

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 *Review & Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_rande_01.php

The Review and Expositor

A BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Edited by **THE FACULTY** of the
SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

EDITORS:

E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.,
Editor-in-Chief.

J. R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.

A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.

E. C. DARGAN, D.D., LL.D.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN, Ph.D., D.D.

W. O. CARVER, D.D.

GEO. B. EAGER, D.D., LL.D.

D. H. DEMENT, D.D.

Associate Editors:

REV. B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.

REV. D. F. ESTES, D.D., Hamilton, N. Y.

REV. J. H. FARMER, D.D., LL.D. Toronto, Canada.

REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.

REV. H. C. VEDDER, D.D., Upland, Pa.

REV. J. P. GREENE, D.D., Liberty, Mo.

REV. W. T. WHITLEY, A.M. Ph. D., Preston, England.

On editorial business address the Editor-in-Chief Prof. E. Y. Mullins; on business matters the Business Manager, Prof. A. T. Robertson, with regard to books and reviews address the Review Editor, Prof. W. J. McGlothlin.

CONTENTS.

Four Early Separatistic Churches in London, By Rev. W. T. Whitley, LL. D.	1
What is the Essence of Christianity? By Prof. William Newton Clarke, D. D.	27
The Baptist World Congress—A Study, By W. O. Carver, Th. D.	36
Manliness in the Ministry, By R. H. Pitt, D. D., LL. D.	44
Anent Reading, in the City of Rome, the Epistle to the Ephesians, By J. Hunt Cooke.	58
The Preacher as Prophet, By Rev. Frederick W. Eberhardt.	68
An Anabaptist Liturgy of the Lord's Supper, By W. J. McGlothlin, Ph. D.	82
Schiller and His Influence on German Life, By A. Vincent Dye, Ph. D.	98
Some Studies in Exegesis, By E. J. Forrester, D. D.	106
Book Reviews.	121
A Study of the Fourth Gospel, By Prof. Henry C. Vedder, D. D.	177
Aristotle's Theology, By W. W. Everts, M. A.	200
The Epistle to the Hebrews, By W. T. Whitley, M. A., LL. D.	214
Is Matthew 16:18 an Anachronism? By Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D.	230
The Essence of Christianity, By Rev. Rufus W. Weaver, Th. D.	233
Some Phases of the Literature of the Old Testament and the Literature of the Ancient Orient, By Prof. Ira M. Price, Ph. D., LL. D.	248
Persuasion in Preaching; Its Nature and Importance, By Arthur Jones, D. D.	264
Book Reviews.	277
The Main Purpose of the Apocalypse, By Prof. J. H. Farmer, D. D. ..	339
The Sunday School of Day After To-Morrow, By Bishop John H. Vincent, D. D.	349
Moses in Archæology and Criticism, By Prof. A. H. Sayce, D. D. ...	356
Some Phases of the Ethical Character of the Old Testament and the Ethics of Ancient Oriental Peoples, By Prof. Ira M. Price, Ph. D., LL. D.	368
The Sociological Concept, By Prof. Frederick W. Moore.	383
The Theological Problems and Historical Persons of Nicaea, By Prof. A. M. Fairbairn.	398
The Use of the Scriptures in Theology, By Rev. Wayland Hoyt, D. D., LL. D.	417
Book Reviews.	431
Higher Criticism, By Prof. D. F. Estes, D. D.	501
The Theoretical Value of Moral and Religious Experience, By Prof. James Ten Broeke.	517
The Epistle to the Hebrews, By W. T. Whitley, M. A., LL. D.	532
Attempts to Eliminate the Supernatural from the Gospel History, By Prof. James Iverach, D. D.	548
The Musical Titles of the Psalms, By Rev. Llewellyn L. Henson, D. D.	562
Prevailing Tendencies in Modern Theology, By the Rev. Prof. James Orr, D. D.	571
The Place of Science in Ministerial Education, By Prof. C. W. Chamberlain	588
Book Reviews.	597

INDEX TO BOOK REVIEWS.

VOLUME III.

Addressed on the Gospel of St. John.....	606
Analysis of the Gospel of John, An, By Frederick L. Anderson, D. D.....	460
Andreas Bodenstern von Karistadt, Von Hermann Barge.....	285
Animal Heroes, By Ernest Thompson Seton.....	173
L'Apotre Paul et Jésus Christ. par Maurice Goguel.....	313
A propos de la Separation des Eglises et de l'etat, par Paul Sabatier.....	621
Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache, Von Dr. Raphael Kühner.....	495
Ausgewählte Psalmen uebersetzt und erklärt, Von Hermann Gunkel Zweite.....	486
Balthasar Hübmaier, By Henry C. Vedder.....	281
Baptist and Congregational Pioneers, By J. H. Shakespeare, M. A.....	487
Baptist World Congress, The, Authorized Record of Proceedings..	171
Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung der Christlichen Religion.....	145
Bernard Rothmann, Von Heinrich Detmer.....	130
Bible and Christian Life, The, By Walter Lock, D. D.....	614
Bible and Modern Criticism, The, By Sir Robert Anderson.....	471
Bible History [Old Testament] After the Results of Historical Criticism, By Pastor X. Koenig.....	472
Bible Outlines or the Second Coming, By C. C. C.....	604
Bible Study Popularized, By Frank P. Lee.....	138
Blue Flag of the Covenant, The, By Robert Pollock Kerr.....	131
Book of Ecclesiastes, The, By Paul Haupt, LL. D.....	484
Book of the Revelation, The, By C. Anderson Scott.....	456
Bread and Salt from the Word of God, By Theodore Zahn.....	617
Buddhist and Christian Gospels, By Albert J. Edmunds.....	466
Carpenter's Geographical Reader—Africa, By Frank G. Carpenter.....	172
Century of Bibles, A, By a Sunday School Teacher.....	627
Certainty of the Kingdom, The, By Heber D. Ketcham, D. D.....	464
Changing Order, The, By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D.....	497
Childhood of Jesus Christ, The, By Henry Van Dyke, D. D.....	312
Christian Belief Interpreted by Christian Experience, By Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D.....	433
Christian Doctrine of Salvation, The, By George Barker Stevens, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D.....	632
Christianity and Socialism, By Washington Gladden.....	137
Christianity of Christ and His Apostles, The, By J. J. Tigert, D. D., LL. D.....	168
Christian Origins, By Otto Pfeiderer, D. D.....	459
Christian's Relation to Evolution, The, By Franklin Johnson, D. D., LL. D.....	132
Christ of To-Day, The, By G. Campbell Morgan.....	464
Church and the Times, The, By Rev. Robert Francis Coyle, D. D....	465
Churches and Educated Men, The, By Edwin Noah Hardy, M. A....	135
Church's One Foundation, The, By Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D.....	431
Codes of Hammurabi and Moses, The, By W. W. Davies, Ph. D....	472
Commercial Geography, By Henry Gannett, Carl L. Garrison and Edwin J. Houston.....	173
Complete Index to the Expositor's Bible, By S. G. Ayres, B. D.....	170
Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament, By William Rainey Harper.....	337
Country Sunday School, The, By Rev. Hight C. Moore.....	628
Creed of Christ, The, By John Lane.....	165

Creed of Christ, The, By Rev. Richard Venable Lancaster.....	166
Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea, A, By William Rainey Harper.....	121
Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, The, By William Sanday, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D.....	160
Crown of Science, the Incarnation of God in Mankind, The, By A. Morris Stewart, M. A.....	432
Cyclopedic Handbook to the Bible, The, By Joseph Angus, M. A., D. D.....	172
Days of His Flesh, The, By Rev. David Smith, M. A.....	163
Development of Palestine Exploration, The, By Frederick Jones Bliss, Ph. D.....	597
Development of the Sunday School, The, By W. N. Hartshorn.....	627
Disciple and His Lord, The, By Rev. J. S. Kirtley, D. D.....	615
Disciples of Christ, The, By Errett Gates, Ph. D.....	277
Divine Tragedy, The, By Peyton H. Hoge.....	449
Early Eastern Christianity, By F. Crawford Burkitt.....	283
Ecclesiology, 2nd Ed., By Edwin Charles Dargan, D. D.....	151
Economics of Jesus, The, By E. Griffith Jones, B. A.....	608
Egypt, Burma and British Malaysia, By William Eleroy Curtis....	330
Entstehung des Neuen Testaments, Die, Von Prof. Lic. Dr. Carl Clemen.....	600
Epistles of Peter, The, By Rev. J. H. Jowett, M. A.....	612
Essays in Application, By Henry Van Dyke.....	495
Essays of Elia, The, By Charles Lamb.....	497
Essentials in Mediaeval and Modern History, By Samuel Bannister Harding, Ph. D.....	131
Essentials of Spirituality, The, By Felix Adler.....	463
Evangelism, By Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D. D.....	145
Evangelism, Old and New, By Rev. A. C. Dixon.....	144
Evangelistic Awakening, The, By Wentworth F. Stewart, D. D....	140
Evangelistic Note, The, By W. J. Dawson.....	140
Evolution, the Master Key, By C. W. Saleeby, M. D.....	443
Expositions of Holy Scripture—Genesis, Isaiah and Jeremiah, By Alexander Maclaren, D. D.....	482
Faith and Life, By Charles E. Jefferson.....	288
Faith and the Faith, By Rev. T. T. Eaton, D. D., Ph. D.....	295
Finality of the Christian Religion, The, By George Burman Foster.	439
Final Preservation of the Saints Versus the Perseverance of the Saints, The, By Rev. R. Venting.....	433
First Primer of Apologetics, A, By Robert Mackintosh, D. D.....	148
First Two Decades of the Student Volunteer Movement.....	492
Four Portraits of the Lord Jesus Christ, By George Soltan.....	311
Friedrich Schiller, By Paul Carus.....	496
Garden of Nuts, The, By Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D....	133
General Sociology, By Albion W. Small.....	314
Gift of Tongues and Other Essays, The, By Rev. Dawson Walker, M. A., D. D.....	610
Gleanings from Paul's Prison, By Wayland Hoyt, D. D.....	134
God's Choice of Men, By William R. Richards.....	437
God's Image in Man, By James Orr, D. D.....	286
Gospel According to St. Luke, The, Edited by W. Williamson, B. A.	606
Gospel and the Church, The, By Alfred Loisy.....	148
Gospel in the Gospels, The, By William Porcher Dubose, M. A., S. T. D.....	640
Gospel of Matthew, The, By Alexander Maclaren, D. D., Litt. D....	605
Gospel of the Rejection, The, By Wilfred Richmond.....	607
Gottes Sohn und Gottes Geist Vorträge zur Christologie und zur Lehre vom Geiste Gottes, Von Wilhelm Lütgert.....	637

Grammar of New Testament Greek, By Friederich Blass.....	311
Grammar of New Testament Greek, A, By James Hope Moulton...	461
Great Pedagogical Essays, By F. V. N. Painter, A. M., D. D.....	496
Greece From the Coming of the Hellenes to A. D. 14, By E. S. Schuckburg, D. Litt.....	645
Happy Life, The, By Charles W. Elliot, LL. D.....	288
Hebrews, James, I and II Peter—A Commentary, By O. P. Eaches, D. D.....	611
Higher Criticism Cross-Examined, The, By F. D. Storey.....	470
Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament, par M. l'abbé E. Jacquier, Vols. I and II.....	462
History and Life of the Rev. Dr. John Tauler, of Strasbourg, The, By Susanna Winkworth.....	488
History of Early Christian Literature, The, By Baron Herman Von Soden, D. D.....	458
History of the Inquisition of Spain, A, By Henry Charles Lea, LL. D., Vol. I.....	492
History Unveiling Prophecy or Time as an Interpreter, By H. Grantan Guinness, D. D.....	302
Homiletics and Preaching, By Walter Rhodes.....	616
How to Conduct a Sunday School, By Marion Lawrance.....	138
How to Conduct a Sunday School, or Twenty-eight Years a Superintendent, By Marion Lawrance.....	624
Ideas from Nature, By William Elder, A. M., LL. D.....	147
Immanence of God, By Borden P. Bowne.....	154
Immortality, By William L. Seabrook.....	134
Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das Neue Testament, Die, Von Lic. Therl Gottfried Thieme.....	615
Inspiration of Our Faith, The, By John Watson, D. D.....	328
Introduction to the Old Testament, An, By John Edgar McFadyen, M. A.....	473
Inward Light, The, By Amory H. Bradford, D. D.....	286
Isle That Is Called Patmos, The, By William Edgar Geil.....	170
James the Lord's Brother, By William Patrick, D. D.....	612
Jesus, By W. Bousset.....	455
Jesus and the Prophets, By Charles S. Macfarland, Ph. D.....	164
Jesus—An Unfinished Portrait, By Charles Van Norden, D. D.....	605
Jesus Christ and the Christian Character, By Francis Greenwood Peabody.....	451
Jesus of Nazareth, the Anointed of God, By P. Cook, M. A.....	166
Jesus und Buddha, Von Prof. D. Fritz Barth.....	468
Jesus und die Rabbinen, Von Dr. Erich Bischoff.....	460
Johannine Grammar, By Edwin A. Abbott.....	457
Johannine Vocabulary, By Edwin A. Abbott.....	458
Jordan Valley and Petra, The, By William Libbey, Sc D., and Franklin E. Hoskins, D. D.....	157
II <i>Καὶνὴ Διαθήκη</i> , Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici A. D. 1550, cum variis lectioni bus, etc., Curante F. H. A. Scrivener..	601
Keywords in the Teaching of Jesus, By A. T. Robertson, D. D....	608
Koran, Der, Von Abr. Amirchajouz.....	469
Land of the Gods, The, By Alice Mabel Bacon.....	331
Last Message of Jesus Christ, The, By John Hamilton Timbrell..	609
Letters of Christ, The, By Charles Brown.....	604
Life and Light, By George Dana Boardman, D. D.....	286
Life and Religion, By the wife of the late Prof. F. Max Müller....	133
Life of John Wesley, The, By C. T. Winchester.....	491
Life Story of Henry Clay Trumbull, The, By Phillip E. Howard...	489
Literary Illustrations of the Bible, The Book of Daniel, Edited by James Moffatt, D. D.....	486

Literary Illustrations of the Bible, Ecclesiastes, The Gospel of St. Mark , Edited by James Moffatt, D. D.	619
Literary Illustrations of the Bible, The Epistle to the Romans , Edited by James Moffatt, D. D.	450
<i>Ἀόλια Ἰησοῦ</i> Sayings of Our Lord from an Early Greek Papyrus , By B. P. Grenfell, M. A., and A. S. Hunt, M. A.	448
Lynching of Jesus, The , By E. T. Welford.	167
Making of a Teacher, The , By Martin G. Brumbaugh, Ph. D., LL. D.	625
Making of the Gospels, The , By Rev. J. J. Scott, M. A.	456
Memories of Life at Oxford, and Experiences in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Germany, Spain and Elsewhere , By Frederick Meyrick.	647
Messianic Hope in the New Testament, The , By Shailer Mathews. .	306
Method in Soul Winning on Home and Foreign Fields , By Henry C. Mable, D. D.	629
Ministry of the Eternal Life, The , By William C. Bitting, D. D.	618
Missions from the Modern View , By Robert A. Hume.	620
Modern Mysticism , By Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., LL. D.	437
Mohammed and the Rise of Islam , By D. S. Margoliouth.	329
Moral Dignity of Baptism, The , By Bev. J. M. Frost, D. D.	297
Moral Education , By Edward Howard Griggs.	628
Moslem Doctrine of God, The , By Samuel M. Zwemer.	468
Nachapostolische Zeitalter, Das , Von Lic. Rudolf Knopf.	129
Nageil, Der Wortschatz der Apostels Paulus	459
Negro and the Nation, The , By George S. Merriam.	650
Negro in the Cities of the North, The , Reprinted from <i>Charities</i> . .	324
Nero , By Stephen Phillips.	624
Neutestamentliche Bibelstunden , Von Dr. H. Hoffman.	450
New Far East, The , By Thomas F. Millard.	648
New Reformation, The , By John A. Bain, M. A.	490
New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus , By B. P. Grenfell, D. Litt., M. A., and A. S. Hunt, D. Litt., M. A.	448
New Testament, The, A Chronological Arrangement , By Principal Lindsay.	601
New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, The , By a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology.	310
On the Borders of Pigmy Land , By Ruth B. Fisher.	621
Our Lord's Resurrection , By Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson.	609
Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels, The , By Rev. Charles Taylor, D. D.	448
Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus Found in 1903 with the Sayings Called Logia Found in 1897, The , By Rev. Charles Taylor, D. D.	448
Papst Stephan I, und der Ketzertaufstreit , Von Dr. Johann Ernst. .	622
Paul Judson , By Edward Bagby Pollard, Ph. D.	435
Paulus der Mensch und sein Werk: Die Anfänge des Christentums, der Kirche und des Dogmas , Von Heinrich Weinel.	313
Perennial Revival, The , By William B. Riley.	140
Philosophy of Religion, The , By Dr. Harald Höfding.	644
Philosophy of Religion, The , By George Trumbull Ladd, LL. D.	444
Phyllis Burton , By Mrs. S. R. Graham Clark.	134
Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, A , By Charles Gallandet Trumbull.	159
Political History of Europe From 1815 to 1848 , By B. H. Carroll, Jr., LL. B., M. A., Th. D., Ph. D.	283
Priestly Element in the Old Testament, The , By William Rainey Harper.	331
Primitive Christian Education , By Geraldine Hodgson.	494
Proceedings of the Baptist Congress for 1905	492
Prophet of Nazareth, The , By Nathaniel Schmidt.	602
Prophets and the Promise, The , By Willis Judson Beecher, D. D. .	476

Psalms, The, Vol. II (LXXIII—CL), By Rev. T. Wilton Davies, B. A., Ph. D.	483
Rational Living, By Henry Churchill King	288
Readings in European History, By James Harvey Robinson	490
Reconstruction of Religious Belief, The, By W. H. Mallock	290
Reden Unseres Herrn Nach Johannes im Grundtext Ausgelegt, Von Dr. Siegfried Goebel	607
Reform in Sunday School Teaching, By A. S. Peake, M. A., B. D. ...	626
Religions of Mission Fields, as Viewed by Protestant Missionaries ...	329
Religion und Religionen, Von D. Otto Pfeiderer	643
Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judenthums im Zeitalter Jesu, Die, Von M. Friedländer	436
Religious Education, By Prof. Albert E. Garvie, D. D.	629
Representative Men of the New Testament, The, By George Matheson, D. D.	169
Rev. John Myles and the Founding of the First Baptist Church in Massachusetts, By Henry Melville King	489
Robbie's Bible Stories, By Gertrude Smith	134
Sankey's Story of the Gospel Hymns, and of Sacred Songs and Solos, By Ira D. Sankey	491
Silver Age of the Greek World, The, By J. P. Mahaffy, D. D., D. C. L.	646
Sir Walter Scott, By Andrew Lang	647
Social Theories and Social Facts, By William Morton Grinnell ...	325
Song of Ages, The, By Reginald J. Campbell	326
Stones in the Rough, By William Ashmore	300
St. Paul the Master-BUILDER, By Walter Lock, D. D.	169
Students and the Modern Missionary Crusade	619
Student's Chronological New Testament, The, By Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D.	171
Studies in the Religion of Israel, By Rev. L. A. Pooler, B. D.	126
Study of the History of Music, The, By Edward Dickinson	128
Sychar Revival, The, By S. D. Gordon	604
Teaching of Jesus Concerning Christian Conduct, The, By A. C. Zenos, D. D.	168
Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Holy Spirit, The, By Louis Burton Crane, A. M.	312
Text-Book in the History of Education, A, By Paul Monroe	631
True Story of Robert Browne. The, By Champlin Burrage, M. A. ...	623
Universal Elements of the Christian Religion, The, By Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D., LL. D.	293
Unlighted Lustre, The, By Rev. S. H. Morrison, M. A.	463
Walter Pater, By A. C. Benson	648
What is the Lord's Coming? By Fred. Erdman	604
Wissenschaftliche und Religiöse Wetlansicht, Von Marcel T. Djuvara	469
Witness of Sin, The, By Rev. Nathan Robinson Wood	639
Works of Josephus, The, Translated by Wm. Whiston and edited by D. S. Margoliouth, D. Litt.	599
Young People's Imitation of Christ, The, By Edward S. Ellis	312

BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. III.

April, 1906.

No. 2.

A STUDY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR HENRY C. VEDDER, D.D., CROZER THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

To master any piece of literature, no single method of study suffices. At least two methods must be pursued, neither to the exclusion of the other, since they are complementary. One is to study the whole in the light of the details—a method commonly called exegesis. The other is to study the details in the light of the whole, and is often called exposition. It is perhaps a matter of no great importance which method is first employed, provided the other is not neglected; for there can be no accurate exposition without careful exegesis, nor truthful exegesis without thorough exposition.

This study of the Fourth Gospel is avowedly expository. Let us at the outset brush aside all questions regarding authorship, time and place of composition, and the like—not contemptuously, as things of no importance, but as irrelevant to our present purpose. That purpose is simply to inquire, What does this Gospel tell, and why? Here is a piece of literature. Somebody wrote it. Let us give him the traditional name of John, and seek to discover his purpose and message. For that the book, in its present form, is the product of a single mind, and was composed with a definite purpose, can be doubted by no reader who has any competence for literary criticism.

What does this Gospel tell? The theme is announced in the opening sentences to be the Word; the Word that was with God in the beginning, and that was God; the

Word through whom all things were made; the Word that is the Light of men; the Word that was made flesh and tented among us, in order that he might declare to men the invisible God. There is no need of a wearisome and bewildering discussion of the Logos-doctrine of Philo, and what John may have borrowed from Alexandrine thought, and for this reason: In spite of the library of learned nonsense, and the modicum of learned sense, that has been written on this subject, it is by no means certain that John had ever heard of Philo and the Alexandrine philosophy. There is no conclusive evidence that he either knew or cared anything about the speculations of Neo-Platonism. His use of the term Logos, or Word, to describe the pre-existent Christ might well have been quite independent of any philosophic speculations. It is a metaphor that might suggest itself to any thoughtful man. A man's word is that by which he communicates himself to others; it is the expression, the revelation, of his thought, feeling, will. A man's word is the man himself. So the Word of God is God, and at the same time he is the revelation of God's will, feeling, thought. The Word is God in creative energy; he is God coming into relation with the world he has made; he is Light, he is Life, he is Truth. And the complete revelation of God to man was attained when the Word became flesh and lived the life of a man, under human conditions and limitations. "No one has ever seen God—God only-begotten, he that is in the bosom of the Father, he declared him." This does not mean that the Word was transformed into man, the divine into the human; nor that the divine became contracted to the limits of the human and so was indistinguishable from it; but that the Word assumed human nature—became mysteriously, yet really and indissolubly, united to a human spirit, clothed with a human body—so that in Jesus of Nazareth men beheld God manifest in the flesh.

The Fourth Gospel is, therefore the Gospel of the Incarnation. And the fact of the incarnation is thus made

primal, central, not for any dogmatic reasons, but to impress duly upon us the lesson of that incarnation: By assuming man's nature, the Word has identified himself with man's state, obligated himself to share man's burdens, to bear man's penalty. Those who come into fellowship with him enter upon the same path of lowly service and vicarious suffering. The same mind must be in them that was in the Word, who emptied himself of his divine glory and power, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death.

This is the Gospel of the Incarnation, not only in that it reveals the wondrous fact of the Word becoming flesh, but because it describes in detail the earthly life of the incarnate Word. That life is briefly characterized in 1:14: "And the Word became flesh and tented among us, full of grace and truth; and we beheld his glory—glory as of One Only-begotten from the Father." The entire Gospel is an expansion of that sentence. The earthly life of the Word is said to have been "full of grace and truth"—"grace," the spiritual condition of one in whom God dwells, and who is therefore completely governed by the divine will and is in full accord with the divine character; "truth," exact outward correspondence in word and deed to a perfect character, which exists in God himself chiefly, and in all God's servants according to the measure of their fellowship with him. Accordingly, in Jesus Christ men beheld "glory, as of One Only-begotten from the Father"—a unique and absolutely perfect excellence, a being not only without sin (that would be merely negative) but possessing and manifesting all those attributes of personal character that we associate with God himself. To justify this description of the historic Christ is the aim of the Gospel.

Two other and minor aspects of the earthly life of the Word are set forth in the Prologue:

1. He came to his own (Israel), the chosen people of God, and they did not receive him (i. 11). This prepares us for the details of Christ's rejection by the official heads

of the nation, the chief priests and Sanhedrin; by their recognized religious teachers, the scribes; and by the exponents of their highest type of piety, the Pharisees. It prepares us also to find that the scene of the Gospel is mainly Jerusalem, where alone this appeal to the nation's representatives could fitly be made.

2. But some received him, both of his own people and of the Gentiles, and to such he gave power to become children of God, for in him was Life (i. 12, 4). We may therefore expect to find this side of the ministry of the incarnate Word fully set forth.

This is what the Gospel has to tell. The purpose of the writer in telling it he has himself explicitly declared: "These things have been written that you may believe Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." The author did not set out to write a biography, but a Gospel. He was convinced, however, that he could best accomplish his purpose of securing belief on the part of his readers by telling how Jesus Christ had manifested his uniquely perfect character—that to relate those things in the life of Jesus which had elicited faith in those who saw and heard would elicit like faith in those who read. Those who have eyes to see would behold the beauty, the majesty, the perfection of his character; they would believe and receive life.

This purpose of the author is told in several different ways. "I have been born for this," said Jesus to Pilate, "and for this I have come into the world, to testify to the truth"—the truth, namely, that he was King, Messiah, Son of God (xix. 37). The mission of Christ is thus defined by himself to have been essentially that of testimony, witness-bearing, the declaring of God to man. In the Prologue also this word is found, and further study shows it to be the key-word of the Gospel: *μαρτυρία*, testimony.* Either as noun or as verb this word is in

*One other word of frequent occurrence in this Gospel, though by no means unique, is *σημειον*, sign, the visible way in which the witness is borne.

constant use, while it is of rare occurrence in the other Gospels. John the Baptist came into the world to bear witness to the Light, to give his testimony to the Messianic office and character of Jesus. The Word became flesh that he might become God's witness, declare God to men. The book was written in testimony to the words and work of Jesus, that men might believe him to be the Christ, the Son of God.

To sum up: as to substance, this is the Gospel of the Incarnation; as to form, this is the Gospel of Testimonies.

As to literary form, the Fourth Gospel is the most regular, the most artificial (in the good sense of that word) of the four Gospels. Its structure or plan is simple and easily seen, and is striking because of its symmetry. Certain numbers—three, seven, ten, twelve—had a special religious significance in the mind of a Jew, and the number seven seems to have had a peculiar attraction for John. The contents of his book are arranged in three main divisions (there is probably no significance in the number three), each of which is subdivided into seven heads or sections, as will appear from the following.

ANALYSIS.

Prologue, i. 1-18.

I. Testimonies and Manifestations of the Early Ministry.

1. Testimony of John and his disciples, i. 19-51.
2. First "sign" at Cana, ii. 1-12.
3. Cleansing of the Temple, ii. 13-25.
4. Conversation with Nicodemus, iii. 1-21.
5. Second testimony of John iii. 22-36.
6. Jesus manifests himself in Samaria, iv. 1-42.
7. Second "sign" at Cana, iv. 43-54.

II. Testimonies and Manifestations to the Jewish Nation.

1. Healing of the lame man, v. 1-47.
2. Feeding of the five thousand, vi. 1-71.
3. Jesus at the Feast of Booths, vii. 1-viii. 59.
4. Healing of man born blind, ix. 1-x. 21.
5. Jesus at the Feast of Dedication, x. 22-39.
6. Raising of Lazarus, x. 30-xi. 54.
7. Jesus publicly assumes title of Messiah, xi. 55-xii. 50.

III. Manifestations and Testimonies of the Last Days.

1. Jesus manifests himself at the Supper, xiii. 1-30.
 2. Last Discourses to his Disciples—the coming of the Comforter, xiii. 31-xiv. 31.
 3. Discourse continued—Union with Christ, xv., xvi.
 4. The Prayer of Jesus, xvii.
 5. The arrest and trial, xviii. 1-xix. 16.
 6. The Crucifixion and death, xix. 17-42.
 7. The Resurrection, xx.
- Epilogue, xxi.

I.

First of all, then, we have a group of seven events, conceived either as testimonies borne to the divine Sonship and Messianic mission of Jesus, or as manifestations of his "glory," his uniquely perfect character, in the earlier part of his ministry. The Gospel begins (i. 19) almost as abruptly as the Gospel of Mark, with the testimony of John the Baptist and certain of his disciples. Knowledge of the preliminary work of John, and its results among the Jewish people, is assumed by the author. This work has created such a stir that the national authorities can no longer ignore it. They send a deputation to John, who demand from him an account of himself and a declara-

tion of his authority. He frankly confesses that he is not the Christ, but only his forerunner; but to their demand for his credentials he gives what must have seemed to them a vague and enigmatic, if not evasive, reply.

On the very next day (if we are to construe literally this note of time) the Baptist bears public testimony to the Messianic character and divine Sonship of Jesus. The baptism of Jesus we must understand from i. 32-34 to have previously occurred, but though John at that time recognized the Messiah in Jesus he had not then opportunity to bear his testimony. He now announces that he has beheld the divinely appointed sign of the Spirit of God descending upon Jesus in the form of a dove and remaining on him, and by this he knows Jesus for the Lamb of God, for him who should baptize in the Holy Spirit. But this was to John more than a mere sign of identity: he recognizes and testifies that in this descent of the Spirit Jesus had received the reality of which the holy oil was but a symbol, and was now become the Anointed One, the Messiah, the Christ. With this formal public attestation of his official character, Jesus begins his ministry.

With John on that day are two disciples who are, like him, waiting and watching for the coming of the promised Deliverer. Hearing the words of their master they follow Jesus, and at his invitation spend the rest of the day with him. What a day of days it was to them! How every incident of it must have remained photographed upon their memories to their latest breath. From that interview they are the devoted followers of Jesus—they become his disciples as they had been John's.

One of these men was Andrew; the other, unnamed—who can he be but the author himself? Andrew, in his new enthusiasm, goes in search of his brother Simon, bursts upon him with these words, "We have found the Messiah," and brings him forthwith to his new found Master and Teacher. Jesus, who needed not to be told what was in any man, beheld in Simon not only the man

he was—impulsive, headstrong, fickle, a strange compound of bravery and cowardice—but the man he would become by God's grace—the leader, the pillar, the tower of strength to his brethren and their common cause—and gives him a new name, expressive of this new character, Kephas, Peter, Rock.

The next day Philip is called to be a disciple, and at once accepting the invitation goes to his friend, Nathanael, the Israelite in whom there was no deceit, who, though doubtful at first, is persuaded to see Jesus, and recognizes him for what he is. Though we are not told this in so many words, we may be sure that John would not be long in finding his brother James, and with him six of those who are to be the Twelve closest disciples have already heard and answered their call. These instances illustrate, and were probably recorded to illustrate, the eagerness with which a select few choice souls, who were prepared by previous spiritual experiences to understand Christ, instinctively perceived his unique character and mission, joyfully welcomed him as one to whom they were drawn by irresistible affinity, and confessed with Nathanael, "Teacher, you are the Son of God, you are King of Israel."

The author now goes on to relate the first public manifestation of his "glory" by Jesus—the first "sign" to the world of his character and office—the miracle of turning water into wine at Cana. What the effect upon the guests may have been we can guess, but we are not told; what we are told is that his disciples were led by this manifestation of himself to give him their whole trust. They had already recognized his exalted character from his words to them; this deed confirms their intuitions. It shows Jesus, as the Christ of God, to be the source of life, King of the physical world as of the spiritual, as far above men in power as he is in character and dignity.

After a brief stay at Capernaum, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem. This ministry in Galilee John passes over in almost complete silence, not because it was in his view

unimportant, not because it is fully described in the other Gospels and so need not be told again, but because it is not germane to his purpose. He has set out to tell the story of Christ's appeal to the Jewish nation, and his rejection by its official and spiritual heads. For the same reason he tells us of but one incident of this visit to Jerusalem—the one that exactly fits his theme and purpose. Jesus goes to the Temple; he is outraged by the flagrant abuses that have grown up; before his authoritative manner, before his flaming indignation, the conscience-stricken brokers and dealers flee in dismay. This assumption of authority, this manifestation of moral power, were strictly appropriate for the Messiah, and were a tacit assertion of his official dignity. It was so understood by priests and Sanhedrin—for by "the Jews" John always means either these official representatives of the nation, or their unofficial religious leaders, the scribes and Pharisees—and they instinctively assume a hostile attitude to this new prophet and teacher. They demand of him a "sign," that he shall work a miracle to attest his right to such exercise of authority. Jesus refused then, as always, to perform a miracle for the convincing of the hostile or incredulous. Nor will he explicitly declare himself to be the Messiah, and thus precipitate the fate that is finally to overtake him.

Though no other acts of Jesus during this visit are narrated, it is easy to gather that John is not silent because there was nothing more to tell. Other "signs" that Jesus did are mentioned, and the fact is recorded that many believed on him at this time—which things show that his ministry here was of some duration and included both teaching and miracles. That he made a profound impression in Jerusalem, both upon the people at large and upon their leaders, is evident. At least one of the leaders was favorably impressed by the teaching of Jesus and desired to know more about him, and accordingly came to him for a private, personal conference. His coming by night may have been due in part to a pru-

dent wish to avoid comment—he was not yet an avowed disciple, and may not have wished to identify himself too closely with a teacher already under suspicion of the authorities. Quite as probable is the conjecture that he came by night, because Jesus was thronged all day by the people, and night offered the only opportunity for a private and prolonged conversation, such as he desired. To Nicodemus Jesus imparts two principles fundamental in his teaching: First, that his kingdom is spiritual and consequently natural birth gives no one entrance into this kingdom. Jew as well as Gentile must undergo a profound spiritual change before he can become a subject of the King. And secondly, he makes clear his atoning work, his redemptive mission. Because his sacrifice was so immeasurable, his exaltation is so matchless—the way of lowliness, of service, of death, is the way of greatness, of glory, in his kingdom.

While we have no definite information regarding the length of this stay at Jerusalem, we may plausibly guess that it was not more than a few weeks at most. It must have created great excitement, and even exposed Jesus to the danger of immediate arrest. We may read these things between the lines, as the reason for his going into the rural districts, where there would be less excitement and danger of interference. He continues to teach and make disciples. His success was so great that the jealousy of certain disciples of the Baptist was roused; they come to their Master complaining that he is in danger of eclipse. John again bears most emphatic testimony that Jesus is the Christ, of whom he has claimed to be only the forerunner. There is no room for jealousy in the great heart of the Baptist; he knows that his work is nearly done. Henceforth he must decrease and Jesus must increase, and he rejoices that such is the case.*

The Pharisees continue their opposition, and Jesus

*The paragraph iii, 31-36 is probably to be regarded as an interruption of the narrative, and a comment by the author, not as a part of the words of the Baptist—though this is not altogether certain.

thinks it the part of prudence to leave Judea for a time. On the journey, at Jacob's well, he meets a Samaritan woman and converses at length with her. Three principal themes are found in this discourse: (1) Jesus declares himself to be the Water of Life, the source of spiritual power; (2) he makes clear the nature of genuine worship, that its essence is not in time or place or ritual, but in the relation of man's spirit to God, who is Spirit; (3) he first explicitly declares himself to be the Messiah. What he would not tell to hostile unbelief at Jerusalem he discloses to simple faith in Sychar. For several days he tarries in the town, and many believe on him there. It is easy to see why John relates this episode: it is, in some respects, the most striking of all the manifestations of the "glory" of Jesus. A hated Jew, the power of his character and teaching are so convincing that multitudes give him their entire trust. There could be no more emphatic contrast between the faith of these Samaritans and the unbelief and rejection of the Jews. To make that contrast as vivid as possible is the writer's evident object.

Which ought a religious teacher to regard as the greater failure—to elicit no faith from a part of his hearers, or to rouse a wrong kind of faith in another part? In Judea, in spite of having created a great *furor*, Jesus had on the whole been coldly received, suspected, rejected; in Galilee men received him favorably because they had heard of his signs and wonders at Jerusalem. Only in Samaria did his message find a ready acceptance for its own sake, for its intrinsic worth. It is perhaps because of this attitude on the part of the men of Galilee that John elects to tell but one incident of the early ministry there. He evidently chose this one, not because it was not told in the earlier Gospels, but because it was a striking manifestation of the "glory" of Jesus, inasmuch as it called forth faith of a peculiar quality, such as he did not often find in Galilee or elsewhere. It was natural that this royal officer should seek Jesus—a journey of twenty miles or so—a father in such case will leave noth-

ing untried. What was not to be expected was the officer's instant and entire confidence in the mere word of Jesus, a confidence that next day he found to be fully justified. Such faith was peculiarly grateful to Jesus. Every man would rather be valued for what he is than for what he can bestow. The faith that sees in Jesus the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely, is surely dearer to him now, in his exaltation, than the faith that sees in him only the most willing and bountiful of givers—though he may not repudiate the latter sort of faith, and may honor it more that it deserves. In his first "sign" at Cana, Jesus had shown himself lord of the forces of nature that minister to the needs of man. Now he shows that his lordship is such that he can heal disease. But who can do this except one that has power also to minister to minds diseased, to heal sickness of soul as well as of body?

II.

Here, with the second main division of the Gospel, begins a series of seven distinct and direct appeals to the representatives of the Jewish nation, all but one of which are made in Jerusalem. These appeals are arranged in a rising scale, a *crescendo* of interest and power. Four of them have their starting-point in the performance of a notable miracle, or "sign," and in each case the miracle is followed by an address or sermon.

The first of the incidents is the healing of the lame man at the pool of Bethesda. His lameness had been caused by sin; the man had become hopeless of cure. What a type of sin and its results! for sin is paralysis, sin is the maiming of all our powers, sin is a hopeless condition apart from divine healing. This healing, which took place during an unnamed feast, was a sign of undeniable power, but nevertheless gave occasion for a charge by the Pharisees that Jesus had violated the Sabbath. We see how rapidly unbelief hardens into opposition. In his dis-

course, Jesus shows how absurd the charge of sacrilege really is, but this only in passing; his main purpose is to announce his divine Sonship and the proofs by which his mission is authenticated. The Jews rightly understood him to claim equality with God, as his real ground of justification in the course he was pursuing. His mission, he declares, is to honor the Father by doing his works. God is the source of Life, but he has given to the Son power to make alive. God is Judge, but he has committed all judgment to the Son. This is not inconsistent with the declarations of Jesus elsewhere (iii. 17; viii. 15) that he did not come into the world to judge the world. All hearing of the gospel is necessarily a judgment; men either accept the truth and find life or they reject it and continue in death. A testing, winnowing, self-judgment of hearers is inseparable from the teaching of truth. In short, the Son is the revelation of the Father, he has come into the world to declare God to man. This mission is authenticated by three lines of proof: (1) the testimony of John; (2) the testimony of the works; (3) the testimony of the Scriptures. If they really believed Moses and the prophets they would believe Him; their rejection of Him proves that they did not really believe Moses or understand the Scriptures. They could not believe Jesus because their ideals were earthly, as they showed by preferring the applause of men to the honor of God.

It was desirable that at least one appeal should be made to the Pharisees and leaders of Galilee. The second notable miracle, the feeding of five thousand, was made the occasion of such an appeal. In the synagogue at Capernaum Jesus delivered a long discourse, in which he explained the spiritual significance of that miracle, and made clear the manward aspect of his mission. He had come into the world that men might have life—had come to satisfy their hunger with the bread of life. He was himself that Bread—in him was to be found the satisfaction of the spiritual hunger of men, and only those that feed on his flesh and drink his blood, that is become par-

takers of his nature, receive eternal life. To a material mind, the figurative way in which this teaching was given would naturally seem grossly material, and so we need not wonder that the Jews "murmured" (discussed, complained, criticised in a hostile spirit). It is more surprising that some of his disciples declared such teaching to be intolerable, and that from that day many who had hitherto professed discipleship turned away from him.

This was the crisis of his work in Galilee. Those who sought material blessings, those who had political aspirations, fell away, unable to receive a teaching so spiritual, caring nothing for a kingdom not of this world, or for food that did not nourish the body. But the Twelve, and some others doubtless, remained faithful. With Peter they believed that Jesus had words of eternal life, that his words and works avowed him to be God's Anointed One. He satisfied their deepest spiritual wants. Yet already Jesus could see in Judas signs of that defection which was to come.

The remaining appeals to the nation were made in Jerusalem. The authorities generally say that John is the most precise in his chronology of all the evangelists, which is true in a sense, though it is also true that John does not care a button for chronology. What he shows us is that Jesus made his appeals to the nation in connection with the great national feasts; partly because he had greater opportunity to present his teachings at those times, partly because the crowds then present were a protection to him. The Sanhedrin did not venture for some time to risk the disapprobation of the multitude by arresting him during a feast. Again and again we are told that he would have been summarily dealt with by that body but for this fear of the people, in whose eyes Jesus was a prophet.

The feast of booths afforded an excellent occasion for teaching the multitudes, and making an appeal to the scribes and Pharisees. Jesus declined to be moved by his brothers' taunts to make a demonstrative entry of the

city and a public proclamation of his Messianic character. A few months later, at the passover feast, he did this; and the result was his speedy death, as he had foreseen. Not to provoke such an untimely fate, while his work was still but half done, he now goes up quietly, but teaches publicly in the Temple. The authorities and leaders were astonished at his teaching, indeed perplexed, because he had not been a pupil of any Rabbi and belonged to none of the recognized schools or parties. But already among the people the question was anxiously discussed whether this teacher were not in truth the Christ. Enraged by this, the Pharisaic party in the Sanhedrin sent officers to arrest him, but these were so impressed by the teaching that they returned without their prisoner, saying, "No man ever talked like this!"*

What had so impressed them? A discourse in which Jesus declared that he was soon going wither they could not come, and because they did not believe his teaching they would die in their sins. He also declared more plainly than ever before his divine authority for his teachings: "He that sent me is with me. He has not left me alone, because I always do the things pleasing to him."

On the last day of the feast the teaching of Jesus becomes more emphatic; he promises the Water of Life; he declares that he alone can make men free. There is a tone of unusual sharpness in his denunciations of "the Jews" (some Rabbis apparently had engaged in controversy with him), for he now says they are not children of Abraham at all. The Jews could not receive him because he was not their ideal of a Messiah; and they had such an ideal because they had become alienated from God and so misunderstood the Scriptures. In conclusion, Jesus makes what every Jew would understand to be a

*The protest of Nicodemus on this occasion against this inequitable action of the majority of the Sanhedrin brings into clearer relief the fact that most of that body were now not merely opposed to Jesus, but determined to silence him—which, of course, could be effectively done in only one way.

claim of divine nature, "Before Abraham was, I am." They attempted to stone him on the spot for blasphemy. The rising tide of opposition is almost ready to overwhelm Jesus—the people are beginning to join their leaders.

The healing of the man born blind, which seemingly happened during this visit, deepens the intensity of feeling. It is symbolic, like all of the miracles of Jesus, and the discourse following in the Treasury of the Temple made clear its meaning. Jesus is the Light of the world; he has come to dispel the darkness, to cure the moral blindness that sin has caused. But he has also come for "judgment," for testing and sifting men. Those who, like the Pharisees, are not conscious of their need of healing and insist that they see, must remain in their darkness and guilt. The Jewish leaders not only could not receive this teaching, but they had the blind man whom he had healed expelled from the synagogue, because he proclaimed his trust in Jesus as the Christ. Persecution quickly followed rejection.

Passing over the intervening time without comment, John comes to the feast that commemorated the Dedication of the Temple. Again Jesus makes his appearance in Jerusalem and teaches in the Temple, this time in Solomon's colonnade. "The Jews" challenge him to tell frankly whether he is Messiah or not, but he does not permit them to force him into a premature declaration of himself. Yet he gives an implicit declaration of his office and work, in the allegories of the Good Shepherd and the Door; and he closes his discourse with the announcement that he and his Father are one. Again the Jews make a demonstration of stoning him, for what they regarded as blasphemous words, but he shows that the Scriptures which they accepted as God's word contained precedents for such language.

Escaping an attempt to arrest him, and judging that the excitement and opposition had become too great for him to continue his teaching in Jerusalem, he went for a

time to Perea. From now on he teaches only those who come to him of their own choice, for instruction. Luke has given us a very full account of this part of his ministry. Chapters xi. to xiii. of the third Gospel are given to this subject, and contain among other things the discourse on prayer, the parables of the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward and the Pharisee and Publican, as well as the incident of the rich young ruler. John merely says that many came to him at that time and believed.

This Perea ministry was interrupted by the greatest of the miracles of Jesus, the raising of Lazarus. The key to the chapter describing this event and its consequences is given us in the words, "I am the resurrection and the life." This "sign" again discloses Jesus as Lord of all things, including life and death, as the one in whom alone men have hope of eternal life. The miracle in the flesh was wrought only to turn men's minds to the miracle in the spirit that he was equally able and equally ready to work. But instead of this, it merely embittered his enemies and precipitated the long-preparing catastrophe. Jesus foresaw the consequences—the final rejection of his claims by the Jewish leaders, who, instead of being convinced by the truth of his teaching, were infuriated by his success, to the point of including Lazarus with Jesus in their scheme of vengeance. It was knowledge of this stiff-necked opposition, as well as the faint faith of his closest disciples, that made Jesus so indignant in spirit as he approached the tomb of Lazarus, and drew from him tears that the bystanders incorrectly interpreted as evidence of his great love and grief for his friend. He was not grieving for the dead Lazarus, but for living sinners, whose fixity of unbelief and malignant opposition cut him to the heart.

They had scornfully rejected him without taking pains to comprehend his teaching. He was not the sort of Messiah they were looking for, so in their eyes he was an impostor. But they greatly feared that his miracles would lead the people to accept him, and that a revolt

against Rome would be the natural consequence—a revolt certain to be unsuccessful and to be punished by a still further loss of their liberties. There was, therefore, (granting the validity of their premises) but one prudent course to pursue; to suppress this false Messiah, before worse mischief should be done. Their culpability lay in the fact that they had not even attempted to understand Jesus and his teachings; had they done so, their fears would have been shown to be groundless. Jesus was put to death in complete misapprehension of his aims, but if they had understood him better would the Jewish leaders have believed in him more readily? Nothing warrants an affirmative answer.

After the raising of Lazarus, Jesus again goes across the Jordan, to await the passover, when he will make the final manifestation of himself and complete his work. At the proper time he goes up to Jerusalem. Jesus may have made no appreciable impression on the Jewish leaders, he may have made less impression on the people than his large following would suggest, but at any rate he had a small company of intimate friends and disciples in whose hearts he was enshrined forever, in whose love and fidelity he could unquestioningly trust. His friends are the measure of his "glory." The story of the supper at Bethany is therefore told by John for its own sake and in its proper order, while the other Gospels tell it out of its chronological order, merely to explain the treason of Judas. The anger of this unworthy disciple at the rebuke of Jesus no doubt precipitated action that he had perhaps long secretly meditated.

On the following morning Jesus makes his entry into the city. The news of his coming has preceded him, and disciples came forth to welcome him. If there has been a steadily growing unbelief and hostility among the ruling classes, there has also been a rising tide of belief and enthusiasm among the people. The enthusiasm of the crowd leads them to make a considerable demonstration, and Jesus does not check them. The time has come for

him to declare himself unmistakably, and he accepts the title of Messiah as his of right when the acclaiming crowd confers it on him.

When he reaches the Temple, Jesus finds certain Greeks desiring to see and hear him, and he hails this as proof that his work has culminated, his mission is accomplished, since his fame has gone beyond the narrow limits of Judea. Henceforth nothing remains but to fructify by his death the truth he has been teaching. He leaves the Temple with his work on earth completed. His few remaining hours of life belong to the inner circle of his disciples, that he may impress himself as deeply as possible on their consciousness and prepare them to become his Apostles and witnesses.*

III.

Eight chapters—nearly half the entire writing, exclusive of Prologue and Epilogue—are devoted by John to the last manifestations and testimonies of Jesus. The greater part of this matter is peculiar to John, and even when he describes scenes and events that are narrated in the other Gospels with sufficient fulness for biographical purposes, the point of view from which he writes is so novel and the end he keeps in mind is so distinctive, that he is invariably led to give fresh incidents and illuminating details. We see this in the very first of the seven subdivisions of this part—the account of the last supper. Of the supper itself John says little, and of the institution of the Eucharist he says nothing at all—an omission that at first seems unaccountable and incredible, until we remind ourselves once more of his main object in writing, and then we see why he tells us only the one incident of Jesus washing the disciples feet. This was the supreme manifestation of Jesus' love. While his disciples were disputing which should be greatest in the kingdom, and

*The paragraph, xii, 37-43 is another pause in the narrative for an explanatory remark by the author.

striving which should have the seats of honor at table, he performs this menial service—not to teach humility, as is so commonly said, but to teach love, as he himself says (xiii. 1): the love that he actually had for his disciples, the love that they should have for each other (xiii. 12-17). He thus says to them in symbol, what he soon after says in word, “This is my commandment, that you love one another, even as I have loved you.”

In the conversation at the supper, we have one of the purely personal touches that are a part of the charm of this Gospel. John alone tells, as he alone of the evangelists knew at first hand, of the by-play between himself and Peter regarding the betrayer of Jesus. For tradition cannot be wrong in its uniform maintenance that “the disciple whom Jesus loved” is to be regarded both here and elsewhere as no other than John himself.”*

After the departure of the traitor—smarting at the knowledge that his treason is now known not only to his Master, but to at least two of his fellow disciples, and burning to accomplish his evil purpose and receive his reward—Jesus begins the most tender and impressive of all his discourses. All that he says may be naturally classified under two topics: Union with Christ, and, The Coming of the Comforter. Let us disregard the exact order of the text and consider his words in their connection of thought.

We may then conceive the discourse as beginning with ch. xv. and the allegory of the Vine (xv. 1-8). From this Jesus passes to the New Commandment that he is about to leave with them (xiii. 34, 35), and the subject is continued in xv. 9-27. Union with Christ, as of the branches with the vine, a union whose proof and manifestation are furnished in their mutual love—this is the topic of the

*How finely, let us note in passing, John has sketched the character of Simon, with a few masterly strokes: his self-confidence, his obstinacy, his great heart, his dangerous impulsiveness. surely, Surely Simon has much to learn before he can become Peter, the Rock.

discourse. Studied in the light of this dominant idea, each verse easily yields its meaning.

The other topic, The Coming of the Comforter, to which transition is made in xv. 26, 27, is continued in xvi. 1-11 and 16-33. Then we return, for its further discussion, to xiii. 31, whence the discourse moves on to xiv. 29, to which should be added xvi. 12-15, and as the conclusion of the whole, xiv. 30, 31. If these discourses are read in this order, it will be seen that they are much more coherent and impressive, and that the meaning of each sentence becomes far clearer.

One can hardly miss the purpose of the author in so fully repeating to us these discourses. They are the crowning manifestation by Jesus to his disciples of his "glory," his unique character. Only the incarnate Word could thus intimately speak of his Father; only the incarnate Word could declare that "he that has seen me has seen the Father;" only the incarnate Word could speak of "the Comforter, whom I will send you." As these promises gave a new idea of their Master to the disciples who first heard them—an idea that never ceased to deepen and broaden—so the permanent record of them, it seemed to John, could not but give readers for all time a truer idea of the real character of Jesus Christ.

And now, having finished his instructions to his disciples, Jesus pours out his whole soul to his Father in prayer. This chapter xvii. is the most wonderful chapter of the Bible, for by admitting us to the privacy of his communion with his Father, our Lord has taken us into the very Holy of Holies. This is commonly called "Christ's Intercessory Prayer," and the title is so far justified as this: Jesus does in this prayer make intercession for his disciples, present and to be. But this is to name the prayer from a single element in it, and that not the most important. The chief thing in the prayer is not Christ's concern for his disciples, but Christ's relation to his Father. His work on earth is finished, he is standing (so to speak) by his open grave,

he is in the very article of death, and under these circumstances he solemnly commends to his Heavenly Father himself, his work and his followers. Far more appropriately than to the prayer given by Matthew and Luke the name of the Lord's Prayer might have been given to this outpouring of our Lord's inmost heart. The other prayer should be called the Disciples' Prayer. It is, of course, hopeless to think of changing a usage that has so rooted itself in Christian literature, but we can at least remember that this is the real Lord's Prayer, and so think of it.

And as to its substance, let us note that it is largely communion with God, soul to soul, heart to heart. It is not mainly petition. Petition has its place in this, as in all prayer, but here its place is distinctly subordinate. Communion, fellowship—that is the essence of prayer. If we come to God only to seek gifts from him, even spiritual gifts, we have not yet learned the nature of true prayers.

Upon the three testimonies of the arrest and trial, the crucifixion, death and burial, and the resurrection, it is not necessary to dwell. The author's purpose is evident in each case; the bearing of Jesus under this supreme test, the proofs of his divine nature that he continually gave, correspond to the general theme and round out the account of the incarnate Word. The words and incidents that John alone reports—we may note especially the incident of "the doubting Thomas"—are such as precisely suit his purpose to let the greatness of Christ's character speak for itself. He was right in believing that Jesus is himself the most convincing argument for the truth of Christianity, as generations of readers of this Gospel have discovered and testified.

With ch. xx. the Gospel proper ends, but who would wish omitted the Epilogue and its personal reminiscences? It is the most touching manifestation of the character of Jesus in the whole book, his unbounded love and mercy, the forgiveness that could restore Peter without rebuke

(save one delicately hinted), to his place of primacy and influence among the apostles.

Who that is not blind to all spiritual verities can fail to see that this Gospel has told the story of a life that continually revealed "grace," "truth," "glory"—a glory as of One Only-begotten of the Father—a character so completely unique that it is explicable only as John explained it: Jesus of Nazareth was not only Son of Man, but Son of God, the Word made flesh.

ARISTOTLE'S THEOLOGY.

BY W. W. EVERTS, M. A.

Aristotle, called by Plato the mind of the school and by Dante the master of those who know, may be said to have made "science his forte and omniscience his foible." His father, Nicomachus, physician at the Macedonian Court, and his pupil, Alexander the Great, supplied him with means to collect books and specimens of every kind. Raphael, in his famous fresco of the school of Athens, represents him as the investigator looking down upon the earth while Plato is represented as the dreamer, looking up into Heaven. Plato called him the reader, and said that he needed the check as much as others needed the spur.

Aristotle followed the scientific and historical method in his researches. Beginning with a statement of his theme he then gave a historical review of the treatment of the subject by others, afterwards stated the difficulties, doubts and contradictions suggested by the subject, then sifted, discussed and explained them, and finally gave his own solution of the problem, much as Dorner does in his "Glaubenslehre." In this manner he studied the cosmos, man and God. It is unnecessary to name the sciences whose foundations he laid, as he invented the nomenclature and outlined the scheme of nearly all of them. The philosopher's tools were forged for him in Aristotle's work-shop. Suidas calls him "the secretary of the universe." Hegel says "he penetrated the whole universe of things." Sir William Hamilton found the seal of the peripatetic philosopher on all the gates of knowledge. St. Hilaire reckons all before the Stagirite only his precursors, and all after him only his disciples. Cuvier was astonished at his knowledge of the animal kingdom; Lessing started with his æsthetics, and

Kant with his categories. Hegel found logic where Aristotle had left it. He was as familiar with the habits of ants as with the social life of man. He wrote more than four hundred treatises. He studied the constitutions of 158 Greek cities in preparing his *Politics*, a book that Thomas Arnold knew by heart.

It is safe to say that Aristotle had the gift of analysis in perfection; he has been well called an "anatomical, critical, descriptive and classificatory genius." In contrasting Aristotle with his great teacher, Goethe likens the younger man to an architect who draws an immense circle for the base of his building, collects materials from all sides, arranges them, piles them up in layers and so rises in regular form like a pyramid to the sky, while Plato seeks the heavens like an obelisk, or better, like a pointed flame.

It need not occasion surprise, if with so many subsidiary sciences to elaborate Aristotle did not take the time needed to study all religions and thus to discover the best. His works on "the Good" and on "the Ideas" are lost, and we are compelled to depend on incidental references to theological questions scattered through his works. Theology had a place in his encyclopædia, but it was not treated by him as fully as the other sciences were. He may have neglected it intentionally, for to judge from what we know of his character, he was not a devout person. No statue of him is extant. The bust in Palazzo Spada in Rome represents Aristippus, and, if it were his, it would convey no information concerning his character, as the head is gone. But, if we may trust contemporary epigrams, the philosopher was a thorough-going man of the world. He was called a gourmand. His stature was small, his legs were thin, his head was bald, his lips curled in a mocking way, his beard was short; he was always well-dressed, his fingers were covered with rings and he lisped. Such a person might be expected to treat religion, if at all, in a condescending fashion, as it was afterwards by Montaigne, Voltaire and

Gibbon. However, Aristotle was not lacking in the nobler traits of character. He refers in his will to his mother and his wife, long since deceased, in most affectionate terms. While he denied the chief tenet of Plato, the existence of ideas, he nevertheless always venerated his teacher and declared that it would be profane for a bad man even to praise him.

In my search for references to deity in the writing of Aristotle I have found his metaphysics and his Nicomachean ethics most helpful. Naturally metaphysics and ethics come nearer to theology; however, I have found in various other books occasional allusions to my theme. I have arranged the quotations under the following heads: Omnipotence and eternity, omniscience, design and first cause, benevolence, blessedness, unchangeableness and the divine image.

I give first what the philosopher has written on the omnipotence and eternity of deity.

It may seem that there is no eternal essence separate and subsisting by itself. This, however, is absurd, for it appears to the most elegant minds that there is such an essence. But how can an eternal essence be the principle of things both eternal and not eternal? The existence of God is eternal and perfect, a life everlasting. We say that God is a living being eternal and the most excellent so that life and duration, continuance and eternity are present with God, for God is this. We should separate from mythology the point that the first and deepest grounds of existence are gods. The world did not spring out of Chaos. There is an eternal and immutable existence, an actuality prior to all potentiality, a source of motion itself unmoved. How could matter be moved if there were no power to move it? The matter of a house does not move itself. God's action is immortal and this is perpetual life; there is perpetual motion in God. Since there is that which is moved, that which moves and that which subsists as a medium between these, there is something which moves without being moved, which is eternal

essence and energy. The first mover attracts that which is attracted and through that which is moved it moves other things, hence he is a necessary being. The first of all is the mover of all, the first mover is God. If movement is eternal, there must be something eternal, too. Movement being continuous this something, which is one, must be eternal. The quintessence is the eternal cosmos beyond earth, water, air and fire. We are accustomed to give to the extreme and highest place the name of heaven, which we call the seat of all which is divine. The sky is a kind of divine body; the stars are far more divine than man; the souls of the stars are God's.

“Imagine men who have always dwelt beneath the earth in good and well illuminated habitations, habitations adorned with statues and paintings and well furnished with everything which is usually at the command of those who are deemed fortunate. Suppose these men never to have come up to the earth, but to have learned from an obscure legend that a deity and divine powers exist. If the earth were once to be opened for these men so that they could ascend out of their concealed abode to the regions inhabited by us and if they were to step forth and suddenly see before them the earth and the sea and skies and perceive the masses of clouds and the violence of the winds; and if then they were to look up at the sun and become aware of its magnitude and also of its workings, that it is the author of day in that it sheds its light over the entire heavens; and if afterwards when night had overshadowed the earth they were to see the whole sky beset and adorned with stars and should contemplate the changing by night of the moon as it waxed and waned, the rising and setting of all these heavenly bodies and their course to all eternity inviolable and unalterable; truly they would then believe that gods really exist, and that these mighty works originated with them.”

Here follow some passages that treat of the first cause, the design and the omniscience of the great spirit.

Whoever thinks there is need of a God has to think that there are gods. God seems to be a sort of beginning of *causes* and God possesses the knowledge of causes. All kinds of knowledge are more needful than this but none is better. The principle of things eternal must be always true for they are not *sometimes* true, nor is anything the cause of their being, but they are the causes of being to other things. Essences should be without matter, for it is necessary that they should be eternal if there is anything eternal. Essence cannot possess any magnitude but it is indivisible. It is divinely said that the first essences were God's. The first intelligent substance to all eternity itself possesses intelligence of itself.

He understands himself if he is the best of all things and if intellect is the intellect of intellect. God's blessedness consists in thinking on thought. He who bids the law to be supreme makes God supreme. Law is intellect free from appetite. Anaxagoras says that man is the wisest animal because he possesses hands. It would be more reasonable to say that he possesses hands, because he is the wisest animal, for it is more reasonable to give a flute to a flute player than to confer on a man who has some flutes the art of playing them. To the creature fitted to acquire the largest number of arts, nature assigns the hand, the instrument useful to the largest number of purposes. "The universe is like an army. The good of the army consists in order and in its commander who is the good of the army in a still greater degree; the commander is not on account of the order, but the order on account of the commander. The same immovable uncreated nature always chooses the best in all cases and being is better than non-being. God and nature make nothing superfluous. God has completed the whole by rendering generation continual. Perpetual production is as near *being* as possible. As the eyes of bats to the light of day, so is the intellect of our soul to such things as are naturally the most splendid of all. It is unworthy not to seek that knowledge which is appropriate to God. Science may be

godlike in two ways, godlike because it is that thing which God hath above all others, or because it is itself, the knowledge of the divine. Some have thought that besides other manifold goods upon earth, there is some absolute good, which is the cause to all these of their being good. But we may dismiss the idea at present for if there is any good universal and generic or transcendental and absolute it can neither be realized nor possessed by man, whereas something of this latter kind is what we are inquiring after. The cobbler, the carpenter, the physician and the general all pursue their vocations without respect to absolute good."

The next group of passages centers around the benevolence of God.

The good is the good of all production and motion.

If the gods take any care for men, as they are thought to do, it is reasonable to suppose that they delight in that which is best in man and most akin to themselves and that they regard those that show greatest regard and reverence as caring for that which is dear to themselves and as doing rightly and nobly. It is plain that all these things are found most of all in the wise man. The wise man therefore is the most beloved of heaven and therefore we may conclude the happiest. Homer very properly calls Jupiter father of gods and men, as he is king of all.

When there comes to be a great distance between persons in virtue, vice or wealth, or in any other respect, they no longer are or expect to be friends. It is most plainly seen in the case of the gods, for they have the greatest superiority in all good things. Given a being very far removed as God, and there can be no friendship. It is always supposed that the gods are of all beings the most blessed and happy, but what kind of action must we ascribe to them? It is ridiculous to conceive of the gods engaged in trade, can we conceive of them as facing danger? To whom are they to give? It would be an insult to praise them for having no evil desires. In short if we were to go through the whole list, we should find that all

action is petty and unworthy of the gods, and yet it is universally supposed that they live, and therefore that they exert their powers, for we cannot suppose that they all sleep like Endymion. Now if a being lives and if actions cannot be ascribed to him, still less production, what remains but contemplation? It follows then that the divine life which surpasses all others in blessedness is contemplation.

Many passages deal with the adorable blessedness of God.

“That which intellect appears to possess as divine belongs more eminently to the first intellect than to ours, and his contemplation is the most delightful and the best. If God always possesses that excellent condition of being which we sometimes possess, it is admirable, but if he possesses it in a still higher degree it is still more admirable. In this manner however he subsists. Life also is energy, essential energy is his most excellent and eternal life.”

The unchangeableness of God is set forth unmistakably. “He is without passion and unchangeable. The heavens that are moved are simple, without beginning or end and immutable. That by which they are moved is still less subject to change for it is first of first, simple of simple, indissoluble of indissoluble and ungenerated of ungenerated. If that which has a body is changeless, much less can that which has no body be changed. The parts may be regarded as changeable, but the whole cannot change, it is increate and indestructible.”

Aristotle seems to have drawn from man’s intellectual grandeur the inference that he must be made in the image or of the nature of God.

“Man’s life is happy as far as it resembles the divine state of mind. The life of God is of a kind with those higher moods, which with us last but a brief space, it being impossible that they should be permanent, whereas with him they are permanent, since his ever present consciousness is pleasure itself. A life which always follows

the reason is something more than human, for it would be the expression not of man's nature, but of some divine element in that nature. If then reason is divine, the life which consists in the exercise of reason will also be divine."

"The intellect seems to have something divine. If the mind were capable of perfect energy we should be as God. The soul is not a body neither is it without a body. The soul may be the realization or perfection of the body as the sailor of the boat. The highest function of the soul is not inherent in the body, and has no special organ with which it is connected like the other functions. It is an emanation from the celestial sphere and is the only part of the soul which survives the death of the body. Death destroys those potentialities that result in happiness. Whether forms remain after separation must now be considered. Is soul a thing of this kind? Not indeed every soul, but intellect, for perhaps it is impossible that this should be the case with every soul. Can Solon have meant that a man is happy when he has died? This would be an absurdity since we consider happiness to be energy. No one desires to remain in all respects the same when he grows older. With God this may be, for God is already in complete possession of the good. As the stories tell us, superlative excellence raises men to be gods."

What conclusions as to the theology of Aristotle can be drawn from these quotations? In the first place it seems he was a deist. He believed in an absentee deity, one who planned the machinery of the world, set it going, and then left it to itself, a being who was good in the philosophical sense, who had a good mind, but gave no thought to anything but himself, an inactive, a self-contemplative being, a being to be admired, worshipped and imitated, and yet without affection for men, a being who is the quintessence of order and beauty, who stamps his law on the constitution of everything in nature, but never bows down his ear to hear the cry of his creatures, who never utters a word of comfort, never extends a hand to help; a being in the

abstract; a principle without a name; a cause without an effect; a force not prior to matter; an unrelated idea; a first form; pure, immaterial actuality, moving, not by creation, for he remains ever unmoved in his own eternity, but by attraction as just ideas and beautiful objects always awaken desire in those beholding them. God is an actual principle, the eternal principle of development, not its product. The formative principle in him is not confronted as in man by an alien matter which can be overcome only after a long and painful struggle. He is the clear dry light of abstract existence. He is the God of animated nature, of Hylozoism rather than of Pantheism. He is an egoist of the transcendent kind, the personification of theoretical reason.

Aristotle's view has been stated in the figure of a sorites thus: There is no extension without time; there is no time without motion; there is no motion without unrealized desire; there is no desire without an ideal; there is no ideal but thought thinking of itself, thought that cannot interest itself in the affairs of men. The God of Aristotle is like the picture of the clock-maker on the wall facing the great clock of the Cathedral of Strasburg; rather he is like a spectator looking forever at himself in a mirror. He is pure intellect separate from feeling and will; the God of logic rather than of philosophy; an interrogation point, a question that, like Plato, Aristotle was always postponing and then answering yea and nay. He confesses that man is blind as a bat before the most splendid things. Now he agrees with the most elegant minds that there is a separate eternal essence. Then he dismisses the conception of a universal general, transcendent and absolute good, because such good cannot be realized or possessed by man. He denies that there can be any friendship between men and gods because men are so inferior to them. But he teaches that it is by the immediate apprehension of the highest truth, by beholding the highest truth, that man gains a participation in that pure thought in which the essence of the deity con-

sists. This beholding, this wishless absorption in the perception of the highest truth, is the most blessed experience of life. This theoretic life is the immortalizing of man. This life according to the divine in man renders him like the divine.

Again we may say that Aristotle believed in final causes. He established the cosmological proof of the existence of God. As illustrations of this argument, you may recall the comparisons which he draws between the world and a house or an army, showing that one needs an architect or a general as well as the other. Then he lays down the broad generalization that nature makes nothing superfluous, but always chooses the best. There is something admirable in all the handiwork of nature. The world is not disconnected like a poor tragedy. It is as beautiful and good as it can be. Matter is under the sway of reason. Throughout his writings he identifies God with law, order, beauty and intelligence. Reason is the ruling and guiding principle within us through which we form our conceptions of what is noble and divine. Whether this be intrinsically divine or only the divine in us, its appropriate activity must be perfect happiness. Such a life is more than human and man can only partake of it through the divine principle within him. He traces the human mind to the divine and considers the original superior to the copy. In the fragment portraying the heavens, a fragment preserved to us by Cicero, he anticipates the apostle's declaration that "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead."

In reply to the query, Was Aristotle a monotheist? we may say with Grant the translator of the *Ethics*: "It may be doubted whether in his own mind Aristotle ever succeeded in arriving at entirely definite results. It was to a first cause that Aristotle did homage. When we use personal language to describe the deity of Aristotle we feel that it is improper and unsuitable even if he resorts

to it himself. To be sure he quotes Homer approvingly, where he says that 'the domination of the many is not good' and then he applies the poet's words to theocracy and affirms that 'one must be supreme,' but we cannot attribute to that one anything more personal than Parmenides had discovered in absolute being, or Anaxagoras in absolute mind, or Plato in the idea of the good. Personality connotes more than being, mind, and the idea of the good. It embraces feeling and will, qualities which Aristotle explicitly excludes from his notion of deity." Prof. Blaikie thus sums up the limitations of the mind of this great philosopher. "His intellect was complete in all the categories of scientific cognition and strongly marked with all the sagacity which belongs to the man of business. His mind was radically different from Plato's. It was curious, while Plato's was inclined to lofty speculation. He was devoted to the analysis of things small and great, while his teacher thought out grand and beautiful harmonies. He had cultivated acuteness at the expense of wonder. The analytical work of mere understanding is an inadequate method of reaching the highest forms of vital reality. Intellectual culture can never produce a complete and healthy manhood; some flowers are without fragrance; some souls are without piety. Devotion is of the finest aroma of the emotional life. The omnivorous lust of knowledge stunted the growth of the most delicate emotions. In the Ethics the god or rather the gods are alluded to in several places, but merely in the form of a passing remark, as a pedestrian may pick up a primrose and throw it away. This is the great defect of his ethics." St. George Mivart reminds us that in the accumulation of natural knowledge, men's minds have been deadened to spiritual truth. "At the end of abstractions," Dr. Goetz observes, "nothing remains but a mechanical principle of motion. Of God, the one, personal God, author and creator of the visible universe, nothing was heard in the Lyceum." "The Ethics fail," Bishop Hampden says, "in elevating the heart

and the mind to objects which it needed divine wisdom to reveal and a divine example to realize to the life." Revelation is necessary, Milton shows, if governments are to stand the shocks of time. Herein to our prophets far beneath,

“As men divinely taught and better teaching
The solid rules of civil government,
In their majestic unaffected style,
Than all the orators of Greece and Rome.
In them is plainest language and easiest learnt
What makes a nation happy and keeps it so,
What ruins kingdoms and lays cities flat.
These only with our law best form a king.”

Practically Aristotle was a polytheist, although he speaks of a first principle and a first cause, he sees no incongruity in believing in gods many and lords many. He favors the worship of idols for the sake of the people. To his mind attention to the service of the gods is more important for a city's welfare than food, arts, arms and revenue. Myths were invented by the law-givers, he says, so as to please the masses. He knew the self-contradiction contained in idolatry, for he said "If you deem the sea goddess Leucothea a mortal you should not offer sacrifice to her; if you deem her divine you should not lament for her."

Nevertheless, he adopts immemorial custom and declares that our ancestors were right when they regarded the stars as gods. He located the gods in the farthest circle of the heavens and he argued to himself, the stars, being so much nearer the gods than we are, must be more divine.

He assigned divine souls to the stars because he could not otherwise account for the force that moved them in their various orbits around the central earth. Like his master he cleared the character of the gods of the charge of immorality, but he did not reduce their number. He had an idea that the gods stood originally for the powers

of nature, but he believed in doing honor to the powers of nature.

When the gospel came it swept away Aristotle's idols but it yielded to his philosophy. When Luther arose he found Christendom following the Stagirite rather than the Nazarene. Galileo was imprisoned for disputing the twice holy philosopher. The books of *the* philosopher, as he was reverently called, were treated as infallible. It is a wonder that he was not canonized. The Franciscans and Dominicans were fierce rivals under Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas but both followed the metaphysics of Aristotle. The whole world, Mohammedan as well as Christian, bowed to his sceptre. In recent years the pope has re-established Aquinas as the standard in theology, and Aquinas' teacher, Albert Magnus, was nicknamed the ape of Aristotle. Calvin inherited from the schoolmen as the schoolmen from Aristotle the thought of God as a being without love. Luther cried out: "God has afflicted us on account of our sins with this cursed, haughty, rascally heathen." But he cried in vain. Melancthon perpetuated his rule in German theology where a second era of scholasticism prevailed until the days of Schleiermacher. The idea so long prevalent that God is outside, not inside the world, is traceable to Aristotle. The first of the 39 Articles that describes God as without parts or passions comes from the same source. Descartes' famous argument for the existence of God which runs in this way "A perfect being must exist because we can conceive it, existence being involved in the idea of perfection," this argument is suggested by the words already quoted: "whoever thinks there is need of a God has to think that there are gods." Kant uses the same argument when he drops the rational proofs of the existence of God and appeals to the needs of the soul. Ritschl with his value judgments, holding that the idea of God is a valuable idea and we must hold to it for that reason, is the last one to use Aristotle's dictum. When Spinoza declared that extension is the other side

of thought, he put in different phrase Aristotle's announcement that the world is the body of God. When Locke planted the empirical philosophy with its offshoots in the scepticism of Hume and the atheism of Diderot, he selected as a seed from the granary on the Lycus, the saying, the mind is like a tablet, on which nothing has been written. When Paley gave his well known story of the watch as an illustration of design in nature, he might have found a better one in the hand which Aristotle had selected for the same purpose. When Richard Rothe magnified the absolute, he got the word as well as the idea from Aristotle, and finally Mrs. Eddy with her denial of the existence of an evil principle in the world can appeal to Aristotle for support. In recapitulation I would say that while Aristotle appears to teach the natural and some of the moral attributes of God, that while he appears to be a deist if not a monotheist he is actually a dualist, accepting the eternity of mind and of matter, and a polytheist assigning powers to various deities in different spheres. While it is impossible to exaggerate the contributions which Aristotle made to the physical and intellectual sciences, it is difficult to define what benefit if any he conferred on theology. We might wish that he had sailed to Egypt, as his teacher had before him, for then he would have found in Alexandria a colony of thousands of Jews, any one of whom could have taught him what he had been seeking so long. "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin."

But it was not so to be. God seems to have kept this wise man as an example of the feebleness and nothingness of the most exalted intellect in the search for God, to prove as Aristotle himself admitted that man is as blind as a bat before the most splendid things, to prove that man by wisdom cannot find God.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.*

I. Chapters i.-vi.

BY W. T. WHITLEY, M. A., LL. D.

Fellow of the Theological Senate.

Some books leap into instant popularity and circulate by hundreds of thousands. Some win a position as classics and are reprinted for centuries. Others fall nearly flat at first appearance, and only obtain recognition at a later crisis. To this third class belong some of the masterpieces of literature, which come late to their own, but come then to stay. Spinoza penned such a book, which was not appreciated till Matthew Arnold popularized his doctrines two centuries later. A like experience had befallen two other tracts by men of his race, known as the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. Romans lay really neglected for fourteen centuries, translated and copied indeed as part of a conventional body of literature, but not forming opinion or regulating practice. Then arose a great Saxon and discerned in it the systematic exposition of one great doctrine needed in his day, Justification by Faith. And since then a large part of the Christian world has exalted this to a foremost position.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been waiting longer for its discoverer and expositor; but the message that it bears is one for this age. The foundation of faith is laid secure; the question is whether Protestants will be content to lay that over and over again, and incur the rebuke of becoming dull, or whether they will press on unto perfection. Others have reared on that foundation an elaborate

*This article will be followed by two others from the pen of Dr. Whitley, covering in the three the entire Epistle to the Hebrews.—Editor.

system of ritualism replete with priests and sacrifices; the need to-day is to test that edifice with the plumbline of this epistle, when it will prove falsely built. "No sacrifice since Calvary, no priest other than Christ" is a watchword fatal to much error, ancient and modern too.

The attempt will be made here to show briefly what this epistle taught, and the situation it discloses in a certain Christian circle; to comment on some of the implications in its argument, and especially to expand and apply the main thought to the situation of to-day. Considerations of space make it needful to deal with the epistle in three articles; it is therefore the more needful to say a word or two first as to its perfect unity and artistic design. The only other treatises in the Bible that can compare with it in this respect are the Gospel and Revelation of John. From both of these it differs; on the one hand it interweaves many religious phrases endeared by the familiar version of the Bible, and indeed embodying many lengthy quotations; on the other it is in a style both pure and elevated, betokening a literary master. Yet no book seems more intensely Jewish, in its choice of a narrow field of argument and in its appeal to Jews at one crisis of their history.

ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE.

A birds-eye view of the whole epistle may be taken. The three paragraphs correspond to sections ending at iv. 13, x. 18, xiii. 19.

"The New Covenant is better than the Old in two respects, its Mediator and its High Priest. Its Mediator is the very Son of God; greater than the angels who mediated the Old Covenant, in that He is the glorified heir (and so worthy of deeper obedience) and in that He has been exalted through death to be High Priest. He is greater than Moses the human mediator of the Old Covenant, even as a son is greater than a servant, however trusty; so He should not be grieved as Moses was, by

unbelief or fickleness. Moses and Joshua failed to bring the people to the promised rest, but Jesus has entered into it and will lead into it all who persevere.

“The High Priest of the New Covenant is Jesus, the Son of God. This doctrine is indeed difficult, but it is a safeguard against apostacy and ruin, which can be averted if you have faith (like Abraham’s) on Jesus our forerunner and High Priest. Consider Melchizedek; he was both priest and king, and his priestly rank was earlier and greater than that of Levi. Now Jesus is a priest of this kind, not like others by mere descent from Aaron, but on His own merits. This rank is confirmed by God’s oath, eternal and unchangeable, for He Himself is holy, separate, and perfect. Consider Aaron the high priest; his office was typical, as was shown at its institution, and by the promise of a *new* covenant, and by the dull repetition of its ritual. Jesus is the intended High Priest; He cleanses from sin really, not by promise only. His death really ratified the true covenant, and opened the way to heaven. Devoting Himself to doing God’s will, He became the only and eternal High Priest.

“The way being open to God, and such a sponsor being ready to introduce us, let us draw near in faith, not turning back nor throwing away the advantage won. Faith is no new specific, it was ever the mainstay of Israel’s heroes. We should patiently follow Jesus, the leader and perfecter of faith, accepting trials as the discipline appointed by our Father, not repining as Esau did, but encouraged by the thought of our covenant being better. Let us manifest the fruits of faith; let us hold to the faith of our teachers in Jesus Christ, the eternal Priest, even though it involve being driven out of the earthly Israel and worshiping by new sacrifices offered through Him alone. So may you strengthen your teachers, old and new.”

This condensation of the argument reveals a few points at once. The tract was obviously addressed to people deeply attached to the Old Covenant, and extreme-

ly loth to abandon it. So fully does it enter into their frame of mind, that the whole of the first section has no other bearing. It may have incidental glimpses of wide truth, it may have passages of striking beauty and permanent value; but as a whole, the argument down to iv. 13 has done its work.

The great section, which after a digression, really begins at vii. 1 and ends at x. 18, is of very different value for our times. If Jesus is a priest of God's own appointment, who has once for all finished atonement, and permanently remains the unique priest; then not only Aaron, but all modern "priests" have nothing more to do in His line. And as sacerdotalism is so insistent to-day, this great passage is exactly the message needed.

The exhortations that follow are also of perennial application, and it is really astonishing how easily we can forget the exact circumstances of the original appeal, in finding the words instinct with life for ourselves.

PARAPHRASE OF i.-iv. 11.

After these preliminary glances, we may now narrow our field of view and attend to the first six chapters, paragraph by paragraph. The first is in such majestic rhythmic Greek that it deserves some special reproduction even in our less sonorous tongue:

"In numerous portions, in numerous manners, God formerly spoke to our sires through the prophets. To us at the last of these days in His Son, constituted of all things the heir, and through whom He created the ages. Who, being His glory's effulgence and print of His substance; upholding too all by the word of His power, achieved first a purification of sins, then seated Himself on God's right hand in heaven, becoming by so much the better than angels, as He is the heir of a Name more excellent.

"For to what angel did God ever say, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?' Was not this meant

for Jesus alone at his baptism? Or what angel ever received the promise, 'I will be his Father, and he shall be my son?' But looking forward to the Second Advent of Jesus, He says, 'And let all God's angels worship him.'

"Again, while about the angels He says, 'Who maketh His angels spirits, His ministers a flaming fire,' yet about the Son His language is as to an equal, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre. 'Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness; therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.' Nor does this stand alone; 'Of old, O Lord, hast Thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure. Yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment, as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end.' Or, once again, to what angel did God ever say, as He did to Jesus, 'Sit Thou at my right hand, until I make Thine enemies thy footstool.' Angels are just laboring spirits, sent forth continually for service to God, on behalf of those about to inherit salvation.

"Wherefore we are bound to heed more earnestly what we heard, lest we be at all misled. For if the word spoken from Sinai through angels was established, so that every transgression or neglect received a just recompense; how shall we escape, if we are heedless of our great salvation. This was first announced to us by the Lord, was then confirmed to us by His apostles, and God added His witness by signs and miracles and various mighty works and endowments of the Holy Spirit according to His will.

"For not to angels did God subject the coming world, of which we were speaking. Remember the testimony, 'What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?' For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou hast put all things under his feet.' Note, in that phrase 'all things,' nothing

is excepted from his power. Now as a matter of fact, we do not yet see everything put under our feet; but we do see One, 'a little lower than the angels,' Jesus, 'crowned with glory and honor' to suffer death, that by God's grace He might taste death for every one. For it be-seemed God, because of whom are all things, and through whom were all things, when He led many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through His sufferings. For both Jesus who hallows, and we who are being hallowed, are all of one Father; wherefore Jesus is not ashamed to call us Brethren, saying, 'I will declare Thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee.' And again He ranks himself with us, 'I will put my trust in Him.' Or again, 'Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me.' Since then the children have shared flesh and blood, He too in like fashion partook of the same, that through his death he might neutralize him who held the power of death, the devil, and might free all who in fear of death passed all their life in slavery. For as we well know, it is not angels that He helps, but 'he helps the seed of Abraham.' So He ought in every way to become like His brethren, that He might become a merciful High Priest, and faithful, in all things relating to God, to make atonement for the sins of God's people. For having been tried by suffering, He can succor those who are still being tried.

"So then, holy brethren, partakers of a calling not to an earthly Canaan, but to a heavenly, consider Jesus as God's messenger, and as High Priest in our system. He is faithful to God who appointed him, as indeed 'Moses was in all God's house.' But our Jesus is worthy of more honor than Moses; Moses certainly was 'faithful in all God's house as a trusty servant,' calling attention to matters which should afterwards be explained; but Christ is the son, set over the house. What is the house? We are, if we persevere to the end, for against His church the gates of Hades shall not prevail. Prove that you be-

long to it, by holding fast, and remember the warning from the past:

“‘To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness; when your fathers tempted me and saw my work. Forty years long was I grieved with that generation and said, They ever err in their heart, they have not known my ways. So I swore in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.’

“‘So beware, brethren, lest in any of you too there be found an evil unbelieving heart, standing off from the living God. Exhort one another every day, while still the To-day echoes, lest any of you too be hardened by the deceit of sin. For indeed we have become partners with the Christ, provided our confident beginning is persevered in to the end. Reflect on that passage: ‘To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation.’ Who heard, yet provoked Him? All who came out of Egypt with Moses. With whom was He angry forty years? Those who sinned and left their bodies in the desert. Of whom did He swear that they should not enter into His rest? The disobedient. Now we see that it was their unbelief that kept them out; despite their glorious beginning; what may not unbelief do even for you, despite your glorious beginning?

“‘That promise of entering into His rest remained over for us; do not fall short of it. Good news is come to us as to them; it took no effect with them for lack of faith. Faith made us the heirs of that promise. The eternal rest mentioned at the creation; forfeited in the days of Moses was again offered in the days of David—clearly Joshua’s entry into Canaan did not exhaust it—and was first earned by Jesus when He ended His atoning work. Shall not we also labor to the end, and then join Him therein?’”

JESUS, THE SCRIPTURES, THE HEBREWS.

If now we pause to study this first section, the substance of the argument will not detain us long. Christian readers regard it as axiomatic that angels and Moses are not to be mentioned in the same breath with Jesus. Other readers doubt whether angels and Moses ever existed, and from utterly different motives would grant this result at once.

The description of Jesus however at the outset is remarkable, for its explicit ranking Him as only one shade less than the eternal God. The final revealer of God, the original creator of the universe, the destined ruler over it, partaker of God's glory, wielder of His power, Son and Heir. No such description had as yet been penned. And the greatness of the theme has produced a majesty of language hardly approached elsewhere in the whole Bible.

Then note the astonishing use made of the Old Covenant scriptures. The Law indeed is passed by, but from Psalms and Prophets are taken passages, regardless of their first application, which are regarded as bearing directly on Jesus. Nor is there any apology for this employment, it is assumed as current in the circles addressed. At Antioch in Pisidia, Paul had quoted the second psalm as really referring to the resurrection of Jesus; now this is seen to be a stock Christian argument. Solomon is taken as a mere shadow of Jesus, the true Son of David, as He had suggested to the Pharisees. Then the words of Jesus as to His coming on the clouds with great glory, sending forth his angels, recalls a passage from the old Greek Bible that seems to foretell it. So passage after passage is seen to have received already a Christian application, so that from the ancient scriptures new glories were flashing forth.

Yet while prophets and historians and psalmists were thus claimed as foretelling Christ, they are unhesitatingly subordinated to Him even in the very point of revealing

God. Their knowledge was piecemeal in effect, and gained in indirect ways; His was complete and direct. Clearly if ever it should be hard to reconcile an O. T. word with a word of Christ, the latter will decide and govern. Scripture is valuable as it relates closely to Christ. Such are obvious conclusions from the treatment of scripture here.

There is however no forgetfulness of the original meaning, even if it suits the writer often to leap on to the final. He can face facts frankly, comparing the ideal man of the eighth psalm with the real average man, and emphasizing the discrepancy; it is Jesus alone to whom are subjected the fish in the sea, and the waves thereof. He knows that the ninety-fifth psalm had a definite meaning for David's day; it was written to urge the men of that age to repentance, and he uses it in a similar fashion for his own age.

And this treatment of scripture, so unlike to the rabbinic style, he justifies by the profound remark that the word of God is living. Its power is not exhausted at first utterance; it may be only heard aright when Christ Jesus is taken as the true theme; its promises and warnings are not for the days of Moses and Isaiah and David alone, but for every generation. Nor is it feeble, easily dismissed; it has power to cleave to the heart of the most negligent and impenitent, and is so designed by Him whose glance pierces to the secrets of all, and whose word can stir the most careless.

This section also throws a little light on the writer and the readers. Of course he is a Jew; no one else would have the Jewish scriptures at his finger ends and treat them with such familiarity and reverence. And as plainly they are Jews too, for nobody else cared about angels and Moses and the devil. They live near enough to Christ to be witnesses of signs and wonders, and to experience the special gifts of the Spirit, yet far enough off to have heard of Him only through the apostles. They are in some great crisis, for the word To-day is hurled at them

again and again, as if to-morrow may be too late.

SECOND SUBJECT STATED, iv. 14—v. 10.

Having closed the first part of the argument, the author next announces his second proposition, that Jesus is the High Priest. The phrase has been employed once already, but not dwelt upon. It is part of the consummate art of this artist, that he springs no surprises, but drops hints and tones up the mind for his most startling doctrine. Even now he advances very cautiously, first enunciating his thesis at some length, then defining his terms, and sketching the two stages in his proof:

“As then we have a great High Priest who has entered the inmost heaven, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold firm our confession of Him. Our High Priest is not unable to appreciate our weaknesses, He has been tried in every way like us, except by sinning. So let us boldly come forward to the seat of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help in due season.

“Consider what a high priest is for. He is taken from among men; he is appointed to act for us in everything relating to God, especially to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin; he can compassionate the ignorant and erring because he himself is full of weakness; indeed this weakness obliges him not only to sacrifice for the people, but also for his own sins. And no one can assume this post of honor, he is called to it by God, as in the case of Aaron.

“Observe how Jesus fulfils these conditions. He did not thrust himself into the high-priesthood, but God glorified him when He said at the baptism, ‘My Son art Thou, I this day have begotten Thee.’ And more emphatically elsewhere, ‘Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.’ Jesus, in His life on earth made offerings, prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, to God who could save him from death, and who did indeed heed his piety. Jesus, Son as He was, yet had to suffer, and therein learned obedience. And

having thus ripened, Jesus became for all that obey Him a source of eternal salvation. For God saluted Him as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek."

INTERLUDE: v. 11—vi. 20.

Here then the subject is plainly announced, but before proving it in detail, the author diverges from the main track in a masterly appeal not to rest content with repeating elementary truisms, but to brace themselves and discern new truth, that their growth in knowledge may keep pace with their growth in grace. This is skillfully brought round again to the very point of divergence, and the main theme is a second time led up to and announced:

"There will be much to say about Melchizedek, and it will be difficult to state it, as you have become dull in learning. For though after all this time you ought to be teaching, some one must actually teach you the very elements of Christian doctrine. You are like sucklings, not men; those who live on milk have no experience of sound doctrine, they are babes; but solid food is for mature men, who are practised in distinguishing good and evil teaching.

