

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Anselm, of Hooker, Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, and Ken, and the sweet singer of Bemerton. Who shall say as he glances even at this imperfect catalogue that quietude is merely self-effacement, or self-absorption, or the dead calm enjoyed by those who refuse to endure the stormy waves of a troublesome world? Rather the quietude of such souls from the apostolic age down to our restless times while it stands upon unearthly supports,

and cannot be disturbed by the fitful fevers of human life, is possessed with a power divine, is bright, active, and energetic through resignation and amid suffering. Such souls have the aspiration touchingly expressed in A. L. Waring's lines—

Father, I know that all my life is portioned out by Thee,
And the changes that must surely come I do not fear to see;
But I ask Thee for a quiet mind, intent on pleasing Thee.

Hebrew Prophecy and Modern Criticism.

BY THE REV. F. H. WOODS, B.D., LATE FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

III.

“Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets.”—AMOS iii. 7.

THE rejection of the supernatural is a common feature of modern thought. It is a still commoner thing to find a difficulty in drawing a definite line between the natural and the supernatural. This is, after all, only another way of doubting how large a sphere of God's work is properly covered by the word “natural.” Such a discussion is apt to degenerate into a question of words. It is of little importance for us to decide whether prophetic prediction should be called supernatural or not; it is of very great importance that we should form some idea what prophetic prediction really meant. There was a time when among religious believers such an inquiry would have seemed superfluous. It was assumed almost as a matter of course that prophecy was a fore-writing of history,¹ and hence implied a power altogether different in kind, as well as in degree, from any purely human faculty. If the word “supernatural” had a meaning anywhere, it certainly had it in prophecy. But times are changed, and even religious men are seriously asking whether the prophets had any real predictive power at all. We feel, therefore, bound, before we attempt to draw any argument from prophetic prediction, to ask whether the prophets had this power, and if they had, what were its nature and its limits? This inquiry will form the subject of the present article. It will be convenient for the present to limit the discussion to such predictions as are

believed to have been fulfilled in events connected with Jewish history.

That the prophets were believed, and *themselves claimed*, to have a predictive power seems capable of easy demonstration.

(1) It is suggested by some of the names of the prophetic office. We cannot, it is true, prove it from the ordinary name נביא. That word indeed seems to imply a divine inspiration, but this would not necessarily include an insight into the future. It is otherwise with the almost synonymous words ראה and רזה, both of which are usually rendered in the Authorised Version by “seer.” Even these words do not in themselves absolutely imply a predictive faculty. A vision might be a vision of the past, as that of Michaiah; or of the present, as that of Isaiah, recorded in ch. vi. But a predictive faculty was evidently thought of in the popular conception of the word, as we see from the figure of the watchman so frequently applied to the prophet. Just as the watchman has a longer range of view than others, so the prophets are able to look farther than others into coming events. Thus in Isa. xxi. 6–9 the prophetic watchman sees from his watchtower the fall of Babylon, which is evidently depicted as future. In the next prophecy (*ibid.* 11, 12) the watchman foresees the chequered career of Edom. One out of Seir anxiously calls out to him, “Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?” *i.e.* “How long is it before the dawn of prosperity is to rise upon a night of adversity?” And the watchman, as

¹ As, *e.g.*, by Butler: “Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass,” *Analogy*, pt. ii. ch. vii. (Angus's ed. p. 272).

though he saw a faint streak of dawn above a dark cloud on the horizon, answers: "The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will inquire, inquire ye: turn ye, come." As much as to say: "There is to be but a brief period of relaxation followed by renewed adversity, from which there will be no recovery except by conversion." Similarly, from his watchtower, Habakkuk sees the future fate of Jerusalem at the hand of the Chaldeans (ch. ii.). The words of Amos iii. 7, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets," suggest the popular conception of a prophet, one who sees the mysteries of God, especially His future dealing with His people.

