
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

CRITICAL NOTES

UNITARIANISM IN AMERICA, PAST AND PRESENT

UNITARIANISM in America in the first half of the nineteenth century had little resemblance to that which goes under the name at the present time. The Unitarianism of which Channing was the representative maintained the inspiration and the authority of the Bible, defended miracles, accepted the historical evidences of Christianity as satisfactory and conclusive, believed in the preëxistence of the Divine Word which became incarnate in Jesus, accepted the miraculous conception of Christ, and defended these views not on purely rationalistic grounds, but by interpretation of what was accepted as the Word of God incorporated in the books of the Bible. No abler statements of the evidences of Christianity have been made than those by Unitarians during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century. No stronger defense of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel has been published than that by Professor Ezra Abbot. No more original, powerful, and satisfactory defenses of the early date and the historical accuracy of the four Gospels have been written than "The Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels," by Professor Andrews Norton, of the Harvard Divinity School, and "Indirect Testimony of History to the Genuineness of the Gospels," by Professor Frederic Huidekoper, of the Meadville Theological School.

For the first seventy-five years of the nineteenth century the controversies between the Unitarians and the evangelical scholars of New England were over the interpretation of the Bible in its bearing upon the doctrine of the real divinity of Christ. The Unitarians advocated the Arian view, that Christ was a created being — the firstborn of the creation — to whom was delegated the creation of the world. Andover Theological Seminary was established in 1808 for the defense of the Orthodox doctrine of the real divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of the

atonement dependent upon it. As the result of this Andover movement, there followed a remarkable amount of evangelical activity, leading to the spread of home missions and of Christian colleges throughout our expanding West, and to the organization of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and subsequently to the foreign missionary boards of various other denominations, whose work now so fills the world. On the other hand, the fruits of Unitarianism were very limited. Their work was almost wholly confined to Massachusetts, and they had practically no foreign missions. In 1844 BIBLIOTHECA SACRA was established, to carry on the controversy in defense of Orthodox doctrines. Some time before the close of the century the exegetical victory was practically complete, and leading Unitarians admitted that if the Bible was an inspired historical record, its interpretation established the Orthodox views.

Due largely to an exaggerated and erroneous belief respecting the truth and significance of the Spencerian doctrine of evolution in its application to human history, and to the equally exaggerated and erroneous credence given to the principles of Biblical criticism prevalent in Germany, a radical change in the attitude not only of Unitarians, but of a large section of those who have been supposed to represent Orthodox scholarship, took place with reference to God and the Bible. The character of this change with reference to the Bible is well illustrated in that which appeared in the attitude of Professor Joseph Henry Thayer, for a long while professor of New Testament Literature in Andover Theological Seminary, where the Creed to which he subscribed compelled adherence to a very high view of the inspiration and the authority of the Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament. Upon the departure of Andover from loyal adherence to the Creed, Professor Thayer resigned, rather than remain in the false position of one who should continue to sign a creed which he no longer believed; and soon after, without changing his church relationship, he accepted a pro-

fessorship in the Harvard Divinity School, which had been Unitarian, but, through the influence of President Eliot, had been transformed and placed upon a basis independent of denominational control. In a lecture given under the auspices of the Boston Board of the American Institute of Sacred Literature, February 17, 1891, and published by Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Professor Thayer makes the following emphatic statement: "The critics are agreed that the view of Scripture in which you and I were educated which has been prevalent here in New England for generations, is untenable. And you and I may convince ourselves that, so far at least, they are thoroughly in the right" (p. 65). With the arguments by which Professor Thayer supports this conclusion we are not at present concerned, only to say that, for the most part, they are based upon an exaggerated estimate of the discrepancies of the Bible, upon a failure to apply reasonable explanations for such as are alleged to occur, and in one instance upon facts in textual criticism which sustain rather than oppose Orthodox views. This relates to the respect which the New Testament pays to the Septuagint Version. Thus he says: "Of the more than a thousand (1,083) reminiscences of the Old Testament which the latest editors of the New Testament find in it, all but two and a half per cent. come from the Septuagint, and, in more than one instance out of a hundred, rest on that version as against the Hebrew original" (p. 20). Readers of Mr. Wiener's writings upon the value of the Septuagint in correcting the text of the Massoretic version will not find their orthodox views disturbed by these facts.