"So let us cease reiterating the simplest truths about Christ, and press on to fuller growth. Let us no longer lay the foundation, that work is dead before God and must be abandoned, that He demands faith in His promises, that Christian baptism is more than John's or than Jewish immersions, that the laying on of hands is in prayer for the gift of the Spirit, that our religion stands or falls with the reality of the resurrection, that there is eternal condemnation for sin. Let us build on this, if God will grant us aid. Build we must, yet how hard for those who have stopped. For when a man has once seen Christ and experienced the new life, and rejoiced in the gift of the Spirit, and realized how beautiful are God's promises and the might of the dawning age, if then he falls away, he cannot be renewed again to repent while he is cruci-

fying afresh the Son of God on his own account, and openly shaming Him. For the ground which has soaked in the frequent rain and yields food fit for those for whom it is tilled, receives again God's blessing; but if it produces thorns and thistles it is valueless and is near inheriting the curse of Adam; its end will be burning.

“Now this is not your case, dear friends; we have better hope of your salvation, though we do speak thus. God is fair, He remembers your record, the love you showed to Him by helping the brethren, as you still do. But we earnestly desire that each of you will persevere, not slackening, but following those who by endurance and trust inherited the promises. God's promise to Abraham is lasting; it was ratified by an oath; and this promise was obtained by perseverance. And as men give greater confidence by taking an oath, God met this custom and conveyed assurance that His promise should stand permanently, by taking an oath. Thus we have two unchangeable pledges of a truthful God to us who have taken refuge, encouraging us to grasp the hope set before us. And our hope anchors our soul, holding fast in the unseen world beyond the veil which Jesus has entered, both as our forerunner, and as our eternal High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.”

CHARACTER OF THE HEBREWS.

This passage adds several strokes to the sketch of the readers. They were of long standing in Christian doctrine, so long that they ought to be an active, teaching, and missionary church. But unhappily they had rested content with works of practical benevolence, and had never striven to follow out the new doctrines to their natural issues. In their Christian thinking they revolved in a narrow circle. They had awakened to the best elements in the old prophetic teaching, as reiterated by John the Baptist, Jesus and James; they insisted on the uselessness of depending on their outward life for stand-

ing before God, and exercised a real trust in Him. They attached an undue importance to outward acts, such as baptism and laying on of hands, though certainly they dwelt upon the value of baptism as involving a pledge to Jesus, and of laying on of hands as indicating a recognition of the Spirit. They harped on the resurrection, as if it simply confuted the Sadducees, without seeing any deeper meaning; they were morbid about everlasting punishment, instead of preparing for everlasting life. These points are in the epistle by no means denied or disparaged, but are regarded as mere foundations on which a body of elaborate doctrine should already have been reared by a church of experience and thought.

And because these readers were so unenterprising, burying their talent in a napkin instead of trading with it, they were in grave danger of forfeiting it. Their duty was to spread the knowledge of Jesus, commending Him in every way to fresh peoples hungering for the bread of life. If they received the dew of heaven on their souls, and used it for no better purpose than to produce a crop of quarrels or of dry teaching with no nourishment for others, what could they expect but to be burned off, that better seed might be sown in the cleared land? Nothing was lacking to them of advantages and impulses to spread the Gospel; early conversion and appropriation of the Spirit, experience of the benefits of its promises and the Spirit's gifts; yet nothing happened! And this passivity, this silence in face of a perishing nation, an ignorant world, was not regarded as having any authority on earth, that His commands to make disciples of all nations might be ignored. This open and flagrant neglect of His charge was dangerously akin to a public repudiation of Him, a jeering at His claims. Should this last step be taken, there was no chance of rescuing a man while he persisted in the conduct of Caiaphas. To this explicit denial of Jesus these readers had not come, despite ominous signs. They were facing in the right direction, but had come to a halt. And the best way to set

them again in motion was to supply fresh motive power: action depends on thought, and their thoughts were cramped. Their doctrines did not place Christ at the center, and could be expounded with hardly any mention of Him. It was needful to restore Him to the true place in their minds and hearts, then His bidding would inspire them afresh to obedience.

The new doctrine is founded on their favorite foundation. They insisted on faith in God. Now by exercising such faith, by patiently trusting in God's promise of a home, despite the long years of wandering in Mesopotamia and Egypt, despite the possession of Canaan by Hittites, Abraham obtained a new promise, of a great posterity. And lest his faith should waver at the long delay in fulfillment, God condescended to strengthen the promise by an oath. The promise descends to all Abraham's posterity, still unfulfilled in its deepest sense, and it may be claimed by all who exercise a like faith. But there is now a deeper sense evident. Is it the land which is in question? There is a heavenly Canaan into which Jesus has already entered as a forerunner of all the faithful. Is it the posterity which is in question? Jesus is the true son of Abraham, and those who join themselves to Him shall be as the sand on the shore or the stars in the sky. Into this Canaan he enters like Aaron into the Holy Place, and opens the way for all His brother priests to follow. These mighty and inspiring truths shall be unfolded in a way that shall appeal to every Jew captivated with the stately ritual of the temple.

In this interlude there are three obvious coincidences with I. Corinthians; the comparison with milk and solid food, the allusion to foundation, the reminiscence of planting, watering and increase. These may be due simply to the author's reading that letter, or to his depending also on his correspondents knowing it. This possibility deserves bearing in mind.

STAGNANT CHRISTIANS.

This passage is full of warning to us to-day. The church as a whole should be rebuked that after nineteen centuries its development of doctrine is so meager. Just a few points have been explored, and ever on them men are readier to repeat the formulas that satisfied the Greeks of the fifth century rather than think out afresh in the language of the twentieth. And strange to say, some have laid over again a very sandy foundation of teaching as to baptisms and laying on of hands, which is greatly in need of a storm to beat upon it.

Any local church will probably find many who should profit by studying this passage. How often we hear sturdy men of forty and aged Christians of seventy express their joy at "hearing the plain, simple gospel of salvation." Babies! They ought to be doing one of two things; either themselves going out into the country or slums or school to teach this simple gospel to others; or encouraging their pastor to lead them into deeper fields of study, and wider fields of action.

Protestants were very slow to learn that the duty of Christians is to spread the gospel everywhere. Lutherans never grasped this truth for two centuries, Baptists were a century later in learning it. And therefore Lutherans were cursed with rationalism, Baptists with Unitarianism or Antinomianism, a plentiful crop of thorns and thistles that had to be burned off before God could sow afresh. And where any group condemns itself to a blind conservatism on old lines, and cries with Moses that it will stand still and see the salvation of God, then it incurs the swift reproof of God. "Wherefore criest thou unto me? Go forward!" Against such dangers Baptists at least need only look at our past history; our victories have been won by our radicalism, by discarding tradition and going to the fountain head. And so there can surely be no lasting halt by those who began so well. The great fight of to-day, within Christian circles, is of evangelicals

against sacerdotalists. If we get a clear idea of the New Testament doctrine of Priesthood, there is less risk of being contaminated with a spurious doctrine. And in this study there are obvious advantages for those who vehemently disclaim all special priestly attributes for their ministers, alike in word, attire, and conduct, while they as strenuously insist on the atonement wrought by the Lord, and the right of every Christian—as a priest—to offer sacrifices of praise, prayer and beneficence. Such is the Baptist position.

IS MATTHEW 16:18 AN ANACHRONISM?

BY PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.

In a recent lecture of Prof. James Drummond, D.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, he argued that Jesus could not have used the words attributed to him in Matt. 16:18, because the ecclesiastical conceptions were too advanced for his time. They were, he said, the addition of a scribe from a later period. This view is held by other scholars also. Leaving out of the question any reference to the divine nature or foreknowledge of Christ and looking at the matter purely from the historical point of view, one can justify the use of the ideas in this passage by the Master. The chief thought here is the perpetuity of the Messianic Kingdom. Now in 2 Sam. 7:8-16 the Kingdom is promised to David forever, through one of his sons, who will build a house for the Lord and whose throne will be set up forever. The Septuagint in 2 Sam. 7:13 reads: *Αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου, καὶ ἀνορθώσω τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

In Psalm 89 (88 in the Septuagint) the writer is lamenting the apparent failure of Jehovah to keep this promise. He recalls the covenant made with David (Ps. 89:3) in the words of Jehovah: "Thy seed will I establish forever, And build up thy throne to all generations." (Ps. 89:4). The Septuagint renders: *Ἔως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου, καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου.* He responds to the words of Jehovah: "And the heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Jehovah; Thy faithfulness also in the assembly of the holy ones." (Ps. 89:5). The Septuagint there reads: *Ἐξομολογήσονται οἱ οὐρανοὶ τὰ θαυμάσια σου, κύριε, καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν σου ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων.*

The writer complains, however: "But thou hast cast off and rejected, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed."

(Ps. 89:38). The Septuagint has τὸν χριστόν μου for "thine anointed." He knows no man who "shall deliver his soul from the power of Sheol" (Ps. 89:48). The Septuagint has ἐκ χειρὸς ᾄδου for "power of Sheol."

Now it is not claimed that the writer of this Psalm had in mind the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah. Clearly he was wrestling with the problem of the promise of perpetuity made to the throne of David. But it is remarkable that all the distinctive terms used by Jesus in Matt. 16:18 occur in Psalm 89. The Psalm discusses the perpetuity of David's throne; Jesus discusses the perpetuity of the Messiah's Kingdom. Jesus felt himself to be the Son of David as the Messiah was acknowledged to be (Mark 11:10; Luke 19:40). There was no difference of opinion between Christ and the Pharisees as to whether the Messiah was to be the son of David (Matt. 22:41-46), but rather as to the character and personality of the Messiah. If it be admitted (for it is a commonplace in the Gospels) that Jesus proclaimed a spiritual kingdom, not a literal, visible kingdom of David (Luke 17:21, for instance), it is surely not straining a point to say that Jesus could see the Messianic application of the promise to David.

Let us then put Matt. 16:18 beside Psalm 89. Jesus said to Peter Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾄδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς. δώσω σοι τὰς κλείδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν σὺρανῶν κτλ.

Now in the Psalm (verse 4) we have the figure of building the throne with which compare building the house in 2 Sam. 7:13. Jesus does not use throne (θρόνος), but rather ἐκκλησία with οἰκοδομήσω. This is a slight mixture of images, but the very word ἐκκλησία appears in Ps. 89:5 though not in the precise sense as used by Jesus. In the image of Jesus ἐκκλησία is not in the etymological sense of assembly, but rather in the sense of οἶκος, house of God, people of God, as we have it in Heb. 3:6. Οἶκος in Numbers 12:7 was used for the people of God in which Moses was a servant. Peter himself (1 Peter 2:5) writing to the Christians of Asia Minor will call them a

spiritual house (*οικοδομησθε οικος*), a probable reminiscence of the words of Jesus to him.

Ἐκκλησία thus is a natural adaptation for the idea of the people of Christ, the Kingdom of Christ as he calls them in Matt. 16:19, the very next verse. It seems clear that Jesus makes no real distinction between *ἐκκλησία* in verse 18 and *βασιλεία* in verse 19. The two terms are practically one in the special sense given to each by Christ in this passage.

Peter had called Jesus by the momentous title Messiah, Christ, *χριστός*. This term is applied to David in this way Psalm 89 (verses 38 and 51). Moreover, Sheol, Hades, occurs in both places. In Ps. 89:48 we have *ἐκ χειρὸς ᾄδου*, while in Matt. 16:18 Jesus spoke of *πύλοι ᾄδου*. But the Gates of Hades is a common image in ancient Greek and occurs in the Septuagint text of Job 38:17 where we have *πύλαι θανάτου, πυλωροὶ ᾄδου*.

In a word, the historical atmosphere of Matt. 16:18 is not that of a later ecclesiastical development. It finds its most natural and simple explanation in the spiritual interpretation of the idea of the Kingdom of David and many of the very words of Psalm 89, not in the way of literal quotation, but in the apprehension of the Psalm as a whole with the use of the most striking words and images condensed into two short verses.

Christ replies to Peter in the language of Psalm 89 which had been used about the perpetuity of David's throne. David's Greater Son interprets that language in the terms of the Messianic Kingdom or Church against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail. This is the sense in which God will keep His promise to David as to the perpetuity of his throne and about which the Psalmist was sore troubled. The historical interpretation of Matt. 16:18, therefore, demands that we look to Christ's knowledge of the Old Testament rather than to a later scribal interpolation as the true setting of the language of these verses. Thus understood the language is not anachronistic, but historically pertinent.

Louisville, Ky.

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. RUFUS W. WEAVER, TH.D., BALTIMORE, MD.

The quest of the intellectual leaders of our times in every department of human knowledge is for synthesizing principles, for fundamental laws, for ultimate truths. The first clause in the credo of science reads: "I believe that the Universe is grounded in reason, and is, therefore, intelligible." Upon this basis scientists organize knowledge, form the curricula of the various schools, and seek through experiment and observation to discover the underlying principles and the universal laws of the world about us.

The most interesting of all the sciences is the most recent—the science that deals with the laws and the processes by which the human mind acquires knowledge. To this is given the name of Psychology. The study includes not only the observation of mental phenomena, the discovery of mental laws, the processes by which the mind acquires knowledge, but also the conditions that make knowledge possible. These conditions are the primary subjects of study for the student who desires to understand either Philosophy or Religion.

Every part of the Universe from the atom to the solar system is in ceaseless motion. The whole creation is subjected to transitoriness—the law of change. The outer world as ceaseless motion makes possible the inner world of thought, for consciousness is conditioned upon an ever changing environment. Feeling exists only in a world of inequalities. Freedom is possible only in the presence of moral peril. Shut in within the narrow limits that are horizoned by birth and death, bound down by laws that he did not make, and can never hope to change, living

upon a revolving sphere, half light and half shadow, with its endless procession of day and night, driven to toil by pangs of hunger, and eating only to hunger again. Man with his narrow, fretting mind, with his untaught will, restless within the limit of his perilous freedom, with his little heart-beat whose systole and diastole are measured by selfishness and love, stands among God's creatures the highest in divine favor only of what he may become. "For man was made to grow, not stop."

Motion is the originating condition of thought. Struggle is the originating condition of growth. Responsiveness to environment is the originating condition of life. Man, the crown of creation, was made to think, and thinking is possible only in the presence of ceaseless motion. Man was made to love, and love is possible only amid the recognized inequalities of personal life. Man was made to develop in moral power, and ethical action is possible only when the freedom extends to the privilege of doing something less than the best—to miss the mark—and to miss the mark is sin. If it be true, and of this there can be no doubt, that man was made for growth in thought, for growth in love, for growth in righteousness, then the conditions of life we so often deplore, struggle, suffering, sin are necessary to the upward progress of man toward personal moral perfection. This world may not be as Leibnitz claimed "the best possible world." It certainly is not as von Hartman claimed, the worst possible. But, this world for its purpose—for the development of man into the moral likeness of God—is the best possible world that Infinite Wisdom could plan and Infinite Power create. The true theodicy can be written only when the scope and purpose of God in the development of man is made its very foundation.

The second thesis in the credo of science is, "the Universe is so built around man that life for him is intelligent correspondence with his environment." Emerson somewhere says, "When God sought to secure certain ends in mankind, He wrought His purpose into the very

structure of the human mind." If Emerson be true, the structure of the human mind is a revelation of the will of God. The possibility of religion is to be found in God's likeness to man, as much as man's likeness to God. Indeed the most wonderful and certainly the most intimate revelation of God is that which is made to man through man himself. Wrought into the very structure of the mind of man as the sense of dependence, the appreciation of perfection and the loneliness of soul that is unsatisfied until the soul rests in God. Man is inevitably religious.

The Psalmist cries "What is man that Thou are mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visiteth him?" What are those wonderful powers that enable man to extend hospitality to God and elevate him to the degree that he is continually in the thought of God? His sphere of knowledge is limited to consciousness and extension. His powers of creation are limited to the present moment, and are measured by the span of life which begins in helplessness and ends in helplessness. His appreciations are limited to the comparisons, sensations that come to him through some one of the gateways of the mind, or the comparisons of ideas for which he has learned some symbols to imagine and describe. And the Maker of Heaven and earth seeks to enter into relations with man! Why? Because man has the potency of becoming a son of God just as the unhatched bird has the potency of flight.

Religion is a relation, limited in its expressions to man's apperceptions. The superhuman relations of humanity are everywhere apperceived in a three-fold way: The first is the cosmological application of the law of cause and effect, seeking a cause or causes behind the things that appear. Polytheism is the product of unenlightened minds creating gods and goddesses to account for the forces of nature. The second universal apperception grows out of the sense of dependence, and the devotees of every religion attribute to their God or gods authority over their lives. Out of this experience,

emerges the consciousness of moral order, the law written in the heart of every man. The third apperception is the personification of the object of worship. Humanity attributes personality to stone and graven images as well as to Him who is spiritual and demands a worship that is spiritual. Out of this apperception arise all the forms of worship, gifts, sacrifices and the infinite variety of religious services from the dances of the Pueblo Indians to the simple worship of the Quaker Meeting-house. This feeling after God is the impressive evidence that man is incurably religious.

There are religions, false and true. False religions are perpetuated by the same method as true religions. Error gathers her worshipers in the same way that Truth gathers her worshipers and often Error crushes Truth to earth. The God who sends the rain upon the just and the unjust alike has so constructed the human mind that it receives ideas that belong to the realm of religion alike whether they be true or false. Every religion reduced to its simplest form is a group of ideas perpetuated from one individual to another individual. Religion, therefore, in its simplest form is communicated idea. The religious experiences of individuals are determined by the ideas of religion communicated to him. The readjustment the individual makes to these ideas determines the expressions of his religious life. Religion is a phase of psychology. The truthfulness of a religion is established by three successive modes of proof. First, that the revelation, the group of communicated ideas, is true. Second, that the mind is empowered to apperceive this revelation. this group of communicated ideas, is true. Third, that the mind is strengthened to express this apperception of truth in worship, conduct and character.

The Christian Religion presents a revelation to man of the *Power that produced him, the Authority that is over him and the Unseen Being with whom he is capable of communing, as tthe God and Father of our Lord Jesus

*See W. N. Clark's *Outlines of Christian Teeology.*

Christ, and extends to him the invitation to enter into relationship with God, so that he may say, "Abba, Father." Christianity in its simplest form is a communicated idea, called the Gospel, and the supreme mission of Christianity is the spreading of the idea, declaring it unto all the nations.

How does Christianity meet the three-fold test of religion? (1) the truthfulness of the revelation; (2) the certainty of its being accurately apperceived; (3) the bestowal of the power for its accurate expression? First, what proof does Christianity offer that this revelation is true? The revelation which Christianity offers is Jesus Christ. The highest forms of truth can only be expressed in personality. Language fails. Jesus Christ stands before the world as the most perfect moral example, the supreme teacher in ethics, claiming to be "the only begotten of the Father," and seeking to bring humanity into filial relation with God. The strongest evidence of the truthfulness of his revelation appears in His resurrection—God Himself in this bearing witness that the revelation made by Jesus Christ is true. The personal experience of him who receives the Gospel is confirmatory evidence of its truthfulness—God, in this experience bearing witness to the truthfulness of the Gospel through the witness of the Holy Spirit. The truthfulness of the revelation is further established by its meeting all the needs of the soul, bestowing not only the forgiveness of sins, but releasing the soul from the dominion of sin, but also awakening in the consciousness a realization of the new relations, new incentives, new capacities, creating a new test in that the Gospel idea is so simple, so human, so spiritual environment. Christianity meets the second divine that wherever received by personalities differing ever so widely, it produces essentially the same effects. The Christian consciousness of primitive Christians is identical with the Christian consciousness of the modern Christian. The higher righteousness that characterizes the life of a Christian after his conversion is the living

truth that new strength is given to express his new relation to God, showing that new spiritual energy has been imparted—and thus the third test is met.

Christianity is the true religion because its Founder is incarnate Truth, because its message exactly fits man's capacity to understand, and meets man's unsatisfied needs, because through it a divine reinforcement enters into his life, enabling him to triumph in the struggle with his lower nature, and to live in the consciousness of a new and permanent relationship with God.

The essence of Christianity is communicated idea. The Gospel which we preach in its simplest form is an idea in process of communication. There are two conceptions of Christianity in Christendom. The one is communicated actuality and the other is communicated idea. The one emphasizes the sensuous appeal and the other emphasizes the thoughtful appeal. The first is based upon the fallacious belief that spiritual reality may be actually transformed into material reality. The fundamental fallacy of the Roman Church is not to be found in its doctrine of the Church, but in its dogma of the bodily presence of Christ in the host and the actual presence of his blood in the wine. If the Roman priest actually reproduces the sacrifice of Christ, then all the claims of the Church can be easily verified. If he can prove that Christianity in its simplest form is not an idea communicated from person to person he is in a position to overthrow the Protestant religion; for the Protestant position, philosophical, psychological and theological has for its foundation the following thesis: "The Universe is so organized that it is possible for man to think, to grow, to choose, and to enter voluntarily into relations with his God—that the prayer of man, groping after God, is answered in God's revelation, whose final word is an invitation to man to enter into filial relation with God as his Father, and everyone who enters into this relation is commanded to communicate the invitation to others."

Jesus brought the Good News. He proclaimed it with

His lips in healing words. He proclaimed it with His hands in loving ministeries. He proclaimed it with His life in unwearied love. He proclaimed it through His death in behalf of humanity. And, when He was raised from the dead, He committed His mission to His disciples, saying, "As the Father hath sent Me, even so, send I you." In the teachings of Jesus there is no intimation of a dependence upon the New Testament or any other book for the perpetuation of His Gospel. There is not even the suggestion that the New Testament was destined to come into existence. It is dangerous to argue from silence, yet, it is a reasonable presumption that if Jesus had considered the New Testament necessary for the establishing of His Kingdom He would have bidden His disciples to write as well as preach. If He had considered a literature an adequate expression of the revelation He had come to make, would not Jesus Himself have written a book? Can the highest forms of Truth be expressed in the symbols of language and literature? Can the necessity of the incarnation be established upon any other claim save that of the inadequacy of human speech and human literature to manifest the truths of deity? Jesus trusted His revelation to be reincarnated in His followers rather than embodied in a literature, for there were elements in that revelation that can never be put into words, elements that can be experienced but never fully described. Jesus choose that the group of ideas composing His revelation should be communicated only by men who had experienced the transforming power that followed the acceptance of these ideas. The fundamental principle of Christianity is "experience precedes expression."

Jesus upon Mount Olivet gave to His disciples the Good Tidings, commissioning them to tell His message, His Gospel, to all the nations of the earth. Without that message the nations should grope on in darkness, searching after God, lifting lame hands of faith toward specters of the divine reality, but not finding Him—their Father

—God. Jesus had prepared His followers fully for the perpetuation of His work, the enlightening and redeeming of the world. In His great commission He bids His disciples to go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He commanded, and closing with the words “and lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the age.” Jesus had fully equipped His disciples for the divine task. He had given to them the message. He had promised them the endowment with power from above. He bade them go.

The group of awed disciples returned with a strange sense of loneliness to the upper room. There had been left to them the mission of communicating the message of Jesus to the world, and that message existed in their thoughts and experiences. Did it exist in any other form? Thirty years were destined to pass before any part of the words of Jesus would be enshrined in literature. Did Jesus leave the world with His message deposited in the minds of frail, tempted men, and with no assurance that it would be accurately proclaimed, except the promised leading of the Holy Spirit? Let us study anew the Great Commission. In it there is a three-fold movement. First, the discipling of the nations; Second, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; Third, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded. In the study of the three-fold mission there is but one fixed, ordained requirement—the act of baptism. There was then, and there ever has been variety in the way that men have been brought to be disciples. There was then, and there ever has been variety in the way that the teachings of Jesus have been given to men. It breaks upon us with startling force that Jesus risked this enterprise in magnitude most extensive, in its importance of priceless value, in its momentous nature, a matter of life and death, involving the destiny of mankind, and risked it in the hands of a company of ordinary men, of little scholar-

ship, of manifold prejudices, slow of heart to believe and slower still in recognizing the significance of their worldwide mission. There is but one explanation: Jesus conceived His message to be sufficiently guarded and preserved in the symbol of baptism.

The place of baptism in the teachings of Jesus is an offense to millions who declare that they honor His name. They turn from it, saying that it is only a form, and it does not matter whether it be performed in the way that He commanded or not. This declaration is one of the most subtle assaults upon the sanity of Jesus ever made by those who claim to honor His intellectuality. Did He introduce this command as one of the three that should embody the mission of all Christians for all succeeding time, giving to it a place so that it should appropriately stand between the two great experiences of the spiritual life—the one of regeneration, becoming disciples, and the other of sanctification, growth in grace and the knowledge of Christ? What explanation of baptism can be made that will give to it the right to its lofty position? For this explanation we seek the oldest of the Christian writings, the New Testament. In it, we are told, baptism embodies three ideas; (1) the idea of the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ—historical Christianity; (2) the idea of regeneration, buried with Him by baptism unto death, raised to walk in newness of life, the spiritual experience of the individual—living Christianity; (3) the idea of the resurrection of the body through the spirit that raised Jesus from the dead, quickening the mortal body—prophetic Christianity. These three tenses of Christianity, the past, present and future, were deposited in baptism. Various writers of the New Testament recognize their presence in their discussions of baptism. The ordinance of baptism became for the early Christians the visible expression of the message of Christianity. All that is essential in the revelation of Christ is here epitomized. The Gospel was destined to be communicated in other languages than those in which Jesus

and His disciples spoke. There was a necessity that it be preserved in a fixed, unchanged form that should epitomize all the essential elements of Christianity, there is no one that so readily, so beautifully, so completely expresses the essential ideas in Christianity as the act of baptism. It is not too much to say that baptism is the Bible which Jesus prepared and that every immersion and emersion in the name of the Triune God is a newly printed copy of the Book. Jesus intended that Christianity should be communicated through personalities that had experienced the transforming power of His message and their confessions be made in this form which He ordained. There is in baptism a sufficient revelation for the perpetuation of Christianity if every Bible were destroyed and every Church leveled to the ground, provided that the revelation were made by two persons, the one administering it, having had its required experience and the other submitting to it, proclaiming anew that experience. The union in Christianity which we all seek for can be realized when Christianity returns to Jesus and submits, as He submitted for the fulfillment of righteousness to the confession of baptism. Then Christians recognizing the essence of Christianity, will agree upon the expression of that agreement in this visible form, more beautiful than any figures of speech, more accurate than any statement of the lips, more complete than the articles of any creed.

Among the modern groups of Christianity who practice the mode of baptism commanded by Jesus are two, who in point of intelligence and numbers are conspicuous; the Disciples and the Baptists. These two bodies are each year growing closer and closer together. To-day we are placing the emphasis upon the points of agreement rather than the points of disagreement, and we rejoice that the points of disagreement are lessening in number. Baptists began their historical career by emphasizing the new birth as a prerequisite to church membership. Later the emphasis fell upon the form of baptism. The strong-

est contention so far has been for the restoration of immersion as the only form of Christian baptism. The basis of this contention has been obedience to Christ—loyalty to Christ. Baptists hold that salvation is secured by faith in Jesus Christ and that this faith manifests itself in obedience to Christ in which baptism is an incident, not necessary to salvation, but necessary to church fellowship, and they have refused to recognize churches that fail to practice immersion as properly organized churches. The weakness of the Baptist position has been the failure to emphasize the meaning, and therefore the ethical value of baptism. We have defended it successfully as a form, but our claim that it is not necessary to salvation has greatly weakened our appeal to the Pedobaptist world. The position of the intelligent Pedobaptist is, “you have proved immersion, but what of it? You admit that it is merely a form, and one form is as good as another if it be used as a confession of faith in Christ.” The Disciples have maintained that the form of baptism is immersion, and that it is intimately associated with the forgiveness of sins. This is based upon the Scripture regarding “baptism for the remission of sins.” This has led many Disciple leaders to insist that baptism is necessary to salvation, there being no remission of sins without baptism. Others hold the position that no confession of Christ is complete without baptism and that the promise that Christ makes, “Whosoever will confess Me before men, him also will I confess My Father who is in Heaven?” is one which gives assurance only to the baptized. It appears to me that Baptists and Disciples are both right in their beliefs; the one that baptism by immersion is necessary to obedience and the other that baptism by immersion is closely associated with the forgiveness of sins. But beyond the command of Christ, Baptists have failed to present convincing argument for the form, and Disciples have failed to establish that the forgiveness of sins is inseparably connected with baptism. If it be accepted as true that Chris-

tianity in its simplest form is a group of ideas that gather about death and resurrection and that Christian baptism is the visible expression of these ideas, the argument for baptism among Baptists is transferred from the command to the *raison d'être* of the command, and the necessity for its observation as a Christian revelation becomes equally urgent, if not more urgent than the necessity for the preservation of the New Testament. If baptism be the Gospel idea enshrined in a form that rises triumphant over the division of races, the separation of languages and the changes of time, it possesses a value as a vehicle for the communication of the Gospel, surpassing all the symbols of speech and literature. If this conception of baptism be accepted by Disciples, they will have ample argument to prove that the act of baptism is intimately associated with the forgiveness of sins. Baptism becomes the perfect confession of Christ, and as the visible form of the Gospel is intimately associated with the forgiveness of sins.

Baptists hold that regeneration is mediated by the Holy Spirit. Disciples hold that regeneration is mediated by the Word. The tendency of the one has been to emphasize the emotional experience; the tendency of the other has been to emphasize the intellectual experience. If the emphasis be properly distributed, we would find that the intellectual experience, the apprehension of the Gospel, comes first. The emotional experience, the response to the Gospel, comes second, while the profession before the world in the ordinance of baptism, is third. The Holy Spirit is acting throughout each of the three movements. Thus, the Pauline phrase "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" is the accurate, scientific account of the genesis of the Christian life; the Lord is the incarnation of the Gospel; the faith is the response of the soul to the Gospel, and the baptism is the profession of the power and the verity of Gospel. Baptism may appropriately be called the Creed of Christ; for baptism is the visible of the essence of the Christian message. Baptism is God's final

revelation to men enshrined in beautiful symbolism.

An address delivered by President E. Y. Mullins, D.D. before the Baptist World Congress entitled, "The Trend of Modern Theology" has created widespread interest. He concluded the address with six axioms for which Baptists stand. Axioms are self-evident statements made in view of and because some mathematical proposition or theorem has been indubitably proved. These axioms of President Mullins demand some such basis; and in his masterly discussion he fails to furnish definitely that Christian theorem. This theorem I find in baptism; and presenting as the primary axiom, the psychological axiom: "A certain likeness of God to man makes possible a divine revelation to man," I subscribe heartily to the six axioms that follow: The Theological axiom: "The holy and loving God has the right to be sovereign;" The religious axiom: "All men have an equal right to direct access to God;" The ecclesiastical axiom: "All believers have equal privileges in the Church;" The moral axiom: "To be responsible man must be free;" The social axiom: "Love your neighbor as yourself;" The religio-civic axiom: "A free Church in a free State." These seven self-evident principles inhere in baptism as the seven colors inhere in white light, and the light is the light of the Gospel of the Son of God, the Message of Christianity.

So far I have said nothing regarding the Lord's Supper. As baptism epitomizes the Christian message, so the Lord's Supper epitomizes the Christian experience. The Gospel is visibly portrayed in baptism and the effects of the Gospel are visibly portrayed in the Lord's Supper. They sustain to each other the relation of cause and effect. In baptism is symbolized the genesis of the Christian life. In the Lord's Supper is symbolized the growth of the Christian life. Christian Theology is the biology of the eternal life. The clearest and simplest statement of the biology of the eternal life is given in these symbols, which we are accustomed to call, the or-

dinances. As in baptism we have the three tenses of the Christian message, so in the Lord's Supper we have the three tenses of the Christian experience. The death of our Lord, symbolized in the broken bread and poured out wine, is the historical fact that makes possible the Christian experience of regeneration. The partaking of the bread that nourisheth and the wine that strengtheneth portrays the present spiritual experience of the soul, nourished and strengthened through Christ. The anticipations of the Lord's Supper refers to His second coming, for which we are ever expectant, and to the feast in the Kingdom of God, when our Lord will sit down with those whom He has redeemed. The Lord's Supper epitomizes for us the Christian experience. Baptism and the Lord's Supper contain the essential ideas of Christianity. Together they form the primary revelation and possess for us a unique value, because they represent to us in the forms which Christ Himself chose to be the permanent expression of His revelation. Baptism and the Lord's Supper together present to us the Essence of Christianity in visible symbols. The New Testament is but the enlargement of these ideas in baptism and in the Lord's Supper, giving fuller definitions, clearer applications, and increasing illustrations of the meaning of these ideas as holy men of God acting under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit were led to write.

Jesus founded His Church upon the rock-principle—"experience precedes expression." The confession of Peter was the outward expression of an inward experience. Upon this rock-foundation, Christ and His disciples builded the impregnable fortress of the Church. Two massive towers were planned and reared by the Master Himself; the one standing at the entrance and the other within. The one tower is named Christian baptism and the other tower is named the Lord's Supper. The walls of the Church were reared by the Apostles and Prophets. They are the New Testament Scriptures. Thus, rose the Church of Christ against which the gates of

death cannot prevail. If the walls ever should be thrown down, and sooner we may expect the stars to be flung from their orbits and chaos to reign, there would remain the impregnable and time-conquering towers, reared by the divine Logos, the eternal Christ; and these towers guard and preserve the Christian message and the Christian experience; and these towers are for us and for the ages to come the visible expression of the Essence of Christianity.

SOME PHASES OF THE LITERATURE OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT AND THE LITERATURE
OF THE ANCIENT ORIENT.

BY PROF. IRA M. PRICE, PH. D., LL. D.,

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Literature is crystallized human life. "Language is the coin-current of thought" (Robertson, *Early Relig. of Israel*). Its preservation in written form represents the truly permanent and valuable remains of civilization, in every period of the world's history. Indeed, the literary remains of any age are a true revealer of the character of that age. Through these we see not only the mental, but the physical, moral, and spiritual life of any given period or people. I would not affirm that literature is the only revealer of such character, but as we look back into the past it is the chief and most reliable one.

Accessory to it, are the remains of architecture, sculpture, painting, religion and commerce. Each of these elements of civilization possesses its increment of value, and helps us to fill out the picture of the people or the nation whom we may be endeavoring to present. But of all the nations great and small, of the past and present, with all their magnificent achievements in political power, and literary fame, there is none which possesses the same charm for the Christian student and scholar as the ancient Hebrews. They were and are 'the people of the Book,' as the Rabbis are fond of saying. To them we are indebted for the reception, preservation, and promulgation of the doctrine of one God. They were the lineal antecedents of the writers and speakers of the New Testament. Their religion was the basis, and contained the germ, of much that grew up, blossomed, and came to full fruition in the life and teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But the task that lies before me in this lecture necessarily has its limitations, and even within these, I can give merely a bird's eye view, of some of the facts and problems that face every thoughtful reader and student of the literature of the Old Testament. It is not within my range to discuss either the revelation or the inspiration of this literature, and this fact must be kept constantly in mind, but rather to look at it in this lecture from the point of view of literature as such.

The Old Testament is the most valuable literary storehouse of antiquity. In the variety of literary form employed, in the range of themes discussed, and in the maintenance of a high moral and spiritual tone, it towers above every literary product of all the centuries preceding the Christian era. Such literary excellence and pre-eminence have given it first consideration in every discussion that pertains to the Semitic race, and the history of religion.

Before we attempt to pass judgment on the literary form and style of the Old Testament, we must fully realize that it was the literary product of an Oriental people, and was permeated through and through with distinctively Semitic thought that was cast in a Semitic mould. In the very nature of the case, an Occidental cannot understand or interpret a Semitic Oriental, even to-day, as some of us have learned by severe experience, until he has made his mysterious stranger a subject of comprehensive and thorough study. Much less should any one of us presume to be able to understand, to interpret, and to dogmatize on the writings of a people of ancient days, when we have slight familiarity with their history, language, and customs. No one can appreciate more keenly the full import of this statement than the translators of the Old Testament. They must transfer, or carry over into English, a language of almost unbounded range of vocabulary—the thought of the Hebrew, which has only about 6,000 words in its vocabulary, and is replete with Oriental pictures, idioms, and customs.

What wonder, then, that some parts of the Old Testament are obscure, that many of its customs, hints, and references, are still mysterious! The simple marvel is, that we who read, not simply the English, but the Hebrew, can get near enough to it to feel the warmth of the life-blood that makes it glow with beauty and power.

I.

Let us now turn our attention to a brief inquiry as to the origin of this remarkable collection of Semitic books. Whence did they arise? By whom, and for what purpose, were they written? What is their content?

The answers to these questions within the last century have filled our library shelves. They have been written by every school of biblical thought, and have reached all the way from the adamantine position of the dogmatist, to the wildest speculations of the extreme radical. In other words, the answers are graded from the method of the man who first lays down a dogma and decides absolutely, in his own mind, "what was," to the arrant critic whose cherished hypothesis determines what "must have been." Or still more definitely the answers are as wide apart as these statements: (1) the writers of the books of the Old Testament received all that they said and wrote it down as a direct, verbal revelation from God, and (2) the literature of the Old Testament as such arose comparatively late in the history of Israel, not dating back of the song of Deborah, in fact, that poem is cited as the earliest specimen of Hebrew literature.

Neither the dogmatist nor the radical has the correct point of view. And the discoveries of the last century have compelled every writer to modify his answer. On what grounds? When we survey the arguments and conclusions of the writers who have decided for themselves the origin of the literature of the Old Testament we find that, up to within a quarter century, they have discussed Israel as practically an isolated race or people, with no

literary antecedents or contemporaries. From this viewpoint they have naturally determined the origin, growth, and final literary form of the Old Testament books.

But the last three-quarters of a century have seen stupendous revelations in the Orient. God has led man to the treasures hidden away and preserved for these days of minute scholarship and speculation, of investigation and research. The temples, tombs and tablets of Egypt and Babylonia have spoken. Vast libraries of ancient literature, on cylinders, seals, statues and papyri, now enrich the great museums of the world. The disintegrating ruins of the Mesopotamian valley, the dismantled fortresses and fastnesses of Elam and Persia, have contributed their part to the immense body of Oriental literature that now claims a place on the shelves of our libraries.

The fascinating and romantic stories of the decipherment and interpretation of these once mysterious remains of ancient civilizations must be passed over in regretful silence. The significance of these interpretations, however, is of untold value to us. What do they reveal? In the first place, they affirm in unequivocal terms, that the ancient Oriental world of South Western Asia and Egypt was occupied almost as long before Abraham's day, as we live since his day, by great nations and mighty empires who were in possession of a culture that every year, and after every inscription newly deciphered, shines forth with new lustre. In the second place, we discover that these old people were not illiterates, nor mere wandering nomads, but that they employed languages now known to us, that reveal in a wonderfully graphic manner their actions, thoughts and aspirations—and these, many centuries before Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees. Now, as we come down the centuries to Abraham's day and beyond, we discover a literary talent—particularly in Babylonia as seen in the code of Hammurabi, and other contemporary matter—that smites us with amazement. And this at 2250 B. C. in Babylonia, the place from which

and about the time when Abraham migrated westward! If now, we take a stride forward of about 1,000 years, we reach the time of Moses. Certainly there was no literary deterioration either in Babylonia or Egypt during this period. The phase of the question that is of prime interest to us is, that these great nations millennia before the time of Moses produced documents, that we may justly call in a broad sense, literature. These compass a large range of subjects, and are in character, historical, religious, magical, astrological, genealogical, philological and commercial. And they were written, too, in languages that were read and understood, at least, by the ruling and educated classes of the people. As we leave the time of Moses (locating the exodus of Israel from Egypt at 1276 B. C., and later) and come on down to the time of the fall of Samaria (722 B. C.) or the fall of Jerusalem (586) or the fall of Babylon (538), we pass through periods in which masses of literature were produced in the great nations of which we today, have many thousands of volumes in the form of clay tablets, bricks and seals. We know also that the small people on the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea were not ignorant of writing even in the fifteenth century B. C., as the Tel el-Amarna tablets, discovered in Egypt in 1887-8, tell us, as well as do hints here and there in the Old Testament. Professor Sayce long ago pointed out that the name of one ancient city of Palestine, Kirjath-Sepher, means "book-city."

I think I have said enough to indicate that Israel was simply one little one among the great nations of antiquity, and that her leaders were doubtless acquainted with the civilization of those days. It is not at all improbable that they were acquainted with methods of writing such documents as were prepared by those great nations. This acquaintance, too, must have extended to methods of preservation as well as to material used, and so vitally affected the good sense that preserved such records as we find in the Old Testament.

Thus the great civilization from which Abraham migrated, the people and lands through which he traveled, and the land of Egypt in which his descendants sojourned, wrote down and preserved their records, both to emphasize their own importance, and to encourage and inspire posterity. It would have been physically possible so far as environment was concerned, for the patriarchs and their immediate descendants to have put into writing the records of their times. Certainly, the education and training of Moses, in view of all the literary activity of the great nations of his day, are favorable to the view that he had a part in the production of the Hebrew literature that comes down from his day. In fact, it is most probable that each period of Israel's history produced its own records, and that these were put into form by compilers, revisers and editors at some later date. Now in all this I am not saying that these documents were merely the records of men's words and deeds. In many places, the writers say, "Thus said the Lord," an explicit statement that what follows was conveyed to the speaker or writer in some way by the Spirit of the Lord.

In view of the statements already made regarding the peoples contemporary with Israel, it is clearly evident that Israel herself, through her leaders, could and would have produced records of her political, social and religious life. In fact, enough evidence is found in the Old Testament to show that there were regularly constituted officials, whose business it was to record the events of their times; also that the prophets even from David's day were now and then the historians of the successive periods of history.

II.

This brings me to the second point in the discussion, namely the form of this literature. What is the form that we find as we examine it?

On turning to the Old Testament the thoughtful and careful reader very soon discovers that almost no book

of it reads straight ahead like a modern production. This discovery may be due to one or both of two things. In the first place, let us suppose that the reader is not an Oriental, and that he looks at things through Occidental eyes. This may seem to be of slight consequence, but one illustration may serve to make my meaning plain. The Oriental usually states a result, and then goes back to recite its cause, e. g., Gen. 10 gives the distribution of the people on the earth, and chapter 11 the reason for that distribution. In the second place, he finds that the narrative is abruptly broken here and there, and that the events in the historical books and the chapters in the prophetic books are not always arranged in chronological order. It is also discovered at the same time, that the narrative passes over long years of activity with but few verses. E. g., the reign of Jeroboam II. of Israel, extending over forty-one years is disposed of in seven verses; and the reign of Manasseh of Judah, covering fifty-five years is dispatched with eighteen verses. More than this, he finds at the conclusion of Jeroboam's reign this statement (2 Kings 14:28). "Now, the rest of the acts of Jeroboam, and all that he did, and his might, how he warred, and how he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, *which had belonged* to Judah, for Israel, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel?" And at the close of the record of Manasseh's reign (2 Kings 21:17), this reference is made: "Now the rest of the acts of Manasseh, and all that he did, and his sin that he sinned, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?" In other words, the reader of these records in the Book of Kings is referred for any further information regarding these monarchs to the annals that were officially kept by the king's recorder. This fact very naturally leads to the question as to the method by which this book or these books were prepared.

The Books of Kings and Chronicles contain scores of references to annals, records, biographies and other writ-

ings which were the sources of information used by their compilers. It is evident that the editor or editors selected from these numerous and various original documents only such matter as served their very definite purpose. These books then are compilations of a selection of matter gathered from a wide range of original sources. They were most probably put into their present form not much later than the time of the latest event mentioned therein.

On examination of this literary compilation, it does not take long to find one of the principles of selection. Only such matter is woven into the narrative, as serves to teach a moral or religious lesson. In the reigns of the kings, many things that a modern historian would regard as essential to the perfection of his account, are not even hinted at. E. g., what was the exact order of events that resulted in the dissolution of Solomon's kingdom? How was it possible that Jeroboam II. was able to carry his conquests so far northward and win back territory that had once been conquered by David and lost by Solomon? And some things that we should have put into a foot-note or left out altogether—such as the long dry-as-dust genealogical tables—are sacredly retained and given an important place in the whole record. The compiler was not a historian, nor did he arrange his selected material primarily to teach history. Hence, while we have not a continuous or connected narrative, the matter in general is arranged in chronological order.

The form of the Books of Samuel is likewise that of Kings and Chronicles. It is clearly evident that the matter was compiled, as any one can readily see, by the putting together of pieces of information, here and there, that break any continuous thread of the narrative. As for example, the two accounts of David's presentation to Saul, and the supplemental chapters 21-24, of 2 Samuel, that gather up individual and scattered documents touching the life of David. Joshua and Judges, likewise, present the same kinds of evidence that they were put together by some sacred editor or editors, who carefully

collected out of the contemporary records such specific events, persons and words, as would enforce some specific phases of truth.

And the book of Genesis, on any estimate, contains material, all of which was compiled by an editor. And its present form is the result of the putting together of these pieces of ancient records to serve the high and noble purpose of the editor.

Coming down to post-exilic times, we find that Ezra and Nehemiah were constructed on a principle similar to Kings and Chronicles, and are as fragmentary and unsatisfactory, as secular history as any book we have in the canon.

Now what can be said of the prophetic books? In many cases we know that the prophets both spoke and wrote down their prophecies. Indeed, it is rightly thought that this was the then regular method of procedure. But when we take the books that are attributed to them—and I speak mainly of the great prophets—we discover that the arrangement of the discourses and of the chapters is not chronological, or even doctrinal. Neither were they placed in the order of utterance. There are, however, little groups of prophecies set here and there; e. g., those against foreign nations in Isaiah are found in chapters 13 to 23, in Jeremiah, chapters 46-51, and in Ezekiel, chapters 25-32. And even within these groups they are not arranged in chronological order, but on some principle, not self-evident, nor yet agreed on by students and scholars. Outside of, and beyond, this group in each great prophet, the chapters have probably been placed in their final order which is chronological—for the purpose of enforcing some great truth. Of all the prophets, Jeremiah was most free to quote, and comment on, the words and prophecies of his predecessors. Isaiah quotes about two chapters (15 and 16) of an earlier prophecy against Moab, and Ezekiel combines in chapters 27-32 a vast amount of valuable information, gathered from wide sources, on Tyre and Egypt. The most that internal evidence reveals in the minor prophets is that they consist

of short discourses pieced together, sometimes with a consecution of thought, but oftener without any such connections.

When we turn to the poetical books we have a variety of form before us. The Book of Psalms is one of the most interesting books of the Bible, merely from a literary point of view. Its 150 psalms are documents that stretch through the larger part of Israel's history, from David's time down into the post-exilic period. These charming little poems were, at some time, collected into five books, each closing with a doxology. These books, however, do not present the poems either in chronological or doctrinal order. For, psalms attributed to David are found in the last as well as in the first book. It is probably true that there is a general chronological order, for there are more late psalms in Book V., than in either of the previous books. It is evident that the compilers of this great collection gathered up and inserted here and there groups that cluster about one name or one theme. We find groups in the psalms of Asaph (73-83), the psalms of the Sons of Korah (42-49), the Hallel psalms (111-118), the psalms of the Ascents (120-134). These may have constituted small collections that were in use in the temple services and in the final compilation of their great hymn book, the Psalter, they were given a permanent place. Both these small collections of poems, and the great compilation itself were revised from age to age as the demands of the temple-service and the modifications of the language required. The changes introduced were just about what is done to some of our old and beloved hymns, by modern editors of music books. They removed obsolete words, and inserted new words for those whose meanings had been modified by the march of time and custom. These statements find their proof in a careful and minute comparison of Psalm 18, and 2 Sam. 22, which are one and the same poem; and also in Psalm 53 which is another edition of Psalm 14. Wherever the word Jehovah occurs in Psalm 14 it has

been changed to Elohim "God," in Psalm 53. In fact, there seem to have been times in which one name for God rather than the other, was held in chief esteem. When we examine the Hebrew of the entire 150 psalms, we find in Psalms 1-41 the word Jehovah used 272 times, and Elohim "God" 15 times; Psalms 42-84, Elohim is used 176 times, and Jehovah only 46 times; while in Psalms 85-150, Jehovah is used 339 times and Elohim of the true God only once.

All of this evidence is cumulative to the effect that there was an active revisional and editorial spirit in the preservation of the psalter, and one that must be reckoned with in any exhaustive study of this "heart of the Bible."

The Book of Proverbs was, of course, collected out of the wisest sayings of the wise men, beginning with Solomon. It is said that Solomon spoke 3,000 proverbs; but the Book of Proverbs as it now stands contains altogether less than 1,000. Furthermore, after we pass the first twenty-four chapters, we have several additions to the great body. Chapter 25:1 reads: "These also are proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah copied out"; chapter 30:1, "The words of Agur, the son of Jakeh, the oracle;" chapter 31:1, "The words of King Lemuel, the oracle which his mother taught him." These superscriptions inform us that these supplementary chapters were added at some time subsequent to the uniting of the main body of the book, and were gathered from various sources.

The Book of Job will never cease to weary the student by its unending problems. The prologue in prose, and the epilogue in prose, and the Book with its semi-dramatic form, give us a production that is unique in every way.

Now, what is the meaning of this bird's eye view of the form of Old Testament literature? This question can scarcely be answered without a glance at some of the elements of form in other Oriental literature. When

we turn to the documents and records of ancient Egypt we discover that almost all of them are such as were originally produced, and were practically, if not entirely, unchanged by later ages. They recite the heroic deeds of a king or of a high official, and stop there. The texts that prescribed the duties of a priest or scribe belong, as a rule, to one age, without much editorial revision of subsequent days. To this general principle there was one notable exception, the "Book of the Dead." This famous religious document—the most important in all Egyptian lore—was written, revised, interpolated and re-revised to answer the demands of each successive age through thousands of years, until the jumble of its vocabulary, its idioms and its syntax has made it one of the most difficult documents to translate into plain English.

The inscriptions of Babylon, Assyria, Elam and Persia are not compilations as a rule. They are made up of single inscriptions of kings, priests or scribes that have for their purpose the laudation of the author or promoter. They have no high historical or moral motive, but are rather intended to perpetuate the valor and greatness of some official. In other words, we find no history proper, carefully collected and compiled among these Oriental peoples. What they have left us is good material as far as it goes for us of later days to work over, and by eliminating self-laudation, bombast, and exaggeration, to construct a history.

As soon as we turn from these single local documents, historical, personal and commercial, to the religious and legal texts, we discover that they have been the result of long experience, of varied regulations, and of many writers. The codified laws of Hammurabi, and the religious rituals of temple service, have many points in common with the form and content of the provisions of the Pentateuch, and show us as did the Egyptian Book of the Dead, that the religious and legal literature of Israel's great neighbors, as of themselves, occupied their

chief attention, and carries the marks of the most scrupulous care in its perpetuation. The most introspective and psalm-like religious texts of Babylonia are poetry, not as majestic in form as our psalter, but still poetic and often truly supplicatory in tone, revealing a vast similarity between the Semitic mind of Babylonia and that found living on the hills of Judea.

III.

The content of these literatures has been partially mentioned, because in some instances it has been difficult to draw a hard and fast line between form and content. This theme must be greatly condensed, as I am already reaching the limits of my space and time. I shall begin with the stories of Genesis and proceed down through the Old Testament citing only some phases here and there.

The creation accounts of Genesis are paralleled by documents of Babylon. While the Genesis account tells a straightforward story in which God is the creator of the heavens and the earth, of the sea-monsters and man, the Babylonian story attributes all creation to the god Marduk, who was only one of the great divinities of the Babylonian pantheon.

The next item in Genesis most completely paralleled in the cuneiform inscription is the account of the flood. The content, even to the birds sent out to search for dry ground, is almost a duplication of Genesis—the chief differences being: first, in the reasons for the causing of a deluge, and second, in the presence in Genesis of one God, and in the Babylonian of many deities.

The contents of the legal literature, particularly of the civil laws of Ex. 21-23, and many others scattered through to the end of Deut. have found many parallels in the code of Hammurabi, codified about 1,000 years before Moses led Israel out of Egypt. Indeed it seems that some of these laws must have been statutes that were in common use among the great Semitic peoples of those

centuries. The existence of them in a code of 2250 B. C. and in the Pentateuch is extremely significant, first, as touching Israel's relations with the nations of that day, and second, the method by which the codes of the Pentateuch were produced. Scores of questions arise right here that would require a whole course of lectures to furnish adequate answers.

The historical literature has been already discussed at some length, and I have shown that its contents are not history in any real or modern sense of that term, but a description of personages and events covering continuously a portion of Israel's activity, out of which the writer could draw a moral and religious lesson. In other words, the history contained in the Old Testament is a moral or religious history of Israel, such as could be used with telling effect in subsequent times. Of this peculiar character of Old Testament literature there is no exact parallel in the literature of the great peoples of ancient days.

Of the contents of the prophetic literature, we have no parallel that deserves mention. The transcendent utterances of the great religious leaders of Israel stand alone, as the sublimest literary documents of the pre-Christian centuries.

But the poetic literature, stamped with the form of true Semitic rhythm, finds its parallels both in Babylonia and in Arabia. The lofty sentiment of a penitent soul, expressed in poetical form, is seen in the following from a Babylonian psalm: "O my God, who art angry with me, accept my prayers! O my God, who art wroth with me, receive my supplication. He who guideth the span of life, who stayeth the hand of death, my God, accept my prayer. Forgive my sins, and I will humble myself before thee. May my sins be forgiven, may my transgressions be forgotten! May the ban be loosened, may the chains be cast off! May the seven winds carry away my sight."

“Make me bright like gold!
 Like a string of diamonds may I be precious in thy sight!
 Cleanse me from wickedness, save my soul!
 I will watch thy court and pledge myself to thee!”
 (*Assyrian-Babylonia Literature*, p. 438).

These marvellous sentiments, many of them parallel in thought to the psalms of David, show us that men were moved by similar motives whether in Babylonia or in the hills of Palestine. Their recognition of guilt, desire for forgiveness, and joy in the presence of divinity were almost equally fervid on the Euphrates or on the east shores of the Mediterranean Sea. But the one far-reaching and fundamental difference consists in the monotheism of Israel's psalms and the rank polytheism of the verses from Babylonia.

Let us now summarize some of the points touched upon in this brief survey of the theme. The discoveries of the past three-quarters of a century have brought to light great masses of literature antecedent to, and contemporaneous with, ancient Israel. The existence of such documents argues for literary ability and productivity in Israel from the earliest times. It likewise prepares us to expect Israel to preserve her own records of events, thoughts and aspirations. Evidence shows that Israel possessed a class of men whose business it was to prepare and preserve her annals, the biographies of her great men, and commentaries on her events.

The form of the literature was such as we designate prose and poetry, embracing therein history, prophecy, wisdom and psalm literature. The present form of the history shows that it was compiled out of antecedent documents; the prophecies are arranged on a principle unknown to modern students, and the poetry was collected from a variety of sources.

The contents of the Old Testament narratives in distinction from those of the inscriptions of Babylonia and all other early Eastern nations are permeated with the

idea of the one true God, as over against hosts of lifeless divinities; they abound in moral and religious teaching that is uplifting and ennobling, while the lofty sentiments of the ancient Orient are weighted down by the cringing attitude of the devotees of the polytheism.

Purely as literature then, full of inspiring sentiment, the Old Testament towers far above all the choicest inscriptions of the magnificent civilizations of the long centuries before the coming of the Redeemer Christ.

PERSUASION IN PREACHING; ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE.*

BY ARTHUR JONES, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

My only excuse for selecting a second time, the subject of Persuasion for my Opening Address, is the fact that the seven intervening years have, to my mind, emphasized the importance of it both to those who are studying the art, and also to those who are beginning the actual work of preaching. To really preach, is to persuade. Persuasion is the end the preacher should have in view: power of persuasion the thing he should covet; the art of persuasion the thing he should study. The preacher is not a teacher. He should teach, and desire to be "apt to teach;" but always with a view to persuasion. His mission is not merely to present the truth to men, but so to present it that they will obey. The preacher is not a messenger. He should have a message, and should deliver it faithfully "whether they will hear or whether they will forbear;" but he must leave nothing undone, save only tampering with the message, that they shall hear. As he stands "to declare all the counsel of God," his prayer of preparation should be—

"O Spirit that dost prefer
Before all temples the upright heart and pure,
Instruct me. — — — — —

What in me is dark,
Illumine; what is low, raise and support;
That in the height of this great argument
I may assert Eternal Providence,
And *justify* the ways of God to men."

*The Annual Address before the Colgate Seminary, Sept. 26th, 1905.

I.

What is persuasion? Let me say first of all, that persuasion is not a formal thing.

In my boyhood I sat under the preaching of a good man of no mean parts, who, as far as I can now recall, never failed to close his sermons with an appeal to the unsaved; and those appeals always began with the set phrase, "And now my dear unconverted friends." What he said in those appeals I seldom heard; I doubt if any of us did. Just as the benediction is to some people the signal to reach for their hats, so that phrase was to us the signal to stop listening. We stopped primarily I suppose, because he had served notice thereby that he was after us; and we were not disposed to be caught. But it was easy to stop because we had found from the few samples we had tested, that, no matter how interesting the sermon might be up to that point, the rest would consist chiefly of exclamation and platitude. Now the good man had the correct theory, but he was not within sight of the spirit of it. That was no more persuasion, than a wooden nutmeg is a nutmeg. The theory of never closing a sermon without some word to the unsaved, rightly understood and applied, does not, in my opinion, need defense. The exigencies under which every true sermon is delivered demand nothing less. But a formal appeal like that is not a genuine word to the unsaved; and the man who gives it supposing that he is thus performing the high duty of persuasion, has only persuaded himself; into an error. The *form* of persuasion may best be absent sometimes, that the essence of persuasion may be most effectively present.

The story is told that Daniel Webster was once pressing a suit to secure pay for a large order of wagon wheels which his clients had delivered, for which payment had been refused on the ground that the wheels furnished were not as good as the sample. The sample wheel, and

some of those supplied under the contract, were brought into court and placed in evidence. After the witnesses had been examined, the counsel for the defense arose and addressed the jury in a speech constructed after the most approved style. He dwelt upon the sacredness of contracts; and asked what would become of the business interests of the land if men were permitted to violate both spirit and letter, and then recover payment the same as if the contract had been faithfully observed. He described a possible accident which might result from the breaking of one of these inferior wheels; where innocent users were dashed to their death, leaving wives and children in sorrow and poverty. He appealed to the jury as honest men who knew their duty, to faithfully discharge their trust and rebuke this shameless attempt at fraud. When he had finished, Mr. Webster arose, and, after formally addressing the court, turned to the jury, and pointing to the wheels, said, "Gentlemen of the jury, look at 'em;" and resumed his seat. Tradition has it that the jury gave him the verdict without leaving the box. The formal appeal was absent, but the essential principles of persuasion were observed. He showed faith in his case, and confidence in the jury. His opponent appealed without persuading; he persuaded without appealing. It was the height of the art of persuasion.

It was my privilege to hear Charles H. Spurgeon and another well-known preacher of London, in their own pulpits, on the same Sabbath. I have not forgotten the object-lesson presented regarding methods of persuasion. Mr. Spurgeon gave a vivid picture of the graciousness of Christ toward his followers, even the weakest. As he went on to portray the considerateness and tenderness of Jesus, the great audience was hushed and weeping. Then the preacher, raising himself to full height and lifting his hand to compel attention, said, "He has appointed me one of his recruiting sergeants, and I have authority to say to every unsaved soul in this Tabernacle: If you want this Christ for your master he bids you welcome."

I do not believe there was one person without the Savior that heard those words who did not receive an impulse to seek him then and there. That evening we listened to the other well-known preacher. The sermon, addressed to young men, was one of rare beauty and tenderness. It too presented Christ faithfully and attractively; closing with an appeal to young men, in the fullness of their strength, with all their wealth of physical and mental powers, to consecrate them to the Master. "He needs you in the contest that is waging. Your strong right arm can carry his banner far to the front. The world needs you; the world's Savior needs you. Oh, I beseech you consecrate those powers you possess to the Master's service. Turn from selfish pursuits and aid the world's rightful King to come to his own." Such, as nearly as I can recall, were the final words. All very beautiful, and uttered in tenderest tones; but I said to my companion as we left the chapel, "I don't believe that appeal scratched the surface of the purpose of one young man present." Mr. Spurgeon, perhaps, was at his best that morning, it was the last sermon he ever preached; the other may have been at his weakest that evening. My purpose is not to compare the men, only this—the one without seeming to try, persuaded; the other tried hard, and failed. Possibly it was more in the way of saying it than in the thing said; possibly it was in my mood, with which you will not sympathize; but the impression remains after fourteen years. The one seemed like the deferential presentation of a contribution bag; the other like the proffering of a royal invitation on a tray of pure gold.

No, persuasion is not a formal thing, so many lines of appeal, so many words of expostulation and entreaty; there may be all these, and no persuasion; there may be none of these, and yet persuasion irresistible.

The fashion in public utterance changes like fashion in other things. It is simpler and more familiar than it was a hundred or even fifty years ago. For my part I rejoice in the change. I regard the recoil from the old form

of appeals as both healthy and necessary. Healthy because the old appeals would be unreal; necessary, because this age will not listen to them. But, unless I mistake, the recoil has gone altogether too far. The pulpit of to-day has, turned, as it seems to me, not only from the old forms of persuasion; it has turned, or is in danger of turning, from persuasion itself. The new conception of preaching seems to place the intellect or the sensibilities rather than the will at the center. Homiletically this is rank heresy; resulting in the lowering of the position of the pulpit, and the diminishing of its power.

Now there have been equally great changes in speech as related to worldly matters; but the children of the world have been wiser than the children of light. They too have changed their methods; but they have not lost sight of the thing to be done. Take for example the selling of goods. The old merchant, when once a possible customer crossed the threshold of his store, wrestled with him by the hour to make a sale. He flattered, browbeat, pleaded, reduced the price, anything to sell. Now all this is changed—except the purpose to sell. And the mad rush on bargain days witnesses to the fact that the people are still being persuaded to buy. Lest this should seem to prove too much for my purpose, and appear to be an argument for the substitution of something else in the place of preaching, I would remind you that the great wholesale houses throughout the land rely more than ever upon the personal touch and the winning word. The great army of commercial travelers is increasing faster in proportion, than the population or the volume of business; and you do not need to be told what tireless students of the art of persuasion these “Knights of the Road” are. In some matters the preacher may well learn from them. Among other things, they might teach him that there is a time for speech, and a time for silence—but both with a view to persuasion. And thus it is clear, to me at least, that in all the changes that take place in tastes and methods, the aim and purpose of

preaching remains the same. It is to persuade men.

II.

What then is persuasion? I answer, (and students of Broadus will note that I am giving a judgment not a definition), persuasion is the intelligent dominance of a definite purpose to persuade; influencing the spirit, manner and matter of a speaker. Persuasion employs all proper methods; it is bound to none. It is free in its choice of means; it is in bondage to a single end. It does many things; but it does them that it may do the one thing more effectively. The foundation of persuasion lies deep. It is in the spirit and temper of the man; in his attitude toward his fellows; in his conception of his work.

I say that an appropriate spirit belongs to persuasion. The purpose to persuade tends, on the one hand, to produce this spirit; and, on the other, by emphasizing its importance, to compel the man to seek for it constantly and earnestly. Persuasion inclines toward gentleness rather than sternness; it woos more than it commands; it pleads with, but does not denounce; it grieves over, but does not despise.

Now this spirit which belongs to true persuasion, determines the attitude of a real preacher toward his fellows. This spirit, controlling conduct and utterance, will tend to place him in right relations with men; and his relations with men, rightly conceived, will lead him to long for, and cultivate this spirit. Persuasion must be in the man before it is in the sermon. It is a spirit that pervades the sermon; not a mould in which the sermon is cast.

I said also that persuasion had to do with a man's conception of his work. Now there are diversities of gifts; some pastors, some evangelists, some teachers. A call to do Christian work is general; a call to preach is specific. Some successful ministers, it would seem, were never called to preach; or, if they were, have failed to do much of it. Every successful minister is called to do many

things besides to preach. The most successful ministers are called primarily to preach; and they do it. They may be excellent pastors, efficient organizers, apt teachers; but their throne is their pulpit. And preaching is persuasion; and where that is, and is sought, you have definiteness of conception of one's work. Perhaps some of you brethren of the student body are, as yet, conscious only of the general call to serve Christ; but if you believe you have a commission to preach, then welcome the limitations imposed, and prepare to do your work; not something else.

He who is to become a persuader of men for God, needs a varied preparation in order that he may do this well. He needs a thorough training in elocution. The most faithful practice is worth while. Read the testimony of Mr. Beecher, given to the Yale students, regarding his own painstaking work in this direction; and if it was of value to him, who may wisely dispense with it? But, he is not to become an elocutionist. He must be a careful student of style; compelling the great writers and speakers to share with him their secrets. But, he is not to become a mere stylist. The preacher should be familiar with the great movements in the Christian church. But, he is not to become a specialist in church history. The principles of interpretation demand his devoted study. He must, if possible, be able to read his Bible in the original tongues; for the most effective preaching is always biblical. But, he is to be the maker of expository sermons, not expositions. Over the profound themes of Christian theology he must brood, and agonize, and pray. But, even here he may build no home; he is not to be a discoverer of truth, but a disseminator of truth. The great verities as revealed in the Divine Word, and verified by his own experience and the Christian consciousness, these he is to persuade men to accept and live. His passion is not to know; but to know, that he may tell. The angel of his vision did not point up the mountain, to the hiding place of great treasure; but down to the valley, filled with starving men. He longs to know of that treasure, but if

he finds it, he will not stay there to exploit its wealth; but, seizing as much as he can carry, will rush back to save his dying parish.

The art of persuasion is not something peculiar to preaching, but is of general use in life. The child turns to it early, and often acquires an adroitness in its use that is the marvel of those who have forgotten about their own childhood; the man who sells or buys reduces it to an exact science; and the traditions of the bar abound with instances of the triumphs of famous pleaders. But there is one thing about persuasion as employed by the true preacher that is unique. The merchant persuades that he may sell his goods; the lawyer to win his case; but the true preacher only that he may do men good. It is as if the merchant forgot his own profits, and sought only to send into the homes of his customers those things that would minister to their comfort and well-being. It is as if the lawyer sought only to persuade the jury only to do right.

I have in my library a book that held a place of honor on the parlor table in my father's house. It is a life of Adoniram Judson. Stamped in gold on the cover is a design representing Mr. Judson preaching to a native of Burma; and beneath are the words of Paul: "I seek not yours, but you." That expresses the characteristic of true preaching—seeking men only to do them good. Persuading them into the kingdom, not to add to personal success, not to strengthen one's denomination or church; but solely to do them good. The best missionary sermons even, are those that are prepared with less thought about an increased collection, than about enlarged hearts. We seek not yours but you; your best good; your salvation; your growth in Christly character. This is the one motive in all real preaching. Alas, the inward shame that comes with the discovery of the base alloys that are mixed with the gold of our devotion; and we realize that we are not better preachers, because we are not better men.

I presume that here are some good people who would be disposed to quarrel with me because I place this motive of seeking the good of men at the center of true preaching, instead of placing there the glory of God. Well, I will not quarrel with them, for if they understand what I mean, and what the glory of God means, there is nothing to quarrel about. These two things are one. Whatever is for man's good is always for God's glory. God's glory is like the rays of the sun; which at the same time are the sun's glory, and the earth's health. And I have justification for stating the motive thus from God's own expression of his thought. "And God said to Jonah, Should I not spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?" God was thinking, not of himself, but of the Ninevites—yes, and of their cattle. He was grieved that his servant should so easily forget men, while thinking of his own reputation as a prophet. When one has caught something of the real significance of the death of Christ for a lost world, to place man's good as the central motive of preaching, is but to express the Divine thought in human terms.

III.

I have thus attempted to present a few judgments regarding the essential nature of persuasion, in the hope of inciting my young brethren to study the art of it; and make it characteristic of their preaching. According to the plan I had in mind for this address, it remains for me now, only to show the importance of persuasion because of the effect of a definite purpose to persuade upon the preacher himself.

1. And first I ask you to note that such a purpose, clearly conceived, tends to give an exalted conception of the worth of man.

What is this being for whom one is to subordinate his literary culture and love of learning? for whose sake,

even the truth is to be sought, rather than for its own? this being whose persuasion for God is the supreme thing to which we are consecrated? These are questions that will press for an answer.

It seems natural for men not to place a very high estimate upon men. However well we may regard ourselves and some other men, we are not disposed to hold men in general as being of very great worth. If it is not natural to thus judge, it certainly is very easy. Many men are weak; many are ignorant; many seem devoid of high moral sense; most are selfish; some are cruel; some are swayed by bestial passions. Not long ago, in our own land, men bought and sold men. To-day they are used like machines; driven like beasts; fleeced and befooled for other men's profit. Mr. Barnum professed to believe that the public liked to be humbugged; the merchant laughs at the gullibility of the bargain hunter; the lawyer laughs at the jury he twists around his finger; and the politician writes it as a part of his creed that the people are mostly fools—and the rest knaves.

How men are divided into classes, and set over against each other! First there are the great racial divisions; then the national; and within these the political, social, economic, intellectual, moral, and even religious—the one despising, or suspecting, or hating, or patronizing the other; but nowhere reverence for man, because he is man. Even that ringing line of Robert Burns,

“A man 's a man for a' that,”

is after all, not a note of recognition of man's essential dignity as man, but the defiant answer that “Honest Poverty” flings back at the pretensions of mere wealth and rank.

And men are so hard to help. So blind to their highest interests; so base in their ingratiitudes; so fickle in their attachments; so feeble in the setting of their wills toward the good; so strong in their love for sin. The reformer struggles with them for a while, and then gives up in disgust. The righteous prophet, flaming with hatred for sin,

ends by hating the sinner too.

But with God all this is different. He loves, not only men, but man; not only Enoch and Abraham and David, but man. Not only Israel, but all flesh. He has made him in his own image, and placed him in the seat of honor. This was the marvel of the writer of the eighth psalm: "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitest him?"

For thou hast made him but little lower than God;
And crownest him with glory and honor.
Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;
Thou hast put all things under his feet."

And amid the awful havoc sin has wrought, God does not despair; the very greatness of the ruin, but reminds him of man's inherent dignity. In the wreckage of the fair temple, he sees "the beams still overlaid with gold; and the stones set with costly jewels." He will not give him up. No, not that, but this—he was not taken unawares; he saw this from the beginning; he counted the cost before he made him a living soul. Nothing in heaven shall be esteemed too precious to be used in the rescue. From the foundation of the world he prepared himself a lamb for the sacrifice, in the person of his only begotten Son. The Psalmist was amazed that God should set man over the works of his hands; what would he have thought if he could have seen Calvary?

This is God's estimate of man. And God makes no mistakes; he knows values. Oh, a wondrous race is in the making here! Through pain and tears, through struggle and burden bearing, and, through the blood of the cross, there is coming forth a people for God's own possession—created by himself, and then redeemed by himself—for himself. And eligibility comes not from birth or any

earthly accident—it comes from just being a man. God will work this miracle of grace on any man who does not hinder him.

This is God's estimate of man; and in some real sense it must become the estimate of every one who is a successful persuader of men for God. Martin Luther's old teacher used to salute his boys as he entered the school-room, because among them there might be the future leaders. He saluted a possibility; the possibility that a leader in the making might be there. The real preacher has learned a better lesson. As he stands before men, he salutes them. He too salutes a possibility, but in another sense; not the possibility that *may be*, but that *is* in every human soul.

2. Helping to a true conception of the worth of man, the purpose to persuade will help also to develop a sympathy with man. There can be no persuasion without this; and very necessity will compel the seeking for it. But there will be better aid than the whip of necessity; for appreciation begets sympathy. Believing in men, creates a desire to understand them. To know their point of view; their hopes and fears; their struggles; and their enemies of every sort. Dull people become interesting, repulsive people attractive, if we can look, ever so little, through God's eyes at the men he loves.

3. And when appreciation of the worth of man has come, and with it, sympathy with him; then will come also something of the mind that was in Christ Jesus when he took upon himself the form of a servant. The service of man will appear, what it really is, a high honor.

What strange changes love works. The missionary lately come to his far-off field, surrounded by strange people and barbarous sights, puts it in his prayer that he may be permitted, please God, to go home to die surrounded by those who are of his own blood and color and speech. But after he has served a third or a half of a century, then, home—where is it, but where he has done his work? And his own people—who, if not those who

are his own children in the Gospel,—“his joy and his crown.” He prefers now to have their dusky hands minister to him in the last hours; and close his eyes when dead.

To such a career, brethren of the Seminary, you are looking forward. I offer you my congratulations. And when the work of redemption has been completed, and the time for the manifestation of the sons of God has arrived, may it be yours to stand in the presence of the King, surrounded by a goodly company of those, who through your persuation, have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

BOOK REVIEWS.**I. CHURCH HISTORY.****The Disciples of Christ.**

By Errett Gates, Ph. D., Associate in Church History, University of Chicago. New York. The Baker & Taylor Co. 1905.

This little volume of 346 pages belongs to "The Story of the Churches" series, for which the Baptist volume was prepared by Professor Vedder. Dr. Gates represents the most advanced thought of his denomination and his attitude toward Baptists is irenic in the highest degree. While he has a very high appreciation of the ability of Alexander Campbell as a controversialist and a party leader, he is fully alive to his weaknesses and extravagances, and still more so to those of many of his contemporaries and successors, who without his genius have carried to extremes the most objectionable phases of his teachings. He does full justice, I think, to the Baptists in his narration of the controversies and proceedings that led to Campbell's separation from the Baptists as whose champion he had for some years been regarded and who had built up a widespread influence among them. Referring to the application of Campbell's maxim: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent," our author remarks: "The principle had both a positive and negative application. It was with respect to the 'order of things' that they were chiefly concerned. It was a simpler task to put into practice the ritual precepts and examples of the New Testament than its ethical and spiritual precepts and examples. They were not oblivious to the fact that the N. T. taught a 'spirit of things' as well as an 'order of things' but they joined issue upon the order. They found that the Scriptures not only spoke of the Lord's supper as being celebrated on the first day of the week, and of baptism as an immersion or burial in water, and of deacons and

elders as constituting the official organization of the local church, and of reception of persons into the church upon a confession of their faith and baptism—all of which they put into practice; but they also found that the Scriptures spoke of the holy kiss, of feet washing, of mutual exhortation in public meetings, of the 'amen' at the close of the prayer, of eating the Lord's supper in the evening, of baptism in streams of water, of kneeling in prayer, of community of goods, of the silence of women in churches—all of which were tried in various churches in the beginning, but never with the approval of the leaders. These things were regarded as 'the circumstantialia of Christian worship,' which should be treated with freedom and forbearance. The Baptists, however, could not tell where the principle would lead them, for it was capable of endless application and experiment. . . While each church was perfectly free and independent, there was one master mind, one controlling genius, who was leading them. He spoke through the pages of the *Christian Baptist*. The mind and personality of Alexander Campbell dominated the entire movement. After he had spoken there was no use for any one else to speak. . . But these Reformers respected the 'silence of Scripture' quite as much as the 'speech of Scripture.' This plunged them into extravagances and extremes in the other direction, much to the annoyance and alarm of the Baptists. Where there was not a 'Thus saith the Lord' for a Baptist belief or usage, there was ready a 'Thus saith the Reformer' *against* it, and the Scriptures were made to speak quite as loudly against some things as for other things. One after another the cherished customs and institutions of the Baptist order were swept away, as having no sanction in the word of God, and there was no telling what would go next. There was no precept or example in the N. T. for the use of creeds as bonds of fellowship, or for the examination of converts as to their Christian experience, or for ministerial calls, clerical authority, associations of churches, missionary societies, Bible societies, tract

societies or Sunday-schools. Wherever the new reformation prevailed all these things were done away. No wonder it looked like disorganization and anarchy to a Baptist who was not captivated by it. What response but opposition could be expected on the part of a strong, established, and respectable body, such as the Baptist denomination, to the inroads of such lawlessness? Whether in the majority or the minority the faithful among the Baptists stood up in defense of their system" (p. 154-158).

The author's description of the process of separation is informing, graphic, objective. The following sentences indicate clearly his attitude to the matter of separation: "To the degree that the Reformers urged the Baptists to give up their creeds, their doctrines, and human inventions, to that degree they held on to them and discovered new reasons for holding on. In this controversy as in most controversies, where there is truth and honesty on both sides, and error and prejudice on both sides, it is difficult, if not impossible, to say which side should surrender. In this, as always, it was fought out to the bitter end. Since that time the Baptists have given up their creeds, have modified their Calvinism, their requirements of an examination and experience for membership in the church, and have reduced the authority of associations; while the Reformers as 'Disciples of Christ' have given up their opposition to missionary, Bible, and tract societies, salaried clergy, association of churches, have recoiled from the literalism of the authority of primitive precept and example, and above all have sweetened in spirit towards those that differ from them. Such modifications and moderations did not seem possible to the parties in the midst of the conflict." (p. 175-6).

Dr. Gates shows, with full command of facts, that from 1813-30 the "Reformers" worked almost exclusively among Baptists, and how having been cast out and disowned by the Baptists, Campbell, contrary to his wishes and professions, instead of leading a great undenomi-

national, unifying movement, was obliged to organize his followers into a separate denomination, which was to take its place side by side with the denominations whose existence as such he considered unwarrantable. It was natural that even now he should choose for his fellow-believers a neutral name that would carry with it the semblance of non-partisanship. Campbell preferred the name "Christian," the followers of B. W. Stone preferred the designation "Disciples of Christ." Both titles are still used by different sections of the denomination.

The union of Campbell's immediate followers with like-minded parties that had arisen somewhat independently under other leaders is well described, as is also the "Early Growth and Organization" of the denomination. The chapter on "The Rise of Internal Controversy" shows interestingly how the schism occurred between those who insisted on carrying out, without Campbell's intelligence and vitality, his most extreme teachings regarding rejection of human institutions and literalistic adherence to Scriptural precept, and those that came to see the need of following other denominations in the use of human means for the diffusion of the truth. In the progressive movement Isaac Errett was the leader. Errett's maxim was: "Let the bond of union among the baptized be Christian character in place of orthodoxy—right doing in place of exact thinking."

Chapters follow on "Missionary Organization," "Evangelism, Journalism, Education, and Church Growth," and "Recent Tendencies and Problems." This last treats in an appreciative way of the growth of liberal sentiments in the denomination and the growing tendency to cultivate the friendliest relations with other denominations and to participate in the great general movements for the promotion of religion and of moral reform. Special attention is called to the education of a large number of young ministers of the denomination in Harvard, Yale, and Union Theological Seminary, the establishment of the Divinity House in connection with

the University of Chicago, with H. L. Willett, who had been educated at Yale, as dean, and the appointment of several of these scholars educated under liberalizing influences to presidencies and professorships in the institutions of the denomination, as indications that liberalism is making rapid advances in spite of the denunciations of the denominational press.

The author closes with these significant words: "There is new hope for union in the increasing agreement among all Christians to regard Christianity as something essentially spiritual and ethical, and therefore universal and practical. The hope of a universal unity lies in the spiritual. The one lesson of this history is, that the letter destroys unity while the spirit makes it alive."

Baylor Theological Seminary.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN...

Balthasar Hübmaier. The Leader of the Anabaptists.

By Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905.

This is another volume of the admirable series of "Heroes of the Reformation," edited by Prof. Samuel Macauley Jackson. It is in all respects a worthy companion to its predecessors in the series and constitutes one of the most important works on the Anabaptists that has yet appeared in English. In fact it is the first adequate treatment of the life of any Anabaptist leader which has been offered to English readers. Hübmaier was beyond question the ablest and sanest of the Anabaptist leaders, gathering up into his system the best elements of the movement while rejecting its extravagances. Prof. Vedder has presented us an admirable study of the man and that part of the entire movement with which he had to do. In this work he had the use of the excellent productions of Loserth and Hoschek who preceded him in this field. He made large use of the results of their labors of course, but has proceeded in a thoroughly independent manner. He has made a careful study of the sources, has visited

the scenes of the story, and often dissents from the opinions of the biographers named. The facts of Hübmaier's life are related in the clear, graphic style for which Prof. Vedder is noted, and the whole of the life is brought into its proper relations to the Anabaptists and to the larger movements of history. Space does not permit an extended account of this excellent work, but a few things will be of interest.

On the question of the act of baptism Prof. Vedder finds that Hübmaier practiced affusion throughout his life, p. 143; "that the Swiss Anabaptists began with the practice of affusion, but soon generally adopted immersion, seems to be the most probable conclusion from all the facts accessible. Elsewhere we find definite proofs of immersion only among the Anabaptists of Augsburg, and in Poland, where the practice was introduced in 1575," p. 144. "The later Anabaptists, known as Mennonites, seem to have consistently practised affusion from the first—at least there is no case known to the contrary, except the congregation at Rhynsburg, which began to practice immersion in 1620," p. 145.

As to Hübmaier's spirit and ability the author says, "As a man of letters, Hübmaier deserves to be ranked along with Erasmus and Melancthon—as a man of letters, be it noted, not as a scholar," p. 155. "It is his power of expression, his sense of literary form, his art of putting things, that sets him alongside of Erasmus," p. 156. "The ethical tone of Hübmaier's writings also marks him for distinction among the writers of his age. He is scrupulously fair to his adversaries," p. 157, in this respect differing from all the great leaders of his time. He was a master in the Scriptures and even modern scholarship has little fault to find with his interpretations.

The value of the work is greatly increased by the quotation at length of many of Hübmaier's more important writings, setting forth with force and distinctness his peculiar views. A further feature of value is a large number of excellent cuts taken from superb photographs

and old cuts that make the scenes of the subject's life live again before us. All in all Prof. Vedder has done a most excellent piece of work and it ought to be widely read among us.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Early Eastern Christianity.

By F. Crawford Burkitt, Lecturer in Palæography in the University of Cambridge. St. Margaret's Lectures 1904 on the Syriac-Speaking Church. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1904. pp. 228.

Christianity rose in close proximity to the great Syriac-speaking population of Western Asia. In fact Jesus himself and his disciples probably spoke a dialect of this family of languages. The Jew soon turned away from the new teaching and the new Master, but it is known that the Syriac world was early and deeply moved by Christianity. And yet little that is definite and valuable has been known about the church in these regions and among these people. We have known that Edessa was the new missionary center and that the church had considerable vigor and strength, but little more. Hence the welcome we accord these lectures. The author is familiar with all that can now be known concerning this church and has made careful use of his scant material. He has chapters on "The Early Bishops of Edessa," "The Bible in Syriac," "The Early Syriac Theology," "Marriage and the Sacraments," "Bardaisan and His Disciples," and "The Acts of Judas, Thomas and the Hymn of the Soul." The author studies these various subjects in detail and lays before us much curious information in this short treatise. These lectures constitute perhaps the best treatise on the subject.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Political History of Europe From 1815 to 1848.

Based on Continental Authorities.

By B. H. Carroll, Jr., LL. B., M. A., Th. D., Ph. D. (Berole), etc. Baylor University Press, Waco, Texas.

This work of over 200 pages is devoted to one of the most interesting and important periods in modern his-

tory. The work is intended primarily for university students but is worthy of a wider reading. It "does not pretend to be more than a compilation from the best and most accessible and usually untranslated continental authorities." The author puts into attractive and convenient form for American students the work which the great German historians have done in this period. He was a brilliant student in the University of Berlin and belongs to that school of historians—"political historians," Lamprecht calls them. He places a high estimate on the place of politics in modern history, in the opinion of the reviewer too high an estimate. On page 15 he says: "Modern History is then externally, practically, diplomacy with the soft voice of Jacob but with the hairy sinewy hand of Esau that holds a naked two-mouthed sword; internally it is the story of parties and partisanship." If that is a just definition of modern history, then modern history does not tell us much about the life of the people with whom it deals. Political history is but one department of history, a very interesting and important department, capable of easy and dramatic treatment, but only a department. Professor Carroll has mastered his authorities and writes with the freedom and force of one who is at home in his subject. His work is in no sense a slavish compilation; it is his own work. His style is vigorous, clear and vivid. He is never dull. His work is somewhat marred by occasional colloquialisms, exaggerations, German idioms and untranslated phrases, while the proof-reading was very badly done, due, as the author explains in a note, to the haste with which it must be finished.

This is not the first publication of its brilliant young author. It is a delight to welcome a book of this kind from one of our Southern professors. Our colleges are laying more and more stress upon history and it is to be hoped that we shall soon see much productive scholarship among our professors of history.

W. J. McGLATHLIN.

Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt.

Von Hermann Barge. Friedrich Brandstetter, Leipzig. 1905. 2 volumes.

The most notable of Martin Luther's early coadjutors was Karlstadt or Carlstadt as we are accustomed to spell the name in English. Nearly the same age as Luther he studied in the same university, that of Erfurt. He began his career as a teacher in the University of Wittenberg in 1505, three years before Luther came thither. Their development toward the acceptance of new views and the break with the old church was on parallel lines. Indeed for some time Carlstadt seems to have been the more influential and prominent of the two. But Luther was by far the more powerful personality, and from 1517 on gradually forged ahead. Carlstadt, however, grasped the principle of the absolute authority of the Scriptures earlier and more firmly than Luther. He was decidedly more radical than his great colleague, and was ready to do in 1521 what Luther did not do until 1525. This difference led to an estrangement between these two friends, reformers and professors of the same university in the early years of the Reformation. Carlstadt was driven from the university in 1522 and spent the remainder of his long life at various places as pastor and professor. He departed from the prevailing Lutheran doctrine on several important articles and in some points agreed with the Anabaptists. For this reason he was compelled to endure untold abuse from his contemporaries, and has failed to receive from modern German historians the attention he deserved. They judged him largely through the eyes of Luther and hence neglected or abused him. The present work is the first adequate treatment that Carlstadt has ever received. It is possibly somewhat too favorable, though the author does not spare his subject's weakness. The views of Carlstadt are studied in minute detail in a thorough German fashion which is sometimes too detailed for easy or popular reading. Incidentally one sees Luther in a new light which is not at

all flattering. Henceforth this work will be, at least for many years, the chief authority on Carlstadt and that interesting phase of the German Reformation. It is a contribution to the history of the highest value.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

II. CHRISTIAN LIFE.

God's Image in Man.

By James Orr, D. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905.

The Inward Light.

By Amory H. Bradford, D. D. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York. 1905. \$1.20.

Life and Light.

By George Dana Boardman, D. D. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia. 1905.

The books here grouped as akin in subject matter and symptomatic of the thinking of the times are sharply differentiated in manner of approach and treatment. Broadly speaking they all deal with 'the newest thinking' of the day, the first with the theological, the second with the spiritual, and the third with the vital and practical phase of it. Dr. Orr avowedly sets himself against "the newer tendency to surrender vital aspects of Christian doctrine at the shrine of what is regarded as 'the modern view of the world,'" boldly declaring that in many respects the Christian view of the world is not the so-called modern view; in fact, is irreconcilable with it, and that we ought to have the courage to avow this and take the consequences. Dr. Bradford clearly accepts "the modern view of the world" and is willing to take the consequences theologically; but he calls for an ampler definition and a new application of the law of evolution, and a new and fuller recognition of "the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." His book represents and pleads for a renaissance of Quakerism. The posthumous work of Dr. Boardman is composed of choice and characteristic thoughts from his writings

clustered about Paul's definition of life: "To me to live is Christ," and John's words of Jesus: "In Him was life and the life was the Light of men;" followed by forty-four pages of memorabilia. Dr. Orr does not believe that the Christian view of the world is irreconcilable with true science or sound philosophy, but he shows in a masterful way that it is irreconcilable with many of the theories that profess to be based on science and philosophy; carrying the war into Africa and disclosing the utter conflict of Biblical and modern views of Man and Sin, of the Origin and Primitive Condition of Man, of Man and Sin in Relation to Redemption, the Restoration and Perfecting of the Divine Image, etc., etc. Dr. Bradford though his chapters were nearly all written before Sabatier's notable volume, "The Religions of Authority vs. The Religion of the Spirit" had appeared, avows similar convictions, though reached along a different path, and likewise finds the source of authority within the soul and not in church, or creed, or book.

He makes a strong and cumulative plea for a more courageous, consistent and all-embracing recognition of the Inward Light, the Immanent God, and the Continuous Leadership of the Spirit, contending that the Inward Light is from God, who dwells in humanity as He is immanent in the universe, and that it may be implicitly trusted. Dr. Boardman in these selections, as in all his writings, evinces his realization of the fact, that spiritual experience and truth are greater than any expression of them, that in all forms of sincere faith and art and life there is some bit of the Christ, some measure of spiritual truth; and that Christianity is larger, not only than any particular denomination, but, also larger than 'the church universal.' So while thoroughly loyal to his own denomination, he is generosity itself in dealing with others, and keen to distinguish between things vital and things formal, things transient and things eternal.

The first book is analytical, argumentative and largely polemical, being addressed to the philosophical or theo-

logical thinker; the second is mystical, poetical, and, in contrast with the first, vague, but only so far, it may be claimed, as mysticism, poetry and vagueness are necessary characteristics of that truth of spirit and experience which transcends exactness of definition and logic; and the third, while utterly non-polemical and irenic, is varied enough in its addresses, studies and outlines to be thought-provoking and inspiring to all classes of readers. The memorabilia is made up of glowing appreciations and character delineations by many friends and admirers of the scholarly and lovable Dr. Boardman. The devout soul will find abundant food for thought and rich spiritual nutriment in all three volumes, read separately or together.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Happy Life.

By Charles W. Eliot, LL. D. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York

Faith and Life.

By Charles E. Jefferson. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York. 1905.

Rational Living.

By Henry Churchill King. The MacMillan Co., New York. 1905.
\$1.25.

