

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

contribution to the subject, which add some finishing touches to the theory which I have been describing. I must now take leave of it for the present. In the next paper I hope to offer something in the way of criticism, and to speak more directly in my own person.

W. SANDAY.

---

### CANON WESTCOTT.

THE Church of England has witnessed, within the last four or five years, an almost total subsidence of the vehement internal controversies which, forty, five and twenty, or even fifteen years ago, divided large portions of it into two or three bitterly hostile parties. And while this change of feeling has been felt to modify the methods of the Church's practical work—while its social, pastoral, and missionary activity has gained whatever it can gain from more united action—the change has affected the field of purely theological study too. The greatest Anglican theologian of the former generation was popularly made the eponymus of a party, and as such was denounced by many who knew nothing, and defended by many who knew hardly anything, of the real greatness of his writings, character, and influence; friends and enemies staked his reputation upon his disputed orthodoxy, not on his unquestioned learning. The greatest theologians of the present generation have a reputation and an influence based upon their learning in the first instance. Their orthodoxy has no doubt contributed to their popularity among the orthodox, but it is their intellectual eminence that has won respect for them, not their personal charm nor their advocacy of certain opinions; and it is when the strife of opinion is quieted, that the respect felt for them is most fully realized.

---

In Canon Westcott's case, this extra-controversial tone and position is more noticeable, because the subject-matter of many of his works is in one sense controversial. From the internal controversies of Christians he stands aside, or refers to them, if at all, in the tone of a moderator rather than of a partisan; but with all the sober and dispassionate tone of his books on Scripture, one feels that he is never far from the attitude of an apologist—that he cannot write about the history of the Bible, and can hardly write about the central doctrines of the Christian faith, without remembering that the Bible and the Faith are liable to attack from without, for which he and his readers have to be prepared beforehand.

Something is lost, no doubt, by this constant apologetic attitude: but more is gained by what makes it unavoidable. When George III. said that "the Bible needed no Apology," his protest perhaps came from a sound devotional instinct, as much as from ignorance of the history of the word; but in our days a man who treats the truth of the Gospel as unquestionable has to live in a world of his own, which, however much better than the great world of intellectual movement, is smaller and quite different from it. If a man lives in that great world, it is quite possible for him to hold the Christian faith. To ignore it as refuted, and to pass it by, is almost as narrowing and much less strengthening to the mind than to assume it as axiomatic: but the man who lives in the main stream of thought can do neither. Whether he be a believer or not, he cannot but remember that some competent thinkers differ from him; and therefore he cannot afford to leave out of memory the grounds which justify his differing from them.

Now Dr. Westcott's great merit as a theologian is this: that he has lived and does live in the great world and not in a little one, in the main stream of intellectual life, not in

a back-water or a side eddy. In theology, as in other sciences, there is in our time a danger (first perhaps pointed out by Dr. Arnold) of specialism and excessive division of labour; a man who is nothing but a biblical critic, an ecclesiastical historian, or a dogmatic theologian, cannot treat even his own subject as satisfactorily as the man who is all three. Still more, it is a fatal disadvantage for a preacher or Church administrator to be behind the age in information—to take things for granted that his hearers will not grant, to ignore questions that they are asking, and to treat as of self-evident importance objects to which they are indifferent. And from these evils a many-sided man like Dr. Westcott is secure. Perhaps an extreme instance, and not the least admirable, of this many-sidedness, is shown by his publication of the *Paragraph Psalter*—an edition of the Psalms pointed for use in Peterborough Cathedral. Englishmen are accustomed to recognise that Cathedrals ought to have good musical services; they are beginning to recognise also that Cathedral endowments are not useless, if given to good theologians. But we usually treat it as inevitable, that there shall be a hard and fast line between the Canons who preach and write on theology and the Minor Canons who chant the services; we are taken by surprise, but we ought to be only the more grateful, when the pointing of the Psalter for chanting is regulated not by a mere musician, but by a man who reads the Psalter as a scholar and divine. One asks whether it be not possible to return to the days when a member of a religious and learned body might be expected to be *in pleno cantu mediocriter doctus*—when some knowledge of music formed part of a liberal, still more of a clerical, education—and when the Precentor of a Cathedral was almost the highest in rank of its members. Peterborough Cathedral, like others of the New Foundation, does not make this claim upon one of its dignitaries; it

is the more honour to one of them to have done the work which was not demanded by the title of his office.