As we have already said, this change of attitude towards the Bible is not peculiar to Unitarians, but indications of it pervade the literature of many of the official publications, and of much of the teaching in the theological seminaries, of nearly all Protestant denominations. The creeds of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopal churches have not changed, but this does not prevent many of their exponents from spreading these new views abroad among

their membership. With the Congregational churches it is different. While each Congregational church is supposed to frame its own creed, the National Council, evidently with little serious thought, has proposed a creed which seems to be pretty generally accepted, but which is observedly non-committal on several important points. In it, all that is said about the Bible is that "we are united in striving to know the will of God as taught in the Holy Scriptures, and in our purpose to walk in the ways of the Lord, made known or to be made known to us." How much of the ways of the Lord in which we purpose to walk is made known to us in the Bible, and how much through other agencies, is left in the dark. In its statement concerning the work of Christ the Creed is also equally indefinite. For anything stated in it, the miraculous element in his birth and resurrection may be entirely ignored.

It is specially significant, however, that, in giving the attributes of God, there is no reference made to his omnipotence. It is simply said, "We believe in God the Father, infinite in wisdom, goodness, and love." The superficiality of this is manifest in more than one respect. Why there should have been a distinction made between goodness and love passes the comprehension of philosophic minds; for it would seem incredible that the theological leaders of an intelligent denomination could suppose that God was an infinite bundle of good feelings independent of his love, and incapable of being a "terror to evil-doers." But the omission of reference to God's omnipotence has deeper significance. Doubtless it originated in part from a misconception of the meaning of the word "omnipotent," or its equivalent phrase, "infinite in power." For infinity of power does not imply that its possessor could do absurdities like making two and two equal five instead of four, nor would it compel the Creator to treat beings which, in his wisdom, he had endowed with free wills, as though they were not moral beings. It would seem, however, that the denial to God of this attribute was made in deference to

the small class of rather vociferous writers who are representing God as subject to the law of evolution in a material universe of which he was not the creator. How fundamentally this conception of God undermines all religious faith these writers either do not appreciate or they are purposely silent in giving expression to their views.

It thus appears that the present generation are facing problems touching Christian faith which are far deeper than those which agitated them a hundred years ago. The vital questions now are, Have we a God to worship who is the creator, the upholder, and the ruler of the universe? Is he infinite not only in wisdom but in ability to do everything which his wisdom and love dictate? Has he made a revelation of his love to us as recorded in the Bible, or is he inflexibly bound in the chains of a materialistic evolution, so that miraculous interpositions are incredible if not impossible?

No more needs be said to show that a serious crisis is at hand in Protestant Christianity. When in our religious faith we are limited to a God who is not omnipotent or, so far as we can see, omniscient, (for, infinite wisdom does not seem to involve infinite knowledge) the hope of good coming out of the present evil world becomes so dim that it will not be sufficient to save us from pessimism. When Orthodox scholars in large numbers follow Unitarians in frittering away both the historical and the doctrinal teachings of the Bible, till there are in the New Testament (according to one of the latest German critics) only nine genuine sayings of Christ upon which we can depend, to say nothing of the way the Old Testament history has been thrown into the scrap heap; and when we no longer are permitted to look to Jesus Christ as a supernatural Saviour (even in the Arian conception) sent from heaven to redeem a world that is lost in sin and misery, not only have we stultified our intellectual capacities and "made lies our refuge," but we have robbed the pulpit of its power, and left a church in the world bereft of its

Christian name and character. What is left is a Judaism without a Jehovah, and a Christianity without a Christ. To save the Protestant churches from such a fate must be the effort of Christian scholarship during the decades of the twentieth century that are before us. May the Lord raise up the required leaders and endue them with all needed wisdom and courage, and, at the same time, give to the people "a listening ear and an understanding heart." G. F. W.