(2) We may notice the universal belief among both Jews and Christians that the prophetic books were predictive. This belief we may consider to have been exaggerated through the mystical interpretation of the Allegorists, who delighted in finding predictive mysticism not only in prophecy, but in all Jewish narrative and Jewish ceremonial; but this is hardly sufficient to explain the universal prevalence of this belief. But we need not lay any stress on this argument, for (3) the historical and prophetic books alike make it evident that the prophets themselves claimed to exercise such a power. In what is undoubtedly a very ancient fragment of history (1 Sam. ix.) Saul is represented as going to consult the seer, to know whether he would recover his father's asses. This is on the recommendation of his servant, who says of Samuel that "everything that he saith cometh surely to pass." Elijah and Elisha are sometimes instanced to show that the original function of the Jewish prophet was not to foretell the future. But we must bear in mind that scarcely anything of their teaching has been preserved. Little as that is, the predictive element is by no means absent. It was the prophecy of the three years' famine that, according to the narrative of Kings, established Elijah's claim to be a prophet. He also foretells the doom of the house of Jezreel for the judicial murder of Naboth (1 Kings xxi. 21-24). Elisha also, among other predictions, foretells the raising of the siege of Samaria by the Syrians (2 Kings vii. 1). Later on, Jonah is said to have foretold the recovery of the trans-Jordanic territory by Jeroboam II. (2 Kings xiv. 25). These passages clearly prove that from the first the prophets must at least have claimed the power of prediction. When

we come to the literary prophets, predictive utterances become so frequent, that it is hardly necessary to give examples, especially as we have already noticed some, and shall have to speak of others for another purpose.

But we now come to a more difficult question. Were their claims justified by the event? (1) First I may be permitted to repeat an argument in my last paper, that the high religious and moral tone of the prophets gives us a right to assume that they were not impostors, but honestly believed that they possessed this power. There is nothing in their teaching to suggest that they would have thought it right to do evil that good might come. To this we may add that their dignified self-control, as well as the general respect in which they were held, almost equally preclude the likelihood that they were fanatics.

(2) We have also direct evidence of the fact. At this point we are at once met by the critical difficulty. We should hardly be wise in laying stress on the fulfilled predictions of Elijah and Elisha, as we should be naturally met with the objection that these are popular stories, and that we cannot vouch for their historical accuracy. Again, we cannot now reasonably maintain that Isaiah foretold, in chs. xl. and following, the release from the Babylonish captivity under the auspices of Cyrus. Modern criticism again does not allow us to argue from the prophecy of the disobedient prophet against the altar of Bethel, because it is held, with good reason, that that episode reflects the religious tendencies of a later age. In fact, we have to face an awkward dilemma. On the one hand, to accept the order of the Old Testament narratives, *i.e.*, as they stand, is to prejudice the question in favour of fulfilled predictions; on the other, to assume that predictions are necessarily "prophecies after the event," is to allow preconceptions against prediction to unduly influence our criticism.

The difficulty is a serious one, but not so great in reality as might have been expected. Critical conclusions have not generally been made to depend chiefly on such objections to prophecy, and in many cases we may feel bound to accept them on other grounds, however strongly we recognise the fact of prophetic knowledge; *e.g.* the relegation of Isa. xl.-lxvi. to the epoch of the Babylonish captivity depends,—as I pointed out in my first paper,¹—not on the impossibility of such

¹ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March, p. 260 *b*.

events being predicted so long before, but partly on differences of style, and still more on the fact that the state of things in the foreground of the prophecy is described not as future, but as present. The real objection to Isaiah's authorship from the mention of Cyrus in chs. xliv., xlv. is not so much that Isaiah *could not* have foretold his name, as that the author of this later prophecy *does not* on the face of it speak of him as a future person, but as one already well known to his readers. Objections of a somewhat similar kind are urged, but with less force, with reference to the prophecy against Babylon in Isa. xiii.-xiv. 23. The style and method of treatment in this passage are different from those of Isaiah, and, moreover, would have been hardly intelligible to his contemporaries. Babylon in Isaiah's time was a small kingdom, more or less dependent on Assyria, anything but the mighty power that "ruled the nations in anger," as it is here described (ch. xiv. 6). It is difficult, moreover, to conceive a sufficient purpose for the prophecy had it been written in Isaiah's day.