But while the *Paraphrase Psalter* stands somewhat apart from the rest of Dr. Westcott's works, it is difficult to classify these, for the reason already given—that few or none of them belong to one branch of theological study to the exclusion of others. Of course the edition of St. John's Gospel, originally issued as part of the *Speaker's Commentary*, and that of St. John's Epistles, may be ranked as purely exegetical, and so form a class by themselves; so do the works which, within the last five years, have brought Dr. Westcott's name most into public notice among those who are not students—his share in the edition of a critical text of the New Testament, and his consequent influence in the Revised English Version of it. But among his other works, though we may draw a line between on the one hand the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, the *History of the Canon*, and *The Bible in the Church*, and perhaps the *History of the English Bible*; and on the other the *Gospel of the Resurrection*, the *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, and such series of sermons as *The Christian Life, manifold and one*, *Steps in Christian Life*, *The Revelation of the Father*, and the recent *Christus Consummator*, the line is anything but a sharp one. There are works like the *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, and *The Historic Faith*, which might almost with equal propriety be assigned to either of the two last groups; and it would be hard to give a description of either which would not include, for instance, *Christus Consummator*.

I. The first of Westcott's publications was *Elements of Gospel Harmony*, the Norrisian Essay in 1851. This was recast in 1860 as an *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, but despite the change of title, the numbering of the editions of this book recognises the work of 1851 as the first edition; though in that of 1860, as is said in

the Preface, "everything is changed in detail, nothing in principle." And the *continuity* of the author's mental life is well illustrated by the history of this book—by the fact that he had no change "in principle" to make or record in the eventful thirty years between 1851 and 1881, but that changes in detail, sufficient to bring the work up to date in view of successive discoveries or theories, were compatible with maintenance of the original thesis or point of view. Indeed, the original thesis of this early work is one lying at the base of several of the later ones. It is namely, that though the Gospels are not—even when all four are combined—adequate materials for what is called a Harmony, for a biography in chronological order, they yet are not only adequate for their actual purpose as a Revelation, but are trustworthy, though incomplete, as historical documents. Now what is here stated of the Gospels as wholes is just what, in 1881, is made to explain the view of the "Revelation of the Risen Lord," in which the Gospels culminate: "That which is incomplete as a history is complete as a Gospel" (*Revelation, etc.*, p. 6).

And if we regard the *Elements of Gospel Harmony* as being, in its original form, a comparatively immature work, the *History of the New Testament Canon*, which dates only four years later, is even more striking an instance of all that we have said—of the author's ability to recognise beforehand what it has taken the world thirty years to learn, so that he is not led by the lessons of these years to change the position that he took up thirty years ago. I have compared in detail throughout the first and the latest edition of this book; and here more than anywhere one feels, on the one hand the soundness of the insight which on a partial view of the evidence came to the judgment which a completer view verifies, and on the other the merit of the patient industry, which has noticed and even recorded, not only the new evidence, but the new argu-

ments which have been brought to bear on the matter, and which yet have not materially modified the view originally taken.

Nor is this less illustrative of what we said at the outset—that Dr. Westcott at once is an apologist, and is not a controversialist. In the edition of 1875 there were introduced, and in the later one there still stand, replies to the strictures of the author of *Supernatural Religion*—a writer who can hardly be said to be forgotten now, but who is felt to have deserved a good deal less than the reputation which he got when his book first appeared. Now it is noticeable how very much more respectfully this writer is treated by Canon Westcott than by Bishop Lightfoot or Professor Salmon. Partly this may be ascribed to the fact that he had pointed his charges against “apologists” by some criticisms on Dr. Westcott’s own book, which the latter felt bound not to seem to resent personally; but it is a sign of an habitual temper disinclined to critical severity, when a man forced into controversy with such an author treats him with such respect. Almost the only point for which he is blamed is the extraordinary inaccuracy, which survived even after the corrections of the second edition.