Here are three books that we have found it interesting and suggestive to consider together. The first, by President Eliot, of Harvard, ante-dated Pastor Wagner's 'Simple Life,' by six years, in a plea for simplicity of living quite as masterful, some think, as that which has been so industriously exploited and so widely read in Wagner's volume. The opinion has even been ventured that it only lacked the recognition given by the President of the United States to Wagner's plea, to make it quite as popular and more powerful! To our mind the difference is essential. President Eliot's plea is for 'the Happy Life' on grounds that are essentially epicurean, even though in conclusion he asks us to consider 'whether the rational conduct of life on the this-world principles he lays down would differ in any important respect from the right conduct of life on the principles of the Christian gospels.' He scouts the doctrine of total

depravity as the invention of a morbid human imagination (p. 25), speaks of 'the Oriental, hot-climate figment that labor is a curse,' asserts that 'the family affections are the ultimate source of civilized man's idea of a loving God,' nowhere intimates any need of a Savior from sin, or of spiritual renewal, in order to perfection of character or true happiness, but coolly says 'we must never distress ourselves because we cannot fully understand the moral principles on which the universe is conducted—an ant might as well expect to understand the constitution of the sun!' Dr. Charles Edward Jefferson, pastor of Broadway Tabernacle, New York, in *Faith and Life*, discourses in a no less rational, but more Christian way, surely, on 'the nature and place of faith in the Christian life,' pointing out that Jesus began his ministry by urging men to believe, and on the last night of his earthly life still had that greatest word upon his lips, 'Believe!' Everywhere He makes the forgiveness of sins, spiritual health, real peace and happiness to be dependent on faith in Him. Faith, however, is not to be confused with credulity, is not the antithesis of reason, is not something occult, esoteric, but something in essence common to all human experience, and in its highest form within reach of the humblest. 'Do you hope for pardon, peace, to be a better, stronger man, to grow more and more into the likeness of Jesus Christ? Then give substance to your hope, and in this way prove that you are a man of faith' (p. 25). In *Rational Living*, President Henry Churchill King, has done this generation a real service in bringing together, out of the riches of wide research, the "four great emphases" of psychological study in popular form, and pointed out their direct practical bearing on the conduct of life. He quotes freely from the masters in psychology, that the reader may judge of the adequacy of the grounds on which are based the practical counsels for rational living, in respect to Growth, Character, Happiness, and Influence; and in conclusion shows that "just these ideal conditions to

which psychology leads us *Christ declares to be actual.*" His work has this shining merit, that he has presented the fundamental facts of psychology, together with the practical counsels which they impose for a life in rational accord with our nature, more comprehensively and completely than any other writer, and yet in such a way as to show their essential harmony with true Christianity.

GEO. B. EAGER.

III. APOLOGETICS AND POLEMICS.

The Reconstruction of Religious Belief.

By W. H. Mallock. Harper & Bros. 1905. New York and London. pp. 303.

The title of this book does not accurately suggest the contents. The author does not discuss the reconstruction of religious belief, but only a reconstruction of the defenses of that belief. By "religious belief" he does not mean Christianity, although the implications at several points are that he is a Christian. He deals with the three fundamental beliefs which lie at the basis of religion. These are, first, the existence and goodness of God; second, human freedom; and third, immortality.

The author undertakes to meet the teachings of materialistic science in the interest of religion in a new way. He thinks that both the "clerical" and the philosophic attempts to reply to materialism are at fault. The clerical method is at fault in its effort to show that science is incorrect in some of its details when science insists upon nature as a closed system of causes and effects. The philosophers, likewise, fail of the point when they reduce the universe of science to a system of idealism. Both classes of apologists, according to the author aim at the same thing, that is, to establish God's existence and to rescue freedom from the perils of a system which cannot brook its presence in any form. The clerical method fails to disprove the detailed claims of science and subjective idealism, as urged by the philosophers is simply absorbed

by science, which then presents us with a universe with mind in the foreground instead of matter, but equally closed and fixed and exclusive of any real freedom. Accepting all that science teaches as to the universe the author thinks it is possible to show that theism is a necessary implication of all science. Purpose, as it appears in chemical and biological processes, and personality in man, are facts of existence which were provided for in the beginning of things and which can only be accounted for by a reference to intelligence and purpose as the explanation of the world in the first place.

The most satisfactory way to approach the matter, however, Mr. Mallock thinks, is to consider the relation of theistic belief to a progressive civilization. This he does by pointing out that the three ideals of our civilization, the True, the Beautiful and the Good, have their necessary roots in theism. Theism thus appears so fertile as a practical and social principle that its rejection would be to lapse into barbarism.

A glance at one or two of his arguments in detail will indicate his method of proof. The ideals implicit in our modern civilization are, as agreed by all parties, the True, the Beautiful and the Good. Science pursues Truth as its ideal. A psychic fact which governs all human effort is the value of the object sought to the man who seeks. Nature answers this psychic demand of man's nature in two ways. She may yield results of practical value for man's comfort and enjoyment. The discovery of scientific truth promotes human welfare practically. Now, if this be not the implicit desire in man's search for truth, there can be but one other, viz., the discovery in or behind nature of an intelligent Principle or Being, who answers man's need as a companion, who can respond to his intellectual cravings and satisfy him. The investigation of nature as a whole cannot yield any practical result of the first kind. Therefore all scientific search for ultimate truth is an implicit acknowledgment or search for an intellectual Companion. So reasons the

author, and correctly. The materialist might, however, carry out the analysis of the first alternative and claim that implicit in the search of nature in its totality is the practical interest, the hope that somehow the result of the discovery of ultimate truth will merely promote the ends of ordinary human welfare.

In like manner the author claims that our ideal of goodness must be traced ultimately to an absolute standard and that such a standard is to be found only in God.

The discussion of the problems of evil and of freedom is one of the most interesting in the book. That both problems are for man in his present circumstances insoluble is freely admitted. Both contain an irreconcilable contradiction. Moral evil as we know it introduces a factor into the theistic problem which cannot be fully overcome in our attempts to prove God's goodness. The existence of goodness, however, must also be accounted for and its presence in the world is at least an offset to that of evil, and must be referred to some source essentially good.

The idea of freedom contains a contradiction also. Indeterminate freedom, capacity for choice independently of the prevailing motive, robs the idea of freedom of its moral content. So also freedom as determined by the prevailing motive, which itself is determined by pre-existing circumstances, robs it of its moral content. The consciousness of freedom, however; as self-determination and its universal value in the social life of man, abundantly established by the author, warrants our acceptance of the fact of freedom regardless of the general facts of science in the physical sphere.

Mr. Mallock sets aside these contradictions arising out of the problems of evil and of freedom as follows: All our ultimate conceptions, scientific, religious, and philosophical contain contradictions. Mansel is cited to show this in the religious and Herbert Spencer in the scientific realm. The presence of contradiction, therefore in an ultimate conception is not to be taken as a badge of its

falsity but rather of its truth. Or more accurately expressed we are warranted in asserting that in order for a thing to be true in itself it must for us appear to contain a contradiction. The existence of evil therefore and of contradictory notions of freedom is no barrier to belief in God's goodness and in the reality of freedom.

From a literary standpoint the book is very attractive. It abounds in telling illustration and the style generally is most excellent. Much of the argument is quite convincing, although more is conceded at times than seems necessary, to unbelieving science. The book will prove valuable to many doubting minds and ought to have a very wide reading.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion.

By Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D., LL. D. F. H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, Toronto.

This volume consists of the Cole lectures for 1905 delivered before Vanderbilt University, at Nashville, Tenn. The lectures are announced as "an attempt to interpret contemporary religious conditions." Dr. Hall brings to his task breadth of view, sympathy with the best elements in the older as well as the newer types of thought, and a profound conviction of the importance and urgency of the missionary task of Western Christianity. Indeed the predominant note of these lectures is missionary. They are in very large part a discussion of the relations of the western forms of Christianity to the missionary problem in Asia. Dr. Hall has had exceptional opportunities for informing himself upon the missionary movement in the East, and for reaching matured conclusions as to conditions and difficulties there. He was a few years ago Barrows' lecturer in India and has published a volume of inspiring lectures on religious experience, as expounded to his Oriental audiences.

Dr. Barrows holds in general in the volume before us that the general theory of Western Christendom as to the missionary task in Asia is in part inadequate and at fault

in certain important respects. For example, he thinks that it is a mistake for us of the West to attempt to establish a religious protectorate over the East, and to seek to perpetuate the sectarian divisions of the West as the fixed and final form of Christianity. He holds rather that there are certain universal elements which constitute the essence of Christianity and that when these have been imparted through missionary labors to the eastern people, we should naturally look for a development of Oriental Christianity after its own kind. The West, Dr. Hall thinks, has failed to understand and appreciate the East, and that the spiritual history of the East, resulting in failure and disappointment, has prepared it in a very peculiar way for the acceptance of Christ and his salvation.

The "larger church" of Christ about which Dr. Hall writes does not receive exact definition. He thinks the time is not ripe for such definition, but holds that the current dissatisfaction with the strife and discord among Christian denominations is an evidence that the *status quo* of Protestantism cannot permanently satisfy. If it should be inferred from the foregoing very inadequate statement of Dr. Hall's position that he is an advocate of a Christianity watered down and weakened, or converted into a pale ethical shadow of the original, this would be a serious error. On the contrary Dr. Hall insists upon the cross and the resurrection of Jesus as the core and center of the Gospel, that his atonement and his glorified resurrection life were in primitive apostolic Christianity, and are to-day its very essence. He deprecates strongly the prevailing tendency to limit the authoritativeness and permanently valid element of the New Testament to the historic life of Jesus as recorded in the synoptic Gospels. He urges that the Gospel of John and the Pauline epistles are the correct interpretation of Christ and that these alone yield to us the complete Christ of the early Evangel, the saving Christ of succeeding centuries.

The reader whose interest in the progress of the king-

dom of God on earth is deep and earnest cannot fail to respond to the general spirit and purpose of this volume, *i. e.*, to its yearning for a more efficient missionary Christianity, and for a Christianity which shall be fully awake to its privilege and responsibility. Few will dissent from the view that the present divided state of western Christianity is not Christ's ideal. While there will be much difference of opinion as to what the "larger church" of Christ should be, yet few will be disposed to question the view that the missionary motive and impulse are a powerful means for the realization of Christ's will on all disputed points. Obedience to Christ in his redemptive purpose will solve a thousand problems. Men may come to see after all that that "larger church" exists already, and that what is needed is simply a making general of principles already in operation, not in the form of a Christian union under some dominating ecclesiastical center, but under the operation of the "universal elements" of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. E. Y. MULLINS.

Faith and The Faith.

By Rev. T. T. Eaton, D. D., Ph. D. F. H. Revell Company, and Baptist Book Concern, Louisville, Ky. 78 pages.

This booklet of 78 pages seeks to accentuate the value and importance of faith and the necessity of "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." It is divided into two parts. Part I. deals with Faith and considerable space is devoted to the superiority of faith to doubt and to reason. The author thinks the verb *faithe* to correspond with the noun faith should be restored to current usage just as believe corresponds with the noun belief. The reviewer agrees with the author in this.

The author condemns doubt in every form. "Doubt always brings paralysis and death" (p. 18). To doubt the wisdom of a sinful life and to turn to righteousness does not mean that doubt has any value. Doubt is like letting go one round of the ladder while faith is grasping the next round and climbing upward. But doubt has no value,

even though it is the letting go the lower round. So reasons the author. This is, to say the least, a questionable conclusion.

The author does not attach much importance to reason as compared with faith. "The function of reason is negative; necessary to be sure but negative." "The one use of reason is to enable us to avoid making mistakes" (p. 24). "All real progress in human history rests, not on scientific investigation, philosophical inquiry and logical deduction, but on the heroes the workers and the martyrs, the men of faith" (p. 11).

Part II. is devoted to The Faith. The author tells us what he means by "the faith," viz: That it is the body of doctrine taught in the Scriptures centering in Christ and his work. In this division of the book the theological battle rages, and the champions on the respective sides shout their battle cries.

There are many strong points made. "It is high time Christians were obeying as they never obeyed before the great command to epi-agonize for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. This faith will not take care of itself. It needs for its maintenance, men and women who are willing to dare and do and die in its behalf. Maintaining it and extending it is our chief business in the world. The hopes of all mankind are centered here. Should this faith perish from the earth, the world would be wrapped in the shadows of a night that is starless. Whatever else fails this faith *must* conquer; whatever else falls, this faith *must* be upheld." pp. 76-77. The tonic of a strong conviction thus runs through many sentences. This conviction sometimes tends to a setting up of things in opposition which are not necessarily opposed. We emphatically dissent from the author's view as to the function of the reason where he declares that the function of reason is merely negative (pp. 24-25). One would think that this was merely an inadvertence if the author had not cited Kant and Huxley as authorities. The theory which he approvingly quotes from Kant is the fundamental

principle of the agnostic philosophy. Huxley, who is also approvingly cited, invented or adopted and made current, the word Agnosticism to describe the mental attitude which Kant expounded. In theology Ritschlianism is founded on the same theory of knowledge and the reason.

The author's praiseworthy desire to exalt faith did not need this theory of the reason to help it out.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Moral Dignity of Baptism.

By Rev. J. M. Frost, D. D. Sunday School Board Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. 1905.

No one who is at all familiar with current theological thought can doubt that we have come to a new epoch in the onward progress of denominationism. It was the glory of the mighty Reformation movement that it brought the individual face to face with the Scriptures, with duty and with God. The many denominations which have arisen since were the result of the new conviction and fresh contact of the souls of men with divine truth and life. Denominational conviction for generations has expressed itself in controversy. The form of its assertion has been that of antithesis and antagonism to opposing creeds and confessions. So chronic has this habit become that in many minds there is a fear lest denominational conviction will perish utterly unless its expression is attended by a sharp polemic against these creeds. To such it does not seem to be conceivable that strong assertion, and vigorous faith are possible to one who abandons the attitude of the polemic for that of the truth-seeker simply and solely. But this is a grievous error. The truth is that the sharply polemical writer on denominational matters is, with thousands of people, discredited at the outset. He can of course strengthen the intensity of the polemic spirit in his own adherents, but he does not convince the outsiders whom he should most desire to reach. In other words he commits a most serious

strategical blunder. The hopeful sign of the times in this matter, however, is that discerning minds everywhere are perceiving that there is a better way. As a result a new denominational literature is coming into existence. This literature is not void of conviction. Ineed it throbs with it. But in it truth is stated on its merits and in its larger relations. It is not impoverished by being set forth merely as an opposing view to some particular form of view held by others.

Dr. Frost's book is an excellent example of the better method of dealing with doctrinal peculiarities of the denomination. The doctrine of baptism has been so bound up with polemics, that one rubs his eyes and looks again more closely as he peruses these pages and fails to find any note of bitterness. Here is strong conviction; here is a militant faith. But here also are love and tact. Here are respect and consideration for Christians whose views are opposed. Here are persuasion and argument and exposition, a setting forth of truth in its simplicity and beauty and *on its merits*. The place of baptism in its doctrinal bearings and relations is clearly set forth, and yet we have here a devotional book on baptism. The believer can read it with profit for the strengthening of the intellectual or the spiritual side of his nature.

The book has fourteen chapters and 282 pages. In chapter II. the "Moral Dignity of Baptism" is set forth. This appears in baptism in that it reproduces the august scene of the baptism of Jesus; is an image of the resurrection of Christ; along with the Bible, the Sabbath and the church baptism is a memorial witness for God; it symbolizes great heart experiences of the believer; it emphasizes the doctrine of the Trinity, and it is a prophecy of the resurrection of the bodies of believers. Chapter II. outlines the entire discussion of the book.

There are many things in this book which attract the reviewer's attention and are worthy of special mention. Our space will admit of a few only. Dr. Frost has set forth the evidential value of baptism, along with the

Bible, the Sabbath and the church with much force. Regarding these the author shows that they must be accounted for. They have a history of their own. There is no way in which their rise can be explained save in the Christian way. The ordinance of baptism points back in a convincing way to the great events of history with which it is associated. "These institutions which are here emphasized as monuments to a great event have a history of their own. Not only the event for which they stand but they themselves must be accounted for in the settlement of the question. They have each of them and inseparably, a history of nearly two thousand years. Where did they come from? And how came they with such charm and power? Manifestly they are here, and are traceable to that memorable morning, and to the event which made the day memorable forever; they are here after ceaseless and terrible conflict through the centuries — assailed, often marred, often broken and corrupted; but still here after many seeming failures, but by a succession of glorious triumphs; they are here accepted and accredited in their evidence after the severest testing by the most powerful appliances known to man; they are here as a large part of the world's life to-day, in great and growing power, much the same in form and spirit and purpose as when our Lord first ordained them and sent them on their mission to testify for him." (p.p. 106-107.)

In chapter X. there is an interesting discussion of "The Believer's Risen Life." Dr. Frost gives us in this chapter much needed emphasis upon a New Testament teaching which is too often neglected. The present life of the believer is a resurrection life. In *kind* it is the same life as that which he shall enjoy when his body is raised from the grave. The same divine power is now operating which will then culminate; baptism is the symbol of this resurrection life and should be so interpreted and understood. The doctrine of the resurrection in its spiritual bearings figures much more largely in New Testament

teachings than it does in current Christian teachings. Much in these chapters will tend to correct this deficiency. There are numerous details worthy of mention which we must pass over. Dr. Frost has placed us all under lasting obligations to him. He has broken ground in a new field on a very old subject in a most edifying way. Every pastor should have a copy of this book, and I know of no volume better suited to the young Christian. It is such a book as every convert sorely needs. It interprets for him all those vital and fundamental truths and experiences which enter into the earlier stages of the new life. He will find his heart burning within him as he reads these pages and follows the author in his exposition of the beautiful ordinance appointed by Christ in all its deep doctrinal significance and in its manifold relations. This volume will take its place in the library of our denominational literature as one of its most treasured volumes.

E. Y. MULLINS.

Stones in the Rough, or Contributions Towards a Study of Theology Approached from the Heathen Side of the Fence.

By William Ashmore. Published by A. M. Skinner & Co., Boston.

Dr. William Ashmore is known by name among all who are informed concerning the last half century of Baptist foreign missions. In that time he came, through his distinguished labors in China, to hold front rank among the forces of Christian conquest. The vigor of his intellect, the stalwart orthodoxy of his faith, the successful skill of his labors gave him the reverent attention of any audience of hearers or readers. In his quiet years he is taking in hand to set forth, as the quotation on the cover tells us, "The gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," dedicating it "to the Executive Committee and Administrative Officers of the American Baptist Missionary Union, as illustrative of the Gospel they send out their missionaries to preach — — —"

The work is in four parts, appearing separately, but to

be bound in a single volume of nearly 300 pages. Three parts are now in hand and one may speak confidently of the whole. The work is a combination of natural, systematic and Biblical theology. The style is clear and vigorous, the manner emphatic and frequently polemical, the spirit reverent and earnest. It affects to be "not for critical scholars, who like to discuss every philological feature of the text and every vicissitude which has attended its transmission from the earliest ages, but for common people whose complaint is soul hunger—who are tired of the everlasting doubts of the 'expert,' who want something to feed upon while crossing the desert, who continue to accept the old book just as it is—just as they had it from their fathers, who in turn had it from the apostles and the holy men of old—therefore the shaping of the discussion will be regulated accordingly." At least such is his attitude in Part III. and elsewhere it is similar. Yet he is unable to leave the "expert" and his vagaries alone, frequently attending to him in no uncertain, but in rather uncritical, style. Part I., about forty pages, deals with "the Method of Study and the Reason therefor." The fundamental religious questions are brought forward with a summary of the answers to them in the ethnic faiths, philosophy, science, etc. Part II., some seventy pages, deals with "the Theology of Nature" along lines largely familiar but with individuality and strength. His presentation of the "Gospel in Nature" is in the nature of a discovery and constitutes an original contribution to the subject. Some will find fault with the idea as being unorthodox, but they will do well to study it.

Part III. presents "the Theology of Revelation." Apparently this is to be "in sixteen lines of suggestion" of which only the first appears so far, viz.: "The Doctrine of These Scriptures concerning themselves," a discussion leaving somewhat to be desired. The other fifteen "lines of suggestion" cover all the topics of Biblical Theology.

Part IV. is to discuss "Related Subjects and Issues."

The interest of the work will be found chiefly in the personality of the author, the presentation of the heathen temper and method of approach in the first parts and in the vigorous contention for the simple faith of the times when men prided themselves not on "critical scholarship," even though they were not wanting it. The orthodox faith is the proper furnishing for the missionary.

W. O. CARVER.

History Unveiling Prophecy or Time as an Interpreter.

By H. Grattan Guinness, D. D., Fellow of the Astronomical Society. Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. XXI, 494. Cloth. \$2.00 net.

Dr. Grattan Guinness has long been prominent as a student of prophecy and a leader in missions. Harley College, London, and the *Region Beyond Mission* are the monuments of his missionary activity; the result of his prophetic studies have been given to the world in a series of eight works of which this is the latest. He tells us (p. 393ff) how his interest on the subject began. It was on a visit to Spain in 1870. A new road, which was being cut through a small hill near Madrid, revealed a broad bank of ashes which had been covered for over a century. It proved to be the famous Tuemadero one of twelve places where martyrs were annually burned in Spain under the Inquisition. It was that day when standing breast deep in the ashes of Spanish martyrs that his attention was specially directed to the fulfillment of prophecy in papal history; and the fall of the Pope's temporal power a few months later led him to study and write on the subject. To Dr. Guinness Daniel and the Apocalypse are the very word of God. His principle of interpretation is "*God is His own Interpreter*" in two ways—by written words and acted deeds. So that Scripture is the key to Scripture and Providence to Prophecy. "The historic interpretation of the Apocalypse which rests on this two-fold foundation has been slowly developed under the influence of the divine action in

Providence; it has changed in details with the changing currents of Providence; it has grown with the growth of the knowledge of the plans of Providence; it has been confirmed and sealed by the whole course of Providence. It is no vain, or puerile, or presumptuous speculation. It is a reverent submission to the very Words of God, and a reverent recognition of His acts. God has spoken; He has given an explanation of the central and commanding vision of the prophecy; and God has acted; He has fulfilled its prediction. In pointing to the words and deeds of God we act as His witnesses. What hath God? What hath He done? These are the questions. We are wearied with vain speculations as to the meaning of prophecy which have no other formation than the assertions of men. We are wearied with speculations as to imaginary future fulfillments of prophecies which have been plainly accomplished before our eyes in the past; prophecies on whose accomplishment in the events of Christian history the structure of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century was built; on the fact of whose accomplishment in their days the confessors stood and the martyrs suffered."

Dr. Guinness follows the continuous historical scheme of interpretation and largely adopts the identification of Elliott's great work. Indeed he gives as sponsors of his general view a long and imposing array of great names from the second century down, including Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome and Augustine of the early centuries; Bede, Anselm, Wickliffe and Huss of the middle ages; the great body of Reformers and Puritan Theologians; and of Sir Isaac Newton, Joanthan Edward, Bengel and many others of later date. The interpretations of the Preterist he regards as "fanciful," those of the Futurists as "reveries," and those of many moderns, German and English, as "vague" and reducing the prophecy to "a nebulous mass of anticipations of things in general in human history."

According to our author the four empires of Daniel are Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome; the six seals represent in general the early triumphs of Christianity and the overthrow of the Pagan Roman Empire; the six Trumpets cover the overthrow of the Western Empire by the Goths, and of the Eastern by the Saracens and Turks; the rise of the Papacy and revival of the Roman Empire under Charlemagne, 800 A. D., answers to the prophecy of Rev. 13 being the restoration of the Roman Empire in its second or Gothic form under its revived eighth head; the Reformation explained the vision of the rainbow-crowned angel in Rev. 10; the papal reaction of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries explains the war against the sackcloth clothed witnesses of Rev. 11, whose death, resurrection and ascension finds fulfillment in English Revolution with its restoration to the Protestants of civil and religious freedom; the Seventh Trumpet heralds the Kingdom of Christ and as preparatory thereto ushers in the French Revolution and the vials of wrath outpoured upon the Papacy and Mohammedanism. Dr. Guinness feels that the seventh vial is yet to come and that it will mean the utter overthrow of Babylon the Great, *i. e.*, the Papacy.

This is all built on the year day theory. The author has brought to that view some additional support in Chiseaux's astronomical discoveries of the secular and cyclical character of the periods mentioned in prophecy, the 1260 years and 2300. Both are astronomic cycles harmonizing the lunar months with solar years, the latter being the only cycle, measured by complete centuries, possible within limits applicable to the cause of human history. The difference between the two, 1040 years, harmonizes days, months and years very exactly. The 1260 solar years represent the length of Papal temporal power from the decree of Phocas, 607 A. D., to 1867-70 A. D. The same number of years, lunar or solar, represent the treading down of the Holy City by Mohammedanism, the prophesying of the sackcloth clothed witnesses,

etc., while the "seven times," or 2520 solar years, span the whole period of the four empires beginning with Nabonassar of Babylon, 747 B. C., to the beginning of the French Revolution. In confirmation of the correctness of this theory he adduces a number of remarkable fore-readings of important events such as those of the Bishop of Worcester (p. 170), Gill (191), Sir Isaac Newton (197) and others.

This will be sufficient to indicate the author's view. We need only add that a spirit of sobriety pervades the volume; that Dr. Guinness is careful not to be too dogmatic about the future, abiding thus by his main thesis that history unveils prophecy; and that the book is pervaded by a gracious spirit and sometimes rises into passages of impassioned eloquence. We are bound to express also sympathy with the main position of the treatise. It seems to us most likely that in the Apocalypse we have a forecast of the fortunes of the cause of Christ in the world as i. 19 and iv. i., imply, that throughout the centuries it has served to cheer Christ's faithful ones with the assurance of final victory, and that it is reasonable to expect some measure of identification of the outstanding features of the centuries. If that be so it is quite unreasonable to think that the tremendous figure of the Papacy should be unnoticed. The facts of this book show a remarkable correspondence, to say the least, between its features and duration and those of the apocalyptic Babylon.

There are Old Testament prophecies which found fulfillment in Bible times; is it unreasonable to believe that some of the New Testament prophecies have been fulfilled within the past nineteen centuries? In view of all the facts the view of Dr. Guinness is immensely saner than that which practically denies the fact of predictive prophecy altogether or reduces it to the shrewd guess of some sagacious man.

J. H. FARMER.

IV. NEW TESTAMENT.

The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.

By Shailer Mathews of the Department of Systematic Theology. The Decennial Publications, Second Series Vol. XII. The University of Chicago Press. 1905. Pp. XX, 338. Price \$2.50 net.

This is a comprehensive survey and application of the Jewish Messianic hope under four historical divisions: "Part I. The Messianism of Judaism," "Part II. The Messianism of Jesus," "Part III. The Messianism of the Apostles," "Part IV. Christian Messianism and the Christian Religion." Dr. Mathews shows a thorough acquaintance with the authorities and sources of his subject and an extensive measure of independent skill in the statement and application of the principles of interpretation and construction by which he determines the conduct and conclusions of his discussion.

The nature of the Jewish Messianic hope is fully discussed by the historical method, under its two aspects of "The Politico-Social Program of Revolutionary Messianism," and "Apocalyptic Messianism," and it is concluded that the latter became the dominant form, and determinant in the forms of thought and expression for the religion of Jesus, both in himself and in his followers. There are found "seven Messianic elements common to the apocalyptic literature," viz.:

1. Two ages, "this age" and "the coming age."
2. The present age is evil and under control of Satan.
3. The coming age will be God's product by some catastrophic method.
4. The judgment in connection with this catastrophe is to be final and will punish the enemies of the Jews.
5. The new age to be characterized by the Kingdom of God, not produced but "given," and a Jewish Kingdom.
6. Resurrection of the righteous.
7. The personal Messiah, either "anointed" for his work, or superhuman.

The Messianism of Jesus and of the Apostles is tested by these seven elements. Jesus is found to hold six of the elements, differing only in the fifth point above. Jesus "distinctly repudiated" "the restriction of membership in the coming Kingdom to Jews." Jesus likewise controverted the characteristic elements of that pharisaic system that was built upon their Messianism. But with Jesus, as with Jews and Christians alike, the Kingdom of Heaven belongs to the future age. He is not, in his ministry, doing properly Messianic work, receiving the Messianic promises, or undergoing the Messianic experiences. He is preparing for all this and so must come again. He and his followers rested their hopes in the speedy coming of the really Messianic age. "Even though it should be shown that such an expectation was historically to be disappointed, the greatness of the personality which compelled itself to forecast its future in such ultimate conceptions is indisputable." Similarly "Primitive Christianity" is found to "reproduce pharisaic Messianism" and Paul, while contributing more of modification than his Christian predecessors, is still only casting in Christian modifications the pharisaic hope. In the "post-Pauline Christianity" we find the beginnings of a new form of conceiving the faith, stating its essentials in terms of Greek metaphysic, etc.

Early Christian history corroborates the results obtained from the previous study. The Christian church is a "Messianic fraternity" "in an evil age." In this Messianic conception the ethical teaching as to the family finds its positive content and its limitations, even its errors, which grow out of its temporary character.

Similarly the economic and political bearings of the new religion are seen from the apocalyptic standpoint and no effort is made to enter Christian principles as vital forces for the reconstruction and renovation of the social organism or organizations. The teaching of Jesus, the practice of the early church, the apostolic teaching all seek to rescue from society the elect and hold them aloof

till God shall "give" the new age with its Messiah in his kingdom.

The object of the book is to constitute a contribution to theological reconstruction. This is forecasted in the first sentence of the *Introduction* and announced in the beginning of the concluding *summary* where the results of "our investigation" are "summarized with a view to their use in constructive processes which lie outside our present purpose" but which a footnote bids us expect in the author's "forthcoming book, *The Gospel and the Modern Man.*" Such reconstruction must depend "not only upon strictly philological exegesis, but also upon that larger historical exegetical process that endeavors to separate the content of a correctly apprehended teaching from the historical form in which it is cast," for "it is in the content of biblical teaching alone that men of to-day can feel more than an antiquarian interest." So far from approving the apostolic injunction to "hold fast the form of sound words," Dr. Mathews finds the form a real hindrance to the freedom of the truth, though he would hardly agree that this injunction is apostolic. This fundamental principle he applies with vigor. To illustrate, in considering the Messianism of Jesus we must deal with three questions. First it is necessary to ascertain what that teaching is; then we must analyze "the content of the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus;" lastly, we must ascertain what elements in the words and thoughts of Jesus are essential. "The question as to what is true, and what is false in his teaching"—there is such a question of which the "reverent critic" is the judge—"is not to be confused with the question as to what is inherited and what is original in his thought." The Messianism of his times is "the interpretative medium through which we must study him;" but not all such heritage is to be rejected at once as false. "Much of what he inherited was rejected by him," and more of it "will be rejected by men in different intellectual conditions." "The practical problem for to-day lies just

here. After a study of Messianism enables us to understand Jesus better, there is still left the question as to what in his teaching is eternally true." We need pursue his application of this method further only to say that his conclusion as to the incarnation seems to be that the strictly Jewish conception of it was quite other than would properly employ our term *incarnation* and that Jesus did not likely so conceive himself. "He regarded himself as the Christ—the Anointed of God—because he was conscious of God in his personality. What 'unction' was in Semitic thought, incarnation was in Greek thought." The Jew might argue from his death that Jesus was the Christ; but "for the man who does not care to reach that particular conclusion it [his death] stands equally significant as a fact in the history of the race, a testimony to the superehuman personality of the historical Jesus. It matters not in what schematic relation it is placed, etc."

What is the principle which is to guide in all this work of separating eternal truth from the forms of conceiving it as recorded in our Bible? The author's answer is *Messianism*, pharisaic, apocalyptic Messianism; and he stretches this term to cover all relating of one's present life and hopes to the future. By such an accommodation of the term the author is able to find his principle everywhere. Paul's doctrine of justification grows directly out of it and means only acquittal at a future judgment. It is hardly too much to say that Paul would never be able to recognize his system under this author's presentation and that he would be utterly surprised to know that he was so dominated by the Messianism of the Pharisees in his religious and theological thought and teaching. It would be equally surprising to the first century Christians to be told how very limited was their outlook, how mistaken their hopes and how crude their idea of their mission in the world.

Naturally such a study as this cannot proceed without critical examination of the literary sources. Such critic-

ism is little applied to the apocryphal literature. Here it is difficult to be sure of conclusions but Dr. Mathews seems to locate rather more of it in the first century B. C. than would be generally so admitted. He follows the usual views of the "critical school" as to the New Testament writings, though with a large measure of freedom and independence, an independence which loses something of admiration from the fact that it not rarely seems to be in the service of the thesis of the present work. We find here the usual vices of that subjective criticism which in the want of any scientific canons must be a law unto itself. We even find that *derniere resort* of the "critic," the "gloss." Peter's confession of Jesus as $\delta \upsilon \iota \delta \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$ (Mt. 16:16) "is clearly an addition of the evangelist." "Clearly" on what grounds? There is need of recognizing that "scholarship" is not the only substantive that may follow the epithet "critical." Criticism is not inseparable from scholarship. There is also a dogmatism of scholarship before which we all tremble. Our author sometimes seems to the reviewer to go out of his way to acknowledge the tyranny of the critical scholasticism of our day. When he reaches "traditional" conclusions, as he does by vigorous reasoning, at many points, he inserts in the text or a note some word to vindicate himself from the suspicion of accepting too much of the text as original or any of it as authoritative. His attitude toward John's Gospel is far more conservative than is popular among the scholars of the day and the author's tone is distinctly confessional in announcing his views and in making such full use of it.

The work is the result of profound research, elaborate thought and keen analysis. It will give any reader new views and heightened interest in the essentials of the faith of the Son of God.

W. O. CARVER.

The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.

By a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. 1905.

This is an admirable piece of work and will be found

of real service by the student who wishes to know exactly what use the Apostolic Fathers made of the New Testament. It is carefully done and a bit sceptical at times, but certainly not credulous. It is exhaustive and gives one all the criteria. Prof. Bartlet is slow to admit that Barnabas made use of Matt. 22:14. The work is done by Profs. Bartlet, Lake, Carlyle, Inge, Benecke, and Drummond.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Grammar of New Testament Greek.

By Friedrich Blass, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Halle—Wittenburg. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray, M. A. Second revised and enlarged edition. London, England and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1905. Pages 372.

The translation is well done and the work serves well those who do not wish so bulky a volume as Winer. The discussions are very brief and the examples very numerous. Dr. Blass is one of the foremost of living Greek scholars and his opinions deserve consideration. One cannot agree to all his positions on New Testament points. But it is a careful piece of work. It is time for more work to be done in the field of New Testament grammar. Winer no longer meets the modern requirements and Schmiedel's revision does not. The Prolegomena of Moulton's New Grammar is just out and will be reviewed in the next issue. Progress is being made in this science.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Four Portraits of the Lord Jesus Christ.

By George Soltan. New York, Charles C. Cook, 150 Nassau St. 1906.

This is not an unsuccessful effort to set forth the characteristics of the Four Gospels. The author conceives that in Mark Jesus is set forth as the Servant in Matthew as the King, in Luke as the Man, in John as the Son of God. The book is popular with some catchy elements, but will be found useful to some classes of readers. There is an introduction by Dr. C. I. Scofield.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Childhood of Jesus Christ.

By Henry Van Dyke, D. D. New York, Frederick Stokes & Co. 1906. Pages 120.

This is one of the daintiest little books of the last season. Dr. Van Dyke takes twenty of the great pictures by famous artists and talks delightfully about them. Murillo, Holman Hunt, Velasquez, Raphael, Burne-Jones, Botticelli, and others have done some of their best work on the Childhood of Jesus. This is a choice book for mother and child to read together. The Sunday school teachers would find it very appropriate this year.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Holy Spirit.

By Louis Burton Crane, A. M. American Tract Society, New York 1905. Price 75 cents.

This is the sixth volume in the series of the volumes on The Teachings of Jesus issued by the Tract Society and edited by the Secretary, Dr. John H. Kerr. Prof. Crane has written on this very important theme with judgment, ability, and reverence. It is distinctly didactic, but is highly devotional also. The book in admirable fashion seizes the point of view of Jesus and gives expression to the mission of Christ for his people and the world through the teaching of the Holy Spirit. This is the best and most helpful brief discussion of the Holy Spirit that one can get. It ought to stimulate many a life to nobler service. Prof. Crane is a thorough scholar in his methods of work.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Young People's Imitation of Christ. Based upon the work of Thomas A. Kempis.

By Edward S. Ellis. Philadelphia. The Rowland & Griffith Press.

This is a little book to lay on the table of a young boy or girl that he or she may often pick it up. Wherever it may be opened there is something to catch the eye, which is so tersely put that it sticks in the mind. Placing the

lofty teachings of Thomas à Kempis in condensed form is a distinct favor in this busy twentieth century.

I. M. M.

Paulus der Mensch und sein Werk: Die Anfänge des Christentums, der Kirche und des Dogmas.

Von Heinrich Weinel. Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, Germany. 1904. S. 316. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

This is not a life of Paul nor a discussion of the critical questions of chronology and authorship. In a "nachwort" the author does express disbelief in the genuineness of 2 Thess., Eph., and the Pastoral Epistles. But he is not so extreme as Schmiedel, Pfeleiderer, or Wernle. He is rather a disciple of Weiszäcker. The aim of Weinel is rather to discuss the problems of Paul's character and the fundamental problems of Christianity in the hands of this "second Founder" of Christianity. He insists that the modern historian cannot understand Paul apart from his time. This analysis of Paul's career is very stimulating. He treats him as The Pharisee, The Seeker after God, The Prophet, The Apostle, The Founder of the Church, The Theologian, The Man. It is a vivid and largely a true picture that Weinel draws of the great Apostle. It is defective at points, but the writer evidently writes *con amore* and so with power. There is a fresh run of books on Paul and this is one of the ablest and most suggestive. Dr. Sanday says that the next great debate will be on the relation between Paul's teaching to that of Jesus.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

L'Apotre Paul et Je'sus Christ.

Par Maurice Goguel. Librairie Fischbacher, 33 Rue de Seine, Paris France. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

The author is right in saying that this is a somewhat neglected field, though Feine's Jesus Christus and Paulus (1902) and numerous magazine articles we have. Dr. R. J. Knowling has just written The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. There are besides the works of Bruce and

Somerville on the Christology of Paul. M. Goguel takes only 1 Thess., Gal., 1 and 2 Col., Rom., Philemon and Phil. as genuine Pauline Epistles. He rejects the Gospel of John. He thus has a much narrower range from which to draw his material. Nor can one agree at all points with his ideas of Paul and Christ. He denies, for instance, that Jesus gave the Great Commission, and yet makes Paul attach a sacramental and saving efficacy to baptism. However, there is much that is helpful in M. Goguel's volume. He has in large measure covered fresh territory.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

V. SOCIOLOGY.

General Sociology: an Exposition of the Main Development in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzenhofer.

By Albion W. Small, Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology in the University of Chicago. Pp. 739. The University of Chicago Press. 1905.

This is a notable contribution to the study of Sociology, perhaps the most notable that has recently appeared. The book is large, well printed and in general sufficiently impressive in form. Its literary quality, however, is seriously open to criticism. It is hard to read, often unnecessarily difficult in phraseology, not always luminous in arrangement, and sometimes unpolished, not to say inexcusably careless in style. The treatment, as the author frankly avows in the preface, is not uniform or proportionate; some topics are needlessly expanded, others merely mentioned. There is much repetition, and sometimes separate discussion of matters that might as well have been treated together. Occasionally one wonders that the analysis is not more clear and condensed, strings of related topics being tied together by association instead of logically grouped under briefer general categories. But these defects are of form rather than in matter, and some are mere things of taste where no two readers would perhaps agree, and the author has

certainly a right to tell his thoughts in his own way. Still one could but wish that so useful and thoughtful a book might have been made more attractive to readers in general, and thus have enhanced its usefulness. Others than specialists would be greatly profited by studying the volume, but they will not find it easy reading! But those who are attracted by the subject and are willing to think will certainly find it both interesting and profitable reading; for a great book it undoubtedly is.

In the preface the author modestly calls his work a "conspectus," and a "syllabus," rather than a treatise. It is the "outline" of his lecture course in the University of Chicago, some topics not being fully treated in the book. The work also represents in a general way the point of view held by the department of Sociology of which the author is the head professor. The purpose of the book is thus briefly stated: "The main objects of this syllabus are, first, to make visible different elements that must necessarily find their place in ultimate sociological theory; and, second, to serve as an index to relations between the parts and the whole of sociological science." In other words: "It is an attempt both to give the layman a general idea of the ground covered by sociological theory, and to orient the student who wishes to prepare himself for independent sociological research." The purpose is still further explained to be that of pointing out the connection and correlation of all the special social sciences, to include all points of view under the broadest possible survey of the "social process" as a whole. It seeks to "show how far the sociologists have gone toward establishing a point of view that will reveal the actual world in which men have their life-problems." Thus the high aim of the work is both scientific and practical.

The work is presented in nine parts, as follows: (1) The Introduction, which discusses the subject-matter, definitions, impulse, history, and problems of Sociology; (2) Society considered as a whole composed of definitely arranged parts (structure)—an interpretation of

Spencer; (3) Society considered as a whole composed of parts working together to achieve results (function)—an interpretation of Schäffle; (4) Society considered as a process of adjustment by conflict between associated individuals—an interpretation of Ratzenhofer; (5) Society considered as a process of adjustment by co-operation between associated individuals—further interpretation of Ratzenhofer; (6) Conspectus of concepts derived by analysis of the social process; (7) The social process considered as a system of psychical problems; (8) The social process considered as a system of ethical problems; (9) The social process considered as a system of technical problems. Such is the author's own outline—our review will follow it.

In the Introduction (Part I.) the leading clue of the whole discussion is put into our hands in the opening statement that "the subject-matter of sociology is the *process* of human association." Further on we meet with the phrase "a science of men in their associational processes." Still further we find the statements: "Wherever there are human beings there are phenomena of association. Those phenomena constitute a process composed of processes. There can be no convincing science of human life till these processes are known, from least to greatest, in the relation of each to each and to all. Knowledge of human life which stops short of this is at best a fragment, and at worst a fiction." The aim of the sociologist is therefore to gain as complete a view as possible of this "social process" considered as a whole. Accordingly we shall not find it difficult to agree with the author when he admits that "sociology thus defined is, and must remain, more a determining point of view than a finished body of knowledge." After insisting in various ways that the special sciences are partial apprehensions and must be contributory to the larger view of sociology, and after giving and discussing several definitions the author sums up his whole contention in the concise definition that "sociology is the science of the social process."

The "impulse of sociology" next receives brief attention, and the author thinks it came rather from philanthropy than from science. Next he gives a brief sketch of the "history of sociology," mentioning with more or less criticism the leading writers, such as Montesquieu, Comte, De Greef, Spencer, Schaeffle, Ward, Giddings, and some others. Finally in this part the problems of sociology are briefly pointed out. The main problem, as it appears to the author from his point of view of the whole "social process," is to discover and combine under one general working concept all the phases of this "process." Or, to use his own language: "Regarding human experience as a whole, how may we mentally resolve it into its factors, and at the same time keep effectively in view the vital interaction of the factors in the one process?"

The next four Parts (II.-V.) deal with the systems of sociological thought represented respectively by Herbert Spencer, Schaeffle and Ratzel. It seems to this reviewer that this portion of the work might with great advantage have been condensed and simplified; the exposition is a little tedious and sometimes confusing. At the same time the criticism of Spencer and Schaeffle is penetrating and judicious, and the setting forth of Ratzel's scheme and its adoption in the main give indication of its influence on the author's own thinking. In fact it is not easy to see always whether your teacher is the German author or his American interpreter. In brief Spencer's scheme is unfolded as representing society as a great static organism; his over-emphasis on the "biological analogy" is properly judged and rejected; and the inadequacy of his system as a whole, because confined too much to a study of social "structure" as evolved and static, is clearly shown. Schaeffle marks a distinct advance on Spencer, for while holding also to the "biological analogy"—that society is to be regarded as a vast living body or organic whole—he looks at it from the point of view of "function" rather than of structure; considers the part played by the various elements in social

progress. This too is inadequate; society is more and other than a great living organism with its bodily "structures" or "functions." Yet this "biological" conception of the social life of men served to bring out some very important elements of the whole truth; and the reality which underlay the overworked illustration must continue to underlie all attempts to express it in terms.

As already intimated the "interpretation of Ratzenhofer" itself needs interpreting; for the author mingles his own views and those of other sociologists with those of the philosopher whom he is "interpreting" to such a degree that what is distinctive in the scheme is hard to discover. But so far as appears the general outlines of Ratzenhofer's system are: (1) That society is to be regarded as a "process rather than a state; (2) that the forces in carrying on this process; (3) that the conflict of these interests is both rudimentary and perpetual as a factor in the social process; (4) but the harmony and co-operation ("socialization") of these interests is both a present force and a final cause in molding and directing the social process. Evidently the system is composite and highly developed, but Ratzenhofer's individual work seems to be that of emphasis, grouping and co-ordination rather than of discovery. At any rate on this general basis—no matter whence derived—the discussion of the book as a whole proceeds. Along with the unfolding of Ratzenhofer's ideas Dr. Small has presented his own analysis of the "social process," and this is now to be considered.

In chapter XIV. (still in Part V.) our author states the "elements of the social process." These are "interests," or "something in men that makes them have wants, and something outside of men that promises to gratify the wants." "The primary interest of every man, as of every animal, is in sheer keeping alive. Nobody knows how many ages men consumed in getting aware of any other interest. This primary animal interest can never be out-

grown, although it is doubtful if we ever observe it alone in normal human beings." Forms of this primary interest have regard to food, sex and work. "The three species of interest which I call food, sex and work make up one genus of human interests to which I give the name the health interest. By this phrase I mean all the human desires that have their center in exercise and enjoyment of the powers of the body." On this basis and in combination with these bodily wants are five other sets of interests and under the six all the activities of men in the social process may be grouped. These are: Health, Wealth, Sociability, Knowledge, Beauty, Rightness. "Men have a distinct interest in controlling the resources of nature, in asserting their individuality among their fellows, in mastering all that can be known, in contemplating what seems to them beautiful, and in realizing what seems to them right." It is (to fall back on Ratzenhofer's phrases) the conflict and the co-operation of these interests that constitute the social process. This analysis of interests is fundamental to the author's thinking in all the rest of the book, and no one can deny him the right to choose both his categories and his terms. Not all would accept them as final or complete, and the author himself intimates as much; but they are convenient guides under which to follow out many aspects of a study of the social process.

In Part VI. a different method of study is pursued, and there is much repetition of ideas brought out in the preceding discussion. This part presents a list of concepts derived from the previous analysis. The list would be open to serious criticism on several grounds—as being ill-arranged, overlapping, disproportionately studied, and other objections. The conspectus, as given in chapter XXIX., contains fifty-one topics; and the last two being subdivided there are in all more than eighty "concepts" strung out in formidable array. With some abbreviations, but no omissions, this is the list: The conditions of society, the elements of society, society, the

physical environment, interests, the individual, the spiritual environment, contacts, differentiation, group, form of the group, conflict, social situations, association, the social, the social process, nature of the social process, content of the social process, stages of the social process; social evolution, structure, function, forces, ends or purposes; subjective environment; social consciousness, ascendancy, control, order, status, unity; corporation, constitution of the corporation, social mechanism, social authority, the social organism; social institutions, relationships, reactions, adjustment, assimilation; integration, individualization, socialization, genesis, genetic structures, social institutions (again), telosis, stimulus and response, the effective interests, struggle or conflict of interests, co-operation or conjunction of interests, moralization, culture, barbarism, civilization, equalization, restraint, means to equilibrium (of the last two); social production, consumption, achievement; partnership of the individual in social achievement, capitalization of social development, stages in the development of civilization, social progress, the dynamic agency of institutions, the State, political principles, property, the sociological point of view, pure sociology, applied sociology, descriptive sociology, expository sociology, normative sociology, technological sociology, sociological problems, social problems. In looking over a list of terms like this one's first exclamation is a paraphrase of a Shakespearean saying: If this be method there is madness in it! But on reading the sane and sensible, often profound and practical, discussion of many of these "concepts" which follows in the remainder of the book, one is disposed to forgive the author for his confusing outline. For there is more of distinction in the topics than appears in the bare statement of them. Some are not discussed at all; some are briefly noticed; and some are treated at considerable length. Nor is the scheme strictly adhered to as proposed. At the close of the discussion (p. 615) the author says: "The terms in our schedule are merely tentative formulations

of social facts which it is the task of sociology to make more exact. . . . The generalizations which we have brought together are not scheduled as a closed system of social science. They are statements of apparent and approximate truths, in the region of which earnest efforts to develop tenable sociology are in progress."

In Part VII. the great topic of the relation of Sociology to Psychology is presented. The discussion is all too brief, but is sound, balanced and suggestive. The discussion opens with an admirable summary (p. 619f.)—too long to quote—of the whole preceding treatment, and a statement of how that brings the student into the field of psychology. Description must precede explanation, but having collected the social data we must seek their explanation. This is social psychology. For "the promising attempts to interpret the social process are all based on the assumption that interchange of psychical influences is somehow the decisive fact in human association. . . . All the physical and biological conditions to which men are subject are taken for granted at their full value; but the variant that at last separates human association from the associations of other animals, and which is trusted to account for the peculiar features of the human process, is the influence of mind upon mind." For which wise words many students, long disgusted with materialistic and biological assumptions of finality, will be profoundly grateful. In discussing elements of social causation our author is no less sane and broad. He disposes of Tarde's attempt to found the whole social process in the single law of imitation in a short but telling criticism. He sums up the matter by saying that Tarde's mistake "in locating the essential social factor in a single form of mental action, instead of in some total assertion of personality, is sufficiently conspicuous to serve as a perpetual injunction upon similar ventures. There is no visible sanction for the hope that a clue to the social process will ever be found in a simple mental reaction." This dictum applies to Giddings' theory (which our author criticises else-

where) of "consciousness of kind;" and, *mutatis mutandis*, to Ward's materialistic theory of molecular aggregation. Again, on p. 639 our author says: "The sociologists have done their part to show that the most significant factors of life are the work of mind, not the grinding of machinery." (And here we must remember that Ward has, in spite of his earlier materialistic assumptions, taken a considerable share). Our author concludes that the real task of social psychology is to state the social process in terms of purpose. The will of man, guided by his feelings and his reason, is the dominant factor in association.

Part VIII. deals with the relation of Sociology to Ethics. The author notes the current confusion of ethical standards, criticises the utilitarian and evolutionary theories as one sided and inadequate, and tries to show that the sociological conception of the whole of human life as a process offers the only hope of developing an ethical theory and standard that will ultimately command general assent. This part of the book is not satisfactory. The author does not seem even to suggest the theistic and intuitional basis of morals, but leaves himself in the air with his "social process" theory. Thus on p. 656f he says: "The next step for our intelligence to take is recognition that these practical judgments of conduct within the actual life-process are the raw material of the only ethics that promises to gain general assent." But as this "process" is not necessarily "moral" wherein does this theory essentially differ from the evolutionary view, except in that it is assumed to have a wider basis and a fuller content? Is not the principle the same? Further, the author's sociological theory has also a trend in the direction of utilitarianism, for it holds that that is good which upon the whole best promotes the life-process. This squints towards the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" notion. While the sociological theory in terms repudiates the evolutionary and utilitarian hypotheses as too narrow it does in some measure pre-

serve whatever is true and best in those partial conceptions, and it does present a better standard by virtue of this larger outlook upon life as a whole; but it is only a degree above them at last, and is as far removed from finality as they were. Any ethical theory which leaves out of account the nature, character and will of God, as somehow revealed to the consciousness and conscience of man, is bound to be incomplete because essentially unsound.

Part IX. briefly considers some of the technical problems of sociology. The main practical problem is how to adjust means to ends in securing the better advancement of the whole social process. In chapter L. we have a "conspectus of the social situation as given in the present state of achievement and in unsolved technical problems." The grand divisions are suggested by the six groups of interests to which Dr. Small holds: Achievement in promoting health, in producing wealth, in harmonizing human relations, in discovery and spread of knowledge, in the fine arts, and in religion. The enumeration under these general heads is exhaustive and able, and presents a capital outline for advanced sociological study.

The defects of the book, as they appear to the reviewer, have been in general and in some details indicated in the preceding account. It remains to summarize some of its merits. Comprehensiveness of range and depth of thought characterize the work in marked degree. On many details where discussion is waived or brief there is evidence of much and profound reflection. Though the author is a well-informed student of many other men, he is a *critical* student. There is sanity and balance of judgment which correctly appraises what is valuable in the work of others and fairly states the author's own conclusions. The absence of dogmatism and sensationalism is a delightful note of both power and rationality in the study. And the book, notwithstanding its depth and its difficulty, is nothing if not practical. It is far from being a mere academic discussion, or speculation on unrealities.

It seeks to come to the heart of "the social process" in order to promote social well-being and well-doing. It is a pleasure to recognize a great achievement and congratulate the author upon his success. E. C. DARGAN.

The Negro in the Cities of the North.

Reprinted from *Charities* Vol. XV, No. 1, Oct. 7, 1905 by the Charities Publication Committee, New York. 96 pp.

Perhaps the wicked and sordid agitation of questions concerning the negro by Thomas Dixon and some of his equally unsober critics may serve the end of arousing a more general, humane and Christian interest in the negro that by the application of sound principles and adequate information will make some noteworthy advance in dealing with a complicated and delicate condition.

The October 7 number of "Charities and the Commons"—weekly, \$2.00 per year—brought together a remarkable collection of articles dealing with all phases of the question of the negro in Northern cities. The writers are white and black and represent all phases of interest in the negro where that interest is sympathetic and constructive. There are some two dozen writers and a brief note with each name tells his relation to the work in hand. The illustrations are numerous, admirable, informing. The articles bring together extensive and most valuable information and constitute one of the indispensable helps for studying the various negro questions.

One does not yet see daylight on this dark problem. That the solution lies along the way of education is clear enough. Just what is to be the nature of that education is more uncertain. So far there are utterly "diverse programs for the education and advancement of the negro with his conflicting ideals" and there is yet a third idea which can hardly be called an ideal and which has no program but many adherents and which is taken little account of by the students of this subject. There is, moreover, one phase of the whole question of which no recognition has come to the notice of this writer: The vast

majority of notable examples of negro education and leadership are of mixed blood and leave the serious question of the native negro capacity unanswered. That many negroes are capable of the highest and best need not be discussed, but are they all or any great number of them capable? One hopes so, but has seen no sufficient evidence as yet. Little account seems to be taken of tribal differences in American negroes, so significant in Africa.

The discussions of this volume call for careful study by every friend of the negro. W. O. CARVER.

Social Theories and Social Facts.

By William Morton Grinnell. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905. Pp. 146.

It is hard to get for the group of subjects discussed in this little book a title that would not be more or less misleading, but there is scarcely excuse for taking one quite so wide of the mark as this. Instead of a treatise on Sociology the author discusses corporations, trusts, competition, cost of living, wages, railway rates, public ownership of utilities, and related topics. In general the argument lies against the popular condemnation of trusts and the popular demand for public ownership of utilities. The author maintains that trusts are a natural development of the laws of trade and that legislation against them is ill-advised. There ought to be enforcement of the laws against individual offenders. He exposes the evils of competition, and maintains that the Standard Oil Trust is a fine flower of the method of competition. The tendency of capitalistic combination has been to increase wealth per capita, and there is now more general distribution of wealth than ever before. For while the management of the great corporations is in fewer hands, their shares are more widely distributed than formerly. In 1880 the Pennsylvania Railroad had less than 14,000 shareholders, while it now has 44,000. He pays his respects to the "municipal ownership" theory in regard to public utilities, and insists that a time when great political

corruption is known to exist is certainly not a favorable one in which to experiment with so great an enlargement of political function. The author has a word to say against labor unions and the strikes promoted by them. He declares for the individual rights of workmen as against the tyrannies of unionism.

Finally the author has a good word for the much maligned railroads, showing how they have developed the country and what friends they have been to labor, and so on. He says that the American railroads in 1904 paid out forty-one per cent. of their gross receipts to labor and twenty-five per cent. to capital, while the English roads paid forty per cent. to capital and twenty-eight to labor.

On the whole the book presents, without bitterness, a pretty strong plea for the capitalistic side of current economic questions.

E. C. DARGAN.

VI. SERMONS.

The Song of Ages. Sermons.

By Reginald J. Campbell. Minister of the City Temple, London. Published by A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

Mr. Campbell is the successor of Dr. Joseph Parker, at the City Temple, London. There is nothing in the book to indicate whether this is the first or second or third volume of sermons by Mr. Campbell. There are seventeen sermons in this volume. Some of them have striking subjects, e. g. "The Unrecognized Christ." John 1:33, "Where Jesus Failed." Matt. 13:58, "The Death of the Soul" Ezek. 18:4, "Hell's Vision of Heaven" Luke 16:23.

What are the impressions on the mind after the reading? It is well to remember that a sermon does not mean the same thing to all hearers. Another might read this volume and lay it down with impressions quite different from mine. It is our duty to hear the preacher with sympathy. He is endeavoring to help us. He cannot do this unless we open our hearts to his message. And he is

speaking in the name of God. These two things should make us gentle critics.

Mr. Campbell impresses me as a sincere man, simple and fearless in his preaching. His sermons show that he is a student of the Word and that he has a pretty fair acquaintance with men. He endeavors to answer the questions of the soul. I do not agree with all his expositions of Scripture nor do all his answers to the questions of the soul satisfy me. Judging from the spirit of the sermons, I imagine that he would not quarrel with me on account of my dissent.

The language of the preacher is simple. He has in every sermon something for the unsaved. And yet every sermon seems to me unfinished, that is, the preacher should have pressed the truth further. It seems to me that he does not drive the nail quite home, and of course does not clinch it. I felt this especially after reading "The Death of the Soul" and "Hell's Vision of Heaven." It seems to me also that he makes unnecessary concessions to the critical spirit of our time.

It was my privilege in 1879-80 to hear Mr. Campbell's predecessor, Dr. Parker, several times. The atmosphere of the City Temple was very different from that of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Mr. Spurgeon's Church. An intelligent business man, a Londoner, spoke of the two preachers in this way: "I hear Dr. Parker nearly every Sunday. He is a pleasing speaker. He rarely says disagreeable things. I always come away from the City Temple thinking well of myself. It never occurs to me that he means *me*. But Spurgeon stirs me up. I feel that he is always addressing me. And he makes me dissatisfied with myself. I come away from the Tabernacle a wretched sinner, and I have to go to the City Temple several times before I regain my equilibrium. I go to the Tabernacle two or three times a year. Mr. Spurgeon is a good man and an earnest preacher. I admire him. But if I were to hear him every Sunday I should have to change my way of living."

These sermons of Mr. Campbell convince me that there has been a change in the atmosphere of the City Temple, and yet not enough change to make the sinner feel very uncomfortable. Mr. Spurgeon's earnestness was intense and perhaps we should not expect it of all preachers. But it is essential to the best preaching—to really great preaching.

At times I was almost on the point of calling Mr. Campbell a great preacher.

J. P. GREENE, Liberty, Mo.

The Inspiration of Our Faith. Sermons.

By John Watson, D. D., "Ian Maclaren." Published by A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905. Pp. 559.

Here are twenty-nine sermons, and you will want to read them every one. Need one say a word more? You may not believe all you read here, but you will find mental stimulus, and what is far more in a sermon, you will find spiritual inspiration. You will know yourself better and God. Life will be fuller and religion will mean more.

It is the custom now to name sermon volumes after the title of the first one in the book, and that fashion seems at first to be followed here. But it is only in the seeming, for the title in this case is truly the appropriate characterization of the whole set of sermons. They deal with the emotional side of the religion of the soul under the lead of the Christ. Our day is fortunate in the vigorous re-assertion of the value and reliability of the "feelings" as the source, or at least the channel, of the highest knowledge and the best certainty. Dr. Watson in his earlier writings showed a mind weary of the dearth of a religion of dogma. It was natural for such a mind to seek relief in the license of criticism. But "Ian Maclaren" was already a man of the heart and the only message in the midst of his criticism that the world listened to was the clear call of all his work. Now he has found himself and the barren conceit of criticism is even more disgusting than the dearth of theological dogma. In this volume he

gives you no preface, for he speaks not for himself. The apostle of the heart calls to the message of the heart of God and shows the way of response. W. O. CARVER.

VII. MISSIONS.

Religions of Mission Fields; As Viewed by Protestant Missionaries.

Published by the Student Volunteer Movement. 1905. Pp. X, 300, 12mo, cloth 50 cents, paper 35 cents.

There are ten chapters dealing with all organized religions with which Protestant missionaries have to do, including Judaism and Roman Catholicism. In each instance there is a good bibliography of both popular and scientific works. The authors have been chosen with an eye to experience and capacity to make use of it, and a certain uniformity of treatment, with personal diversity has been secured by the editing committee. For a practical, clear, working view of the religions as they are today no single small volume is equal to this one. One questions many of the generalizations of Dr. Richards concerning the Religion of the African and may not be in perfect accord with all conclusions of other writers. Yet the work is remarkably well done and is cast in a form easy to get. It is just the thing for study classes and for private reading. W. O. CARVER.

Mohammed and the Rise of Islam.

By D. S. Margoliouth. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905. Pp. XXVI and 481. Numerous illustrations.

This volume is one of the Heroes of the Nations series which these publishers are bringing out. Professor Margoliouth is known as a competent scholar and his selection for this volume is fully justified by the outcome. Full use is made of all the sources and of all the works of preceding writers. The author is cautious of conclusions where the evidence is conflicting or insufficient and where the interpretations differ, but he is not more timid

than scientific statement will require. He points out, on occasion, the bias and error of some of his predecessors in this field. He takes the view that Mohammed was a shrewd builder of empire. It is of Mohammed "as a great man, who solved a political problem of appalling difficulty" rather than as the founder of a great religion that this volume treats. Due regard is had for the part played by the religion in the solution of the problem, but it must be understood that the work is not primarily a study in religion. The work is well done and will be of great value to all students of Islam and of its Prophet. It is an interesting fact that recent students are returning to the older view that Mohammed was a deceiver in the claims of revelation, though the spirit of the charge is quite different from that of a century ago. Such is the attitude of this author.

W. O. CARVER.

Egypt Burma and British Malaysia.

By William Eleroy Curtis. Published by Fleming H. Revell Company. 1905. 400 Pp. Price \$2.00 net.

Mr. Curtis' reputation makes necessary now only the announcement that he has produced a book of travel and it is taken for granted that it is of the first order in description and information. He has not yielded to the temptation, natural under the circumstances, to do careless work, though it must be admitted that a little more time and pains would sometimes meet appreciation in his readers.

In this volume three countries, to speak freely, are grouped for no other reason than that the author's convenience was thus suited. Egypt comes in for fullest and best treatment, occupying 250 pages. Burma gets fair consideration in 100 pages with six chapters, lacking logical relation or comprehensive combination, but touching matters of prime interest.

British Malaysia is a title to cover what remained of

a journey, though the author never grows uninteresting nor fails to inform.

The illustrations are of high quality.

W. O. CARVER.

The Land of the Gods.

By Alice Mabel Bacon. Published by Houghton Mifflin & Company, 1905. Pp. 267. Price \$1.50.

This volume is made up of ten stories setting forth characteristic Japanese superstitions. The legends of folk-lore and superstition are full of interest in themselves and are told with great charm and skill. No explanations are given and no theorizing—just the plain tales woven about living characters with all the thrill, and sometimes horror, of the utmost reality. It might readily be supposed that the author believes every word of the wierd stories with a faith surpassing that of the Japanese.

One would err if he inferred that belief in the superstitions here set forth is universal in Japan, but an intelligent reader will find delight and learning in the volume.

W. O. CARVER.

VIII. OLD TESTAMENT.

The Priestly Element in the Old Testament.

By William Rainey Harper. Revised and enlarged edition, 1905. Pages 292, 8vo. cloth; postpaid \$1.25. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and New York.

This book is a delight to the eye in its orderly arrangement of general topics and sub-heads, its paragraphing, the use of different fonts of type, the employment of bold-face type, italics and all other devices known to the printer's art. The pages have wide margins, on which the biblical references find a suitable place opposite the paragraphs to which they are related. Three valuable appendixes present lists of the more important words in the vocabulary of worship, classified lists of important books and a conspectus of the newer literature (since 1901) on

the priestly element. A fairly good index adds to the value of the volume.

The results of a quarter of a century of critical study of the Old Testament by a keenly analytic mind are embodied in this book. The author's skill in arrangement appears in every chapter. He is a past master in the art of making a dry subject interesting.

There are copious references to the literature on the various topics, the books and articles being arranged chronologically, and the literature in languages other than English being placed by itself. Practically all the best works of the radical school receive constant mention, and many books and articles by mediating critics; the conservative literature does not meet with equal favor, though on some topics it is given satisfactory citation.

In the preface the author indicates the foundation on which he builds his book: "The general results of modern historical criticism have been taken as a basis for the work, since it is only from the point of view of history that these subjects may now be considered intelligently. Each special topic connected with the general subject of the Priestly Element furnishes a beautiful illustration of the growth and development of Israelitish and Jewish thought under the controlling influence of a conception of God which became more and more pure with the advancing centuries." By "the general results of modern historical criticism" our author means substantially the views propagated by the Kuenen-Wellhausen-Stade school. Books and articles by scholars of the radical school receive most frequent mention in the literature on the various topics. In a good many details, however, Dr. Harper sides with the mediating critics, standing with Driver as against Cheyne, or with Dillmann as against Wellhausen.

It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the views of the radical critics are thoroughly anti-biblical. Kuenen had no hesitation in saying that his understanding of the Old Testament history differed widely from the

views entertained and enforced by the Old Testament writers. They united in the view that Moses was the great lawgiver through whom Jehovah gave not only the Ten Commandments but hundreds of precepts and regulations for the conduct of the sons of Israel. Modern divisive critics are largely agnostic with respect to the famous lawgiver; "as for this Moses we wot not what is become of him." Our author ascribes to Moses most practical use of the tent, or tabernacle; as to his part in announcing laws to Israel he has little to say. He holds that laws regulating worship and life were largely formulated, as well as executed, by the priests. "Legislation, therefore, in its stricter sense, was the function of the priests, rather than of the prophets or sages." The sacred writers in both the Old Testament and the New held that the law was given by Moses, one of the greatest of the prophets.

It is important for the Christian reader to note at the outset of any examination of the book under review that Dr. Harper does not take his stand beside the organs of revelation, the great religious leaders through whom God spoke to the Israelites; but rather among the masses of the people with their superstition and slowness of heart to apprehend the messages of the prophets. He seems to have as his center of interest the unspiritual masses; he will not leave them to breathe the purer air of the mountain tops on which the prophets stand. He wishes to write a history of the priestly element in Israel, regarded as one of the nations of antiquity. He tries to trace the history of Israel's religion as evolved from primitive semitic life and worship, and as influenced by the religious beliefs and customs of all the peoples with which at different periods Israel came into contact. The average Israelite with all his weaknesses and sins is the man whose evolution Dr. Harper seeks to describe. In the past, Christian writers have usually tried to trace the history of God's self-revelation through the religious leaders whom he raised up to guide the nation into higher knowledge of his

will. Dr. Harper does not confine his attention to the history of worship as approved by Jehovah, but describes the worship as practiced by the masses of the people. This explains the presence of paragraphs on sorcery and witchcraft in close connection with purer and approved modes of worship. It would seem that the author ought to have made it plain to the general reader that the Old Testament writers are in no wise responsible for the failure of the masses to surrender crass notions in exchange for the higher faith everywhere taught by the organs of revelation. It means little to us now that even as late as the days of Manasseh of Judah human sacrifices were offered in sight of Jehovah's temple; it would mean much for us to discover that Moses or Isaiah approved the horrid practice.

The plain reader of the Bible will probably feel a shock of surprise to find that the early Old Testament period closes shortly before 621 B. C., the middle period with the visit of Ezra to Jerusalem about the middle of the fifth century B. C., while the late period includes the early Maccabean history. The modern critical theory almost ignores the patriarchs, knows little of Moses, gets mere glimpses of the judges, and begins to reach historic ground only with Samuel and Saul.

Dr. Harper accepts the late dates commonly assigned by the Wellhausen school to the Old Testament writings; in two or three instances he would put a book half a century earlier than Wellhausen and Stade. The analysis into documents as formulated by our author is substantially that promulgated by the leading German and Dutch critics of the last thirty years. If the modern critical view of the Old Testament is true, the credit for the discovery must be given to avowed naturalistic scholars like Kuenen and Wellhausen; all that mediating scholars can hope to do is to improve the literary analysis in details, check up the historical criticism in the interest of a modified and somewhat more reverent view of the value of the sacred writings, and especially to preach the new view

to the Christian public, which is always tempted to rate the Old Testament as highly as Jesus and his apostles rated it.

The Constructive Bible Studies, edited by Professors Harper and Burton, of which the volume under review forms a part, are designed for use in Bible classes in colleges and theological seminaries. In the preface to a companion volume, Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament, President Harper says: "These studies are intended primarily for students in college and those in the theological seminary, but they will not be found too technical for more intelligent Bible classes in our best Sunday schools." On almost every page of both these manuals by Dr. Harper are questions that will put the feet of the average theological student into the air, to say nothing of the advanced pupils in the Sunday school. In order to find light on the difficult questions thrust into his face, the young theologian must turn to books and articles filled with the most radical speculations in the study of Comparative Religion; books that he is scarcely prepared to understand, and can by no means *test* in their fundamental assumptions; books that manufacture from an ounce of supposed fact a pound of unverifiable theory. Such books often overawe the honest student in his earlier researches and make him imagine that such erudite thinkers must be right, even when his heart protests against their conclusions and his judgment is not satisfied as to the cogency of the arguments brought forward. Before the sacred writers are subjected to a merciless cross-examination, they ought to be allowed to tell their story in their own way, and be treated as honest and intelligent witnesses. Most of the students in college and theological seminary have imperfect knowledge of the Bible story; they ought to hear the direct testimony of the historians and biographers, and read the prophetic and wisdom books as they have been preserved to us, before listening to searching and scathing cross-examination on the part of able ad-

vocates who believe that the witnesses are in a holy conspiracy to cover up some of the most important facts.

Of the many difficult speculative questions thrust upon the college student, take a few samples: "Note (1) the distinction between clean and unclean animals made in the narrative of the deluge, and consider (2) whether the words *unclean* and *sacred* may not be used synonymously; that is, was not the *unclean thing* (whether animal or person or object) something in connection with which 'a superhuman agency of a dangerous kind' was supposed to be acting, and which, therefore, was, from one point of view, sacred, from another, unclean? (3) whether this is not to be closely associated with the usage existing among many nations and called *taboo*." The student is sent for an answer to an article in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and to W. R. Smith's difficult book on the Religion of the Semites.

The key to the critical position is the Book of Deuteronomy; if the addresses ascribed to Moses were really made by that great leader of Israel, the whole modern critical theory is on a foundation of sand; if Deuteronomy was composed shortly before 621 B. C., the so-called traditional view falls to the ground. Dr. Harper accepts the late date for Deuteronomy, and faces the question, Is not the book a forgery and fraud, if not written by Moses? In his able discussion of this question (pp. 164f.) the author raises some difficult questions: "(7) Whether Hilkiyah in permitting the belief in the Mosaic authorship was really guilty of *delusion*; was it not rather *illusion*? (8) Whether the principle of illusion is not (a) necessary in all educational work; (b) practiced in the Old and New Testaments; (c) one of the greatest elements in the teaching of Jesus himself."

Did Jesus practice *illusion*? The only proof-text given for such a startling view is John 16:12, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Arithmetic first, then Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Analytical Geometry, Calculus; we are familiar

in all educational work with progress from lower to higher things, but where is the *illusion*? The Century Dictionary defines illusion as follows: "1. That which illudes or deceives; an unreal vision presented to the bodily or mental eye; deceptive appearance; false show." "2. In *psyschol.*, a false perception due to the modification of a true perception by the imagination; distinguished from false apearances due to the imperfection of the bodily organs of sense, such as irradiation, and from hallucinations, into which no true perception enters." "3. The act of deceiving or imposing upon any one; deception; delusion; mockery."

If the Century is right in its definition, Jesus did not practice *illusion*, and it has no place in a sound educational method. Jesus said concerning the hope of a blessed immortality in God's house, "if it were not so, I would have told you." He was the most candid, genuine, fearless teacher the world ever saw.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament.

By William Rainey Harper. Pages 142, 8vo, cloth; postpaid \$1.00. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and New York. 1905.

This book is a companion to the *Priestly Element in the Old Testament* by the same author. Dr. Harper says in the preface: "The plan rests upon two vital principles: (1) That the student, guided by the suggestions made, shall do his own thinking and reach results which at least in a measure may be called his own. No conscious effort has been put forth to control the exact development of his thought. (2) That the student shall do his own work upon the basis of the Scripture material; in other words, that he shall study the Bible, and not merely read what others have said concerning it." These are fine words; we cannot withhold our hearty indorsement of both these vital principles. But the program of work as here outlined does not put the Bible as it is in the hands of the

student, but a new book constructed by modern critics who have reversed much of the work of the Old Testament writers. The college student, while imagining that he was doing strictly original work, would almost inevitably imbibe the author's own views, tactfully suggested by questions, and taught fully in the books most prominently mentioned in the literature on the various topics. Is this an example of *illusion*?

Who that ever knew the lamented author could fail to admire his genius for teaching and administration? He did much to revive Hebrew and Old Testament studies, more than any other man of his generation; the more is the pity that he accepted so many of the results of a criticism that sets so low an estimate on much of the Old Testament.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Ballard—Hæckel's Monism False. C. H. Kelley, London.
- Simpson—Our Lord's Resurrection. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.
- Winkworth—The History and Life of the Rev. Dr. John Tauler. H. R. Allenson, London.
- Scott—The Making of the Gospels. John Murray, London.
- Lock—Bible and Christian Life. Methuen & Co., London.
- Timbrell—The Last Message of Jesus Christ. Eaton & Mains, New York.
- G. B. Stevens—The Christian Doctrine of Salvation. Scribners, New York.
- J. H. Moulton—A Grammar of the New Testament. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
- H. Von Soden—History of the Early Christian Literature. Williams & Norgate, London.
- James Orr—The Problem of the Old Testament. Scribners, New York.
- Jacquier—Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament. Lecoffre, Paris.
- E. A. Abbott—Johannine Vocabulary. A. & C. Black, London.
- Gunkel—Ausgewählte Psalmen übersetzt u. erklärt. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gottingen, Germany. 1905.
- Lea—A History of the Inquisition in Spain. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Schmidt—The Prophet of Nazareth. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Howard—Life Story of H. C. Trumbull. Sunday School Times, Philadelphia.
- Bischoff—Jesus und Rabbinen. J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, Germany.
- Foster—The Finality of the Christian Religion. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Hoge—The Divine Tragedy. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.
- Barth—Jesus und Buddha. A Francke, Bern, Switzerland.
- Mead—Irenic Theology. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
- Triggs—The Changing Order. The Triggs Publishing Co.
- Strong—The Next Great Awakening. The Baker & Taylor Co., New York.
- From Servitude to Service. The American Unitarian Association, Boston.
- Hume—Missions from the Modern View. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.
- Davies—Theological Encyclopædia. Methodist Book Concern, Cincinnati.
- H. M. King—Rev. John Myles and the Founders of the First Baptist Church in Massachusetts. Preston, Rounds & Co., Providence, D. I.
- Ruth B. Fisher—On the Borders of the Pigmy Land. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.
- Djuvara—Wissenschaftliche und Religiöse Weltansicht, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gottingen, Germany.
- Bond—Old Tales Retold.
- Ladd—The Philosophy of Religion. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Freer—The Philippine Experience of an American Teacher. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Phillips—Nero. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Long—Sir Walter Scott. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Pfeiderer—Christian Origins. B. W. Huebsch, New York.
- Scott—The Book of Revelation. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The next regular session will begin October 2d and continue eight months.

Thorough courses of study are given in all departments of theological education.

All studies are elective.

Four degrees are conferred, including a post-graduate degree.

The regular course for the degree of Master in Theology covers three years.

An admirable course of one year in English, without degree, is adapted to the needs of busy pastors who cannot remain for a more extended period.

A great Library is open to all students.

Cost of living in Louisville is not high.

For Catalogue or other information, address

E. Y. MULLINS, President,
Louisville, Ky.

For information as to financial aid, address

B. P. SMITH,
Room 10, New York Hall,
Louisville, Ky.

BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. III.

July, 1906.

No. 3.

THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE APOCALYPSE.*

BY PROF. J. H. FARMER, D. D., TORONTO, CANADA.

The Rigi and Pilatus are the northern sentinels of the Alps. The former is the mountain of the sunshine, the latter of the cloud. Stand on the Rigi Kulm under the blue sky, and though the sunshine sparkles on the Lake and glorifies a hundred peaks westward and southward, there to the northwest stands Pilatus cloud-capped and still—unless indeed, as often happens, he be in the tumult of a storm. For, as outpost of the Alps, he first confronts the storms that march from the north, and on his rugged height they often spend their force. The Apocalypse is the Pilatus of the New Testament.

I. IT IS A BOOK OF CONTROVERSY. About it hover clouds of mystery. Around it rage the storms of disputation.

1. There is controversy as to its *author*. It is not the purpose of this article to discuss that. Enough to avow one's own belief that there is no sufficient reason in language, teaching or spirit to warrant one in refusing the almost unanimous tradition of the early centuries that it is the work of the Apostle John—the Son of Thunder whom Jesus loved.

2. There is controversy also as to *date*. On this I shall not dwell but again content myself with saying that other voices are not strong enough to drown the clear note of the Fathers that it was written in the time of Domitian, say about 95 A. D.

* Thankful acknowledgement is made of special indebtedness to the lectures of Dr. Broadus, and "The World Lighted" by Charles Edward Smith.

3. The chief controversy, however, has been about the *interpretation* of the book. What a multitude of theories, what a clash of opinions, there have been!

(1) The *Preterists* tell us it has all been fulfilled. Some of them say it refers on the one hand to the events of the three or four years that close with the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A. D., and on the other, to the overthrow of heathenism in the death of Nero and the stop thus put to persecution. This view, of course, assumes the early date and has found great favor in Germany. Many like it because it makes so little of the predictive element. Others of this class believe that the book found fulfillment within the first three centuries after the death of Christ in the overthrow of Judaism in the second century and that of Pagan Rome in the first-quarter of the fourth. Yet the fact that Church and State were wed by Constantine, in which these Preterists see the fulfillment of the glorious victories symbolized in the closing chapters, seems to most Baptists, I presume, one of the most calamitous events in all history.

(2) The *Futurists* place all the events referred to in the future. One class refers them to the three and a half years immediately preceding the second advent. Others postpone all until after Christ has come.

(3) The *Historical* schools assert that the series of visions spans the whole period from the Apostle's time until the end. And here again different views appear. One school regards the three series of sevens—the seals, the trumpets, and the bowls—as continuous; another as synchronous. In the former case they are like the successive arches of a single bridge; in the latter, they are like three parallel bridges, each one of which spans the whole period from the first century to the end of the age. Others again feel that these visions may find many fulfillments among many different nations.

(4) Still others, *Idealists*, deny any literal fulfillment and see simply the play of great principles—the struggle and the ultimate triumph of the good. Now in the midst

of this uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the book what are we to do? When the doctors differ so, what can ordinary mortals do? Many have answered that question by inventing a new view. Many, repelled by what they consider extreme and hurtful notions and dissatisfied with any theory that has been presented, have turned away from the book altogether. There is a better way.

II. THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE BOOK MAY BE KNOWN. In this respect also it is like Pilatus. For if you will spend the night on the Rigi and rise before the sun, while yet the mists sleep in the valleys and all the world is still, you may, in the gray morning, behold Pilatus with his face unveiled and learn the secret of his high places. So if one will come to this book when the world is still and the voices of controversy are hushed, at the quiet hour of devotion, seeking the hidden manna for the soul's sustenance, he may get the main message that the Master sends us through His servant John.

1. Surely *this is to be expected*. Is it at all likely that the chief blessing of the book should wait until all its mysteries had been solved? Or that only the few capable of recognizing in the broad field of history the events symbolized in it should share in that blessing? That is not the general spirit of Scripture which unfolds itself in its essence to those of child-like heart. Even though one may feel that a day may come when in manifested fulfillment it may vindicate its own inspiration and serve such purpose as prophecies of the Old Testament have served in their fulfillment, yet it is quite unlikely that this last voice from heaven should not have its message for the multitude of believers through the centuries.

2. And is this not *suggested* in the opening verses where blessing is pronounced upon him that readeth and upon them that hear the words of the prophecy and keep the things written therein? That brings before us the picture of the church assembled for worship where one reads and the others hear, and it implies two things,

namely: That ordinary Christians could understand the main teaching of the book and that practical obedience to that teaching was expected.

3. *How can we discover it?* By putting ourselves in their position; or in other words by noting the circumstances under which the message was given.

They are indicated in I. 9, where John refers to their common tribulation. He himself was an exile in Patmos, banished thither because of his fidelity in testifying to Jesus Christ. The ruthless Domitian had set himself to crush out the spreading gospel. The mighty power of Rome, so long a shelter, has now become an enemy. The last Apostle has been singled out, torn from the church he loved, and withdrawn from direct contact with those to whom for a generation his presence had been a benediction. Well might the churches in Asia feel disconsolate. And well might John, encompassed with the infirmities of age and oppressed with a sense of isolation and loneliness, feel the chill of discouragement and begin to wonder what it all meant. The old question might well recur, "Are there few that be saved?" Is sin always to triumph? As the Master Himself was slain, are his people too to be cut off? For there were other reasons for discouragement besides that of outward persecution. There was corruption and degeneracy among the churches themselves. False doctrines were harbored, gross immoralities were tolerated; the spirit of the world was gaining an ascendancy; and the love of many was growing cold. With such weakness within and persecution without, need we wonder if something of gloom should settle down upon the Apostle's spirit?

Nor is John alone in such experiences, John the Baptist had known it as he languished in the fortress of Machaerus. Peter refers to "the fiery trial" in his first letter and in his second has much to say of degeneracy within and opposition without. Jude follows in the same strain. And even Paul, dauntless hero, though he was, shows in his last letter a genuine tinge of sadness. Con-

trast it with the splendid hopefulness of his letter to the Romans or the optimistic outlook of the letters written during his first imprisonment. Something of the sombre shade of the dungeon has darkened the earthly prospect though the heavenward aspect cheers the old warrior's heart and peace reigns within.

Indeed this seems generally characteristic of the later apostolic age. In the early days the gospel went forth conquering and to conquer. Hope ran high and was fed by a succession of signal triumphs. Delightful is the fresh zeal and high courage that breathe through the book of Acts. It is an inspiring history of how the gospel spread from Jerusalem to Rome. But a change came; and the early buoyancy seemed to pass away. It looked as if the early promise was not being fulfilled, and timid questioning began to spring up in many a soul. Were the churches to sink into the weakness and corruption of the world about them? Or if a remnant escaped this contagion, was it to be exterminated by the hostile powers of the world? Such probably were the thoughts of John as in his weary exile, he restlessly turned the matter over in his mind. When Peter was thus distressed his heart was comforted by the promise of the Master's coming, the day of the Lord, and the new heavens and the new earth in which righteousness should have its abiding dwelling place. Jude, too, under like conditions is cheered by the thought of Him who is able to set the believer before the presence of His glory without blemish in exceeding joy. James bids suffering Christians be patient unto the coming of the Lord, and Paul, as the shadows gather about him, stays himself on the Lord who would save him unto His heavenly kingdom and exults in soul as he catches a glimpse of that radiant crown of righteousness which the righteous Judge should give him at that day.

Would it not be strange if to him whom Jesus loved no special word of comfort came amid the weakness of age, the loneliness of exile, and the soul agony he felt for the churches he had served so long? Could anything be

more fitting than that the Master should give His last inspired message through the last of the apostles or more natural than that that message should be comfort to His faithful ones and a warning to the unfaithful, through all the long centuries until He comes again? *That surely is the main purpose of the book—to comfort and to warn.* To say this is not to deny that there is in the visions a general forecast of the general outlines of the struggle between Christ and His enemies, or that these are worthy of study and may yet, when seen to be clearly fulfilled, serve some gracious purposes. But it does imply that these purposes are secondary in God's thought.

4. Note *how thoroughly adapted it is to that purpose.* The opening vision is that of the glorified Christ in the midst of His churches. "His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." In the presence of that glory John falls as one dead. But the old-time touch restores him and the familiar voice bids his fear depart. And, if one might venture, in imagination, to fill in the story it would run like this: The Lord might have said to John, "My son, you have been downcast and discouraged, you have been wondering whether my cause was not doomed to failure. But now do you not see that in me there is light enough for the whole world and power enough to vanquish every adversary" and John's reply might be: "Yea Lord; and yet men love the darkness, and still the enemy seem to triumph. And knowest thou, Lord, that thine own people are harboring the evil and turning themselves once more to idols."

Whereupon the Master takes him round the churches and as again and again He says, "I know thy works," John is made to feel that the Master's confidence is not due to ignorance of the conditions, but has good grounds. He proceeds to show the perplexed disciple what those grounds are and at the same time gives him a foreview of the struggle with evil and its final issue.

So in the fourth chapter John is shown a vision of the opened heaven—and there he beholds God Almighty seat-

ed upon His throne, language is beggared to describe His ineffable glory and infinite power. Compared with that the earth must have seemed small; Rome's power contemptible, and the devil's devices unavailing. Surely John's hope must revive and faith take on new strength. There is light enough in heaven to lighten the world, and power enough to vanquish all God's foes. But the victory is not just now. The struggle is to be long and to the churches trying. The panorama of that struggle is unrolled in a series of wonderful visions. It is like the conflict on the plain of Troy. Not earth alone but heaven as well is interested and shares in it. Sometimes the saints of the Almighty are discomfited, their ranks shattered and the surviving remnant driven into the wilderness. Again the enemy are defeated and hallelujahs fill the heavenly regions. So for long long ages the tide of battle ebbs and flows, the slow fierceness of the struggle involves unspeakable suffering and hardship, and calls for and develops the patience of the saints. But the issue is that Christ conquers and reigns. The former things pass away—the sin, the sorrow, and the weariness; the heavens and the earth are made new; the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven resplendent with glory; and the saints enter upon their eternal service with everlasting joy upon their heads.

5. That *these visions brought John comfort* is perfectly evident. Is that not implied in the twentieth verse of the closing chapter? Does the glorified Jesus not virtually say to him "You thought my cause was losing; but lo! I am on the way to victory and the throne; yea and I am coming to it quickly?" And John responds "Amen, keep coming, Lord Jesus." For must not the present imperative which John employs emphasize the thought of progress while not excluding the transcendent event in which that progress finds its culmination? It is quite natural accordingly that when John sits down to pass the message on to the churches he should feel assured of the blessedness of the faithful ones who should receive it (I. 3).

The Apocalypse which comforted him would comfort their hearts also.

And what it did for them it has been doing for God's suffering saints all through the centuries. Has any book of Scripture ministered more strengtheningly in days of persecution than this? Let the heroic Vaudois in Alpine valleys, or the sturdy Covenanters in the glens of Scotland answer. It is equally true of the more common sorrows of life. How the eyes of age to which earth's scenes are growing dim love to linger upon the pages that tell of that new life that never knows weariness, the new city whose inhabitants never grow old. How often the poor sufferer, tossing in pain through weary hours of a slow disease, has called for some loved one to read those glowing chapters that tell of the time when there shall be no more pain or crying, no more dying or mourning, when God Himself shall wipe away all tears from their eyes! How often the book has brought cheer to the poor, the discouraged, the outcast, the oppressed! How often, by its hope of reward, it has nerved to fidelity; braced for self-denial, and made brave to endure the crucifixion of our "members that are upon the earth." Unquestionably its chief ministry has been to our times of sorrow and struggle, perplexity and gloom. This is the obverse of the coin—a message of comfort, an incentive to fidelity.

6. The reverse is that it issues a warning to the churches.

There is warning against false doctrine, which it combats by holding before us in striking ways the fundamental doctrines of the faith. Could the deity of Christ, for example, be more emphatically proclaimed than it is in v. 8-14 where the same worship is paid to the Lamb as unto God Almighty—especially when one contrasts it with xxii. 8, 9 where the mighty angel so promptly refuses the worship John was about to offer and bids him worship God. So the atonement by blood is constantly meeting us. We "are loosed from our sins in His blood" (I. 5). The new song is "Worthy art Thou—for Thou

wast slain and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe and tongue and people and nation.” The ever-recurring title “Lamb” keeps this doctrine ever before us. So the resurrection is everywhere implied, and in the Lord’s first word expressly stated, “I was dead” He says “and behold I am alive for evermore.” Even the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity is implied in I. 4, 5, in each of the last four letters to the churches (e. g. iii. 21, 22) and elsewhere. The everlasting Gospel is the means of conquest, the power of God unto salvation, as unmistakably as in Paul’s letter to the Romans.

There are also the sternest possible warnings against unrighteousness. Conduct is regarded even more than creed. Sin will not go unpunished. It will never pay to do wrong. One feels as he reads that heaven is near with its exhaustless power and ever with the right. His reward is with Him to give to every man according as his work shall be.

Along with this is shown the sin and folly of relying upon any earthly power as against God. The mightiest combinations of evil whether beast or Babylon, opposing State or Apostate church, shall fall. The way of wisdom is to stand true to Jesus and so share in His victory and glory.