In fact, it is now becoming a recognised canon of criticism that a prophecy must have some intelligible relation to the events of the prophet's time. This tends, of course, to limit the range of prophecy, and bring the time of its fulfilment nearer to the writer's own day, but not in all cases so much as might have been supposed. For example, any prophecy against Babylon is in itself likely to have been written at a time when Babylon, and not Assyria, was the ruling power in the East, and therefore is probably the work of a later prophet than Isaiah. But we cannot make this alone an absolute criterion of date, for such prophecies would have been intelligible enough at the time when the Babylonian adventurer Merodach-Baladan was seeking an alliance with Hezekiah against Assyria. Hence many critics, while they deny to Isaiah the authorship of the prophecy in chs. xiii.-xiv. 23 for the reasons already given, yet believe him to be the author of the prophecy against Babylon in ch. xxi. This latter prophecy represents Babylon as a city in whose fate the prophet feels a keen sympathetic interest. It is argued that such feelings would be unnatural if it were written at a time when Babylon was Israel's great oppressor.

We may willingly accept this canon of criticism, and do full justice to indications of date arising from differences of style and treatment, and yet

find unmistakable instances of fulfilled predictions. The Book of Amos is particularly instructive in this respect, because it affords clear indications of its date. We learn from ch. vii. 10 that he was a contemporary of Jeroboam II. He prophesied, therefore, if not so long before as the biblical chronology would have led us to suppose, at least some thirty years before the destruction of Samaria.¹ And yet he foretells unmistakably both the overthrow of Jeroboam and the captivity of Israel. "Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith Jahweh, whose name is The God of hosts" (ch. v. 27). "For thus Amos saith, Jeroboam shall die by the sword, and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of his land" (ch. vii. 11). "Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth" (ch. ix. 8). Isaiah again foretells the horrors of the Assyrian invasion at a time when the danger of the Syro-Ephraimitish campaign was tempting Ahaz to make a secret alliance with the Assyrian monarch, Tiglath-pileser (ch. vii.). This (B.C. 734) was twenty-three years before the supposed invasion of Judah by Sargon (B.C. 711), and thirty-three years before the far more disastrous campaign of Sennacherib (B.C. 701). When that campaign was actually in progress, Isaiah had the boldness frequently to comfort the people with the assurance that it would end in a sudden and complete collapse. We have a typical example of this in ch. x. 24 and following:—"Therefore, saith the Lord, Jahweh of hosts, O my people that dwellest in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian: though he smite thee with the rod, and lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall be accomplished, and mine anger in their destruction. And Jahweh of hosts shall stir up against him a scourge, as in the slaughter of Midian at the rock of Oreb: and his rod shall be over the sea, and he shall lift it up after the manner of Egypt. And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall depart from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed by reason of fatness." In the following verses he describes in graphic detail the march of the Assyrians, and the terror that they would inspire at every stage of their progress, and finally repeats with majestic dignity their final overthrow. "Behold, the Lord, Jahweh of hosts, shall lop the

¹ See Robertson Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 151.

boughs with terror; and the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, and the lofty shall be brought low. And he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one."

Of course it is always possible for captious critics to say that such prophecies are the inventions of a later date; but if we approach the subject without prejudice, we must admit that such a hypothesis is extremely improbable. Their very indefiniteness is a strong argument in their favour. A later writer than Amos or Isaiah putting a prophecy into their mouths would have made it tally more in detail with the event. He would have expressly mentioned, we may feel sure, the power by which God's justice on the northern kingdom would be vindicated, if not the name of the king. He certainly would not have represented Isaiah as describing a route which the Assyrians never took.¹ And the same objection applies if we suppose that Isaiah himself composed what he wished to pass for a prophecy after the event. Such examples of obvious fulfilment of predictions are important, because of their bearing on prophecies of which the date is less certain. They make it probable that when a prophet speaks in language which obviously foretells a future event, which we know actually took place, he is really relating words uttered before the event, not a supposititious prophecy composed after it.