The *History of the Canon*, good and solid as it is within its limits, had this defect in its original form, that it scarcely dealt with any periods except those which fell within the range of common study. Ecclesiastical history means, to the average English ecclesiastical student, the history of the first five centuries and of the Reformation: they vaguely suspect that, in the thousand years between those limits, the Church was not in the blessed state of having no history, and they know that, in the three hundred years since, their own Church at least has had a varied and eventful one; but they never realize that mediæval or modern Church history may be as theologically significant as primi-

tive. Now for the special subject of the *History of the Canon*, it is comparatively harmless to confine the view to the first four centuries and the sixteenth, because there was no other time, till the present century, when Christian thought was actively concerned with the question. Still it is an improvement when, in *The Bible in the Church*, and in later editions of the *History of the Canon*, the age of the Reformation is treated fully, and the ages before and after it are not ignored. It is a more doubtful gain when, in *The Bible in the Church*, the scope of the work is extended so as to take in the history of the Old Testament Canon as well as the New. Of course a theological scholar like Dr. Westcott may be trusted to know what is known on subjects which, like Rabbinical literature, are not specially his own; but such secondary knowledge is not sufficient to enable one to close questions that are in any way open. One would need extensive knowledge of Rabbinical literature at first hand, to judge whether Palestinian or Eastern Jews never treated the work of the Son of Sirach as canonical; while if the question be thrown further back, and we ask when and how the notion of a Canon of Scripture first arose, we have really no adequate materials for a scientific answer at all. What scanty evidence we have is ambiguous, unless a rare degree of knowledge could throw an altogether fresh light upon it. For instance, the story in 2 Maccabees about Nehemiah "founding a library," is at least as easily to be understood as a description of the compilation of the Book of Chronicles (including Ezra) as of the collection or "canonization" of the Hagiographa. In order to tell us authoritatively which is likely to be meant, a writer must know more than is generally known; if he knows nothing to decide the point, it is scarcely worth while to repeat the common conjectural interpretation.

The *History of the English Bible*, first published in 1868,



is perhaps the least interesting and most disappointing of the author's works. It is well done, but a weaker man could have done it as well; and it may be doubted whether the precise thing which it does was worth doing. To any one who wishes really to study the successive modifications of the text, it does not supersede the English Hexapla; and to any one who does not, the subject seems a minute one, and the book not worth reading. Tyndale's own life is an interesting one: his character and opinions, and Coverdale's too, are of importance as illustrating the real moral influences at work in the history of the Reformation; but here these are only treated allusively and incidentally; and we do not feel either that the author's estimate of their work as translators is all we need to know, or that the specimens given of their work are enough to enable us to verify or criticise his estimate.

II. In Dr. Westcott's contributions to dogmatic or (if we may use the term) speculative theology, there are two main tendencies of thought, the predominance of one or other of which makes them fall into two groups. In the *Gospel of the Resurrection* (1866), the *Revelation of the Risen Lord* (1881), and the *Historic Faith* (1883), the prominent thought is the historical Christ, Christ as revealed on earth; while in the *Revelation of the Father* (1884), and *Christus Consummator* (1886), it is rather the Eternal Word, by Whom and for Whom all things were created, Whose Incarnation, or the knowledge of God which it makes possible, is regarded as the key to all the problems of the universe.

It seems irreverent, or at least impertinent, to criticise books like these, which are not only devoutly written, but are suggestive and stimulative of devout thought, so that they ought to be read rather in a devotional than a critical temper. Perhaps the one that most challenges criticism is the *Gospel of the Resurrection*. We may say that this is

because it is the earliest of the author's works of this class : not meaning that it is less mature or well considered than the later, but that it deals with a state of mind which, though common twenty years ago, has not proved permanent, and probably did not deserve to be so. In matters of scholarship, biblical or otherwise, Dr. Westcott has always stood ahead of his readers, and an advance in the general standard of knowledge has done nothing to discredit him ; but it is less certain that in psychology or metaphysics his judgment is more than that of an average educated man of his time. Now, such a man twenty years ago was apt to think the eternity of matter inconceivable, and the existence of a personal God a necessity of thought ; but people whose minds are active, and who know what the movement of men's mind is and has been, now know that materialism, pantheism, and atheism are things which, right or wrong, it is at least possible for serious thinkers to believe. And the incapacity here shown to do justice to the materialist point of view is the more surprising, because it is recognised how arbitrary is the line popularly drawn between "soul" and "body." He who feels how hard it is to draw this line should have felt how rash it is to assume that we *feel* something intuitively, because we *believe* it undoubtingly. To say that we have intuitive knowledge of the existence of our own souls, or the freedom of our own will, may be a true or a misleading description of the facts of consciousness ; but it is at least certain that the facts so described are given in consciousness, and can be denied by no one. It is further a tenable though not an incontestable view, that we are directly conscious, as of the power to choose either a right or wrong course of action, so of responsibility for choosing the right—*i.e.* that the individual subject is intuitively conscious of its subordination to the universal order—to the Power, whatever it be, that is supreme in the universe. But it is not a part of this consciousness, even if it be a