III. Finally because this is the purpose of the book it becomes to us *the crowning glory of the Bible* just in proportion as we know and feel what it is to suffer with and for Christ. They who glide smoothly with the currents of worldly thought and practice, and have never felt the pangs of self-crucifixion or the hardships of warfare for the sake of Christ and his truth, are not likely to find anything very attractive about it. It will be to them as the Lord Himself was to many “a root out of a dry ground, without form or comeliness.” But to those who do know what it means to lose and suffer and endure for Christ’s sake, the book with its sure promise of victory and reward becomes like Him “altogether lovely” and perhaps the chiefest book of all. It becomes inspiring in

the highest degree and forms a fitting close to the sacred writings. Though it begins in mystery and gloom, and passes on through struggle and conflict, it ends in light and peace, in gladness and glory. Pilatus still remains its fitting symbol. Some of us remember how in the gray dawn as from the Rigi we gazed upon his cloudless summit a sudden storm came from the northwest, broke in fury upon his brow, swept across the Lake a blinding mist and drove us to our rooms. Fifteen minutes later as I looked out the western window, there appeared a small rift in the clouds through which I caught sight of Finsteraarhorn, fifty miles away, just as his snowy peak began to kindle with the first rays of the rising sun. The rift widened, and there before our eyes peak after peak caught the growing splendor. It seemed as if the glory of heaven were descending upon the earth bathing it in light supernal. By and by we walked out again to the kulm and looked toward Pilatus. There he stood silent, majestic and crowned with a wealth of cloud—not now, however, the sombre cloud of yesterday, nor the storm-cloud of an hour before, but mountain masses of cumulus shot through and through with the many-colored splendors of the morning. He was transfigured. The mountain of mystery had become the mount of glory.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL OF DAY AFTER TOMORROW.

BY BISHOP JOHN H. VINCENT, D. D., INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

1. The School of yesterday is the old-time Sunday School for children with its earnest teachers and limited facilities. And it did a good work.

2. The School of to-day is an advance upon that of yesterday.

3. The School of to-morrow will perhaps be as great an advance upon our present system as we imagine ours to be in advance of that which our good old grandfathers developed.

4. But I plead for such an emphasis upon "certain fundamentals" that we may begin to look and plan for the Sunday School of Day After To-morrow—something better than the next few years is likely to realize—the church school at its best—better than our best—a school built upon certain fundamentals, evangelical, psychological, social, educational and spiritual; a school that will embrace all the educating, evangelizing, and edifying factors of Home, Pulpit, Pastorate, School, Press, Civilization—in a noble unity. There may be some formal organization by which we shall secure the benefits of cooperation and economy.

5. Too few of us appreciate the unity of this wonderful Book of God; the emphasis it puts on teaching, the profound pedagogic wisdom, that fills its pages from Genesis to Revelation. And teachers—professional teachers—the teachers of teachers, have gone to it to find the profoundest philosophy and the wisest and most concrete illustrations of a perfect teaching system the world and the ages have ever known. The School of day after to-morrow will follow its guidance. And if you will not be tangled up by my play on words—the yesterdays and to-morrows

of which I have spoken (perhaps an apparently trifling mnemonic device) I will say first of all that "the school of day after to-morrow" must be a reproduction of "the school of day before yesterday."

6. In a word our ideals of the church, the school and the family, must be drawn, not from the theories, policies and ideals of the present, nor of the immediate past, but from the principles and precedents laid down in God's Word.

7. The school of day before yesterday is set forth in the Bible—its roots and trunk in the Old Testament and its branches and fruit in the New. Our best school of the future is to be found in the Bible. Let us go in quest of it there. When I want a forecast of the best that God can do for man and the best that man can do in his work for God and humanity I go to the Bible. And as far as I can understand the subject I sympathize heartily with reverent modern criticism.

8. If a philanthropist in New York desiring to educate a waif picked up from the streets of that city were to ask foremost educators of the present age what steps he should take in order effectively to accomplish his work they would suggest substantially as follows: Separate the lad from his present unfavorable conditions; arrest his attention; give him new ideas so that he may be ensphered in a new world; use, as you will be compelled to do, the object method of instruction; whatever else you do win his confidence, his affections and his will; and be patient and persevering in your efforts in his behalf.

9. Now, as I review this hurried and superficial, yet on the whole, comprehensive Counsel, I recall the divine processes in the same direction when God took in hand a waif, thousands of years ago, on the banks of the Nile, and through divine processes led Israel out of an old land and its slavery into another land and through long century processes created a new civilization, not as yet quite completed, and the end of it all—of all the centuries of effort, of beginnings, of failures, of renewed endeav-

ors, of divine and supernatural interpolations—national, racial, personal, spiritual—will be the noble school of a Christian civilization a little later on—the school of day after to-morrow.

10. The Christ study of the old Jewish Tabernacle, that great kindergarten of religion and of theology, was a complicated object lesson, a mold for a new language to express new and divine ideas.

11. Stand with me for a moment on a rock near the base of Sinai and watch the splendor of that object lesson. The hidden priest is in the holy of holies. All at once behold the mysterious transformation. Everything vanishes—curtains, altars, sacrifices, candlestick, sacred ark, mercy-seat, cherubim, all gone! The robes of the high priest, his crown and all his official glory—gone! The shekinah fades. The cloud itself disappears. What is left? All that is worth while—a man in plain Israelitish costume bowing reverently under the cloudless heaven in personal communion with God!

12. This is the ripe fruit of the whole ceremonial system—of all the doctrines and precepts and institutes of Judaism—man the individual alone a worshipper before the unseen God—himself the temple of God. “Neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem” is God to be sought. “God is a spirit.” All men as men, all women, all children, anywhere, everywhere, may through Jesus, whom all these things foreshadowed, have immediate access to God. Altars and incense, candles and sacrifices, splendors of ritual, all the kindergarten apparatus of the infantile period of the race have been superseded—abolished as belonging to an initial period in an educational process. Lessons in the alphabet are no longer needed by the student in the university. Judaism was only the preparation for Christ. And Christ having come and the Spirit having been given every individual believer has all this within his personality and the invisible spiritual environment in which he lives, including the fellowship of other

believers; all that the Jewish theology kindergarten contained and foreshadowed.

13. And really a few centuries later when the plain Christ appeared among men the world saw that whole Jewish system free from all its externals and cumbersome and complicated ritual. They saw the plain man in everyday costume living among men, talking in simple and natural fashion to men, teaching, demonstrating by the deeds of grace and help that he wrought what the teaching work of the church was to be. And later on, before He passed again into the heavens He gave His commission to His followers. The Church is to preach His gospel, to make disciples and then to teach these disciples and the church becomes the aggressive teaching power in the world with simple symbolic and commemorative observances—Baptism and The Lord's Supper—freed as far as possible from ritualistic rites, having as its motto and keynote: "We look not at the things that are seen but at the things that are not seen." And to aid this we have the Sabbath Day retained as the Lord's day and a great Book that records God's way with the race and the assurance that "all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, completely furnished unto all good works."

14. And we have the church that is a school of personal character under the leading of the personal Christ through the Holy Spirit. The church is to set forth the Word of Life, to preach, to teach, to lead, to train, to comfort, to defend the truth and become the center of a splendid school of eternal life using all agencies in this work and so controlling civilization that our national, political, social and educational life may all contribute to the building up of Christ's kingdom. "All things are yours." In every realm where you have an ounce of influence you are responsible for the use of it.

15. The Jewish system was incomplete without Christ.

He came to fulfill its foreshadowings as the great teacher and sacrifice and He abolished all mere incidents and artificialities of religion, provided the simplest possible external service and commissioned his disciples to go abroad and teach. His commission has molded a new civilization and put this civilization at work as a school of truth and righteousness. Jesus suggested no robes of office, provided no ritual, ignored all mere externals beyond the simple appointment of baptism, the Lord's Supper and the setting apart of certain believers to the work of the ministry. The Christianity of the New Testament is at the last remove from the ceremonialism of Judaism. That was kindergarten. It served its purpose and has passed away.

16. But the work of teaching did not pass away. The ministry was pre-eminently a ministry of teaching—of simple everyday, straightforward teaching with no regulations about costumes, programs, symbols, ceremonies. The complicated paraphernalia of ritualism now played with by Roman, Greek and high Anglican ecclesiastics has no place in New Testament Christianity. See the plain peasant of Nazareth as he sat on the well of Shechem under the shadow of Gerizim. The woman of Samaria found opportunity to put what was to her the question of questions between Jews and Samaritans—the place of worship! “Is it this mountain? Is it Jerusalem?” See the face of the Master as he replies, “Neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem shall men worship the Father. God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.” In this scene we have a representative of the teaching process that was to supplement Judaism—the emphasis of Christ's own words and an example of the highest of Christian pedagogic methods.

1. It was an individual process, the emphasis on the unit, “To every creature.”

2. It was by conversation—not oratory, but simple talk—saying, suggesting, starting questions, answering one

question by asking another, stimulating the curiosity of the individual, one at a time or two or three in conversation; no oration, no studied eloquence, no elocution, no display, but simply telling and talking in neighborly conversation.

3. The teaching process of the New Testament found its stimulus not only in conversation with units and groups, but its highest inspiration in private prayer. It was in personal communion with the Father that Jesus found (and all his true successors will find) the secret force that made conversation effective.

4. The conversation, teaching, preaching method of Christ was radiant with parables, incidents, figures of speech, metaphors, and especially biographical and personal applications, "Without a parable spoke He not unto them." What use he would make to-day of science, of electricity, of the telegraph and the telephone and the latest mystery of wireless fellowship through unmeasured distances!

5. Let me emphasize the individual process which is indispensable to success in church life and work. The mass must be served, the class cared for, but mass and class are made up of units. It is not enough to preach to a congregation. Some do that. The value of a congregation is in the individuals that compose it and in the knowledge of the units which preacher, teacher or lecturer has; and the aim of his service must be the improvement of the individual.

17. The Sunday School of day-after-to-morrow will be:

1. A school of supernatural ministry.
2. It must begin with and embrace home.
3. It will be a school taught by plain every-day men—men who pray, men who teach by what they are, men who teach chiefly in conversation.

4. It will be a school whose largest power will be in action. The noblest oratory is action. Do you know how God speaks? He acts! "He made known His ways unto Moses, His acts unto the Children of Israel." So it was

with the whole history of Israel. So it was with Jesus. He did not write, He wrought.

5. Again in the school of day-after-to-morrow we shall return to the divine way of emphasizing biographical study. History is biography. Politics is biography. The Bible is biography. Christianity is the making of biography—"the living epistle read and known of all men."

18. Thus the school of day-after-to-morrow should embrace all the factors of life as set forth in God's Word—living, thinking, praying, demonstrating, conversing, doing, writing, printing, persevering in preaching and persuading men to accept the truth.

19. Let us turn the whole world, including the over-arching heavens into our school room—our university. Let us turn the whole of life into our school term. Let us dedicate to God the universe that our eyes behold and all the facilities that our place in the world and life embrace and let us each one of us be in God's home our school now and always.

MOSES IN ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

BY PROF. A. H. SAYCE, D. D., OXFORD UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND.

We all know the Moses of tradition—the Hebrew hero, the deliverer of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, the first of legislators, the compiler of the Pentateuch. Cast adrift on the Nile and rescued by the daughter of Pharaoh, a fugitive in Midian from the vengeance of the Egyptian government, a worker of miracles who brought the ten plagues upon the land of Egypt, he led his people to the edge of the Promised Land, and then died, alone with his God, on the summit of Pisgah, so that “no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.” Such was the Moses of tradition, the Moses whose story has claimed the belief of generation after generation for more than two thousand years.

The Moses of tradition has disappeared in the crucible of twentieth century criticism. There was no babe left to die in his cradle of bulrushes on the Nile; similar stories were told of other national heroes, of Romulus at Rome and of Sargon the Elder in Babylonia; it was but a folk-tale that came perhaps from Babylonia. There were no ten plagues, for they are all represented as miraculous, and the very mention of a miracle in a narrative makes it suspicious; criticism admits of nothing that savours of a miracle in the history that it reconstructs. There was no miraculous passage of the Red Sea and destruction of pursuing hosts; if the Israelites escaped from Egypt at all, they were but a small company of despised and insignificant serfs whom the Pharaoh would never have thought of pursuing with his armies. There was no legislation, for a code of laws at so early a date is inconceivable. There was no compilation of the Pentateuch, for if Moses and his compatriots existed they would have been unable to read or write. Has not Wolf shown that

there were no books even in the Greek world of the sixth century B. C.?

Moreover criticism has succeeded in analysing the Pentateuch into minute parts, in dividing even a single verse among three different writers, and none of these parts is as old as the age assigned to Moses. Indeed between the earliest of them and the Mosiac age there is a gap of several centuries. The legislation assigned to the single hero was the work of anonymous and for the most part self-interested priests, which extended over a great length of time. The critic can distinguish in it at least three successive strata, the earlier of which were revised and supplemented by the latter as priestly authority became more confirmed and priestly greed more grasping. In a hodge-podge of this sort, separated from its legendary author by so great a space of time, and written to a large extent with the purpose of claiming divine authority for a late ceremonial law, it is useless to look for history. When there were no books to hand it down, anything like authentic history was necessarily out of the question.

Here, however, twentieth century criticism ceases to be consentient. Some writers draw the logical conclusion that Moses never existed, and that the Israelites were never in the land of Goshen, or at any rate that we have no evidence for believing that they were. Other writers, less logical, or more influenced by old associations, shrink from so extreme a scepticism, and in spite of their premisses still cling to the belief that there was a Moses and even a Jewish legislator, though they have themselves destroyed all valid grounds for such a belief. As long as we confine ourselves to the Old Testament, an analysis of the Pentateuch which results in assigning it to a number of different and very inharmonious writers who lived long after the Mosiac period has only one logical conclusion—if there ever was a Moses, there is no literary evidence of the fact.

But the critical analysis of the Pentateuch involves

certain prodigious assumptions. First of all, that we are better acquainted with ancient Hebrew than we are with modern English. Secondly, that the student of the West is a competent judge of the motives and points of view of the ancient oriental. And thirdly, that what the critic imagines ought to have been the particular line of evolution in religious ideas actually was so. As a matter of fact, we cannot dissect into its component parts an English work which we know to have been written by two—much more three—persons. The critics who can distinguish with such mathematical precision the various “sources” of the Pentateuch cannot separate Besant from Rice in one of the novels which bear their conjoint names, or pick out the individual authors of the leading articles in a newspaper. And yet Hebrew is not only a dead language; all our acquaintance with it is confined to a limited number of books, and our knowledge of its grammar, and still more of its vocabulary is very imperfect. In fact, it is just because of our ignorance that it has seemed possible to dissect the Pentateuch; the field of comparison is not large enough to check and correct our supposed results.

For comparison is the instrument of science, and where the materials for comparison are wanting, a scientific conclusion is impossible. Criticism is still debating whether the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John are by the same author, although Greek is a European and not a Semitic language, and our knowledge of Greek is infinitely greater than our knowledge of Hebrew. But it is just because of this that the criticism of the New Testament is more modest than the criticism of the Old Testament; the more we know, the wider the range of our materials, the more difficult it is to come to a conclusion when the subject in hand is purely literary.

One reason for this is that in such cases the evidence is philological, and from philological premisses only philological conclusions can be drawn. The province of the grammarian is grammar, not history. A study of the

words of a language or of a document will tell us in what way they have been read at a particular time, what their history has been and what their relation is to the words of another language; it cannot tell us anything about the history of the people who spoke them or of the individual authors who employed them. There was a time, indeed, when the comparative philologist thought that, in the case of the Indo-European languages at any rate, it was possible to extract from them a picture of the primitive "Aryan" community; but the picture was wiped out by anthropology, and the scientific philologist of to-day recognizes that language and history belong to different provinces. There is a history of words, but out of words we cannot construct history.

The picture which the comparative philologist had drawn of the prehistoric Aryan community was shown to be a fiction when confronted with anthropology. The negative picture of the analyst of the Pentateuch belongs, not to the prehistoric age, but to the middle of the historical age of Western Asia, and oriental archæology has now given us the means of testing its truth. For archæology is scientific history, that is to say, history as gathered not merely from literary sources, but from contemporaneous evidence, which can for the most part be handled and felt. In place of the subjective impressions and "literary tact" of the critic we have the testimony of pottery and similar objects which are like the fossils of the geologist or the chemical elements and compounds with which the chemist deals; in place of books written long after the events they narrate, which have come down to us through numerous copyists, and the language of which admits of more than one interpretation, we have contemporaneous annals and first-hand documents. The method of archæology is that of the other inductive sciences, and its conclusions, therefore, have the same scientific authority. In the words of German philosophy they are "objective" and not "subjective."

Now it so happens that the Mosaic age is one about

certain prodigious assumptions. First of all, that we are better acquainted with ancient Hebrew than we are with modern English. Secondly, that the student of the West is a competent judge of the motives and points of view of the ancient oriental. And thirdly, that what the critic imagines ought to have been the particular line of evolution in religious ideas actually was so. As a matter of fact, we cannot dissect into its component parts an English work which we know to have been written by two—much more three—persons. The critics who can distinguish with such mathematical precision the various “sources” of the Pentateuch cannot separate Besant from Rice in one of the novels which bear their conjoint names, or pick out the individual authors of the leading articles in a newspaper. And yet Hebrew is not only a dead language; all our acquaintance with it is confined to a limited number of books, and our knowledge of its grammar, and still more of its vocabulary is very imperfect. In fact, it is just because of our ignorance that it has seemed possible to dissect the Pentateuch; the field of comparison is not large enough to check and correct our supposed results.

For comparison is the instrument of science, and where the materials for comparison are wanting, a scientific conclusion is impossible. Criticism is still debating whether the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John are by the same author, although Greek is a European and not a Semitic language, and our knowledge of Greek is infinitely greater than our knowledge of Hebrew. But it is just because of this that the criticism of the New Testament is more modest than the criticism of the Old Testament; the more we know, the wider the range of our materials, the more difficult it is to come to a conclusion when the subject in hand is purely literary.

One reason for this is that in such cases the evidence is philological, and from philological premisses only philological conclusions can be drawn. The province of the grammarian is grammar, not history. A study of the

words of a language or of a document will tell us in what way they have been read at a particular time, what their history has been and what their relation is to the words of another language; it cannot tell us anything about the history of the people who spoke them or of the individual authors who employed them. There was a time, indeed, when the comparative philologist thought that, in the case of the Indo-European languages at any rate, it was possible to extract from them a picture of the primitive "Aryan" community; but the picture was wiped out by anthropology, and the scientific philologist of to-day recognizes that language and history belong to different provinces. There is a history of words, but out of words we cannot construct history.

The picture which the comparative philologist had drawn of the prehistoric Aryan community was shown to be a fiction when confronted with anthropology. The negative picture of the analyst of the Pentateuch belongs, not to the prehistoric age, but to the middle of the historical age of Western Asia, and oriental archæology has now given us the means of testing its truth. For archæology is scientific history, that is to say, history as gathered not merely from literary sources, but from contemporaneous evidence, which can for the most part be handled and felt. In place of the subjective impressions and "literary tact" of the critic we have the testimony of pottery and similar objects which are like the fossils of the geologist or the chemical elements and compounds with which the chemist deals; in place of books written long after the events they narrate, which have come down to us through numerous copyists, and the language of which admits of more than one interpretation, we have contemporaneous annals and first-hand documents. The method of archæology is that of the other inductive sciences, and its conclusions, therefore, have the same scientific authority. In the words of German philosophy they are "objective" and not "subjective."

Now it so happens that the Mosaic age is one about

which oriental archæology has a good deal to say. And what it has to say by no means agrees with the conclusions of the literary criticism of the Pentateuch. Between this and the results of archæological science there is about the same relation as between the philological picture of the primitive Aryan community and the results of anthropological research.

In the first place, the Mosiac age, we have now learnt, was a highly literary one. It came at the end of a long-preceding period of literary culture and intercourse. All over Western Asia there were roads along which the postman travelled and letters passed to and fro between Babylonia and Egypt, between Canaan and Cappadocia. Libraries were multiplied all over the East, and Canaan was filled with schools where the foreign script and language of Babylonia were taught and learned. In Egypt the commonest articles of every-day life were inscribed, and even the potters had a system of writing of their own. The overseers of the workmen were required to be able to read and write like the heads of the villages or of the tribes who were settled in the land. As in Babylonia, so too in Egypt, books had been written and edited from a remote antiquity; in Egypt even the historical novel had come into existence, and the Egyptian gentleman counted among the future delights of Paradise the enjoyment of books. In Canaan the petty shêkhs of third-class towns, like Taanach, were writing to one another about their private affairs in the foreign language of Babylonia and in the complicated cuneiform syllabary. And in this correspondence women took part, not only in Babylonia, but also in Canaan. If Moses and his people had been brought up in Egypt, it would have been nothing short of a miracle had neither he nor the Israelitish upper classes been able to read and write.

In the second place, a codification of law in the Mosaic age, so far from being "inconceivable," turns out to have been the most natural thing in the world. Eight centuries previously Khammu-rabi or Amraphel king of

Babylonia had codified the Babylonian law, and a copy of his code is now in the Museum of the Louvre. Khammu-rabi was king of Canaan as well as of Babylonia, Canaan being at the time a province of the Babylonian empire, and the Babylonian law was consequently in use there also. Hence the code was known and obeyed not only in the country of Abraham's birth, but also in that of his adoption, and the conception of it had been familiar to the inhabitants of Western Asia and Egypt long before the Israelites left the land of Goshen. The code had been compiled out of the case-law of Babylonia, the individual laws in it being the decisions given by the judges in actual cases which had come before them; each law is, therefore, introduced by an "if." The individual laws of the civil code of Israel have precisely the same form (Exod. XXI., etc.), and the account of the manner in which they had first been laid down (given in Exod. XVIII. 21-26) exactly agrees with what we now know to have been the origin of the laws of the Babylonian code. The compilation of the civil code of Moses was but an imitation of that of the Babylonian code which had so long been in force in Western Asia and with which the civilized world of the East must have been thoroughly acquainted.

Then, thirdly, the very name of "Israelites" has been found on an Egyptian monument. The discovery was unexpected, for it seemed probable that the Egyptians were as little likely to record the name of the Hebrew serfs as the Anglo-Egyptians of to-day are to record the name of the Bedâwin in the eastern part of the Delta, more especially if these same serfs had escaped after bringing disaster upon their masters. Nevertheless, the unexpected has happened. In 1896 Prof. Flinders Petrie discovered at Thebes a stela containing a poem in honor of Meneptah, on which the name of the Israelites is spelt in full. Their "seed" is said to have been destroyed so that their kinsfolk in the land of the Horites, or Edom, have become "as widows" for want of men to marry. As

the determinative of "country" is not attached to the name of the Israelites as it is to those of the other peoples mentioned along with them, it would appear that though the Israelites had already fled from Egypt they had not as yet conquered a new home for themselves in Palestine.

That Meneptah, the son and successor of Ramses II. of the nineteenth dynasty, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, has long since been recognized by the Egyptologists—supposing, that is, that credence should be given to the story of the Pentateuch. Here we read (Exod I. 11) that the Pharaoh of the Oppression built Pithom and Raamses with Israelitish labour. That Ramses II. was the builder of the city of Ramses or Raamses in the Delta was already known from a papyrus, and Prof. Naville's excavations at Patum, the Biblical Pithom, proved that Ramses II. was the founder also of this latter city. Ramses II. was the greatest of Egyptian builders; all over Egypt he built, repaired and restored—or in some cases deformed—and foreign captives and royal serfs were employed in his works. He died after a long reign of sixty-seven years and was followed by his son Meneptah II., whose accession is referred to in Exod. II. 23. Then it was, according to the Old Testament narrative, that Moses returned from Midian to Egypt and demanded of the new Pharaoh that he should let the people of Israel "go three days' journey into the desert" that they might sacrifice unto the Lord their God. Since his predecessor had built Pithom and Raamses, and Egyptian discovery has shown that their builder was Ramses II., it follows that Meneptah must have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

Once this is admitted the archæological facts fit in with the Biblical story. The exceptionally long reign of Ramses II and his mania for building agree with the use made of the children of Israel as well as with the length of time during which it is implied that their oppression lasted. Forty years, it is true, and its multiples signify merely an indefinite or unknown period of time in

Hebrew idiom (see for example 2 Sam. XV. 7, compared with XIII. 38, XIV. 28), but Moses was already a grown man when he left Midian, so that we may suppose him to have been at least thirty years of age. In the latter part of the reign of Ramses the power of Egypt had begun to wane, and there were signs that invaders might again assail it on its Asiatic frontier as had been the case in times past. The Asiatic tribe, therefore, settled in the land of Goshen on the eastern side of the Delta was a standing danger; an Asiatic invader might find in them useful allies, and in view of their rapid increase it seemed sound policy to break their spirit and limit the number of their male offspring. Hence we can understand why the Israelitish herdsmen of Goshen were transformed into the Pharaoh's serfs who had to toil for him at his numerous buildings in the Delta, and why the order was issued to destroy their male seed.

The invasion actually came in the fifth year of Meneptah. Egypt was attacked on both sides, by the Libyans from the west and by the nations of Asia Minor and the Greek seas from the north. The invaders made their way across the Delta and encamped near the modern Belbeis at the western extremity of the land of Goshen and not far from the site of Pithom. The fears of Ramses were thus justified, and though the invading troops were eventually defeated in a decisive battle, the Delta had been ravaged and the Egyptian monarchy had never been nearer its overthrow. That the enemy should have encamped on the borders of Goshen is significant; it is still more significant that immediately after the invasion is over we find the land of Goshen is empty.

In the account of the invasion we are told that this land "had been left as pasture for cattle for the sake of the foreigners, abandoned (to them) since the days of (Meneptah's) ancestors." The "foreigners" were still there with their "tents" when the invasion took place. But three years later a letter was written to the king, the papyrus original of which is now in the British

Museum. In this the writer says: "Here is another matter for the consideration of my master. We have allowed the tribes of the Bedâwin (Shasu) from the land of Edom to pass the fortress of Meneptah in the land of Succoth (Thukut), (and go) to the lakes of Pithom of Meneptah in the land of Succoth, in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds on the great estate of the Pharaoh, the beneficent sun of all countries. (Dated) the year 8." Consequently, between the 5th and the 8th years of Meneptah the pasturage land of Succoth or Goshen had been denuded of its population. The fact that the land of Goshen was regarded as an estate of the Pharaoh throws light on its gift to Joseph's brothers as well as on the right of Ramses II to turn the herdsmen settled in it into his own workmen. Its Hebrew title was derived from the name of the capital of the District Kosem in Egyptian, now Saft-el-Henna, which was excavated by Prof. Naville in 1884.

We may perhaps infer that the escape of the Israelites from their "house of bondage" was aided by the Libyan invasion. At all events we are told that "a mixed multitude" accompanied them in their flight, which led them from Raamses to Succoth, then to Etham, the Egyptian Khetem, and to "the sea." This geography agrees exactly with what the papyri of the age of Ramses and Meneptah have informed us was the geography of the eastern Delta at this particular age. And it is noticeable that it was a geography which does not suit any other period. Raamses had no existence before the time of Ramses II. and falls out of sight after the epoch of the nineteenth dynasty, while Etham, "in the edge of the wilderness," is either the Khetem or "Fortress" of Ramses II on the border of the desert or the Khetem of Meneptah "in the land of Succoth," both of which disappear from later history.

The Exodus of Israel centers around the figure of Moses. He is presented to us as at once an Israelite,—full of patriotism and sympathy with his fellow-tribes-

men,—and as the adopted son of an Egyptian princess who had been brought up at the Egyptian court where he had been instructed in all the literary “wisdom of the Egyptians” and had learnt the art and principles of statecraft. In the age of the nineteenth dynasty we find other Semites similarly rising to posts of influence at the Pharaoh’s court where (like Joseph in earlier days) they assumed Egyptian names. Thus the prime-minister of Menepthah was a certain Ramses-em-pe-Ra, whose father, Ben-Mazan, had come from the land of Bashan and settled in Egypt and there received the name of “Yu the Elder.” Moses, or rather Mosheh as it is written in Hebrew, the name given by the daughter of Pharaoh to “the child” she had rescued from the water, was a common Egyptian name at the time. It is generally transcribed Messu by Egyptologists and signified “son” or “child.” A governor of Ethiopia under Ramses II. bore it, so also did another governor of Ethiopia under Menepthah, who has left a record of himself on the granite rocks of the First Cataract, not far from the modern Cataract Hotel. Another Egyptian name of the same period was Pi-Nehasi “the Negro,” which we find again in Phinehas the grandson of Aaron.

The flight of Moses to Midian and his subsequent return to Egypt is curiously paralleled in the history of an Egyptian named Saneha who lived many centuries earlier in the time of the twelfth dynasty and whose biography has been preserved in a papyrus. Why Moses should have fled so far as Midian from the vengeance of the Egyptian government has now been made clear to us by the hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered in the Sinaitic Peninsula. The turquoise mines of Sinai had been worked by the Egyptians from a very early epoch, and the Peninsula (or Market as it was called), was an Egyptian province, possessing an Egyptian temple and stations for Egyptian soldiers. If, therefore, the fugitive wished to be beyond the reach of the Egyptian power and

to evade the Egyptian garrisons, Midian was his nearest point of safety.

Midian was at the time ruled by a high-priest. This, too, is in agreement with the latest results of archaeological research. The early inscriptions found in Arabia have disclosed the fact that there, as in Assyria, the "high-priest" preceded the "king." The high-priest did not become a king until after the Mosiac age was past.

On the ten plagues archæology is not likely to throw any direct light. The native monuments of Egypt are not likely to record national disasters. The Pharaohs describe their triumphs, but naturally not their defeats. Those, however, who have lived in Egypt know that the ten plagues were but intensified examples of the common visitations of the country. Year by year at the time of inundation the Nile becomes blood-red and is for a short while undrinkable; frogs and lice, and still more flies, are annual plagues—the plague of flies, indeed, it may be said, has never been removed. The cattle of Egypt at present are but just recovering from a "murrain" which has all but destroyed them, and boils and blains are the commonest of diseases. More than once during the past ten years the crops have been ruined by the hail and rain of violent thunder-storms, and the locust is still a cause of dread. Even the plague of darkness can be matched to a limited extent by the darkness occasioned by a bad "khamasin," when the sun becomes invisible from the blinding dust which fills the air and produces a darkness that "may be felt." And cholera and plague carry away their victims in a few hours. The "ten plagues" were characteristic of Egypt and, as a whole, of no other country on the globe.

Here, however, we pass from archæology to the modern world. What archæology has done and is doing is to recreate the age in which Moses lived, and the social, political and geographical conditions under which he was born. Thanks to recent research and discovery that age

is now becoming as well known to us as the age of Alexander the Great, and we have at last a scientific test for determining how far the history contained in the Pentateuch is trustworthy. We can now compare its statements with the contemporaneous records of the epoch to which it professes to belong, and see whether or not it agrees with them. We have been told that the use of writing for literary purposes was unknown in the Mosiac age and that consequently the books ascribed to that age must be of much later date, and now archæology has shown us that the age was really almost as literary as ours. We have been assured that a codification of law in the time of Moses was inconceivable, and we have learned that a code of law, obeyed in Canaan as well as in Babylonia, had been compiled eight centuries before he was born. It has been asserted that the geography of the Exodus was the invention of Jewish writers of a late date, and we now find that it agrees with the map of north-eastern Egypt as it existed in the epoch of the nineteenth dynasty and at no other period. It has been maintained that the story of the Exodus has no standing place in actual history, and contemporaneous monuments have now proved that it is in full harmony with the political circumstances of the time. Moses himself has been pronounced to be a myth, and, behold, the very name has turned up in hieroglyphic inscriptions. Of the two pictures that have been presented to us, the picture of the Moses of tradition and the picture of the Moses of criticism, the second has been demolished by the archæological facts. All we can say of the first is that much of it has been directly or indirectly supported by the progress of archæological discovery, that there is nothing, or little, in it which is inconsistent with what we now know to have been the history and condition of the oriental world in the age of Ramses and Menepthah.

SOME PHASES OF THE ETHICAL CHARACTER
OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE
ETHICS OF ANCIENT ORIENTAL
PEOPLES.

BY IRA MAURICE PRICE, PH. D., LL. D.,
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The morals of a person or a people are a true index of character. The ethical code of the Old Testament has been, and is to-day, a stumbling-block for many to belief in the Bible. It is presented, however, not as an organized and complete system of morals, but is rather gathered up from here and there throughout the various and diverse books and set forth in accordance with modern occidental methods.

The necessity of treating this theme is increasingly apparent. To some readers, the Old Testament is full of the impossible, and inexplicable, and the unthinkable. Many of its characters, though nominally believers in God, they say, were inexpressibly bad, and their conduct such as to condemn them without a hearing. Their code of morals would not be tolerated in any civilized nation on earth, and their presence in the Old Testament involves the whole book in their guilt. With such a decision there is large sympathy on the part of the apathetic who are looking for some pretext behind which they can hide their neglect and their indifference.

Again, some of the most vigorous and telling attacks on the Old Testament, and that includes the New as well, have been and are hurled against the sins, both individual and national that are there spread out with so much gruesome detail. One of the latest books on Old Testament history vigorously condemns and practically excommunicates from the roll of the saints some of the characters who have in the past occupied honorable places. Even

the actions of Jehovah himself, in commanding the extermination of the Canaanites, and the slaughter of the Amalekites are characterized in the famous lectures delivered in royal audience in Berlin within the past three years, as savagery and butchery of an incredible and uncompromising kind. The presence in the Old Testament of many chapters, hundreds of expressions, figures, and facts, that ill-become the modesty of this age, have given occasion for many bitter condemnations of the Bible.

On the other hand, there is another class of readers and students of the Old Testament, whose unswerving belief in the wisdom and truth of its every act and utterance, feels called upon to defend it. In their attempt to justify and vindicate the language and the characters of the Bible, they usually employ such arguments and methods as rather confuse than aid the man or woman who is seeking the truth. A practical example: A few years ago I heard one of the most eloquent preachers in this land publicly declare with solemn emphasis, that the so-called immodest language of the Bible was intended by God only for private reading, and therefore forms no objection whatever. Whence did he obtain such information?

Again, some of our most zealous defenders of God's Word seem to think that they are required to justify the words and deeds of Old Testament characters on the basis of New Testament standards of right; and in the process, they slip down themselves, and thus display their own lack of footing. For example, when Abraham went down to Egypt, and told Pharaoh, to save his own life, that Sarah was his sister, he was justified on the ground that she was his half-sister. Justified! Only half a lie, then! But moral confusion of such a defense stirred up in the mind of the listener is worse by far than the original act of Abraham.

We have no right to require of Old Testament characters that they should be measured by the moral standards of the New Testament, and every attempt to compel them to do it results not only in a perversion of the

facts, but in a confusion of moral standards in the minds of our listeners, that can result only in harm to the cause of Christianity.

These various views and methods of explaining the so-called moral difficulties of the Old Testament, have resulted in sore confusion in the minds of some earnest students. They have led some either to shatter, or make complete shipwreck of their faith and to reject the Bible *in toto*. Others have set up their own standards of judgment, and by means of these, accept or reject the biblical books and doctrines. In fact, the chief fault found with the Bible in the past, and I might say in the present, has been not because of its moral and religious claims upon the individual, but because of its pictures of the immoral and irreligious men and women of Bible times. In other words, the Bible has been and is largely judged, not by its rules of conduct, but by its living examples or supposed embodiments of those rules. Such a standard of judgment is both natural and justifiable. We all admire the sublime and beautiful precepts and ethics of Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Confucianism, even though moral conduct is not required by any of them. They are inspiring and elevating and ennobling. But our judgment of the real value of either of these faiths, is based, not on the exquisite literary form or statement of their sacred books, but on the results seen in the lives and characters of the peoples and nations where these faiths hold sway. We must grant the justness of the contention of the man who finds difficulties in the Old Testament and must seek in a helpful and rational manner to dissolve his doubts. For these questions, these moral precipitates of those times, are not insoluble.

It is not my purpose to discuss the entire moral code of the Old Testament, nor to answer the avalanche of questions that deals with its application. I shall rather confine myself to a consideration of the basis of the phases of conduct that we find scattered through the Old

Testament and shall take up a few examples by way of illustration.

1. Recent discoveries in the ancient oriental world have lifted the clouds from our sky, and let in some of the sunlight of God's day. Shining through the prism of modern scholarship this light has been broken into its different colors, so that we are enabled to distinguish between the different shades of thought and truth, and further to explain more fully their proper relations to each other.

To be more specific, the Hebrew people, as we have seen, were a part of the ancient Oriental world. They were only a small folk living in the midst of an active, aggressive body of great nations, such as the Egyptians, the Babylonians-Assyrians, the Hittites, and the Phœnicians. They were an integral part of that civilization that had its home on the East coast of the Mediterranean Sea. Its own neighbors and associates were the Canaanites, the Moabites, the Edomites, the Ammonites, the Philistines, and the Syrians or Aramæans. Recent discoveries on the soil of the territory occupied by several of these ancient peoples, and the records of the Old Testament give us a fairly true picture of the moral as well as political conditions that were prevalent among them. Their proximity to them, their substantial oneness of language, their commercial relations, their common modes of life, made them in these respects, at least, sympathetic and helpful to each other. Such points in common led to intermarriages, and all that that implies. The moral standards, and the religious obligations, of each individual people could not, under these conditions, long remain isolated. Custom and conduct are too closely intermingled and inter-related to allow of any violent or even gentle rending asunder. Israel then as a people became entangled in all that characterized the peoples on the East coast of the Mediterranean Sea.

But some one may ask, Were they not the people of Jehovah, and as such under his guidance? Certainly; and they were also people of those times. Right here we

must make an essential distinction. Doubtless, God chose Abraham, revealed himself to him, made a covenant with him, and made him the progenitor of the Hebrew peoples. To the leaders and the prophets, God spoke in diverse manners and in diverse places. The best classes of Israel knew Jehovah, and served him in their way, not in any one period, but in all periods of their history in the Old Testament. My contention carries with it the thought that Israel in its leaders knew God, and maintained the highest form of worship known to the world. Furthermore, I affirm that for all such Israelites their conception of God was the ruling idea of life. Morality for them was what God commanded, and immorality was what he forbade. To the pious Israelite, God was the basis and the sanction of moral law.

Nevertheless, the nation as a nation, and the leaders as leaders, were not immune to their environment. To make them so would be to regard them as unhuman, as demigods, and thus characters with whom we could not deal or sympathize. They were an integral part of the life of their times, and in all our discussion, this fact must be reckoned with.

2. Any detailed and full discussion of the ethics of the Old Testament will embody answers to two questions: (1) What did God command? (2) What did God prohibit? To answer these in full would be to set forth the complete provisions of the law, affirmative and negative. Furthermore, such answer would be a true presentation of the methods by which Jehovah sought to lift up, elevate, and train Israel in the paths that he desired they should walk. In other words, if such a full and complete code of laws could be made we should no longer be in doubt as to the divine programme for the separation, the elevation, and perfection of a people after his own heart.

But unfortunately, we cannot do this thing. No two schools of Bible students or scholars agree. But on one point there is harmony. All agree that God took Israel as he found her, among, and mingled with, the peoples of

her time, saturated by the social and moral ideas of those times. By gentle steps, and gradual rises, sometimes scarcely perceptible, he led her up out of the total degradation of her neighbors, to appreciate in some small degree higher and better things. He gave her laws only as she could comprehend them, and such laws as would not violently break down the most deep-seated customs of the day. Prohibitions seem to have been the most favorite form of early law, revealing the fact that the conduct of Israel was such that improvement must be made by a series of eliminations. Of the ten commandments, eight are prohibitions, one a command with an implied penalty attaching to its violation, and followed by a prohibition. Now those so-called ten commandments or words cover the moral action of Israel as required by God. Several of these prohibitions had been made prior to the giving of the law at Sinai, but are here first concisely and specifically laid down.

Soon after the flood there was established between God and Abraham covenant relations, symbolic of intercourse between them. This covenant carried with it certain obligations of obedience and loyalty to Jehovah. Such obedience implied an abandonment of certain popularly recognized local customs, and rules of conduct. Murder had been prohibited just after the flood; and the sin of Sodom had been condemned by the judgment of God. But the ten prohibitions as they should be more justly termed did not cover the whole category of sins. They required man to worship the one true God reverently, to honor the Sabbath and his parents, and to have due regard to the family and property rights of his fellow-man. Interpreted merely from an external point of view, these would strike at the heart of many of the most flagrant violations of divine and human law current among the nations who were Israel's neighbors. But the immorality and the wrongs that were permitted, aside from those which were openly and secretly violated, are to some the disturbing factors in the problems before us. We are to keep per-

petually in mind, the fact that the *morale* of every nation about Israel, and of the mass of Israel itself, was of a low, degraded order, that they were swayed by their passions as the sea is by the winds, that they had slight stability, and less resistance to outbursts of anger, violence, and bloodshed. Furthermore, the commands and pronouncements of God secured their enforcement almost entirely by the bonds of the covenant, or the fear of a penalty. Such being the case, it is plainly evident that the authority of the law alone made but slight gains until a class of men arose whose mission it was to speak for God.

Let us now look at some of the sins which were prevalent but were not prohibited by law. Polygamy appears before the flood (Lamech), and is prevalent during all of Israel's pre-exile history. We find it in the families of Abraham, Jacob, Esau, Gideon, David, Solomon, Rehoboam, and Josiah. Oriental tribal leaders, rulers, landed-proprietors, and kings, in all the nations about Israel, in Egypt, Babylon, Elam and Persia were of one mind, in the perpetuation of this ancient custom. The only limit that seems to have curbed it was the shortage of resources for the maintenance of so expensive a household.

The prevalence of polygamy led to the extension and multiplication of a whole list of horrible social evils, that threatened the very existence of some of the peoples of that day. Priests, prophets, and reformers cried out against them as the bane of civilization. The seventh commandment touches only one of these sins.

Lying was recognized as a legitimate method of acquiring the ends sought after—the end justified the means—and was indulged in by king and peasant. Deception, a lie's half-sister, not simply in war, but in peace, and everywhere was regarded as both right and honorable, provided one was not caught in the act. Abraham and Jacob succeeded in winning their cases, and hence by Oriental codes of ethics were in the right—nor, indeed, by their interpretation did they break any of the prohibitions

of the ten commandments. "Thou shalt not kill," was doubtless intended to be a curb on the prevalence of blood-revenge. If a man intentionally or accidentally killed another, it was the duty of the nearest kinsman or of the tribe of the slain to slay the murderer. This custom became so destructive, that often almost entire tribes were, as they are to-day, in the Orient, wiped off the map. The statement of the sixth commandment is explicit, but was not effective in checking the scourge of blood revenge. The selection of six cities of refuge located in different parts of the land, was intended as an appendix to the sixth commandment. To these the unintentional slayer could flee and after trial and proof of his accidental murder, could remain in security until after the death of the high-priest.

But the violations of this law, with few exceptions, were almost as common in Israel as among their neighbors. Human life was of little account, as we see in the many bloody conflicts both of individuals and of nations. Wars of extermination both of families and of peoples were the order of the day, and some of them, too, for trivial offenses. Such was the unwritten law of the nations, against which the written law of Jehovah was almost powerless. To say that the sixth commandment meant, "Thou shalt not kill without good reason," does not explain the constant violations of it that fill the pages of the Old Testament.

Besides the decalogue Israel had laws touching assaults, treatment of slaves, relations of parents and children, idol-worship and magic, property lost, strayed, or stolen, the poor, unjust judges, etc. These provisions put checks on the current customs of the times, and thus gradually set Israel apart as a people of God's own choice.

While all this may be truly said, it is, at the same time, a fact, that quite all of these regulations just noted were codified and enforced 1,000 years before Moses' day by that master warrior and ruler, Hammurabi, in the valley

of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. The common law of the great nations was also being enforced among the smaller and less completely organized governments.

The specifications against uncleanness in person and in foods, the provisions for sins of ignorance and other delinquencies point to a system of sacrifices that did much to maintain the moral tone of the law. Beneath and permeating every sacrificial provision, and every ritual requirement, is the holiness of Jehovah.

The legal provisions of Deuteronomy emphasize some things hitherto implied. Justice between man and man, through the medium of impartial and God-fearing judges, attains new importance. The moral character of Jehovah is brought out into a new light, thus impressing upon Israel the desirability of remaining true to one who is so faithful and long suffering toward his own people, and the stranger. The whole book looks at the religious progress of the nation, rather than at the observances of the ritual.

The historical books are marvelously lacking in references to the law or to its enforcement. They show us a people who were gradually rising through a tribal to a unified national existence. Many examples might be cited of the moral obliquity of the actors, to show that Israel was as yet barely rising above the environment of her neighbors. Jael's treachery within the confines of her own tent, and the poet's praise of her, underscore all that has been said of Israel's *morale* in the early years of her history.

As we pass now to the prophetic and poetic utterances, we encounter a new force. The prophet supplemented the ten commandments; he wrought for the ethical evolution of Israel. Ritual and sacrifice became to him of secondary importance. The nation and man should come into direct relation with God. Mere sacrifices were valueless. Their efficacy was positively conditional on the attitude of the offerer. The moral law must be kept in all

its details, and violation of it would be followed by con-
dign punishment.

The strongest representation of Israel's relation to Jehovah is that of a wife to her husband. In each of the great prophets, and particularly in Hosea, this relationship is set forth with tenderness and pathos. The prophet was the moral arbiter of the times. He condemned the numberless and nameless evils that were sapping the nation's power. So far as we can measure, he introduced few new moral ideas, but rather gave his strength to the widest application of the those already current in Israel.

The underlying idea of law, the holiness of Jehovah, became his fundamental text. Purity of life, of worship, and of ritual, and in this order, were his cry. Only such as embodied these virtues were immune from the judgments of Jehovah. Such a doctrine repeatedly and persistently emphasized, passed from the nation to the individual as the one and only one directly responsible for his own acts. But the righteous person's righteousness could not be imparted to another, nor could it be efficient in averting any punishment of which another was guilty. Actual things done were the measure of a man's responsibility. Nevertheless, man's responsibility reached beyond himself, and his good or his evil acts were far-reaching.

The prophets penetrated the shams of their day with divine insight and wisdom. They openly condemned kings, princes, and priests for their commercializing methods of worship. Sacrifices should not be perverted for private gain (Saul), nor the moral law violated for purely personal and selfish ends (Ahab and Manasseh). One who could not appreciate Jehovah directly, could not reach him through a sacrifice, for it was the heart, and not the act that determined the man's character in the presence of God.

The Psalms are the moralist's treasure-house. Underneath the poet's exuberant and buoyant faith in God we discover the highest respect for divine law, and its

application in his daily life. Every event of his day, every fact of history is based on his supreme regard for law, and the transcendent moral character of the law-giver. With fiery wrath and burning indignation, he heaps his imprecations upon the wicked, and can find no punishment for them too cruel, or too well-deserved. His humanity, his enmity for the enemies of God, combine to give us writings that are but a natural outburst of his sense of justice.

The Book of Proverbs is a collection of ethical precepts. It is built on the desirability of living a moral life. Its motive seems to have been wholly utilitarian. "Be" and "do right" for that is the road to success. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." "Honor Jehovah with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of thy increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy vats shall overflow with new wine" (3: 9, 10). "Fear Jehovah and depart from evil: It will be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones" (3: 7, 8). The two ever-present characters of Proverbs are the Wise Man and the Fool, compared and contrasted until we can faithfully sketch each one of them. They are the personifications respectively of a law-abiding, and of a reprobate life.

"Why do the righteous suffer?" is the question of the book of Job, unanswered and still unanswerable.

The pessimist of Ecclesiastes, having exhausted all the means at hand for the gratification of his desires falls back on the simple truth, "fear God and keep his commandments for this is the whole of man" (Eccl. 12:13).

Having now briefly scanned some of the main features of Old Testament morality, let us take a general view of the case.

We have seen that the Hebrews were steeped in the customs and manners of their times; that they were so wedded to the traditions and the life of their day, that it needed more than man-power to lift them. God's choice of one man and his immediate descendants as the vehicles

of his truth, put the first check on a headlong rush towards destruction and extinction. A code of ten prohibitions, enjoined on his covenant people, formed the nucleus of a new ethical code. This nucleus, by a process of elimination, prohibited many of those acts of men that had been for centuries the cause of the degradation of worship and the disintegration of social life. Besides reverence for Jehovah as the *one* God, and regard for the property of their fellow men, there were special laws on the duties of man to himself, to his fellow-man, to the animal creation, to the soil, and to nature itself. Every such restriction on conduct was a step in advance, and gradually widened and enlarged the moral horizon of the man who was obedient to the God who was the basis of all moral law.

The coming of the prophets introduces to us a class of men whose life-work was the condemnation of every violation of high ethical standards, and the enforcement of the just claims of the moral law. Their conception of right was grounded in the holiness of Jehovah, and no sacrifice was adequate to secure his approval that did not carry with it a penitent heart. The poets of Israel built their productions on moral standards that far eclipse anything found in the literatures of their antecedents or contemporaries. In short, the ethical standards of Israel were based on the moral character of Jehovah as revealed in the successive laws, prohibitions, commands, and regulations entrusted to the prophets, priests and reformers through a long period of years, as over against those of contemporary peoples, which were based either on the caprice of the gods or the decisions of a ruler.

3. With this bird's-eye view of the ethical character of the Old Testament what can be said of its so-called moral difficulties? We have seen that the method of revelation was gradual and disciplinary, and that the purpose of the law was pedagogical; that it was enjoined and enforced only as fast and as far as the elementary minds of the age could apprehend and appreciate it. Such a

method of procedure permitted, rather did not prohibit, at first many things that do violence to our ideas of right. The so-called moral difficulties, rather immoral acts, of the Old Testament, where they are neither prohibited nor rebuked, are simply to be regarded as moral defects of the age, requiring neither justification nor vindication on our part. Our New Testament standards tell us what those sins were, but do not ask that we palliate or excuse them, or attempt to explain them on any artificial hypothesis of the inviolability of Holy Scriptures.

When Jehovah commanded the extinction of the Canaanites, or Saul's slaughter of the Amalekites, he was doing nothing more than to allow the natural hatred and the blood revenge of the peoples of that day to have full sway. There was no cold blooded, unprovoked move on God's part. In the same spirit, he uses the Assyrian as the rod of his anger to punish wayward Judah (Isa. 10:5), and the Babylonians to punish all the earth.

The moral character of Jehovah, here as elsewhere, in the Old Testament, was displayed in its disciplinary, pedagogical acts, based on a high motive in the training of the race.

When Gideon had routed the Midianites, he captured two of the leaders, Zebah and Zalmunna. On learning that they had slain his own brethren at some earlier time, he, in accordance with the requirements of blood-revenge, slew them, his own captives, in cold blood.

Samuel took a sword and hewed Agag to pieces in the presence of Saul and the people—from our point of view a bloody, inexcusable crime. But Agag was the Amalekite king whom Saul had brought home as a trophy of victory, when he had been commanded to destroy the entire tribe. Samuel was simply concluding with his own hand the orders that had been given to Saul to slay all the devoted or banned living beings.

In David's last charge to Solomon, he includes the slaying of Joab and Shimei. This has been called a cowardly, savage order, that greatly discredits the great

king's character. But regard for the safety of an Oriental monarch and his throne required that all rivals and dangerous men in authority should be dispatched. This fact, with some purely human and thoroughly Oriental spirit of revenge, sufficiently account for David's orders.

These are some of the illustrations, of the scores found in the Old Testament, of difficulties that practically vanish when put under the light of ancient Oriental ethical codes.

Before I conclude I wish to revert to one fact mentioned in the beginning of this lecture. From choice, I should pass it over in silence but loyalty to my theme and to the Bible requires that I speak plainly. The immodest and immoral facts described in the Old Testament are merely a shadow of what we find in the literatures of the times of the ancient Hebrews. Perhaps we may not be aware of it, but many of our Latin and Greek text-books in use in our schools to-day are expurgated editions. The *morale* of Old Testament literature even as we find it has given ground for valid objections to the public use of certain portions of it. I am sure that a judicious and careful up-to-date translation could tone down and practically nullify the bold statements of some of these passages—which the Authorized Version and even the American Standard Revised Version render inexcusably objectionable.

But we must remember that the records of the Old Testament were written by, and for peoples, who lived from 3000 to 2000 years ago; and that for them and in their times, the bold and crass statements of the evils of social life were entirely admissible and proper, and, doubtless, in their methods of presentation, served to emphasize with telling power, certain phases of truth. But happily that age has gone by, and we stand on higher levels, with our standards of propriety based on New Testament models, and the evolution from these models of the best that modern Christianity and Christian society demands.

What shall we say then of these old records that em-

body such objectionable material? They are wholly archaic; they represent an age long ago left in the rear, no longer to be condoned, excused, or to be used, except as relics of a *morale* that should be forgotten, and forgotten, the sooner, the better.

I have sincere sympathy for the man or woman, who, with a high and noble sense of moral purity of thought, and principle, objects to the promiscuous reading of the Old Testament by the children of the family. But ought we to retain in our Bible things that not only raise violent objection to it on moral grounds, but actually militate against the best interests of the growth of the Christian religion? Who can answer? Should we expurgate every such moral taint and thus put them all beyond the reach of doing harm? Or, can we from now on, positively, absolutely and everywhere emphasize the truth that every such chapter, verse, or figure is but a relic of a degraded *morale* of a far-off age, that deserves perpetual oblivion?

In this rapid survey of my theme I have endeavored to set forth three points. (1) That Israel was one of the peoples of the ancient Oriental world, possessing almost every element of character in common with her neighbors; (2) That laws of prohibition and command were issued by Jehovah gradually, only as they could be apprehended and applied; and (3) That the moral obliquities of the Israelites, which stand out so conspicuously in the Old Testament, are to be regarded simply as relics of the emergence of a people from comparative barbarism to the better moral standards laid down in the laws of Jehovah, and later in the New Testament.

With infinite wisdom, skill, patience, long suffering, and tenderness, Jehovah selected, trained, disciplined, and refined as in a furnace, an ancient race, a degraded race, a stubborn and recalcitrant race, that thereby he might have a vehicle for his truth, a nation for his name, and a people who could preserve and perpetuate his revelations for future generations and for time immemorial.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPT.

BY PROF. FREDERICK W. MOORE, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

The idea which we express by the signs "social" and "society" is common to all peoples and all languages; is older than literature and is found in the most ancient traditions. But the expression "social science" has a meaning which is modern and specific; and it deserves careful and serious attention. We owe the suggestion to August Comte, a famous French scholar, who just before the middle of the nineteenth century undertook to write a comprehensive system of "Positive Philosophy." He proposed to classify knowledge into five sciences: mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology in order. In his day all of these were recognized as he arranged them and the phenomena assigned to them respectively had been subjected to the positive or scientific method of treatment. But Comte further observed a large and important mass of phenomena arising out of the relations of man with man in society which could not be classified in any of the five sciences which he had recognized. These he grouped together under the designation of social phenomena and asserted that they too must be subjected to the positive method of treatment, proposing to call the resulting body of knowledge sociology and ranking it in his system sixth and last in order of complexity.

In the next generation the German political scientist Schaeffle and the English philosopher Herbert Spencer not only treated social phenomena by the positive method but declared society to be an organism. Though as a working hypothesis this theory did not fully accord with the facts, yet there seemed to be some degree of truth in it. Sociologists are not satisfied to cast it aside altogether. Some limit themselves to saying cautiously that

society is organic, like an organism, having essential resemblances to an organism. Others would take the suggestion of Lester F. Ward that if we are to rely upon the analogy between society and an organism we must seek the analogous organism among the lowest biological orders, among the protozoa for instance, where the brain and other important functioning organs are not differentiated and localized in one part of the body, as in higher organisms, but are diffused. Thus the brain is localized in man but not in society. We may not permit ourselves to say as Spencer did that the brain of society is represented by the governing or regulating body. This statement may seem to be rather plausible when applied to a despotic monarchy. But it is plain, even to the cursory observer, that it gives a very inadequate characterization of the real directive agency in a modern popular government where the dependence of elected representative officers upon their constituents is obvious and notorious and a matter of fundamental principle.

But however close or remote the analogy between society and an organism, sociologists are agreed in recognizing an important and comprehensive class of phenomena in which the essential unit is not the individual but the group, in which the group unit, as such, shows growth, increasing complexity, differentiation of function and organ, adaptation to environment, degeneration under adverse conditions, and development and progress under favorable conditions. The individual may have his part in making the group what it is. But it is a fact equally conspicuous that the group has its part in making the individual what he is; and that what it makes of him is even incidental to what it is and is becoming. The individualist, representative of the philosophy of a century ago, studied the individual as such. The individual, made in God's likeness, was to him the supreme, the sublimest entity. The sociologist is by definition a student of society, of the group, and only incidentally of the individual as contributing to or as affected by it. Hence the socio-

logical concept, the working hypothesis of the sociologist, is that there are entities which are composed of individuals in some organic relation. The number of individuals in the various social entities may be larger or smaller; the organization may be more or less perfect. The same individual may be a member of more than one of these groups at the same time. Yet even so each entity has its nature and being, its end and purpose, and its modes of behavior apart from other groups and from the individuals which compose it, a nature and being which are the proper subjects of study by observation, experiment, and induction.

It is a proposition which almost states itself that the immediate end of sociology must be the development of the group entity, be it class, caste, community, state, or race. But it does not follow that this development is to be considered an end in itself. Is it not rather to be treated as a means to the higher development of the individuals into which the group must at last be analyzed? Is it not perhaps true that the individualist of old dropped a link in his chain of reasoning and neglected a factor both helpful and necessary in perfecting the individual? Is it not the mission of the sociologist to show that the highest type of individuality is to be found in the individual who is himself the product of the most highly developed group? If indeed this is the ultimate end to which the sociologist may conduct us the mind can scarcely comprehend the vastness, the grandeur, and the sublimity of his task and opportunity.

In the first place, this sociological concept, with all its dreamed of possibilities, is at least entitled to the toleration which is universally accorded to a working hypothesis in positive science. So long as the rule is new or has not been frequently tried or is thought to be based upon too narrow or uncertain a range of facts or observations to deserve complete confidence and dependence it may be called a working hypothesis and the experimenter will have a double interest in applying it. If by its aid he is

able to explain the facts which he has observed he will place confidence in the explanation and increase his reliance upon the hypothesis. This is the situation with the sociological hypothesis. It must still be tested as it is applied. Time and experience will undoubtedly give us some important corrections as they will most certainly give us many additional facts and laws based upon the facts.

Secondly and specifically, the sociological theory deserves consideration because it furnishes a very satisfactory test of the older theories, confirming some of them and making apparent the weakness of others, offering at the same time a more satisfactory solution of the problem in hand. One instance of the latter sort is the theory of paternalism in government, which has given way to the theory of an individualistic society; and now both have yielded place through weakness in certain points to the sociological. The paternalistic theory imputed to the head of the state a function that was fatherly. One of the most conspicuous exponents of it was Frederick the Great, of Prussia. He in his time epitomized the essential philosophy of it in the figure by which he sought to characterize and magnify his royal function when he called himself the "first servant" of his people, the one who was accountable before the world and before God for their welfare, the one whose office and responsibility it was to care for them. This he did with a degree of officiousness in political, economic, and social matters that gave him the title of the "benevolent despot."

Before the end of the eighteenth century this theory of government was found to be leading monarchs and statesmen to indulge in the public regulation of affairs to a degree that people began to resent as undue and harmful interference with the liberty of the subject, especially in economic matters. So a revolution was worked out both in philosophy and in the practices of government.

This revolt led to the promulgation of the theory of in-

dividualism. As a political and economic doctrine it is negative. It is the doctrine later formulated by Jefferson that the people best governed is the people least governed, that the government should busy itself about the fewest things possible. Some things were by long experience and common consent admitted to belong to the government, which because of them had a reason for existence. But the other things were best done when the government left them alone; when they were left to each individual and to each community to attend to as private and local interests dictated. Adam Smith developed it into a system of political economy that first helped to change and then came to express the economic ideas of the generation which succeeded him. Moreover he and his disciples elaborated it into a system of philosophy making selfishness, the self-interest of the individual, its corner stone. It assumes that a man can rightly discern and successfully achieve his own best interests if he will; if he does not the fault is his own. Again a man rightly discerning and rightly achieving his own best interests cannot harm his fellows if he would but must promote their interests whether he would or not. It is therefore his policy to seek to know his own interests intelligently and to follow them faithfully; thus will he best serve himself, his generation, and mankind.

The new theory of individualism grew apace and seemed to be vindicated by changes in industrial life. But scarcely had the first quarter of the nineteenth century passed before the validity of this working hypothesis was challenged by alarming facts that were all too pitiful and patent. Men became conscious of the fact that the property holding classes of England, especially the factory and mine owning classes of England whom the revolutionized processes of industry had raised to a prominence which they had not before had, persisted in seeking their selfish interests at the expense and to the hurt of the very life energy of the working classes; and that the latter, however clearly they might see their own interests, could

but see also how hopelessly unable they were to protect themselves. Society must take heed; the government did come to their aid. But first the rising spirit of democracy had to force the great reform bill through a privileged Parliament. Then there came into the new House of Commons the representatives—not of the lower radical classes—but of the sturdy middle class of English manhood who did not hesitate to insist that the government should lay its hands upon the abuses and correct them. So factory acts were passed regulating the number of hours which employers might require women and children to labor in their factories. Mine acts were passed forbidding the employment of women and children underground and limiting the ages and hours of work of those employed above ground. Acts were passed protecting the poor little chimney sweeps. The Earl of Shaftesbury, the seventh of an illustrious line, was a pioneer in securing these reforms. He ranks as one of the great reformers of the nineteenth century; and it is incredible to us that in the second quarter of that century he should still have had to struggle so hard and even to endure the disdain of his peers before he could get a hearing for matters that are to-day the commonplace of philanthropy. We are now taught that we are our brothers' keepers. We are warned that we must be held responsible for much of their condition. We are shown that man is not an independent self-sufficient unit, a law and an end unto himself, who can be left to follow his own desires and use his opportunities without restraint. It appears that he cannot control his own desires within the limits necessary if the degree of welfare which we concede as a right to others is to be respected. If his opportunities are great he will use them to abuse others. If they are too few they do not suffice him to protect himself. He either needs restraint or protection. He cannot be left entirely free. We are taught to observe that he is a member of a group which must restrain him, protect him, and direct him.

Thirdly, not only negatively—as eliminating unten-

able theories—but positively—as gathering up and interpreting the theories which have stood the test of time and have long enjoyed public approval—does the new sociological hypothesis concerning the character and nature of the group command consideration. In the light of the new hypothesis the state is but the people politically organized seeking through the agency of government to procure those ends which may be best achieved in this way. But it is a question to be discussed in political theory and practical statecraft what ends it is proper for peoples to procure through their political organization and what governmental forms are best suited to certain ends and conditions. From the sociologist's point of view it would seem that political organizations are not all comprehensive nor are governments all powerful. But the theory long so dear to Americans and to Baptists, the separation of state and church, is founded in the very nature of things. We now realize that it is not best for state or church, good government or spiritual religion, to try to promote religious interests and political interests by one and the same compulsory organization.

Still another theory rescued from the wreck of old economic doctrines presents in the new light of modern social science such a broad, expanding, elevating, ennobling conception of man's highest wants that it deserves to be treated separately as a fourth co-ordinate reason for giving consideration to the working hypothesis of the sociologist.

The Ricardian theory of economics laid the stress on production. It was a question of making the greatest product at the least cost, of selling it at the highest price, and of netting the greatest gain to the producer. But the modern school looks at the matter in a different light. It puts human happiness as the great end, not the producer's gain. According to the conceptions cherished by the members of this school man does not simply live to work; he works to live, and to live more abundantly. Man is conceived to be a being with wants which are ex-

pansible. The want or desire for a good of any given kind, granted the means with which to obtain it, will grow. But the quantitative increase of any particular want is the least important part of the expansion, for in fact it is very limited. Of bread one soon gets enough. Money is accounted the only material good of which everybody always wants more than he has. New wants will arise and human wants should not only increase in variety but should also improve in quality.

As they are not all to be accounted of the same worth what should be accepted as the standard of valuation? Shall it be a physical standard; that of the athlete? An intellectual standard; that of the scholar? A moral standard? Above and beyond all these is there not a spiritual standard? If God created us in his own spiritual likeness shall we presume to ignore the significance of that fact, making no provision for the cultivation of the spiritual side of our nature, the development of our spiritual wants? It is indeed unquestionably a matter of ethical and spiritual moment which of our wants are developed. The *laissez-faire* theory would let it alone and leave every individual to his own unguided, self-determined inclinations. But it is very plain that people are not so left. They are environed with civil, moral, and social laws. Under the uncontrolled operation of the struggle for existence the fittest to survive might be the lowest morally; fist-right overmastering moral right. But that we will not consent to allow. We are our brothers' keepers, theoretically, actually, positively. We defend them and we constrain them, also, in the way they should go.

Now who should be most concerned regarding the proper oversight over these matters? Can the high-minded consent to abdicate in favor of those of lower ideals? Will not the Christian positively assert and confidently maintain that the Christian ideals include all that is best in the other ideals of health, of intellectual vigor and activity, of culture, of art, of civilization, of morals—and the religious and spiritual ideals beside, striving to

realize them in social and in individual thought and rule and practice? But to such an end no theory of life could be more favorable than this of the modern economists. It calls upon us to conceive and to plan the noblest things for the individual and to devise the wisest means for their realization, through the agency of social forces among others.

So then, fifthly, the working hypothesis of the social scientist commands our acceptance as Christians because it predicates an end, a goal, an aspiration to human development.

In studying the history of social groups to discover the law of their formation and development Ward has been led to the discovery of two classes of forces in operation: the genetic and the teleological. "The difference between telosis and biological genesis may be expressed by saying that under genetic processes the subject has to yield to environment. Only those specimens live which are fitted to survive or are plastic enough to become adapted to the environment. But telic man changes the environment and adapts it to himself; as when a man by the aid of fire and clothing overcomes the rigors of a harsh climate. This distinction which is easy to make and illustrate in the case of the individual also applies to society. Some of the progress of society may be genetic; how much is undetermined. But the rest is planned and purposed by society itself through its governing agency. Some social progress is clearly telic."* Now Ward is an avowed materialist and will trace genetic progress no further back than to the unconscious force of environment and the telic progress no further than to intuition. But I apprehend no difficulty in the way of the Christian theist, with his belief in God, accepting the classification of Ward for he will simply refer both environment and intuition back to God as their author. In the Christian philosophy of life man is something more than a material

*Page 721, "Political Economy, Political Science, and Sociology," University Association, Chicago, 1899-1900. Cf. Ward's *Outlines of Sociology*. pp. 182 ff.

or even a merely conscious, reasoning being. Neither his physical nor his intellectual nature nor both together comprise his whole being. There is a spiritual part to his nature. He has an immortal soul and there is an element of the divine in him that has been developed some; but perhaps, nay shall we not certainly believe, is capable of vastly more than he has yet attained or we can now comprehend that it is possible for him to attain. Man has been developing his God-like faculties. Sometimes unconsciously, but sometimes also consciously and with a realization of the end to which he is aspiring he has shaped his course excelsior, excelsior. If we are to live as immortal spirits forever in the presence of God who is Spirit does it not follow that we as Christians must look upon our spiritual faculties as the noblest part of our natures and the development of these faculties as a Christian duty and the goal of all our striving? If this is the end towards which we are tending shall we not make use of every scientific principle that may serve to help us direct our efforts intelligently? To my mind there is no doubt that the study of the telic purpose, the philosophy of history, promotes this sublime end.

Again and sixthly, the sociological working hypothesis commands our favorable consideration because it allows full value and effect to all of the moral and religious agencies through which people have tried to work. It outlines a system in which each one is seen to be a social organ performing its appropriate function more or less successfully, with more or less permanent and ennobling results.

It looks upon society as an aggregate of individuals with many and varied interests, some mutual, some opposed. Those who have opposed interests oppose each other and those whose interests are the same associate to promote their common interests. Each individual is looked upon as a member of more than one of these groups at one and the same time, following out many purposes as intelligently, consistently, effectively as possible. So-

ciologists are studying the process of association and conflict, the nature of groups, the forces that differentiate them, and the functions which they serve. They are not only watching the movements of social groups in contemporaneous society. They are studying also the history of institutions, industrial, political, religious, or of whatsoever other sort they may be, identifying the forces that brought them into existence, discerning the methods of their operation, their adaptation to the ends to be accomplished, and the substitution of better institutions in place of them at the appropriate time.

Property, private property, in goods and in land, is one of the oldest and most general and most universally and highly respected of institutions. Yet we can certainly go back to civilizations in which at least private property in land was not recognized; and it is now a question of serious and pressing importance with scientists who study history and with men who love equity and righteousness whether the existing rights in land and goods are not used in some respects contrary to public welfare. Religion is an institution as old as association itself. It is one of the characteristics of a man that he should want to know his Maker and strive, if ever so crudely, to figure to himself who and what his Maker is that he may fall down before him and worship and propitiate him.

It is entirely unnecessary to demonstrate the importance of Christianity as an institution in the world's history. But it is in point to show how the world is coming to appreciate the fact as never before. It is not so very long ago that secular history was exclusively political, scarcely more than a chronicle of royal acts. Then it became constitutional also in its scope, then industrial, and institutional, with special reference to secular institutions. We have a history of art and a history of literature. It is now beginning to be realized more clearly that ecclesiastical history is not a professional subject for theological schools alone. Historians are coming to treat the mediaeval church as one of the most influential among

the social institutions of the Middle Ages. This period fell heir to the literature and philosophy of Greece and to the law and administrative system of Rome. But incomparably greater than all these was the contribution of Christianity in respect of "the definiteness and confidence of its teachings on the immortality of the soul, and the expiation of sin," "the tender fatherhood of God," and the belief "that an intimate personal tie had been established between" the Christian "and God by the Savior."*

Education, charity, and morals are other important classes of public interests which require proper organs or institutions to care for them. In part they are cared for by the state through the agencies of government. To some extent they are cared for by voluntary efforts organized apart from the church. To some extent, at least, they are cared for through ecclesiastical agencies or under ecclesiastical control; and very properly so since the educational, benevolent, and moral ideals of the Christian religion are pitched upon a distinctly higher plane than those of the secular state. The Sunday School and the whole of the recently developed work by and for young people may be classed as specialized religious institutions subordinated to the local church which have made for themselves opportunities to do a work which the churches without them were doing inefficiently or not at all. The Y. M. C. A. is an institution which has been organized on an interdenominational and in international scope. In using these organizations as practical agencies in Christian work it is well not to forget their sociological significance.

Once again and finally, the sociological concept has singularly strong attractions for the Christian because the sublime law of self-sacrifice is common to them both. Can this be a mere co-incidence or is it not rather due to the fact that Christianity is the crowning idea of the

* *Mediæval European History*, J. H. Robinson, preface. *History of Civilization in the Middle Ages*, G. B. Adams, pp. 39-64.

sociological system? Sacrifice is the law of life and progress. Except a seed of corn fall into the ground and die it cannot bring forth. And it may not be the weak and criminal and worthless element which is selected for the sacrifice, but the best. It is the sacrifice of the parent for the child, of the patriot for his country, of the nurse and physician for those stricken by epidemic, of the rescuer for those perishing in fire and flood, of the missionary who sacrifices home life and opportunities for life in the foreign fields, on the frontier, or in the city slums; of the only begotten of the father who died that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life, of him who said: "If I be lifted up I will draw all men unto me," and who later prayed: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

The spirit of service permeates the gospel message through and through. "But whosoever would be great among you" let him win the honorable and coveted position by social service; let him "be your minister," "your servant"; therein lies the truest, greatest honor. He that selfishly seeketh after and "findeth his life shall lose it," for it is but as the grass that dieth and counts as nothing when measured by the standards which Jesus sets. "But he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Here as so often Jesus speaks in hyperboles. He that liveth to himself dieth to all that is most worth living for, his life is already wasted and thrown away. He that dieth for Jesus' sake shall be as one who has lived with honor for he hath done that which it is worth one's while, dying, to have accomplished. Elijah was fed by the ravens; John, the Baptist, lived on locusts and wild honey; Jesus was entertained by his friends; Paul boasted that he had supported himself by his own hands, being chargeable to no one. But who would for an instant suggest a comparison between the wages and the services of these men? It is true that the current economic policy which is relied on to stimulate our industrial life is based on the principle that men will be led to prac-

tice thrift by being guaranteed the benefits of their own thriftiness. It is true also that many men look upon the emoluments and the honors as the principal inducements to entering upon the practice of the law or into public service. But this does not change the fact that in theory the function of the lawyer is to be the servant of the court and that the social function of the judge, the governor, and the legislator is to be the servant of the people. It is a misfortune which we have not yet succeeded in eliminating and which we still suffer from that public services are too often done by those who put a higher estimate upon the personal gain than on the social service.

In another field social service is more clearly recognized as the predominant motive. If social service promotes social progress; if social progress is telic, having the improvement of the race and the development of the individual as its aim; and if the moral and religious ideals of Christianity are the noblest and sublimest which the world knows of or can conceive, what shall we say of the social service of the Christian ministry, of those who are devoted to preaching righteousness and serving their fellow men?

These are the considerations which justify us in giving consideration to the sociologist's working hypothesis that the group is the proper unit of social observation and experiment. Is there anything in it irreconcilable with a Christian's faith in God? There are two things in it: facts and inferences from the facts—which we call, according to their credibility, hypotheses, theories, laws, and principles. As to the facts involved they are what the best trained scientific minds using the best methods of investigation determine them to be. As for the inferences from the facts, if any man believes in God and believes that this universe is his handiwork, built and ordered in harmony with his nature, can he refuse to risk the legitimate inferences from the facts of that universe? It is preposterous. If contradictory inferences are paraded let him show that they are based upon imper-

fectly determined or insufficient facts; and let him do his part in postponing the drawing of inferences until they can be drawn with wisdom and not rashly. If the experience of the past teaches anything on this point, it teaches the need of conservative Christian men in checking rash inferences.

The sociologist's working hypothesis is affording results that are helpful and abundant and that with every step strengthen and confirm our confidence in it. I see no reason why the Christian, be he layman or preacher, should not take it for what it purports to be and handle it as such things ought to be handled, ever watching it critically and testing it as he uses it. Let us commend to him as he sets about his work the conception that the individual in whose immortal soul and eternal welfare he is interested is first of all a unit in a group. Whether he shall be sacrificed to the group that it may progress; or be the victim of its inequities; or profit, if he but will, by what the group has to give him, may not at once appear. But his likes and his dislikes, his limitations and capacities, his fears and his aspirations, will be largely those of the group around him. Moreover our interest is not in the individuals of this generation alone; but in improving the group for the sake of the generations to come. Let us therefore give intelligent consideration to the body of social knowledge as it accumulates that we may more intelligently deal with the community and the church with which our lot is cast and may more intelligently handle the individuals whom it may be our lot to serve.

THE THEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND HISTORICAL PERSONS OF NICAËA.

BY PROF. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, OXFORD UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND.

In the controversy which is named after its great protagonist, Arian, and which broke out in Alexandria in 318 or 319, the deepest theological problems were formulated. The problems were not new; only the sharp and definite terms in which they and the alternative solution were stated. They were essentially involved in the primitive facts and principles of the Christian faith. Their historical source and symbol was the person of Christ; their ultimate object and endeavor was the conception of God. If Christ was what the church believed Him to be, how must God be conceived? If He was not what the church believed him to be, what right had the Christian religion to live and claim the lordship of the whole man? The incarnation was the ultimate fact of faith; the word which was in the beginning with God and was God had become flesh and dwelt among us; the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father had been born of a woman and born under the law. But now if Christ must be conceived as Word and Son, what was His relation to the Father and the Father's to Him? If deity must be ascribed to both, how could God be thought and spoken of as one? Was not the affirmation of more than one divine Person equal to the denial of the divine unity?

These problems which harassed the speculative spirits of the early church were problems the church must either solve or die. For it could not surrender its belief in the deity of Christ without surrendering its right to be and to be believed; and it could not sacrifice its faith in the divine unity without abdicating its place in history and adding another to the many impotent polytheisms of the world. And so many attempts at premature solution

had been made, with no other result than on the one hand to multiply heresies, and, on the other, to show the difficulty of the problem and the necessity of a sufficient solution. Some sought their way to one by emphasizing the divine unity, and substituting a plurality of manifestations for one of persons, God exhibited as creating and maintaining, being named the Father, as suffering and redeeming, the Son, as renewing and sanctifying, the Holy Spirit. God still remained in these different aspects or relations one Person. Hence come the Patripassian and Sabellian heresies, which sought to affirm the divine unity by abolishing all personal distinctions in the Godhead. But thus saving the unity they lost out of the conception of the Godhead all the realities and truths which were creative of the Christian religion, the affections and activities that are possible only as personal relations are real and realized in deity. Others attempted to find a solution through the Person of Christ, either by placing Him as created in subordination to the Father, or by resolving His human personality into a mere form or mask for the divine. Hence came, on the one hand, the various subordination theories both of Alexandrian and Antiochine Fathers, and, on the other, the several types of Doketism, all agreeing in the ascription of a thoroughly unreal or merely apparent humanity to Christ. But these were not so much solutions as the hurried affirmations of impatient and disloyal thought. An unreal divinity or an unreal humanity for Christ meant an unreal Christianity, the translation of its cardinal facts into a series of shows or semblances, or its cardinal truths into a series of finely imagined, but unauthoritative dicta. Without the unity of God and the divinity of Christ the church was but one among many religious societies, not the creation and vehicle of the Absolute Religion.

The period of the controversy was critical, for it was the period when the church passed from proscription and persecution to royal favour and political power. The position was full of danger, for on every side new forces

of good and evil were suddenly evoked and precipitated into the sharpest conflict. The sudden passing from poverty and humble service to opulence and authority was to prove a fateful change to the Christian religion. The men who had grown holy and heroic in the presence of the dungeon and death were now to face the deadlier because more alluring temptations of imperial policies and episcopal wealth. The emperors, too, though in name Christian were in fact Roman emperors still, conquering and commanding through the cross rather than conquered and commanded by it. They simply changed their religion, were not changed by it. They rather regarded their relation to the new faith through the customs and associations of the old religion than apprehended it with all the duties and possibilities of their position through the words and purpose of Christ. The heathen religions had been affairs of State, determined in doctrine and ritual worship and order, fast and festival by the imperial will. And what had been was meant to be—the changed religion did not mean a changed authority. Constantine thought he had as much right and ought to have as much liberty to regulate the new as former emperors had had to deal with the old religion. He held himself to be not simply “Imperator,” but also “Pontifex Maximus,” the supreme spiritual as well as the supreme civil power, able to settle questions of doctrine and discipline like matters of polity or statecraft, by an imperial decree. The consequent danger was immense, the emancipated church, as it seemed, being sorely tempted to be grateful to subservience to its benefactor, and it had not yet learned by bitter experience that the rule of a Christian might be more calamitous to it than the rule of a pagan Cæsar.

The change in the relation of Church to State was soon to raise many new questions, and unhappily, in the worst possible form the church was, as we have seen, divided. The controversy as to the most vital of all matters, the conception, on the one hand, of God, on the other, of the person of Christ, had long agitated all minds, and the

most opposite and sharply antithetical doctrines were now wrestling for a foothold within the church. Two things embittered and lengthened the controversy—the action of the revived heathen philosophy, which at once opposed and imitated Christian theology, and the action of the State, whose interference was most disastrous and depraving, for it attempted to settle the question by outraging the liberties of the church, but succeeded only in turning the highest truths of faith not so much into statutory matters or affairs for civil legislation, as into subjects for court intrigue. Hence the theological confusion became more confounded by the various winds raised by policy and passion. In 323 Constantine, first at Hadrianople then at Chrisopolis, defeated Licinius; in 324 he was undisputed emperor of East and West. But the fierce divisions in the church troubled him, for they seemed to threaten disaster to both religion and the State. He would deal with them as if they were imperial questions; his will would make peace in the church and put an end to the controversy which convulsed it. An imperial letter was issued, rebuking its chief representatives, commanding them to be reconciled, to desist from questions too high for them, to differ quietly as to accidents since they agreed as to essentials. But the imperial voice was unheeded, was hardly heard, indeed, amid the storm. So other means to subdue it were tried; a council was convoked which met on May 20th, 325 at Nicæa.

In this council, Bishops, in number, Eusebius says, over 250, Athanasius, about 300, or more exactly, 318, attended by a multitude of priests, deacons and under-acolytes, assembled at the command and under the presidency of a semi-Christian emperor to decide the subtlest, yet most vital point of faith. Of the 318, the immense majority are utterly forgotten, many are mere names, a few are still known to the historian, and only one or two bear names honored and imperishable. The most famous then are among the least known now. Theodoret says:

“Many were illustrious from apostolic gifts, and many bore in their bodies the marks of Christ.” In the crowd we mark Paphnutius, from the upper Thebaid, with ghastly eyesocket, devoutly kissed by the emperor, out of which the eye had been torn in Maximin’s (Days) persecution; Patamon, of Heraclea, one-eyed, too, and from the same cause; Paul, of Neocæsarea, with the marks of the red-hot branding irons still on his hands; Spiridion, the shepherd Bishop of Cyprus, said to possess a wonderful gift of miracles, so protected by God that robbers attempting to carry off his sheep were bound in invisible bonds till his prayers released them, so gifted with spiritual sense as to hear his dead daughter speak to him from her tomb. On the other side stood the Arian group, headed by Eusebius, of Nicomedia, a man skilful in courts, potent, or wishful of potency in State affairs, using theological questions as political agencies, agitating craftily, in the diplomatist’s way, to have his belief declared the faith of the church. Between the Arians and the orthodox stood Eusebius, of Cæsarea, learned and observant, courtly and garrulous, distrustful of extremes, hateful of fanaticism, wishful to find in the simpler creed of older and soberer times a golden middle way in which all parties might walk, if not in perfect concord, at least in serene good fellowship. But the person at the council manifestly greatest was Constantine, the emperor. He opened it in a speech that praised peace and advised conciliation; and later he showed how peace was to be reached by casting into the fire a sealed packet containing all the complaints which had from the various sides been made to him, saying to the bishops, “You cannot be judged by men; God alone can decide your controversies.” “Christ has commanded man to forgive his brother, if he would be forgiven himself.” But the matter was not to be so easily settled; compromise was impossible, for even the most suservient there held the honour of Christ greater than the will of Cæsar.

But besides the emperor, who was manifestly great,

other two notable men were there, though neither could boast any episcopal dignity. The first of these was the man who has given his name to the controversy. Arius was a Libyan by birth, who had been educated at Antioch, and was in 319 a preacher in Alexandria. The cities, Antioch and Alexandria, were theological rivals, their schools alike famous, but in principles and methods most dissimilar. Antioch was critical, devoted to grammatical and historical exegesis, to literal and realistic interpretations; but Alexandria was more imaginative and speculative, loved to find allegories in history, to discover double meanings, outer and inner, carnal and spiritual senses in plain narratives and simple texts. Antioch liked clear definitions, doctrine that could be built into a system that would satisfy the logical understanding, but Alexandria, more lofty of reason, strove after the discovery and articulation of truths faith demanded, though logic might be unable to define or prove. In the third century the most famous teacher in the school of Antioch was Lucien, in the school of Alexandria, Origen. In the former, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicæa, and Arius were educated; and their doctrinal affinities throughout life show how much they owed to the school. There the idea of subordination reigned; Father and Son were not equal, but subordination was essential to the one, superiority and supremacy to the other. Arius carried these ideas to Alexandria; here another order of thought reigned. Devout minds were looking toward a notion that would, as it were, co-ordinate Father and Son, making each eternal, necessary to the very conception of God. Hence, while Lucien had seized on the ideas of supremacy and subordination implied by the two terms, Origen had speculated as to the process they implied, and had striven to reconcile the plurality of persons with the unity of essence by formulating the idea of Eternal Generation. Now this conflict of mind and thought could not but affect Arius, forcing him either to modify or develop his own ideas. The latter was the way he took, being roused into re-

sistance rather than subdued into harmony by his new conditions. In personal appearance he was tall, severe of aspect, with head covered by a mass of unkempt hair. He was austere in character, yet of agreeable address, ascetic, yet popular, tenacious, persistent, with a disposition his foes thought quarrelsome, but his friends most winsome and steadfast. He was without speculative genius, but of immense logical ability; skilful in dialectic, but deficient in the spiritual vision that ever distinguishes the true divine. His gifts were altogether of the order that could bring the loftiest problems into the region of popular debate, that could find terms for the inexpressible level to the common understanding, coining formulæ that made it in no degree intelligible or known, yet allowed it to become a matter of familiar controversy. The phrases that became the Arian watchword in the conflict were phrases that bore the very image and superscription of his dialectical adriotness and speculative impotence "God was not always Father, but there was a time when He became one." "The Son did not always exist, for He was not before He was begotten." "He is not of the essence of the Father, but as created a creature," "not existing by necessity of nature, or essence, but by the choice or will of God." And Arius adopted the most effective means of making these easily handled and most intelligible formulæ matters of common currency. While without imagination or the faculty and vision of the poet, he yet had enough rhetorical skill to write what seemed poetry to those degenerate days. In his "Thalia," or Banquet, written in the sotadic metre that was so offensive to his devouter opponents, he justified himself and his doctrines. Athanasius has preserved its opening stanzas for us, and there we read how he praised himself as one who had learned from the possessors of wisdom, the well cultured, the divinely taught, and now going along harmoniously with them, he suggested much for the glory of God, learning while he suffered. Besides his "Thalia," he had songs for sailors, millers and way-

farers; and these scattered among all classes, enabled the most ignorant to enjoy the rare privilege of arguing, even while they sang, with the most learned. And so as Socrates brought philosophy down from the clouds; Arius called theological controversy from the schools into the streets. The discussions suited the Alexandrian wits; the people rushed into the fray with a fine sense of their ability for it. Wharfmen and porters, buyers and sellers, serving men and maids held strong debate on generated or ungenerated being, on the *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* or *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*, on the *ὁμοουσιον*, the *ὁμοιουσιον*, or the *ἀνόμοιον*. As Athanasius himself witnesses, the Arian man, anxious to puzzle the orthodox woman, would not, too modestly inquire, "Hast thou a son before thou didst bear? If thou hadst none, how can God have one before He begets?" Or the Arian would demand of the Athanasian, "Is there one ungenerated Being? or are there two? How can the Unbegotten and the Begotten be alike eternal and alike necessary in their existence? If the Begotten is one who begins to be, how can He have been from eternity?" Gregory of Nyssa has given us a characteristic sketch of the Constantinople of his day, but it describes even more accurately the Alexandria of our period, "every corner, every alley of the city was full of those discussions—the streets, the market-place, the drapers, the money-lenders, the victuallers." Ask a man, (how many oboli?) and he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, (the Son is subordinate to the Father). Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, (the Son arose out of nothing).

There are two stories as to the origin of the controversy. One makes the Patriarch or Bishop of the city, Alexander, go out of his way in a meeting of his clergy to declare the Son equal in eternity and essence with the Father, which Arius at once and hotly contradicted; the other makes Arius voluntarily assume the offensive against the orthodox faith. Both are probably true: the declaration of Alexander, with the public contradic-

tion, simply the result and recognition of controversies long conducted in private. What followed need not be described. Alexander demanded retraction; Arius refused. Parties were formed; Alexandria cast out the heretic; he went eastward and found friends. Eusebius, of Nicomedia stood forward as his apologist, and Alexander in a circular epistle accused him to the churches. This letter was almost certainly the work not of Alexander, but of Athanasius, the second of the notable men within the council, though he had not yet attained episcopal rank. He was only indeed a deacon and the Patriarch's secretary, but he was destined even more than the emperor to command the storm, and to play for almost fifty years a leading part in the church. He had already proved himself a subtle apologist for the Christian religion and a strenuous critic of heathenism. He was to be a mighty foe of Arius and a victorious champion of orthodoxy, a valiant defender of the liberties of the church and its strong bulwark against the rising tide of imperial tyranny. He lived and contended a much loved and much hated man, the idol and the abhorrence of his own age, and to after years either a saint and a successful exponent of the deepest mysteries of faith, or a dexterous dialectician and furious stickler for the minutest verbal distinctions. He had a soul so noble as to touch even the cold and critical intellect of Gibbon with enthusiasm. The cynical historian, who made merry over "the furious contests which the difference of a single dipthong excited between the Homocousions and the Homoiousions," *could not refuse his admiration to the "immortal name" of the man whose courage and genius made the Homocousions victorious.