But we must now speak of the nature and limits of prophetic foresight. First, its limits. (1) It clearly neither was, nor was intended to be, a fore-writing of future events at all analogous to the historical narration of past events. The prophets did not write to satisfy a morbid curiosity about the future, nor yet to establish by fulfilled predictions their claim to divine power. They do not boast in the spirit of Zadkiel's Almanac that what they have foretold has come to pass,² and that, therefore, they are to be believed in the future. They had too much confidence in their divine mission to doubt their power, or expect others to doubt it. They very frequently do not give the details of

future events. Such events have their interest, not so much in being future, as in being instances of God's judgment on sin, or His goodness towards His people. The details when given are often the dress in which the prediction is clothed. Take, for example, the graphic description of the future desolation of Babylon (Isa. xiii. 20-22): "It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall shepherds make their flocks to lie down there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and ostriches shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there. And wolves shall cry in their castles, and jackals in the pleasant palaces: and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged." We cannot but feel that to press many of these details would be to rob this prophecy of its poetry. Again, in the prophecy of the Assyrian collapse in ch. x., already described, an ideal line of march is probably added to give a realistic colour to the whole scene; and we are no more compelled to take this literally than the figure of the Assyrian tree with its branches lopped off, which immediately follows (ch. x. 33).

(2) Even where details seem literally intended, they were sometimes not fulfilled. In the prophecy against Babylon just quoted, a far more complete destruction was evidently contemplated than ever took place. Again, the city of Damascus, though taken by Tiglath-pileser, did not, as far as we can tell, become a ruinous heap, nor cease from being a city, as foretold in Isa. xvii. 1. Nor does it appear to have ever done so. It is again threatened with disaster in Jer. xlix. 24-27. And the reference in that prophecy to the "palaces of Ben-hadad" proves that it is no newly-built city which is spoken of. It afterwards became a flourishing commercial city, and has remained so, more or less continuously, to the present day. Tyre did not, as we should have expected from "the burden of Tyre" in Isa. xxiii., fall and then recover itself after seventy years, and become a great commercial power converted to Jahweh. At any rate, no such fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy has been made out so as to give general satisfaction to those who have looked for it.

(3) Again, we find limitations as to the time and manner in which prophecies were to be actually fulfilled. The Captivity of the North was not, as

¹ As in ch. x. 28-32.

² Such passages as Isa. xli. 21, 22, xlii. 9 are no exceptions. The point here is not the glorification of the prophet, who does not refer to his own predictions, but of God, who has the power of determining, and therefore fore-knowing the future, in contrast to the idols, who can do neither this nor anything else.

Amos certainly seems to have contemplated (Amos vii. 11), connected with the death of Jeroboam, but took place nearly thirty years after. The Assyrians did not, according to the most probable explanation of Isa. xxiii. 13, take Tyre, though Shalmaneser besieged it for five years, nor yet apparently the Chaldeans, according to another interpretation of the verse, though Nebuchadnezzar is said to have besieged it for thirteen years (see Ezek. xxix. 17, 18); but it was first taken by Alexander the Great, and only eventually destroyed by the Saracens in 1291.¹

(4) It should be also noticed that the prophets sometimes modify their previous statements about future events. Amos, in ch. v. 2, sees no hope for Israel. "The virgin of Israel is fallen; she shall no more rise: she is cast down upon her land; there is none to raise her up." Later on, in ch. ix. 8, after saying that "the sinful kingdom will be destroyed from off the face of the earth," he adds, "saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob." It may be said, and has often been said, that all prophecies contain an implied condition. But this is, in fact, the admission of a very real modification of their absolute accuracy. It would probably be truer to say in such a case as this that the prophet first foretells the judgment as absolutely as he in fact sees it; and then afterwards softens it as he sees some hope for the more faithful remnant.

We have now to deal with the further question: What is the nature of prophetic foresight? Is the predictive power capable of a psychological analysis? Up to a certain point it surely must be so. On the one hand, we know that a prophet was possessed by a real religious conviction. He felt certain that he was called by God to protest against wrong, whether in morals or in religion, and to assert God's righteousness. He believed that what he said was a word of God, and not merely the utterance of his own thoughts and ideas. But, on the other hand, we cannot help recognising in his predictions a human element as well. For (1), as we have already shown, there was an element of human anticipation which was not always realised.