legitimate inference from it or from other data, that the universal or supreme Power is itself a conscious Subject, in Whose image the human consciousness is made. That it is so is the postulate of Christian theology—perhaps of anything to be called a theology as distinct from mere metaphysics; and a Christian theologian may be excused in taking it for granted, when dealing only with fellow-Christians. But he weakens instead of strengthening his theological system, when he rests this postulate of theology not on what may be true reasonings, but on a false appeal to consciousness. And accordingly we find that in this group of Dr. Westcott's works the best are those which, being actually series of sermons, or at least framed in the form of sermons, are addressed to Christians—not necessarily to perfectly convinced Christians, but to men who may be presumed to be willing to hear what is said from the Christian point of view, without challenging that point of view as untenable. *The Revelation of the Risen Lord* and *Christus Consummator* are in this way far more satisfactory works than the *Gospel of the Resurrection*. In the former of these the scantiness of the purely historical evidence is in some sort admitted and accounted for, while in the *Gospel of the Resurrection* the statement of the evidence is less satisfactory than the working out of the significance of the doctrine. These later works do not treat the postulate of Christianity as a theorem to be proved; but perhaps they do something more than assume it—they show that the assumption can be verified, and that it is a guide to other truths that would be unknown without it.

III. Perhaps the works in which one feels Dr. Westcott's strength most fully shown are the exegetical ones—the commentary on St. John's Gospel and the edition of his Epistles. Here we feel especially the advantage of a man being at once a reverent theologian and a critical scholar, not a mere specialist in either abstract theology or verbal

criticism. And the Essays appended to the Epistles have all the merits of Dr. Westcott's theology—except to some extent that of practical application. In that on the “Two Empires—the Church and the World,” it is something to have the situation in St. John's day stated candidly, and not to find Nero or Domitian treated as an average specimen of pagan morals or pagan power; but we are disappointed when nothing is said of “the world in the Church”—of the opposition that still exists, unavowed and perhaps less intense, but not less real, between the nominally Christian world and the really Christian Church.

The Essay on “The Gospel of Creation,” like *Christus Consummator*, deals with the important principle, that primitive and catholic theology does not regard the doctrine of Atonement as the whole of the Gospel, but regards the knowledge of the Son of God, and of the Father through Him, as an end in itself, distinct from the redemption from sin which the Father has sent the Son to effect. But it is one thing to recognise that redemption was not the only purpose, or the only effect, of the Incarnation, and another thing to say that the Son of God *would* have been incarnate if there had been no Fall, and so no need of a Redemption. If the matter be put this way, we feel there is some presumption in saying what God *would* have done if things had been different from what they are. It is an inadequate conception of His action to regard it as contingent or modified by circumstances; and as this forbids us to say that if man had acted differently, God would not have done what He has, so it hardly allows us to say that if man had acted differently, God still would have done the same. God has done what He has; and He did it in fulfilment of an eternal purpose—a purpose formed in His eternal knowledge of what man would do and now has done; we cannot say that the purpose depended on the knowledge, but it never existed without it.