PROFESSOR BARTON ON "THE RELIGION OF MOSES"

THE Editor has asked me to answer the discussion on pages 242–246, *supra.*

In the BS for Oct. 1918 I published a reply to an article by Rev. A. E. Whatham, in which he advocated views similar to those here under discussion, which were indorsed by Professor Barton and Professor L. B. Paton. As there has been no reply to my defense at that time, it will clarify the matter to summarize at the outset the points then made on both sides, which were briefly stated as follows:—

It is common ground that Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the oppression in whose reign Israel built Pithom and Raamses. According to Nu and Dt, within five years of his death these Israelites had migrated from Egypt, and, while still on their wanderings, after initial successes against the Canaanites of the Negeb and the Amalekites (Ex xvii), separately, had met with a crushing defeat in Canaan at the hands of the combined forces of these peoples. We know, from the political circumstances of the time, that these tribes were under the suzerainty of Merneptah, the immediate successor of the Pharaoh of the oppression. This battle sufficed to protect Canaan from further attack by Israel until some 38 years later. According to Egyptological evidence the people of Israel while roaming (to use Dr. Barton's word) met with a crushing defeat in Canaan within 5 years of the death of

Rameses II.; and this, with other events, secured a durable peace for Palestine. Further, 3 years later, according to another document, the strictly limited territory around Pithom where the Israelites had been settled during the oppression, is no longer in their occupation, for Edomite Bedouin are admitted to it. Naturally I conclude that the Hebrew and Egyptian records relate to one and the same wandering Israel and one and the same defeat in Palestine during the early years of Merneptah's reign. To avoid this conclusion, Mr. Whatham writes, "Merneptah may *not* personally have undertaken . . . but he *may* have done so." Such virtue resides in his "may," that, on its unsupported authority, he duplicates a nation, postulating a second Israel composed of two persons. This had not left Egypt during Merneptah's reign and was still in Goshen when the Edomites arrived, though the only document that refers to these persons would lead us to look upon them as palace attendants who had nothing whatever to do with the building of Pithom and Raamses or any of the experiences of the historic Israel. Unlike the first Israel, this second "nation" consisted not of an organized community subjected to forced labor under its own leaders, but of two males of unknown nationality. By some intellectual process which I do not profess to be able to follow, all the tribes and personages mentioned in the Pent in connection with the Exodus and the wanderings — even the women and children — are telescoped into this duovirate, which Mr. Whatham terms "Israel," and made to descend from Rachel, though most people would feel some difficulty in disposing thus of Reuben, or Gad, or Moses, or Dathan, or Abiram. All this on the strength of a single "may." And Professors Barton and Paton are so impressed by this magic monosyllable that they proclaim Mr. Whatham's article "irrefutable."

It is essential to remember that this is what Dr. Barton believes, since he has nowhere explained publicly that he no longer holds these views. In these circumstances we

may assume that his views on my paper are of a piece with his views on the Exodus. Before proceeding to their consideration it is, however, proper to remind him and his two associates Whatham and Paton that I challenged them in the clearest language to answer certain questions. "In this way," I wrote, "all men will have an opportunity of judging whether or not the documentary theorists can meet my contention." No answers have come in, and I accordingly repeat the questions, this time with the clear statement that they have been found by the documentary theorists to be unanswerable, and that henceforth anybody who propagates the documentary theory will be propagating a false hypothesis which has been publicly refuted for all men to see. This is of supreme importance in view of the attitude taken by Dr. Barton on the Pent.

