

possible meaning is 'and the glory (or, strength) of the wild ox is His.' It is true, this does not suit the context, but it was the habit of the editors of partly illegible passages (such as Ps 95<sup>4b</sup> very likely became) to imagine a sense where they did not find one, by putting the legible or partly legible letters together, and gently manipulating them. I think that the original reading may have been something like this: וַיַּחֲקֵי בְרֵיחַי הַבַּל, 'and he fastened the bars of the world' (cf. Jon 2<sup>7</sup> [6], Job 38<sup>10</sup>). This, when it became indistinct, the editor may have misread as וְלוֹ חֻעֲפֹת הַיָּרִים, the famous old passage in Numbers having already, in his copy of the Oracles of Balaam, become corrupt in one word. The LXX translator, therefore, had to guess a meaning, and rendered τὰ ὑψητῶν τῶν ὀρέων. There is, I believe, one other passage of a Psalm in which Nu 23<sup>22</sup> is probably quoted, but the discussion would be a difficult and abstruse one, and it would draw away the reader's attention from the comparatively plain and simple matters which I have brought before him. The discussion of כֶּסֶף בְּרִצִי in the Massoretic text of Ps 68<sup>31</sup> [30] I must also reserve. I believe the phrase to belong to v.<sup>32</sup>, and that the true reading is בְּאוֹצַר כֶּסֶף, but to make vv.<sup>31, 32</sup> quite plain would hardly be possible without considering this by no means hopelessly difficult Psalm as a whole. I am sorry that Wellhausen has treated the passage respecting the 'Beast of the reed' and the 'calves of the people' so superficially. If the 'calves of the people' are allowed to remain, we need not wonder at 'Trample thou down the lovers of lies.' There is no doubt corruption in the line, but the single word which cannot be corrupt is כֶּסֶף, 'silver,' which is protected by v.<sup>29</sup>. It surely ought not to have been altered into קִנְיָ, 'lies'; while to be content with בְּרִצִי for בְּרִצִי is a piece of con-

servatism which I can hardly account for in such an acute critic as Wellhausen.

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

### The Western Text of Acts.

THE opinions which are quoted in Professor Tasker's interesting article in your last issue reinforce the position taken in my books and papers regarding Blass's theory. I, too, have 'endeavoured to prove that the language of the R. text often lacks the characteristics of Luke's style, whilst in many places it clearly bears the marks of a later recension' (see review of Blass in *Expositor*, 1897, p. 460; 1895, pp. 129, 212). The same explanation of the R. text of Acts 18<sup>7</sup>, and the same inference therefrom, as are quoted from Professor Bousset, were stated in my *Church in Rom. Emp.* p. 158. That 'the peculiarities of the R. text are not likely to be accounted for, except as the work of an editor who was not the author,' is the view I have maintained from the first, and had contended for, before Professor Blass wrote on the subject. My view, however, has been, on the whole, a little more favourable to Blass. I have maintained, as regards a considerable number of passages, that the R. text is either the original Lukan, or points the way to it, but the A. text is in most of these cases non-Lukan; and Bousset similarly admits 'the possibility that in the R. text an original reading may sometimes be found.' But, apart from my being, perhaps, slightly more favourable to the R. text, the contention of Professor Bousset is the same that I have been upholding for six years. Further, I have maintained that the 'editor' makes additions which are almost always good and true in Asia, but often false in Europe.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Aberdeen.

### Entre Nous.

The *Record* of the 7th October announces that in its next issue there will begin a series of articles by Dr. Sinkér, the librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, on 'The Higher Criticism: what is it? where does it lead us?' That is good news. Dr. Sinkér is extremely conservative, but he is a

scholar and a Christian. His articles will open the subject to genuine investigation, and, as the editor hopes, they will help some to view the position with more courage.

It is good news for the *Record*. With all our

love of the evangelical religion it was disappointing to find that the only disparaging review of the first volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* was printed in the pages of the *Record*. The disappointment was not on our own account, for the *Record* bore witness to the scholarship of the *Dictionary* as freely as any other review. But the volume had slipped into the hands of a man who was irreconcilably opposed to the criticism of the Old Testament, and the reason of his disparagement lay there. Now the truth is, that without the recognition of Old Testament Criticism, the *Dictionary* could not have been written. There are not scholars in existence to write it. Our business, as we conceive it, was to find for each subject the man who had made the deepest study of it. We could not have followed that principle, we could not have reached the scholarship which the *Record* itself gives us credit for, if we had first of all ruled criticism out.

The *Dictionary* has been well received. Not in this country only, but in Germany and America it has had a great reception—the reception for which we all worked hard, but which we scarcely dared anticipate. And besides the searching reviews, there comes constant evidence that the volume is in daily use. Men tell us that it is now at their elbow in the preparation of every sermon. At the recent Church Congress, Principal Robertson, of London, referred his hearers for the best discussion of the Acts of the Apostles to Mr. Headlam's very able article, and Professor Lock, of Oxford, quoted the book repeatedly by name.

Here is one of Professor Lock's references: 'It has become more evident that St. Paul's language is very often not primarily his own, but that he is taking up phrases, or even whole sentences, which have been uttered by the people to whom he is writing, or have been embodied in a letter from them. This is especially true of 1 and 2 Corinthians, because in this case we know that several letters had passed between St. Paul and Corinth. It is scarcely too much to say that the whole historical situation implied in 2 Corinthians has been so successfully reconstructed as to give an entirely fresh and more vivid interest to the letter (see Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. '2 Corinthians'); and I have elsewhere tried to show that the argument of 1 Cor. 8 is made much more clear if we suppose it to consist of a series of extracts from the Corinthian letter followed by St. Paul's comments upon them' (see the *Expositor*, July 1897).

Here again is an interesting quotation from the preface to the new edition of Dr. Plummer's *St. Luke*: 'This edition has also been improved by many small insertions, chiefly of references to books, which have either appeared, or have come to the writer's knowledge, since the first edition was published. First among these in importance is vol. i. of the new *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by Dr. Hastings, which should be in the hands of every biblical student. Three articles in particular may be mentioned, both on account of their excellence, and also of their helpfulness to the student of the Third Gospel: these are the articles on "Angels" (for this Gospel might be called the Gospel of Angels, so often does it mention these glorious beings); on the "Chronology of the New Testament"; and on the "Acts of the Apostles."

The editors of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in their issue for October, draw attention to our remarks and to those of Dr. Driver in the *Expositor*, in regard to the attitude of that venerable quarterly, and proceed to explain and defend it. The explanation is that it was founded in 1844 by Professor Bela B. Edwards and Professor Edwards A. Park, of Andover, with the co-operation of Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, and Professor Edward Robinson, of Union Seminary, New York. It was founded as a representative of the 'New School Calvinism,' with liberalising tendencies in the interpretation of Scripture; but not too liberal. And the defence is that it has kept along these lines and keeps along them now. Well, we doubt it. Our impression is that the *Bibliotheca Sacra* is far more conservative now than it was when it was started.

'You may be glad to know,' writes Professor Ramsay, 'that I think I have established "the first census (of the system) ordered by Augustus" as a fact henceforth fundamental in ancient history, instead of being (as most thought) a fiction, or a mistake, on the part of St. Luke. The consequences are important in numerous ways. The dating by Quirinius is also established as highly probable, though not on the same footing of practical certainty as the "first census."'

We shall find the proofs in Professor Ramsay's forthcoming book: *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton announce as nearly ready.

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 12 Clarendon Terrace, Dundee.