And one deduction must be made from Dr. Westcott's almost perfect qualifications as an expositor of Scripture. The man who reads it both critically and theologically has a temptation not identical with that of the merely verbal critic, but like it; being accustomed to bring knowledge of one study to throw light upon another, he learns to overvalue the light so thrown. Dr. Westcott seldom or never, indeed, attempts to settle a critical question by theological considerations; but he is less free from a tendency to draw theological or at least exegetical inferences from grammatical minutiae, which we may be sure were not present to the minds of the New Testament writers. Thus in St. John, Ep. I. i. 5, *σκοτία οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐδεμία*, he says, "The form of the negative sentence is remarkable. . . . The double negative is lost in the Latin, *tenebræ in eo non sunt ullæ*." Surely here the difference is one simply between the idiom of the two languages: *οὐκ ἔστιν* would be literally translated by *non sunt*, though the one verb is singular and the other plural, and *οὐκ ἔστιν . . . οὐδεμία* is just as literally translated by *non sunt ullæ*. Again, in *Christus Consummator*, near the end of the first sermon, we are told that the simple verb *γινώσκωσιν* in St. John xvii. 3 implies "know with a knowledge which is extended from generation to generation and from day to day." Such overtranslation is in a schoolboy a fault on the right side; but when a scholar like Dr. Westcott does it, we can only say that we see the disadvantage of giving to professors the work that should be done by schoolmasters—that they do not leave behind what may safely be forgotten by those who are past the schoolboy stage. The fact that such details as these cannot be dwelt on in a commentary for English readers as much as in notes on a Greek text, does not a little to make Dr. Westcott's notes on the Gospel more satisfactory to read than those on the Epistles; though there is perhaps here and there more power, and more

suggestive matter for thought, in the latter than in the former.

IV. It is difficult to speak fairly of Dr. Westcott's share in the critical text of the New Testament published by him and Dr. Hort. The latter did those parts of the joint work which put his personality most *en évidence*; and he gives, far more frequently than his colleague, notes signed with his own initial, putting forward individual opinion on a point where the two were not able to agree. So far as these notes enable us to distinguish between the two editors, we get the impression that Dr. Westcott worked in the more sober and patient spirit, with more candid recognition of the uncertainty that remains when critical science has done its best. But in other works he has indicated opinions on some critical points which we can hardly suppose him to have abandoned, and which, if not, imply that he does not absolutely concur with all that Dr. Hort says in his Introduction. In the *History of the Canon*, and in the *Bible in the Church*, it is inferred from the list of books, including St. Clement and not Hermas, that Cod. A was of Syrian rather than Alexandrian origin; while Dr. Hort says (§ 348 of Introduction) that the evidence, "such as it is, suggests that A and C were connected with Alexandria." A more important difference is, that while Dr. Hort considers the "fundamental text" of  $\mathfrak{N}$  to be "free from Western or Alexandrian elements" (Introd., § 205), and though allowing that "the Western readings are specially numerous in St. John's Gospel" (*ibid.*), yet speaks of "the fundamental similarity of text . . . throughout the whole of  $\mathfrak{N}$  with the exception of the Apocalypse" (§ 352), Dr. Westcott, in his Introduction to St. John's Gospel (V. 1, p. xc. in the original edition of the *Speaker's Commentary*), couples  $\mathfrak{N}$  with D and the Old Syriac and Old Latin Versions, *i.e.* regards it as giving mainly an ancient "Western" text. It would not follow from this, that he disagreed from

his colleague as to the exceptionally high value of the combination BN; but we cannot feel sure how far he would agree with the reasoning on which that high estimate is based by him.

But it is idle to speculate about the respective share of the two editors in the merits or weaknesses of what they have agreed to give forth as their joint work: and it would be an inadequate account of the work of Dr. Westcott's life which refrained from estimating the edition of the New Testament because it is not his work exclusively. For the plainest, perhaps the greatest, of its faults, it is likely enough that neither of the editors was responsible, but the publishers. The book is either too large or too small, tells us too little or too much. No one would complain if they had given us a work like the first volume by itself—a text which they believe to be the soundest now attainable, with alternative readings in cases which they regard as doubtful, and a very brief outline of their principles of criticism. But when they do more than this—when they set forth at some length their theory of the history of the text, and the grounds for it—when they discuss in full detail some of the interesting points that they have to decide—then we have a right to ask that they shall not pass over other points as interesting; that they shall at least show us how their theory works in representative cases. On every page we see that the editors must have asked themselves half a dozen questions and answered them; and just because we know their opinion to be weighty, we demand that they shall show us, not the bare answer, but how and why they arrived at it. There is something indeed to be said against obtruding on the average student a complete *apparatus critici*, in which one cannot see the wood for the trees; whether this be given or no, there is at any rate much to be said for giving him such a summary of the evidence as *e.g.* that on Matt. viii.