The youth of Athanasius lies in the deepest obscurity, the very year of his birth being unknown. It must have happened at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. His first work must have appeared dur-

*"Decline and Fall," Chap. xxi.

ing or before 319, and we may well assume that he did not become an author before he was 21. He had recollections, though indistinct as those of a child, of the persecution under Maximian in A. D. 303-5; and so if we make 298 his birth-year, we cannot be far wrong. The only glimpse we have into his boyhood is through a story which shows the boy so like the man that we can hardly tell whether Nature so propheised what was to be or fond fancy imagined what ought to have been. Alexander, the then Patriarch of Alexandria, looking out from a house where he was to dine, once saw a band of boys on the sea-shore playing at a religious service, in which with all the needful and established forms, baptism was administered. Anxious to discover whether it proceeded from reverence or mockery, Alexander called the boys, examined them, found all had been done in proper form and with utmost sobriety of spirit, and was so struck with the boy who had acted the Bishop that he adopted him, and had him educated under his own eye. This boy was Athanasius, and the story represents him as with the qualities he was most to need so built into his nature that they broke out spontaneously in his very play. And he was placed where these qualities were certain to be most completely developed. Alexandria was exactly the city where such a boy could be most thoroughly educated. In no city was life so varied, intellect so active, man so busy, religion at once so strenuously aggressive and so strongly resisted. The people were mobile yet tenacious, nimble and subtle of wit, rich and resourceful in trade, of mixed blood and wide culture. The harbour was crowded with ships that carried the grain and fruits of Egypt to Rome, and bound in intercourse and interests the cities of the Nile and the Tiber. The Jews had an immense colony, a synagogue that was almost a fourth temple, a worship elaborate as the old Judean, and schools where Moses was made to speak in Greek things he had never uttered in Hebrew. Philosophy, too, decayed in Greece had made its home in Alexandria, and

as Neo-Platonism had attempted to become a religion, wearing rags it had borrowed from Plato and Moses, Christ and Buddha into a system as beautiful but as unsubstantial as the rainbow, perhaps all the more beautiful that it was stretched over the dark background of expiring paganism. Though its most creative teachers had passed, it was yet full of vigorous life, and with its ecstasies, visions, mortifications of the flesh, its æons and spiritual hierarchies, its allegorical interpretations, which enabled it to find wonderful wisdom in the most offensive parts of the old mythology, its theistic and even sacramentarian doctrines, it had attracted to it and rallied round it all the noblest hearts and best heads of the dying Faith. The antagonism between Neo-Platonism and Christianity was all the intenser because they faced each other not simply as foes, but, in a sense, as rivals. The gymnasium of the one vied with the catechetical school of the other, and the same persons were often found to be students in both. And the catechetical school had its own fame; within it Clement, Origen and Dionysius had taught, bringing intellects broadened by philosophy to the interpretation of the Christian scriptures and the explication of Christian truth. And within and beneath all this intellectual life there beat a passionate religious zeal. Alexandria had had its martyrs, among the sternest of their order, and now had its hermits. Antony had sanctified and glorified ascetism. Fiery Copts, sick of heart, weary of the struggle to reconcile a nascent faith with a decadent civilization, had fled from the city to the hermit's cell, and the wonderful colonies of the Thebaid multiplied and flourished while society decayed. And all these influences acted powerfully on Athanasius. He had in the home of the Patriarch the breeding that made him sensitive to the honour and liberties of the church, conscious of her more than royal dignity, of her mission as too high and holy to be forgotten or forsaken at the smile or frown of an emperor. The far-stretching commerce of the city helped to make him cosmopolitan, prevented him

falling into the narrow ways of a provincial ecclesiastic. The philosophical school made him a skilled disputant, exercised not simply in knowledge and by dialectic, but trained through sympathy with men who had struggled towards the truth in the past to speak to the men who were seeking truth in the present. The catechetical school instructed him in the most generous and creative Christianity of the early church, and inspired him by the example of teachers who had been alike victorious in argument and through martyrdom. And the enthusiasm of the cell, the devotion that could forsake the world to save the soul begot in him the spirit of sacrifice, and made him thrill under the hands of Antony as if he had been touched by the finger of God. And his earliest work showed how these varied forces had affected him. The young was a mature man; he came out of the schools with the enthusiasm of the student tempered by the spirit of the Christian. His first work consisted of two treatises, one a discourse against the Greeks, the other "concerning the Incarnation of the Word." They form together a new apology for Christianity, distinguished throughout by one remarkable feature—it was not so much defensive as constructive; it set the Christian religion as a positive and scientific interpretation of Man and his Universe over against the ancient Heathenism. The first treatise started from a strenuous criticism of the Old Polytheism, argues for the higher rationality of Monotheism, and the need alike to God and Man of the Son and Logos. The second continues the argument so as from the history and state of Man to bring out the necessity and significance of the person, death and resurrection of Christ. In this method and aim there was the wisdom of true genius. The best apology for Christianity is its interpretation, to bring out its inmost meaning and set it before the intellect of Man as the articulate truth of God is the best way to commend it to his acceptance. And this is what the treatise of Athanasius did. The time had passed for apologies. Christianity did not now need

to plead, even in the proud words of Tertullian, to be allowed to live; it had proved its right by living to purpose, and turning the very power that persecuted into the power that befriended. What was now needed was to persuade the reason as it had conquered the heart and conscience of man. And so Athanasius planted over against the eclecticism a new philosophy that combined the sublimest elements of all the older systems, a true religion that was also true science, and answered the coarse and disdainful charges of Celsus, and the embittered criticisms of Porphyry, by placing face to face with theirs a system whose centre was the Christ of Nazareth, whose circumference was the infinite God—completer, better reasoned, and more rational than anything that had ever entered the imagination of Plotinus, or been heard in the Neo-Platonic school.

What might have been the issue had no influence turned Athanasius from his path, we cannot tell; yet, indeed, he was never turned from it. His controversy with Arius was a controversy with the fundamental principles of heathenism. The supreme moment of this controversy was the council of Nicaea. The question that there emerged was more soteriological or Christological than teleological. It concerned much more the status of the Son within the Godhead than either the function of the humanity or the relation of the two natures in the Incarnate Christ. What was involved was the predication of necessary existence rather than conditional existence to the Son. It was felt that a being who depended upon anyone's will, even the will of the Father, had, however high he might be placed in the scale of being, a mere contingent existence. He might, or he might not be. A necessity had, therefore, to be claimed for the being of the Son. And this necessity was expressed in the term *ὁμοούσιος*, to be the same substance as the Father or to be independant of any will, even the Divine. The term said, in effect, the Son is as essential a constituent of deity as even the Father. Hence, round it raged the

fiercest conflict. The one party objected to it, because it was an unscriptural term, incorrect, heretical, since it had been condemned by an earlier council. Athanasius and his friends argued that no other term could adequately condemn the new heresy, which said the Son is a creature and made by the will of the Father out of nothing and so affirm the truth that the Son is as necessarily existent as the Father, is eternal, and has from the beginning been in God and with Him. The emperor, who was at first averse to the introduction of anything non-Scriptural into a creed which was to be enforced by statutory enactment, was converted, and *ὁμωούσιος* was, therefore, accepted and subscribed as the symbol of the orthodox faith.

Now it would have been altogether agreeable to me, had it been possible, to discuss the meaning of the Nicæan Creed. Picturesque historians of the Eastern church have turned wearily away from the fierce and often ignoble conflict over mysteries too high for human speech concerning terms that denoted things so transcendent as to be without significance for man. But there may be truths in the world the eye that looks for the picturesque fails to see. The struggle at Nicaea was as to whether there should be a Christian God, whether the Christian elements in man's conception of Him should be lost or retained and developed. Beneath the apparent issues the real question was concealed. The Arian formulae that tripped so lightly from the tongue were but as the babbling of a child before the last problem of human reason; and however imperfect the technical terms might be, they represented a far profounder, more reasonable and exalted conception of God. The Arian Deity was a naked and indescribable simplicity, but the Athanasian a manifold active unity. Does God live? Does He love? Is He capable of sustaining relations? These questions now come remote enough from this old Nicæan controversy, but they lay at its very heart. If God lives, His nature must be an eternal activity, infinite

in all its processes and movements; if God is love, He must have ever loved, which means that within His own absolutely perfect essence all the conditions of loving, object as well as subject, are necessarily contained. If God is capable of sustaining relations to the universe, it implies that His being is essentially related being; within Himself, as it were, relations exist, and the absolute God is the God who has never been and can never be out of relation. To express it otherwise—the Arian formulæ implied a conception of God that made creation and redemption alike impossible to Him, but Athanasius strove after a conception that would make both not only possible, but, in a sense, necessary. And he in a wonderful degree reached it. The Father who had never been without a Son was in the strictest sense an eternal Father. The Son, who was consubstantial with the Father, represented relations within the Divine Nature, which made God the object as well as the subject of love. The “eternal generation” was the symbol of a process immanent in Deity, the sign of the manifold energies that made God necessarily creator. The God of Arius was abstract, an impossible, immobile, impotent name; the God of Athanasius was concrete, a Being who necessarily lived, loved and created. If Arius had prevailed, the church would have fallen back into a bewildered Pantheism, or an arid Deism. The victory of Athanasius was the victory of Christian Theism, the only Theism that possesses a living and personal God.

But now let us see how Athanasius lived for the doctrine he had done so much to formulate and maintain. For court favor ever fickle was never so fickle as in the later Empire. Hardly was the council over when Alexander died, and Athanasius was chosen his successor. And we may well believe Gregory of Nazianzus when he describes him as being all that a bishop ought to be, so living as to set an example more persuasive than any eloquence, stooping to common-place minds, yet able to soar high above the more aspiring, accessible

to all, slow to anger, quick in sympathy, pleasant in conversation, still more pleasant in temper, effective alike in discourse and in action, assiduous in his devotions, helpful to Christians of every class and age, a theologian with the speculative, a comforter of the afflicted, a staff to the aged, a guide of the young, a physician to the sick. But he was not to be allowed to exercise his pastoral qualities in peace. Eusebius, the crafty, he of Nicomedia, got to the ear of Constantine, won him, and an imperial mandate was sent to Athanasius—"Restore Arius, or I will depose you." But he refused; where Christ reigned Cæsar could not be allowed to rule. Where force fails, fraud may succeed. Charges of injustice, oppression, continually were carefully framed so as to be most offensive to the emperor, who at length, in 335 commanded Athanasius to appear before a council at Tyre. He was charged with desecration, sorcery, murder; but he silenced his calumniators in the most conclusive way, by the production of the reputedly murdered man, the Meletian Bishop, Arsenius. But as his condemnation had been determined beforehand, Athanasius "resolved to make a bold and dangerous experiment, whether the throne was inaccessible to the voice of truth."* He went to Constantinople, presented himself before the emperor, and demanded that either a lawful council should be assembled, or the members of the Tyrian synod summoned to meet him in the imperial presence. For a moment reason and truth prevailed. But Eusebius, the crafty, touching the point where Constantine was sorest and most sensitive, said: "He once threatened to stop the Alexandrian corn-ships bound for Constantinople." Athanasius denied; Eusebius re-affirmed; and the emperor banished, 336, the accused to Trier, then in Gaul.

For two years and a half he lived at Trier, restful, studious, watching as from afar the movements in the Empire and in the church. The news was now and then momentous. In 336, he would hear that Arius had sud-

*Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," C. XXI.

denly and tragically died, just as he was about, in obedience to the imperial mandate, to be received into the church. A year later Constantine himself passed to his account, and in 338 Athanasius was restored to his flock. "The people ran in crowds to see his face; the churches were full of rejoicing; thanksgivings were offered up everywhere; the ministers and clergy thought that day the happiest of their lives." He was magnanimous, and could proudly boast that "he caused no imprisonment, no bloodshed—not a man was banished from Alexandria for his sake." But his enemies were busy and Constantius, the new emperor of the East, became their facile tool. His was the sort of mind the Arian formula convinced—what so perfectly lent itself to dialectical dexterities must be the very truth of God. And he could not brook a bishop who despised his formula and denied his authority in things divine. So the imperial decree invaded the sacred rights of the church. Athanasius was again sent into exile, 340, and Gregory, the Cappadocian, was instituted, as the new bishop or Patriarch. The wanderer sailed for Italy, was kindly received and hospitably entertained by the church at Rome, used his leisure to good purpose, addressed by pen the church of East and West, powerfully influenced the Latin peoples, persuaded at length Constantius into friendship, and was restored to his see October 21, 346. The day of his return was one of "glorious festivity." To the fond imagination of Gregory Nazianzus it seemed as if the Alexandrian people had become another Nile, flowing along the highways, covering every bank and height whence they could see and salute him. So joyful was the time that it became a proverb, and the day of gladness and promise was "like the day when Father Athanasius came home."

For ten years he was allowed to labour in his loved city; but not untroubled. The death of Constans deprived him of his truest friend. Constantius, fickle, prone with that soul of his to Arian formula, inclined to

exercise his brief authority over the church, liked not the inflexible courage, the jealous independence, the devotion to Christ and His kingdom of the great Patriarch. So it was determined to remove him, and the rude soldier, Syrianus, was sent to do it. The scene has been described by Athanasius himself. On Thursday, February 8, 356, he was in the church of St. Thomas, conducting a night-long service. Suddenly the church was surrounded. Athanasius sat down on his throne, commanded the deacon to read the 136th Psalm, and all the people responded—"For His mercy endureth forever." Then the word was given, "every man to his home." But the soldiers broke in with a fierce shout, swords flashed, arrows were discharged, the crowding people were trampled down, many wounded, some killed, while above the din rose voices urging the Patriarch to escape. But he would not go till the people were saved, and amid the last, in the darkness unobserved, he made his way through the soldiery, passed out of the city to wait till "the indignation was overpast." Finding all appeals to Constantius hopeless, he turned towards the desert, and found refuge and a home amid "the pathless solitudes which surrounded upper Egypt, and the monasteries and hermitages of the Thebaid." There he devoted himself to the exposition and defence of the doctrine he best knew and most loved. The day was dark; in a less faithful heart hope had died. The apostasy seemed general, Arianism was victorious at court and truculent in the church. The heart of Hosius failed him, Tiberius disowned his past, and Athanasius was alone. As Hooker so finely says: * "This was the plain condition of those times: the whole world against Athanasius and Athanasius against it; half a hundred of years spent in doubtful trial which of the two in the end would prevail, the side which had all, or else the part which had no friend but God and death; the one a defender of his innocence, the other a finisher of all his troubles."

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 1-530. (Ed. 1825.)

Constantine died, 361; Julian assumed the imperial purple. Paganism flamed up into an ecstacy of joy over the succession of the Apostate. The pagans of Alexandria seized George, the Arian bishop, dragged him out and kicked him to death; and in February, 362, Athanasius returned. But it was only for a little while. He was too courageous to be spared for he was in the revived pagan speech, by pre-eminence, "the foe of the gods." So the old man had to be a wanderer once more, though a voice from out his weeping flock assured him—"It is but a cloud, it will soon pass; be of good heart." He was by imperial orders pursued. He embarked on the Nile; his pursuers followed. The imperial emissaries met a boat coming down the river, and demanded—"What of Athanasius? Where is he?" "Not far off," was the reply, and the boat sailed on carrying Athanasius in it, who was possibly himself the speaker. His home was once more in Thebaid, whence, however, he was soon to return. Julian died in June, 363, and with his death the troubles might be said to end, and a happier day dawn. Usefully and heroically the old man laboured, careful of many things, loving the truth he had lived for, the church that lived by it, the hopes the church bore for the dying Roman State but reviving humanity, and in the spring of 374 he peacefully laid down his burden and entered on his eternal rest. He lived for his own age and, therefore, for all ages; and looking back over the centuries we thank him for his noble struggle, for the splendid victory he achieved for the truth of God and the liberties of the church of Jesus Christ.

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY!*

BY REV. WAYLAND HOYT, D. D., LL. D.

It goes without saying that these lectures are extremely interesting. Beyond most men Dr. Clarke is master of a fascinating and enthralling style. There is a certain singular charm in what he writes. I suppose no technical book has ever commanded wider or more various audience than his "Outlines of Theology." There is not a dry page in it, nor one difficult to the ordinary reader. Somehow upon his pages a soft and gentle sunlight seems to fall as in June days, and the flowers bloom and the birds sing. Nor is there any straining to get them to bloom and sing. They do it spontaneously. The high themes are so arrayed in the garments of shining, pleasing speech one's attention cannot but follow easily and joyously. What is so true about the style of the "Outlines of Theology" is as true of the style of these lectures. But light and flowers and birds may hover over and adorn and sing in and about dangerous ravines and precipices. I think, though somewhat hiddenly, these gaps and threaten in the "Outlines of Theology." In these lectures they are opener and more disclosed. Indeed, for myself, I do not know a book which, while it is professedly devoutly Christian, is more subtly and speciously dangerous to the fabric of our faith.

But let me most heartily and gladly go with Dr. Clarke in his averments of the Lord Jesus Christ as the crowning, ultimate, authoritative, revelation to us of God—all through these lectures there are such averments. It is necessary to my purpose that I quote freely.

"But the specialty of the Bible is Jesus Christ. On these pages we have practically all that we know of His history and His works. He uttered the highest, simplest,

*The Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1905. Given before the Divinity School of Yale University. By William Newton Clarke, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University.

most self-evidencing, most final body of truth concerning God and the relations of men to Him that this world has ever received; and here we find it, together with writings that show how it was understood by receptive minds, and brought into life as a transforming power." Page 3.

"The fullness of the Christian light is given in Christ." Page 43.

"Theology is the orderly presentation of what we have reason to hold as true concerning God and the relations of men to Him; and the Scriptures are those writings which preserve the story of Hebrew and early Christian religion, with Jesus Christ and His revelation concerning God and man for their crowning element. For us Christians theology and the Christian Scriptures thus conceived, are manifestly inseparable, and the point at which they meet is plain. They meet in Christ. He is the common possession of the two—He and what He contributes—and He is their common glory. He is the crown of the Old Testament and the New, and the crown of the Bible as a whole, and in the field of theology there is none that compares with Him in clearness of revelation or in fullness of light and truth. If He has made theology to be Christian, it is equally true that He has made the Scriptures to be Christian. To either there is none like Him." Page 51.

"From Him"—Jesus—"there came forth the clearest, simplest, worthiest and truest view of God and the relation of God to men that has existed in this world; and in Him there has proved to be inexhaustible power to establish that right relation between God and men in actual life. There is no doubt or mystery as to what His revelation was and is. He has sent forth living truth concerning God, and has made it to live in men." Page 57.

Perhaps this much quotation is sufficient. Certainly it would be difficult to find words or to shape sentences which could more luminously tell and set forth the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as the crowning, ultimate,

never-to-be-superceded, revelation and authority in religion. And with this certainly agrees the Scripture:

“God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in *his* Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”

What now is the attitude of this Jesus Christ—this worthiest, truest, ultimate, authoritative revelation of God to men, and of men’s relation to God—what now is the attitude of this Jesus Christ to the Scriptures of the Old Testament?

This Jesus declares the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or, at any event, that portion of them attributed to Moses, to be the *word of God*. Listen to Mark, 7:5-13:

“And the Pharisees and the scribes ask him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with defiled hands? And he said unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written,

“This people honoureth me with their lips,

“But their heart is far from me.

“But in vain do they worship me,

“Teaching *as their* doctrines the precepts of men.

“Ye leave the *commandment of God*, and hold fast the tradition of men. And he said unto them, Full well do ye reject the *commandment of God*, that ye may keep your tradition. For *Moses said*, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death: but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, Given *to God*; ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father

or his mother; making void *the word of God* by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do.”

In the Greek that word of God is *λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*—the translation is accurate. Unequivocally here this crowning revelation of God, this Jesus Christ declares that so much of the Old Testament Scriptures as are commonly attributed to Moses are the *word of God*. Turn now to Matthew, 5:18:

“Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.”

Here the reference of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, is to the prophets as well as to the law. No slightest atom of either, this Jesus declares, shall come to failure. Neither jot nor tittle of them may be disesteemed. As the bulb pushes to the flower this so precious deposit of God in the Old Testament Scriptures shall come to exactest and fullest bloom.

Then further to John 10:31-37:

“The Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from the Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the *word of God* came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am *the Son of God*?”

Here Psalm 82:6—“I said ye are gods,” though it be song, is invested with the dignity of law. Here, again, the Old Testament Scripture is designated the *word of God*; here, in addition, this Jesus, this crowning revelation of

God, asserts that the Old Testament Scripture is irrefragable—*οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι* cannot be loosened, undone, dissolved. Turn, in addition, to Luke 24: 25-27, Christ is saying to the despairing disciples on their way to Emmaus: “O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.”

Join with this the 44th to the 48th verses of the same chapter, Jesus is saying to the affrighted disciples after He had assured them that though risen from the dead, He was veritably Himself: “These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.”

Notice these words, “Moses and all the prophets”—“in all the scriptures”—“written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms”—might understand the Scriptures—“thus it is written.”

How more unequivocally could even this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, dignify, enhance, glorify, declare the mighty and limitless value of the Old Testament Scriptures? Whatever these Old Testament Scriptures may be to the modern destructive critic, they certainly were to this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, august, commanding, sacred.

And such instances of such recognizing of the Old Testament Scriptures—and we possess them substantially in the shape in which He taught and used them—

such instances of such recognizing of the Old Testament Scriptures by this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, could be indefinitely multiplied.

And will you go on to notice that this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God to man, was a great and habitual quoter of *proof-texts* from the Old Testament Scriptures. Let an instance or two suffice. Amid the stress of His temptation this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, vanquishes Satan by texts quoted from the Deuteronomy of these Old Testament Scriptures. "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "Again it is written, Thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God." "Get thee hence Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shall thou serve."

To the Sadducee's quibbling about the seven times married woman and the resurrection, Jesus replies: "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, *have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*"

To the young man who came asking what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life, Jesus quoted the Commandments as written in Exodus, Deuteronomy and Leviticus. The solemn and repeated "I say unto you" of the sermon on the Mount concerning murder, adultery, profanity, retaliation, enemies, is not abrogation of the law, but is declarative and applicative of the law concerning these things. Jesus quotes that He may disclose how the law of God pushes and pierces to the thoughts and intents of the heart.

And almost the last word of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, is a quotation from the twenty-second Psalm: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken

me"? And there is scarcely a book in the entire range of these Old Testament Scriptures from which He does not frequently quote.

To this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, these Old Testament Scriptures are, most manifestly, standard and directive.

But what of the relation of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, to the Scriptures of the New Testament?

During the sojourn on earth of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, the Scriptures of the New Testament were not yet written. But the Scriptures of the New Testament are, by anticipation, and in the clearest way, shielded and authenticated by the special promises of this Jesus. And surely, if this Jesus be the best, worthiest, ultimate revelation of God, as Dr. Clarke admits and so constantly insists on, this Jesus had both the right and the ability to make such anticipating and authenticating promises. Listen to John, 14:25-26:

"These things have I spoken unto you, while *yet* abiding with you. But the Comforter, *even* the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you."

Here this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, puts this stamp of authentication not only upon a divinely given teaching which should be ministered to the Apostles, but also upon their divinely helped and so trustworthy *remembering* of what this Jesus Himself had taught the Apostles.

Listen again to John 16:12-15: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, *these* shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine,

and shall declare *it* unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you."

Could promise of a divine assistance, of a divine inspiration, if you choose to call it such, of a divinely-helped disclosure and unfolding of truth concerning this Jesus—truth as yet dim and latent in the minds of these apostles—but to be revealed to them; of a divine guidance into all such truths—could promise of a divine superintending, enlarging and quickening of perception, ability of grasping and setting forth, could such promise be at once more abundantly and unmistakably given? As another has suggested, the cry "Back to Christ," is a good cry. Christ is forever to be the name and standard of interpretation of what apostles say. But when you get back to Christ must you not hear Christ saying, "On to the apostles," if you would know the fuller, deeper, larger meaning of that which Christ Himself had taught? And that this anticipatory promise of Jesus was a real and valid one, the Day of Pentecost is, at least, beginning proof. His to-be New Testament Scriptures are sanctioned and authenticated by the promises of Jesus. And surely, if this Jesus be, as Dr. Clarke so steadily asserts, the worthiest, truest, crowning revelation of God, this Jesus had both the forecasting ability and authority to make such authenticating promises. The Scriptures of the New Testament are authoritative because this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, promised His apostles divine guidance into all the truth.

But now let us open the pages of Dr. Clarke. I quote freely that I may not misrepresent.

"The ground for the ancient manner of use"—of Scripture—"in the doctrine of an equal and infallible inspiration is gone." Page 50.

"The Scriptures contain that indispensable material without which theology would not be Christian or rise to the height of truth, and they contain a great deal more.

Speaking in terms of time we can say that they contain a Christian and a pre-Christian part; speaking in terms of quality they contain a Christian and a non-Christian element. What is pre-Christian, or non-Christian, may lie close upon the spiritual borders of Christianity, or may be far removed from the Christian view of things."

"The point to be held fast and for certain is that the Bible does bring us the contribution of Christ, together with much that did not proceed from Him; and this besides, that the difference between these two elements is not necessarily a difference in quality. That great word, Christian, is not merely a term that belongs on one side of a time boundary; it is a descriptive and qualitative term, with a meaning in itself. There certainly is non-Christian matter in the Old Testament, and for aught we know there may be in the New. In either place the question is one of spiritual quality, character, kinship with the revelation that we have in Christ.

"It is the Christian element in the Scriptures that must be received as constituent element into our theology, for it is indispensable and formative there. But non-Christian matter contained in the Bible need not, and must not, be so received. Nothing that is not Christian in its genuine quality has any place in our Christian theology, even though we may have read it on the pages of the Bible."

"It might be thought that the Christian element in the Scriptures consisted of the words of Jesus, or was co-extensive with the record of His life. Or it might be identified with the New Testament, the part of the Bible that was written by Christians. But the test already proposed, of character and quality, is more internal and searching than any such test of localization and measurement. That is Christian which enters into or accords with the view of divine realities which Jesus Christ revealed." Pages 53, 54, 56.

And the norm of discrimination, by which we are to

judge of and separate the non-Christian, pre-Christian and Christian elements in both the Old Testament and the New is, perhaps, most clearly stated by Dr. Clarke in this sentence: "The Christian element, or the gift of Christ, is not a body of words, or even a body of thoughts, but a body of truth." Page 60.

But yet, concerning this "body of truth" which finds expression necessarily in neither words nor even thoughts, Dr. Clarke goes on in almost the next sentence to confess it is something somewhat difficult of comprehension. Dr. Clarke says: "I have often found students unable to grasp the distinction between a body of truth and a body of thoughts, or even words. They have always thought of truth as expressed in words, and of the most exact wording as making the best expression." But Dr. Clarke goes on to say "the Christian body of truth is a body of spiritual reality put into life. Until we make this view of Christ's gift our own, we shall not rise to the spiritual clearness of the true faith, or appreciate the true glory of theology." Pages 60, 61.

Dr. Clarke goes on, but I think vainly, to reply to objections to such a norm of discrimination amid the Scripture as this. Such a norm of discrimination is nothing plain and steady, it is a "moving point," says one. But is it not possibly that and necessarily, a moving point, when your norm is not definitely what Christ has said and done, but is really what you chance to think Christ ought to have said and done?

But your standard is altogether *subjective*, says another. Dr. Clarke denies this. "But," I quote his words, "I freely own," he says, "that the principle gives the need of a standard visible and audible, so unequivocal that it can be understood only in one way." What is that but confusing, after all, the real and masterful subjectivity of the standard? For here, again, the standard is not definitely what Christ did do and say, it is what, in

this doing and saying, seems to you, for the instant, fitting that he do and say which is the standard.

So then this "body of truth," so nebulous and various that, as Dr. Clarke himself confesses, it is quite difficult to get students to comprehend it; what shall we say of the difficulty it flings in the way of the men of the street, the usual throng of the persons who make up our churches? To them this unworded and even dimly conceivable "body of truth" is to be the test and standard of decision as to what to accept in them or to reject in them, as we go through the Scriptures, both of the Old Testament and the New.

Well, what will the acceptance of this cloudy and varying so-called "body of truth" do for us in our use of Scripture?

(a) It will deliver us from the need of quoting proof-texts. This Dr. Clarke is constantly asserting. But is this a real deliverance where Jesus Christ, the crowning revelation of God, was so constantly falling back on the "it is written" of the Scripture? was Himself so constantly quoting special texts of Scripture?

(b) This so-called "body of truth" will set aside and exclude from use large portions of the Scripture, both Old Testament and New.

According to Dr. Clarke this "body of truth" will exclude all acceptance of the Genesis statements of the origin of man and the origin of sin. Jesus Christ makes no statement or quotation as to either of these. Says Dr. Clarke: "Theology needs a right conception of the human race, but does not obtain from the Bible an account of its origin, or the origin of the world. The facts must be learned from other sources. This is a case in which the Scriptures, rightly read, withdraw their sources." Dr. Clarke also says: "We have no historical narrative of the beginning of sin, and theology receives from the Scriptures no record of that beginning. Theology must

account for sin, if at all, without the aid of such a narrative.”

It is true that Jesus Christ makes no direct statements as to the origin of the world, the race, or sin. But it is also true that this Jesus Christ, this crowning revelation of God, quotes again and again from the Scriptures of Genesis; speaks as though the flood was an historic verity. Is this fact of our Lord's reverent quoting from Genesis to be entirely ignored?

Besides, though Jesus makes Himself no reference to the origin of sin, His apostle, St. Paul, does make such reference largely; does fall back upon the Genesis statement, and does steadily declare that the Gospel he preached and wrote was given him by direct revelation of Jesus Christ. Is such fact to be slightly ignored? Also, according to Dr. Clarke, this so-called “body of truth” excludes from Scripture and theology all vicarious, propitiatory element in the atonement of our Lord. Rule out the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is only a lot of Alexandrian allegorizing. Says Dr. Clarke: “The book of Leviticus has done more to give form to the doctrine of salvation than any single book of the New Testament.” And the Hebrews is a Christianizing statement and application of Leviticus. But Dr. Clarke declares that the “altar forms” of Scripture are clashing with this “body of truth.” So rule all out. And St. Paul's statement of the vicariousness of the atonement, why St. Paul states the atonement under the forms of Jewish and Roman law, therefore rule out such statements. Dr. Clarke does not think that they comport with this “body of truth.” Therefore rule them out. And all this notwithstanding the fact that this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, Himself expressly declared that He came to give His life a *ransom* for many—ransom, *lutron*—a peculiarly vicarious word—notwithstanding the further fact that this Jesus, the crowning revelation of God, quotes Leviticus as Scripture; notwithstanding the further fact that this

Apostle St. Paul, whose statements concerning our Lord's sacrifice for us are red with altar forms, makes declaration that the good news of God he was commissioned to preach was veritably given him by revelation from the risen, ascended, glorified Jesus Christ.

But Dr. Clarke would also, testing them by this so-called "body of truth"—this subjective standard, this standard of what anybody may think—ought to go to form this body of truth. Dr. Clarke would rule out, by this standard, from Scripture and from theology the "advent—expectation" "which can be quoted from the lips of Jesus Christ Himself." No, either this is true concerning this advent-expectation that Jesus Christ falsely conceived the time and form of the kingdom, or that the synoptic writers have falsely attributed to Jesus the advent-expectation.

And this notwithstanding the fact that our Lord's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem which was prefigurement of the advent-expectation, was, how precisely, fulfilled.

Is it not a fair question? Does Dr. Clarke in his even slashing excision of Scripture at all follow that loving and reverent use of Scripture set us by the example of our Lord? If Jesus Christ, as Dr. Clarke so steadily insists, is the crowning and authoritative revelation of God, has Dr. Clarke, or anybody else, a right to so clash with the example of Jesus Christ in the use of Scripture?

I think this word of Prof. George Adam Smith, whether he always consistently practices it or not, a word far truer, more reverent, limitlessly more Christian: "The Bible of the Jews in our Lord's time was practically our Old Testament. For us its supreme sanction is that which it derived from Christ Himself. What was indispensable to the Redeemer must always be indispensable to the redeemed."

Another question. Is not Dr. Clarke's use of Scripture, in his so wildly slashing way of using it, radically destruc-

tive of the basal principles of our Baptist denomination? Certainly Dr. Clarke's way of using Scripture at once and forever relaxes the grip of Scripture as Scripture. This so-called "body of truth" possessing such elements as Dr. Clarke declares it does for himself, what is there to prevent anyone from saying, "But my 'body of truth' does not for me hold either this element or that?" What is to prevent any one from saying, "I exclude from *my* body of truth the demand of Jesus for the new birth, it is only a Johanine notion foisted into the teaching of Jesus, I exclude it, if you please." What is to prevent any one from saying, "My body of truth excludes baptism by immersion; the great commission is only a synoptic addition to the teaching of Jesus?"

According to Dr. Clarke any man may have, indeed, ought to have, his own shifting "body of truth." If anybody, for reasons good to himself, shall exclude the doctrine of the New Birth, or the duty of Baptism by immersion in obedience to Christ, what is to hinder him? In the light of Dr. Clarke's norm of discrimination amid the Scripture, all Scripture has lost its authoritative grip.

But the fundamental and persistent position of the Baptist denomination has always been the sceptre of the Scripture. Because the authoritative Scripture so commands and demands we believe and practice as we do.

But Dr. Clarke's notion of the unauthoritative Scripture puts dynamite under the foundations of our Baptist faith.

BOOK REVIEWS.**APOLOGETICS.****The Church's One Foundation.**

By Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

This book is issued as a "popular edition." Our readers will recall the first edition which appeared three or four years ago. The work was reviewed quite generally at the time and has been rendering admirable service in the interest of the evangelical faith ever since. Indeed it is one of the most clear and convincing of the briefer works which have appeared in recent years on its chosen subject. It deals with the heart of Christianity, Jesus Christ himself, and with critical theories relating to the Gospel records. Criticism has during the last generation attempted from so many individual points of view to undermine these records that it is a considerable task even to enumerate the attempts. With criticism as such Dr. Nicoll has no quarrel. As he says in his introduction "The church cannot without disloyalty and cowardice quarrel with criticism as such." But, as Dr. Nicoll shows, when the claims of criticism are subjected to careful scrutiny it is found not only that there is no unanimity in the conclusions reached but also that criticism is without canons of judgment and critical methods for reaching conclusions on many of the problems with which it assumes to deal. It would be a great gain if criticism could define its function and limits, and then adhere to both. The scholastics never dogmatized about the unknown in a wilder manner than many of the modern critics. The inductive method which limits assertions to known facts has had a curious reversal in this particular sphere of investigation.

Dr. Nicoll points out the real issues raised by the

destructive critical process as applied to the New Testament, and shows their significance for faith. He writes in a style most lucid and interesting and exhibits a familiarity with his subject which reassures the reader from the outset. There are few of the technicalities which, in the hands of so capable a scholar, it would be natural to expect. We do not know of any book which we would recommend more heartily to the mass of thoughtful men and women, younger as well as older, who in our day have been disturbed in their faith by the claims of criticism.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Crown of Science, the Incarnation of God in Mankind.

By A. Morris Stewart, M. A. Fourth edition. London. Andrew Melrose. 1904. pp. xvi, 223. Price 3s 6d.

In the enlargement of knowledge and the elaboration of theories in this new day of scientific discovery, research and outreach very divergent attitudes toward religion, especially toward the Christian religion, have been all along evident. That the present temper of thinking men is increasingly reverent and religious is beyond question and cause for fresh hope in the onward and upward advance of man. Our larger learning sought out for itself new forms of interpretation and theories of content. The new wine must need have its new skins. Many there were who cared little for saving either the old or the new and with reckless hands poured the new wine into old skins only to exult in seeing them burst and to revel in the abundance of the new wine little concerned for saving it.

Maturer thought has changed much of this and is changing more. The new skins are good also for the old wine and will themselves grow old. A large school has arisen to make use of the conceptions and theories of the larger learning not only to conserve but to expand and enforce these fundamental facts and truths that are as old as man is old, because they set forth the relations of man and God.

No one has done better service in this way than Mr. Stewart. No one has seen more deeply and reflected more profoundly nor written with more of vigor and suggestiveness. "The endeavor * * is to state * * the unity of the energy and life and understanding and will which are in all Nature and especially in Man *; the convergence, showing and communication of these in the Son of God *; their operation in the Higher Life which He brought * * and corresponding to which S. Paul indicates a marvelous biology *; the consummation of this process in an Ultimate Incarnation of God in Mankind."

This author sees clearly that the slavery to Moral Law against which Paul labored has its counterpart in our time in Natural Law which is "a new bondage oppressing human life." Hence "we need somewhat that is more than natural, and stronger than nature" and we find that "God Himself, who made the laws that threaten men, has come within their circle to meet them there." "We must not fail to see in the Christ Himself, 'the Power of God,' and in His Religion, the Crown of Science." This is a masterful little work. W. O. CARVER.

The Final Preservation of the Saints Versus The Perseverance of the Saints.

By Rev. R. Venting. Published by Alfred Houless, London, and R. L. Allen & Son, Glasgow. 1903. 74 pp. 4 x 3½.

A brief, but comprehensive, scriptural discussion of this doctrine and its implications. There is also an effort to meet the objections so far as they are based in the Scriptures. The work is dogmatic in form and spirit but its interpretations are usually correct and its purpose is deeply earnest. W. O. CARVER.

Christian Belief Interpreted by Christian Experience. The Barrows Lectures 1902-3.

By Charles Cuthbert Hall D. D. The University of Chicago Press 1895.

These world-famous lectures now appear in this au-

thorized edition precisely in the form in which they were delivered in India. The lecturer wisely decided to retain the forms of local delivery so as to set before Western readers the manner and style of the work done in India, for Indians. It is evident, as Dr. Mackican, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bombay, says in the Introduction, that, though these lectures mark Dr. Hall's first actual contact with the people of India, his mental contact with them is of much older standing; and we may believe, what he further says, that they are the fruit, not only of a deep spiritual realization and masterful philosophic grasp of the essence of Christianity, but of a careful, sympathetic study of the ancient things of India, and of a very extensive knowledge of the present movements of Indian religious thought. The author appeals to his Western readers to remember that there is a Christian essence, which, like a disembodied spirit, may subsist without the corporal vesture of theological definition sanctioned by Western usage; to transport themselves in imagination into the pantheistic atmosphere of the East, where religion is the chief business of life, while the validity of personal religious experience is discarded by many as illusion; to recall that the religion of Jesus Christ, and its Semitic antecedents and cognates, were primarily Oriental; and that the East to-day, not without reason, prefers the primitive type, with its accentuation of Oriental features, to the widely divergent type of modern Christianity in Europe and America. He believes that at the present stage in the Christianization of the East the most urgent and vital things to be done are these: to give moral content to the Idea of God; to differentiate the Incarnation of the Son of God from the incarnations of Hinduism; to *ethicise* religion in the thought and practice of the individual. This, he well says, requires a preparation of spirit, as well as of mind, a chastened and humbled temper, as well as intellectual research, indeed, and above all, a heart of unflinching faith and all-embracing love. Surely, whatever

the lectures lack, they show remarkable breadth of conception, deftness of touch and eloquence of expression, and a profound and glowing sympathy with the religious strivings of all who in any age or clime have been seekers after God. Indeed, it would be difficult to find a better example of a Christian approach to the non-Christian mind than that here made; and we are not surprised to learn of the impression produced in the various centers where educated Indians gathered to hear the lectures, or of the appreciative response which they awakened. It may be not unreasonably objected that the lecturer shut his eyes to the sadness of the degeneracy and spiritual failure of which the best Indian minds are profoundly conscious, and dealt only with the ideal side of Indian thought and aspiration; but it was better, perhaps, to have addressed himself to the supreme, positive aim of his mission—to exhibit Christ as the Fulfiller, and His religion as the ultimate realization of that Ideal toward which humanity has been feeling its uncertain way through all the ages. At any rate, the secret of the inadequacy of even the highest non-Christian thought to explain God and man, and to lead man up to his truer, fuller life in God, is here expounded by him with philosophic thoroughness, and yet with rare tact and tenderness; while the adequacy and completeness of the revelation of God in Christ are set forth and illustrated in the light that comes from religious experience the world over.

GEO. B. EAGEB.

Paul Judson.

By Edward Bagby Pollard, Ph. D. *The Baptist Argus*, Louisville Ky. 1905. Price \$1.00.

This is the best story of Baptist principle and conquest that I know. It is the career of a boy from the Kentucky mountains who fought his way to success and to the Baptist position. Dr. Pollard has written with genuine skill and puts the Baptist case in the modern spirit of conciliation without sacrifice of essential truth. It is a

book to circulate by the thousand and ought to be in demand for a generation at least. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Die Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judenthums im Zeitalter Jesu.

Von M. Friedländer. Georg Reimer's Druck, Berlin, Germany. 1905. S. 380. To be had of Lemcke, Buechner & Co, New York.

Friedländer is well known as the author of *Sittengeschichte Soms* and *Griechische Philosophie in Alten Testament*. This is a very able and important work which no New Testament scholar can afford to ignore. It is more even than the title implies. The book not only gives a masterly survey of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism in the first and second centuries before Christ, as well as the first Christian century, but it attempts briefly and very skilfully to set the career and teaching of Jesus in proper relation to the current Judaism. But the book goes still further and seeks to show how Paul as both Pharisee and Hellenist became the congenial interpreter of Jesus.

It would be hard to find a volume that hits more exactly the vital problems in New Testament teaching of today. Friedlaender sketches briefly the rise of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Therapeutæ. He shows how the Apocalyptic writers were the popular prophets of the time. He contrasts clearly the Pharisees and the Am-ha-aretz. The Minim in the Talmud are shown not to be the Christians, but in origin a pre-Christian sect opposed by both Pharisee and Christians. The influence of Greek philosophy and the Sybilline oracle upon Hellenistic Judaism is unfolded. The volume emphasizes anew the importance of a knowledge of current Jewish theology in order to get the proper background for the teaching of Jesus and Paul. Friedlaender makes a constructive effort, and a not wholly unsuccessful one, to fit that teaching into the time and show its relation to the Old Testament. He presses too far the correspondence between the divine claims of Jesus and the phrases in Philo and the Apocalyptic books. But he has done a

notable service for New Testament learning. Jesus is no less divine because he used the language of his time.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Modern Mysticism; or the Covenants of the Spirit, their Scope and Limitations.

By Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Introduction, Davidson College, N. C. Published by Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. pp 116. Price 75 cents net.

This volume is the third series of "Davidson College Divinity Lectures, Ott's Foundation," 1905. The lectures present an interesting combination—"Modern "Mysticism" discussed after the manner of Mediæval Scholasticism, only wanting the thoroughness of that out-grown method.

We have often heard of "salvation by logic." Here we have an exposition of religion by logic. No one who has given thoughtful attention to the movements of mysticism can question that they are chargeable with many faults and these our lecturer has hit upon with tolerable accuracy and dealt with in a thoroughly unsympathetic spirit and with little recognition of the vital energy of these movements.

The fundamental positions of the lectures are a fairly accurate and profound analysis of Scripture doctrines but if we must compare the author's deductions from his principles with the mystic's divergence from them it will be hard to locate the honors. Whether it is worse to make crude and unwarranted claims of the vital workings of the Holy Spirit or by the forms of logic nullify His manifestation in practical consciousness one need hardly seek to say.

W. O. CARVER.

God's Choice of Men. A Study of Scripture.

By Wm. R. Richards. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1905.

The author of these stirring chapters is an independent thinker—a veritable free lance among Presbyterians. His appeal is not confessional but to Scripture. "It is hardly to be supposed," he says, "that my effort would

receive the unqualified approval of those who profess to speak for the traditional positions." "I myself do not profess to speak for traditional positions, or any other, but *simply to open the Word of God and let that speak for itself.*" He may well announce the result as "a new-fashioned treatment of the old-fashioned doctrine of God's election of men." He regards "election to service," quoting Dr. Henry van Dyke, as "the supreme saving truth." He believes that this old faith in a divine election still offers men the right sort of courage for worthy living and for good hope in dying." He divides the material, for convenience and clearness into two parts. In the first he gives from Scripture various examples of God's choice of men, and some significant examples of human response to the divine call. In the second he vigorously investigates the purpose of the election, raising the inquiry what God chooses men for. The chapters appear substantially in the original form of discourses preached in the Brick Church, New York City. "The provoking occasion" of the book is explained in the opening sentences of the second chapter—a sweeping editorial charge in a leading New York daily that Presbyterian clergymen of to-day are guilty of hypocrisy and need to "vindicate their sincerity"—the question in the popular mind being how a man can be outwardly faithful to a creed which it is thought he has inwardly rejected. The answer given is straightforward and without evasions. Touching the confessional treatment of God's Eternal Decree, he "confesses," with "innumerable loyal Presbyterians," "that our fathers tried to settle too many things about these high mysteries." To believe the confession perfect is forbidden the Presbyterian minister by the very terms of his reception of the confession, in which he is made to say that the Scripture is the only infallible rule. Touching the present Revised Confession, however, he avows, "I am willing to take my stand before the world, and call God to witness that I have no apologies to offer for it, and employ no mental reservations in sub-

scribing to it." The book may be placed in DeQuincy's category of "the literature of power," and will abundantly repay reading.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Finality of the Christian Religion.

By George Burman Foster, Professor of the Philosophy of Religion. The Decennial Publications, second series, Vol. XVI. The University Press, Chicago. Pp. xv and 518. Price \$4.00 net, \$4.22 postpaid.

Two things make demand here for more extended notice of this work than its attitude and contents could claim on merit; the relation of the publication and the author to the University of Chicago, and the deep note of humanity in the entire work. Its place in the Decennial Publications with the imprint of the University serves to emphasize the institutional character that must in any case belong to a work issuing from the occupant of a University chair. The *preface* touches the vital cord of sympathy that binds men of earnestness however far they may differ. When one knows that "the book is a mirror of the development of the author's own experience," one must take interest in it and the interest grows as one shares or even appreciates, though he may not share, the author's belief "that a greater multitude will travel, with bleeding feet, the same *via dolorosa* . . ."

Yet this work has received more attention than it deserves. Its radical positions, its iconoclastic contentions and the vital issues involved have caused radicals to leap for joy and herald a new gun in their batteries while some of the "traditionals" have been terrified afresh, and the "heresy hunter" has judged from the noise and commotion that he is on the trail of big game.

The author of this work is a deeply pious, scholarly, sincere teacher who wants to believe the truth, if he cannot know it. As we see him in this book he is not so much the teacher as the student, even though of negative dogmatism there is quite a deal. He is thinking and toiling toward some goal. It seems a pity he could not have waited until he were a little farther on the road before

calling quite so much attention to his uncertain track. For the work is chiefly destructive. Again there is want of unity, originality, independence. Nothing is more true of the scientific, critical and philosophic situation of the day than its variety. It is full of differences, inconsistencies, uncertainties.

It is interesting, too, that when we are seeing all the ancient authorities flayed, drawn and quartered before our eyes, when even Jesus himself is unworthy when he is authoritative, that at the same moment the great names of "experts" in the various fields of investigation must so terrify and intimidate us that we dare not have an opinion of our own. Religion must no longer have any "authority," for that would conflict with "assured results" of modern research.

Our author must needs use for this volume philosophy, history, science, criticism and, be it said in fullest appreciation, faith. In all the realms of knowledge he has chosen his masters, Dutch and German they are, in the main, and the highest stars in their respective constellations. But Dr. Foster has not been able to unify the teaching from these sources, and with all his own vigor of thought he seems not yet to have found any position which is assured.

On the faith side of his materials he draws on his own experience and insight, and here we find strength, comfort, inspiration. This reviewer has nowhere seen an estimate of the Master that for incisiveness, vigor, sympathy, spiritual insight, surpasses that of page 467. In fifteen pages preceding this section there is as gross and unscientific a misrepresentation of Jesus as one will likely find. Here, however, one finds a true interpretation of Jesus, as far as it goes. In most of his discussion of Jesus Dr. Foster yields himself the interpreter of Hermann, Wernle, Wrede, Bossuet, without being able to reach a unified result, but in the pages referred to he breaks away and interprets the Christ whom he has seen

and loved and worshipped in another temple than that of rationalistic culture.

A phase of development in modern religious thought under the influence of current scientific and critical presuppositions and methods, a phase psychologically interesting and religiously significant, is manifest in a considerable number of scholars, devout in spirit, sincere in purpose and conviction, and godly in life, who, after having built up such a character in the foundations of an orthodox faith and having reached a stage of spiritual discernment and fellowship which can dispense with authority, can even find little need of it, give themselves up to views, methods and results that would have been utterly inadequate to production of their own religious experience and which are not only powerless to initiate and foster such experience in others but stand directly in the way of such experience. Having built on accepted foundations a good structure of experience and life they undermine these foundations, forgetting that others will need them.

“The Church’s Theological Christ” has long been in disfavor, and is now well nigh demolished. At first we were to pursue this method to reach the historical Jesus, who was the real Christ of God. But now we find that the historical Jesus is as unknown and undiscoverable as all other essential things. So far as we may know Jesus historically, he was so controlled in his own self-consciousness by the type of religious and scientific culture of his time and place, or so limited by the naïveté of the thought of the day; and, furthermore, was so subject to the misrepresentations of the intellectual media of his followers that we can put no reliance on the forms in which he appears in the unhistorical presentations that have come down to us. We are shut up to the acceptance of the utterly unworthy Christ of dogma, or the little less satisfactory Jesus of the remnant of reliable tradition, or to the creation of our own Christ. Come to look at it, the relativity

of all knowledge shuts us up to the self-credited Christ any how, and so we must extricate the eternal principles from the life and words of Jesus and in the light of our larger learning make such a Christ as we must have. So the reasoning goes, and this work is a rather bold and frank statement of it.

It is a gratification to the reader and a credit to the author that Dr. Foster deals frankly with us; "that the reader will find no orthodoxy in this book under the mask of liberalism, and no liberalism under the mask of orthodoxy; but yea is yea and nay is nay," for otherwise we could not "know when he was telling what he believed to be the truth, and when he was holding the truth back for reasons of policy." One could wish that all the writers of this school of thought were equally frank and unequivocal.

There are two attitudes toward the historical data of Jesus. One seeks to find all that it can of fact and is over credulous, while the other wants to find little and is cautious with abandon of the true principles of caution. A third attitude will be more reliable in its results.

Dr. Foster has been dragged into the rationalistic attitude and at length is seeking to walk in its leadership. He has even reached the stage of dogmatic ridicule. "An intelligent man who now affirms his faith in such stories [as the miraculous narratives of the Bible] as actual facts can hardly know what *intellectual* honesty means."

Such is the lash of contempt which the scholastic tyranny of the hour holds for all who fail to submit. One had hardly looked to see it wielded by Dr. Foster.

The nine chapters of the work give a good survey of the historical, philosophical and critical relations of the form of Christianity here advocated, and of the view of Jesus—one was about to say lying at its base; but this view of Jesus does not so much lie at the base of this Christianity as it is created for the purpose of being put under the Christianity to give it a semblance of support

in the Christ. We have come already into discussions of "the Christianity of Christ," and the phase of rationalism of which this work is perhaps the best American exponent is frank to admit that it by no means agrees with Jesus's interpretation of himself; it thinks that it values him and knows him far more truly than he knew and esteemed himself. In all sincerity such views and such a system ought not to insist on naming itself after the Christ. It may make what claims it will as a religion and give what credit it will to Jesus for his suggestiveness, but it ought not to call itself Christianity. Christ is Greek for Messiah, and this book ridicules the Messianic idea and ideal.

Our view touches chiefly the discussion of Jesus because that is the matter of chief concern. The philosophic foundations of the discussion belong to that phase of speculation now coming into more distinct form, and which may be described as *personalized pantheism*. Its best exponent is Prof. Borden P. Bowne. Constructive philosophy is now headed in this direction, and its constructive principle is at once true, vigorous and important. It errs in incompleteness, and in its declared and implied negatives. Dr. Foster accepts and uses this philosophy.

W. O. CARVER.

Evolution, the Master Key. A Discussion of the Principles of Evolution as Illustrated in Atoms, Stars, Organic Species, Mind, Society and Morals.

By O. W. Saleeby, M. D. (Edin.), Author of "The Cycle of Life." Published by Harper & Bros., London and New York, 1906. Pp. viii. and 364.

This is a considerable volume by one who has been at pains to keep informed of all the progress in scientific research and speculation. That he is also acquainted with metaphysical and religious thought the evidence is wanting. The author is a writer of the *smart* sort that seem ever to be writing between the lines. "Here is wisdom, heed it well." Yet there is a real store of knowledge,

grasp of thought, and insight which do not properly belong to the *smart* writers. The explanation of this combination is not far to seek; he is a devotee of Herbert Spencer. He has imbibed the great philosopher's spirit, exceeds his learning, imitates his comprehensiveness of statement, and pursues after his insight.

He analyzes theories, discusses such as he can, and ridicules the rest. One may think that "henceforth he who doubts that man and the chimpanzee have a common ancestor must be congratulated on his inviolate mind. Facts have no terrors for him," but it is hardly a finality of science when said, especially when the next paragraph must write down Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace as one of the "inviolates." Nor again is he as wise as smart, to speak of "the stupendous impertinence that 'God made man in his own image.'"

The author's reasoning is of that easy sort that follows the laws of logic where this is convenient, but cuts across them or leaps them entirely where this is easier. And yet, for all the strictures, the book is quite readable, and will be very instructive to the man who is not informed of the progress of science along various lines. A glance at the sub-title will partly reveal the comprehensiveness of the view. The short chapters, averaging eleven pages, make the reading easy, even though the style is not free from error.

The main value of the book is its emphasis on the facts that evolution is not self-explanatory; is not progressive toward a perfect goal, and so is dependent on voluntary direction.

W. O. CARVER.

The Philosophy of Religion. A Critical and Speculative Treatise of Man's Religious Experience and Development in the Light of Modern Science and Reflective Thinking.

By George Trumbull Ladd, LL.D., formerly Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. Two Vols. Pp. xx and 616 and xii and 590. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1905. Price \$7.00 net.

"Truth results from the application of reflective think-

ing to experience facts." As one meditates on that emphatic sentence of the *preface* one finds a description of this *magnum opus*.

The extensive sub-title is unassuming enough, but modestly describes in bold terms the author's work. Its subject, note, is "Man's Religious Experience." By this the author means man's actual experience as contained in multiform and manifold experiences; only experience and all religious experience is to be taken into account. That is not the method of the hour, for science cannot take account of the "supernatural" and remain scientific. But if man has religious experiences that relate themselves, and man, to the supernatural a genuine science, and not its more pretentious pseudonymous shadow, will reckon with even these, and as they are.

But observe the descriptions of the treatise: "Critical and Speculative." *Critical* not in the popular sense of the day, destructively analytical; nor *speculative* in the sense of that guessing so much of which is in circulation under the stamp of "assured results of scholarship." No, here is a man who believes in the value of the mind, and the reliability of its powers and processes. No mere tabulator of phenomena is here, but a thinker who trusts his thought. He does not cut himself off from his age nor ignore, quite, its clamorous spirit for he speaks "in the Light of Modern Science" truly, and no man can charge him with ignorance of modern psychology, history, social science, comparative religion, or Biblical criticism. But he hastens to add "and reflective thinking," a quality by no means essential in the spirit of the learning of the day.

One reviewer has called attention to Dr. Ladd's fearlessness of the *Zeitgeist* before which so many tremble in awe and bow in subjection. Indeed, the doctor was a man of recognized learning before this *Zeitgeist* of "Historical Criticism" transferred the seat of his throne from Germany to America. His ground is so sure, his learning so large, his love of truth so great that Dr. Ladd not only

stands forth a man unafraid, but he see nothing to fear. He dismisses the whole "critical" contention that Jesus made no claim to be "Son of Man," and that "Messiahship" was a transient form of thought, in a brief footnote. And the refreshing fact is the "critics" will not poke fun at Dr. Ladd, however they may marvel at his disloyalty. "Reflective thinking" recalls Jonathan Edwards, Noah Porter, Hodge, Locke, Hamilton. And reading this book will carry one deep into fellowship with the reflective thought of the day when that activity was popular.

But of the contents. Volume I may, in a general way, be said to collect the material "in the light of modern science," while Volume II sets forth the "reflective thought." An *Introduction* (82 pp.) gives us the problem, difficulties, presuppositions.

Part I (to p. 258) treats of religion as an historical development. The author denies the popular theories of the origin of religion in magic or mythology, or in "any one lower form of religion," least of all in "irreligious practices." There is no fixed law, and one must recognize the facts as he finds them. The effort is made to fix the laws of development culminating in "obligation to an Ideal."

Part II (pp. 259-481) deals with man as a religious being, showing this in his religious consciousness, relating him, as rational and free, to a god some way the author of his being. Then appears the religious relation to all man's physical and social environment.

Religion: A Life, is the thesis of *Part III* (completing Volume I). The chapters deal successively with faith and dogma, the cult of religion, the way of salvation, the religious community, the individuality of religion, the problem restated.

We are now ready for the reflective speculation. Three topics divide the theme.

Part IV presents God as the object of religious faith. Here is the conception of primary importance. What at-

titude shall one take? Three are possible, "indifferentism, syncretism, agnosticism." Knowledge and faith must be distinguished and related. The customary "proofs" for God are examined and the argument restated. The problem of evil is faced in the light of the moral holiness and perfection of God.

Thus we have been brought already to the test of *Part V*, to consider God in his relation to the world. This calls for consideration of the subject of Pantheism. Then it becomes necessary to discuss the supernatural, and to seek to reconcile the immanency and transcendency of God in the return to the conception of the personal absolute, so strong a note of the rising philosophic thought. Of course evolution must be reckoned with, and all God's relations to men, culminating in the relation of Redeemer. "It is, indeed, no superficial work which suggests the division of all religions into 'religions of salvation, and those that are not. * * * What, then, will remain to humanity? It may try to console itself, and to quench its insatiable thirst for the ideal, with socialistic dreams, imperialistic plans, or selfish strivings for the place of the 'Overman' among the common herd of men. A few may comfort themselves with imaginary constructions of a universal but non-religious altruism. * * * The alternative for a religion is either itself to perish or else actually, but progressively, to effect the redemption of mankind." Sin is fundamental in man's consciousness and calls for redemption. Redemption involves revelation, including inspiration, which must be taken serious account of inasmuch as they constitute notes of all religions." For the history of man's religious evolution is not antithetic to the rational doctrine of a divine self-revealing. On the contrary, the historical view of religion * * * *demand*s a doctrine of revelation which shall be so framed as to accord with the historical facts."

Part VI gives the philosopher's answer to the query after the destiny of man. Considering the "permanence

of essentials," the "universality and absoluteness of Christianity" in the light of progress of race culture one cannot anticipate the predicted 'irreligion of the future,' but must look for a final testing of the rival religions when Christianity must appear as the real 'psychic uplift' not of the race alone but of the individual, also issuing in 'the triumph of the divine kingdom' wherein the individual believer will realize his present legitimate 'certainty of immortal life, which admits no doubt, and which feels no lack of joyful assurance.'

A noble service, nobly rendered will meet grateful thanks in thinking and believing men. "Science and religion, and philosophy and religion, cannot long refuse to take account of each other's truths. They are all aiming at the One Truth; and this truth must base itself upon, and be understood in the light of, the totality of human experience." "Religion itself is an ever-developing experience. Its object of faith is essentially an ever-expanding Ideal-Real. Therefore any attempt to treat the truths of the religious experience of humanity by the method of philosophy can only terminate in a still imperfect condition of knowledge although in an improved condition of rational faith." *An improved condition of rational faith.*

W. O. CARVER.

ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗCΟΥ. Sayings of Our Lord from an Early Greek Papyrus.

By B. P. Grenfell, M. A., and A. S. Hunt, M. A. Published by Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, London, E. C., England. 1897.

The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels.

By the Rev. Charles Taylor, D. D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, England. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. 1899.

New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus.

By B. P. Grenfell, D. Litt., M. A. and A. S. Hunt, D. Litt., N. A. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1904.

The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus Found in 1903 with the Sayings called Logia Found in 1897.

By the Rev. Chas. Taylor, D. D., L. L. D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. The Clarendon Press, Oxford and New York, 1905.

These four books give the facts concerning the famous

discoveries of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus. In each instance Dr. Charles Taylor, of Cambridge, has issued a little book concerning the discovery, which is one of the sensations of modern New Testament scholarship. Too much credit cannot be given the patience and fidelity of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt who are still editing the Papyri in fast following volumes. More Logia may yet be found. It is now certain that there was a book called Logia of Jesus, though it is not yet settled whether it existed before our Synoptic Gospels or not. Some of these new Sayings have a Gnostic flavor and seem to belong to the second century. The present popular view is that Matthew besides Mark used such a book of Sayings. That is possible though it would not follow that it was the one a few pages of which we now possess. One of the Logia uses ἐντός ὑμῶν in a connection where Dr. Taylor says it "must mean that the Kingdom of God is not external but within a man, in his heart." This throws light on Luke 17:21. In simple truth no example of ἐντός in the sense of "among" is known. Let us hope that Drs. Grenfell and Hunt will find yet other leaves of these interesting Logia of Jesus.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Divine Tragedy. A Drama of the Christ.

By Peyton H. Hoge. Published by the Fleming H. Revell Company New York. Pages 146. Price \$1.00 net.

"The Divine Tragedy" tells in blank verse the story of the Christ from the anointing in Bethany to the ascension. The undertaking is such a difficult one that it is easy for a feeling of prejudice to spring up against the author for his presumption—but if so, the frankness and good sense of his "foreword" dispels that and prepares as to read dispassionately and with the reading impression grows that Mr. Hoge has succeeded remarkably well. He has put himself under a proper self-restraint, kept close to the record, and taken pains to maintain historical truth in the details of the various scenes.

It is no small achievement to throw the harmonized

gospel narratives into dramatic form without sacrificing their simplicity and strength, lowering their never-failing dignity or doing violence to our Christian feeling. Rather one feels afresh the power of that old old story to touch the heart and to deepen one's sense of the wickedness of the Jews and the divineness of Jesus, the horror of the cross and the gladness of the resurrection, the sinfulness of one's own heart and the sweetness of the divine forgiveness. Thus the book becomes a benediction, and the author has our thanks. We cordially commend it to all who would see Jesus more clearly and who welcome all that sticks to reverent love and devotion.

J. H. FARMER.

Neutestamentliche Bibelstunden.

Von Dr. H. Hoffman. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Leipzig, Germany. Band I (1903). Band II (1904). Band III (1904). Band IV (1903). Band V (1904). To be had also from Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

These five volumes cover the Acts, all of Paul's Epistles, 1 and 2 Peter, and 1 John. There are other volumes to follow. They give the German text with brief comment. The exposition is practical rather than critical. It is a good sample of the work of a scholarly German pastor. Dr. Hoffmann is pastor at Halle. He accepts all of Paul's Epistles as well as 2 Peter. The radical criticism has not carried all before it in Germany when in a great university town like Halle a vigorous pastor can write so firmly and sanely about the books of the New Testament. Ministers who have difficulty with the abstract theological German would find Dr. Hoffmann's style not hard to manage. They would find also many fresh ideas that would be helpful.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Literary Illustrations of the Bible. The Epistle to the Romans.

By Rev. James Moffatt, D. D. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son London, Hodder & Stoughton. 1905.

This is a new kind of commentary and a very helpful

one to the busy preacher. There is no analysis, no introduction, no comment by Dr. Moffatt. But to many a verse he adds a lucid saying that illustrates the profound words of Paul. There are also comments on various verses by great writers of the past. Dr. Moffatt has read an amazing amount and to a good purpose. He is himself rather radical in his critical views of the New Testament, as is shown in *The Historical New Testament*. But he does not show such a bias in his quotations here. The little book will bring real refreshment to many a student.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Jesus Christ and the Christian Character.

By Francis Greenwood Peabody, Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1905.

This volume contains the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in 1904. The author begins his discussion by insisting upon the social mission of Jesus Christ. It is true the regeneration of the social order was to be a by-product of his work rather than the immediate aim of Jesus. Nevertheless the urgent question to be faced by the Christianity of to-day is the Social Question. How then, shall society be saved? The Socialist offers his program; he says change the surroundings and thus improve the individual. Jesus is primarily concerned with the person rather than with the social machinery, though he aims to create characters which will remake the machinery.

The prime consideration is the character of Jesus itself. The author claims that the imitation of Christ is the basis of Christian character. What of the character of Jesus. The ascetic ideal and the aesthetic are both declared inadequate as interpretations of that character. Power is the distinguishing mark of Jesus, intellectual and moral. His vast sympathy and his isolation are the tokens of his power. He communicates in prodigal measure; he is in his inner life in constant relations with the eternal sources of strength.

Next, what is the type of moral character produced by Jesus? The sin he condemned most strongly was spiritual satiety and self-sufficiency. The Pharisee was its living embodiment. The quality he approved most was that of the child, teachableness, docility. Herein lie the roots of Christian character. A conviction for sin, and turning from it is a necessary element in a complete conversion. Here the will, and not merely the emotions or intellect, is chiefly concerned. The teachable spirit and susceptibility to growth, with a consciousness of shortcoming and sin lie at the threshold of Christian character.

Three great words serve to indicate the growth of Christian character according to the teaching of Jesus. The first is righteousness, into which he imported a deeper and richer meaning than it had known. The second word is love, to which Christ gave a new ethical quality. Not the emotions but the will chiefly determines the development of love. Love expresses itself towards individuals, not merely to men in the mass. The other word, more comprehensive than either righteousness or love, embracing both, and particularly emphasized in the fourth Gospel is life. These qualities combine in the character of the Christian to produce power, moral energy, which is capable of enduring suffering, imparting tranquility and peace to others, overcoming circumstances and redeeming the world. It is the supreme need of society to-day.

The author asks next what are the personal consequences of the Christian character? What sort of a person should the Christian be? Tolstoi's view ignores a large part of our Christian social obligation, and Nietzsche in his doctrine of the superman fails to understand Christian ideals or the present age. The mark of Christian character is moral power. The body is not to be overcome by asceticism. It must be subdued. The body is not an enemy but an instrument of character. The mind holds not the primacy in moral attainment, our author asserts, but the will. Belief, doctrine, grows out of an

obedient will. The emotions have no moral quality in themselves. The three leading elements of personal Christian character are Poise, which unites various traits; Simplicity, which refers not to the contents but to the direction of the Christian life; Peace, which implies not that the life is sheltered or free from struggle but that it is inwardly tranquil; and Grace which combines the other qualities into a higher unity.

The author sums up the social consequences of the Christian character in three great paradoxes in the teachings of Jesus. First the paradox of self-realization through self-surrender. Second the paradox of service. He who would be first of all and greatest of all must become servant of all. Third the paradox of idealism. The impossible becomes possible, the ideal is the truly real. In these paradoxes Jesus uncovered a new continent of moral values and forces. Society as a whole inevitably comes under their sway when they are embodied in individual character.

The two closing chapters have as their titles "The Ascent of Ethics" and "The Descent of Faith." Under the first head Professor Peabody points out the necessary completion of ethics in religion. Ethics and religion are concentric circles. The frontiers of ethics touch the borders of the large realm of the religious life. Ethics are only relatively complete in themselves. Under the discussion of "the Descent of Faith" the position is maintained that religion of the sane and sound type can never be content with dwelling on the mountain top. It will inevitably descend into the valley of service and practical life. Religion as mere ecclesiasticism, or mysticism, or intellectualism is but fragmentary. Ethics and religion complete each other. The two together constitute a living whole. Particularly in modern life is there need of a return to the ethical side of religion. The principles of Christianity are needed in the home, and in the political and commercial world. The church is guilty of gross neglect if timidly or hesitatingly it faces the ethical issues

and demands forced to the front in our complex and rapidly growing modern life.

In conclusion it may be said that Professor Peabody has given us a fresh and stimulating discussion of a vitally important theme. It is highly important that the ethical teachings of Jesus be understood and applied to the life of to-day and that religion be called back to this part of her sublime task wherever she tends to forget it. And there can be no question that she does too often forget it.

Many will take issue with Professor Peabody on the question of the relation of ethics to religion. These will say we do not come to religion through ethics, but to ethics through religion. They would restate the titles of his closing chapters. Instead of "The Ascent of Ethics" and "The Descent of Faith" they would say "The Ascent of Faith" and "The Descent of Ethics." Christian ethics, in other words, do not blossom into religion, but Christian faith blossoms and points in ethics. And this suggests that Professor Peabody scarcely assigns to Christ his true place and function in relation to ethics. Christ is more than a teacher of ethics. He is an object of faith, and as such creates as well as defines the ethical ideal and life. Every reader, however, will be stimulated and inspired by Professor Peabody's moral earnestness and the strength of his convictions, and will rejoice that he has given us so suggestive and helpful a discussion of a theme of such vast importance. E. Y. MULLINS.

II. NEW TESTAMENT.

Jesus.

By W. Bousset. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1906. Pages 211. Price \$1.25.

This is another volume in the Crown Theological Library. It is the radical view of Jesus presented with great ability and confidence. The dogmatism of Bousset is refreshing, not in its rarity, for radical and conservative are often dogmatic, but in its vigor and boldness. There is no hesitation with Bousset. He knows all about it. He knows, for instance, that the birth accounts are pure legend, that John the Baptist did not indicate Jesus as the Messiah, that Jesus did not know that he was to die till the very end, that we must "forego all attempts at a formal life or history of Jesus;" (p. 19) that Jesus' mission "was not in any sense expressly Messianic (p. 21), though he thought himself the Messiah (p. 67), that Mark is "preposterous" in making Jesus use parables because the people rejected him (p. 42), that Jesus did not gather a formal band of disciples, that he never gave a "command to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles" (p. 51), that he did not preach a kingdom of the newer life (p. 78), and was mistaken in his ideas about the end (p. 75), that the use of the name at baptism ("actual immersion") "was intended as a protection against the evil spirits working in the world" (p. 109), that Jesus did not institute the Lord's Supper (p. 109), that Jesus did not teach what we have in Matthew 25 about the judgment day (p. 121), etc. In fact, Jesus was a good man and a good teacher, indeed a wonderful teacher, but evidently he missed much—not having Bousset's help! It is pitiful how poorly the Gospels are put together! If they had only had Bousset's redactorial skill! As it is, Bousset can tell what we do not know about the history of Jesus in eighteen short pages. "Only a few scanty data can be established with certainty" (p. 12). For the pure, un-

adulterated article commend us to Bousset. Foster and Schmidt are only disciples, for Bousset is their master. This is the new evangel of ignorance which is to save the people.

Bousset knows finally that Jesus never used the term Son of God about himself (p. 182), that he did call himself Son of Man a few times only (p. 193 f.), that he "never overstepped the limits of the purely human" (p. 202), and "did not thereby place himself on a level with God" (p. 203). Bousset admits that these are "tortuous paths" (p. 195), but he becomes positively offensive when he speaks of the "broodings" of Jesus (p. 195).

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Book of the Revelation.

By C. Anderson Scott. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1906. Price \$1.25.

Mr. Scott edited the volume on Revelation in the Century Bible, and it was one of the best of the series. The same thing is true of this volume in the Practical Commentary. He is an alert scholar, with a wholesome sanity of outlook. Mr. Scott accepts at most points Prof. Ramsay's view in the Letters to the Seven Churches, but thinks the second beast is not the Provincial Power, but the Priestly Cult. He sees the legend of Nero redivivus in the beast that was, is not, and is to come—a matter by no means certain. The book has many sensible observations, and at once ranks with the best of the commentaries on Revelation.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Making of the Gospels. Six Lectures Delivered During Lent, 1905, in Manchester Cathedral.

By Rev. J. J. Scott, M. A., Canon of Manchester. London, John Murray, Albmarle St. West. Pp. 112, paper \$1.00 net.

These lectures profess to give a summary of the best English Biblical Criticism. From the facts concerning the four oldest Bibles—the Old Greek Text, the Old Latin and Syriac Versions, and the Diatesseron—the author con-

cludes (1) that the Gospels were written within the period when their reputed authors lived; (2) that the Church was inspired to include all four in her volume of Gospels, and that the authors were inspired what to include in their several works. He dates Mark 63, Matthew and Luke 70, John 96. Mark is accepted as the basis of Matthew and Luke. Their portrait of Christ is his, and his is Peter's. We have only two portraits; the other is John's. Peter's is the Human side; John's the Divine.

The last four lectures deal with the sources, object and characteristics of each of the Gospels. It is refreshing to find Textual Criticism given its proper authority—that is the author's guiding principle. Early true interpretations are referred to the school founded by John at Ephesus. Very interesting is Canon Scott's conjecture of Luke's connection with, and indebtedness to John. More can be said for it than for most of the conjectures one meets with.

The book is popular, very racy and readable, fresh and interesting, and, barring a bit of its churchiness, judicious. One could wish it wide circulation. For it is sane and scholarly, holds close to facts, and confirms faith in the Bible as the Word of God.

J. H. FARMER.

Johannine Grammar.

By Edwin A. Abbott. Adam & Charles Black, Soho Square, London, England, 1906. Pages 687. Price 16s. 6d.

This is the most valuable of the six parts of Diatessarica. It is in fact a grammatical commentary of a very high order, and far more helpful than many of the perfunctory commentaries. Here an effort is made to understand the language of the writer. There are many significant things in John's Gospel such as his use of terms, his repetitions, his use of the pronouns, his prepositions, his use of *καί*, so often and to mean "and yet," his use of *ἵνα*, etc. In this volume also Dr. Abbott's rich scholarship comes out with fine originality. He has not simply read widely, he has ideas in abundance on a multitude

of interesting points, and they are always worth considering. This volume can be cordially commended to any scholarly man who is anxious to go deeply into the Gospel of John. It is indispensable to the trained student who wishes to get all the fresh knowledge from linguistic research. We may have a Pauline Grammar next, but, if it is as good a piece of work as this Johannine Grammar, it will be cordially welcomed. One is astonished again at the virility in turning out so many books of such excellent quality in so short a time. No student of Gospel problems can neglect Diatessarica.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Johannine Vocabulary.

By Edwin A. Abbott. Adam & Charles Black, Soho Square, London, England, 1905. Price 13s, 6d. Pages 353.

This volume is Volume V in Diatessarica, a series of six books on Gospel problems. The four preceding ones are Clue, The Corrections of Mark, From Letter to Spirit, Paradosis. It is positively amazing to me the amount of detail that Dr. Abbott has so accurately put together in this volume. He has done original thinking at every turn. The words of the Fourth Gospel are compared with those of the Synoptic Gospels. As examples of his careful work one notes the discussion of *πιστεύω* and *ἐξουσία*. "Believe" in John has several senses. The chapter on Johannine Synonyms is especially suggestive and helpful. Dr. Abbott has a spirited style and maintains the interest right through. The book will be useful to all students of John's Gospel. Dr. Abbott's Diatessarica will make a thesaurus for technical students of the Gospels.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The History of Early Christian Literature. The Writings of the New Testament.

By Baron Herman Von Soden, D. D. Translated by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M. A. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. Pages 476. Price \$1.25.

This book belongs to the Crown Theological Library. The series is a set of handbooks that expound the liberal

and even radical view of Christianity. This work by Von Soden is very ably done. The style is clear, and he has a vigorous grasp of his theme. He is best in his discussion of Paul. He rejects the Pastoral Epistles and the Gospel of John and other N. T. books. He conceives that the Revelation of John (early date) incorporates a Jewish Apocalypse. His criticism is keen, direct and frank. There is no mistaking the position that he takes. Certainly this reviewer disagrees with him at a great many points, but he has been glad to read this able statement of the views of the radical school of criticism. He hits hard, but he has a right to do that.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Christian Origins.

By Otto Pfeiderer, D. D. New York, B. W. Huebach, 1906. Pp. 296

This book is translated by Rev. D. A. Huebsch. It is Pfeiderer's characteristic style. He is cock-sure about everything, and can lightly set aside any passage of Scripture which conflicts with his theories. Pfeiderer rules out the supernatural and endeavors to explain Christianity purely as a natural development. He has great mental force, but is so unscrupulous in the use of the sources that one can have little confidence in him.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Nagel, Der Wortschatz der Apostels Paulus.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Goettingen, Germany. To be had also through Lemcke & Buechner, New York, 1905.

This book is part of a lexicon to Paul, which it is hoped the author will finish. We have now a Johannine Grammar, why not a Pauline Lexicon, if not grammar? Nageli only uses the letters α — ϵ , but he has given us a very careful and helpful study. He has made use of the inscriptions and the papyri to fine effect. Some day Thayer must be revised, and this work will help it on.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Jesus und die Rabbinen.

Von Dr. Erich Bischoff. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany, 1905. M. 2. 20. Gebunden M. 3. S. 114. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

This is a very careful comparison between the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and that of the Rabbis as reported in the Talmud. So far from proving the dependence of Christ on the Rabbis for his distinctive ideas, Dr. Bischoff insists that the Rabbis made use of the New Testament. Besides in the mouth of Jesus kingdom of heaven had a far deeper sense than in the Old Testament or the Talmud. This scholarly study of the words of the Sermon on the Mount will repay any earnest student of the teaching of Jesus.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

An Analysis of the Gospel of John, with Notes.

By Frederick L. Anderson, D. D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass. Pages 23.

The cover page states in addition that this was prepared for the Rhode Island Committee of Pastors. In it Professor Anderson has done a helpful work for others than the Rhode Island pastors. In a concluding note he asserts his increased confidence in the trustworthiness of the Fourth Gospel as history. But he regards it as primarily a philosophical work, "the results of reflection on the character and words of Jesus." The inner thought of this philosophical work he traces "by certain characteristic and typical words," Glory, Light, Father, Son, Believe, World, Truth, Testify, Life, Judgment, etc., and the analysis is stated in relation to these words. To have followed "their lead" is what the author claims as his own contribution to his subject. To have shown the importance of these words as clues to the *thought* must be helpful to the student of this Gospel; and, even if later discussions shall show that they are controlling in discovering the writer's thought, this analysis must still be helpful to any diligent student. It is to be hoped that it may be widely used.

D. F. ESTES.

A Grammar of New Testament Greek.

By James Hope Moulton. Vol. I. *Prolegomena*. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906. Pages 274.

This volume marks a new era in the study of New Testament Greek. The era had come before and produced this Grammar. The two chief characteristics of the new grammatical study of the New Testament are the use of the papyri and inscriptions and the application of comparative philology to the New Testament language. Dr. Moulton has long been a specialist in comparative grammar at Cambridge University, and along with Deissmann has done most to investigate the bearing of the newly discovered papyri vernacular on the New Testament Greek. He is the son of Dr. W. F. Moulton, the English translator and editor of Winer. The Winer-Moulton has for over a generation been the standard New Testament grammar in Britain as the Winer-Thayer is in this country. This brilliant work of Prof. J. Hope Moulton will at once supplant the Winer-Moulton, and will be a necessity for the scholarly student of the New Testament. This volume gives the bulk of the new light of an introductory nature that Prof. Moulton has to offer, and it makes fascinating reading. But let no one think that because it is interesting, it is not scholarly. There is a wealth of the best modern scholarship with all a scholar's painstaking accuracy. Dr. Moulton is now Tutor of New Testament Greek at Didsbury College, Manchester, and is pushing ahead the second and main volume of the grammar. When that appears he will commemorate a magnificent achievement. As it is, I propose to use the *Prolegomena* of Moulton next session instead of Winer. If I had known several years ago what Dr. Moulton was doing I probably should not myself have undertaken the task of making a New Testament grammar. As it is, I can only go on to the end. But I rejoice heartily that, whatever fate awaits my humble performance, the world has already a New Testament Greek grammar that is up-to-date and adequate for modern needs. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht

tell me that they have engaged Prof. Schwyzer to join hands with Prof. Schmiedel in the completion of the Winer-Schmiedel revision. Schwyzer is an expert in the *κωνή* and will add distinctly to the value of the Schmiedel revision.

But I cannot close this brief review without expressing again the enthusiasm that I feel for Moulton's Prolegomena. It fairly bristles with life and interest. Get it and read it, and go at your Greek New Testament with fresh energy.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament.

Par M. l'abbé E. Jacquier, professeur d'Écriture sainte aux Facultés catholiques de Lyon. Tome Premier. 1 vol. in 12, de ix-495 pages de la *Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique*. Prix: 3 fr. 50. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris.

Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament.

Par M. l'abbé E. Jacquier, professeur d'Écriture Sainte aux Facultés catholiques de Lyon. Tome second: *Les évangiles synoptiques*. 1 vol. in-12 de 511 pages: Prix: 3 fr. 50. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris.

These are both new editions of the excellent volumes of Abbe Jacquier. He is a scholarly Roman Catholic, and, while conservative, is fully abreast of the new scholarship. He has the best ideas from every source in order to make these manuals helpful. There is an excellent spirit in the author. He is not always pugnacious, but is constantly constructive and aims to give a positive picture of the New Testament books. These volumes are not studies in the New Testament Canon, but rather historical and exegetical expositions of the various books with copious critical comments on numerous matters of interest. There is much of the characteristic French alertness and lightness of touch. These volumes serve as a good illustration of the conservative element in modern French Romanism in contrast to Abbe Loisy. Abbe Jacquier is not merely traditional. He gives a good account for his loyalty to the New Testament books, and his volumes are full of rich suggestions. He writes with vividness and force.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

III. SERMONS.

The Unlighted Lustre. Addresses from a Glasgow Pulpit.

By the Rev. S. H. Morison, M. A. Pages, 278. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son.

There are thirty sermons in this collection, each good and fit for its place. One thing to note is that they are really sermons, personal and persuasive. The subjects are fresh and freshly stated, "The Unlighted Lustre," "The Intrusiveness of Christ," "The League with the Stones," "Hands Beautiful." As a rule, too, they are markedly Scriptural. The acquaintance with literature displayed is wide and varied, but the Bible is more to the author than other books, and he has read it for himself with his own eyes, and not another's. To be sure, these are not great sermons. They do not set forth the profoundest truths of the Book, nor search the depths of the soul, nor grapple with the greatest problems of life to-day; but they might well stimulate many a preacher to emulation by their almost breezy freshness, their directness and simplicity, their wealth of allusion, their variety and fertility, and their consequent attractiveness.

D. F. ESTES.

The Essentials of Spirituality.

By Felix Adler. Pages 92. New York. James Pott & Co.

This volume, made up of four addresses before the Ethical Culture Society of New York City, of which Dr. Adler has been the leader from the beginning, deserves wide and thoughtful reading. We may not agree that his definition of spirituality, "always keeping in view this supreme end" of moral completeness, of perfection, exactly expresses our idea of spirituality; but it were to be hoped that we all agreed with the author in devotion to this purpose. What he says as to living in view of death and as to our attitude toward our fellow men deserves not

reading only, but re-reading and repetition. Of course, the teachings of Dr. Adler must be limited by his failure to accept Christianity, but it is also to be recognized that he feels and says some things which many who have the Christian faith are neglecting. This little book of ethical culture addresses may well evoke and enrich many Christian sermons.

D. F. ESTES.

The Certainty of the Kingdom, and other Sermons.

By Heber D. Ketcham, D. D., Pages 152. Cincinnati, Jennings & Rat. 50 cents net.

The preacher of these sermons publishes them "that the ways of God in the heart of man may be made plain." Doubtless by the preaching of them souls were helped, and it is to be hoped that the same result may attend them as printed; but this is not certain. The author laments the confusion of the definitions which state "the processes of grace in Christian experience." It can hardly be said that he has escaped a similar confusion. These discourses are earnest in tone, not specially simple in style, indeed sometimes almost turgid, rather forceful than clear, showing no keen discrimination either in acceptance of historical statements or in analysis of human emotions, but demonstrating the author's loyalty to Christ, and also his soundness in Wesleyan doctrine, as befits a Methodist preacher.

D. F. ESTES.

The Christ of Today. What? Whence? Whither?

By G. Campbell Morgan. Pages 64. Fleming H. Revell Co.

In this little book, presumably the printing of an address, the "Problem of Jesus" is stated once more, and once more in a way that ought to be effective. The author argues on the basis of four "facts of the hour, embedded in the consciousness of enlightened people." "Christ is the Revealer of the highest type of human life . . . the Redeemer of all types of human failure . . . Ruler over the most remarkable empire that man has ever seen . . . the Restorer of lost order wherever he is

obeyed." "If you grant me the Christ who is Revealer, Redeemer, Ruler, Restorer, I claim that he is the Christ of the virgin birth, the virtuous life, the vicarious dying, the victorious resurrection," "the Christ of history . . . and the Christ of the New Testament writers." All this is helpfully developed, and then the question "Whither?" is briefly discussed in the fullest assurance that the Christ of to-day who is the Christ of yesterday shall to-morrow fully triumph. It is a pity that two pages are marred by the blunder "Vie de Jesu" as the title of Renan's book, for nowhere is absolute accuracy, even in proof reading, more important than in apologetic works. D. F. ESTES.

The Church and the Times. Sermons.

By the Rev. Robert Francis Coyle, D. D., Moderator of the 115th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905. Price \$1.50.

This collection of fifteen sermons takes its name from the first, but the name is appropriate to the entire collection. They are a product of the large city and have no vision beyond its soot and grime. The diagnosis of society is the diagnosis of city society, and is, therefore, decidedly too somber for American society at large. It is one of the faults of most of the literature, both religious and secular, of our time. The great world beyond the city is almost forgotten. The author pleads for evangelism but shows little of it himself in these sermons. The Bible is little used except as a quarry for texts, and one could very well label some of these sermons, "Lectures on Sociology." They lack fervor and spiritual power. The style is simple, matter of fact, but devoid of grace and beauty.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

IV. MISSIONS.

Buddhist and Christian Gospels, Being Gospel Parallels from Pali Texts, Now First Compared from the Originals.

By Albert J. Edmunds. Third and complete edition, edited with parallels and notes from the Chinese Buddhist Tripitaka, by M. Anesaki, Professor of the Science of Religion in the Imperial University of Tokyo. Published in Tokyo by the Yuhokwan Publishing House, 1905. For sale in America by the Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. Pp. XIII, IV, 230. Price \$1.50.

The author, in ways explained in the prefaces, became enamored of studies of the *Sacred Books of the East* and of *New Testament sources*, for which he seems not to have had sufficient preparation, adequate skill, nor ample opportunity. He has made the most of his chance and deserves recognition for his results; a recognition which he complains came tardily, for in prefacing the *second edition* he said: "The publication of historical works is very difficult in this age of ephemera. The only genuine publishers are governments, universities and learned societies, together with a very few commercial firms that have men of learning at their head. Not having any influence with the first three, and having sought in vain to find the last * * * I am compelled, etc." He adds: "But while the commercial world ignores a work of research, scholars accord it recognition." We are thus prepared for the buoyant hilarity with which Mr. Edmunds at last finds full and appreciative sympathy in Professor Anesaki, and brings out this *complete edition* with happy gratitude to "all those who have helped me, not forgetting the fair wielders of that convenient instrument, the typewriter."

"The present work is part of a larger one, viz.: *Cyclopaedia Evangelica; an English Documentary Introduction to the Four Gospels*," of which the author feels he "may truly say it is my life work."

The author avers that "no borrowing is alleged on either side—Christian or Buddhist—in these parallels.

We offer no theory but present them as facts. They at least belong to a world of thought which the whole East had in common." This language already betrays rather distinct theory. It speedily becomes evident, and the evidence multiplies, that the author does attribute borrowing. Besides numerous other marks of a theory we find on p. 48 a list of seven "incidents * peculiar or original to Luke, * * nearly all demonstrably fiction," and on p. 49 we read: "Luke then, who aimed to make the Gospel universal, as Paul had done, was influence [d] by the Buddhist epic, but did not slavishly copy it."

Comparing Christ and Buddha, pp. 51-2, the author makes one the apostle of the heart, the other of the head and refers to the efforts "to fill up the deficiencies of the Master's." "All is so far imperfect." Both these must be taken into account while we await "the Christ-Metteyyo * * the prophet of a perfect balance between mind and heart * * * for whom the ages wait."

Theoretically, Mr. Edwards, recognizes the crude and uncritical state of the Buddhist literature telling us: "After a hundred years of hard work by Pali scholars, Chinese, Tibetan and Singhalese, we may hope to arrive at a scientific understanding of the Buddhist Holy Writ such as we are now arriving at as regards the Christian," but practically this significant fact puts no check or modification on the methods and little on the conclusions of the work. The actual Parallels are classified under the several "Parts:" Infancy Legends; Initiation and Commencement; Ministry and Ethics; The Lord; Closing Scenes, the Future of the Church, Eschatology. The editor has added the Chinese text wherever it is found to correspond and by various notes and marks thrown light on the process. Some interesting conclusions are suggested by the variations between the Pali and Chinese texts but neither the American nor the Japanese contributor has taken note of them.

The work is of interest to any student of this subject.

A number of errors will doubtless find correction in the next edition.

W. O. CARVER.

The Moslem Doctrine of God. An Essay on the Character and Attributes of Allah according to the Koran and Orthodox Tradition.

By Samuel M. Zwemer, Author of "Arabia, the Cradle of Islam," "Raymond Lull," etc. Published by American Tract Society. Pp. 120.

This "essay" shows that breadth of scholarship, profound thought, accurate discrimination and moral earnestness which all who have read this author's works have learned to expect of him. His thirteen years of missionary service in Arabia have been sufficient to place him in the forefront of devoted and scholarly missionaries.

This little volume sets forth with convincing clearness the poverty and lack of morality in the Moslem conception of Allah. He agrees with the view now growing in form that Mohammed willfully neglected and misrepresented the Christian theology.

Mr. Zwemer does not allow himself to be deceived by superficially reading Christian concepts into Mohammedan terms and phraseology, but by a thoroughly scientific method arrives at the Moslem concept in the theological term, a concept barren and disappointing enough. Only thus can we understand the faith of Islam.

A summary chart, giving an "Analysis of Islam as a system developed from its creed," is interesting and valuable.

W. O. CARVER.

Jesus und Buddha.

Vortrag, gehalten von Prof. D. Fritz Barth an einem akademischen diskussionsabend in Bern den 4 Juli, 1905. Preis M. 35 Pf. 12 pages.

A brief, clear summary outline of the correspondence in history, person and teaching of Jesus and Buddha, and a vigorous presentation of the exalted superiority of Jesus and the influence of his divine personality.

W. O. CARVER.

Der Koran.

Eine Apologie des Evangelinismus, von Abr. Amirchanjouz, Missionar in Vorna (Bulgarien). Gutersloh, Druck und Verlag von C. Bertlesmann. 1905.