(i) How comes it that JE speaks of *the* Hormah as a place already known in Nu xiv 45, while a subsequent passage (xxi 3) first explains the giving of the name?

(ii) Do you believe that either JE or any other Hebrew historian in the original order of his work told that Moses after receiving a divine command to turn *to-morrow* (Nu xiv 25b) proceeded to ignore it without rebuke or punishment for the period of time required for all the transactions narrated in the portions of the history assigned to JE which at present lie before the narrative of the execution of the command in Nu xxi 4b?

(iii) Do you believe that in the form of the Numbers narrative known to the author of Dt i 40; ii 1, 14, the order was as at present? If so, why did the Deuteronomic writer gratuitously assert that the 38 years which, according to that narrative, were spent at Kadesh, were really occupied in wanderings after the departure from Kadesh?

(iv) Why did Moses after receiving a command to turn southwards immediately (xiv 25) endeavor to obviate the necessity for this march by seeking permission to cut across Edom? And how comes it that the historian recorded this conduct without any hint that it was a defiance of an earlier divine command or other sign of disapproval?

(v) How do you explain the extraordinary geographical eccentricity of the wanderings of the Israelites in the present order with the cut across Edom from Kadesh to

Mount Hor (on either of the two views of its position) and the doubling back to the neighborhood of Hormah?

(vi) How came the Israelites, after receiving the command to turn southwards from Kadesh and suffering a grievous defeat in the Negeb to the north, to wage a successful campaign in that same northern district (embracing the very scene of their defeat) as a preliminary to turning south?

(vii) Why did they, immediately after winning a signal victory in the Negeb (xxi 1–3), with no other reason than the divine command which they had ignored with impunity for 38 years, suddenly evacuate the conquered territory and turn southwards to the gulf of Akabah?

(viii) How do you explain the Sahidic variant "Moab" in xx 23?

(ix) Do you hold that Nu xxxiii 40 is an original part of the text? If so, what does it mean?

(x) How on any theory of intelligent compilation from complete and orderly documents (as opposed to my hypothesis of accidental damage to a library of short writings, and consequent attempts to improve matters) do you explain the conduct of the editor in turning the consistent and intelligible narratives of JE and P into the present chaos?[1]

It will be remembered in this connection that what happened, was that the critics after many years of silence fell upon me after I had been called to the colors. As a result I was not able to defend myself as thoroughly as I should have liked, though it is true that I have reason to suppose that that article did not prove wholly ineffective. I purpose, therefore, to seize the present opportunity to put a couple of supplementary questions:—

[1] The true order of the Nu narrative is Nu xii; xx 1, 14–21; xxi 1–3; xiii–xiv; xvi–xviii; xx 2–13, 22a; xxi 4b–9; then a lacuna followed by xx 22b–29; xxi 4a. Numbers xxxiii 40 is a gloss to be omitted with bw. In xx 1, "third" should be read with B* (*vid.*) p for MT "first"; in xxxiii 38, "first" should be substituted with the Syriac and Sahidic for "fifth"; and in xx 23 we should restore "in the mountain country of the land of Moab" (BS, April, 1919, p. 78). See EPC, pp. 114–138; BS, Oct. 1918, Oct. 1919, etc. The itinerary in Nu xxxiii is a rewriting of old materials that were in a fragmentary condition, and does not preserve the correct order of the stations (BS, April, 1919).

(xi) Do you really believe that any nation would invent to its own disadvantage a story, that, on attempting an invasion, it had been defeated so crushingly, and with such heavy casualties, as to be compelled to wander in a wilderness for 38 years before embarking on any further undertaking (Dt i 43 ff., ii 14)?

(xii) Do you really believe that there were two non-territorial peoples of Israel, both roaming about and both, within a few years of the death of Rameses II., suffering a decisive defeat, with heavy casualties, in or near Canaan in such a way as to give the country durable peace?

