for the time of Moses. In other words, these reasons rest on deduction, while they ought to rest on induction; for scientific criticism has only to do with the gathering of facts, it has nothing to do with their philosophy.

To the issue for 1896, just published, of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Professor Francis Brown of New York has contributed an article on 'Old Testament Problems.' Professor Robinson wrote from the outside; Professor Brown writes from the inside. He is not troubled about the date of Deuteronomy. He actually takes it as axiomatic still. He writes as an Old Testament student, not as one of the outside public. There are Old Testament problems that still face the Old Testament student, but Professor Francis Brown is evidently sure that the Mosaic date of Deuteronomy is not amongst them.

The first set of problems that still face the Old Testament student relate to the Old Testament text. Every careful exegete must be a critic of his text. And as yet he has no good critical editions to work upon. The Septuagint, the Peshittâ, the Vulgate—not one of them is yet to be had in an adequate critical form. Even the Hebrew text itself remains unedited till now. For Dr. Brown is not unmindful of the 'Haupt' editions of the Hebrew books (any more than he

is ungrateful for the smaller Cambridge edition of the Septuagint), but 'the plan of such a work permits it to be little more than a register of results attained, and the variety of its workmanship, the lack of common canons of judgment, the absence of the foundation-laying which the completed preliminary studies will, let us hope, some time supply, and the very limited space that can be given to critical apparatus or textual argument, all make its character, in this regard, of necessity provisional.'

Meanwhile something might be done by the commentators. 'How much may be accomplished within the limits of a commentary has become clear through Professor Moore's recent work on *Judges*, in which thorough examination of the facts and mastery of their details, delicate perception and discrimination in using the facts, and sober cautious judgment, are as manifest in the critical remarks on the text as they are in the exegetical matter.'

The next set of problems with which the Old Testament student has now to deal are literary problems. And first of all there are the problems of which the theological dogs of war are still in pursuit. With these Professor Brown is not particularly concerned at present. For 'it has more than once happened that science has learned to regard as a necessary postulate what defenders of the faith are just beginning to take alarm at, as a suggestion of the Evil One.' So Professor Brown will touch upon only one phase of this conflict—'the so-called appeal to archæology.'

Professor Brown does not quote Professor Sayce, who once remarked that the kings of Assyria were brazen-faced liars on their monuments. But he says that the witness of archæology is still historical witness, and has to be sifted and interpreted just as any other historical witness has to be. Its advantage lies in its antiquity; its disadvantage in the proportionate difficulty of its interpretation. 'It is in a high degree trustworthy, but often in a high degree unintelligible, or of doubtful meaning.'

'But one of the crudest of mistakes in using archæology as a conservative ally is made when it is employed to win a battle in literary criticism. It is not equipped for that kind of fighting. It has its proper place in the determination of *historical* facts, but a very subordinate place, or none at all, in the determination of *literary* facts. To attempt to prove by archæology that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, is simply grotesque. The question is, not whether Moses could write, it is whether he did write certain books which there is strong internal and historical ground for holding he did not write; and on this point Archæology has nothing to say, nor is it likely that she will have anything to say. We only discredit a most useful, often surprisingly useful, handmaid of truth, when we set her a task for which she is in no way prepared.'

There are other questions that are raised in a more scientific spirit. There are difficulties that to the most scientific criticism are difficulties still. And now Professor Brown passes quickly to name the questions that, within the science itself and by its most conspicuous adherents, are still recognised as unsettled.

And, first of all, is the now widely accepted name of 'Hexateuch' a mistake? The name was given when it was seen that the same documents which were found in the first five books passed also into Joshua. No one denies that they pass into Joshua. The question is not, have we extended the designation too far? but, have we extended it far enough? In other words, do the same documents J and E, which are traced through the Hexateuch, run on through Judges, Samuel, and Kings; and, instead of 'Hexateuch,' ought we, trying to be perfectly accurate, to speak of the 'Dekateuch' rather? Professor Brown will not tell us whether we ought or not. It is a matter 'not yet fully determined.' But 'even in the present situation of somewhat tentative opinion on this point, we can see how large the interest is which attaches to the inquiry.'

More positive is Professor Brown's position on a question that is more disquieting. For he thinks that criticism in its progress is diminishing the amount of pre-exilic Hebrew literature that has come down to us, and increasing proportionately the exilic and post-exilic, particularly the latter. 'Observation of details,' says Professor Brown, — 'observation of details, and a growing historical and literary sense, combine to produce the evident result, that national disaster gave the greatest impulse to the crystallisation of literature, and that most of our Old Testament in its present form, as well as a much larger *original* part of it than was supposed even by free critics a few years ago, is of date subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem.'