This tractate, 45 pages, "carries the war into Africa." It is a vigorous attack on the morality and religious worth of the Koran. It proceeds in a scholarly way, the author seeming to be familiar not only with the Koran but with the critical discussions of it. He supports his charges by actual quotations and incisive interpretation. Too long, perhaps, has Carlisle's lead been followed in flattering interpretations of Mohammedanism. A reaction has come not among missionaries alone, or primarily, but among scholars as well. Let it not go too far.

W. O. CARVER.

Wissenschaftliche und Religiöse Weltansicht.

Ein Vortrag von Marcel T. Djuvara Gottengen. Vanderboeck & Ruprecht, 1906. Received through Lemcke & Buechner, 11 East 17th St New York.

This discourse of 39 pages is an interesting and suggestive effort to point the way of reconciliation between scientific and religious knowledge. The author sees as the one way the Kantian method of reconciling the *pure reason* and the *practical reason* through *logic*. Religious knowledge represents transcendental truth, scientific knowledge *empirical truth*. Faith when properly understood is independent of science. If now one shall avoid the errors of phenomenalism, and abstraction and will recognize the relativity and actuality of knowledge at the same time the conflict can be harmonized.

All of which might be theoretically true, but is practically useless, even as Kant's critiques never quite met the demand of practical thinking and acting, to say the least.

W. O. CARVER.

V. OLD TESTAMENT.

The Higher Criticism Cross-Examined. An Appeal and a Warning.

By F. D. Storey. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1905. Price \$1.25, postpaid \$1.35.

Every Bible student who has been disturbed by the growth of radical criticism would find this book interesting and informing. A sane and reverent layman who has taken the time to inform himself in a general way as to the history and methods of modern Higher Criticism, tests the critical processes by which the books of the Bible have been dismembered, and shows that such logical processes would not be tolerated in a court of justice.

“The assumption of the critic to act in so many diverse, not to say incompatible capacities, is one which is surely open to serious question, if not to absolute ridicule. He is, first of all, an expert, a specialist in his own line—usually a man with a theory to support. His place is the witness box, and it is his to testify to the facts; and those who have been in any degree familiar with the course of legal procedure in recent years will know that of all classes of evidence expert testimony is regarded by the courts as least trustworthy, as most open to suspicion, and as calling for the severest scrutiny. Indeed, the cases are rare in which standing alone the opinions of experts (and their testimony seldom amounts to more), would be regarded as a sufficient basis for judicial action. The critic is then a witness; or, if you would stretch his functions to the utmost limit of legitimacy, he is also an advocate to press by argument his theory as to the facts upon the court. But he is not satisfied even with this double role. He must ascend the bench, and by his charge as judge throw the weight of the court’s authority into the scale in his own favor; then as jury render a verdict in accordance with his original testimony; and finally, as sheriff, execute the sentence of dismemberment im-

posed by the court. A most convenient, short-cut method this, and one calculated to discourage overmuch controversy. In the ordinary walks of life such all-embracing pretensions are rarely encountered, and when they are the pretender is naturally overwhelmed with deserved ridicule. To find an exact parallel one would have to resort to the pages of comic opera, where Pooch Rah was not only the Mikado's prime minister, but also held every other office in sight that was worth having."

The literary and historical canons of the divisive critics are subjected to tests that a plain man can understand. It becomes manifest to the reader that the modern critical positions have been attained, not so much through a revival of Hebrew learning, as through the application of philosophical assumptions which the Christian scholars of the past could not accept. The effort to bolster up these anti-supernaturalistic assumptions by literary and historical arguments is subjected by Mr. Storey to the most rigorous and outspoken criticism. The author, even when tempted to apply the lash to men using unequal critical balances, always observes the courtesies of debate. The sane, vigorous, timely discussion ought to have a wide reading. It is the kind of book the advocates of destructive criticism never try to answer; they will simply ignore it.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Bible and Modern Criticism.

By Sir Robert Anderson. Hodder & Stoughton, London, Fifth Edition, 1905. Pages 281.

Sir Robert Anderson is a free lance in Biblical Criticism. He applies epithets that sting wherever they are deserved. Of course he is not in this respect introducing a new attitude into the discussion of critical questions, for the divisive critics have often applied opprobrious epithets to their more conservative associates in the field of Biblical research. With Sir R. Anderson's advance criticism of the Greek text adopted by the Canterbury revisers this reviewer has no sympathy; and the author's

views of the prophetic future seem open to criticism. But, as a challenge to the divisive critics to submit their processes and results to the tests applied by men in courts of law and in the business world, this book has a mission. One reviewer found the book so interesting that he read it through at one sitting.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Codes of Hammurabi and Moses.

By W. W. Davies, Ph. D. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati. Pages 125. Price 75 cents net.

This is easily the most convenient manual on the Code of Hammurabi. The text of the Code is given in Small Pica type, the parallels from the Old Testament in Long Primer, while the author's notes are printed in Brevier type. The book is thus a delight to the eye. Dr. Davies has made good use of the best work of the specialists in Assyriology. He has appended indices that greatly increase the usefulness of the manual. Bible students everywhere ought to have the book.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Bible History [Old Testament] after the Results of Historical Criticism. Arranged for Students of Different Ages.

By Pastor X. Koenig. Translated from the French by Mary Louise Hendee. 1905, McClure, Phillips & Co., New York.

In the introduction the author says: "It is the aim of this little book, which we confidently offer to Bible students and teachers, to help restore the Bible to the unique place it ought to hold in every Protestant family; and it is also its aim to testify to the fact, that historical criticism, far from having 'demolished' the Bible, has, by subjecting it to tests used in establishing the validity of other documents of antiquity, eliminated a great part of the difficulties it presents in the face of modern thought, and made it yield up more of its grandeur and significance, as the priceless document of the progressive revelation of God for the salvation of suffering men." In an-

other connection he remarks: "We recognize the fact that there are myths and legends in the Bible, and we do not fear to acknowledge that it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to disengage the true history from the legends in which it is buried. Before this frank avowal, Voltaire is disarmed." The question arises in the mind of the reader whether Voltaire, if he were alive, would care to take up arms against such a naturalistic view of the Bible as this little book presents. Thus the author holds that the narratives of the lives of the patriarchs are absolutely legendary. He would draw moral and spiritual lessons from legendary material, and would explain the presence of such legends in the Old Testament on the ground that our Lord himself used fiction in his remarkable parabolic teachings.

The book contains selections from all parts of the Old Testament Scriptures. In circles in which the Bible is no longer read this little manual might call attention to the charm and beauty of the Scriptures; in circles where the Bible is studied as the priceless Word of God such a book would be absolutely worthless.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

An Introduction to the Old Testament.

By John Edgar McFadyen, M. A. Octo., cloth. Pages 356. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1905.

For a reasonably brief and attractive presentation of the so-called advanced criticism of the Old Testament we know of no volume that is superior to this work by Prof. McFadyen. The author avows his chief purpose in the discussion to make an interesting book. In this he seems to have succeeded. On almost every page we have encountered statements which were either questionable or from our point of view manifestly untrue. With the philosophical assumptions at the bases of the book we have little sympathy. It seems to us that for the young minister to begin his study of the Old Testament with this manual as a guide would be exceedingly unfortunate.

He would almost inevitably take a lower view of the Old Testament revelation than the Biblical writers took. The author tries to reassure himself and his readers by remarking: "Traditional opinions on questions of date and authorship may have been shaken or overthrown, but other and greater things abide; and not the least precious is that confidence, which can now justify itself at the bar of the most rigorous scientific investigation, that, in a sense altogether unique, the religion of Israel is touched by the finger of God." It has always seemed to some of us who have for many years studied the Old Testament that on many occasions in the sacred history Jehovah made bare his mighty arm. Even the magicians of Egypt reluctantly admitted in connection with the third plague that this was the finger of God. Surely the devout Christian scholar ought to be able to go further than this.

The fondness for discovering discrepancies and contradictions in the text of Scripture leads Prof. McFayden and others of his school to manufacture difficulties where the ordinary intelligent reader would never suspect them. Thus, in the account of the capture of Jericho our author remarks: "In one version Israel marches six days silently around the city and on the seventh they shout at the word of Joshua; in the other, they march around seven times in one day and the seventh time they shout at the blast of the trumpet." To the reader not looking for discrepancies it would seem that the account marches straightforward with perfect consistency. Our author can be sufficiently liberal upon occasion. Thus he quotes a statement in Joshua 27:11, "the men of Jericho *fought* against you," to show that the account in the earlier part of Joshua is a poetical narrative, omitting all details of the struggle which must have taken place at the capture of the city.

Our author accepts the newest phase of the radical criticism, which would convert J, E, D, and P of Hexateuchal criticism into schools of writers and editors.

Thus he says: "The documents J, E and P, which, for convenience, we have treated as if each were the product of a single pen, represent in reality movements which extended over decades and even centuries." Thus each of these alphabetical symbols comes to stand for a number of individuals living in different generations and centuries. The author's sober judgment asserts itself in the remark that "though they stand for undoubted literary facts, it is altogether futile to attempt, on this basis, an analysis of the entire document into its component parts." Nearly every book in the Old Testament, according to Prof. McFadyen, has received accretion from the hands of post-exilic redactors. Whenever there is need of a new editor he is immediately forthcoming. If conservative scholars could summon spirits from the vasty deep with equal success, we might leave it to disembodied spirits to fight the battles of criticism to a finish.

Our author is exceedingly fond of identifying similar events as duplicate accounts of the same event. If difficulties confront him in the identification, he falls back upon the fact that there are many other unmistakable duplicates as justifying the fusing of two separate narratives into one. He has attempted to make the Amalekite's story of Saul's death another version of that event differing from the one given by the author of I. Samuel 31. In some instances widely different conceptions are taken as a mark of widely different ages, while in others the fact of difference is not pressed.

We have found the author's treatment of the Prophets engaging in style, but exceedingly unsatisfactory in its minimizing of the predictive element in the Old Testament. Most of the great Messianic prophecies are transported bodily to the exilic and post-exilic periods, though they often seem to be firmly imbedded in their present context in the roll of the Prophets. Prof. McFadyen takes a rather low view of the author of Isaiah,

chapters 40 to 55. "Isaiah mounts upon wings as an eagle; the later prophet neither mounts nor runs, he walks—XL.: 31. He has not the older prophet's majesty; he has a quiet dignity, and his tone is more tender." Having referred to the prophet's doctrine of approaching fulfillment of the words of ancient prophecy, our author adds: "This very attitude to prophecy marks the book as late; it would not be possible in a pre-exilic prophet." In view of the great extent of time between Samuel and the early prophets and the period of Isaiah, this remark would seem to be a rather bold assertion. The disposition to dump into the late exilic and the post-exilic periods all the noblest literature of Israel has always seemed to the present reviewer exceedingly uncritical. It is quite convenient, of course, for those who wish to eliminate supernatural prediction from the prophetic rolls, but for one who can with perfect intellectual self-respect think of the Old Testament as Jesus and the Apostles did such a view seems to mix in inextricable confusion the entire Old Testament. Prof. McFadyen is skillful in sugar-coating the drastic critical medicine which he hopes to dispense among the theological students of our day. We would respectfully recommend to these young ministers a very careful study of the Old Testament as we have it in the American Standard Revision before they undertake to swallow large doses of the patent medicine of radical criticism.

The Prophets and the Promise.

By Willis Judson Beecher. D. D. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York, 1905. Pages 427. Price \$2.00 net.

This book is for substance the lectures for 1902-3 on the L. P. Stone foundation in the Princeton Theological Seminary. "The presentation it makes is essentially a restatement of the Christian tradition that was supreme fifty years ago, but a restatement with differences so numerous and important that it will probably be regarded, by men who do not think things through, as an at-

tack on that tradition." Dr. Beecher goes on to say: "I have tried to make my search a search for the truth, without undue solicitude as to whether its results are orthodox; but it seems to me that my conclusions are simply the old orthodoxy, and with some new elements introduced by widening the field of the induction."

Dr. Beecher makes several valuable preliminary statements as to the right method of approach to the subject. He insists on a careful study of the Old Testament itself. "In Old Testament studies, the thing now more needed than anything else is a more correct knowledge of what the Old Testament says." He holds that the proper method is to begin with a direct examination, and not with a cross-examination. The statements of the sacred writers, apart from any acceptance of the doctrine of inspiration, ought to be previously adopted. "We shall surely test the dates as we advance. If they are not trustworthy, we shall find it out. If they are trustworthy, we shall see them to be so, and shall thus transform our provisional results into final results."

Eisegesis, whether of ideas imported from the New Testament on the one hand or from theories of Comparative Religion on the other, is to be sedulously avoided. "We are to go to the Old Testament to find what is there, and not to find what we suppose ought to be there." Dr. Beecher reminds us that many modern scholars are so afraid of reading into the Old Testament more recent truth that does not belong there that they actually expel from it, in their interpretations, some of its simplest and most evident teachings. The author thinks that the true method is to come to any given Old Testament passage with the question, What did this mean to an intelligent, devout, uninspired Israelite of the time to which it belongs? "The givers of the message claim to be inspired, but it was to uninspired though thoughtful men that the message was immediately directed."

In the first part of his book Professor Beecher treats

of the Prophets, and in the second part he discusses the Messianic Promise. We thus learn much about the men through whom the Promise was given before following the author in a careful study of the elements that enter into the Messianic doctrine.

The terms for prophet, seer, prophecy, burden, vision, etc., are set forth according to the usage of the sacred writers. The author remarks, "Follow what critical theory you please, there is a somewhat extensive vocabulary of prophetic terms from a time as early as the earliest surviving records of the earliest times in Israelitish history." Dr. Beecher does not believe that the different Hebrew terms for prophet were sharply differentiated; for Samuel was both a *roeh* and a *nabhi*, and Gad was both a *hhozeh* and a *nabhi*. "With perhaps some limitation in the case of *roeh* and *hhozeh*, a person who was regarded as having certain supernatural gifts was called indifferently man of God, prophet, seer, beholder. One term may have been at certain times current, rather than another, the term *roeh*, for example, just before the prophetic revival under Samuel, but all four of the terms were current from very early times."

Dr. Beecher, in tracing the external history of the Old Testament prophets, makes the first period close with the death of Eli; the second period extending from Samuel to the close of the Old Testament. He finds in the first great period prior to the death of Eli the words "prophet" and "prophesy" employed not less than twenty-four times. There are also other words indicating the reception of supernatural revelation from Jehovah. As to these early organs of revelation the author uses a convenient term to separate them from Samuel and the succession of prophets to the close of the Old Testament. He remarks, "If we distinguish between prophets and prophetic men, applying the latter term to men who had prophetic gifts, but are better known in some other capacity, the great names before Samuel are of prophetic men only." Dr. Beecher rightly opposes

the notion that I. Samuel 9:9 affirms that the word "prophet" was new in Israel when this narrative was written, and that neither the word nor the fact had ever before been known. "The writer contemplates prophecy, both the word and the fact, as a gift to Israel which had been interrupted but was now restored, and not at all as a new gift which had never till now been bestowed. In this he agrees with the writers of the earlier history, who speak of prophets as existing at least from the times of Abraham."

Dr. Beecher conceives of the prophet as a citizen with a message. He thinks there was no regular prophetic costume; the man is everything, and his dress nothing. Nor were the prophetic companies bands of whirling dervishes. The prophet did not as a rule receive any anointing at the hands of men, but became a prophet through the call of God. Jehovah chose true and brave men for the prophetic office. "A distinguishing thing in the religion of Israel is its proclamation *that a man is the truest channel of communication between man and God.*"

Professor Beecher divides the functions of a prophet into those which require distinctly supernatural gifts, and those which do not require such gifts. Under the head of naturalistic functions he would include the work of the prophets as statesmen, always opposed to all entangling alliances with foreign powers; as reformers, rebuking injustice and immorality; as evangelistic preachers and organizers, preaching the cardinal duties of repentance and faith; and as literary men preserving all sorts of valuable information. Other gifted men in all ages and countries have shown kinship to the prophets in these departments of exalted endeavor. But the prophets also exercised distinctly supernatural powers: "the working of miracles, the disclosing of secrets, the fortelling of events, the revealing of Yahweh's law, the teaching of the doctrine of the Messiah."

Dr. Beecher believes that the prophets received their

message from the inspiring Spirit. "In fine, this Spirit that inspires the prophets is presented to us as a unique being, having personal characteristics, effluent from Yahweh the Supreme Spirit of the Universe, at once identical with and different from Yahweh." As to the modes of revelation to the prophets, he prefers a new classification: "first, dreams; second, picture-visions; third, visions of insight; fourth, theophanies."

What was the relation of the prophet to the law? The Hebrew noun *torah* and its verb *horah*, according to our author, "are never used of teaching or instruction merely in the sense of giving information. Always they denote authoritative teaching," thus corresponding very nearly with the current idea of divine revelation. Professor Beecher opposes the view that there was a priestly *torah* and a prophetic *torah*. "They were both teachers of *torah*, but the prophet was, in addition, the revealing agent through whom the *torah* was given." The prophetic *torah* was a growing aggregate, a body of literature that continually enlarged its boundaries while revelation lasted. The *torah* is thus wider than the Pentateuch, and Ezra 6: 18 shows that the additions to the Levitical law that were made in the days of David were grouped with the regulations of the Sinaitic legislation as forming part of the book of Moses. The later rabbinical exaltation of the Pentateuch above the other Old Testament writings is unknown in Old Testament times. "The books of Moses, as treating of the oldest events, and as containing the received directory for worship, had the place of honor and were mentioned first. But the most obscure scriptural book was regarded as the prophetic word of God."

The second half of the book under review treats of the Promise. Emphasis is laid upon the statement that "Messianic prophecy is doctrine rather than prediction." "As the biography of Jesus is really doctrine rather than biography, and is the heart of the apostolic Christian doctrine, so the prophetic forecast of the Messiah is doctrine

rather than prediction, and is the heart of the religious teachings of the prophets. Certainly we should treat their utterances as predictive; but this by itself is inadequate. They teach a doctrine concerning God's purposes with Israel, intelligible in each stage of Israel's history, so as to be the basis of religious and moral appeal for that age, but growing in fulness from age to age until it becomes the completed doctrine of the Messiah." Dr. Beecher thus formulates his thesis: "God gave a promise to Abraham, and through him to mankind; a promise eternally fulfilled and fulfilling in the history of Israel; and chiefly fulfilled in Jesus Christ, he being that which is principal in the history of Israel." The men of the New Testament, as our author shows, find the Messianic doctrine pervading every part of the Old Testament. "In their minds it takes the form of the one promise. They identify it as the promise made to Abraham for the nations. They recognize the particulars included in it as 'the promise.' They trace it throughout the Old Testament. They appropriate the phraseology in which the Old Testament speaks of it. Further, they preach this promise as the one great thing they have to preach; emphasizing its irrevocability; claiming that Jesus Christ is the culminating fulfillment of it, basing upon it the hope of salvation for the gentiles, connecting it with the whole body of the doctrine of the Gospel."

Already in the book of Genesis the promise to Abraham was the central and commanding article of theological belief. "Its earliest student found in it a great religious fact, holding the same place in his theology that the fact of Christ holds in ours, something to be believed and taught and practiced for purposes of current living; a doctrine that could be preached, and made pivotal in all attempts at religious persuasions."

Dr. Beecher traces the removal of the Messianic promise to Isaac, to Israel and to David. The prophets enlarge upon the various aspects of the promise. "This is their gospel, as the same promise at a more advanced

stage of fulfillment is the gospel that we preach in the twentieth century."

The author makes a careful study of certain Messianic terms, such as Servant, Messianic King and Yahweh's Ahasidh. "Who is the Servant spoken of in these Isaiah chapters? A certain interpretation replies that the Servant is the people of Israel, and therefore is not Jesus of Nazareth." This interpretation is contradicted by another which affirms that the Servant is Jesus Christ, and therefore is not Israel." "The truth is, that both interpretations are correct in what they affirm, and incorrect in what they deny." Dr. Beecher adds further on, "If the New Testament writers are correct in regarding Jesus as pre-eminently the representative Israelite, as the antitype of all types, then they are correct in applying directly to him what the prophets say concerning Israel the Servant."

In his closing chapter, Professor Beecher shows that his substitution of the conception of one promise for that of many foretold events, adds immensely to the apologetic value of prophecy.

This book, while containing a good deal that one ought to think through for himself, is one of the most suggestive and helpful of the new books on prophecy. Ministers and Sunday school teachers ought to give it a careful reading.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Expositions of Holy Scripture—Genesis, Isaiah and Jeremiah. 3 vols. Octo.

By Alexander Maclaren, D. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1906.

Dr. Maclaren seems equally at home in either Testament, being an accomplished Hebrew and Greek scholar and an expositor of the first rank. He is reasonably familiar with the critical questions in the realm of biblical scholarship, and his insight into the meaning of Scripture is marvelous. He also has a very happy method of developing and presenting his message. He combines with

profound thought and careful research an almost faultless English style. While enjoying each of the three volumes in the Old Testament field, we have been particularly impressed with his expositions of Isaiah. We heartily commend the series to ministers and Bible students everywhere.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Psalms. Vol. II. [LXXIII-CL).

By Rev. T. Wilton Davies, B. A., Ph. D. The Century Bible. Edinburgh, T. C. & E. C. Jack.

It is a slight disadvantage that the whole of the Psalms could not have been annotated by the same commentator, but the volume before us is second to none in the series for first-class workmanship. Only one who has toiled in the same field can at all estimate the vast amount of reading and patient research which every page of this commentary unostentatiously discloses. No modern writer on the Psalms has escaped the perusal of Dr. Davies, and the best works have been consulted, not spasmodically, but constantly, verse by verse. The strongest point of the work is, as it should be, the Exegesis. The comments are invariably terse, pithy, and really helpful in removing difficulties. One regrets sometimes that the exigencies of space prevent the author from giving other views than his own for the selection of the student, but this was impracticable—indeed the immense amount of matter that is crowded into this small volume is astonishing. Still one would like to know, e. g., what grounds Dr. Davies has for asserting in the 119th Psalm that “it is not so much the written as the orally handed down Word of God which forms the theme of this long Psalm.” Dr. Davies seems unnecessarily cautious as to the admission of Messianic elements in the Psalms: as e. g., when in Ps. 110 he asks: “Is the Psalm Messianic?” and gives the reply: “Looking at it by itself, and without prepossession, one would not say that it is.” His eschatological position, in which he deserts Dillman, Smend, Charles and Cheyne, renders necessarily sundry

emendations, which would be uncalled for, we venture to think, on a sounder induction. There are, however, points on which there is abundance of room for difference of view. On the whole the work is very ably done, and Dr. Davies has at once stepped into the front rank of Biblical experts.

J. T. MARSHALL.

The Book of Ecclesiastes. A New Metrical Translation with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes.

By Paul Haupt, LL.D. 50 pages, bound in cloth, price 50 cents net. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

The author's position may best be expressed in his own words; "I believe that the genuine portions of Ecclesiastes were written by a prominent Sadducean physician in Jerusalem, who was born at the beginning of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164) and died in the first decade of the reign of Alexander Jannæus (104-78 B. C.). Ecclesiastes may have been a son of David; he may have been a king in Jerusalem, if we take *king* to mean head of a school." Professor Haupt thinks the author may have worked on the book for more than forty years. "Nietzsche would have called it *eins der erlebtesten Buecher*. The three or four interpolations suggesting that this pessimistic poem was a work of the wise King of Israel, Solomon ben — David (about 950 B. C.) may be due to the friends of the author, who edited the book. On the other hand, there are a great many Pharisaic interpolations directly opposing the Epicurean teaching set forth in the poem. The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes are Sadducean and Epicurean; Stoic doctrines are found almost exclusively in the Pharisaic interpolation."

The plain reader wonders how the learned editor discovered so much that is definite as to composite authorship. He is curious to know how the original author could be located with such accuracy in time, party affiliation, professional life, etc. Here are the author's arguments to prove his thesis: "Ecclesiastes must have been a Sadducee; for he doubts the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body (3, 21). He must have been

a physician; otherwise he could not have given the enumeration of the symptoms of senile decay in the beautiful allegorical description at the end of the book. He must have been born under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164); for in 4, 13-16 he says that he saw the general enthusiasm for the *poor* but wise youth (i. e., Alexander Balas) who succeeded (150 B. C.) to the throne of the *old* and foolish king (i. e., Antiochus Epiphanes). Ecclesiastes also states, at the end of c. 9, that he saw the successful defense of the small place (Gethsura) against the great king (Antiochus Eupator, 163 B. C.)."

After such categorical affirmations as to the author's date and theological affinities, we are almost surprised to read the confession on p. 4: "We have, of course, no mathematical evidence, and I do not claim to have been present when the editorial changes were made, but my theory explains all the features of this remarkable book."

Professor Haupt vindicates the originality of his views as to Ecclesiastes, since his theory, though published recently, had already been elaborated before his classes fourteen years earlier than the appearance of his book. One of the axioms of the modern critical school is that the ancients cared nothing for literary originality and proprietorship. Might not their modern critics learn a lesson of modesty in this regard? Siegfried divides Haupt's pessimistic, Epicurean Sadducee into two parts; the original author being a rank pessimist without any remaining faith, the second contributor to the composite not known as the Book of Ecclesiastes being a Sadducee who glorifies the pleasures of eating and drinking.

If Professor Haupt's views of the composition of Ecclesiastes are correct, then he would be right in the conclusion stated on the opening page of his Introduction, "The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes are out of place in the Canon."

The author's learning is ample, and one who wishes to acquaint himself with the latest critical views as to the difficult Book of Ecclesiastes will find in this treatise a

cheap and convenient manual. The new translation is often felicitous.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Ausgewählte Psalmen uebersetzt und erklärt.

Von Hermann Gunkel Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Preis 3 M. 20 Pf. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Goettingen, 1905. May be had of Lemcke & Buechuer, New York.

Gunkel is famous both for a charming German style, easy for foreign students to understand, and also for a good degree of independence and originality in his critical views. He has given to the public a fresh translation and exposition of a goodly number of the most popular poems in the Hebrew Psalter. The translation has life and movement, and often gives a felicitous rendering of the Hebrew. The author also shows skill in interpreting the psychological experiences of the psalmists. He follows the radical school in his dates.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Literary Illustrations of the Bible.

Edited by James Moffatt, D. D. The Book of Daniel. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1905.

These brief illustrations are drawn from a wide range of both prose and poetry. Many of them throw light on the text, though others are of the nature of literary padding.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

VI. CHURCH HISTORY.

Baptist and Congregational Pioneers.

By J. H. Shakespeare, M. A. The Kingsgate Press, London, England, 40c.

This little volume of 196 pages contains the fruits of more original research than many larger books, and no student of the origins of English Congregationalists and Baptists can dispense with it. Americans will be surprised to see how these two denominations were originally intertwined in England, till they see that Congregationalists there are simply Baptists arrested in their evolution. The connection has been maintained, owing to the hostile pressure of the Established Church, and therefore the free churches find it natural to emphasize the points wherein they agree, and to combine for much work. Indeed it is to the National Council of Evangelical free churches that this book is due, the best of a series of thirteen to cover Free Church History. If it is a pity that Baptists alone did not demand such a story, it is fortunate that a true—and largely new—account of Baptist origins is now likely to circulate widely among other readers. Henceforth no one can excuse himself if he confounds the semi-socialistic, semi-orthodox Anabaptists of the continent with Baptists. And some may be glad of a reference to an early English Anabaptist work of Robert Cooke, strangely neglected now though it elicited replies from two champions. Particularly fine is the hint that in the evolution of Jacob's church from State Puritanism to strict Baptist principles, the whole times are epitomised, and that it shows the logical issue to which all must at last conform. Of little touches in the book, specially admirable are the sketches of Ainsworth living on his "boiled roots"—Irish potatoes?—and producing commentaries or metrical psalms; of John Smythe the ring-leader of the separation rising up and following the beckoning hand of a properly constructed syllogism.

Has any Virginian enquired what happened to the section of the Ancient Church of 1592 which started the religious emigration in 1619 under Elder Blackwell, and prompted the better-known expedition of the Pilgrim fathers next year? If occasionally Mr. Shakespeare thus leaves a thread unknotted, he gives a splendid specimen of what he can do in his leisure hours when the cares of the Baptist World Congress are added to his usual work. What could not be accomplished to elucidate our history by such a man if he devoted himself to the matter? The story here is chiefly of Holland and London; but there are one or two English districts besides Gainsborough and Scrooby which claim to have produced other pioneers, and a competent investigator might soon enrich our annals and set our early story in new perspective. W. T. WHITLEY.

The History and Life of the Rev. Dr. John Tauler, of Strasbourg; With Twenty-five of his sermons, translated from the German, with Additional Notices of Tauler's Life and Times.

By Susanna Winkworth and a Preface by Charles Kingsley. Published by H. R. Allenson, London. Price 6 shillings.

This is a reprint of an earlier edition but is none the less valuable for that reason. Tauler was one of the greatest preachers of the middle ages and his sermons are of perennial interest. Of course many of them are for Protestant readers marred by Catholic superstitions and errors as well as other faults of the age and church in which he lived. But the principle upon which these twenty-five were selected has almost completely eliminated these objectionable features. They were chosen for their bearing upon practical life and will be found exceedingly stimulating and helpful. Tauler was one of the greatest of the mystics, but little of his metaphysical subtleties appears in these sermons. These sermons are given without emendation and give a fair presentation of Tauler's best preaching. The work of translation was well done, while the notes by the translator are valuable.

Any pastor would find this volume a valuable addition to his library.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Rev. John Myles and the Founding of the First Baptist Church in Massachusetts.

By Henry Melville King, Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Providence. Preston & Round, Providence, R. I. 1905.

This neat little book of 112 pages consists of an historical address delivered at the dedication, on June 17, 1905, at Barrington, R. I., of a monument to Myles, together with several important historical documents in the form of appendices. The address is a very interesting account of the life and work of Myles, who in some respects is unique among American Baptists. It throws important light upon the struggle for religious liberty in England and America. To his former monographs the author has here added another of equal, perhaps even greater value.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Life Story of Henry Clay Trumbull; Missionary, Army Chaplain, Editor and Author.

By Philip E. Howard. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia. 1905. pp. 525. Price \$1.75 net.

Henry Clay Trumbull, for years the editor of the Sunday School Times, was one of the best-known and most influential Sunday school workers in America. It is doubtful if any other single man has done so much for the elevation and efficiency of the work done in the Sunday schools. For years under his editorial direction the Sunday School Times was an essential help to good teaching.

But he was a man of distinction in many other directions. As an author he produced several books of permanent value; as a traveler he made important contributions to our knowledge of the Holy Land; as a preacher he was effective in the army and elsewhere. The remarkably interesting story of his rich and varied life is admirably told in this work. The author is his son-in-law and was

for several years his business associate. He knew Dr. Trumbull intimately during the later years of his life, and has diligently studied the sources for the earlier years. This is one of the most important of recent biographies.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Readings in European History. A Collection of Extracts from the Sources chosen with the purpose of illustrating the progress of culture in Western Europe since the German Invasions.

By James Harvey Robinson, Professor of History in Columbia University. Vol. 1. From the Breaking up of the Roman Empire to the Protestant Revolt. Ginn & Company, Boston, New York, Chicago, London.

The title of this collection of mediæval documents is sufficiently descriptive. The documents are well chosen and seem to be carefully translated. The collection is intended primarily as a handbook of materials to accompany the editor's "Introduction to the History of Western Europe." It may be used with advantage in connection with courses of lectures on mediæval history, being as well adapted for the Church Historian as for the teacher of secular history. It would be easy, of course, for any teacher of mediæval history to point out the omission of documents that would have enriched the collection and the inclusion of some that might have given way to others of more importance. But the present collection will prove eminently satisfactory to the average teacher.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

Baylor Theological Seminary.

The New Reformation. Recent Evangelical Movements in the Roman Catholic Church.

By John A. Bain, M. A. T. & T. Clark, Edingburgh, 1906. Imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 283. Price \$1.50 net.

As its name indicates, this work is an account, compiled from the latest sources of the progress of Protestantism among Roman Catholics in all the principal countries of Europe and America. To one who has not kept pace with

these movements or this movement, for it is well nigh universal, the contents will be surprising. For the last six or seven years it has been specially strong and widespread and really deserves the title of a New Reformation. If the movement continues to gather momentum it will certainly accomplish as much in fifty years as was accomplished by the Lutheran Reformation in that period. At present it is strongest in Austria, and in this country alone some 50,000 people have left the Catholic Church since 1898. As children under fourteen are not counted it is probable that as many as one hundred thousand have left the Church. A similar but even more religious secession is in progress in France and Germany. The story is one to make Protestants thank God and take courage. The book is the best account of the whole movement known to me.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Sankey's Story of the Gospel Hymns, and of Sacred Songs and Solos.

By Ira. D. Sankey, with an Introduction by Theodore L. Cuyler. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, 1906. Pp. 272. Price 75 cents net, postage 10 cents.

This little book contains an interesting sketch of the life of Mr. Sankey as a gospel singer and associate of Mr. Moody for many years. There are many thrilling stories of the power of song in bringing men to accept Christ. The body of the book is given to accounts of the origin of many of the best known Gospel Hymns of recent years, and to incidents of the power of these and many of the older hymns as they have been sung by Mr. Sankey and others. Some of these stories were already known, but many of them are new. Pastors would find it full of interesting and helpful incidents and illustrations.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Life of John Wesley.

By O. T. Winchester, Professor of English Literature in Wesleyan University. Pp. 301. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1906.

The many and valuable lives of John Wesley already

before the public do not make this one superfluous. The subject is of perennial interest. John Wesley is confessedly one of the great characters of Christian history. The revival which he with others started has subsequently given color to the Christianity of the English speaking world and its power is not yet exhausted. This new Life of Wesley is the result of a fresh and thorough study of the sources. It is not written "by a Methodist for the Methodists," nor does it deal with Wesley primarily as the religious reformer. The attempt is made to set forth the man, with all his varied interests and marvellous activities, before the general reader rather than for the student of religious history. The work loses nothing in value or popular interest in this attempt. In fact, Prof. Winchester has done his work admirably. There is not a dull page in the book. If it induces the ministry of his own and other denominations to study afresh the life of the great reformer, it will render a good service to the kingdom of God.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress for 1905.

Price 50 cents. Baptist Congress Publishing Co., New York.

These papers are always live and interesting and serve to accent the diversity of opinion among Baptists on current questions.

A. T. R.

First Two Decades of the Student Volunteer Movement.

The Student Volunteer Movement, 3 West 29th Street, New York.

The rapid growth of this movement is well set forth in this report.

A. T. R.

A History of the Inquisition of Spain.

By Henry Charles Lea, LL. D. In four volumes. Vol. I, pp. 620. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1906.

Henry Charles Lea is perhaps better known in Europe than any other American historian. His works on the "Inquisition of the Middle Ages," "Auricular Confession and Indulgences," "Sacerdotal Celibacy," etc., are

quoted as authorities in the lecture rooms of the German universities. Liesure, wealth and native ability have made it possible for him to obtain and utilize the published and unpublished sources to a rare degree that gives him a unique place among American historians.

The present work, of which only the first volume has as yet appeared, is to be an exhaustive treatment of that terrible engine of oppression and destruction known as the Spanish Inquisition. It is in a sense a continuation of his "History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages." As was to be expected this first volume manifests the same exhaustive and painstaking work we have learned to look for in Dr. Lea's productions. The conclusions are based almost wholly on original sources, some of which had never been utilized before. It falls into two broad divisions, first the "Origin and Establishment" of the Inquisition, and second, its "Relations with the State." After sketching in a masterful manner the disorders that prevailed at the beginning of the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella, he sets forth the gradual development of the persecuting spirit in Spain under the fostering care of the church. It was directed against the Jews and Moors and finally resulted in the expulsion from Spain or the forced conversion of all of both races. The genuineness of these *conversas* or "new Christians" was doubtful, and the Spanish Inquisition was set up primarily to hunt out and destroy these suspected Christians. Its establishment began at Seville in 1480 and it was gradually extended over all Spain. It differed from the Inquisition elsewhere and also from the previous Inquisition in Spain in that it was controlled neither by the bishops nor by the Dominicans, but by the pope and the crown and at times was largely independent of both these powers. It was the exercise of irresponsible power that made it so terrible.

The work is too detailed for popular reading, but for those who wish to really understand the Spanish Inquisition it will prove to be indispensable.

W. J. McGLATHLIN.

Primitive Christian Education.

By Geraldine Hodgson. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906. Imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y. Price \$1.50. Pp. 1, 287.

In this volume the author discusses the schools of Roman Empire in the first four Christian centuries, the attitude of the Christians toward these heathen schools and toward education in general and the methods and aims of the great Christian teachers down to Jerome. The work has a good deal of irrelevant matter which does not bear directly on Christian education and the author is too desirous of making out a favorable case for Christian schools and teaching; but it contains much useful information on a very interesting and important subject which has not received sufficient attention. Christianity and learning early became friends and true Christianity and true learning have gone hand in hand ever since. The work is replete with quotations bearing upon the subject in hand and cannot be omitted by any student of the history of education or any one interested in early Christian education.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

IX. MISCELLANEOUS.

Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache.

Von Dr. Raphael Kühner. II Teil Zweiter Band, Besorgt von Dr. Bernhard Gerth. 1904. Hahnsche Buchhandlung, Hannover und Leipzig, Germany. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

This able volume completes the revision in four large volumes of Kühner's famous Greek Grammar. It greatly needed revision in the light of modern comparative grammar. The first two volumes are the work of Prof. Blass, of Halle, who treated the forms. The two concluding volumes are the work of Prof. Gerth, of Leipzig, and discuss the syntax. Without any doubt they form the greatest grammar of the Greek language now in existence. They can, of course, even to German students, be only works of reference because of their great size, but the Greek scholars all over the world are to be congratulated on the successful completion of this great task.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Essays in Application.

By Henry Van Dyke, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Pp. X, 282.

In this volume of essays we are not to look for "a defense, or even a statement, of a complete system of philosophy or faith" but characteristically lucid and lurking expositions of principles of philosophy and faith by a man who believes that "life is the test of thought, rather than thought the test of life" and that, therefore, "we should be able to get light on the real worth of a man's theories, ideals, beliefs, by looking at the shape they would give to human existence if they were faithfully applied." There are twelve of these studies in real life, social, religious and personal. Some of the most striking are: "Is the World Growing Better?" "Ruling Classes in a Democracy," "The Heritage of American Ideals,"

“The Church in the City,” “The Creative Ideal in Education,” “The School of Life.” It needs only to be said that Dr. Van Dyke has given us in this volume some of his best work.

W. O. CARVER.

Great Pedagogical Essays.

By F. V. N. Painter, A. M., D. D., Professor in Roanoke College. Author of “A History of Education,” etc. Cloth, 12mo, 426 pages. Price \$1.25. American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

Here we have a compilation of selections from twenty-six of the greatest theorists and workers in education from Plato to Spencer. The design is to place before the student of the history of education the chief sources of that history. A brief biographical sketch, usually two pages, introduces the selections from each author. This sketch states in each instance the service to education rendered by the author and the extent of his writings on the subject of education. The compiler has done well a service which he naturally wonders no one has undertaken before.

W. O. CARVER.

Friedrich Schiller. A Sketch of his Life and an Appreciation of his Poetry.

By Paul Carus. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. 1905.

The centennial of the death of Schiller was fitly celebrated last year in Germany and this volume is a beautiful memorial of the great poet. There are a large number of handsome illustrations and copious selections from his writings are made in the German and with a metrical translation. The facts of his life are briefly told and then discriminating discussions of his philosophy and poetry follow. Schiller was devout in spirit though a free lance in his religious views. He was an eclectic in his philosophy and religion. But it is a pleasure to read this estimate of one of the most original spirits of the eighteenth century. His poems are admired not only in Ger-

many, but all over the world. His life was far nobler than that of Goethe, his great contemporary.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Essays of Elia.

By Charles Lamb. The MacMillan Co., New York. 1905. 16mo, cloth, 25 cents.

A charming volume of Macmillan's Pocket American and English Classics, with an appreciative and delightful Introduction and illuminative notes by Helen J. Robins, teacher of English in Miss Baldwin's school, Bryn Mawr. Miss Robins tells us in a fresh and pathetic way of the one tragic happening in Lamb's life which determined his career for him—the only fact of his life which never found its way into his writings, and which was even unknown to many of his friends during his lifetime, but which pointed out to him the path which he followed, "courageous and faithful to the end." It was in the year of that happening and touching that experience, that Coleridge wrote: "I look upon you as a man called by sorrow and anguish and a strange desolation of hope into quietness, and a soul set apart and made peculiar to God." The story of the life thus "set apart," and the cream of the writings of "one of the rarest and most delicate of the humorists of England" are here put within the easy reach of all.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Changing Order.

By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D. Oscar L. Triggs Publishing Co., Chicago, 1905.

The author accepts the term Democracy as broadly indicative of a new order of ideas, an attitude of mind opposed to the monarchic and aristocratic, a new spirit of life, an old order changing, yielding place to new, or viewed in the concrete, as the uprising of the people and their complete utterance and exercise in politics, art, education, religion and all other forms of human activity. Because the foundations of the existing social order are

largely aristocratic, the new ideas are obscured and their effects neutralized or destroyed by the stream of traditional tendency. His avowed purpose in these chapters, which he calls *Series I.*, is to separate, as far as he may, the new order from the old, to gather materials for a definition, leaving the final formulation of it to those who shall live within the new world yet to be; dealing, in the meantime, with certain phenomena of the present that seem to be the effects of the new spirit and the new order now in its incipiency. He attempts no elaborate description of democratic polity in the sphere of government, deals with what he regards as the more vital and subtle effects of democracy—its radiation in art, industry, education and religion. He finds in Carlyle, “the Apostle of work;” Maeterlinck, “the prophet of the humble;” William Morris, “the laureate of sweating men,” indeed in Chaucer, who gave the miller and the plowman a place among his “pilgrims;” in Burns, “who sang the glories of home and field,” and in Wordsworth, “who depicted with all sincerity, the dignity of the commonplace,” “the historic tokens of democracy.” He finds in the world of art, and of education, and, last of all, of religion, “the turmoil of transition”—the spirit of democracy penetrating into all realms of thought and life—“prophets arising upon whose lips the word king is never heard, and in whose minds the conception of kingship is never formed, even concerning God—prophets, that is, of cosmic democracy,”—“even the doctrine of immortality, once aristocratic, is now all-inclusive and democratic!”

These are the types of phenomena the author deals with in the freest, most engaging, though not always the most convincing way. “What is needed at this hour, he says, is not to establish free government in Church or State, but to develop free men—“not,” as William Morris once said, “to establish socialism, but to educate socialists.” He turns for illustration of what may be done in formulating a new and modernized theology to Walt Whit-

man's "Leaves of Grass," and quotes with utter approval his words: "The time has certainly come to begin to discharge the idea of religion from mere ecclesiasticism, from Sundays and churches and church-going, and to assign it to that general position, chiefest, most indispensable, most exhilarating, to which the others are to be adjusted, inside of all human character, and education and affairs. The people, especially the young men and women of America, must begin to learn that religion is something far, far different from what they supposed. It is indeed, too important to the power and perpetuity of the new world to be consigned any longer to the churches, old or new, Catholic or Protestant—Saint this, or Saint that. It must be consigned to democracy en masse, and to literature."

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The next regular session will begin October 2d and continue eight months.

Thorough courses of study are given in all departments of theological education.

All studies are elective.

Four degrees are conferred, including a post-graduate degree.

The regular course for the degree of Master in Theology covers three years.

An admirable course of one year in English, without degree, is adapted to the needs of busy pastors who cannot remain for a more extended period.

A great Library is open to all students.

Cost of living in Louisville is not high.

For Catalogue or other information, address

E. Y. MULLINS, President,
Louisville, Ky.

For information as to financial aid, address

B. P. SMITH,
Room 10, New York Hall,
Louisville, Ky.

EDITORS.

E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.,

Editor-in-Chief.

J. R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D. W. J. McGLOTHLIN, Ph.D., D.D.
A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D. W. O. CARVER, D.D.
E. C. DARGAN, D.D., LL.D. GEO. B. EAGER, D.D., LL.D.
D. H. DEMENT, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

REV. B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.
REV. D. F. ESTES, D.D., Hamilton, N. Y.
REV. J. H. FARMER, D.D., LL.D., Toronto, Canada.
REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.
REV. H. C. VEDDER, D.D., Upland, Pa.
REV. J. P. GREENE, D.D., Liberty, Mo.
REV. W. T. WHITLEY, A.M. Ph. D., Preston, England.

On editorial business address the Editor-in-Chief Prof. E. Y. Mullins; on business matters the Business Manager, Prof. A. T. Robertson; with regard to books and reviews address the Review Editor, Prof. W. J. McGlothlin.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS NUMBER:

The Development of Palestine Exploration, by Frederick Jones Bliss, Ph.D. The Works of Josephus, translated by William Whiston and newly edited by D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt. Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments, von Prof. Lic. Dr. Carl Clemen. The New Testament, a Chronological Arrangement, by Principal Lindsay. Η Καινή Διαθήκη, Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici A.D. 1550, cum variis lectionibus, etc., curante F. H. A. Scrivener. The Prophet of Nazareth, by Nathaniel Schmidt. The Letters of Christ, by Charles Brown. What Is the Lord's Coming, by Fred Erdman. The Sychar Revival, by S. D. Gordon. Bible Outlines, or the Second Coming, by C. O. C. The Gospel of Matthew, by Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Litt.D. Jesus, An Unfinished Portrait, by Charles Van Norden, D.D. The Gospel According to St. Luke, edited by W. Williamson, B.A. Addresses on the Gospel of St. John. The Gospel of the Rejection, by Wilfred Richmond. Die Reden Unseres Herrn Nach Johannes im Grundtext Ausgelegt, von Dr. Siegfried Goebel. The Economics of Jesus, Or Work and Wages in the Kingdom of God; a Study of the Money Parables; by E. Griffith Jones, B.A. Keywords in the Teaching of Jesus, by A. T. Robertson, D.D. Our Lord's Resurrection, by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson. The Last Message of Jesus Christ, Or the Apocalypse in a New Light, by John Hamilton Timbrell. The Gift of Tongues and Other Essays, by the Rev. Dawson Walker, M.A., D.D. Hebrews, James, I. and II. Peter, a Commentary, by O. P. Eaches, D.D. James the Lord's Brother, by William Patrick, D.D. The Epistles of Peter, by the Rev. J. H. Jowett, M.A. The Bible and Christian Life, by Walter Lock, D.D. Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das Neue Testament; eine sprachgeschichtliche Studie, von Lic. Therl Gottfried Thieme. The Disciple and His Lord, or Twenty-six Days with Jesus, by Rev. J. S. Kirtley, D.D. Homiletics and Preaching, by Walter Rhodes; Lectures on Homiletics, by Henry C. Graves, D.D. Bread and Salt from the Word of God, Sixteen Sermons, by Theodore Zahn. The Ministry

of the Eternal Life, by William C. Bitting, D.D. Literary Illustrations of the Bible, edited by James Moffatt, D.D. Students and the Modern Missionary Crusade. Missions from the Modern View, by Robert A. Hume. On the Borders of Pigmy Land, by Ruth B. Fisher. A Propos de la Separation des Églises et de l'État, par Paul Sabatier. Papst Stephan I, und der Ketzertaufstreit, von Dr. Johann Ernst. The True Story of Robert Browne, by Champlin Burrage, M.A. Nero, by Stephen Phillips. How to Conduct a Sunday-School, or Twenty-eight Years a Superintendent, by Marion Lawrence. The Making of a Teacher, by Martin G. Brumbaugh, Ph.D., LL.D. Reform in Sunday-school Teaching, by A. S. Peake, M.A., B.D. The Development of the Sunday-school. A Century of Bibles, by a Sunday-school Teacher. The Country Sunday-school, by Rev. Hight C. Moore. Moral Education, by Edward Howard Griggs. Religious Education, by Prof. Albert E. Garvie, D.D. Method in Soul Winning on Home and Foreign Fields, by Henry C. Mabie, D.D. A Text-Book in the History of Education, by Paul Monroe. The Christian Doctrine of Salvation, by George Barker Stevens, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Gottes Sohn und Gottes Geist Vortrage zur Christologie und zur Lehre vom Geiste Gottes, by Von Wilhelm Lütgert. The Witness of Sin, by Rev. Nathan Robinson Wood. The Gospel in the Gospels, by William Porcher Dubose, M.A., S.T.D. Religion und Religionen, von D. Otto Pfeiderer. The Philosophy of Religion, by Dr. Harald Höffding. Greece from the Coming of the Hellenes to A.D. 14, by E. S. Schuckburgh, D.Litt. The Silver Age of the Greek World, by J. P. Mahaffy, D.D., D.C.L. Memories of Life at Oxford, and Experiences in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Germany, Spain and Elsewhere, by Frederick Meyrick. Sir Walter Scott, by Andrew Lang. Walter Pater, by A. C. Benson. The New Far East, by Thomas F. Millard. The Negro and the Nation, by George S. Merriam.

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. III.

October, 1906.

No. 4.

HIGHER CRITICISM.

[COPYRIGHTED.]

BY PROF. D. F. ESTES, D. D., HAMILTON, N. Y.

On scarcely any topic are opinions more widely divided than in relation to Higher Criticism. There are a very great many Christians and some leaders who have the ear of multitudes to whom the very name is an offence. A great denomination has been made responsible for the declaration, "We thank God that there is no Higher Criticism among us."* In short, as a most eminent American scholar said, "It has come to be considered one of the most dangerous forms of infidelity, and in its very nature hostile to revealed truth."† On the other hand, it is most highly exalted, not only by those who practice it and are expert in its use, but no less by throngs who accept the conclusions of their favorite critics without debate or question. The fact is that most people have only the most vague and hazy ideas as to what Higher Criticism really is.

This uncertainty and ignorance can scarcely astonish one in view of what appears on consulting the dictionaries. Of the three leading English dictionaries consulted, the first gave no definition at all, under either "Higher" or "Criticism." Nor did the other two agree. While giving substantially the same definition for "Criticism," as being inquiry into the text, origin, character and authenticity of literary and historical documents, they then part

* Bible Student and Teacher, April, 1906, p. 324.

† Professor W. H. Green, D.D., Preface to the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.

company. One says, "Higher criticism concerns writings as a whole; lower criticism concerns the integrity or character of particular parts or passages," a distinction really incorrect and misleading because out of harmony with its ordinary use by scholars; the other remarks, "The lower criticism commonly deals with the text of such productions, the higher criticism with the historical and literary features," a statement pointing in the right direction, but neither fully accurate nor sure to be grasped by all.

Should we undertake to form our own definition, we may well begin by noting that criticism is judging, and as applied to a book it would be forming an opinion about it in any way, as in art or music critic denotes one competent to form an opinion, a skilled judge. But if criticism is judgment, what is "Higher" criticism? It may be noted at once that the name is unfortunate. Higher Critics are often sneered at as if by their very designation of their undertaking they had set themselves up as superior, and this sneer has even shaped the title of a book, "The Higher Critics and the Highest Critic." (Was the author ignorant or malicious in choosing this title?) In spite of the fact that the name has been in use more than a century, it remains unfortunate. It came into use in this way. The first critical study of the Bible having been in relation to the establishment of the text, when the step was taken to more advanced study of the documents in the Bible, the distinction between textual study and broader study of the character of the writings was made by calling the former lower criticism and the latter higher criticism,* and though unfortunate, the name has somehow stuck, though more freely used in English than in German.

Various attempts have been made to introduce other names. In German we sometimes read of "innere kritik," (internal criticism). So too the names "literary," "historical" and the combination "historico-literary" have

* Eichhorn seems to have been the first to use these names.

been suggested, but no one of these seems likely to gain common acceptance, and most probably we shall continue to have the name "Higher Criticism," though many do not understand it, most would call it unfortunate, and some make a mock at it.

It is also to be understood that Higher Criticism is practiced no less outside the sphere of Bible study than within it, although it less often bears the name. Whenever any written thing is studied to see what story it tells of itself, its own origin, its own purpose, its own character, then we really have Higher Criticism. It matters not whether it is in a court of law, where a contract, a deed, a will, a letter or any other written evidence is scrutinized, or in the classroom or study of a teacher or student of any literature, ancient or modern, where some book is cross-examined, so to speak, till a confession is wrung from it, or in the public or private library or governmental archives, where the historian weighs the worth of some document, old or new, anywhere, everywhere, where the evidence of the written matter itself is gained, the process is really Higher Criticism. And while some well-meaning but ill-advised persons, in their reverence for the Scriptures sometimes protest against all Higher Critics and Higher Criticism, I never yet found one who would not use on his side of the argument any and all evidence which he could gather from the study of the Bible itself, and this made him in spite of himself a Higher Critic.

Of course not all study in relation to the Bible is properly to be styled Higher Criticism. A late author in the book which he entitles "The History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament" says that "Criticism is Bible study, or interpretation, as it must needs be pursued in an historical age. * * * The Higher Criticism, the original text having been found, aims at the historical interpretation of Scripture."* But there

* Professor Henry S. Nash, D.D., p. 11 of the book named above.

is a great deal of Bible study to-day, in what this author would presumably call "an historical age" (he doubtless meaning by this somewhat inexact phrase, an age in which prevails widely a disposition to consider how things came to be)—there is to-day, as there ought to be, much Bible study outside the realm properly characterized as critical.

First, there is all the study which goes to the establishment of the correct text of the Scriptures, for which, to be sure, most persons lack alike training and materials, but which is to some extent forced upon all in these days by the common use of the various revisions. Then there is exegetical study, the scrutiny of the language so as to answer the question, "What does the author mean?" Sometimes this study is slighted by the declaration, "The Bible means what it says," a saying not so much untrue as misleading. It ought to be put rather, "The Bible says what it means," and the finding out what is meant and consequently what is really said, is a very important part of Bible study, but lying outside the sphere of Higher Criticism. Then there is what has been called the literary study of the Bible, the investigation of the literary forms employed and the rhetorical significance of these forms, a branch of Bible study which has only lately come up, but likely to have increased attention hereafter, and having little connection with Higher Criticism. Then there is the study of all the history which may throw light on the Scriptures. All that can be learned of the past, its dates, politics, manners, customs, ideas, all has been used to throw light on the Bible, and this is important Bible study, but it is not Higher Criticism, though if combined with Higher Criticism it may gain higher value.

Higher Criticism is properly the making of the Bible, to illuminate itself, as a whole and in its several parts. Sometimes a great ocean steamer is brought into the harbor by the aid of half a dozen tugs, sometimes it comes in by the use of its own steam. Now Higher Criticism is

letting the Book navigate by the use of its own steam. It gathers the testimony, direct and indirect, all the testimony of the Bible itself to itself. And this testimony is of the highest value. Nothing about the Bible can be as important and as trustworthy as is the Bible itself. Of course this evidence must be searched for with diligence and scrutinized with care. The consequences are so momentous that we must guard ourselves against any false conceptions of the books which we receive as inspired, their date, their authorship, their composition, their transmission, and in answering these questions no evidence can be more conclusive than that furnished by the books themselves. The testimony of the Bible itself is all important, and consequently the gathering of this testimony and the weighing of its real meaning and worth, which is Higher Criticism, are of the greatest importance and value. If this work has not always been done fairly, carefully, well, the remedy is not to deny the possibility or the right of doing it well, but rather to demand and to exemplify fair and careful doing of it. If Higher Criticism, because of the use of faulty methods or false premises, has resulted in erroneous conclusions, these can be properly set aside only by better and more accurate Higher Criticism which carefully starts from verified premises and proceeds by correct methods, so that the conclusions are no longer erroneous. To be sure, when a man's position is due to prejudice, wilfulness or blindness, without reasons, it is usually hopeless merely to multiply arguments and ply him with reasons; but it is no less true that a man ought never to be asked to lay aside a conclusion derived from reasoning however faulty without showing him his error and giving him better reasons for a better conclusion. It is thus with statistics. Though it is proverbial how misleading they are, yet we must, provisionally at least, accept conclusions based upon figures, until we can find and show how they have been misused and how they ought to be used. In the same way, I admit, I insist that conclusions professedly

based on Higher Criticism are erroneous because of mistake in data or processes, but this means fighting fire with fire, using Higher Criticism to correct Higher Criticism. Where truth has been undermined by Higher Criticism wrongly used, it must be re-established by Higher Criticism rightly used.

There are many difficulties in relation to the practical applications of Higher Criticism which may well make us cautious in accepting critical conclusions, however confidently presented, until confirmed and verified. It is often spoken of as a science, and heed to its conclusions is demanded because they are "scientifically" reached. But in one important use of the name science, it does not properly belong to Higher Criticism. For instance, Morley said of Voltaire, he "hardly left a single corner of the field entirely unexplored in science, poetry, history, philosophy." Now as the word is here used, Higher Criticism is no more science than it is history or philosophy. Here science applies especially to the natural sciences, where the possibilities of experiment or the abundance of material renders verification of hypotheses so easy that certainty is practically assured. When this is the meaning of science, criticism like history and philosophy stands outside its realm. To be sure the name science has another application in which it may be used of Higher Criticism. If by science we mean merely ordered knowledge, a definite relation established between principles and facts according to a regular procedure, then the name may be allowed to Higher Criticism. But then we must be on our guard lest we surreptitiously bring over the element of certainty which rightly belongs to the name in its first sense and attach it wrongly to what is science only in the second use of the name. Great uncertainty still attaches to the practice of many a science in the second sense of the word. In this sense history is a science, but all over its field uncertainties abound. If history is a maze of uncertainties, uncertainty may attach to the conclusions of Higher

Criticism, though likewise dubbed a science. Even in the natural sciences there is somehow, somewhere chance for error. Medicine is a science in the strictest sense, but that does not guarantee its results.

Again, it ought to be remembered that there has never yet been a thorough, systematic and standard formulation of its principles as a science. In conversation with a physician of high standing not long ago the writer was informed that this physician studied under the first medical professor who ever taught the principles of diagnosis; that is, men had been practicing medicine more than two thousand years since Galen and Hippocrates without a careful statement of how to proceed in diagnosing a disease. In a similar way, men have been using Higher Criticism out of the Bible ever since they began to study written documents attentively at all, and have been Biblical Higher Critics by name more than a century, and there is not yet any recognized statement of the principles and methods of the science.* If the science of chemistry were in such a condition, with no accepted formulation of its principles and processes, a jury would be false to its oaths which did not have reasonable doubt whenever its verdict hinged on the testimony of a chemical expert.

Now this is not to be understood as casting discredit on all critical work. Some critics have done work that has been careful, successful, really scientific. The classic example of this sort of work is of course Bentley's "Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris." Similar credit is due to the discussions of the forgeries of Chatterton and Macpherson. The writer is told by a friend that Bancroft's Life of Van Buren was critically shown to have been written long before its publication. All this is pure Higher Criticism and has been successful and commendable. A piece of work substantially similar has been done in the sphere of the New Testament. The Epistle

* This statement should not be understood as slighting the very helpful popular work of Professor Zenos, "The Elements of Higher Criticism."

to the Hebrews was traditionally assigned to Paul, as may still be read in our Bibles, even the Canterbury Revision. But after thorough study of the letter itself, its style and thought, it has been decided with practical unanimity by scholars that it cannot have been the work of the Apostle to the Gentiles, a piece of pure Higher Criticism, but well done.

On the other hand, the work of Higher Criticism sometimes results in demonstrably complete failure. In 1899, the *Critic*, a literary journal, advertised a series of articles by a well-known Thackeray expert, in which were to be published hitherto uncollected papers of the great humorist, gathered from *Punch*. But at once another critic wrote in the same journal of "the absolutely untrustworthy character of the papers" already published, and the latter proved his contention by showing that he had had access to the payrolls of *Punch* and had verified from them the names of the real writers of the articles in question. In discontinuing the publication the *Critic* said, "An investigator writing at a distance from such first sources of information as the records in the office of *Punch* was not, of course, in a position to speak with any final authority concerning these unidentified contributions," words which might well be hung as a motto in the studies of many critics who at a greater distance from first sources of information assume to speak with final authority.

In any case we search in vain for a clear statement anywhere of the principle employed in proving or disproving authorship by Higher Criticism. Perhaps it might be stated thus. If unlikenesses increase beyond a certain degree, a single authorship becomes increasingly improbable until this improbability becomes sufficient to justify us in acting on it, though it can never reach positive certainty. Conversely, as resemblances are noted, confidence that there was only one author of both increases, it may be to conviction. The same principle is involved in the identification of persons and of signatures

and other handwriting, but all are more or less familiar with the practical uncertainties which beset such applications of it. It is no less uncertain business to apply it to literary compositions.

It may be interesting in several ways to consider the application of this principle to certain Epistles usually ascribed to Paul. In certain letters, notably those to the Colossians and Ephesians, the style is quite different from the Roman and Corinthian Epistles, and the thoughts, as well, are in many respects different. The documents have been searched as with a microscope, and the likenesses and particularly the unlikenesses have been carefully drawn off. The German critic Holtzmann has devoted special attention to this work and probably it would not be unfair to find in the Commentary of which he was general editor his own final conclusion, though the form of the following statement is to be attributed to von Soden: "If we combine all these observations as to style, ideas and literary position, we are forced to the conclusion that Ephesians cannot have had Paul as its author."* But Jülicher, a later, and many will say greater expert, who wrote in view of all his predecessors' work, concludes his own discussion thus: "Although, then, Ephesians may not belong to our unquestioned Pauline heritage, it would be equally impossible to deny the Apostle's authorship with any confidence."* Next in order of time Professor McGiffert, an eminent scholar of great freedom from any bias in favor of traditional views, while recognizing that the great majority of what he calls the "critical school" deny the Pauline authorship of Ephesians, yet himself holds that even on grounds of style identity of authorship "with Paul's acknowledged letters is not impossible," and finds that the doctrinal utterances are "sufficient * * * to confirm the explicit claim of the letter to be Paul's own production."† And

* Translated from *Handcommentar*, III (2te Aufl.), p. 100.

* Introduction to the *New Testament* (Eng. trans.) p. 147.

† *Apostolic Age*, pp. 383, 385.

latest comes Professor Bacon, of Yale, utilizing the materials of his predecessors and no less free from traditionalism, and he brushes away the arguments from style by saying we shall "find it easy to explain a few peculiarities of language and style,"‡ and by a course of argument in relation to the thought, too long to quote here and too compact to summarize, turns the ideas contained into weapons in defence of Paul's authorship. While this bit of history forcibly exemplifies the uncertainties which beset the conclusions of Higher Criticism, it at the same time shows no less conclusively that the way to meet Higher Criticism which is unsound and erroneous is not to ignore it, still less to denounce, but to use it rightly and to turn its methods against itself.

An element of uncertainty, a possibility of error must always remain in the inevitable subjectivity of Biblical Higher Criticism, that is, in the fact that its measures are individual judgment and personal opinion, not any objective standard and test. If Holtzmann thinks that the arguments lead to the conclusion that Paul did not write the Epistle to the Ephesians, there is no way that he can verify and demonstrate his view as the Punch records showed that Thackeray did not write certain papers attributed to him. If a man thinks that free trade or prohibition is desirable, the experiment can be tried, in England or Maine, perhaps elsewhere, and his view is checked up. If a man holds that vaccination will lessen smallpox, or radium cure cancer, there is always a chance to test the accuracy of his opinion by experiment, but Biblical Higher Criticism unavoildably goes on unchecked and unverified to the end of the chapter in almost every case.

Another source of difficulty is the limited amount of material which can be used. In many cases where actual experiment is impossible there is much material. For testing theories in language or sociology there are vast and

‡ Introduction to the New Testament, p. 121.

varied fields in which tests may be found. But the Bible presents phenomena which have no parallels elsewhere in literature, and so Higher Criticism has to deal with unique facts. For example, there is no other such problem in literature, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, as the so-called Synoptic problem. So, too, the problem of the Pentateuch stands alone. This problem is just the opposite of the Synoptic problem. There, to give the conclusion without the reasons, it seems that several sources have been differently combined in the several Gospels; here the different documents, if they ever existed, have been strangely combined into one book or series of books, and there is no exact parallel elsewhere in all known literature to such a fact.

Now the scientific method imperatively demands verification. The cornerstone of the inductive sciences is experiment or observation to check up hypotheses and previous results. If possible, an experiment is actually tried. If a chemist holds that helium is an emanation of radium, he watches the behavior of radium. If it is announced that photographs can be taken by X-rays, immediately all the physicists interested try it. If it is impossible actually to reproduce the phenomena desired, then the test comes by extended observation. Geologists are not quite certain as to their hypotheses concerning the formation of rocks and the earth itself, because they cannot reproduce the situation in question. But there must be verification, and so they search the world over and compare results gathered from a wide area, and these fresh inductions serve as in some sense equivalent to experiment. But neither course is possible for the Higher Critic, and so his hypotheses unavoidably go unverified.

Now one might think that this fact would lead to modesty on the part of those who practice this science, but few need to be told that it has not had this result. The men who constitute the great body of "the critical school" are peculiarly unlike most of the men versed in natural science, in their loudness of claim, their fre-

quently almost ferocious positiveness and self-confidence. Is it not possible that the explanation lies in the fact just mentioned, the impossibility of verification? Think how a great scientific man, a Liebig, a Helmholtz, a Virchow has been taught by his mistakes. He thought that he knew, but the first experiment taught him better and sent him back to interrogate nature more carefully. There is an old story of a difference in opinion of doctors by the bedside of the patient, and one ended his discussion with the simple remark, "You'll find out at the autopsy." The Higher Critic has no such test. He cannot experiment, he cannot verify, and while on that account he ought to be all the more modest in feeling and guarded in statement, the result has been the opposite.

Another thing which the man who gives himself to the natural sciences has to learn is to exclude everything but the one thing sought. The seismometer is to measure the earthquake shock, then it must be set where the vibrations of traffic cannot affect it. The astronomer wants simply the light of the star, then he must set his observatory away from everything which would interfere, and so the Lick Observatory is set on the top of Mount Hamilton. If chemicals are to be combined to prove anything, everything else must be excluded, and so a chemist of my acquaintance tells his students, to begin with, that they must wash their beakers so clean that if they had contained strychnine, they would not be afraid to drink out of them. Failure here means necessarily absolute failure in the experiment. But something, possibly again lack of verification, has led many Higher Critics to fail in this point. Higher Criticism ought not to be mixed with philosophy, and observation of facts should not be affected by theories. But unfortunately such has been the case. The conclusions of the most prominent Higher Critics have been protested against by many Christian teachers, and often with good reason, but in most cases, though the objectors have failed to understand it, what was really objectionable was not the

critical method, but the domination of the critics by philosophical theories. German Higher Criticism is very largely not this science by itself, a registry of purely scientific results. The procedure from beginning to end is controlled and warped by the idea of naturalistic evolution, or evolutionary naturalism, as one may prefer to put it. Evolution as evolution is not necessarily to be set aside, no more as a historical hypothesis than as a biological hypothesis. What is objectionable is naturalism seizing on evolution as a means to dominate Higher Criticism. By naturalism is meant of course that philosophy which excludes God from history, even when it claims to include him in all history, and which approaches the story of Judaism and of Christianity as recorded in their documents with the fixed presupposition that this history is like any and every other history, and so that it can be asserted that things *must* have happened thus and thus, in this order and with such and such results, and garbles the documents, and rewrites the history and denies the facts solely because of the theory that a merely natural evolutionary process controlled the whole, without any supernatural element, with no peculiar intervention of God. If on philosophical grounds it is asserted that God never specially intervenes in human affairs, that there is no prophecy, that miracles never happen, that God dealt with the Jews in the same way as he has dealt with all nations, and that there has been no incarnation, no resurrection, no divine guidance in history and no inspiration in composition, that is a comprehensible position to be proved or disproved on philosophical grounds. But the mischief in Higher Criticism has been that these purely philosophical presuppositions have controlled processes which should have been purely critical, and consequently have entirely vitiated them. It is to this importation of naturalistic philosophy into a field where it does not at all belong that we owe, in my judgment, the complete rewriting of Jewish history which stands out in most minds as the chief re-

sult of Higher Criticism. But this is in fact a vicious arguing in a circle. First the documents are rearranged to conform to a theoretical course of history. Then from these rearranged documents are drawn data which are thought to confirm the presupposed history. But nothing is gained logically by this process. Of course the magician can take out of the hat every rabbit he puts into it, and of course if the documents have been rearranged according to a theory, even by cutting them in shreds to make them fit, they will fit the history.

To this protest against adulterating Higher Criticism with philosophy, may perhaps well be added another against warping it to meet historical considerations. To be sure, most of us are not practically engaged in Biblical Higher Criticism. But it is to be remembered that the Higher Critic sustains to the common student a relation parallel to that of expert and jurymen. The expert gives his judgment with his method and reasons; the common man decides the case. It may then be helpful to point out some of the possible sources of error on the part of the critical expert. Now sometimes assertions have been made as in the name of Higher Criticism which rest rather on historical and archeological considerations. When, for instance, it has been argued that there could be no element in the Pentateuch dating back to Moses, because writing could not have been known to him and his circle, that is not a critical but a historical position, which has of course been shown by the discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna letters to be such a gross blunder that those who made it only wish it forgotten. So, too, the argument that the Pentateuch could not have dated back to Moses because such a codification of laws would have been impossible at that time, an argument which the Hammurabi Code has shown to be another blunder, may have been put out by Higher Critics, but that did not make it critical, for it was supposedly historical in character, and should have been used and received as such. Care must be constantly exercised to distinguish con-

clusions which are really critical in character from those based on other grounds.

In this paper, a definition was first reached for Higher Criticism as the investigation as to the origin and character of books on the basis of what is in the books themselves, they being made to turn states evidence, as it were; then some of the difficulties in the practical application of the science were pointed out; then were named some of the elements, philosophical or historical, which are erroneously taken as essentially critical. It may be well in conclusion to point some of the results thus far attained by the practice of Higher Criticism. A late writer* has named but three: 1, the composite nature of the Pentateuch; 2, the proof that our present books of Isaiah and Zechariah are each the work of more than one author; and 3, the composite nature of the Synoptic Gospels. To these the present writer would add two more, one, already mentioned, that the author of Hebrews could not have been Paul, and the other that the author of the Fourth Gospel must have been, if not John himself, then one closely associated with him, a disciple of his and a product of his teaching. Of these the second, the plural authorship of Isaiah and Zechariah, shocks many students greatly, but needlessly. This conclusion does not militate at all against the character of these books, as they have been recognized by the church in all ages, nor is it based on any doubt as to the existence or nature of inspired prophecy. It rests simply on the principle that God adapted the message which he inspired to the men who received it, and that part of the messages in these books are adapted to one age and part to another. It may be added that we have no sufficient reason for asserting that the works of prophets could not have been combined in transmission. It need shock the faith of no one to accept this conclusion, if proved. That the Synoptic Gospels show the use of documents in their

* Dean Burnham in *The Encyclopedia Americana*, art. Higher Criticism.

composition is in line with the claim of Luke to have investigated and used all sources of information, and that earlier documents should have been incorporated in the Pentateuch is no more surprising, and in neither case is there any decision as to the date of composition. Finally, it will be observed that the conclusion stated as to Hebrews is not out of harmony with ancient tradition, and that the conclusion as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is, so far as it goes, directly in support of the ancient and uniform view of the church.

It is often represented on both sides that the work and results of Higher Criticism are destructive to the view that the Bible is due to the peculiar agency of the Holy Spirit. Those who pose as especial friends of the Bible fear it; those who hold to the opposite view rejoice in what are claimed as its conclusions. The fact is that both are in error. While many Higher Critics are hostile to the view that the Bible is God's book in a unique and authoritative way, yet it cannot be fairly asserted that the results of the assured principles and carefully guarded processes of Higher Criticism are such in any sense. Reverent Biblical scholars have but to master the principles and methods of Higher Criticism to make it serve their cause. As captured Russian battleships swell the Japanese navy, so Higher Criticism will yet contend for the age-long truth.

THE THEORETICAL VALUE OF MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

I.

BY PROF. JAMES TEN BROEKE, TORONTO, CANADA.

The significance of this theme may be otherwise expressed in such questions as these: Is morality ultimate? What is the final meaning of moral and religious experience, so far, at least, as religion is related to morality? How should the facts of the moral consciousness be valued by him who would construct a philosophical system?

A word as to the conditions under which morality might be regarded as ultimate. The moral good cannot be defined except in terms of itself; the moral good is that which satisfies the desire of a moral agent; the moral good is "the realization of the moral capability."* Note also the distinction between ultimate morality and morality as ultimate. We cannot know because of the limitations of our developing life what the final state of moral beings would be. We may know, I think, that the ethical Ideal is finally real, that that for which a man strives is realized in a living existence and is a controlling principle of reality, indeed, is an attribute of the World-Ground and an essential factor, although perhaps not the only factor, in the supreme end.

The following positions may be taken: First, that we cannot know the Absolute and so cannot say that morality is ultimate; secondly, that morality has an ultimate significance but only when transmitted into some higher experience; thirdly, that theoretically we do not know whether morality is ultimate or not, but that through the soul's unique function of faith, we know that it is and that the Divine Being is moral; fourthly, that a philosophical investigation of our experience of both the real and the ideal can only lead to the conclusion that the

* T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, Secs. 171-2.

Absolute is a moral Personality realizing himself in a society of moral selves, in consequence of which it may be said that morality is ultimate. It is the purpose of this paper to offer some considerations as to the manner in which this last view may be successfully maintained in a philosophical system.

But what, after all, is philosophy? It is not easy to define it nor is it easy to be convinced that the task implied by its definition can be accomplished. Who is bold enough to say that philosophy is a well-wrought-out science which has a definite history and is now in its most complete stage of development and is universally accepted? The fact is that there is no such thing, never was and never will be. Hence the surprise and in a measure the disappointment on the part of the beginner. How can there be a history of philosophy, for the absolute truth does not change in time? Or, if you have history, you have not philosophy. Philosophy is rather self-knowledge which includes a knowledge of the world and of God as dependent upon a knowledge of the self.* If so, how can we escape the conclusion that there are as many philosophies as there are selves and that philosophy is a certain aspect of individual experience, a certain attitude of reason towards life in all its complexity, both material, economic, social, religious, indeed, the entire compass of experience? As to any other kind of philosophy—a philosophy which can claim to be a science, verified and universally accepted, I doubt if there be such, either in the past or present. And yet some have been courageous enough to undertake a history of philosophy, seeking to find a logical order in the development of the world's thought, tracing the genesis and order of conceptions as they have appeared throughout the centuries. If philosophy be a personal affair and yet these personal views of succeeding generations fall into some discoverable order exhibiting a development towards a larger and more satisfying whole of truth, it is a fasci-

* Kuno Fischer, *Descartes and His School*, 1-14.

nating thought, causing us to raise the question whether the springs of our life are not deeper than we had believed, even in the eternal Spirit, else how account for this strange harmony amidst the individual diversities?

I would, then, define philosophy in this personal way, as "self-knowledge"—as an attitude of reason—an adjustment of the man to his living—an adjustment gained through reflection upon himself in relation to the world and to God, striving after, though not always gaining, a consistent view.

Why should this reflection be undertaken? Why not be satisfied with the piece-meal view of things? Because we must live, and the true life is the inner life, and the inner life seeks completeness and harmony of experience without which the mind cannot rest. Every contradiction impels forward. The mind ceaselessly puts forth new demands and refuses to take any answer as the whole truth because the mind itself is implicitly larger than the questions it can ask or the answers it can give. How must I think of myself and the not-self, call it world and God, if you please? What in my experience can I depend upon as having final significance? Does it make any difference how I conduct myself, and if it does, why should it? A few such questions arouse the mind from indifference—it may be only to fall back into despair, discovering no satisfying answers to its questions. Philosophy is a personal soul-struggle for the light of truth.

Another fact seems to complicate the difficulty, namely, consciousness and conscience admit no protesting appeal—what is true—what is right—must be at last my own decision. I may be taught by others past or present, but finally the belief in the truth and the right is my own response to the collective reasons that I have gained in my experience thus far.

It would seem as though those features of my experience which are of most significance in the conduct of my life should be given most importance in my final decisions concerning the truth, that they should convey

to me the deepest significance of my own reality and of all reality—in short, those principles which are pre-eminently practical and social—the moral and religious. Is it not true that the moral and religious experiences become most developed comparatively late in life, as though they could come into clear consciousness only as the confirmed result of long and complex experience?

Moreover, the plain man is forced to regard the universe from the moral and religious standpoint. He may be easily confused if asked whether the moral law is as real as the stone at his feet whose weight he lifts and whose form and hardness he experiences. The senses may have chronologically the first claim upon him for acceptance of what they reveal as final truth, but he at the same time conducts his life according to principles that transcend the senses, counting those principles as real and necessary in dealing with reality as what the eye and the hand reveal. And certainly in the later history of his mental life, a man would sooner doubt his own eyes than the final trustworthiness of a moral principle. How easy to regard the world as having a moral order—as grounded in a moral Personality who has intimate relations with real finite moral agents—how necessary to say this in the light of experience! Few would hesitate to accept such a statement as the truth. But only a little attention to the history of philosophy is needed to convince one that the above proposition is yet perhaps the boldest and most comprehensive of syntheses, full of difficulties, for can we after all say that the self is a real moral agent with moral responsibility? That the world-order is moral, consequently purposeful, even having the moral as at least one factor in the supreme purpose? That the World-Ground is a moral Personality --not only self-conscious thought and will, but also moral, therefore, realizing in His own perfectness the moral Ideal? It is, then, of much importance to determine the place of morality in a philosophical system.

First, consider some examples of the skeptical reply

that we do not and cannot know the nature of the Absolute. Restricting the discussion to narrow limits, I refer to the negative result of the Critique of Pure Reason, which has proved acceptable to so many, that this negative, skeptical position has in consequence been regarded by some as the essential teaching of Kant. This negative position concerning the ultimate consists in limiting knowledge to sense phenomena in space and time. Our sense perceptions are indeed determined by the subject according to certain pure concepts and principles. The result of this synthesis is the world of experience with its laws. Space, time, things and self are "empirically real but transcendently ideal." Concepts without sense intuitions are empty, and to become knowledge must be intuitionalized in space and time and causal relation. Hence the limits of knowledge. To be sure we have other conceptions like soul, world and God, but they are regulative, subjective principles necessary to the highest possible synthesis of knowledge, but to regard these conceptions as signifying ultimate realities would be to give objective validity to what are only *a priori* regulative principles. The influences of this negative results of the Critique of Pure Reason have been widely felt.

Mr. Shadworth Hodgson furnishes an illustration of the influence of this negative result of Kant's work. His "Metaphysics of Experience"* leaves us at last in the presence of Unknowable Power. Hodgson maintains that he continues the Kantian limitation of knowledge to experience, but also holds that he is more true to Kant's position than was Kant himself by insisting that the analysis of experience be undertaken without any assumptions. He will not, therefore, like Kant, assume forms of knowledge, a self that knows and a noumenal reality. All there is, is consciousness and its states which transform themselves into an external world, a human body and a self, distinguishing itself from yet knowing

* "The Metaphysics of Experience," Vols. I, II, III, IV., by Shadworth H. Hodgson. Longmans, Green & Co. 1898.

the world, possessing the body and being self-conscious. This process is not the unfolding of the life of a metaphysically real soul, for there is no such thing—there are only conscious states becoming of themselves in turn body, external world and the self in contrast to, yet in peculiar but different relations to world and body.

Moreover, conscious states are simply the accompaniment of brain states. The real agency is not consciousness but nervous changes; the order of conditioning is, brain state, then conscious state and this order is never reversed. Even in the highest forms of intellectual synthesis and ethical choice, the nervous elements interacting are the real agencies.*

While Mr. Hodgson says he is a materialist in psychology, he is not a materialist in metaphysics. Matter indeed marks the limit of our knowledge; matter embraces the nervous system which in the cerebral changes conditions our consciousness, but matter itself is in turn conditioned by a higher though unknown realm of real conditions—the unknown Power which can be conceived neither as matter nor as a universal consciousness, but which embraces in itself both the seen and the unseen. With these conceptions our positive knowledge ends.

Turning to the moral and religious sphere, we find that Mr. Hodgson follows Kant's example in the Critique of the Practical Reason, although he does not leave us with a like confidence in the postulates of Practical Reason. Kant leads us to believe that he himself really meant more than his clumsy words enabled him to say, namely, that the postulates of God, freedom and immortality are the highest form of knowledge and worthy of all confidence as the truth about reality. But Mr. Hodgson shows that the completion of the conception of the Unknown Power is accomplished through the "moral ideas and feelings which are the creatures of conscience."* Hence this addition to the conception of the

* *Ibid.*, Vol. III, 310-311, 335. Vol. IV, 53-54, 20. Vol. I, 416.

* *Ibid.*, IV, 203-6.

Unknown Power "that sustains the universe" is speculatively gratuitous. We know only that there is such a power to which neither blame nor praise, nor, least of all, moral goodness and self-conscious interest in human life can be attributed. Yet Mr. Hodgson would have conscience follow implicitly with "the confidence, that the power which we exert in so acting is identical in kind, and continuous *in fact*, with the inmost nature of the Infinite and eternal Power which sustains the universe."^{*}

I think that Mr. Hodgson is here trying to keep with one hand what the other takes away, for if the World-Ground is not known as moral and as interested in moral agents, how can there be any confidence that in obeying the imperatives of conscience we are any more in harmony with the Unknown Power than in disobeying them? If the principles and conceptions which express the moral consciousness have not an objective as well as a subjective significance—if they are not the deepest meanings of all reality trustworthy to the core, what do I care about them? Why not make a lie my good? There is no answer. Mr. Hodgson's final position is disappointing and full of a stinging bitterness in the discovery that those things which I hold supremely valuable and significant are neither ultimately valuable nor significant. I do not intend to misrepresent this author's view of moral experience; but when he cuts it off from any final significance, condescending to recognize the moral as only a phase of the practical—all the practical being only the conditionate of an Unknown Power—I must indeed have great faith if I am to act upon a moral principle and regard it as identical and continuous with the Unknown Power.

What I have just said is supported by the treatment of theology in its relation to philosophy. Theology is regarded as simply the conceptual representation of the practical—the moral and the religious. It has no connection with philosophy and does not have the value of

* *Ibid.*, IV, 206-7.

knowledge. It does not in any sense throw light upon the nature of the Absolute. Theology, however, serves a useful purpose, in that it formulates the moral and religious experience of a given age. As a poem like Dante's *Divine Comedy* formulates the prevailing thought and spirit of an age in a pleasing manner and to a useful end, although the poet would not expect his statements to be received as a theoretical expression of the nature of reality, just so theology serves its day and generation without being able to claim acceptance as speculative truth about the Absolute. Theology is not knowledge, which amounts to saying that theology is not a possible science.

It is evident that "The Metaphysics of Experience" gives no prominent place to morality in its structure, although it is treated at much length. We feel that such a system can not be true. Why? Because the author undertook to base his metaphysics upon experience—which, of course, is the only correct thing to do—and yet has been untrue to the most significant factors in that experience—the moral and religious—regarding these factors out of their proper relations in the whole and consequently reaching a result which cannot prevail as a system satisfying to the subjects of these experiences.

Moreover, this theory attempts to explain morality on a naturalistic basis and according to a materialistic psychology, although we must give Mr. Hodgson the benefit of his assertion that he is not a materialist in metaphysics. T. H. Green in his "Prolegomena to Ethics" has shown that such an attempt cannot succeed. How can fear and compulsion generate the sense of moral obligation, and the energy of material forces have as its result the ideal of "the ought to be?" Prof. Huxley, although sympathizing with a line of thought like that of Hodgson, confessed that "all modern as well as ancient scientific effort has utterly failed" to bring the order of things into harmony with the moral sense of man, and "the cosmic process has no sort of relation to moral

ends." And to Spencer's question: "If the ethical man is not a product of the cosmic process, what is he a product of?" Prof. Ladd replies: "The naturalistic view of ethical phenomena has, of course, no sufficient answer."* I believe that moral experience can be satisfactorily understood only from the point of view of moral personality, both human and divine.

I now, however, call attention to a system which takes an intermediate view and maintains that morality has final significance but cannot as such be predicted of the Absolute. This is Bradley's "Appearance and Reality"—a work in which many difficult questions are acceptably treated. As I wish to show the value given to moral experience in this system, it is necessary briefly to outline it.

First of all, Bradley's starting point is acceptable, namely, "that the object of metaphysics is to find a general view which will satisfy the intellect—and—that whatever succeeds in doing this is real and true, and that whatever fails is neither" (553-4). It may be that to restrict this satisfaction to the intellect rather than the whole man is too narrow; but I think Bradley means all our experiences expressed in terms that will satisfy the intellect, and when so expressed we have to take the view as both the real and true. The world of "appearance" is the world of "experience"—using the term "experience" in the Kantian signification—and includes our thoughts, volitions and feelings—the world of things, events and selves. We must think of all these—not as illusions—but as appearances not in themselves real, manifestations of ultimate Reality. The world is not made up of real existences conceived as independent and persisting through successive changes, for "so understood the world contradicts itself; and is therefore appearance and not reality" for, whatever cannot be conceived without contradiction is less than reality and must be regarded as a fragment, as reaching beyond itself to a whole in which it is embraced as a constituent but trans-

* Quotations from Ladd's *Philosophy of Conduct*, p. 603.

mutated factor. Measured by this standard, space, time, change, causation, even the self are not ultimately real but are real only as "appearances," as experiences.

What, then, is reality? Reality is the only individual, embracing all finiteness, even selves and their acts, in a perfect harmony of "sentient experience" (p. 142). The Absolute Reality is never less than its appearances in thought, feeling and volition, but all this diversity of the finite actual is taken up into the Absolute Unity and so transmuted that, while all is retained, yet the differentiations disappear in an inexpressible highest unity of experience. Perhaps the undifferentiated state of feeling—the supposed condition of the self before the distinction of subject and object and relations arises—may furnish an analogy of what that highest unity of experience in the Absolute is. Somehow the things of the natural world, finite souls, the good, the true, the beautiful, "ugliness, error, and evil, all are owned by, and all essentially contribute to the wealth of the Absolute," but "all of these are worthless alike apart from transmutation" (489).

It is at this point that Bradley's theory of the Absolute becomes mystical. In one sense we may say that the Absolute is personal—for all finite personalities are in Him—indeed, it is better to call the Absolute personal than impersonal, but better still super-personal, super-rational, super-moral—an undifferentiated whole of immediate experience.

The "appearances" constituting the finite world differ in rank. Thus Bradley tries to avoid Pantheism which regards everything as equally divine (551). The relative rank and value of appearances is determined by the degree of freedom from contradiction and incompleteness, or, in other words, by the amount of transmutation and supplementing necessary to reach the Whole, the Absolute. For example, the evil and the good differ in degrees of realness and value, both being manifestations of the Absolute. To be evil is to suffer loss

and perish, because in the end the evil is overruled and transmuted into the inexpressible unity of the Absolute experience which is above the distinctions and relations of the finite yet possesses this finite in this perfect unity. But the good, though suffering transmutation, stands nearer the harmonious whole and is consequently of more value in the scale of appearances.

But why is the morally good not ultimate? Stated very simply, the moral life consists in the volitional effort to realize one's self-perfection with as great an extent and as perfect a harmony as possible. But it is soon found that this perfection of the self involves self-assertion and self-denial and that moral goodness requires now one and now the other. The more comprehensive the life, the more self-assertion and self-denial are required, and yet the assumption of morality is that the life may be a harmony. But how can these contradictions, self-assertion and self-denial, which are evidently two factors of moral goodness, be brought into unity? Their unity is inconceivable. So morality must issue in religion. Consequently, the next step after morality is religion which is the anticipation of the ultimate unity of all opposites in the Whole (438-440).

In a paradoxical sentence, Bradley says: "The moral duty not to be moral is the duty to be religious," for religion feels the unity even of good and evil in the Absolute experience. And yet religion itself is not final, but must be transcended and transmuted. Religion is incomplete and inconsistent because its faith is a "making believe," and yet because religion is practical, "it is at the same time a making as if one did *not* believe," i. e., the felt, the anticipated, final unity of good and evil found in religion contradicts the practical inability to escape the difference and the recognized necessity of living as though there never could be any transformation and unity of the good and the evil in something higher than themselves (440-3).

Another reason why religion is inconsistent and con-

sequently not ultimate lies in the relation between God and man which is supposed to be an essential factor in the nature of religion. But relation destroys the independence of both terms which can only stand in a unity embracing both. Consequently, man and God become finite forms of the Whole. In the realm of appearances, God and man may both stand as related personalities, but personality cannot be applied to the Absolute nor reality to the finite person. On the other hand, religion shows its inconsistency and consequently its incompleteness and unreality by its effort to attain the perfect unity of God and man. "And, if so, nothing would in the end fall outside God." But, "if you identify the Absolute with God, that is not the God of religion. If again you separate them, God becomes a finite factor in the whole. And the effort of religion is to put an end to, and break down this relation—a relation which it none the less presupposes. Hence, short of the Absolute, God cannot rest, and having reached that goal, he is lost and religion with him" (440-447).

I will now emphasize some of the features of this theory which are worthy of favorable consideration in any attempt to estimate the value of the facts of moral and religious experience in a philosophical system.

First, moral and religious experience is an expression of the Absolute Reality. The Absolute is its appearances and is not less real than are they. This is a far stronger position than that taken by Hodgson. In moral and religious experience we may be confident that we are grasping true Reality. It is my conviction that we must in the end ground moral and religious experience somehow in ultimate Reality. It is thus that I understand and accept Bradley's meaning.

Secondly—It does make a difference to the Absolute unity whether one is good or evil, for each contributes according to its nature to this Absolute whole of immediate experience (430).

Thirdly—It is a fair inference that the morally good

is relatively nearer the Absolute fulness—is more real than the evil—needs less correction—less transmutation to be brought into the Absolute Whole.