These prefatory remarks put us in a position to observe how Dr. Barton has applied his methods to the discussion of the religion of Moses. And here we are at once arrested by an outstanding feature of the utmost gravity. Confronted with my explicit declarations that Moses was a monotheist, Dr. Barton has elected to "restate Wiener's positions as I understand them" with (*inter alia*) the assertion, "Moses, it is conceded, was not a monotheist." In view of this it is necessary that I should repeat my statements on the subject:—

This is followed by the great conflict with the gods of Egypt in which monotheism clearly emerges for the first time in the narrative. . . . And so we read Ex viii 6 (10), "that thou mayest know that there is no other save the LORD"; viii 18 (20) that thou mayest know that I, the LORD, am baal of all the earth; ix 14 ff., "that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth . . . to shew thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth"; ix 29, "that thou mayest know that the earth is the LORD'S." The monotheism of Israel had been born (p. 31). He is the only Deity (Dt iv 35, 39; xxxii 39). He too is God and king over spirits of whatever nature just as fully as over flesh (Nu xvi 22; xxvii 16; Dt ix 26; *supra*, pp. 26 f. = BS, 1919, pp. 348 f.).[1] And while there is none beside Him, He has assigned objects of worship to the heathen. . . . In these passages we have the only possible reconciliation between the idea of

[1] Septuagintal readings are adopted in several of these passages (see Religion of Moses, pp. 24–27).

a single beneficent God and that of a special revelation to a particular people; but so far as the monotheistic idea is concerned they carry us no further than Exodus. In all alike we see One, all-powerful God. . . . And thus monotheism is consistently made the basis of special obligation on the part of the people. . . . One supreme God and a chosen people of revelation . . . that is the doctrine (pp. 34 f.). Moses was a monotheist, whether or not he prophesied the exile. . . . Moses *was* a monotheist (p. 36).

In the face of this, Dr. Barton represents his understanding of my position as follows: "Moses, it is conceded, was not a monotheist. . . . The monolatry of Moses prepared the way for the monotheism of later times." I therefore ask him the following question:—

(xiii) Do you solemnly and sincerely believe that there is no difference in meaning between the statements cited above from my pamphlet and your representation of their effect, "Moses, it is conceded, was not a monotheist. . . . The monolatry of Moses prepared the way for the monotheism of later times"?

For myself I should be content to leave Dr. Barton's remarks there unless and until he can provide a satisfactory answer to Question (xiii). But it is to be remembered that there are others to be considered. There are, first and foremost, his pupils and the pupils of others who are not materially different from him. And then it may be a convenience to many in dealing with Dr. Barton's fellows to have at hand a fuller exposure of his positions. I accordingly proceed to deal with some other points.

His 1 is not an accurate presentation of either my views or Breasted's as set out in the pamphlet. It would take too much space to correct him in detail, and I therefore merely refer to the earlier discussion.

Under 2 he writes, "That there was a God, Bethel, worshipped by Jacob does not seem to be made out." If there is any doubt in anybody's mind as to the true meaning of Gen xxxi 13, I will ask:—

(xiv) Do you really believe that this verse should be translated, "I am the god, Bethel, *where* thou anointedst

a pillar, *where,*" etc.? If so, what is the meaning of "where" as applied to the god Bethel? And what is the sense of the words "where thou didst vow to *me*"? If the god Bethel is the "where," who is the "me"?

As to 4, I do not believe that Moses imbibed his monotheism from the priests of Aton, but I believe that he was familiar with their teachings, and, while totally rejecting the nature of their deity, nevertheless, as the result of his meditations, brought what may reasonably be called a prepared mind to his task. I think it was Pasteur who remarked that discoveries frequently come by accident, but that accidents only happen to prepared minds. So I believe it to have been with Moses. What was most important in his religion came by revelation, but I hold that it was revelation to a prepared mind. I regard it as most improbable that before the episode of the burning bush Moses had never given a thought to the nature of God. After what has been said, I need scarcely add that I hold he taught monotheism while properly devoting his main effort not to the speculative but to the practical side of his task.