28, “Γερασσηῶν Western (? Gr. Lat. Syr. Eg.); Γεργεσηῶν Alexandrian and Syrian (Gr. Eg. Æth. Arm. Goth).” But if we are to have such a summary of the evidence, it ought to be at least twice or thrice as full as it is. “The list (of select readings) might,” we are told, “without any serious difference of purpose have been made much longer”: and why was it not? “The list was not intended to have any completeness except in respect of the more important or interesting readings.” But is not the ternary variation in Luke x. 41-2 both important and interesting? And here, moreover, we know from Dr. Scrivener (*Plain Introduction*, p. 595, ed. 1883) that the editors have actually changed their opinion. We expect them, then, to tell us both what their definite opinion is and why, and why they were once almost convinced of a different one. We hunger for information which the editors must have, not only in their heads but in their desks. When they have spent twenty-five years in the labour of study and thought, we complain of their having grudged us the few hours’ labour of transcribing the result—unless, indeed, it was Messrs. Macmillan that grudged them paper and type.

The same complaint of inadequacy applies to the Introduction as to the Appendix; if it had been longer, it could have avoided the excessively abstract method, the barrenness of definite instances, which makes the earlier part of it all but impossible to read, and the latter impossible to test or verify, except to some one who is willing to study the subject almost as thoroughly as the editors themselves. It is said that Dr. Burgon’s trenchant reviews did much to check the circulation of this edition, as well as of the Revised Version of the New Testament; and unfortunate as this result is, it was largely Dr. Hort’s fault—or his publishers’. He, whether with or without the excuse of want of room, gives us barely seven or eight instances of “neutral” readings that approve themselves as right;



Dr. Burgon gave dozens, and marshalled a vast show of evidence on each, where he thought them wrong; and the public concluded that he could, and Dr. Hort could not, give concrete reasons for his general view; and that therefore his was the view of common sense, Westcott and Hort's of crotchety doctrinaires.

And though any one who has seriously and dispassionately studied the purely critical question will be inclined to think the exact reverse, this would be unjust to the Dean of Chichester. As against the Revised Version, he really had a case; he only damaged it by "abusing the defendant's attorney," which character he rightly or wrongly ascribed to Dr. Hort. If we admit that Westcott and Hort interpret the evidence rightly, the "neutral text" represents what the Apostles and Evangelists wrote; and they are right in printing that text in a critical edition. But on their own showing no less than on Dr. Burgon's, the so-called "Syrian text"—with or without the pre-Syrian elements preserved in the Latin Vulgate, and the late glosses embodied in mediæval and modern editions of the latter—is the text which the Church has received; and it is a question, not of pure criticism but rather of practical theology, whether the Church is not bound to retain what she has received, even when she knows that it is not what was originally written. It is really a reasonable view, that as the human authors of the New Testament were guided by the Holy Spirit, so were its human editors; that, *e.g.* though St. Luke wrote neither the story of the man working on the Sabbath, nor the exact words of the rebuke to the sons of Zebedee at the Samaritan village, it was a sound, or even a Divine and infallible instinct, by which the one is rejected, and the other accepted, as authentic words of the Master, worthy to be inserted in the Gospel. If so, a critical edition is right in giving both, if at all, in the margin; but a version for popular use has no right

to banish the second from the text. From this point of view, even 1 St. John v. 7 is not indefensible. St. John did not write it, but the Western Church for twelve centuries, and practically the whole Church for three, has accepted it as harmonizing well with what he did write; and in view of the Church's acceptance it is rash to deny that it is a relevant as well as an orthodox gloss, rightly appended for popular use to the text.

W. H. SIMCOX.

---

### *THE PROPHETESS DEBORAH.*

THE history of Israel is a history of prophecy, a history in which men of prophetic rank and name stand at the great turning points of the people's life and direct the movements. And the inner progress of the people was throughout guided by prophets, who fertilized the religious life of the nation with new thoughts, or nourished the seeds of truth and the higher aspirations already planted in the heart of the people, into fuller growth and fruitfulness; and who, especially in the many crises of the nation's history, prepared for the crisis by revealing truths regarding God which enabled the people to encounter the storm without sinking beneath it, as, for example, at the time of the destruction of the State.

It is the conviction of the prophets and writers of Israel that the line of prophetic teachers has been unbroken since the days of Moses. Jeremiah brings Moses and Samuel together: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before Me, yet My mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of My sight, and let them go forth" (xv. 1). And elsewhere he speaks in the name of the Lord: "Since the day