Fourthly—Judged by the principle involved in “degrees of reality and truth,” religion in which morality culminates is the highest in rank among the appearances of the Absolute Reality. “There is nothing more real than what comes in religion.” “The man who demands a reality more solid than that of the religious consciousness, seeks he does not know what” (449). I would draw especial attention to religion as the climax of the process in the world of finite experience, and the reason why it stands highest is that it is the most complete experience, the nearest approach to the unity of experience in the Absolute.

Fifthly—Moral and religious experience as certainly lays hold of the Absolute reality as philosophy, and in some respects is superior to philosophy. Neither religion nor philosophy can be said to be the completion of the other (454). As a mere intellectual expression of ultimate truth, philosophy may be said to stand higher than religion; but, on the other hand, so far as religion succeeds in its “attempt to express the complete reality of goodness through every aspect of our being—it is at once something more, and therefore something higher than philosophy” (453). To one man, philosophy, to another the intensity of religious experience may be the way to the Divine (6, 7).

But, on the other hand, there are some positions taken by Bradley which present great difficulty. For example, without attempting any definition of the moral good and evil, let us ask this question: Is God good, morally good? I cannot avoid the affirmative answer, and yet there are difficulties. Certainly, so far as we know, good is relative to evil, yet Christian faith holds that God is all in all, overrules the evil and causes the good to triumph. But how are error and moral evil to be in the All? Surely the temptation is strong to say with Bradley that the good,

the evil, the ugly, the erroneous are but "appearances," manifestations of the one Reality which holds all these, "transmuted," in a highest unity of experience wherein distinctions and relations do not exist. Of course, there is no telling how, but somehow this highest unity of experience is the highest, indeed, the only complete fact. Is this the way in which we must think of God over-ruling the evil and making the wrath of man to praise Him? Has Bradley offered the only solution?

Let it be remembered that Bradley has shut the door of escape by way of the free initiative of man as a moral agent rebelling in his evil independence against the divine Person, for man and God were shown to be only correlatives in conscious experience, both phenomenal, both adjectives of the Whole. To escape this conclusion seems to me almost impossible. How can anything be outside the Whole in order to be related to it as God (519)? How can there be created an independent-dependent being, namely, man as a moral agent? Are we driven to say that all including man's moral history is simply a process of the one Absolute Reality?

Another difficult point raised by Bradley is contained in his assertion that there can be no real moral progress except in the phenomenal order. In one sense of the term Absolute it would seem as though we were obliged to accept this denial of ultimate real progress and confine progress to the swiftly passing order of human life. But I am unwilling to admit that our triumphs are not real moral advances with ultimate significance—more than mere appearances. Are we shut up to Bradley's conclusion?

I frankly confess that I do not know how to get over the difficulty involved in the relation of man and the Absolute. To say that man is created by God and given moral independence is little short of a makeshift—and yet, that something has been granted to man which cannot be metaphysically expressed it seems unavoidable to maintain in behalf of the validity and trustworthiness of the principles of morality, but even then we may not have

escaped monism; we may have only made the difficulty involved in the relation of the finite and the Infinite a little less pronounced. To this end, I offer the following suggestions: Is knowledge of anything and the actual experience of it a necessity in the divine Life? Is it not possible that God may know a moral human act, yet that act not be, as such, the divine experience? Surely we know the act of another which is not made thereby our own. How can we hold that the human moral act which is an object of knowledge for the subject of it is at the same instant "transmuted" into something other than it is known to be by that human subject without destroying confidence in the trustworthiness and possibility of knowledge? Surely there cannot be two different kinds of truth about the same thing nor a finite experience which in its transmuted form is the same thing; and yet has not Bradley asked that this be granted?

Is it not conceivable that the very nature of God must realize itself in a society of moral selves in whom, indeed, there is struggle, passion, ignorance, and evil, initiated by their own volitions and in whom there is a separation between their conceived moral ideal and their moral attainments, while in God the ideal and the real form a true unity in virtue of which He is the perfect moral Person in fellowship with finite moral persons? Moreover, is it not possible that in such a society of moral selves the divine ends are progressively realized and so moral progress is real even from the absolute point of view?

NOTE—The second division of Prof. Ten Broeke's article will appear in the January Review and Expositor.—Editor.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

II. Chapters vii-x. 18.

BY W. T. WHITLEY, M. A., LL. D., PRESTON, ENGLAND.

With chapter seven we enter on the main theme of the epistle, the Priesthood of Jesus. After the many hints and the cautious preparation for it, less than a third of the space is spent on proving it. Direct and continuous exhortation follows from the middle of the tenth chapter, which will occupy our attention another time, with its modern application.

The theme met difficulties certain to be felt by most Jews. They were deeply attached to the sacrificial system descended from antiquity. It is therefore shown to be essentially prophetic, valuable not for itself, but for its hints of a deeper reality now presented in Jesus. No advantage is taken of the unworthiness of recent high priests, such as Annas or Caiaphas; the system is taken at its best in the person of Aaron; the sordid realities and reeking shambles of Jerusalem are not held up to disgust, but the ideal directions of Leviticus are chosen. These at their very best are shown to be inadequate. And was the system antique? yet it originated long after Abraham, who met a priest of an older and better type; and when it did come, it was only copied from a heavenly pattern, now presented not to Moses alone, but to all in the person of Jesus; the second-hand system must be abandoned for the first-hand.

There are three steps in the argument: First, that Jesus is a Priest, then that Aaron's high priesthood was only temporary and prophetic, then that Jesus is the High Priest prefigured, doing in reality what Aaron only excited hopes of. These points are then summed up. The

turns in the argument are at viii. 1, ix. 11, x. 1. It may be thus represented:

JESUS IS A PRIEST.

“Consider Melchizedek, the strange figure once in contact with our father Abraham. Not king alone was he, but priest also. As priest he blessed Abraham and received a tenth of his spoil. Of descent, of inauguration, of resignation, we know nothing; he is like the Son of God declared in the psalm to be priest. Such priesthood is permanent.

“Contrast him with the Levitical priests in the matter of the tithe. They tithe by law, he by merit. They tithe only their brethren, he the patriarch himself—yes, and bestowed on him a blessing also. They are dying off constantly, he is spoken of as living. Indeed as they were latent in Abraham, they themselves paid tithe to Melchizedek.

“See how inadequate is the Levitical priesthood. After many centuries’ trial, its failure was declared in the promise that a different priest should be appointed after the order of Melchizedek. With this downfall of the priesthood comes the downfall of the whole Law. For observe the facts about the hero of the psalm, Jesus. He belongs to Judah, not Levi, and yet is priest; how about the Law there? Look at the promise in the psalm; our Priest is installed not by an arbitrary rule of hereditary descent, but by the inherent value of an indestructible life: ‘After the order of Melchizedek.’ This utterance repeals the former rule as to the priesthood as feeble and unhelpful—for the whole law was no real help—and substitutes a better hope which does bring us near to God.

“And this priesthood of Jesus was inaugurated with an oath, for ‘the Lord swore;’ whereas the Levitical priests had no such solemn appointment. This again guarantees us a covenant that is better.

“These priests have become numerous as death carries

off one after another, but Jesus as He abides 'forever' has His priesthood changeless. Herein again He can thoroughly save those who approach God through Him, as He is still alive to intercede for them.

"How suitable is such a High Priest for us? Sundered from sinful men and exalted above the heavens, He need not, like those high priests, offer constant sacrifices; this He did once for all when He offered Himself. And thus, instead of an arbitrary succession of weak men, there is the Son of God, installed by His oath, consecrated forever.

AARON'S HIGH PRIESTHOOD WAS ONLY SECONDARY.

"Next to advance a step and crown this result. Of what stamp is our High Priest? He is seated on the right of the heavenly throne, minister of the Holy Place and of the original tabernacle pitched by God, not by man.

"High Priests exist to offer gifts and sacrifices; what has our High Priest to offer? The Levitical priests on earth offer their legal sacrifices; but they serve what is a mere copy and imitation of the heavenly realities, as Moses was warned when he was told to construct the Levitical tabernacle: 'Mind and make them after the pattern shown thee in the mount.'

"Consider the whole covenant with which the Levitical priesthood is bound up. How far better is that covenant which Jesus negotiated, based as it is on better promises. For if that covenant at Sinai had been faultless, there would be no room for a second; whereas God did find it faulty and say: 'The time is coming when I will make a new covenant with Israel.' When God uttered that phrase, a new covenant, He branded the other as old. But what was becoming old and growing obsolete even in the days of Jeremiah, is not far off destruction.

"Now even that first covenant had rites divinely appointed, and its sanctuary, ornamental in a way. For there was a tent prepared, in two parts, full of emblematic

furniture which there is no time to expound in detail. Attend to the significance of there being two parts. Into the outer tent the priests may go freely, performing their duties; but into the inner tent may pass the High Priest alone, and he only once a year, after sacrifice. This is the divine meaning, that while the outer tent stands, there is for a sinner no way into God's presence. This symbol receives its explanation at this present time. And it is only as symbols that Levitical gifts and sacrifices are offered; they cannot help the conscience of a worshiper for they, like the food and drink and the various baths of the Levitical law, are rites affecting merely the flesh, imposed until a time when all should be set right in reality.

THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF JESUS IS REAL AND EFFECTIVE.

“Contrast the work of Christ, who ascended to usher in the new age. The blessings He offers come by means of the real original tabernacle, not the manufactured imitation; He depended not on the blood of the dumb goats and calves, but on His own blood; He entered once for all into the true Holy Place, obtaining thereby a redemption that is eternal. For if animal blood and ashes sprinkled on a man set him apart technically so far as his body is concerned, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who deliberately offered Himself to God, sinless, cleanse our conscience from lifelessness and enable us to serve the living God?

“His death has a double reference. Not only did it ratify a new covenant, but it redeemed those who transgressed the old covenant, and enabled them to enjoy the inheritance promised to Abraham. For a covenant involves the death of him who breaks it, as is represented in the actual death of the victims at the sacrifice which ratifies the covenant. But the death incurred by the general breach of the old covenant was borne by Jesus.

“That old covenant, important as it was, was inaugurated merely with blood. For Moses took the blood of calves and goats, and sprinkled both the book recording

the covenant, and the people, and the tent, and all the utensils for the ritual. Indeed I may almost say that everything is cleansed in blood according to the Law. And if without shedding of blood no forgiveness is granted, these earthly copies of the heavenly tabernacle must be cleansed—in blood. Cleansed, in blood!

“But the real cleansing of the heavenly original must be with better sacrifices. For Christ did not enter an imitation holy place, but the very heavens, where He now represents us before God. Nor does He keep on offering Himself, as the earthly priest goes yearly into the holy place, with blood, and that not his own! Once only, at the crisis of the ages, has He manifested Himself to abolish sin by a real sacrifice of Himself. He is like us in death and judgment; but His death was to bear the sins of many, though Himself sinless; and sin being done with, the judgment is an award of triumph, namely that He may come again and complete the salvation of those who earnestly expect Him.

“Or look at the sacrifices. The Law simply foreshadowed the blessings to come, but did not pretend to bestow them; the priests cannot free worshippers from sin by those sacrifices which they keep on endlessly offering. For if the worshippers ever attained an easy conscience by a real cleansing, the round of sacrifice might cease, whereas it continues year after year reviving the recollection of sins without removing them.

“The fact is that no amount of bloodshed can take away sin; material acts cannot rectify spiritual wrong. And so when the Word became flesh, He took as His motto the old psalm which on the one hand declared that God wanted no sacrifice or burnt-offering, and on the other announced, ‘I am come to do Thy will, O God.’ Sacrifice, ordered indeed in the Law, is yet abolished, and obedience is exalted. Jesus never slew and offered a beast on the altar, throughout His life He obeyed God. And God accepting that obedience which culminated on the cross, willed to pronounce us thenceforth free from sin.

“Those Levitical priests toil away at their useless drudgery, while our Priest is content with His one effectual life and death, and now confidently awaits in glorious rest the final issue of His work. For brief as was His career, it suffices thoroughly to make and keep men right with God. Have we not a clear promise of this? When Jeremiah was commissioned to announce the New Covenant, it proved to consist not simply in touching the hearts and consciences of men, but also in blotting out from God’s mind the memory of sin. And since this is so, further sacrifice can only recall sin again to mind, and undo the work of Christ.”

Perhaps the best way to study this great argument is not to follow it point by point, but to examine its teaching on four great topics: Covenant, Law, Sacrifice of Christ, Priesthood of Christ.

COVENANT OR TESTAMENT; CONTRACT OR WILL?

That a covenant was in question was almost hidden from the reader of the Authorized Version by the wrong translation Testament. Now in the Revised Version the true translation is given in such places as vii. 22, viii. 6-13, ix. 1-15, 18-20, x. 16. But right in the middle of a connected argument the RV breaks it up and makes it illogical by keeping the old rendering for two verses. It may seem plausible to say that the only document which first comes into force at the death of him who made it, is a Will; but this shirks two points: There is nothing to limit our consideration to a document; the argument before and after is about a Contract, not a Will. Moreover the Jewish Law did not admit of wills; property was divided between the children with a double share to the oldest. If it be said (without much evidence) that wills had been introduced under Roman influence, the answer is plain, that a Roman will did come into force when made, before the death of the maker. Besides, who is the “Mediator” of a will, the Executor or Trustee? And

who is supposed to die that the will may come into force? Christ? Then He willed away His gifts to others and was left destitute, which is absurd. The Father, so that Christ is joint-heir? The idea is unthinkable.

Trying then if the author is not more logical than the revisers think, we have as a literal translation of ix. 16-17: "For where there is a covenant, there must necessarily be borne the death of the covenanter. For a covenant is valid over dead (victims), since is it then of force in case the covenanter lives?" The translation is easy enough, but the question staggers a modern reader. This is only because we are more familiar with contracts signed, sealed and delivered, than with ancient Jewish covenants. These were usually ratified by a sacrifice, as we see in the cases of Abraham and Jacob, Genesis xv., xxxi. The meaning of this seems to be that each covenanter invoked on himself in case he broke his word, such a death as the victims actually bore. Now on this understanding the question in the epistle is most pertinent. The men who made the first covenant broke it and incurred the penalty of death; but Christ bore that penalty and so redeemed their transgressions, leaving them pardoned and able to benefit by the promise of the eternal inheritance. This promise had been made to Abraham, long before the Law, and was quite independent of it, permanent not parenthetical, vi. 12-17. But whereas hitherto only the promise had been inherited, since the death of Christ the fulfilment also was available for all who were called. Such is the steady view of the epistle, xi. 39.

THE COVENANT.

Apart from these two verses, there is now no doubt that the main thread of argument is about not a Will, but a Contract; or rather about the Old Contract made at Sinai, and the New one promised through Jeremiah and arranged through Jesus, superseding the Old. The parties

to the old contract were Israel and God, while Moses was the middle-man. For the new contract the middle-man is Jesus; the parties are not defined here, except by the quotation from Jeremiah and by the vague phrase, "They who have been called;" it was not expedient to annoy Jews by obtruding the fact that all men were now free to contract with God; throughout the epistle the horizon is limited to Jews.

This subject of the Covenants has been specially obscured by a Dutch theology which ignores the Bible usage of two historical contracts, at Sinai and at Calvary, and which dwells on two theological covenants "of works and of grace." To understand Hebrews these modern ideas must be banished from the mind. At Sinai the people promised to do what God asked, they heard His orders spoken direct or read by Moses from the Book of the Covenant, they held a solemn meeting and promised anew, they offered sacrifices to ratify the covenant, and they joined in the final meal before God. But within six weeks they broke one of the leading conditions, thus ending the covenant and absolving God from His promise; on the intercession of Moses He condescended to renew it. The next generation was equally faithless, but again it was renewed on the plains of Moab. Every succeeding generation broke it, and after a solemn renewal in the days of Josiah and a wholesale apostasy under Jehoiakim, the prophets took up the thought of Hosea i. 9-11, and treated the covenant as broken beyond repair, so turned their hopes to a new one, Jeremiah xi., xxxi., xxxii., Ezekiel xvi., xxxvii., Isaiah xxiv., lxi. Ezra also felt that the old covenant was ended, and hoped he could be the middle-man of the new one, for which he elaborated a long service, Nehemiah ix. It does not seem to have occurred to him or to Josiah that while they were in earnest, they had no invitation from God to renew the covenant, and no token whatever that He paid any attention to their proceedings. Later ages instinctively perceived this, and ignoring them, harked back to the transaction at Sinai,

where undoubtedly God manifested His approbation, and took the initiative. But with strange blindness they fancied that though their side had never been kept, the contract was still in force, and that God was pledged to fulfill His side. With equal one-sidedness modern Jews still hold that this Covenant is available for them, though they explain away their obligation to fulfill half the conditions explicitly stated.

Really the New Covenant was announced by Jesus; the terms of this new contract were Love to God and Man, and the benefit offered was Pardon for sin and Help to do better. The ratifying service culminated at the cross, where the penalty of breach was borne by Jesus; and He ordered a festal meal in memory of the whole transaction. The new contract is open for any one to enter into on his own account; Jesus has arranged it and is surety that it will be carried out, surety for the Father to the contracting sinner, surety for the sinner to God. And whereas the Old Covenant had no promise, open or implied, that it could be begun again after failure, one of the leading features here is that when we fail to keep it, we may repent and confess to God, and find it still available.

THE LAW.

From the Covenant we pass to the closely related topic of the Law. This is the Jewish Law, contained within the five books of Moses, especially in the three great collections, Exodus xx-xxiii., Leviticus with a few supplements in Numbers, Deuteronomy xii-xxvi. This Law is declared to be obsolete, and a variety of depreciatory terms are heaped upon it—changed, carnal, preliminary, annulled, weak, unprofitable, shadowy. Such amazingly strong language was necessary to drive into the patriotic heart of Jewish Christians that there was no sin in disregarding what was already repealed. If the great American Constitution with its history of 118 years was repealed from top to bottom, and no longer had any binding force,

yet sentiment would cause millions to act voluntarily along its lines still. And if it should be highly inexpedient that such obedience should be given—may the profane supposition be forgiven—then the innovator would have to smite with sledge-hammer blows in order to break the links of custom.

There is however no explicit reference to the act of abrogation, nor any mention of a new Law substituted for the old. The matter had been implicitly settled when Peter publicly stigmatized the Law as “a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear,” language unrebuked at Jerusalem, even by James. Those who acquiesced in such contempt had really conceded that the Law was done with. James had frankly admitted that whoever stumbles in a single point, keeping all the rest of the Law, was yet guilty of all; this is evidently a *reductio ad absurdum*, and he infers that the ancient Law is repealed and replaced by the Royal Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. No debate expressly on this point has been recorded, for in Acts xv. the point was whether the Law should bind Gentiles; but Paul’s arguments to the Galatians, including many who were “Jews by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles,” go nearly to the root of the matter. The Law was added till the Seed should come; now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor; Christ set us free from the yoke of bondage; the whole Law is fulfilled in one word; fulfill the law of Christ. While to the Romans he discussed chiefly the point of justification, yet he widened to say, Ye were made dead to the Law through the body of Christ, we have been discharged from the Law. If this may be understood of a few individuals exempt from the Law, which yet remains generally, he deals with it objectively to the Colossians, saying that Jesus blotted out the bond written in ordinances and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; and he goes on to drop a seed which finds here ample growth, that ceremonies are but shadows of a substance now come in Christ.

Nailed to the cross. When Jesus declared with His dying breath, It is finished, He announced that the time had arrived at which He had hinted when He said that no jot nor tittle could pass from the Law "till all things be accomplished." Even then He had criticised isolated details of the Law, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, An eye for an eye; in place of these He had offered one comprehensive and deeper precept, declaring that it was the Law, All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also unto them. And thus in one sense He filled the Law full; but in another sense His whole life was a fulfilling it, obeying it in every minute detail. If to John He said at the outset that He must fulfill all righteousness, He declared to the Father at the end that He had accomplished the work assigned Him, and the claim was admitted in the resurrection. Christ then had fulfilled the Law, and his death brought down the whole scaffolding with a crash, leaving instead His own permanent command, Love one another.

Now in this epistle the moral side of the Law is not touched, it is the temple ritual that is chiefly discussed; but it is urged that a change even in any detail of ritual really means a change of the whole Law. The position of James is endorsed, that the Law is one and indivisible. This was indeed the general Jewish view; Paul warned that obedience to the law of circumcision was useless unless the burden of the whole Law was assumed; Moses had bidden Israel neither add nor diminish. It may suit the modern Jew to classify the 613 precepts of the Law into four groups, and to say that the sacrificial laws are not binding because there is no temple, the political laws are not binding because there is no Jewish state, so that only the ceremonial and moral laws still hold; but no passage in the Law warrants this division and this putting half of it into obedience. The Law stands or falls as a whole. And it fell, when Christ died.

This epistle deals directly with only one part of the

subject, that the sacrificial laws are not binding on Jews; but the far wider conclusion is warranted, that no solitary part of the Law is now binding on any man whatever simply because it is part of the Jewish Law. Indeed this conclusion is drawn by others, and taught on the authority of Christ. Paul summed all the commandments in the word Jesus had quoted, Love thy neighbor as thyself, and said that love was the fulfillment of the Law. As a standard of conduct it has faded out of Peter's thought in his epistles, and he allegorizes in the strain of this epistle. Mark never mentioned the Law at all, in any part of his Gospel; and he commented on our Lord's saying about clean and unclean, that it virtually made all meats clean. Luke the Gentile hardly mentions it except in reporting the speeches of others; if he mentions it on his own account it is usually with a significant qualification, such as, The Law of Moses. Matthew has preserved for us the two great utterances of our Lord, which concentrate and implicitly supersede it, vii. 12, xxii. 40. John even in his gospel seems equally detached, reports Jesus as calling it "your Law," contrasts it with the grace and truth that came through Jesus Christ; and in his epistles he never alludes to it; it is no rule of life to which he refers, it is not even a danger to be warned against, it is off his horizon, while the duty of a Christian is to keep Christ's commandments, summed up and repeatedly referred to in the phrase, Love one another.

It is astonishing that after this plain exposition by many writers, Christians often hanker after the Law, or after a few fragments of it. When we have a compact announcement of the will of Christ, the one Law-giver, who has all authority in heaven and on earth, how foolish to rake over the Jewish scrapheap and rescue a rusty chain or two to wear as a yoke of bondage! We live under the New Covenant, not the Old; our law is the will of Christ, not the Law of Moses. History attests that once men meddle with that obsolete rubbish, they are tempted to take up more and more of it, until in ritual they blossom out

with robed priests offering sacrifices on altars, in ceremonial they have holy days and celibacy and unclean food, in politics they have a doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, and in ethics their "moral theology" stinks to high heaven. If many of us shudder at this as almost an apostasy from Christ, let us remember that he who appeals on any point whatever to the Law rather than to Jesus Christ, has in principle admitted all this declension, and when he himself presently feels inclined to stop will be powerless to draw any line.

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

When the Jewish law of sacrifice was criticised, the true meaning of sacrifice was set forth in the case of Jesus. First it was shown that the main purpose of the old animal sacrifices had been misunderstood. Whatever the old heathen meant by sacrifice, whether a totem feast, a sacramental meal, a harvest festival, or what not, yet the main thing meant by God for the Jews was, a reminder of sin. Sin was the one thing dwelt on in sin-offering, trespass-offering, burnt-offering, atonement-offering. This was well known. But there was some novelty in saying that sacrifice served only to recall sin to mind, not to banish it and give an easy conscience. Even spiritual psalmists had not seen things quite in this light; they knew that God wanted broken and contrite hearts, but saw no connection with sacrifice, and were somewhat inclined to withhold it; while mere ritualist choirmasters editing the psalms for public worship, cheerfully acquiesced in the notion that to roast a bullock whole on the altar was itself good.

It was a splendid contribution to thought that sacrifices were to recall sin to mind and make the conscience uneasy. Missionaries still find the Christian application true, that when talking about duty will arouse no sense of sin, yet the story of Jesus dying on the cross can cause shame and repentance.

Then came the next problem, how to get rid of sin; and the notion is brushed aside contemptuously that blood can do it. If this is to us axiomatic, to them it was revolutionary. An educated Hindu to-day thinks that he can get into communion with God by putting his limbs into a certain position and stroking his stomach; small wonder that educated Jews then still dallied with the thought that blood could cover up sin. This writer can hardly conceal his scorn of such materialist notions; and his insight is the more remarkable if he had not actually seen and smelt the steaming slaughterhouse of the temple, but simply read as we do the directions in Leviticus. According to the Law, nearly everything is cleansed with blood! Apart from shedding of blood there is no forgiveness! We must have better sacrifices than this.

What then does he rely on, the blood of Christ? Not so, if that phrase be taken literally. He uses it as a half-way house in his exposition; but he presently speaks also of the Body of Christ. And when he discards metaphor, he lays the stress on the Obedience of Christ. "Lo, I am come to do Thy will." This is comprehensible. Man's sin is dealt with by man, not by bulls and goats. Man's disobedience is met with man's obedience. These things are on a plane.

How far was this obedience carried? Through life to death, and we are not warranted in dissecting them apart and discarding either. Christ's life was one perpetual obedience, from birth under the Law to acquiescence in a condemnation for blasphemy at the lips of the high priest. He announced publicly that He came to fulfill the Law; He bade the leper go and obey the rule as to purification. He openly challenged His foes whether they saw any fault in Him, and except for mutterings about the Sabbath, which He met by saying that He disregarded their traditions, there was no reply. The general people, a hostile council, an intimate like Judas, a dispassionate observer like Pilate, all concurred in seeing no fault. But a crucial test came in Gethsemane, to cease obeying;

hard was the struggle, yet the issue was as usual, Thy will be done. And so He was obedient, even to death. The twelve legions of angels were not summoned, the sword of Peter was ordered back to its sheath, the taunt "Himself He cannot save" was allowed to pass; and He died on the cross. With that the sacrifice was complete, and instantly the veil of the temple was rent in twain in token that once again, as in the days of Ezekiel, the place was abandoned by God, and its secrets were exposed to all.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

While the sacrifice is important, the Priest is the central topic here. There were priests before Aaron, the memory of them remained in the days of the Levitical priests, and a future priest of one such type was promised; in Jesus he appeared. Such is the argument.

But what is the most important duty of a priest? And from the analogy of the Day of Atonement the answer is, To enter the Holy of Holies after the sacrifices, and intercede for forgiveness. This was no novel doctrine; every priest, if physically unblemished, might butcher an animal, tend the fire, daub the blood; but to enter the temple and burn incense was a far greater honor, only possible for a few, and so dealt out by lot, and permitted only once in a lifetime. And to enter the inner apartment was permitted to the high priest alone, on one day only in each year.

So from this analogy the chief priestly work of Jesus came after His sacrifice; and therefore it lies in heaven. When sacerdotal metaphor is dropped, we find it stated in such terms as these: To show mercy and bestow grace to help in time of need; to be the author of eternal salvation to all that obey Him; to be our forerunner in heaven; to lead us nigh to God; to save to the uttermost by making intercession; to cleanse our conscience from dead works; to serve the living God; to appear before the face of God for us; and, yet in the future, to appear before

us for God to complete our salvation by the abolition of sin and taking us into full fellowship. While then the initial atoning work of Jesus receives ample recognition, yet the emphasis is thrown on the continuous intercessory work to culminate in the Second Advent, when we too pass within the veil.

Christ's prophetic work is over; no longer does He teach in person, that was done once while He lived on earth; now we are His deputies to speak for Him and announce salvation. His kingly work is hardly begun, except where the few enthrone Him in their hearts; He is sitting and waiting till His foes be made His footstool, that He may take His great power and reign. But His priestly work is at its zenith. For all who accept Him as their representative, He is the ambassador at the court of heaven, presenting our praise and our prayer. He takes the initiative and pleads what He has wrought. Through Him passes upward our confession of sin, through Him pass downward forgiveness and cleansing and help.

ATTEMPTS TO ELIMINATE THE SUPERNATURAL FROM THE GOSPEL HISTORY.*

I.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES IVERACH, D. D., FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
ABERDEEN, SCOTLAND.

It is impossible, within our limits, to enumerate the attempts which have been made to eliminate the Supernatural from the Gospel history. They vary from age to age, they depend on the tone, spirit, and tendency of the time, but whatever these may be the attempt is ever renewed, and those who make the attempt are always persuaded that they have been successful. At all events they proclaim loudly that they have succeeded. Yet every fresh attempt is a criticism on all former attempts, and a confession that so far former attempts have been a failure. Recall to mind the criticism of Strauss on the rational endeavors of the *Aufklärung* movement, and the subsequent criticism of Baur of the theory of Strauss, and the reply of Strauss to Baur. One might write a history of these failures, from the writings of those who successively have been in the van of the attack. Yet this is not the place for such a work.

The attempts have in the main proceeded from science, from philosophy, or from those mainly interested in history. Typical illustrations of the attack from the scientific side are to be found in the writings of Huxley and Spencer; from the side of philosophy one may find the attack proceeding from the various schools, materialistic or ideal, but both schools are equally determined to reduce the processes of Christianity to that level which will bring them within the grasp of the principles they regard as sufficient for the explanation of the world and

* In our January issue will appear the second part of Prof. Iverach's article, in which his suggestive argument will be completed.—Editor.

of all the changes within it. Then there is the attack from the student of history, who is resolved that all historical movements shall be explained on grounds common to them all, and that there will remain in history no movement that cannot be explained from principles which operate along all the lines of history. There is one thing in common to all these attacks. Science claims that all the changes in time and all the movements within the world are to be explained by the general laws of science. Philosophy demands that the Whole and all the interrelations within the Whole shall be explicable through the working of the categories which philosophy has ex-cogitated as the principles which regulate the ongoing of the Whole. And the historical critic is not behind these in his demand that reality shall conform to the canons of historical criticism which they have found to be applicable over a wide range of history. Now all these have their rights, and all of them have a high and noble function to perform. Science, philosophy, and criticism are among the highest achievements of the human mind, and without them the work of man in history could not go on. For my part, I owe too much to them all ever to deny their place and power in the evolution of man.

It is one thing, however, to recognize the worth of the work which these have done in the history of man, it is another thing to yield to their claims when they tend to imprison the human spirit within the cramped, and confined boundaries drawn by rules abstracted from reality, and made absolute in a negative direction.

To abstract is necessary; it is the condition under which finite intelligence is able to deal with the complexity of the real world, if we are to have any possibility of understanding that world. We must isolate certain aspects of experience if we are to have any mastery over it. But then we are apt to place the aspect we have isolated as if it were the reality, and to ignore altogether the elements we have neglected. Thus a chemist complains, as Ostwald did the other day, that the abstractions of the

physicist leave out of account those very aspects of reality which are the essential notes of matter from the chemical point of view. Sufficient for the purpose of the physicist, they misrepresent altogether the objects of the chemist's vision and research. So we might pass round the circle of the sciences and note that each one makes its own assumptions, looks at its own problems from its own point of view, and states its problems according to its own method of procedure. Each of them, too, ignores to a large extent the problems of the others, and each of them tends to describe reality in terms derived from its own abstractions.

Let me recall to you the twofold process of science, philosophy, and criticism. There is a process which we all know. Is it not described in every text-book of logic, is it not set forth in every manual of philosophy? Induction, deduction, generalisation, the process of discovering more and more general laws, till you come to the highest and widest generalisation of all. So you arrive at such laws as those of gravitation, conservation of energy, and the like. These are largely useful, and helpful in many ways. But their use is largely in the way of limitation. They describe conditions which are universal, conditions to which the world is subject, and which the changes of the world must submit to. They are of little use for purposes of explanation. Architecture must be limited by gravitation, but gravitation does not explain architecture. General laws will never account for particular effects. Mill, or Bain, or others, say Jevons, will tell you all about induction, and so on. They will not tell you anything about the other process which after all is the greater part of science and philosophy. They will not tell you how to recognize the uniqueness of the unique, nor enable you to recognize that unique assemblage of qualities which make the thinghood of the thing. What I contend for here is just this, that science, philosophy, and criticism are as much interested in, are as much bound to recognize the concrete reality in its individual concreteness, which

makes it what it is, and not something else, as it is interested in, and bound to recognize the linkage which connects one thing with every thing else. The bearing of this remark on our subject will appear very soon. Abstract science can never represent the real world. Abstract science deals only with those aspects which they have abstracted, and those features of reality which have been neglected clamor for recognition, and must have their place in any final or adequate interpretation of experience. This is true for all science, it is emphatically true of those sciences which deal with man. The synthesis of particulars, which from one point of view is the goal of all science, is accentuated in the case of the most complex of all known objects, the individual being which we call a human person. In dealing with men we have not only to deal with general rules, not only with those qualities which are common to all men, but with that uniqueness which makes this individual a being unlike all other beings, one in all respects never to be repeated, one that has a place which no one else can take, and a work to do which no one else can do. Not to speak of science generally any further let us take psychology, and what we have to say of psychology will be so far true of all science. I take psychology for various reasons. For one reason I take it because of the demands made in its name by men like Sabatier, Amiel, Percy Gardner and others. In their hands psychology has become the almost universal solvent of views regarding the Gospel History which have been the accepted beliefs of generations of Christians. Amiel demands that Psychology shall take the place of history. His statement is, "What our age needs especially is a translation of Christianity from the domain of history to the domain of psychology." Professor Percy Gardner gives his emphatic approval to the statement of Amiel and endeavors to work out the thesis in his *Exploratio Evangelica*.

These writers take the mind of the believer as the

primary object of investigation in religion. What is belief? How does it work? How has it manifested itself throughout those generations of men regarding whom we have sources of information more or less trustworthy? Thus we have any number of investigations into the beliefs of mankind, their nature, their laws of growth, their recurring notions, and the various ways by which they strive to make their beliefs correspond with their experience. It is this vague and large sphere of investigation that is indicated by Amiel, rather than the domain usually indicated by psychology. But even then it is a demand which can hardly be justified. To clear our views let us hear one or two of the masters in psychology. Dr. Ward, universally acknowledged to be one of the foremost psychologists of our time, says: "To be characterized at all, psychology must be characterized from the standpoint from which this experience is viewed. It is the way of expressing this that widely different schools of psychology define it as subjective, all other positive sciences being distinguished as objective. But this seems scarcely more than a first approximation to the truth, and is apt to be misleading. The distinction rather is that the standpoint of psychology is what is sometimes termed 'individualistic,' that of the so-called objective science being 'universalistic,' both alike being objective in the sense of being true for all, consisting in what Kant would call judgments of experience. For psychology is not a biography in any sense, still less a biography dealing with idiosyncracies, and in an idiom having an interest and a meaning for one subject only and incommunicable." (*Encyc. Brit.*, art. *Psychology*). Munsterberg says: "Psychology is not at all an expression of reality, but a complicated transformation of it, worked out for special logical purposes in the service of our life." In truth the idea of psychology apparently, in the minds of Professor Gardner, Sabatier and others, seems to be on a level with that idea of psychology which has given us the popular expressions psychological moment, psychologi-

cal atmosphere, and the like, which must be characterized simply as mostly psychological nonsense, the product of imperfect knowledge, and inexact thinking.

“Psychology is not a biography in any sense,” says Dr. Ward, and when he says it, he disposes of the notion of Sabatier that Christianity has to be translated from the domain of history to that of psychology. For professedly the claim advanced by Christianity on the part of its founder is one which can be tried not on the grounds of psychology, but on that of a biography. It is a personal, not a racial question. A biography in general terms is a failure. A biography must give us the man in his habit as he lived, must paint him with the warts, must set him forth in all the idiosyncracies which make up uniqueness of his personality, as well as in those common to him with all men. Processes described by psychology are here only limiting conceptions, descriptive of bounds beyond which you may not pass, and of conditions within which you must work.

My contention is that, while you bring to the study of the origin and character of Christianity all the knowledge you can possibly gather from the general history of mankind, from the nature and working of human belief in general from the conditions, circumstances and characteristics of the special time in which Christianity had its origin, you must not be content with that; you must have regard as well to those features of Christianity which make it what it is. What I ask in relation to Christianity is nothing more than is conceded willingly in relation to those periods of history which may be described as epoch-making. In the sciences you seek to set forth processes, laws, recurring cycles, movements which are regarded as continuous, but in history as it is, not merely as we write it, you have to deal with events which only happened once and never again, with persons who lived and worked, and appeared only once in all the uniqueness of their personality in this world's history. It is well to describe the sphere of their work, the condi-

tions of their life, but not to forget their concrete reality. From the point of view of physical chemistry, Napoleon, Wellington, Newton and Goethe, represent only series of complicated chemical processes, which physiologically complete themselves within a certain cycle, to the psychologist they are only a series of psychological processes which went on between their birth and their death, yet history has much to say of these men, and they form for history a series of problems of exceeding interest, so difficult is it for us to think out all those determinations which meet in the life and work of those men. You must recognize in Julius Cæsar more than the expression of the tendency of the Roman people towards a centralized form of Government, and Plato is not a mere type of Greek genius. It is not enough for you in practical life to know man, you must know men. It is not enough to know general tendencies about a period of history, you must come to particulars, and become acquainted with the men in whom moved the spirit of the time in a definite and concrete form.

Thus, in relation to the origin of Christianity, it is not enough to know the history of the times in which it originated, not enough to trace the history and development of the Hebrew people, and to recognize the dominating conception of the time, not enough to trace the laws of human belief as these have been ascertained by a comparative view of the action of the human mind as far as these can be known; there must be here as elsewhere a definite recognition of the actual phenomena of the Christian movement as a whole. Not one of us but recognizes with gratitude the real and helpful work done in psychology, archæology, history and in other spheres by the many workers of the last century. We all gladly welcome the light cast on the New Testament by the persevering and varied research of the present time, we hail with pleasure the descriptions of the life, thought, feeling of the world, Jewish, Greek and Roman, in the first century of our era, and we welcome any connection which may be

traced between Christian life and thought and the life and thought of the time, but we venture to say that no amount of such investigations can give a sufficient account of the origin and character of Christianity. It is simply rigidly, scientifically true that one cannot account for Christianity apart from the creative personality of Jesus Christ. Most of the attempts I have read from the Wolfenbittel Fragmentist down to the most recent are attempts to turn the story of Christianity into a story which began after Christ. After we have studied with minuteness, accuracy and impartiality the connections between Christianity and former and contemporary faiths, let us study Christianity itself with like minuteness, accuracy and impartiality. Many of our friends neglect the particular study, or reduce the peculiarities of Christianity until nothing is left save that which it has in common with the ordinary processes of human history.

Critics bring to the study of the New Testament a number of generalisations which they have taken from the study of history, of psychology, of anthropology, and of science in general. They have learned something from the history of myth, and they carry with them to the study of Christianity what they have learned from the study of mythology. Legendary literature has its characteristics, and they search for such characteristics in Christianity. Then there is the maxim that any given literature bears the marks of its time, and shares the limitations of the period of its production. Then, too, we are reminded often that ancient history is never history in the modern sense of that word. Ancient peoples never cared for what actually happened, they never recorded fact for the sake of fact. History was written for didactic purposes, for edification, for the glorification of a cause, for patriotic purposes, or simply for artistic purposes. They never sought or desired, so we are told, to know what really happened; facts were manipulated in order to point a moral or adorn a tale. In this there

is no doubt a measure of truth. But it is greatly exaggerated. But what truth is in it is equally true of modern history. Read Hegel on the history of philosophy, or on the philosophy of history and you will find that history is simply an illustration of the Hegelian process, thesis, antithesis, synthesis. Read Lange's History of Materialism, and you will find an illustration of what has been described above as the very spirit of ancient historians. Read Macaulay and you will find a strong subjective bias, apologetic throughout of the whig party. Read Mommsen, the greatest of modern historians, and one of the most objective of them, and you find a history of Rome written throughout with an eye on the problems of Prussian Politics in the Nineteenth Century. Read Ihne alongside of Mommsen, and you have a history colored throughout by antagonism to Mommsen. Yet we do not accuse these eminent historians in philosophy and history with that wholesale disregard of fact which we find thrown out by Professor Gardner as the note of ancient history. Let us acknowledge that even ancient history had some appreciation of what actually had happened, that Ramsay's claims that Luke was one of the great historians of the world has truth in it, and that that claim can be justly made for other ancient historians as well.

Let us be thankful for the fact that this generation knows the first century of our era as no generation ever did. What the Old Testament and the history of the Hebrew people really was, and what was the influence of the great Hebrew tradition in Palestine and the Diaspora on the life in Palestine in the First Century is known in great fullness. The political conditions and the religious atmosphere of the time are also known. The ideas, the expectations, the hopes and fears of the Hebrew and Hellenistic worlds are so far understood, and in the light of all that knowledge the uniqueness of Christianity shines forth more and more.

We know something about myth which was unknown

to Strauss. Tendencies can be traced with more exactness than could be done by Baur with the means at his command. And there is the further advantage that the documents of the New Testament are acknowledged by most critics to be documents of the First Century. Any processes which are descriptive of the growth of the New Testament history must have their scope within the First Century. Nay, further, mainly in relation to the Synoptic Gospels, the processes through which the materials of the Gospels passed must have their limit within fifty years after the events happened. That is the state of New Testament criticism at the present time. Of course, I must acknowledge the existence of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and of Professors Schmiedel and Manin. These writings have been described as Midsummer Madness. I do not object save in the limitation of the noun by the epithet.

Time will not allow me to enumerate in historical order the attempts which have been made to eliminate the supernatural from the Gospel history. Nor is it necessary, for many of them are obsolete, or survive only in an attenuated form. We need not go back to the Wolfenbüttele Fragmentist, or think of Paulus and the like. Strauss has placed them forever in the museum of the superannuated. Nor is Strauss himself much in evidence at the present time. Yet he is in evidence in another form and his mythical theory appears in a transfigured form in Professor Percy Gardner. Strauss has exaggerated, they say, the mythical theory, but there is something in it. So also with Baur, he has exaggerated the tendency criticism. He has extended it over too wide a field, his successors tell us, and has lengthened its action for too long a time. But they say Baur discovered a true cause. But he did not discern its true character, nor its true scope. He ought to have seen that its action began earlier, and its function was more fundamental. The modern form of the Tendency Criticism is to say that the "Synoptic Gospels are the resultant of several factors.

They represent not merely the contemporary feeling and opinion actually within Christian circles between 70 and 100, but also the processes of reflection, the dominant interests and activities of faith, the mental and devotional attitude to Jesus, which must have been current through the memory and teaching of the early Christians during the years that intervened between 30 and 70. "Thus the modern form of the principle of Baur is that the Gospels are the outcome of two main tendencies, first of the impression made on the first disciples by Jesus, and the interpretation of that impression by the first generation of Christians. If you read the *Exploratio Evangelica* of Professor Percy Gardner you will be struck with the fact that all the principles by the use of which Christianity was reduced to the level of ordinary history are present in his book in an attenuated form, but none the less effective on that account. You will remember, too, that all the processes at work are supposed to have completed their action within the First Century. That is the limit set to that process by the concession that the documents of the New Testament are of the First Century. Briefly the contention set forth is that the New Testament and all that it signifies is the work of a multitude, is the outcome not of Jesus Christ's person, work and teaching, but the work of a generation of men of the ordinary stature of humanity. The reflection of these men produced alike the character, the teaching and the work of Jesus Christ. Let me quote from Professor Percy Gardner: "Our Gospels belong to the great formative time, when the great ideas of Christianity were surging up, when inspiration flowed to mankind in a broad stream, and found itself a place amid worldly surroundings with a rapidity which is astonishing. Some geologists hold that there have been periods in the history of our planet when all the processes of biologic evolution took place with far greater rapidity than now. There have also been times of sudden growth of mankind. The first half of the Fifth Century B. C. was to the Greek spirit such a

time when art, poetry, the drama, all the great fruits of Hellenic genius suddenly ripened. Such a time to the Teutonic spirit was the age of Luther and Calvin, when great systems of doctrine arose suddenly. Such was the earliest age of Christianity, of which the New Testament is the eternal fruit. But great times of creation are of all times least critical. Personality and the bias that goes with it are at their strongest, while the absence of self consciousness prevents men from taking precautions against their own bias, or being at all aware of it. It is precisely the power of the inspiration of the early Church which makes the life of Jesus, from the critical and historic points of view, so embarrassing." It is a remarkable passage, and other passages quite as remarkable might be cited from his interesting book. Observe what is alleged. A great period of inspiration flowing to mankind in a broad stream, great ideas surging up, coming we know not whence, working we know not how. We were wont to think of this stream of inspiration as flowing from a personal source, and the great ideas of Christianity as originating in a single mind. And if that creative personality be what his disciples believed him to be, we had a real source of the inspiration, and a real thinker with whom the great ideas of Christianity originated. Apparently great ideas are more intelligible to Professor Gardner, if they do not originate in a single mind. It is a consolation to have from Professor Gardner and those with whom he agrees that there were great ideas in Christianity, and that these ideas require a special inspiration to account for them.

Let us look, however, at the contention that the synoptic Gospels are the result of many factors, and especially that they are the product of Christian reflection. This is the special modern attempt, the special machinery whereby it is sought to reduce Christianity to the level of the ordinary. We read the Synoptic Gospels, and we seem to come into contact with a unique figure, who makes that impression on us which he appears to have made on His

contemporaries. We, too, feel that he speaks as never man spoke. We feel a power of superhuman goodness manifested in his character and action, and we yield ourselves to that impression and feel that there has been no one else of whom it could be said simply and sublimely, "He went about doing good." Yielding to that impression we find that he makes claims on our thinking and acting, a claim to our loyalty and obedience and trust which is absolute. Then, too, in many passages he seems to claim all the future of the world as belonging to Him, and as His own in a very definite sense. He seems to foresee a time when His cause and kingdom will be so visible and successful that men will seek to be identified with them from other motives than those which actuated his first disciples. Are we justified in yielding to these impressions, and in taking him to be what he seems to be in the Gospels? Well, the criticism with which we at present deal comes to us and says, "No, you may not trust those impressions." It is necessary to find out what in the Gospels is fact, and what is the product of reflection on the fact. We must start with the minimum, with that which was intelligible to the first generation of the Jerusalem Church, with what they were able to assimilate. Then we have an ideal construction of the capacity of the Jerusalem Church. We had one picture already from the pen of Prof. Gardner. But the favorite picture is to describe the earliest generation of Christians as merely Jews, with one additional article of faith, that Jesus is the Messiah. Clearly, they say, "Whatever is beyond the accepted comprehension of the early church in the Gospels must be set down as the product of Christian reflection." Thus you must shut out of the original Gospel every universal statement regarding the mission and work of Christ, and every statement regarding the mission and work of Christ, and every statement regarding the world-wide mission of the Christ must be set down as not spoken by Him. This one principle makes an amazing sweep, and if you apply it rigidly, you will be

surprised to find how many of the sayings of Christ it sweeps away. All that is universal is late, then there is another principle at work. All that seems to raise Jesus Christ above the stature of ordinary men, all that claims for Him power beyond ordinary, or insight more than human, must be set down to reflection. Schmiedel acting on these principles reduces the authentic sayings of Jesus to a very few, and these have not much significance. Of any saying of Jesus, of any deed recorded of Him, of the scope of His character as a whole, on these principles you have only to ask, was this a likely thing to be accepted by the Jerusalem Church? and the answer quickly comes, it is far beyond their horizon, it is something they could not have understood, or have accepted. I do not know what the materials are from which the critic derives his view of the early church, and at present I do not inquire. For I find that the picture drawn of the primitive church, of its range of mind, of its qualification generally, only place difficulties in the way of the critical assumption by which the New Testament literature is accounted for. On the one hand the early church is narrow, bigoted, exclusive, the people in it are Jews, holding the whole circle of Jewish beliefs. On the other hand, this people by a process of reflection have transcended their own narrowness, have passed from bigoted particularism to a universalism unknown in the world before, they have created an ideal of a man and of a humanity unsurpassed before or since, they have set up a conception of the fatherhood of God and of the brotherhood of man, confessedly beyond the reach of any other literature, ancient and modern; in short, they have set up a standard of life and conduct and thought which is the standard yet. I say look on this picture and on this, and ask yourselves, are they consistent with one another? Either the early church was much greater than is set forth in the one picture, or the New Testament literature was not the product of the reflection of the early church.

THE MUSICAL TITLES OF THE PSALMS.

BY REV. LLEWELLYN L. HENSON, D. D.

A most remarkable book, "The Titles of the Psalms," by James William Thirtle, LL. D., of London, has recently reached its second edition. In this book, the author stoutly maintains that he has found the long-lost key to an understanding of these hitherto mysterious titles.

Some of the psalms have no titles at all, as 1 and 2. There are, to be sure, in connection with all the psalms in the American Revision, certain explanatory editorial notes, such as are placed elsewhere at the top of the page, and similar notes are found in the Authorized Version. But the English Revised Version prefixes nothing whatsoever to the thirty-four psalms which have no inscriptions in the Hebrew text.

Others, however, and by far the greater number, do have titles. Sometimes it is a mere note of authorship as "A Psalm of David," "A Psalm of Solomon," "A Psalm of Asaph," etc. Sometimes the historical setting is also given as "When Saul sent and they watched the house to kill him," Ps. 59; again a word may indicate the literary character of the psalm as the word "Song" at the beginning of 46, or "Prayer" prefixed to 86, or "Michtam" which precedes 56 and which means a private prayer; and yet again there often appear, either with or without such note of authorship or historical background or literary character, certain other titles which go by the name of "Musical Titles" as "For the chief musician, set to Al-tashheth," Ps. 57, or "For the chief musician, set to Aijeleth hash-Shabar," Ps. 22, or "Shoshannim Eduth," Ps. 80, or "Gittith," 81.

The titles which refer to authorship, to literary character and to historical connection are, of course, more or less understood by biblical scholars at large, but the

musical titles have been a puzzle for two millenniums or more. Many attempts to interpret them have been made, it is true, and many different meanings have been suggested as possible solutions, but the fact remains that they have defied the scholarship of the ages, being for thousands of years a veritable "sphinx to interpreters." Kirkpatrick says, "Many of them are extremely obscure and their meanings can only be conjectured," and Driver adds, "The terms are frequently obscure." Wellhausen tells us that, "In most cases these musical directions are unintelligible to us," and Franz Delitsch goes so far as to say, "The Septuagint found them already in existence and did not understand them. The key to their comprehension must have been lost very early."

As is well known, the original manuscripts were written without division or paragraph or punctuation. If there was no title there would be no break between any two consecutive psalms, but all the titles or words of benediction that follow any psalm and all the titles that precede the following psalm would thus be thrown together between the two. In separating the psalms from each other, therefore, that each might stand alone, one can easily see how all the titles between any two psalms might have been set apart together as belonging either to the psalm that immediately precedes or to the psalm that immediately follows. And it now seems that at some remote period the possible did actually happen and all the titles occurring between any two given psalms were put together as belonging to the second, thus placing every title at the beginning of some psalm and not one at the end, even as they appear in the Psalter to-day. In other words, all *subscriptions* were removed and were made parts of the *superscription* of the following psalm so that we have in the headings of various psalms words that being misplaced have been for ages "a stumbling-block for lexicographers, critics and commentators."

Thus great violence has been done these titles. Words

which in other connections are easily understood become in their new surroundings veritable enigmas "enshrouded in mystery." The fact is, they don't fit. Frequently there is nothing in the following psalm to which these words can refer. Their usual and well understood meanings are absolutely foreign to the thought of the psalms to which they have been attached. This led naturally enough to the most fanciful interpretations of these harmless and ill-used titles. They have been interpreted as being the names of old and long-forgotten musical instruments as "a harp of eight strings" or "a trumpet in the shape of a lily," although such instruments are not known to Semitic literature or oriental antiquity; or they were called catch-words of popular ditties—rag-time music forsooth—which had been caught up from one of the surrounding heathen nations and introduced into the worship of Jehovah, or they were said to have a mystical meaning, which was safe, of course, for no one pretended to say what that meaning might be.

Dr. Thirtle, in his study of the psalms, was led to believe that the psalm found in the 3rd chapter of Habakkuk, standing alone as it does, might be a normal psalm, for no other precedes it from which it could steal a title and no other follows which might rob it of that which is its own. It has at the beginning the usual notes as to class authorship and character, viz.: "A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet set to Shigionoth," but the musical description, "For the chief musician on my stringed instruments," appears at the end.* So, using this psalm in Hab. 3, as his model, our author went to work upon the Psalter and, picking out all the musical titles he proceeded to move them back in each instance from the position which they occupy at the head of various psalms to the end of the psalm that immediately precedes, and in the latter part of his work he has given

* Something similar to this may also be seen in connection with the Psalm in Isa. 38, and Col. Conder, the noted English archaeologist and Palestine Explorer, now testifies by way of confirmation that the titles on Assyrian tablets often occur at the end.

us a new edition of the book of the Psalms in accordance with his new, and as he believes, proper arrangement.

Now one naturally asks, Is this simply a new theory, and a fanciful one at that? Or does the key really fit the lock and open to us the door to an understanding of these much-discussed titles? A brief examination of some of the titles themselves will perhaps be the best answer to these and other questions of like import.

Take *Shoshannim* for example. In the Revised Version it stands at the beginning of Psalms 69 and 45. In the margin at each place its meaning is given as "lilies." But why should a word meaning "lilies" be placed at the head of either of these psalms? No one has been able to point out any real connection between either of the psalms and the word we are discussing, and therefore we have been in the dark in the matter of its interpretation. Gesenius says the word in the singular means a lily, but he adds that according to most interpreters it also means an instrument of music so called perhaps as resembling the form of a lily. And referring to these particular passages he says it is here nothing more than lilies and indicates some well-known song or poem after the measure and numbers of which these psalms were to be sung. The German edition of that great work says there is no indication of its meaning. Haupt says it may mean with Susian instruments, and Kirkpatrick tells us that it was a melody to which the psalm was to be sung—some well-known song beginning with the word *Shoshannim*—and Fürst declares it is a proper name of one of the twenty-four music choirs left by David and so called from a Master Shushan. These quotations show us the difficulty which scholars have met in trying to interpret this one word. But Thirtle tells us that the word does not belong to Ps. 69 and 45 at all and that it ought to be pushed back in each instance to the preceding psalm. That would locate it with Ps. 68 and 44, and so he has placed it in his book. The question now is, can it be understood in this, its new location? The word means

“lily” as used elsewhere. Will that meaning fit here and can it be maintained in these new connections?

Dr. Thirtle in support of his theory, maintains that Shoshannim does mean here, as elsewhere, “lilies,” and as such it represents flowers in general and stands for the springtime and in that, as in Israelitish life, the springtime meant the Passover, the season recalling the feast; the reference here is to the first of the two great feasts, viz.: that of Unleavened Bread or the Passover. He quotes Dr. Post in the Hastings Dictionary, who says the word in Arabic is a general term for lily-like flowers being as general as the English term lily and that the Hebrew word must be taken in the same general sense. This word, therefore, has, according to Thirtle, been placed in connection with these two psalms because the chief musician or precentor had received them into his repertory for special use in the liturgical service at the time when Israel celebrated by the Passover Feast her deliverance as a nation from her bondage in Egypt. It was, so to speak, his mark of endorsement of these two psalms for use on that particular occasion from year to year.

Or take the word “Gittith.” That word in the Revised Version stands at the beginning of Ps. 8, 81 and 84, but we are told that it really belongs to Ps. 7, 80 and 83. Among the meanings suggested by various scholars for this word are Upon the Gittite lyre, an instrument with a joyous sound. A march of the Gittite guard, a musical body of Levites of the city of Gath, and belonging to the city of Gath, though it must be admitted that the true meaning, relating to winepresses, has been suggested by other scholars prior to Thirtle. As the former word referring to the flowers of the springtime stands for the Passover, so that word referring to winepresses suggests the autumn and stands for the great feast of that season, viz., the Feast of Tabernacles. This feast, the joyous “Harvest-Home in Israel’s land,” brought afresh each year to the minds of the people the keeping power of

Jehovah, and this word marks these three psalms as selected by the musical leader for use in connection therewith.

In support of his thesis our author calls attention to the fact that these two ideas of lilies and winepresses or flowers and fruit occur together oftentimes and in various ways. On the pillars of Solomon's Temple were lilies and pomegranates, 1 Kings 7:20-22. On the table which Ptolemy Philadelphus gave to the Jews were lilies and clusters of grapes, Jos. Antiq., 12:2, 9. On the veils that covered the doors of the Temple of Herod were flowers of purple and golden vines. Jos. Antiq., 15:11, 3. And the high priest's robe had golden bells (in the shape of lillies) and promegranates of blue. Ex. 28:33. In the remains of ancient synagogues which have been excavated in Palestine are lintels and cornices decorated with lilies and wine-bowls or clusters of grapes, and the old coin, the half shekel, has on one side a triple lily and on the other a wine-bowl. These and other symbols that might be mentioned seem to sum up and bring vividly before the eye and mind of the people the two great thoughts which the two great feasts symbolize, viz.: That Jehovah is the Redeemer and the Keeper of Israel. It is not strange, therefore, that certain psalms should be selected for use in connection with these feasts, and exactly that it is claimed was done, the two words under discussion being but the marks that indicate those psalms.

But perhaps the best and most convincing proof will be found in an examination of the psalms themselves to which these words are now attached. Two or three instances must suffice. In psalm 68, one of the Shoshannim psalms, at verses 7 and 8, we have:

“O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people,
When thou didst march through the wilderness,
The earth trembled,
The heavens also dropped rain at the presence of God;

Yon Sinai trembled at the presence of God, the God of Israel.”

And at verses 19 and 20 we have:

“Blessed be the Lord, who daily beareth our burden,
Even the God who is our Salvation.
God is unto us a God of deliverances;
And unto Jehovah the Lord belongeth escape from
death.”

In Psalm 44, the other Shoshannim psalm, we have verses 1-3:

“We have heard with our ears, O God,
Our fathers have told us,
What work thou didst in their days,
In the days of old,
Thou didst drive out the nations with thy hand;
But them thou didst plant;
Thou didst afflict the peoples;
But them thou didst spread abroad,
For they get not the land in possession by their own
sword,
Neither did their own arm save them;
But thy right hand, and thine arm, and the sight of thy
countenance,
Because thou wast favorable unto them.”

Certainly Shoshannim, meaning lilies and representing the springtime and suggesting the great Feast of the Passover, is a note that fits these two psalms in a most remarkable way.

Or in Psalm 80, one of the Gittith psalms, take verses 8 to 11:

“Thou broughtest a vine out of Egypt;
Thou didst drive out the nations and plantedst it;
Thou preparedst room before it,

And it took deep root and filled the land.
The mountains were covered with the shadow of it,
And the boughs thereof were like cedars of God.
It sent out its branches unto the sea,
And its shoots unto the river."

This passage, it will be admitted, brings before us in a most beautiful way the fact that Jehovah is the Protector of Israel.

Once more take the phrase "Jonath Elem Rehokim" from Psalm 56 and give it to Psalm 55, where it really belongs, and you are impressed at once with the fitness of things. Indeed the correspondence of the title of Psalm 56 to the text of Psalm 55 has often been noted before, for these words meaning "the dove of the distant terebinths" are plainly a reference to the moan of David, verses 4 to 8 of Psalm 55. Hear him as he cries:

"My heart is sore pained within me;
And the terrors of death are fallen upon me.
Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me,
And horror hath overwhelmed me,
And I said, Oh, that I had wings like a dove!
Then would I fly away and be at rest.
Lo, then would I wander far off,
I would lodge in the wilderness."

Certainly "the dove of the distant terebinths" is a splendid name for the psalm that contains that passage.

Likewise many other examples of a similar and perhaps equally convincing kind are given, and there are enough of them it would seem to make good the claim with which the author approaches his task. Thus these words so little understood heretofore are now allowed to mean what they mean elsewhere and therefore are easily understood. In other words, the key does seem to fit the lock. Prof. Price says: "The main contention of the author is certainly true. He has the key that has been

lying within sight of scholars but unseen for long centuries." His claims are "certain in some cases, probable in most and doubtful in only two or three."

One other probable result of this discovery ought also to be mentioned. In an indirect, but nevertheless in a very forceful way, it gives us proof of the age of the psalms. If these titles were misunderstood when the Septuagint was made say 250 to 200 B. C., if the scholars of that day had so far forgotten the temple service that the precentor or chief musician was unknown to them, if the liturgical use of the psalms in this worship had been so long forgotten as to be lost sight of entirely, if the meaning of *Alamoth* and *Sheminith* was to them unknown, if these musical notes had been made and used and discontinued and forgotten two or three centuries before Christ, it does seem to show that the psalms themselves to which the titles had been attached must have been older than the titles could possibly be, and therefore must date from long before the Maccabean age. How much older they are let the critics proceed to show, but it may turn out that this *obiter dictum* is the most important result of the new discovery.

PREVAILING TENDENCIES IN MODERN THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. PROF. JAMES ORR, D. D., GLASGOW, SCOTLAND.

Coleridge was once asked by a lady if he was afraid of ghosts. "No, madame," was his reply, "I have seen too many of them." The thoughtful observer of the signs of the times may be pardoned if, in the existing clash and conflict of theological opinion, he sometimes feels like that philosopher. He has seen too many theories, had to do with too many novelties of speculation, each one claiming to be the last word on the subject it was dealing with, each, too plausible in its own way, to be unduly carried away by the cry that criticism "demands" this, or science has "finally established" that, till at least a little time has been given to test results. The present writer, speaking for himself, is far from thinking that there is in the present situation any reason for discouragement—much less for panic. For the moment there is perplexity, as there has often been in the history of the church before, but he can see no cause for being shaken, or troubled in mind, as to the ultimate outcome. What is needed at the present moment is not excitement, or the loud beating of "the drum ecclesiastic," but an endeavor to approach these modern movements sympathetically, and with the fullest desire to do justice to whatever soul of good is in them—above all, a cool head, strong faith, a little patience, action like that of the mariners with Paul, who, when they feared lest they should have fallen among rocks, and when for many days neither sea nor stars appeared, sensibly dropped four anchors, and waited for the day.

At first sight the theological world in which we move seems a scene of confusion—all kinds of currents are melting and commingling in it. When, however, we begin to know it better, it is not quite so incomprehensible. Those whose business it is to work and study in this world

soon forget to feel that, amidst the multifarious side eddies, there are certain main currents which give its set and direction to the stream of thought, and that even these are not unconnected, but are more or less the expressions of a common spirit of the age. Among these main currents—these influences and tendencies which at present dominate theology and stamp a character upon it—one may specially distinguish five, on which it will be the object of this paper to offer a few remarks.

1. A first powerful current flowing through a large section of existing theology is that derived from *the modern idealistic philosophy*, with which may be associated the later *Monism*. Of the former we have a well-known German example in Professor Pfeiderer, but much more influential in moulding the thoughts of the high-minded and intelligent youth of Britain and America has been the Neo-Hegelian influence proceeding from the school of the late T. H. Green, of Oxford, and from Dr. Edward Caird, now master of Baliol in the same university. Only a shallow-minded person will speak lightly of the philosophy of Hegel, but time has shown that it is hopeless to look to it as an ally of Christian faith. Discarding the blind evolution of the naturalists to be afterwards commented on, this philosophy substitutes the more rational conception of an idea immanent in nature, and gradually realizing itself through ascending kingdoms and stages, till it culminates in the self-conscious activities of man. The effect of this in theology is, under the name of a doctrine of the divine immanence, to lead to an identification of God—or of the divine life—with the process of the world. Even where a certain self-consciousness is attributed to God, He is still regarded as nothing more than the rational principles which binds together the various stages or movements of the world-process. A good deal of Christian terminology can be employed in this theory, and it is supposed by many that by means of it a new and profounder meaning may be put into such doctrines as the Incarnation. But, in reality, the Scrip-

tural meaning of these doctrines is altogether lost, and the character of Christianity essentially transformed. The point at which the theory needs fundamentally to be dealt with from the theologian's point of view is that just noted—the merging of the divine life in the process of the world. Any view which, under the name of exalting the divine immanence, identifies God with the process of nature and history—makes the world as necessary to God as God is to the world—is fundamentally irreconcilable with a Scriptural theology. A God in process is of necessity an incomplete God—can never be a true personal God. His being is merged in that of the universe; sin, even, is an element of His life. It is indubitable that God, in order truly to be God, must possess Himself in the eternal fulness and completeness of His own personal life; must possess Himself for Himself and be raised entirely above the transitoriness, the incompleteness, and the contingency of the world-process. Only where this is recognized are we on Christian ground. We are then enabled to think of the world and history, not as the necessary unfolding of a logical process, but as the realization of a free and holy purpose; and inconsistency is no longer felt in the idea of an action of God along supernatural lines—above the plane of mere nature—as wisdom and love may dictate, for the benefit of His creature man.

The day of Hegelian idealism, however, has now somewhat declined, and attraction is felt rather in one or other of the imposing systems which display the flag of Monism. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss monistic systems in detail, but only to weigh the value of the general idea for theology. Numerous books have recently appeared on both sides of the Atlantic which have for their immediate object to rescue this idea of Monism, as that of a Single Power manifesting itself continuously and progressively in the universe, from the false uses made of it by such naturalistic writers as Haeckel, and to turn it to account in the service of a true theology. Will

the present writer be pardoned if he says that the effect of the study of these works has been to make him feel increasingly that the term is an unclear and ambiguous one, and that a Christian theology, while recognizing the truth that underlies its various uses, will do well to discard it for formulas better adapted to its own purposes. In a sense, indeed, every truly theistic system is monistic. It denies dualism, or the co-existence of eternally distinct principles, say, of good or evil, mind or matter, and recognizes but one ultimate and eternal Being, Power, and Will, from which all else that is in the universe proceeds. Christian theology has never invested the world with a being apart from God, or independently of Him. It has taught that the world is God's creation—that it derives its being and its powers from Him—that He is present and active in all its forces—that it continues to exist by His sustaining energy constantly imparted to it, and sustaining it in existence. But it contends at the same time that the world is not God, but the creation of something other than God; not simply an aspect or manifestation of God, but a constituted system of beings and forces which God distinguishes from Himself and uses as the means for the revelation of His glory. But it is precisely this fact of a distinction between God and the world which "Monism," as ordinarily understood, rejects. For the idea of a creation of the world by God, and of a world distinct from God, yet dependent on Him, it substitutes the notion of a Power, or "Substance," or unknown Somewhat, of which the worlds of matter and mind are a two-sided "manifestation"—two aspects of the same "Reality"—identical in their origin, in their essential nature, in the Power that operates in them. Not only is this the common acceptance of the term; it is one also into which those who seek to give to Monism a spiritual and Christian interpretation are involuntarily compelled to fall. Thus, in a recent able work (*Walker's Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism*): "It cannot be doubted that Life and Mind are but different forms in which the

one all-working Power is manifested, * * * Matter, Ether and Energy, Motion, Life and Mind; if we follow out the conception of these, as far as they are known, we shall find ourselves always carried back to the working of a Single Power." Plato of old had difficulty in making clear his thought of the "participation" of things in the "idea;" it is hardly less difficult for the Monist to make clear his idea of the relation of God to the world. For this reason many may think it is better to discard the name "Monism" altogether in theology, as prolific of misleading, if not of positively false, associations.

2. A second powerful current flowing through our theology in the immediate present is that that *especially associated with the name of Ritschl*. This has been so often discussed that it is not necessary to dwell on it at great length. In one respect the Ritschlian influence is the direct antithesis of the speculative tendency just described. It is throughout of the nature of a reaction—a reaction against scholasticism in dogmatics, against the intrusion of philosophy into theology, against the overstraining of mystical feeling to the neglect of the historic in Christianity. It has for its avowed aim to free Christianity from extraneous supports, and in the immediate appeal of the image of Christ to the heart to find a ground of certainty which shall be independent of science and criticism, and of the changing moods of philosophy. The watchwords of this influential school, so far as it has affected theology in English-speaking countries, will be readily recognized—*theology without metaphysics, a return to the historic Christ, and the idea of the Kingdom of God*. It need not be pointed out how powerfully these ideas, coalescing with a certain weariness of dogma, and with the social spirit of the age, have taken hold on many—not, be it granted, without a certain rejuvenating effect upon theology. The Ritschlian movement is not without its wholesome side; but, like every other reaction, it tends to pass over to an opposite extreme—an extreme in which it seems to deny its own first principles, and

practically to come round in its results to the very rationalism which it condemns. Disclaiming dependence on philosophy, it is governed at bottom by a peculiarly subtle and dangerous philosophical theory of the agnostic type. Under pretext of extruding metaphysics from theology, and of expressing religious truth in the form of "value-judgments," it expels from Christianity most of its profounder and characteristic doctrines, e. g., the Trinity, the pre-existence of Christ, the Incarnation of the divine Son, His heavenly reign, etc., and gets rid of the Divinity of Christ in any but an ethical sense; boasting of a return to the historical, it really sacrifices the historical at the shrine of theory, giving up, e. g., the miraculous birth at the one end of Christ's life, and His bodily resurrection at the other, as non-essential elements of Christianity; professing to go back to the pure evangel, etc., to free it from later adulterations, it excludes from it vital and essential elements of the apostolic Gospel, e. g., the whole doctrine of the propitiatory character of Christ's death. These are worse than mere defects in a system of theology—they involve, under color of stripping off metaphysical accretions, a transformation of the whole substance of Christianity—a reduction of it to a humanitarian and non-miraculous level. It was inevitable therefore, that a disintegration should take place in Ritschl's school, some going more to the right, in a return to many of the conceptions he had discarded, others more to the left, in the direction of "historical-criticism" and naturalism. Prof. A. E. Garvie, a sympathetic expounder of Ritschl, tells in a recent paper how this reaction is emphasized by the late Prof. Reischle, of Halle, in his *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Although a disciple of Ritschl, Reischle "expressly mentions" as one of the reasons for a changed attitude to Christianity "a reaction among the younger disciples from some of his one-sided views." Ritschl raised, but did not solve, the historical problems of the Person of Christ and the Kingdom of God. By violent exegesis he forced

his system on the New Testament teaching. He ignored the history of religions, tried to impose what he regarded as a normal type of piety in opposition to mysticism, and expressed himself too arbitrarily in regard to the relation of Christian faith to science and philosophy." This is pretty much what some critics of Ritschl have been saying from the beginning.

3. A third powerful current which all must recognize as flowing into theology at the present moment is that which has its source in *Old Testament—now also New Testament—Criticism*. This, despite all quietives, is occasioning perplexity to many, and surely not without good reason. The time is past for urging that the case is one only for experts. There are portions of the field which only experts can deal with, but the critics themselves have ceased to speak or write only for experts. They have come out into the open, and address themselves to all. The subject has reached a phase in which it is no longer a matter of option with the non-expert whether he will occupy himself with it or not. The conclusions of the critics are forced on him with a persistence, and with a confidence and authority, which compel him, whatever his inclinations, to take up some attitude to them. If it were, indeed, merely a matter of "doubtful disputation" about secondary and unessential points, he might be content to leave them to the discussion and decision of those more learned than himself, but this is not its character. There is, no doubt, a *per contra* side of the account. The critical movement is not, as some would have it, evil and only evil continually. It was inevitable that such a criticism should come, and even already certain compensating advantages have resulted from it, which should do something to mitigate the alarm with which many are disposed to regard it. It is much of itself to have had a new breath of life infused into Old Testament studies. But this is not the aspect in which the ordinary man commonly regards it. He sees that what he is asked to do is practically to surrender the view

of the Bible to which he has been accustomed all his life, and at the bidding of the critics to adopt another which seems to him at the first blush to reduce it to a *caput mortuum* of traditions, legends, fictions, inventions of men, not without a considerable admixture of fraud, in which he finds it difficult to see how he is to retain anything which can be to him a sure word of God. The critics ought frankly to face this difficulty. The question is not one of mere dates of books—of whether there is a first and second Isaiah—or of the compatibility of trifling inaccuracies with inspiration. It is a question whether many of the historical books of the Bible are books of history at all—whether, e. g., the books of the Pentateuch are any more historical than the opening chapters of Livy, or Buchanan's narratives of the Early Scottish Kings. Much is said of critical "settled results," but one cannot go far into this subject without perceiving that the forces which engender much of the criticism, both of the Old and of the New Testaments, lie a good way below the criticism itself. That was conspicuously illustrated in the Tübingen theories of the New Testament of sixty years ago—now everywhere discarded—and it is just as true of the critical theories of to-day of the Old Testament. This, one may be excused for thinking, is a defect of our critics of the more believing school, that they do not sufficiently recognize the solidarity which exists between the theory of religious development which they reject, and the critical opinions which they retain, and in consequence do not do justice to the logic of their own positions.

This, however, is a matter which will right itself—so far as it needs righting—in time. A believing theory of the Bible will not fail in the end to work out critical results in harmony with its own—that is, the Bible's own—presuppositions, and it may be expected that these will differ very materially from theories which start from a naturalistic basis. It is too early to predict, but it may be affirmed with great certainty, that the last word is

still very far from having been spoken on Old Testament questions, and, when it is spoken, it may be found that we are not so remote as many people imagine from what the church has always believed about the Bible. Meanwhile, notwithstanding the complacency with which the critics move along in their assurance about "settled results," there are not wanting indications that, through developments in their own circles, and the new perspective created by archaeology, the ground is cracking in all directions beneath their feet in a way that portends great changes. To take but one example—the J and E distinction in the Pentateuch. Those who harp on this as a "settled result" appear to have little conception of the extraordinary changes which have taken place on this part of the theory in later years—the multiplication of sources (J¹, J², J³, E¹, E², E³, etc.), the lowered dating, the conversion into "schools" of writers—which really nullify a simple J and E distinction. It is comparatively easy to postulate two writers, one, say, in the South Kingdom, using the name "Jehovah;" another in the North Kingdom, using the name "Elohim" (God); but how are we to conceive of two "schools" going on for long years side by side, even after the Northern Kingdom is broken up—both, therefore, now Judean—yet one persistently clinging to the use of E, and perpetuating its style, the other as pertinaciously adhering to the use of J. The thing is incomprehensible. A yet greater blow, one may anticipate, will be given to the certainty of Old Testament methods when it is seen what havoc these make when fearlessly applied to the New Testament, as they are now beginning to be applied. On this a few words will be said below.

4. A fourth powerful current affecting theology at the present time is that flowing in from *the sciences*—especially from *the general acceptance of the idea of evolution*. There is no mistaking this current either. Evolution is an idea which has laid hold upon our age with a fascination which is fast in danger of becoming a super-

stitution. Carried out as the thorough-going naturalistic school would have it carried, the evolution theory admits of no breaks, or supernatural interpositions, and so excludes miracles all along the line. On the other hand, if a supernatural new beginning is admitted at any point—as in the Incarnation or Resurrection of our Lord—a thorough-going evolution theory is *ipso facto* discredited, at least is proclaimed inadequate to embrace all the facts. The point where the modern theory of evolution seems specially to strike into Christian theology is in the article of sin. The more carefully the present writer reflects on this subject, the less does he feel it possible even to obtain the true Scriptural idea of sin out of the hypothesis of man's gradual development from the bestial condition, and his start off in existence from a point only a degree removed from unrelieved brutishness. Where, on this hypothesis, is there any room for the awful tragedy of moral evil, for which the work of Jesus Christ affords the only and divinely-appointed remedy? Sin is not sin in the old sense, when it can be shown to flow unavoidably from man's constitution, and from the environment in which his Creator placed him. Instead of exhibiting the character of a fall, history takes the new aspect of a rise. Instead of the world lying under condemnation, as the Bible says it does, it is rather to be congratulated that it has done so remarkably well—has advanced so far from primitive barbarism or worse. Jesus it apt to appear in this scene simply as the apex of the evolutionary movement, and redemption only as aid rendered to the race in its upward march of progress by a great and good personality. One is familiar with the line of argument taken by W. F. R. Tennant and others in reply to this difficulty. But what no one has ever been able to show is how, under the conditions supposed, a sinless development was possible to man, or how his moral condition, when he came to understand it, could be regarded by him as aught but *ab initio* wrong. It is easy to speak, as one writer does, of man, emerging from ani-

malism, "when the germ of moral consciousness first appeared," being "in a position to choose deliberately in any given instance whether he would strive upward, or obey the animal nature which pulled him in an opposite direction," and to add, "If, for an instant, he chose the lower, and refused the higher, sin would for the first time exist in the world." "The stress and strain caused by his animal tendencies he must feel; but it was not necessary even to yield to them where they conflicted with his upward progress." But reduce this to the concrete, and what does it amount to. Has any such creature a freedom fitted to cope with the whole force of unrestrained animal impulse? Is not the whole conception of freedom, as existing in such a nature, abstract and unreal? Not to say that even moral failure has only the character of *sin* when it is brought into relation with *God*, the idea of Whom is here absent.

There seems little question, therefore, that, if this hypothesis is to rule the Christian system, our theology must be recast from top to bottom, if, indeed, theology remains to us at all. But is there need for this? If we go strictly by what is proved, there surely is not. Certain it is that the production of a first human pair by gradual transformation from the animal is an assertion which yet lacks all scientific evidence—towards the proof of which, as time goes on, science even does not seem to get any nearer. And if that is not proved, the essential point in the Biblical account of man's origin and primitive state is left untouched. Science itself is beginning to distinguish between evolution and Darwinism, and to recognize that evolution may admit of new starting-points, and does not invariably proceed by slow and insensible gradations.* The savage has been thought to be the intermediate stage between developed man and the animal, but the work of missions, to speak of nothing else, by discovering the

* See the writer's book on the *Image of God in Man and its Defacement in the Light of Modern Denials.*

depth of divine possibilities latent in the breast of the lowest savage, effectually knocks this on the head. The lowest barbarian is yet in every essential respect a man. Here also, as in the region of criticism, it is necessary to receive with caution the assertions even of experts. The strongest case of a "middle link" between man and the ape family is the *Pithecanthropus erectus* of Java, a few remains of which (top of a skull, teeth, a femur) were found by Dr. Dubois in 1891-2. Yet Virchow, to the end of his life, refused to admit that it was anything else than a large Gibbon. To convince the writer of the contrary a scientific friend—a Professor—put into his hands a text-book of repute, W. L. H. Duckworth's *Morphology and Anthropology*, in which elaborate calculations are given, based on "cephalisation" (ratio of brain-weight to body-weight) to show that demonstrably the *Pithecanthropus* was a form intermediate between man and ape. Unfortunately the learned author had neglected to work his own sums, and, when an obvious discrepancy led the present writer to test them, they were found to be hopelessly—even ludicrously—astray. It is right to add that the error, on being pointed out, was frankly admitted. In brief, what is true and proved in evolution is not incompatible with anything in Christianity. To quote what has been said elsewhere: "With man, from the point of view of the Bible, we have the rise of a new Kingdom, just as when life first entered, the entrance on the stage of nature of a being self-conscious, rational, and moral, a being made in the image of God, and it is arbitrary to assume that this new beginning will not be marked by differences which distinguish it from the introduction of purely animal races."

5. The last important current affecting theology which need be noticed is that entering from *the new "historical-critical" school*, and from the *science of comparative religion*. There are signs that this is the dominant influence with which Biblical learning and theology will have for some time to do, and against which the older methods,

alike of criticism and of apologetic, will not be of much avail. It is, at the same time, not easy to explain the genius and methods of this new tendency, to which the criticism of Wellhausen has already become antiquated, and which boasts of effecting a radical transformation in the literary and historical treatment of both Old and New Testaments. There is as yet little cohesion in the ranks of its adherents, or unity in its results; but Gunkel, Bousset, Winckler, Cheyne, may be named as representatives of it from different standpoints; T. G. Frazer is another type, in the general field of religion. It is a chief characteristic of the school that it refuses to look at any people or religion in isolation from general history, and aims at explaining any given religion from the circumstances of its environment, and from analogies and parallels drawn from other religions. It recognizes, ordinarily, no distinction of origin in religions; treats with bold scorn the older cautious (or incautious) methods of textual, literary, and historical criticism of books, and enters on a course of new construction from a broader basis. The religion of Israel is to be explained from ancient Semitic, Babylonian, Arabian, Persian ideas and usages: Christianity is to find a key to much in the life of Christ, and to its early institutions, in the same, or like sources. Prof. Robertson Smith gave an impulse to this way of handling the Old Testament in his studies on the religion of the Semites: an extreme newer phase is the "Pan-Babylonianism" of the Winckler school, against which Old Testament scholars themselves are setting themselves with sturdy determination. Harnack, again, paved the way for the application of the method to the New Testament in his theory of the penetration of early church dogma by Greek influences; but the movement has now assumed proportions, and yields results for the Gospels and Apostolic history, far beyond what he can approve. One feature of the method is that it desires to do away with theology as a separate discipline altogether; theology is to be merged in a historical and comparative

treatment of religions, or in a general philosophy of religion. This is not the place for an exhaustive enumeration of the tendency in question—more revolutionary, it will be seen, than any that has gone before—and the glance here taken will have reference chiefly to the New Testament.

The fountain-heads of this new stream of influence are, first, archaeology, laying bare in amazing fashion the civilizations and religions of the East, in part also, as in Crete and Greece, of the West; and, next, the comparative study of past and existing religions, higher and lower, as that has been pursued with rare indefatigableness and brilliant results during the last half century. These fascinating studies have opened up new worlds, appealed to the imagination, and naturally set new problems. Christianity, no more than the religion of Israel, can any longer be looked at by itself, but must submit to closest scrutiny in the light of all that has been discovered of other faiths. Sacred books are pitted against sacred books; moral codes against moral codes; Jesus against the founders of other religions; Gospel stories against legends of the Buddha; ideas like those of the Virgin-birth, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, against seeming parallels elsewhere; miracles in the Bible against miracles on other soils. It cannot be said that the comparison gives us nothing to think of. One discovers much that is in itself remarkable and interesting; and admiration is involuntarily awakened by the breadth and elevation of the moral teaching, the nobility of personal character, and the depth, and even spirituality of the reflection occasionally met with. The conviction is forced on us that if heathenism has sank to such depths of degradation as history shows, this has not been altogether for want of light; the world has always had a great deal more moral light than it knew how to make use of. There are sides of the religions of China, of Japan, as of Mohammedanism (its mystical schools), we are only yet beginning to know. How curious, e. g., the development of

Buddhism into the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Dharma, or in Japan the doctrine of Amida Buddha, with its repudiation of works, and inculcation of salvation by faith! The religions of the ancient Orient disclose yet stranger wonders. What marvel if all this takes hold on the imaginations of modern historical scholars, and that they are tempted to proclaim that the religions of Moses and Jesus are but two more among the rest. The Rev. C. H. Johns, e. g., has discovered apparently, that, on the whole, the prophets of Isreal must take a back seat in comparison with that of Babylonia! "They by no means everywhere attained a level of approach to what is now regarded as true, that was higher, or even as high, as the highest reached in Baylonia." It is interesting to know that so much excellent morality is found by Mr. Jones in his Babylonian tablets, but it may be predicted that the star of the Hebrew prophets is not likely to be eclipsed just yet. What are moral counsels without a living God of righteousness, as potent to save and to bless as He is to judge and to punish, behind them!

The stream that has thus gathered to flood is now pouring its full force upon the Gospel history, and many and strange things are the results. The old mythical theory has served its day, and this new theory of mythological borrowing from other religions has come to take its place. It is Christ, as before, that is in the center, and the aim, likewise as before, is to strip Him of all supernatural and Messianic prerogatives, and reduce Him to the level of a simple religious teacher—a genius in religion, let it be owned, of the first order—but still no more. Whether there may not yet be a greater is left a moot question, for it would outstep the limits of this new mode of criticism to admit the "absoluteness" of Christianity! It has often been noted how this is the goal of so much "modern" thought about Jesus—humanitarianism. It is in part the instinct to make sure that we have true humanity in Jesus; not one foreign to us in nature, and sympathy, and experience, but veritable man. This is

well, were it not that in the heart of the movement there is the determination, not less fixed, that He shall be no more than man. For a time this tendency was veiled by so-called "Kenotic" theories; but now the superfluous appendage of a depotentiating Logos is set aside, and we have man pure and simple. This is the characteristic of the newest lives of Christ—Bousset's, e. g., or Neumann's, both translated. And the above-described "historical-critical" method comes in conveniently to remove all that fits in badly with such a construction. Yet when one looks at its operations with narrowness what fantastic tricks is it seen playing! Leaving aside Gunkel, who has written a brochure on the new lines, we take up a book like Cheyne's *Bible Problems*, or Farnell's *Evolution of Religion*, both published in what is called the "Crown Library," and get a lesson as to how the new method works. "Conservative theologians," we are told, "will have to admit that the New Testament now has to be studied from the point of view of mythology as well as from that of philological exegesis and church-history * * * For the due comprehension of the New Testament, it is essential that the help of mythology, treated of course by strictly critical methods, should be invoked. * * * And the leading factor in this is Babylonian." So, for the explanation of the story of the Virgin-Birth we are taken to "the N. Arabian myth of Dusares," and to "corroborative Assyrio-Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian illustrations," and to "the Graeco-Asiatic myth of Leto." As if there was the slightest probability that the writers of the realistic and chaste stories of the Gospels ever heard of these extravagances! The narratives directly or indirectly, of the Descent into Hades—of which the Gospels say nothing—and of the Resurrection and Ascension are similarly accounted for. Paul's allusion to Christ's death and resurrection in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, "in reality points," we are told, "to a pre-Christian sketch of the life of Christ, partly—as we have seen—derived from widely-spread non-Jewish myths, and em-

bodied in Jewish writings." As if there was the faintest evidence of the existence of such a "sketch," or as if the historic witness to the fact of the resurrection in the streets of Jerusalem a few weeks after the event did not preclude all insubstantial concoction of the kind! More outrageous and bizarre than anything else, probably, is the extraordinary theory of Dr. J. G. Frazer in the 2d edition of his *Golden Bough*—a theory whose absurdity is mercilessly exposed at unwonted length by M. A. Lang in his *Magic and Religion*. The Babylonians and their Persian conqueror, he avers, were wont yearly, at a vernal feast, to dress a condemned criminal in the royal robes (a proxy for the divine King of Babylon, who, in an age less civilized, had been sacrificed annually—so Dr. Frazer thinks), to enthrone him, to grant him access to the ladies of the royal parlor and there, at the end of five days, to strip, whip, and hang him. The Jews are supposed to have borrowed this feast, which they called Purim, from the Babylonians and Persians, and with it the practice of crowning, stripping, flogging, and hanging a mock-King, a condemned criminal, in March. They are also conjectured to have borrowed a custom of keeping a pair of condemned criminals, one of whom was hanged, *i. e.*, died as an incarnation of the good of life; the other was set free for the year. It is this role of mock-King which was forced on Jesus, and which is the real explanation of his crucifixion. Hence the belief in His divinity, etc.; in a word, Christianity! The whole thing, as M. Lang shows, is a tissue of fables from beginning to end; but imagine this seriously put forward by a sane man as an account of the origin of the Christian faith! From it one may learn the general worth of the theorizing on religion in *The Golden Bough*.

No; the foundation of God standeth sure, so far as this whole class of theories is concerned. We end where we began—that none of the currents at this hour assailing the bulwarks of our Zion are likely to do them even temporary damage.

THE PLACE OF SCIENCE IN MINISTERIAL
EDUCATION.

BY PROF. C. W. CHAMBERLAIN, GRANVILLE, O.

We are assured almost daily by the public press and by popular consent that the present is not only an age of scientific progress, but that it is pre-eminently THE age of scientific progress. Has the idea been ingrained into our lives to such an extent that we have forgotten the reason for our existence? Have the mighty achievements of science intoxicated us? Have we so closely watched the investigator of whom Chaucer wrote?

“Fortune him hath enhaunced so in pride,
That veraily he wend he might atteygne
Unto the sterris upon every side;
And in a balance weyen each mounteyne,”

have we watched him laying his hand upon the swiftly moving sunbeam and forcing it to give up its secret, turning the lightnings from their course of destruction into channels of peace and usefulness, gathering materials from every part of the earth, from the mountain top to the lowest levels of the mine, from the ocean depth and the depths of space and patiently, thoughtfully sifting out from them the gems of truth; and then turning them all to practical account to ease the burdens of tired humanity; seeking out the wondrous and mysterious forces and compelling them to run as the swift messengers and patient servants of mankind. Have we watched these things so closely that we have permitted the college, so dear to our hearts, to forget that it was founded to provide for the education of a Christian ministry? Or is it true that these things, modern as they may be, have an important part to play in the education of a young man preparing himself for the Gospel ministry?

I do not propose to make a plea for scientific education. That course of training which is best, which is necessary

for the education of a young man preparing himself for a technical profession, is not the course to be pursued by a young man preparing to enter the ministry. I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the comparative educational merits of the Classical and Scientific courses, as offered in our college. Had I believed, as many men do, that our college curricula are still in the hands of the medieval church, which demands the study of words instead of things, and that these curricula have become heavy with age, I would not have done as I did—take a classical course in college when it was my intention to spend my life in scientific pursuits. Had I believed that a college course might be likened to emery used in polishing a piece of metal, and that we are not concerned for the emery after that metal has been polished, I should hardly have consented to the lengthening of my course made necessary by my desire to put myself in thorough sympathy with both phases of modern educational methods.

I do not propose to resurrect the ghost of Conflict between Science and Religion. Dramatic events have been involved in the rise of science from the Alexandrian epoch to the present day. We all recognize the existence of a family skeleton. A few men still love to speak of the "warfare of science," and the "martyrdoms of science," and recall to memory the cruelties of the dungeon and rack, suffered by truth seekers at the hands of ecclesiastical intolerance. The scientific man who loves to call to mind these early mistakes too often preserves the spirit of the persecutor rather than that of the martyr, the spirit of intolerance creeping in with the consciousness of power. Mistakes have been made on both sides. He who claims to be the "Successor of Peter," conscious that men believed he possessed power to open Heaven to them or shut them out, found it easy to assume dominion over the earth. On the other hand, unsupported guesses at the unknown are often uttered with an assumption of authority, beside of which the

pretensions of the Pope and Council seem slight and shadowy.