With regard to the "assumption" that Moses wrote the Pent, we have seen that the documentary theory has been decisively proved to be false, and that Dr. Barton and his associates when brought to the test could find no word to say in its defense.

Now as to his specifications: No 1 is self-contradictory. I am, first of all, belabored for not quoting "elements" of a monotheistic tendency, and then told that "in reality the phrases are not monotheistic." Precisely; and it was just because I had formed that opinion that I decided that they were not material to the purpose I had in hand. Ikhnaton, he reluctantly admits, "might be called a monotheist," which is exactly what I said. But this admission is gall and wormwood to the evolutionary school, for they have always contended that monotheism originated many centuries after Moses, not a century and a half before his time. So he

adds the words — but without evidence — "or at least a monolater." He will find quoted in my pamphlet such expressions as "beside whom there is no other," "sole (god)," "O sole God whose powers no other possesseth," which exclude the view that Ikhnaton was anything but a monotheist.

Then he asserts of the Midianite-Kenite hypothesis that "in all candor" — note the phrase — "it must be said that it has a far weightier mass of evidence in its favor than the hypothesis set forth here." In point of fact, there is no evidence whatever for the Midianite-Kenite hypothesis.

As to No. 2, Ezk xx 23 ff. contains a perfectly clear statement that the exile had been prophesied in the wilderness. To appreciate its full force we must look at the circumstances in which it was uttered. The prophet had been asked for an oracle by certain of the elders of Israel, and it is in reply to them that the statement was made as something perfectly well known. Had this not been so, the elders would have replied in effect, "What is all this? We have never heard of any such prophecies." Dr. Barton seems to have been conscious of this, for he does not follow Wellhausen in accusing Ezekiel of draping accomplished facts in a mantle of morality. He will have nothing to do with the hypothesis that the prophet was deceiving his audience, and quite rightly. On the contrary, he holds "that the passage proves that Ezekiel believed that such a prophecy had been made in the wilderness." But then he says that "Ezekiel does not mention the name of Moses as the instrument through whom the prophecy came." Neither does Hosea when he writes: "And by a prophet the LORD brought Israel up out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved" (xii 13); but I have yet to learn that anybody imagines that Hosea refers to any other than Moses, or that he understood by the word "prophet" somebody who did not prophesy. And Mic vi 4 says, "I sent before thee Moses." In view of these facts, Dr. Barton's attitude on the point stands in need of further elucidation. I will therefore ask:—

(xv) Do you contend that Ezekiel in this passage contemplates some other instrument of desert prophecy than Moses, and, if so, whom? Do you doubt that Hosea refers to Moses?

It is impossible to say till we have his answer to this, whether Dr. Barton conceives Ezekiel to have been familiar with some other desert prophet. But, in any case, it is certain that he regards him as having believed in such prophecy. Therefore we come to these two alternatives: either the prophet's belief was true or else he had been deceived. It is quite true that he lived some 600 years after Moses; *but it is also true that he was born in the generation in which the book of the law was found, and had ample means of knowing whether that was a genuine ancient book or a forgery.* Dr. Barton admits his belief, and in those circumstances everybody who reads the prophet's book can form an opinion on the psychological question whether in such a matter his belief was false. On the one hand, we have a prophet of supreme ability and transparent good faith who, by reason of his priestly birth and associations and his contemporaneousness, was in a position to know; on the other, the school of Wellhausen, who lived 25 centuries later, was so incapable of doing good historical work that he rewrote the history of Israel on the basis of his own inability to distinguish between a cairn and a house, and certainly was not in a position to know anything about the matter. There can be no question as to the respective credibility of the witnesses on the two sides. For the purpose of getting to the bottom of Dr. Barton's meaning, however, it is necessary that I should put two more questions:—

(xvi) Do you believe that the Pent and Ezk contain a divine revelation?