Other matters still unsettled are the traces of the Editor's hand in the Old Testament, the disintegration of Isaiah, especially of the second part, and the existence of Davidic psalms. But it is evident that to Dr. Brown of deeper interest for the moment than any of these is the nature of the literature that passed through the hands of the Chronicler. At the winter meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Dr. Torrey of Andover read part of a paper in which he argued that of the books which we name Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the only original historical source is the memoirs of Nehemiah; there are no memoirs of Ezra, and all the rest is the work of the Chronicler. Dr. Brown has not heard the whole of the argument, and he will not pronounce on imperfect knowledge. But it is an inquiry 'of immense interest, and the result to which it has led Dr. Torrey emphasises, with emphasis new and exceeding, the necessity of submitting to the most minute and searching scrutiny every particle of the old Hebrew collection which has reached us.'

With that Professor Brown passes to the problems that are historical. The fourteenth chapter of Genesis is one of these. That chapter has been the subject of no little discussion, and that by

eminent scholarship, in recent numbers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. It is therefore of special interest to us to note that Professor Brown sees no sufficient reason yet for abandoning its essential historicity. But the place in which the difficulty lies is often misapprehended. The Babylonian elements are easily accepted. These it seems unlikely that any Israelite in any period would have invented, and, in the absence of conclusive proof to the contrary, Dr. Brown is prepared to find them true. It is to the Abrahamite episode that uncertainty attaches. The Abrahamite episode is to the Hebrew writer the kernel of the whole matter. And on that part of the story no new light has yet been thrown.

The other historical problem to which Professor Brown refers is perhaps for the moment the most keenly interesting of all Old Testament questions. Two years ago a Dutch theologian, Professor Kosters, the successor of Professor Kuenen, published a pamphlet in which he doubted or denied the return from the Captivity under Cyrus. It is astonishing to find Dr. Brown falling in with that. He does not do so absolutely. But he says that, inasmuch as the most familiar statements about the return in Cyrus' time cannot be traced farther back than the Chronicler, and the silence of the prophets is opposed to it, the position that no such return took place is one that cannot be disregarded—one that has very much in its favour.

The romance of Palestine exploration is like the romance of foreign missions. On a certain occasion in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland a member of Assembly spoke of the halo of romance that attached to mission work abroad. Dr. Duff of India was present. He rose and told that member what the romance of foreign missions came to, and the General Assembly has never forgotten the incident. Professor Porter of Beirut has just been telling us what the romance of Palestine exploration means.

Professor Porter left Beirut in August last to go to Jerusalem and see the work that Dr. Bliss is doing there. He had read the reports which every quarter Dr. Bliss has written of the progress of the work. And he had no doubt found them interesting and sometimes even romantic. So he went to Jerusalem to see the work itself. 'While I was there,' he says, 'work was being carried on in several different places, some on the hill within the Augustinian property, and others in the Tyropœon Valley below. It required much travelling up and down the steep hill to visit the various gangs of workmen, give directions, and keep everything fully in hand. The sun that beats down into the Tyropœon Valley in August is merciless, and the odours that arise from the open drain that pours its foetid stream down from the city are most pungent, especially when reinforced by the carcasses of mules and donkeys which find there a resting-place. It is a relief to escape from such an atmosphere, and burrow in the shafts and tunnels.'

But then the discoveries? Yes, if there *were* discoveries. Read the reports and see. The Palestine explorer is surely a man of faith no less than the foreign missionary. And it sometimes seems as if, like the foreign missionary, his faith must be sorely tried in the writing of his reports. That he *has* to write them, write them every quarter, write them fully, even elaborately, to the length of many pages of the *Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, and not a discovery to speak of!

Well, scarcely ever a discovery. There is one this quarter, perhaps. Dr. Bliss describes it

fully. The committee notes it in their introductory paragraphs. These are the committee's words:— 'Dr. Bliss's excavations in the Tyropœon Valley have brought to light a very remarkable stone stairway, forming part of a road leading down from the city past the Pool of Siloam. This stairway is 24 feet broad, and on its eastern side is a parapet, apparently constructed to prevent passengers falling over the scarp which exists there. The steps are thirty-four in number, so far as discovered. They are almost 7 inches in height, and are arranged in a system of wide and narrow treads alternately, the wide treads measuring between 4 and 5 feet in breadth, and the narrow ones about one foot and a quarter. The stones comprising these stairs are well jointed, and finely polished by footwear.'

That is the discovery. It is not much, you say. No, it is not much, if you have been looking for the covered colonnade which Solomon made to take him to the temple on Sabbath, or even, as Professor Hull seems bold enough to do, for the sacred vessels of the temple itself. It is not much. And even though the committee is ready to remind us of 'the stairs that go down from the city of David,' where Shallun, the son of Colhozeh (Neh. iii. 15) repaired the fountain-gate, they do not suggest that these are the stairs, they only suggest that 'possibly they may be on the same site.' So Palestine exploration, like foreign missions, can never live on romance. But, being still pursued, as at first it was undertaken, in the single-eyed service of the truth, it will still find willing supporters.