But (2) besides this, there was undoubtedly an element of imagination. The prophets are not content with a general declaration of God's judgments and mercies, or a general statement of the

direction in which they will be manifested; but besides these, they give descriptions of future events. These are sometimes in the form of visions, as in the last chapter of Amos and in the earlier part of Zechariah, but more frequently are expressed in the language of poetical symbolism. But in either case they give the impression of being the portrayal of pictures present in the prophet's own mind. But how did these pictures arise? Were they, so to speak, written in the prophet's mind by the finger of God, or were they the creation of the prophet's own imaginative power? In other words, is this prophetic faculty to be identified with what the late Professor Mozley calls the passive, or the active, imagination? On the first supposition we might be inclined to regard it as an indication of mental weakness. But it is not necessarily so. So-called thought-readers are not weak-minded or weak-willed men. They show a peculiar power by the very fact that they are able, when they so desire, to divest themselves of their own intention and will, and to allow themselves to be guided by the intention and will of others. So with the mind. The power to make the mind a blank in order to receive impressions is a highly-developed phase of that faculty which we commonly call receptivity. And every view of inspiration to a certain extent admits this power and indeed necessitates it, unless inspired men are to be reduced to mere machines.

But does such a power alone explain the facts of prophetic imagination? We can hardly think so. For we find the same sort of variety in the forms which the imagination takes in different prophets, as we find in different poets. If we were to say that the imagination was quick and vivid in Isaiah, subtle in Hosea, mysterious or symbolical in Jeremiah, every one would feel that such was an attempt, however imperfect, to express concisely a difference which really exists. In other words, the imagination takes a form which is influenced by the personal character of the prophet. The most obvious difference between a Jewish prophet and a poet is that while the one boldly claimed divine inspiration, and his claim was admitted by his contemporaries, a poet does not seriously make the claim, and would not be listened to if he did. But it does not follow from this either that poets have had no real imagination, or that the prophets had no power of creative imagination. The difference seems to be this, that the prophet consciously realised the divine source of his utterances,

¹ See Delitzsch, *in loco*.

but did not to the same extent realise the working of his own imagination; poets do realise the working of their imagination, but do not always realise the nature of the spiritual forces which, to a certain extent, control them.

Sometimes, no doubt, the prophets consciously clothed their prediction in a poetical dress; but in most cases they probably simply described what they felt and saw, without making any effort to distinguish the foretold fact from its poetical dress, the divine foreknowledge from the poetical imagination or the human speculation. Indeed, sometimes they seem positively to refer the effects of poetical imagination to a divine source. In Isa. xxxiv. 14, 15 the description of the wild animals establishing themselves in the desolate cities of Edom is obviously the language of poetry. It is, moreover, so closely parallel to the similar description of Babylon in ch. xiii. 21, 22, which we have already quoted, that the two cannot be independent, and both appear to belong to the period of the Babylonian captivity, and are very possibly by the same prophet. Yet in this prophecy against Edom the prophet enhances the realism of his description by saying that when it should be fulfilled, people were to look at the prophecy in the "Book of Jahweh," and see how exactly it tallied with the event. Every one of the animals would be found there, even the evil spirits, which, according to Babylonian mythology, inhabited desolate regions. "Seek ye out of the Book of Jahweh, and read: no one of these shall be missing, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and His spirit it hath gathered them. And He hath cast the lot for them, and His hand hath divided it unto them by line: they shall possess it for ever, from generation to generation shall they dwell therein." If this description of the wild animals is repeated from an earlier prophecy, how strange to speak of it as in all its details (for its details are what the prophet insists upon) as a special revelation from Jahweh! If it was itself the earlier prophecy of the two, how strange to repeat with reference to Babylon exactly these details belonging so peculiarly to the fate of Edom! If these details are purely poetical, there is no difficulty in the repetition; but the assertion at the end of this prophecy of Edom compel us to say that the prophet evidently sees before him the literal fulfilment of his words.