(xvii) Do you believe that the God of truth revealed Himself through the instrumentality of literary forgers and their dupes?

Wellhausen answered these questions quite clearly when he said, "I knew the Old Testament was a fraud, but I never dreamt, as these Scotch fellows do, of making God

a party to the fraud." I do not know whether Dr. Barton here accepts Wellhausen's position; but these questions will enable him to make the matter clear.

In No 3 I find nothing definite that calls for comment. No. 4 misrepresents me, but Question (xiii) appears to cover the ground.

It remains to notice Dr. Barton's silence on my view that "Baal" was often used in the original texts where to-day we read other words.[1] The reason for that silence is his inability to discuss the theory without making admissions in my favor. Every higher critic whose private utterances on the subject have come to my notice has

[1] See Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1918, pp. 164–169; BS, Jan. 1915, pp. 134–153; April, 1915, pp. 308–333; April, 1916, p. 332, note; Oct. 1916; April, 1917, pp. 315 ff.; April, 1918, pp. 239 ff.; Methodist Quarterly Review, April, 1918, pp. 183 ff.; Religion of Moses, pp. 17–27. I hold that the text of the OT books has been revised by men who accepted Biblical verses as canons of emendation. Thus in Jgs ii 1 MT has "Bochim" for "Bethel," because of ver. 5; in Josh viii 12 there are two readings, "Bethel" and "Bethaven" (a substitute due to Am v 5); in Jgs ix, 46, Greek authorities still preserve "Baal" for MT "el." While these cases are generally admitted, the new part of my theory consists in the view that the principle has been much more widely applied. Thus in Gen xxxviii 15 I hold that *qedeshah* (hierodule) has been removed (cp. 21 f.) in deference to Dt xxiii 18, and that the word "baal" was common in all the early OT books, and has frequently been supplanted by "Elohim," etc. A few instances may be given: in Dt xxxiii 12 I restore "his Baal" for the meaningless "on him" (see BS, April, 1918, pp. 238 ff.); in 1 K xxii 6; 2 Ch xviii 5, "the baal" as the god of Ahab's prophets; so, too, in the explanations of Baal-Perazim (2 S v 19–21, 1 Ch xiv 10–12) and Reuben (Reubel) (Gen xxix 32); in most of the cases where K and Ch differ as to the name of God; in Jgs ix 7 (a case that is particularly clear on the context and literary considerations); in Ex iv 24–26 (for no Hebrew historian would have told that God tried to kill a man and failed); in Gen xiii 13 (since the men of Sodom cannot have sinned against a Deity of Whom they had never heard); in 1 S xxix 6 (which seems to me to have been affected by Jer xii 16), and in numerous other passages. "Baal" was commonly used of the God of Israel in early times, and sometimes the reference is to Him, and at other times to some other deity.

made such admissions. But all will remain silent as long as they can, sooner than admit to the public that I could ever be right. Fortunately, however, the time for these tactics has gone by, for Professor Böhl has just torpedoed the good ship "Conspiracy of Silence," with all the higher critics on board.

HAROLD M. WIENER

London, England

CRITICISM OF JOHN ROBINSON BY A FRIEND

NOTHING could be more timely than the issuance of the ninth number of the "Harvard Theological Studies," entitled "An Answer to John Robinson of Leyden by a Puritan Friend. Now First Published from a Manuscript of A.D. 1609" (edited by Champlin Burrage). The treatise here published for the first time from a manuscript of the Bodleian Library not only contains the answer of John Robinson's friend, but also a large part of Robinson's own argument in defense of his separation from the Church of England. It is full of sharp and learned discussion relating to all points of ecclesiastical control. Indeed, not much light has been added by subsequent discussion of the validity of church government. It is fortunate that the discovery of this manuscript has made it possible to publish it in connection with the Tercentenary of John Robinson's flock at Plymouth.