But are we certain that there was a divine

element in prophecy at all, except of course in the sense that all human faculty is originally divine, and that God by general laws directs human faculties for higher ends? Some critics have resolved the predictive power into a mere human sagacity. Thus the late Professor Robertson Smith, to whom the student of Jewish prophecy is so deeply indebted, in speaking of the prediction by Amos of the northern captivity, writes as follows:—"The danger . . . was visible to the most ordinary political insight, and what requires explanation is not so much that Amos was aware of it, as that the rulers and people of Israel were so utterly blind to the impending doom" (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 131). But after making full allowance for the already existing encroachments by Assyria, which recently discovered monuments have brought to light, is it not accrediting the herdsman of Tekoa too much with that sort of wisdom which is so rare before, and so common after, the event? It is true enough that Amos places the impending danger in the moral degradation of the people. But the question is whether he realised that this was to act as a natural cause. Was not his feeling rather most obviously that such wickedness was calling for divine vengeance? If we are wrong in reading into the prophets the mystical symbolism of the Cabala, we are equally wrong in reading out of them their essentially religious character, religious, I mean, as distinct from merely moral. A sagacious politician in the reign of Ahaz might have foreseen that to make an alliance with Assyria was to play a dangerous game. Isaiah saw in it not so much folly, as a wicked apostasy from God, which deserved to end in national ruin. Whatever modifications, then, we have to make in our view of the sources of prophetic foresight, we seem bound to make them not so much in favour of a purely human sagacity (though the prophets were certainly no fools), as of a religious instinct. And this religious instinct, we cannot but believe, was divinely inspired and divinely directed.

To sum up, the position of the prophets seems to have been something of this kind: They were men endowed with a very strongly-developed religious instinct. They felt within them a religious impulse which they were confident was from God. They regarded themselves as His agents to denounce wrong, because it was contrary to God's character and God's will, and to announce God's

judgments on wrong, and His goodness to those who proved themselves worthy of His love. This religious impulse was usually combined with a strong creative imagination which showed itself in many ways; sometimes by their seeing a deep spiritual and religious meaning in dreams and even ordinary events of life, which were thus allegorised and made sources of religious lessons. To Hosea, for example, as the late Professor Robertson Smith has shown us, his whole domestic life was an allegory of the religious fortunes of God's people. The announcement of God's judgments and goodness directed their minds to the future in which God's ways would be justified. This combined with natural clear-sightedness produced those often vivid pictures of the future, which though not fulfilled in all the details, which their vivid imagination painted, nor quite as they themselves seem to have expected, were yet fulfilled in their

main features, and point to a very remarkable, if we ought not to say supernatural, power of foresight, such a foresight as to us justifies their own claim to inspiration.

I fear some may think that this is a low estimate of prophetic prediction, and I think that possibly my desire to do justice to criticism may have led me to underrate this power. But it would be well to remember that the higher the claim which we make for prophetic fulfilments, the more serious the danger to the cause of truth if they fail the test of honest historical investigation. Christian apologists should be above all suspicion of tampering with witnesses. The more unnatural the strain we put upon the argument from prophetic predictions, the more are we in danger of losing sight of the infinitely more important argument from the moral and religious character of the Christian faith.

The Books of the Month.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS, GALATIANS, AND ROMANS. BY THE LATE BENJAMIN JOWETT, M.A. Third edition, edited and condensed by Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D. (*Murray*. Two vols. post 8vo, pp. xvi, 434; ix, 409.) It is not possible and it is not necessary now to criticise the contents of these volumes. The work has had its full share of criticism even to the running over, and now has passed, like its author, to where beyond these voices there is peace. All that is necessary now is to tell why this third edition has been issued, and wherein it differs from the second. For of the persons to whom the Bible and its interpretation are of interest, none will ask whether they ought to secure this book except those who possess a copy already.

Well, it is right to say at once that they who possess the second edition of Jowett's *Epistles*, together with a copy of *Essays and Reviews*, possess the third also. For the only addition is the essay "On the Interpretation of Scripture," an essay which was written for the second edition, but was not ready when that edition was called for; and it was then included in the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*. For the rest, not a single

line has been altered by the present editor. This only has been done, the parts have been rearranged, and some omissions have been made.

The rearrangement is a great gain. The text and the notes, together with the smaller and more immediately interpretative essays, are found together in one volume; the longer essays are gathered into the other. The book is more modern, more scientific, more conquerable.

It is not so easy to pronounce judgment on the omissions. Professor Campbell anticipates the regret of "old lovers of the book." Certainly, no one will hanker after Lachmann's Greek text; and few will even miss the examination of the *Homæ Paulinæ*. But nearly every "old lover" will mourn the loss of some favourite Note.

This third edition, however, is not issued for "old lovers," and they had better be dismissed without further parley. It is issued because the second edition was out of print, because a second-hand copy cost more than the original price, and because even then it was scarce procurable. And it is issued in the interest of liberal theology and the new generation. Professor Campbell remembers the reception the book got on its first appearance. He anticipates another reception