A young man preparing himself for the ministry ought to take enough scientific work in his college course to obtain a fair view of the place such courses should occupy in the college curriculum. He is about to enter a profession from which college presidents, trustees, and administrators are largely drawn. May the time never come when the connection between the college and the interest of the church shall be less marked than now. Schools and colleges, wherever they exist, almost without exception owe their origin to the church. Christianity has always been friendly to learning. Its ministry is a teaching and preaching ministry. Christianity produces an inquiring, observing, thinking people. Occasionally infidelity or irreligion have founded colleges, but as such, they have not prospered, and it has been found necessary to transfer them to the hands of religious teachers and guardians to save them. We have in the United States at least one great university founded by atheists, who became convinced that Christians were gaining an undue advantage through their Christian schools. Should you visit that institution to-day, probably the first structure you would enter would be the Christian Association Building. A college president of our own denomination has made the statement publicly that one of the most important cares of his administration, the laboratories, while not outside his interest, were quite beyond his comprehension because his own education had given him no insight into their proper functions.

Why should not he who is making an effort to read God's thoughts as he left them, written in these wonderful things about us, be a Christian man? For my part, I do not see how it is possible for a man observing the wonderful things revealed to his senses in the laboratory to fail to see God's hand in it all. And yet it sometimes occurs that a man is looked upon with suspicion because he happens to be a scientist.

Not long ago a young man received the hand of fellowship in a New England Baptist church, and the pastor, good man that he was, took occasion to remark upon the strange circumstances, "A man of science knocking at the doors of the church." Had he known a little more of the facts of the case the scene would not have appeared so strange to him. Had he seen that same candidate enter his laboratory and with bowed head ask God's guidance in the research of the day he would not have been suspicious of the young man's profession.

No system of education is a good one in which the student gets out of touch with the great body of men. This is beyond doubt a scientific age. The young minister to whom nature is a sealed book will be greatly handicapped. Modern science has so lessened and narrowed hardship and suffering, so widely diffused ease and comfort, covered with a soft cushion the rough places in life, not only for the rich but also for the poor, that a great majority of our young men, consciously or unconsciously are following its leading. The terminology, the figures of speech, the points of view of science are quite common in the realms of thought. The minister who possesses a sympathetic understanding of these things has at his command a wealth of illustration and influence over those he is seeking to direct. He can hardly afford to be out of intellectual touch with his hearers, for the pews contain many men "gifted with the sad endowment of a contemplative mind."

It is an interesting thing to observe the student as he discovers for the first time that he cannot trust his unaided senses in the investigation of the simplest and most obvious phenomena. He must make correction for his personal equation. Watch the expression on his face as he measures for the first time the amount by which another man sees a thing too late, and he in the excitement of anticipation sees it, or thinks he sees it, before it really happens. He realizes as he never did before that his own judgment may be no better than that of the other

fellow. From that time on he is never quite so cock-sure of a thing, and, believe me, he is a good deal more agreeable to live with.

How unfortunate it is that in this day and age there should be abroad in the land so much false—philosophy, I almost called it, but it is hardly proper to dignify it by that term. And how much of it is foisted on the public in the name of religion? Did the Baptist denomination ever lose a minister to one of these many isms? While they were with us we believed them to be good devout men. And they were. What they lacked was balance. Education in the traditional humanities alone does not seem to be sufficient protection to those who fall easy victims to the vagaries of quacks. There is no better antidote for unworthy credulity than a consistent course in some good laboratory.

The spirit of the laboratory is not dogmatic, as some would make us believe. Intolerance has no place in it. Mistakes have been made and the truth is being sifted from error. The ghosts of phlogiston, caloric, and luminiferous ether, and a crowd of other phantoms haunt the investigator. Science, like Bunyan's hero, has sometimes had to pass through the "Valley of Humiliation." Theories have been propounded and for a time accepted, which later investigation has disproved. This does not necessarily discredit the method. Faith in the fundamental principles persist notwithstanding the difficulties encountered. The student cannot help seeing that however much science may analyze and explain, back of it all is God. A student of elementary chemistry, profoundly impressed with the ability of the teacher to explain natural phenomena, asked him: "Professor, why is gold yellow?" Whereupon the wise man answered: "Because God made it so."

The good college teaches science to the ministerial students in a reasonable way. He is not allowed to fritter away his time in acquiring a little knowledge of this thing and, a dangerous omitting of that. He is allowed

to choose from a wide range of scientific studies, one suited to his ability and taste. His time would be well spent if the only thing acquired were the knowledge of how little he knew about it after all. Who can tell how many mistakes he may thus avoid and the chargin he may be saved. There is a wide-spread taste for sensationalism which gains with the efforts made to satisfy it, which offers a premium upon anything startling or revolutionary. If a fraction of the wonderful scientific discoveries which have been announced in the public press and too often referred to or made the basis of an illustration in the pulpit, had actually been made, this would indeed be a sign of scientific progress. The daily newspapers and popular magazines sometimes make as sorry a mess of their attempt to describe a scientific discovery as they do to report the doings of a religious convention.

A few years ago an attempt was made to fix the ratio of the circumference to the diameter of a circle by legislative enactment. That legislature was chosen by the people of one of the greater states of the Union, a state ranking high in the number of eminent men it has produced, and the excellence of its educational institutions. In the legislature of this great state, House Bill No. 246 was introduced. The bill has this title: "A Bill for an Act introducing a New Mathematical Truth," which truth in the second section of the bill turns out to be that the circumference of a circle is just 8 1-5 times its diameter. One of the great daily papers of the state capital, a paper famed for the excellence of its editorials, its clean management and complete lack of sensationalism, devoted several columns of its first page to an exploitation of this fake discovery which had been made by a doctor living in an obscure part of the state. Announcement was made that at last the circle had been squared, and the method, copyrighted, and the demonstration had been accepted by all great mathematicians; at Washington it had the support of the National Astronomical Observatory; the

mail of the discoverer was packed with letters from scientific men in Europe and America, and so on for several columns the unsuspecting editor continued to present the effusions of this lineal descendant of Ananias. The article furnished a wealth of illustrations for sermons on the following day. When the bill was introduced in the House, the Speaker, a graduate of a famous educational institution, happened to be a man with a sense of humor and ordered it referred to the Committee on Swamp Lands. Two days later the great discoverer had a hearing before the State Superintendent of the Public Schools and the Committee on Education, who immediately endorsed his views. The Committee on Canals and Swamp Lands reported the bill back, recommending that it be referred to the Committee on Education. This committee carefully considered the bill and reported, "the same back to the House with recommendation that the said bill do pass." The bill was called up by the committee and actually passed the House by a good, safe majority. Before it actually became a law its character began to be recognized and its progress was stopped. It will be a good many years before the participants in that comedy can contemplate their part in it without a blush of shame.

On the top shelf in an obscure corner of a department library of a great institution rests a book donated to the library by its author. It holds its position in the crowded shelves, not because of the author's reputation, the title, or the flaming Harvard crimson in which it is bound. The contents are most unique. The author of "My Sound Philosophy" is a demented man. The book is a strange combination of witticism, fact and insane fancy. Many a time have I seen my fellow-students, wearied by the labors of the day, gathered about the library table, while one of their number read extracts from "My Sound Philosophy." Whenever the red book was taken from the shelf, it was the signal for fun and recreation.

In the same city is a minister of the Gospel. He is

well known all over the United States as an earnest Christian man and an eloquent platform orator. His church was one of the largest in the great city and at the time of which I speak was attracting wide attention because of the old-fashioned revival which the good doctor was conducting. May I ask pardon for making a personal reference. It seems necessary to do so in relating an incident which affected me deeply at the time. My fellow-students were men of rare intellectual gifts, picked men training for special positions. They are all college professors now, leading the world of thought in their particular investigations. Not one of them is a Christian man. My own position and belief was thoroughly understood and respected. I was particularly anxious that these young men, richly endowed by nature for leadership, might be set to work in the Master's cause. As my old teacher, C. L. Herrick, used to say, "The influence of these men seemed destined to run wild like an uncontrolled prairie fire, but when once placed under subjection by the Master Hand, might be made to burn as a back-fire in the same Master's cause. One night I asked them to go with me to the particularly mentioned church. They readily consented. I hoped for much. I had heard this famous man lecture in my college town. He was a man with large gifts and spoke with conviction. He seemed to have the power to move men. Imagine my surprise when the speaker announced that the evening's discourse would be taken from a scientific lecture. Imagine my companions' amusement and my own shame when it appeared that the speaker's information had been gathered from "My Sound Philosophy" and similar sources. Should I quote from that lecture, you would be greatly amused. So were my companions part of the time; at other times they were angry. On our way home, one of them, a strong intellectual man, said, "Do you expect me to accept religious instruction on questions concerning which I have honest doubts, from a man of whose inability to distinguish truth from error I have no

doubt?" If the college can save its young ministers from mistakes like that it will mightily increase their usefulness.

A reasonable amount of scientific study will give the young ministerial student an educational balance, and broaden his view. Dealing directly with the concrete things which God has created he will obtain a wider grasp of what God's creation means.

“———— verily many thinkers of this age,
Aye many Christian teachers, half in Heaven,
Are wrong in just my sense, who understood
Our natural world too insularly, as if
No spiritual counterpart completed it,
Consumating its meaning, rounding all
To justice and perfection, line by line,
Form by form, nothing single nor alone,
The great below clenched by the great above.”

BOOK REVIEWS.

I. NEW TESTAMENT.

The Development of Palestine Exploration.

By Frederick Jones Bliss, Ph. D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906. \$1.50 net.

In this volume the author of "A Mound of Many Cities," "Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-1897," etc., puts us under new obligations. It presents the lectures delivered before the Union Theological Seminary in 1903 on the Ely Foundation considerably amplified and modified. It treats in a broad and scholarly way the development of Palestine Exploration from its dawn down to the present time, but is in no sense a compendium of the results of Palestine Exploration. The shifting point of view of travellers from age to age; the displacement of the classic geographer by the credulous pilgrim; the gradual evolution of the pilgrim into the man of science; these are some of the subjects treated and illustrated; but we must look elsewhere for lists of sites identified, inscriptions found, monuments described, etc. The lectures take up in order the following subjects: "The Dawn of Exploration," "The Age of Pilgrimage," "The Crusaders and After," "From Fabri to Robinson," "Edward Robinson," "Renan and his Contemporaries," "The Palestine Exploration Fund," and "The Exploration of the Future."

Without intending to be such, the volume is in itself no mean essay toward an eclectic and comparative bibliography of the subject. It is interesting to find how rich our country is in the literature of Palestine. "Scattered among our various libraries," the author says, "I have found every book that I have sought except Michel Nau's 'Voyage Nonveau de la Terre Sainte.'" He warns the reader that he will not find in all the names he

mentions "The Ideal Explorer." Robinson in field work and Petrie in excavation come near the mark, but they do not reach it. The Ideal Explorer of the Holy Land must combine the qualities of a geographer, a geologist, a naturalist, an architect, an archæologist, an ethnologist, an historian, an epigraphist, a Biblical student, a painter, a mystic and a poet, and, if an excavator, an engineer and miner as well; but first and foremost he must be a man of common sense, who is your only real diplomatist. "Fact, hitting the mark in one's dealings with men, hitting the mark in dealing with one's own observations, in building theories upon these—this is the one thing needful."

The author aptly likens our present knowledge of Palestine to a mosaic and colored tesserae, which, though broken here and there, yet shows broad patterns and many curious details. Scattered in the surrounding *debris*, and sometimes buried by this, are the little cubes waiting to be found and fitted into their proper places. For the parts of the mosaic now complete we have to thank the Explorers of the Past, for the filling of the *lacunae* we look to the Explorers of the Future.

The book is well printed, well bound and supplied with an exhaustive index.

The lecture on Edward Robinson, the pioneer scientific explorer, the man who reconstructed the map of Palestine, who "found it afloat like an island in a sea, almost like a cloud in the sky of fable, and left it a part of Asia," is alone worth the price of the book. Every young American, especially every young minister, should read it. That he was "raised up, endowed and trained for this very purpose," the story here told makes clear. He stands at the focal point where all the various lines converge. The time had come for a scholar equal to the best in acuteness and breath of judgment to enter this tempting field with thermometer, telescope, compass, and measuring tape, but, above all, sharp-eyed and sufficiently sceptical, and then make report of what he had seen and

measured. "Such a man," says Dr. Hitchcock, "was Robinson; so keen of vision that nothing escaped his notice; so sound and solid of judgment that no mere fancy could sway him; so learned that nothing of any moment pertaining to his work was unknown to him; and yet, withal, so ardent in his religious affections as to pursue his task like a new crusader." "There was never a man better suited to his calling."

It is interesting to note that in the scientific exploration of Palestine, America took the initiative. America was followed by Germany, Germany by France, and France by England. The "great quartette" is Robinson, Tobler, Conder and Guérin, and the work of these four shows "a logical progression." Robinson established the correct principles of research, Tobler applied these minutely over a limited range, Guérin with the same minuteness tried to cover the whole field, but was limited by straitened resources, and Conder, with an expedition adequately manned and splendid, was enabled to fill in the topographical *lacunae* left by his predecessors.

GEO. B. EAGEB.

The Works of Josephus.

Translated by William Whiston and newly edited by D. S. Margoliouth, D. Litt. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co. 1906. Pages 989. Price, \$1.50.

This is not a new translation of Josephus like that of Shillito, but is a correction of Whiston by the text of Niese. Whiston's notes are omitted and the division of Niese's text into sections is introduced also. In a brief introduction, Dr. Margoliouth discusses succinctly and satisfactorily the main problems concerning Josephus and gives a survey of the most important literature concerning him. There are besides a few notes appended concerning such points as the Testimony of Josephus to Christ, the Chronology of Josephus, Josephus and S. Luke. Dr. Margoliouth does not think that Luke had made any use of Josephus. The recent work of Harnack is reassuring on this point, since he argues strongly

that Luke, the physician, the companion of Paul, was the author of both Gospel and Acts (Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt, der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*. The print is rather small, but otherwise this is the most serviceable edition of Josephus to be had. Dr. Margoliouth is Professor of Arabic at Oxford University and a thorough scholar.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments.

Von Prof. Lic. Dr. Carl Clemen, G. J. Göschensche Verlagshandlung, Leipzig, Germany. 1906. Pages 168. Price, 80 pfennig.

This is one of the volumes in the popular *Sammlung Göschen* and aims to give a presentation of the modern views of the origin of the New Testament. There is no question as to the ability or scholarship of Dr. Clemen, but his judgment is warped by his extremely radical views. He dates sixteen books of the New Testament between A. D. 94 and 140! He does it by processes of reasoning that have been long exploded. At the very time that Clemen is dating Luke's Gospel and Acts about 94 or 95 A. D., Harnack, the leader of the liberals in Germany, comes out with a book (*Lukas der Arzt und Verfasser, etc.*) in which he argues for the authorship of both Gospel and Acts by Luke. Clemen rejects also Eph., Heb., 1 and 2 Peter, the Epistles of John, James, and Jude, as well as the Pastoral Epistles save 2 Tim. 1: 15-18; 4: 9-18; and Tit. 3: 12-15.

Galatians he puts in A. D. 50 as the earliest of Paul's Letters.

This handbook will be serviceable to those who wish to know the views of a German radical of much ability, but not as a sample of the soberer German criticism of the present day. It seems a pity that such an extreme radical should have been asked to prepare a popular handbook for general circulation.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The New Testament. A Chronological Arrangement.

By Principal Lindsay. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co. London, J. M. Dent & Co.

This is a new volume in Everyman's Library. It is the King James' Version with all the words of Jesus, other speeches and quotations set in narrower form. The type is clear and the binding is pretty. The books are printed in chronological order, as Dr. Lindsay conceives it, though Jude and 2 Peter are put at the end and Revelation before Acts. The trend of opinion is now towards the later date of the Revelation. It is difficult to use the New Testament intelligently purely on the chronological plan for the reason that the books thus arranged do not represent the actual knowledge of the early Christians. They knew much more either from personal acquaintance with Jesus and the Apostles or from tradition. You cannot think of a Christian community knowing only James or the Thessalonian letters. Dr. Lindsay has sought to remedy this by printing first a brief summary of the Synoptic tradition. On the whole it is best to put the Gospels and the Acts first and then the Epistles, in chronological groups. I am more than ever convinced about it since seeing this new attempt. There are no notes at all as in Moffatt's *Historical New Testament* and the *Students' Chronological New Testament*.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Η Καινή Διαθήκη.

Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici A.D. 1550, cum variis lectionibus, etc. Curante F. H. A. Scrivener. Editio Quarta ab eb. Nestle Correcta. Londini, G. Bell and Filii, 1906. Price, 6 shillings. pages 600.

This is a delightful edition of the New Testament in Greek. It is the Textus Receptus indeed, but with the various readings of Beza, Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the English Revision of 1880. Thus the student has conveniently before him the readings of all the great Greek New Testaments in any given passage. The text itself is thus not that of Westcott and Hort with which scholars are so familiar

now, but the text of Westcott and Hort is always at hand at the bottom of the page. For one who has no critical apparatus like Tischendorf this arrangement has a great advantage in giving him at least the various readings.

The marginal references are also useful. The pages are longer and wider than in Westcott and Hort and the whole make-up of the volume is exceedingly convenient.

Dr. Nestle has done his work with all the marvellous accuracy of detail, so characteristic of him. He has the eye of a microscope.

The book is bound to be widely used, and even those who have Westcott and Hort will find it very handy to have Nestle's Scrivener also. And what book is there which so richly repays continual and enthusiastic study as the Greek Testament?

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Prophet of Nazareth.

By Nathaniel Schmidt, Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures in Cornell University. The MacMillan Company, New York. 1905. Price, \$2.50 net. Pages 422.

It is difficult to treat this book with the seriousness that it deserves. It treats the highest of themes, but with a narrowness and a rancor that one can find only in a work like O. Holtzmann's *Leben Jesu*. Of the author's ability and research there is no question. Where he fails utterly is in spirit and judgment. He is a Baptist who no longer regards Jesus as divine. He dismisses what Matthew and Luke have to say of the Virgin Birth as "Parthenogenetic speculations" (p. 249). The resurrection of Jesus did not take place, but was due to belief that God could not allow his Holy One to see corruption (p. 398). It is now "recognized by critical students" (p. 294) that Jesus did not predict his death and resurrection. He denies that Jesus ever called himself "Son of God" (p. 152) or Messiah (p. 134), or "Son of Man" (p. 134). He gives an elaborate argument to show that "Son of Man" can only mean "man," in spite of Dalman's denial that *bar nasha* in

Galilean Aramaic means "man" and in spite of the absurdity that this translation would make in many places. He knows that "Jesus did not speak Greek" (p. 115). He knows that the Old Testament has nothing about a Messiah in it (p. 55), such an idea arising for the first time about 63 B. C. (p. 68). "He never ordained either baptism or eucharist" (p. 379). This is not all that Prof. Schmidt "knows." He knows that Jesus wrought no miracles (p. 238), that John's Gospel is a Gnostic production (p. 213, shades of Cerinthus), that Luke did not write his Gospel (p. 226), that neither Jesus nor David was born at Bethlehem (p. 247). In this book of 422 pages there is only one chapter on The Life of Jesus (pp. 240-292). The rest is taken up in showing what we do not know about Jesus. But in this chapter Schmidt contends that we have "a few glimpses of the real life of Jesus" (p. 240). The one-sided narrowness of the author is apparent in many ways, but especially in his use of adverbs. The story of the Virgin Birth is "clearly a later insertion" (p. 248). "It is equally clear that he was a Gnostic," speaking of the author of the Fourth Gospel (p. 213). "Papias evidently did not know the Apostle John" (p. 209). He is sorry for the rest of us. "Undoubtedly, the traditional conception of Jesus will long continue in the world, and through it his power will be felt as of yore" (p. 340). But "the devil will never be raised from the dead" (p. 346), and he implies that ere long the old idea of Jesus will be buried for good.

The author makes a justification of his attack on the deity of Jesus by several times appealing to the example of the Unitarian Anabaptists like Denck. He wrongly calls these Baptists and seems to argue that the only true Baptist is of the Unitarian type. That is a perversion of the facts and an insult to Baptists of to-day.

"The Baptist churches in Poland were quietist and Unitarian" (p. 22). "But it was among the Baptists of the Sixteenth Century that freedom from dogma, a reverent yet critical study of the Bible, personal loyalty

to Jesus and a high conception of the worth of human nature, led to the complete rejection of the trinitarian idea of the term "Son of God" (p. 136). This is not a just appeal. Those Anabaptists were not Baptists. There are some Unitarian Baptists to-day in England, but they are not allowed in the Baptist Union. The author tells of the "deep satisfaction" (p. 233) that he has in coming "to the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth actually existed."

I conclude this review with the remark that the tone of the book is one of insufferable dogmatism and intolerance.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Letters of Christ.

By Charles Brown, Minister of Ferme Park Baptist Church, Hornsey, London. James Clarke & Co., 13 and 14 Fleet St., London.

The author treats the letters of Rev. II. and III. as actual letters of the glorified Christ and the churches, and as one reads he feels that there is no other adequate source. Mr. Brown writes in the full light of present-day scholarship with much spiritual insight and teaching skill. The divine "goodness and severity," as revealed in these sternly gracious messages of Christ, are brought out with great clearness and force.

Perhaps there is no one thing the churches need more at this time than to take heed to these letters and "hear what the Spirit saith." Mr. Brown's little book should help us all so to do, for it breathes the spirit of faithfulness and tenderness in which such searching messages should be given.

J. H. FARMER.

What is the Lord's Coming.

By Fred Erdman. Price 10 cents.

The Sychar Revival.

By S. D. Gordon. Price 10 cents.

Bible Outlines or the Second Coming.

By C. C. C. Price 5 cents. Published by Charles C. Cook, 150 Nassau street, New York.

These pamphlets all bear on the question of the Lord's
Second Coming. A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Gospel of Matthew.

By Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Litt. D. Three Volumes. New York.
A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1905.

These volumes belong to the set of six comprising the First Series of Expositions of Holy Scripture. The set sells for \$7.50 and is wonderfully cheap at that price. Dr. Maclaren expects to prepare the whole series on the entire Bible. It is a monumental undertaking, and this first installment whets our appetites for the rest. Dr. Maclaren appears at his best in these noble volumes on Matthew. What more can one say? He is indeed the Prince of Preachers. Here is exposition that is scholarly and practical. It is the beaten oil alone that is given. There is the keenest insight into human needs and the strongest grasp of Scripture teaching. The English of Dr. Maclaren is so rich and stately that this alone repays reading his sermons. But if one wishes spiritual edification and enlightend exposition of the Word of God, he will find it in these volumes. They sparkle with ripe wisdom and stimulate to highest endeavor. Sooth to say one is a bit at a loss when it comes to giving an adequate review of three such books. A sense of helplessness takes hold of you. Let us hope that the series will be completed. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Jesus. An Unfinished Portrait.

By Charles Van Norden, D. D. Funk & Wagnalls, New York. 1906.
Price \$1.00. Pages 295.

This is a very remarkable book. It is readable, almost fascinating in style, and contains many noble and true ideas. Dr. Van Norden has keen insight and a realistic imagination and often luminously reproduces the historical situation. But with all its brilliance it is a very one-sided book. The author takes the usual Unitarian ground that Jesus is only a man, though the greatest of

men. He frankly admits his inability to explain all the facts on this hypothesis, but claims that he can come nearer to it than by any other. Many of his sentences are roughly repulsive to evangelical sentiment, as when he says: "Dogmatism began with Paul and culminated with the Inquisition." It was the Judaizers whom Paul opposed whose work terminated in the Inquisition. The book lacks balance and comprehensiveness, but is incisive and suggestive.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Gospel According to St. Luke.

Edited by W. Williamson, B. A. Methuen & Co., 38 Essex street, W. C., London.

This volume is one of a series of "Methuen's Junior School Books," and is a characteristic English commentary—scholarly, concise, suggestive.

It admirably answers its purpose as a college textbook, but it is serviceable to all who wish a small, cheap and withal a first-class exposition of the Gospel of Luke.

Besides the "Text with Notes," the Introduction treats of Luke as a writer, and as an evangelist; the sources of the Gospel; time, place, and purpose; characteristics of thought, style and language; the parables and miracles peculiar to this Gospel; and a brief analysis of the book. The appendices consist of a comparison of the Authorized Version, and the Revised Version; a classification of the parables and the miracles of our Lord; a series of examination papers given on Luke by Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and a goodly list of miscellaneous questions and topics.

BYRON H. DEMENT.

Addresses on the Gospel of St. John.

Printed and circulated by the St. John Conference Committee, Providence, R. I. 1905. Pages 505.

These are popular addresses on the Gospel of John by various men from different parts of the country, so arranged as to cover the whole of the book. It is a practical view of the Gospel and may be of use to some.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Gospel of the Rejection. A Study in the Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three.

By Wilfred Richmond, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. John Murray, Albemarle street, London, England. 1906. Price 5s. net.

Mr. Richmond has made a fresh and luminous study of John's Gospel in a very helpful way. He shows clearly that the Synoptics presuppose the facts supplied by John, that the antagonism toward Jesus was provoked by work in Jerusalem, and that the Galilean disciples needed preparation for the reception of the new truth. The ideas advanced are not so novel as they are lucidly expressed. The author has a mastery of the Gospel and convincingly uses the facts in relation to each other. Incidentally the book serves as a strong defense of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel when taken in connection with Drummond's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, or Sanday's *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. Such a candid examination of the facts will be reassuring to many who have wandered afield after speculative will o' the wisps. The book is interesting in style though critical in subject matter.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Die Reden Unseres Herrn Nach Johannes im Grundtext Ausgelegt.

Von Dr. Siegfried Goebel, Professor in Bonn. Druck und Verlag, von C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, Germany. 1906. 9 M. Gebunden 10 M. Erste Hälfte, Kap. I—II.

Goebel accepts the genuineness of the Gospel of John and seeks to reproduce in the historical setting the words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. These are chiefly in the form of dialogue, not set discourse, especially in the first eleven chapters, covered by this volume. We have here a straightforward and careful discussion of the great sayings of Christ in John 1-11. The style is more simple than one always finds in German theological books. But the clearness and lucidity of the sentences must not blind one to the real merit of the treatment. Goebel is a real scholar, and, though he uses little of the lumber of the workshop, he has mastered the material. Those who

have difficulty with theological German will like this book. Many helpful remarks are made in the setting forth of the historical situation. His *Die Parabeln Jesu* is one of the best books on the subject of Christ's Parables. He is thoroughly at home in the field of this new work. He takes the resurrection of Lazarus from the grave as a real event. It is clear that all German scholars are not yet ready to give up the supernatural element in Christ and Christianity.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Economics of Jesus. Or Work and Wages in the Kingdom of God. A Study of the Money Parables.

By E. Griffith Jones, B. A. Cincinnati. Jennings & Graham. New York, Eaton & Mains. 35 cents net.

Here are six short discourses, the first considering the Inequalities of Life, the last presenting Some Final Considerations. The other four deal respectively with the problems of Ability, Opportunity, Diligence, and Motive, as these are presented by our Lord in the parables of the Talents, the Laborers in the Vineyard, the Pounds, and the passage (Luke 17: 7-10) about the servant coming from the field and serving his master without receiving thanks. Thus the teaching of our Lord in regard to the fact and the lessons of the four sets of inequalities is set forth by an expository study of the passages named. The little book is thoughtful, clear, and interesting, without being very thorough or profound.

E. C. DARGAN.

Keywords in the Teaching of Jesus.

By A. T. Robertson, D. D. Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society. 128 pp. 75 cents.

The "Keywords" are seven: God the Father, The Son, Sin, The Kingdom, Righteousness, The Holy Spirit, The Future Life. The lectures on these topics of our Lord's teaching were given at a summer assembly at Jackson Springs, N. C., in June, 1904, "published practically as they were delivered, and at the request of the assembly."

The treatment is characterized by the thorough scholarship for which the author is well and widely known. Mastering of the text of Scripture, and of the mass of opinion upon it, is easily in evidence. Reverence of mind and heart toward the Great Teacher is shown everywhere. There is sane, balanced, but not colorless discussion of the great problems involved. Our author knows what and why he believes, and is not afraid to stand up and speak his mind. The style is crisp, vigorous and forcible. There is no dullness or dragging, but perhaps a too great fondness for short sentences, not giving the requisite variety; and both smoothness and clearness sometimes suffer. But far better is a string of aphorisms than a flow of vapid sweetness! The little book deserves and will receive wide and careful reading.

E. C. DARGAN.

Our Lord's Resurrection.

By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, Oxford. Longmans, Green & Co. New York and London. 1906. Price \$1.40 net. Pages 320.

This is a very timely book, for the resurrection of Jesus is denied by the modern radical critics. We need fresh accent on this great fact, this fundamental Christian reality. Mr. Simpson has done a fine service in this sane and scholarly discussion of the subject. It is a book that laymen as well as ministers would find helpful. While it is thoroughly able and modern, the style is clear and the arguments easily grasped. It is a comfort to get hold of so fresh and frank a book that does not truckle to modern infidel views in the least. A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Last Message of Jesus Christ.—Or the Apocalypse in a New Light.

By John Hamilton Timbrell. Eaton & Mains, New York. 1905. Price \$1.75 net. Pages 456.

We are making headway in understanding the book of Revelation. Prof. W. M. Ramsay has done a great service in his Letters to the Seven Churches in pointing out the relation of the book to the history of Asia Minor,

and especially to that of the seven cities whose churches are addressed. Dr. Timbrell calls us back to the Old Testament imagery. The general plan is perhaps artificial, but it is of value to recall the symbols in Ezekiel and Daniel and to see that they *are* symbols. As to the thousand years or millennium he says (p. 397f): "To take this one lone number as a literalism, in a book which is built upon the mystic principle from beginning to end, is to violate every rule of interpretation upon which enunciation is grounded, and to take leave of sane exegesis as of good common sense." It will be a distinct gain when this number is admitted to be symbolic, not literal.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Gift of Tongues and Other Essays.

By The Rev. Dawson Walker, M.A., D.D., Theological Tutor in the University of Durham. T. & T. Clark, Edinburg, Scotland. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 1906. Price \$2.00.

This is a book of the ripest scholarship. Dr. Walker brings the widest reading and the ripest judgment to bear on the problems here under discussion. He carries conviction by the evident fairness of his mind and his care to put all the facts before the reader. I do not know anywhere quite so good a discussion of the Gift of Tongues, which has real difficulties enough, but which has had needless complications in abundance. The problem is to reconcile all the facts in Acts 2 with those in 1 Cor. 12-14. In a long, patient examination Dr. Walker concludes that on the Day of Pentecost the Galilean disciples did speak with foreign tongues and that this same sign reappeared at Corinth, with perhaps rhapsodical features also. Dr. Walker does not stress a point which seems to me to have weight. An interpreter was needed at Corinth, and not at Jerusalem, for the obvious reason that at Jerusalem the various tongues were understood by the representatives from the land in question, while at Corinth as a rule that was not the case. As to the legal terminology in Galatians, Dr. Walker concludes that the background was Graeco-Roman, but the Jewish ideas are also present.

He sums up in favor of Lightfoot's position that the visit to Jerusalem in Gal. 2 is the same with that in Acts 15. He indorses the possibility that the visit of the "certain from James" may have been before the conference at Jerusalem. This is a possible interpretation, but not the natural one. What Peter and Barnabas did at Antioch was not so much a change of view concerning the freedom of the Gentiles as a yielding to the pressure on social grounds. They had been eating with the Gentile Christians. Peter had once before been arraigned at Jerusalem on that point and probably was afraid that he had gone further than was meant by the decision of the conference. Or at any rate that point could have been made against him. It is delightful to see Dr. Walker have the boldness to put Acts at "about 62 A. D." and the Gospel of Luke "somewhat earlier" (p. 246). It has been a long time since I have read a book of New Testament criticism which is so able, so just, so reassuring. This is real scholarship of the Lightfoot-Hort-Westcott type.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Hebrews, James, I and II Peter.—A Commentary.

By O. P. Eaches, D.D. American Baptist Publication Society. Philadelphia. 1906.

This volume belongs to a series known as Clark's Peoples Commentary. The title page calls it "a popular commentary upon a critical basis, especially designed for pastors and Sunday-school workers." The author has successfully carried out this purpose. His work is not so elaborate as the Cambridge Bible, he aims to give results rather than processes, and the style is of a more popular kind. Every page shows a thorough knowledge of the great critical commentaries, but all the writer sets before us is concise, lucid, bright and very readable. The preface indicates how thoroughly alive the author is to the dangerous theological tendencies of this age. He believes those Epistles furnish the right antidote to many such pernicious doctrines. The introduction to each of

the four Epistles if brief, yet sufficiently comprehensive. Little here is new, but the best results of conservative scholarship are placed before us in excellent form. The author's method is to take up the Epistles chapter by chapter, give first a brief digest of each, then the interpretation, and this followed by a series of pithy and pointed practical remarks. The commentary proper is praiseworthy, the difficult passages, such as Heb. 6: 4-8 and 1 Pet. 3: 19-20 are well handled. A serious fault is the fineness of the type, otherwise it is an admirable Peoples Commentary.

J. J. REEVE.

James the Lord's Brother.

By William Patrick, D.D., Principal Manitoba College, Winnipeg. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1906. Price \$2.00 net. Pages 369.

This is a needed book, for James has not before been adequately treated in a separate volume. There is nothing startling in the discussion, but there is something far better. The author is eminently sane and well-balanced. His discussion is comprehensive, is just, scholarly, and satisfactory. It is not a mere traditional repetition of previous opinions, but a carefully reasoned statement of all that we really know about James. This volume will help every student of the New Testament. It is the kind of book of which we have all too few. The author denies that those who came "from James" to Antioch represented the mind of James. He holds also that James does not oppose Paul's idea of faith. "The reality of faith can be attested only by works" (p. 326.)

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Epistles of Peter.

By the Rev. J. H. Jowett, M. A. New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1906.

The indefatigable Dr. Robertson Nicoll has undertaken to edit a new series of commentaries to be entitled "The Practical Commentary on the New Testament." The third volume of the series is on the Epistles of Peter,

and is prepared by the Rev. J. H. Jowett, the brilliant successor of Dr. Dale at the Carr's-lane church Birmingham. In the advertisements of this series reference is explicitly made to Dr. Nicoll's earlier success, the well-known "Expositor's Bible," and thus comparison becomes almost inevitable. The earlier volume on Peter by Professor Lumby was more than half larger than that now put out by Mr. Jowett, and, laying the books together, seems throughout more soundly exegetical. On the other hand it must at once be recognized that Jowett is constantly more suggestive and stimulating than was his predecessor. No introductory matter is furnished, even for the much disputed Second Epistle. The present reviewer has certainly no objection to the conclusion that Peter wrote it, but to assume it without a word of justification or discussion appears scarcely the most helpful course in these days of widespread questioning, when one needs to be able to give a reason for his conclusions as well as his faith. Much, not to say most, of Jowett's book is homiletical rather than exegetical in tone and temper. It begins with a striking example (on 1 Peter i. 3-5): "How easily these early disciples break into doxology! Whenever some winding in the way of their thought brings the grace of God into view, the song leaps to their lips. The glory of grace strikes the chords of their hearts into music, and life resounds with exuberant praise," and so on for a full page. There is a whole chapter of twelve pages on "Be pitiful!" (1 Pet. iii. 9). The theological position of the author it is not easy to gather from his book. These Epistles themselves are to be sure rather practical than theological, and the few theological teachings are ignored, it would seem studiously ignored, by the author. The thoughts of Peter, that Christ is our sin-bearer on the tree, and that we are to be sprinkled with his blood, seem not to be touched upon at all. The acuteness of the sufferings of Jesus is emphasized with reiterated assertions (pp. 139-'42), but that is about all. The most definite teaching which the reviewer has noted is

in connection with the words "By whose stripes ye were healed," (p. 99). "Do not let us overlook the experience because we cannot find an explanation. Do not let us reject the fact because we cannot contrive a theory. The sorest places in human life, the raw, festering wounds of indwelling sin, can only be remedially touched by the healing influence of his stripes." One will naturally turn also to the discussion of "the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20). From this passage the author draws the conclusion, "No man's destiny is to be fixed until he has heard of Christ" (p. 144), but as usual no reason is given for the statement. Here at least it might fairly be said that exegetical justification of the position taken is imperatively demanded, but it is searched for in vain. The book as a whole will doubtless be found a helpful stimulus for many preachers; if only it had been made even more helpful!

D. F. ESTES.

The Bible and Christian Life.

By Walter Lock, D. D., Warden of Keble College, Oxford; Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis. Methuen & Co., 36 Essex street, London, W. C., England. 1906. Price, six shillings.

Dr. Lock has a ripened culture and a balanced judgment that show to great advantage in this collection of essays. They are partly critical and exegetical and partly practical. The discussion of *The Sources of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel*, *Presuppositions of N. T. Study*, and the *Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles* is rich in original suggestion and penetrating insight. Common sense is applied to matters of criticism, a trait by no means common among great scholars. Dr. Lock accepts more of the modern critical view of the O. T. than I think the facts justify and a Baptist cannot indorse the ecclesiastical views at all points. But for great ability blended with rich scholarship and real wisdom these papers have a high place. They are modern in spirit, devout in tone, and really edifying and stimulating. One is grateful to Dr. Lock for publishing the volume.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das Neue Testament.—Eine sprachgeschichtliche Studie.

Von Lic. Therl Gottfried Thieme. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Goettingen, Germany. 1906. Pages 43. Price, M. 1.20.

This is a helpful treatise and supplements Deissmann's *Bible Studies*. In the inscriptions of Magnesia are found such N. T. words as *λογεία*, *κυριακός*, etc. There will be more of such detailed application of the language of the inscriptions to the N. T. This piece of work is well done and can be commended to all who are interested in the new knowledge of N. T. Greek.

The work of Thieme is of course, not so extensive as that of Nachmanson, *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften*, 1903, but none the less it is of real value.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Disciple and His Lord, or Twenty-six Days with Jesus.

By Rev. J. S. Kirtley, D. D. American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia. 254 pages.

This attractive and instructive volume has just come from the press, and emanates from the pen of the beloved and scholarly pastor and writer, Dr. J. S. Kirtley. These studies recently appeared in "Service" as a part of the sacred literature course of the B. Y. U. A. for 1905-1906, and are now wisely combined into permanent form. They reveal a clear insight into the life and work of Christ, and present the most significant events in the matchless life of our Lord in chronological order. The volume deserves a wide circulation among all who wish a clear, succinct, orderly and attractive presentation of the Gospel narratives. It should be used extensively in the homes of our people, in Sunday-schools and young people's societies. It is indeed a capital book.

BYRON H. DEMENT.

II. HOMILETICS.

Homiletics and Preaching.

By Walter Rhodes, Baptist Minister, Baltimore. The Peters Publishing and Printing Company. 255 pp.

Lectures on Homiletics, by Henry C. Graves, D.D., Teacher of Homiletics in the Gordon Bible and Training School. Philadelphia. American Baptist Publication Society. 1906.

The first of these books comes from a busy pastor, and is the enlargement of papers presented at the Baltimore Baptist Ministers' Conference. The book has some blemishes of style and proof-reading that need to be removed, but the matter is judicious, clearly presented, and for the most part pleasingly set forth. The aim and spirit of the book are good, and many a pastor would find profitable suggestion and stimulus in reading it.

The second book is from the pen of one who has had large and varied experience in the ministry, and is now teaching in the Gordon Training School at Boston. It is needless to say that the book is neatly printed and bound, pleasing to the eye. The Publication Society is doing excellent work in bookmaking. The contents of the book are well worthy of their dress. The incisive style, the sound comment, the excellent principles, the modest expression of a personal acquaintance, all go to make up a sensible and pleasing presentation of many of the essentials of Homiletics. The little volume will reward an attentive reading.

After all, it is rather hard to say anything new about Homiletics! Here are two quite different books. They draw freely upon the masters, saying little that has not been as well or better said before and often; and yet they are things that constantly need to be said over and over again. The theme must be wisely chosen, properly analyzed, clearly and forcibly presented. The Bible must be regarded as the preacher's storehouse both of texts and doctrines. The preacher must be a man of character and prayer. The aim must ever be to win men and build them up in the spiritual life. All this and more these books tell us. Each one in its own way gives the author's theory

of his work. Dr. R. W. Dale has been quoted by some one recently as saying that he read every book on preaching that came under his notice, and with profit. So it is needed that there should be frequent presentation of the principles underlying preaching, as of every other great and worthy work. Each age must adapt universally recognized principles to its own demands. So books are helpful that keep freshly before us the greatness of the work of preaching and the best ways of making it effective to our own times.

E. C. DARGAN.

Bread and Salt from the Word of God.—Sixteen Sermons.

By Theodore Zahn, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated by C. S. and A. E. Burn. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. \$1.50 net.

Dr. Zahn has long been known as a theologian and scholar of first rank, especially in the department of Introduction to the New Testament. This volume of sermons, which are admirably translated, will introduce him to English and American readers as a preacher of decided merit and power. The sermons range in date from 1871 to 1900, most of them having been delivered at Erlangen. The principle of selection is thus stated by the author in his preface: "When choosing a limited number out of the large mass of sermons which I was permitted to preach in my official capacity before Easter 1877, and since then as a voluntary substitute only, I have given the preference to those which, as far as I can remember, fulfilled their object better than the others, and partly to those which, in accordance with the wish of some members of my audience, had already found a certain, though very limited circulation."

The sermons are marked by a clear evangelical note, which is very refreshing. The preacher holds firmly to orthodox views of the deity and the atonement of Christ. He accepts the miraculous elements of the Bible, and preaches it as the true Word of God. Thus in the sermon on the Temptation of Jesus (date 1891) he says: "My

friends, I do not wish to be misunderstood. From time immemorial there have been teachers, both inside the church and outside the church, and there are such also at the present day, who preach on the old Bible texts, and take the old sacred words into their mouths, speaking of the Son of God and His miracles, of the Atonement and of the Resurrection, and, if need be, of the devil also; but by it all they mean something quite different from that which Jesus and His Apostles, and the community of the faithful, have ever understood by it. May God, in His mercy, preserve this pulpit of St. Paul's at all times, so that none who are thus double-tongued may ever preach here!"

There is also a strong and capable handling of current moral issues and present-day problems from the point of view of a devout and evangelical German Lutheran. The sermons well repay reading, as they show how the best modern scholarship can still retain a devout grasp upon Gospel realities.

E. C. DAGAN.

The Ministry of the Eternal Life.—A sermon preached before the National Baptist Societies at their Anniversaries at Dayton, Ohio, May 20, 1906.

By William C. Bitting, D. D. Philadelphia. American Baptist Publication Society. 1906.

The sermon received at the time of its delivery—and most justly—wide commendation both for its timeliness and power. The Publication Society has done well to give to it in this neat form a wider audience than that which was privileged to hear the discourse when delivered. A number of texts from John's Gospel are quoted so as to present the teaching of the Master on the great theme. But the prime object of the sermon is to discuss the duty of those who receive this eternal life from Jesus to pass it on to others. It is the missionary plea, presented from a very important and often neglected point of view, and presented with thoughtfulness, feeling and power, and in a style both forcible and pleasing. The characteristics of the eternal life are described;

that it is spiritual, ethical, free, and indestructible; then the variety, unity and witnessing power of the various agencies for its dissemination are considered; and finally the call for such dissemination is set forth in the needs of men for this eternal life, their capacity for receiving it, and in the value put upon it by those who possess it. It is a fresh, stimulating and helpful sermon.

E. C. DARGAN.

Literary Illustrations of the Bible.

Edited by James Moffatt, D. D., Ecclesiastes. The Gospel of St. Mark. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. 40 cents each, net.

These little volumes contain what the title sets forth—a number of quotations from great writers, in illustration of texts from the Bible books named. There is of course difference of value and appositeness in the quotations. This sort of thing must be largely a matter of individual taste; but those who like to see how well a good reader can gather and arrange such a series of quotations for preaching and teaching purposes will find help from the series. Any who may find it accordant with their principles and tastes to have this sort of work done—and well done, in the main—ready to their hands may find another and dubious sort of aid in these selections. The little books are beautifully printed and are pleasant to eye and mind.

E. C. DARGAN.

III. MISSIONARY.

Students and the Modern Missionary Crusade.

Addresses delivered before the Fifth International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, Nashville, Tenn., February 28th—March 4, 1906. New York. Student Movement for Foreign Missions. 1906. XVI. 713 pp. Price \$1.50.

This report, for the most part, complete and exact, covers the general meetings and all sectional meetings and constitutes a contribution indispensable to every missionary library that seeks to be.

The remarkable success of this movement is due to a masterful leadership that nowhere becomes more evident

than in the plans and programmes of its conventions—quadrennial, as is well known. The programme reported in the present volume covers a series of subjects in the theory, history, and relationships of Foreign Missions, as well as Comparative Religion, and personal appeals. In sectional meetings the various countries have separate treatment, the various denominations their own presentations, and the schools discuss their relation to the great movement.

W. O. CARVER.

Missions from the Modern View.

□By Robert A. Hume, of Ahmednagar, India, with an introduction by Charles Cuthbert Hall. Published by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, Toronto. 1905. 292 pp.

No sphere of Christian work can remain unaffected by the "modern views," and none should seek or desire to avoid that view. Because of its vital power and its creative Work Missions is the last cause much to feel change induced by *Modernism*. Vital forces ever more affect every situation than are affected by them. The channel and method of operation for a vital force are in their measure influenced and determined by the spirit, ideas and ideals of the time and place. Moreover, it is the aim of missions to redeem what at the moment is ever the modern view and to turn it into the channel of the redemptive Kingdom. Certainly then, missions must need and be adjusted to the modern view. What the nature of that adjustment shall be depends on the conceived aim of missions. Missionary workers are occupied first with the unlimited demands of energetic service and, then, with the assurance that they are working with those eternal principles that are effective for every age. Hence are they slow, as a rule, to recognize the ever-changing "modern views." Too few have been the attempts to view missions modernly. One recalls at once Clarke's *Study of Christian Missions*, Horton's *the Bible a Missionary Book*, Gulick's *Evolution of the Japanese*, and now this of Dr. Hume. Several other volumes with titles suggestive of a treatment of the *modernism of mis-*

sions, again to employ that term, prove not to deal with this phase of the subject. Dr. Hume is conservative and really has few changes to suggest, although he thinks his "modern view" quite other than that of a generation ago. He presents ideas as new that have been common-places of missions for a half century. His work is fresh and interesting enough, and especially as it has the life of personal experience and conviction. There are several aspects of the modern view that are not fully presented and some not touched.

W. O. CARVER.

On the Borders of Pigmy Land.

By Ruth B. Fisher (nee Hurditch). Published by the Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, Toronto. 1905. 215 pages, 32 full page illustrations and picture of the author.

A remarkably bright, informing and fascinating account of the country and people of the Uganda Protectorate, especially the Toro territory in which Mrs. Fisher has spent four or five years of most energetic and effective service as missionary. She is a bright, vivacious writer with an eye for the humorous. The style is graceful though several errors appear in the last three chapters, and the proof-reader occasionally nodded elsewhere.

W. O. CARVER.

IV. CHURCH HISTORY.

A Propos de la Séparation des Eglises et de l'état.

Par Paul Sabatier, Librairie Fischbacher. Paris. 1906. Pp. 1-216. Price 75c. Quatrian edition. Complètement revue et très Augmentée.

It is very difficult for Americans to understand the religious situation in France. Until the appearance of this book by Sabatier, already well known through his "Life of St. Francis of Assisi," we have been compelled to gather our information from passing articles in the press written largely for polemical purposes. Sabatier comes at the question from the point of view of a liberal theologian rather than that of a Protestant. He deals with the "Origines of the Crisis," the "Actual Situation of the

Roman Church in France," the "Consequences of the Denunciation of the Concordat," and then add several appendices giving documents illustrative of the religious condition of contemporary France. A wide knowledge of the current literature of the controversy in France, a vivid and striking style and intense earnestness have combined to make a most interesting book. The story of the causes of the crisis and the view of the religious conditions in France are gloomy reading—a story of ignorance, passion prejudice, obscurantism, servile submission, violence, lawlessness, political chicanery on the part of the church which can scarcely be paralleled. The marvel is that the crisis was so long delayed. The author declares that liberal thought in France is not hostile to Christianity, but to clericalism. He believes the liberal elements in the church will regenerate it, not by bringing it to Protestantism but by liberalizing it, introducing spirituality into its forms and free thought into its theology. He has no hope for the great body of the church, regards it as in the death-throes, but he looks with joyful hope to the liberal wing. He may be a prophet, but it is doubtful if the leopard can change his spots even when fed on the soft diet of liberalism.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Papst Stephan I, und der Ketzertaufstreit.

Von Dr. Johann Ernst, Verlog von Kirchheim & Co., Mainz. 1905. Pp. 1-116. P. M \$3.50.

One of the most interesting and important controversies within the folds of the ancient church was that about heretical baptism at the middle of the third century. Cyprian the great bishop of Carthage, supported by most of the churches in North Africa and Asia Minor, held all baptisms administered among the sects (heretics) invalid, and required rebaptism on entering the Catholic church. Stephen, bishop of Rome, held the opposite view, maintaining that the practice of that church had always been to receive these alien baptisms. The controversy

waxed hot and little reverence was shown to the bishop of Rome. The correspondence gives us the clearest view we have of his relations to the rest of the church at this period. It differs so widely from the position he holds to-day that it has long given the Catholics great trouble. In 1902 Leo Nelke published a vigorous book setting forth the Protestant view of this correspondence. The work before me is by a Catholic and is an answer to Nelke's work. It does not treat the question of heretical baptism as its name indicates, but the position of Stephen as revealed in this controversy. It has ecclesiastical approval and of course supports the claims of the Pope to-day. Neither its arguments nor its conclusions are to be accepted.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The True Story of Robert Browne (1550?-1633.)—
 Father of Congregationalism, including various points hitherto unknown or misunderstood, with some account of the development of his religious views, and an extended and improved list of his writings.

By Champlin Burrage, M. A., Brown University. Research Fellow of Newton Theological Institution. Henry Frowde. London. 1906. Pp. 1-75.

Robert Browne is one of the most interesting figures in Christian history. His life has been the subject of numerous treatises and not a little controversy. The author of this pamphlet has become deeply interested in the subject in recent years and has made valuable additions to our knowledge of Browne's writings and life. These he sums up in the little work before us. It is published "as a supplement to, and corrective of, Dr. Henry Martyn Dexter's account of Robert Browne's life," and "as a companion work to Dr. Dexter's little volume, entitled "The True Story of John Smyth the Se-Baptist." The author does not believe that Browne was a coward or apostate, nor that he lost his mind in his old age. He differs from the current views on several other minor points. The pamphlet contains extended extracts from Browne's works, reproduced in the most exact and scholarly manner. The work is a real contribution to

church history. It must be consulted in order to know all there is to be known about Robert Browne.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Nero.

By Stephen Phillips. New York. MacMillan Company. 1906. Price \$1.25 net. Pages 200.

This is a wondrously graphic tragedy. The poem does not cover all the career of Nero, but closes with the burning of Rome. It gives, however, the development of Nero in strong relief. There is the sure grasp of a master workman in this drama. One doubts if Mr. Phillips has done anything better than this brilliant portrayal of the world's most capricious tyrant. The world was at its nadir in moral conceptions and Nero was its exponent.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

V. SUNDAY SCHOOL.

How to Conduct a Sunday School, or Twenty-eight Years a Superintendent.

By Marion Lawrance. Fleming H. Revell Co. New York, Chicago, Toronto.

This is one of the most practical and helpful books which has been issued from the press for many a day on the Sunday-school. Mr. Marion Lawrance is an expert on the Sunday-school in all departments. The book consists of twenty-two chapters, with three appendices. Some of the topics dealt with in the chapters are as follows: The Sunday-school Equipped, The Sunday-school Organized, The Sunday-school Graded, Sunday-school Giving, Special Occasions, The Blackboard and Object Teaching, Temperance Day, Decision Day. The last chapter is on an intensely practical theme. That Big Boy and How to Deal With Him. Appendix A, is on A Superintendent's Suggestions to Himself; Appendix B, One Hundred Good Books for Sunday-school Workers; C, My Former Pastors: An Appreciation.

Simplicity of style, clearness of view and practicality

are the distinguishing marks of this volume. Mr. Lawrence is one of the warmest-hearted men in the country. He is brimming over with enthusiasm for the Sunday-school, and is a host in himself. This book contains the cream of his experience as a Sunday-school man. He is to-day superintendent of a great and successful Sunday-school, and thus speaks out of the very heart of modern Sunday-school life. Every pastor, every superintendent and every teacher ought to have a copy of this book. I can commend it most heartily.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Making of a Teacher.

By Martin G. Brumbaugh, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Pedagogy in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia. The Sunday School Times Company. 1905.

This is a volume of 351 pp. designed as "a contribution to some phases of the problem of religious education," and well has the distinguished author executed his noble purpose. The very title, modest and practical, rather than pretentious and technical, is a fair indication of the statements of the chapters and of the development of the topics.

The author intentionally avoids many technical expressions usually found in discussions of Educational Psychology. For this he may be slightly criticized in some ultra-scientific quarters, but highly commended by those who are led in natural paths into the fertile fields of a charming study.

The Elements of Psychology which render genuine service to a practical teacher are clearly and attractively discussed and illustrated by an able scholar and efficient teacher. Dr. Brumbaugh is an expert in the science of education and in the art of teaching, and in this volume he gives the essence of his philosophical thought in its application to the teaching process. He has given the public an admirable treatise on the true psychological principles with a general application to the work of any successful teaching and a special application to the teaching of religious truth. It is a timely and practical volume

full of guiding principles and suggestive illustrations easily comprehended by the average Sunday-school teacher, and yet refreshing and illuminating to those who are at home in the more advanced and technical treatises on educational psychology. Though not scholastic, it is scholarly; though not technical, it is fundamental. The reviewer's opinion of the volume is further indicated by the fact that he has selected it as one of the text-books for the classes in Sunday-school Pedagogy in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

BYRON H. DEMENT.

Reform in Sunday School Teaching.

By A. S. Peake, M. A., B. D., Professor of Biblical Exegesis and Dean of the Faculty of Theology in the University of Manchester, Etc James Clark & Co. London. 1906. Pp. 1-128. Price 1s 6d.

The reform on which Prof. Peake insists is that of the lessons, the curriculum. He recognizes the need of trained and efficient teachers, but does not, as does Prof. Brumbaugh, think it useless to attempt to improve the lesson system until we have provided our schools with better teachers. pp. 116ff. He exposes unsparingly and in the main justly the weaknesses of the present system of lessons. It certainly can not be justified on sound principles of teaching, and it is to be feared that it is not giving the children any adequate knowledge of the Bible as a book, of Bible history, or of religion and morals. Some reform along this line must come in the near future; but the question is exceedingly difficult and complex and it can not be said that Prof. Peake is equally as successful in his constructive as in his destructive work. His desire is for a system of lessons graded to suit the capacities of the children, and not simply a graded treatment of the same lesson as at present. Reform will come along this line and we welcome this and all similar discussions as leading toward this end.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Development of the Sunday School.—Official Report of the Eleventh International Sunday School Convention at Toronto, 1905.

1905. W. N. Hartshorn, Fort Hill Press. Boston. 1905.

This volume is a most valuable contribution to Sunday school literature. It has four main divisions. The first is historical, containing accounts of the modern Sunday school movement in its various aspects. There are chapters here on Robert Raikes and the Eighteenth Century, The Nineteenth Century Sunday School, Organized Primary Work, 1870-1905, National and International Conventions, and on many other valuable subjects.

In division two the addresses of the Toronto Convention are printed in full. This section is an astonishingly rich collection of Sunday school literature and will repay careful reading and study. The third division contains reports of the various conferences which were held. In these proceedings numberless practical and pertinent topics are considered and they furnish valuable assistance to the seeker for light on Sunday school work and method. The fourth division contains tables and appendices. From this very inadequate outline of the contents of this volume the reader can form an opinion as to its attractiveness. It should have a wide circulation and careful reading. It will prove exceedingly valuable to all who desire material for addresses, as well as to other students of the Sunday school movement.

E. Y. MULLINS.

A Century of Bibles.

By a Sunday School Teacher. The Griffith and Rowland Press. Philadelphia.

This booklet of 88 pages was written for Sunday school teachers. It contains a mass of valuable information concerning Bible publication and distribution in the last century put in a form that will be specially attractive to Sunday school teachers. It is an inspiring story well told.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Country Sunday School.

By Rev. Hight C. Moore. American Baptist Publication Society.

This is an excellent pamphlet of 27 pages on a very important subject. The author knows the country Sunday school, its limitations and imperfections, but also its excellencies and possibilities. He believes in the country Sunday school and this pamphlet will help others to believe in it and make it useful. W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Moral Education.

By Edward Howard Griggs. B. W. Huebsch. New York. 1904. \$1.50 net.

In noticing this second edition of a well-known work by one of the most thoughtful and high-souled lecturers of America, it may be well to recall the lofty and worthy aim of the author. Recognizing that much of the literature dealing with ethical problems is born of the study rather than of the world, and that it shows a detachment from human life that involves a loss of appreciation of its actual and concrete problems, he was led to adopt a method that would keep close to the process of life itself. Setting out reverently to answer the question, what is the truth, and seeking to find the eternal in the best life of the moment, he hoped to achieve something toward making the process more real, and toward retaining, both in the study and the practical work of moral education, something of the deep interest that ethical problems possess for us in our real experience. He set about, therefore, to make as exhaustive a study as he could of the whole problem of moral education according to this method and from this point of view: its purpose in relation to society and all the means through which that purpose can be attained.

His aim was "sanity not novelty." "In education, as in life, we are led astray by brilliant half-truths." "Wisdom means putting half-truths in their place, viewing each element in widest relation, and, therefore, truest perspective; seeing life, as Matthew Arnold said Sophocles saw it, 'steadily and whole.'" The avowed aim of the

author in this book, then, is just that, to see "steadily and whole" both human life and the process of moral culture that leads to it and makes possible at once the happiest and most helpful living. It is especially intended to guide parents and teachers in their delicate duties, but is an effort, also, at a complete and inclusive view of the problem for all who are interested in moral culture. Whatever the author may lack, he is always sincere, vigorous and suggestive, believes that the great truths of life are simple and universal, is singularly clear in seeing and lucid in stating them, and is always superior to the temptation to be sensational. GEO. B. EAGER.

Religious Education.—Mainly from the Psychological Standpoint,

By Prof. Albert E. Garvie, D.D. The Sunday School Union, 57 and 59 Ludgate Hill, London, E. C., England. Price, one shilling net. Pages 94.

Dr. Garvie has packed into these four lectures (all but one of the British Chautauqua) a vast amount of thought, and thought that is worth while. Some will not agree with all that he says about sin and the conversion of children, but the book is full of suggestions and helpfulness. It is a timely discussion for Great Britain, but most of the questions treated are of a fundamental nature. Dr. Garvie has a keen mind and he writes pungently and clearly. He wisely sees that the minister of the future must know how to teach children and to train teachers of children. He will be interested to know that our Seminary has recently established a chair of Sunday School Pedagogy.

The book will help all who take genuine interest in the religious training of children. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Method in Soul Winning on Home and Foreign Fields.

By Henry C. Mabie, D.D. F. H. Revell Company. New York, Chicago, Toronto. 1906.

The author of this book, the well-known home secretary of the American Baptist Missionary Union, has

peculiar gifts and attainments for writing on the subject of soul winning. Experience as pastor and pastor-evangelist at home, further experience as a soul-winner during an extended tour of foreign missionary fields, and a singularly rich experience in his own spiritual life unite in imparting the needed qualifications for the task.

There are six chapters. The Presuppositions of the soul-winner include the vision of God and the consequent possession of something to impart. This is set forth and illustrated in chapter one. In chapter two The Evangelizing Message is expounded. It is necessary to delimit the evangelizing message. We should not require the sinner to understand and accept an entire body of divinity before accepting Christ. "To evangelize a soul is to make clear to it the evangelical status made possible for it by Christ" (p. 37). The evangelizing message is "the message which announces that on the basis of what Christ has done in his eternal atonement, a new kind of probation, namely, a probation of grace—offering salvation by gift outright on the ground of what Christ has done in His new covenant or will—exist for all, is their new birthright" (p. 40). In chapter three "The Immediate Practical Aim" is discussed, and in chapter four "The Nature of Saving Faith" is very suggestively and forcibly set forth. The author's definitions of faith and his exposition of the idea are of great value. His discussion of "Tact in Personal Approach" in chapter five, and of "Christ's Method of Self-Disclosure" in chapter six will prove most helpful in practical evangelistic effort. Dr. Mabie possesses rare spiritual insight and sympathetic appreciation of the profoundly doctrinal in combination with a practical skill acquired through long experience. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that this volume on soul-winning has already found a large sphere of usefulness. We expect for it an increasingly useful career as the years pass. E. Y. MULLINS.

A Text-Book in the History of Education.

By Paul Monroe. The MacMillan Company. New York. 1905.

This volume, by Prof. Monroe. of Columbia University, has 759 pages, and is a very valuable contribution to its subject. The discussion is comprehensive and clear and as thorough as the nature of the case would allow. A vast amount of ground is covered in a most satisfactory way. Prof. Monroe begins with primitive education, which he describes as non-progressive adjustment. The next chapter is devoted to Oriental education, which conceived of education as recapitulation. Next he discusses Greek education, which was progressive adjustment, and in Chapter IV., Roman education, which was conceived of as practical training. In Chapter V., education as discipline is discussed. Then comes a discussion of humanistic education, and that of the Reformation and counter-Reformation, which involved the religious ideal in education. In Chapter VIII., he discusses realistic education. In Chapter IX., the disciplinary conception of education is set forth, with John Locke as representative. Next, Rousseau's ideal of education is set forth. Chapters XI., XII. and XIII. give a very illuminating and helpful discussion of the three great tendencies in modern education—the psychological, the scientific and the sociological. These three tendencies are the most pronounced in modern education. Under the first, the author outlines the influence of Pestalozzi, Herbart and of Froebel. The psychological tendency in education relates chiefly to method. It conceives of education as the natural development of the mind and follows psychological laws. The three writers mentioned above gave special attention to this aspect of education. The scientific movement in education lays special stress upon the inductive method and upon the study of nature, its facts and phenomena. The sociological tendency in education chiefly puts emphasis upon the institutions of society and the mission of the individual to society. Chapter XIV. gives a conclusion and

summary, and discusses in a telling way the present eclectic tendency in education. Under this head the author shows that the present educational activity aims to secure the harmonious co-operation of the psychological, scientific and sociological tendencies; that is to say, to incorporate into our educational ideals and methods all the good features of all the tendencies of the past. He also makes the point that the highest aim of modern education is the production of character.

As the title indicates, the book is eminently adapted for text-book purposes. The analysis is entirely clear, the arrangement is progressive, the argument is cumulative. There is an excellent index, and the table of contents is sufficiently full to indicate without difficulty the various stages of the discussion in the text itself. The bibliography is full and very valuable. A great deal is done to aid the student in finding the sources and material in the history of education. Of course no reviewer will agree with all the positions maintained by the author of this book, but I do not hesitate to say it is one of the most valuable contributions to the subject in recent years. Every pastor and every teacher in the land should possess a copy.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation.

By George Barker Stevens, Ph. D., D.D., LL.D., Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905.

It is saddening to reflect, on taking up this book, that it is the author's last contribution to theological learning. In June, 1906, his days were numbered and his earthly work ended. It is, consequently, his last as well as first book in the field of dogmatics, which he had been teaching for some years. It may also be said, if in view of the author's earlier work any should be surprised at his latest conclusions, that the reviewer is informed that this work is the result of a fresh and, so far as possible, independent and impartial investigation of its theme.

Of a work with which so many personal considerations

are entwined it would be pleasant to do no more than to call attention to its devout and pure temper, well worthy the theologian, and its sweep and strength of thought and clearness of statement, no less befitting the scholar. Yet as the really extraneous considerations named above might lead some to give it unjustified authority, it belongs to the reviewer in all simplicity and respect to discuss this book simply as a contribution to theological literature.

This book is divided by the author into three sections, "The Biblical Basis of the Doctrine," "The Principal Forms of the Doctrine," and "Constructive Development of the Doctrine," occupying respectively 135, 126 and 275 pages (indexes, pp. 537-546).

Any one familiar with the Biblical work done by Professor Stevens will expect the clearness and strength of exegetical work here displayed, though on several points, there is room for most serious question as to the trustworthiness of his views. That "cleansing" in John's speech is anything other than ceremonial, that "taking away sin" means to bring it about that men should not go on to sin further, that "to give the life," or "to lay it down" could mean something besides dying, and, finally, that the offering of the "blood" does not involve death, these are not unfamiliar propositions, but as yet they have not been demonstrated. Professor Stevens asserted with convincing cogency that the Godward efficacy of the death of Christ is a part of Paul's teaching. But, mainly by the use of the exegetical assumptions stated above, this thought is eliminated from the teaching of Hebrews and John. First Peter is ignored as a mere result and echo of Paul's teaching, and, finally, it is held that the words of Jesus are not sufficiently clear for use as a basis for the "traditional" doctrine. It remains only that Paul's clear and reiterated teachings should be stigmatized as survivals of "his Pharisaic training" and character as truly Jewish and rabbinic, and the field is clear for the author's own constructive work.

Under "The Principal Forms of the Doctrine," Professor Stevens discussed in turn, "The Commercial Theory of Anselm," "The Governmental Theory of Grotius," "Modern Penal Satisfaction Theories," "Modern Ethical Satisfaction or Ethicized Governmental Theories," and "Modern 'Subjective' Theories," showing in his Historical Statement as also in his "Summary and Conclusions" the difficulties which to his mind beset these various theories.

Part III., "Constructive Development of the Doctrine," occupies, as has been noted, more than half of the book. The doctrine set forth and substantiated with all the clearness and force which seems possible is the "moral" or "ethical theory, that "Christ's whole aim was to induce men to desire and accept pardon. . . . His mission was to incite men to faith in the infinite love of God" (p. 534). Every other theory and thought in relation to the saving work of Christ he sets aside, controverting it at greater or less length.

As a statement of this "ethical" view and the arguments for it, a view already considerably prevalent and possibly gaining ground, this work possesses great significance and value. Whatever may be its fate later, it is reasonable to expect that for a generation to come no discussion of Christ's saving work can ignore it. It should also be said, in detail, that the language and expression is almost invariably worthy of the high theme, that the author's statement of the views against which he has argued seems to be fairly justified by his abundant quotations, that his argument is usually clear and seems the strongest presentment of his case likely soon to be made, and that his spiritual tone is lofty and pure.

There is no room in the space of this notice to attempt to justify or to controvert the argument as a whole. A few suggestions may reasonably find place here.

(1) Part III., styled by the author "constructive," deserves no less to be styled "controversial." This the author himself recognized and attempted to justify (p.

529). It may be, as he claimed, that he could fairly and helpfully present his view and as he did present it, as in turn his criticism of some other discussions seems reasonable, but a reader may be pardoned for feeling regret at times that the controversial element so outweighs the constructive.

(2) Among the theories which are set aside, the purely "penal" theories receive much the largest share of attention. The author said "the ultimate choice among theories of the atonement reduces at last to the alternative between the penal satisfaction and the moral theory." They "alone are definite and consistent. * * * The choice should be frankly made between them" (p. 531). Now this opinion may be correct, but to convince his readers Professor Stevens should have not merely asserted it but given conclusive demonstration of it, even if we grant that he has successfully controverted the "penal" theory, many of his readers will find themselves unaffected by his assaults, for they do not feel themselves shut up to these alternatives.

(3) Many readers who are in fullest sympathy with the author's positive assertions, will fail to join in some at least of his denials. For his purposes it was essential to show that we must limit ourselves to a single view of the significance of Christ's work. Granted that Christ aimed "to induce men to desire and accept pardon," as Professor Stevens contended, (a view which some may have too little emphasized, but which none, to my knowledge, have set themselves to controvert), it will seem to many that it is more than possible that it may also have conditioned the activity of God, and that too, in more than one aspect. Why must any one theory of the atonement, even Professor Stevens', be regarded as exhaustive and as excluding other views? Why may not the partial conceptions of many thinkers be mutually complementary?

(4) Indeed, were it not for positive assertions that Christ's aim was merely to win men, Professor Stevens has so put the thought of the satisfaction of God in the

work of Christ, that it might naturally be held that he had held to this as an essential element in his doctrine (see Chapter IX., Part III.)

(5) While certain phases of the doctrine (the "penal") find thorough discussion, certain other phases are insufficiently discussed, if, indeed, in every case clearly recognized. That propitiation makes each loving in heart or gracious in sentiment is more than abundantly controverted, but the really distinct, even though apparently kindred, idea that propitiation is a conditioning of activity, not sentiment, is practically ignored. The notion that propitiation of God can be *ab extra* is dealt with repeatedly, but that it was wrought in Christ by God himself (a Pauline idea, to be sure) is too much neglected. It were indeed to be denied that Professor Stevens had given, as seems demanded in his teaching on this subject, his view as to what the relation of Christ to God really was. He seems inclined to discredit his pre-existent personality at any rate (pp. 297ff, 440). The criticisms of the author on the use of the words "subjective" and "objective" (pp. 258, 259) may be more than justified, but they have been used, and their use in reference to men, that "subjective" refers to effects in the man himself, and "objective" to effects outside his own soul, on his relations, not his character, deserves an attention which it did not receive.

(6). Not only did Professor Stevens intend to be scrupulously fair, but in general his success should be recognized. But he was not accurate whenever he seemed to imply the conception of faith which he strongly urged, not "a passive acquiescence or intellectual assent, a notion, however correct, concerning the essence or policy of God," but "a faith which binds the soul to Christ in sincere preference and aspiration for the life he bids men live" (p. 465), that this conception is not equally consistent with any theory of the atonement. And if the following extract was intended as a description of the work of any worthy antagonists of the author's, he sadly mis-

understood them: "Who that has observed religious movements at all closely has not often heard an account of the process of salvation of which the following would be a fair outline: you must, first of all, believe that Christ has paid your debt to God for you; accepting this for true, you are released from the burden of your guilt and from liability to punishment in the world to come; as an additional assurance of heaven, it will now be your duty to join this or that church, which, by its divinely authenticated organization, or, its correct theological theories or ritual practices offers superior guarantees for your future safety" (p. 495). The reviewer can only protest that he never read or heard of any such preaching.

(7) Finally, it should be noted that this "Doctrine of Salvation" does not rest upon the Scriptures as its basis. To be sure the argument from the supposed silence of Christ is pressed to the extreme, but beyond this, as has been remarked, positive teaching of the Apostle Paul, which he emphasized more than once, which he claimed, as it is fair to infer, to be a revelation from Christ, is unceremoniously set aside as unworthy of credence or respect. We may appeal to the author's own definition of "scriptural" as formulated in reference to "eternal atonement." "The question here is not, of course, whether such a generalization was elaborated during the first age in the form in which modern thought conceives it, but whether we meet in the New Testament the elements of which it is composed. To me it seems clear that the earliest speculative thought is moving in that direction. Take, for example, Paul's idea of the cosmic Christ" (p. 438). Now, by the same token, some thought of atonement other than that set forth in this book is "scriptural." Here as in so many cases the question ultimately resolves itself into the more far-reaching question, what value have the teachings of the Apostles?

Gottes Sohn und Gottes Geist Vortrage zur Christologie und zur Lehre vom Geiste Gottes.

By Von Wilhelm Lütgert. George Böhme. Leipzig. 1905.

This is a series of discourses delivered by Professor Lutgert, of Halle, upon various occasions. They relate to a number of the most important issues now agitating the theological world. A number of them are controversial in character. Some of the subjects are as follows: The Confession of the Divine Sonship of Jesus; The Mission as Proof for the Divinity of Jesus; The Credibility of the Picture of Christ in the Gospels; The Cross of Christ and Our Reconciliation; The Doctrine of Justification by Faith; God's Word and God's Spirit. The Controversy About Baptism.

The views expressed in this volume are for the most part evangelical and wholesome. The author, unlike so many German scholars, does not seem bent upon economizing the Gospel away in the interest of a philosophic theory. He is willing to allow the religious interest to have proper sway in dealing with Christ, the great Leader and Revealer of the True Religion. That Christ is divine is a proposition susceptible of proofs in various ways: "The acknowledgement of the divine sonship of Jesus finds expression in prayer to Jesus. Historically this fact cannot be called in question. The Christian church arose from the circle of men who prayed to Jesus. This constitutes the peculiar character of their piety. But prayer to Jesus is the confession of his deity (Gottheit), for prayer pertains to God alone; every prayer to man is sin. Prayer to Jesus is the simplest, most primitive and at the same time the highest expression of faith in him." (p. 3.)

The series of subjects is not developed in a strictly progressive order, hence there is not the logical and internal unity which would simplify the reviewer's task. Only a glimpse of the argument here and there is possible. In the chapter on God's Son and God's Spirit the author holds that unless the Gospel records are trustworthy as a whole, apart from details and minor questions, we can never know Jesus. The synoptic records agree in the following vital points: All agree as to Christ's raising

the dead; as to his never refusing a prayer for help; in all divine energy works; the death and resurrection of Christ are the chief goal in all. Is the picture authentic which is thus one? The answer is that Jesus is essentially miraculous, and to exclude the miraculous is to destroy the picture. The denial of the supernatural is not a result but a presupposition of modern science and historical criticism. But these, which are presuppositions are dogmas. And all dogmas root themselves in a God-consciousness. This thought the author does not develop. He probably means that a belief in God is the basis of every assumption as to a fixed order of things.

The miraculous element is credible because Jesus is credible. We reject the miracles of the saints of after ages because we do not believe in the saints. Jesus is the proof of his miracles.

The question of the credibility of the Gospels is the question of God. The distinction here is radical. Christ was a product of nature with only natural gifts, or he had supernatural origin and gifts. The Gospels give us not an unnatural but a supernatural Christ.

Thus throughout the volume. The argument is clear, compact and strong. There is no wavering on vital issues as to the Person and Work of Christ. The book is a stimulating discussion of many vital themes.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Witness of Sin.—A Theodicy.

By Rev. Nathan Robinson Wood. Fleming H. Revell Co. New York, Chicago, Toronto.

This little book grapples with the age-long problem, why God permitted sin to enter the world. The author discusses somewhat fully past attempts to explain the origin of sin and points out their failure. He concludes in general that sin is a witness to God, his love and his power. He makes the point that the greatness of any creation is in proportion to the fullness of life which it receives from its creator and its distinctiveness from the

creator. The author illustrates by means of the poets. For example, Byron's poetical characters are all reproductions of some phase of the poet's own character. Byron could not create a character distinct from himself, while the poems of Shakespeare, on the contrary, and of other great poets, are quite distinct from the poets themselves. That is to say, the measure of the greatness of the poet is his ability to create a character totally distinct from and independent of himself. Now, argues the author of this little volume, man who was created in God's image was nevertheless created such that he could assert his independence of God. His capacity, therefore, to choose evil and depart from God is a witness to the greatness and power of God. The question as to the final cause in the creation of man is answered, according to the author, in the redemption provided through Christ, God's greatness and power being witnessed even in the choice of evil on the part of man. God's purpose of love in creating man is fulfilled in the redemption that is in Christ. The style of the book is simple and clear, and indicates that the author has done a great deal of careful thinking on his theme. His book, while it does not fully solve the great question with which it deals, is a suggestive contribution to the problem of evil. The young author should continue to give himself earnestly to theological study, as he gives evidence of much ability in this direction.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Gospel in the Gospels.

By William Porcher Dubose, M.A., S.T.D., Author of "The Soteriology of the New Testament," etc., Professor of Exegesis in the University of the South. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London. 1906. \$1.50 net.

This book has to do with the Gospel only so far as it is contained in our canonical Gospels, or can be legitimately deduced from them. "My true objective point," says the author, "has been the complete construction of the Gospel according to St. Paul, to be treated in a volume to

follow the present one." But that the epistles of Paul are an interpretation only, and not a transformation, nor even an essential modification, is—next to the hope of casting a new ray of light upon the nature of the Gospel itself—the point which he avows he has most at heart to prove in the end. In defiance of what is claimed in high quarters to be the well-nigh acknowledged conclusion of present criticism, and after a careful and critical survey of the field, the author unhesitatingly declares his own firm conviction that the variant conceptions of the Gospel in the New Testament, so far from being different Gospels, are consistent and mutually competitive aspects of the one and only Gospel; that, while there are, even within the limits of our Gospels, actual diverse impressions of what the Gospel is, and that full justice is due to each such impression, the main point to be kept in view is that the very fullest justice to each is the only way of arriving at the truth of all, or at the truth of the whole of which they are the complementary and necessary parts. At the first no less than now it was needful, and now as much as then it is needful that the truth of every variant opinion and the light from every opposite point of view be duly considered. This may indicate the high purpose, as well as the temper and spirit in which the book is written. It is divided into three parts: (1) The Gospel of the Earthly Life, or the Common Humanity of Our Lord; (2) The Gospel of the Work (What our Lord Came to Do and Did), including the Resurrection; and (3) The Gospel of The Person, or the Incarnation. The author believes these to be three aspects or stages of one and the same Gospel and treats them accordingly; and thus adroitly adapts himself to certain aspects or schools of present-day thinking. He furthermore believes that, however honest we may be in the effort to do justice to each set of facts, or distinct aspect of the subject by itself, and to keep them apart and distinct, so predetermined are they, and so determined, to find each its own meaning and fulfillment, not in the separate truth of each, but in

the united and common truth of all, that such effort results, and in proportion as it is thoroughgoing, must ever result, in failure, until it issues in the unity of the common truth. The book abounds in clear and cogent thinking, which, though often abstract, in the main surely, issues in sound conclusions. At points author and reviewer and reader may have to agree to disagree; but we may hope it will be with the blessed result contemplated by the author, that, bringing all our differences together at the last, we may be able to see if they together are not wiser than we, and if they cannot and will not of themselves "find agreement in a unity that is higher and vaster than we."

Christianity in its largest sense, the author concludes, is "the fulfillment of God in the world through the fulfillment of the world in God." This assumes that the world is completed in man, in whom also God is completed in the world. So God, the world and man are at once completed in Christ—who, as He was the *logos* or thought of all in the divine fore-knowledge of the past, so also is He the *telos* or end of all in the predestination of the future. That is to say, the perfect psychical, moral, and spiritual manhood of which Jesus Christ is to us the realization and the expression is the end of God in creation, or in evolution. "I hold that neither science, philosophy, nor religion can come to any higher or other, either conjecture or conclusion, than that." But when we come to the actual terms or elements of God's realization in us and ours in Him, we cannot think or express the process otherwise, the author contends, than in the threefold form of the divine love. "Putting it into scripture phrase we speak as exactly as popularly, in defining the matter of the Gospel to be, the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the fellowship of the Spirit." As our spiritual life is dependent upon each and all of these three constituents, so we can know God only as we know Him in the actual threefold relation of Father, Son, and Spirit. The book will command, require, and repay serious study.

GEO. B. EAGER.

VII. PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

Religion und Religionen.

Von D. Otto Pfeiderer, Professor an der Universität zu Berlin. J. F. Lehmann's Verlag. München. 1906. Pp. 1-249.

The professors in the University of Berlin are accustomed to give a series of public lectures, one a week, each winter semester to the students of all faculties and others who may be interested in the subject treated. They sum up in a popular and easily comprehensible form the professor's views of the essential outlines of the subject. Some of these have been published and have reached a wide public reading, notably Harnack's "What is Christianity?" Dr. Pfeiderer published such a series on the rise of Christianity in 1905 and now gives us a second series, the work before us, on Religion and Religions." All the fifteen lectures were actually delivered except the last on Islam, which was not delivered for lack of time. They have, therefore, the length, style and form of a forty-minute popular lecture. The first three are introductory to the whole. They are: "Das Wesen der Religion," "Religion und Moral" and "Religion und Wissenschaft." The essence of religion consists in a feeling of dependence, reverence and duty; it is the basis of sound morals. In the fourth lecture on "The Beginning of Religion" the author is much more modest than investigators in this field were a few years ago. He asks, p. 53, "What do we know concerning the beginning of religion? To be perfectly accurate, nothing." We can only set up suppositions, but not one of them can be proven. He relies for his theories on the religion of barbarous people and upon certain elements in the religion of cultured people which do not seem to harmonize with the rest of their lives and may therefore be regarded as the remains of their primitive religion. However, he frankly admits that the religion of barbarous people may be a degeneration rather than a case of arrested development, and further admits that there are some evidences that such is the case (p. 54). After these admissions he

proceeds to derive religion from dreams, personification, hallucination, etc., in the usual naturalistic way.

The remaining lectures are devoted to a brief exposition of the peculiarities of the great historical religions in their relations and contrasts. He treats the Chinese, Egyptian and Babylonian religions, "The Religion of Zarathustra and the mithras cult," "Brahmanism and Gautama Buddha," "Buddhism," "The Greek Religion," "The Religion of Israel," "The Religion of Post-exilic Judaism," "Christianity" and "Islam." Want of space prevents even a notice of the contents of these various lectures. Suffice it to say that they were written with fullness of learning and religious earnestness. His views as to the origin of Christianity are already well known as radical and fanciful. He declares the characteristic thing in primitive Christianity was belief in redemption through Christ, a threefold redemption present, past and future; the hope of a future redemption of society as well as the individual in this world, the hope of a blessed beyond for each individual and a present redemption through the various ordinances of the church. Some of the doctrines of primitive Christianity which admittedly contributed most to its success have according to Pfeiderer no value for us because we can no longer believe in them. For example, he finds the origin of Paul's doctrine of the resurrection in the myth of the death and revival of Adonis in the Lebanon mountains with which Paul became acquainted during his first stay at Antioch. Nothing could be more absurd. But amid some wild speculations like this there is much that is highly valuable.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Philosophy of Religion.

By Dr. Harald Höffding, Professor in the University of Copenhagen. Translated from the German edition by B. E. Meyer. The MacMillan Company. New York. 1906. Pp. 1-410. Price \$3.00.

Professor Hoffding is already well known to English and American readers through his "Outlines of Psychology," "History of Modern Philosophy," and "Philo-

sophical Problems." His work is characterized by clear and penetrating thought illuminated by ample learning. He is a bold thinker, seeking to go to the heart of the problems presented and at the same time recognizing the limitations of thought. He recognizes the fact that religion has a permanent, in fact an essential place, in the life of man and he seeks to find the intellectual basis for it. "Religion itself never becomes a problem." He writes neither for the satisfied, whether orthodox or free-thinking, nor for the anxious who are afraid to think, but for those who recognize the value of religion and at the same time regard it as a legitimate object of investigation. "Our task is to elucidate the relation of religion to spiritual life. Religion is itself a mode or form of spiritual life, and it can only be truly estimated when it is viewed in its relation to other forms and modes of spiritual life," (p. 4).

The author treats the subject under three general heads: The Epistemological Philosophy of Religion, The Psychological Philosophy of Religion and The Ethical Philosophy of Religion. Under these general divisions there is gathered a mass of thoughtful discussion that is scarcely equaled in similar works of the same length. The author's thinking is so clear, his style so simple and lucid that one scarcely realizes the difficulty and abstract nature of the subject. The work of translating was well done. Space forbids any extended exposition or critique of the book. Suffice it to say that it is one of the ablest recent books on the subject. W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS.

Greece From the Coming of the Hellenes to A. D. 14.

By E. S. Schuckburgh, D. Litt. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. London. T. Fisher Union. Price \$1.50. Pages 416.

This is a splendid manual of Greek history. The main things are told and well told with the result of modern research. The maps are large and comfortable while the

numerous illustrations light up the whole story. The various parts are fairly well balanced, though one could have wished a little more concerning the literary and artistic life of the people. Still a closing chapter is devoted to this subject. At the bottom of page 205 there is a misprint, 305-303 being a slip for 405-403. But the movement of the Greek people and the Greek spirit are rightly presented. The leading men stand out with clear perspective and relieve the story of internecine war, the weakness of Greece. It is a sad, but an even wonderful story that Dr. Schuckburgh has told again. The book meets the modern requirements and ought to have a large circulation. It belongs to the Story of the Nations Series.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Silver Age of the Greek World.

By J. P. Mahaffy, D.D., D.C.L. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 1906. Price \$3.00 net. Postpaid \$3.17.

To students of ancient life and thought, Professor Mahaffy's scholarly volumes on the history of Greek civilization need no introduction. For this particular period, no modern authority ranks above him in the estimation of scholars. Indeed, in the minds of thousands of readers, the ancient world is a world re-created by this delightful writer—a world with a clear air and a serene sky. The subtle charm of his style will be found to have in no wise diminished in this, his latest book.

The author's purpose is well stated in the following extract from the preface:

“This book is intended to replace my *Greek World under Roman Sway*, now out of print, in a maturer and better form, and with much new material superadded. There has grown up, since its appearance, a wider and more intelligent view of Greek life, and people are not satisfied with knowing the Golden Age only, without caring for what came before and followed after. In this Silver Age of Hellenism many splendid things were produced, and the world was moulded by the teaching which

went out from Greek lands. If this teaching diminished in quality, it certainly increased greatly in influence, and led its higher pupils back to the great masters of the earlier age."

Prof. Mahaffey has made himself perfectly at home in the Graeco-Roman world, that world in which Christianity sprang into being. In no books can the general reader find a better conception of the movements of the time than in those of Prof. Mahaffey. Schuerer has a greater wealth of scholarship over a more limited field, but Mahaffey covers the whole field and gives the spirit of the time with rare skill. This volume now brought up to date is one of his very best.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Memories of Life at Oxford, and Experiences in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Germany, Spain and Elsewhere.

By Frederick Meyrick, Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Blickling. John Murray, Albemarle street, London, England. 1905. Price 12 shilling 6

Mr. Meyrick has made a very entertaining book, especially for one who has personal knowledge of English life. He knows the ins and outs of Oxford, and sketches simply and graphically many great personages connected with the Oxford of his time. He is a strong opponent of the Oxford movement though a loyal churchman. This book is one that will afford real pleasure to the cultivated reader during the hot months. You can stop almost anywhere and go on again at your leisure. The book is chaty without being scrappy. After all, few things are as interesting as delightful people and they move before us in this book in great variety and each time with a touch of life. To one who has "Memories of Oxford" of his own a double charm is added to the pages.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Sir Walter Scott.

By Andrew Lang. Illustrated. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. Pages 216. Price \$1.00

This book belongs to the Literary Lives Series edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. It has the flavor of Scotland and smells of the heather, the rare white heather. Mr. Lang understands Scot and the Scotch. The book has a touch of tenderness about it that is quite appropriate. One who is a lover of Sir Walter (and who is not) can speak of him only with reverence. But there is real criticism here also. For those who have not time for Lockhart this is just the book and many who know Lockhart will revel in the luminous pages of Lang. One effect of the book is to make you wish to take down the Waverley novels again and read them afresh.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Walter Pater.

By A. C. Benson, Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. The MacMillan Co., New York and London. 1906. Price \$1.00.

Mr. Benson writes sympathetically, though with reserve, of this very remarkable man. He cannot be said to be an easy subject, for he is elusive and even shadowy in his personality. The personality of Pater is not very vivid in Mr. Benson's treatment though much of his mystical charm is here. The style of Pater is peculiar though wonderful at its best. He is an artist in the use of words, and deserves a place in the English Men of Letters Series. Perhaps no one else could have discussed Walter Pater better than Mr. Benson unless indeed Dr. F. W. Bussell, of Brasenose College, Oxford, could have done so. Pater was tutor at Brasenose, though a student of Queen's College. In a way he was the most striking figure at Oxford during his prime, though his lectures were above the heads of the students. He will live in his books on artistic and critical subjects.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The New Far East.—An examination into the New Position of Japan and her influence upon the Solution of the Far Eastern Questions, with Special Reference to the Interests of America and the Future of the Chinese Empire.

By Thomas F. Millard. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. XII-319 pages.

Here we get a note of discord in the harmony of current praise for Japan and all things and plans Japanese. Mr. Millard finds himself at variance in mind and spirit with the popular condemnation of Russia and admiration of Japan. He undertakes to account for the general attitude toward Japan as produced by a remarkably profound and shrewdly successful propaganda of the Japanese Government.

He gives the Japanese credit for being able to hoodwink the world, even to the extent of expecting us to believe that a really inferior and superficial people are practicing the deception upon us. England has of course been the ally, confederate and conspirator of Japan in it all.

One wonders whether Russia may not be pushing a propaganda with Mr. Millard in its employ; and whether the author may not also be nursing some grievance against the Japanese. Certain it is that a cool, calculating, material principle lies at the basis of judgment and advice to America throughout the volume.

The spirit of the work is never admirable and often repulsive. At the same time there is a deal of wholesome and timely information and warning here. One can not think of Mr. Millard as a statesman, certainly he is no diplomat; but materials for statesmanship and questions for diplomacy he does give.

The present situation in China, Corea, Japan, Manchuria, Russia is presented with cool calculation and the significance of the situation for Western governments, especially for America, is suggested rather fully. The author does not play the role of prophecy but seeks to present the materials of destiny. And one must think that he is quite correct in his estimate, for China is really for more significant for the future of the Orient than is Japan.

All students of the Eastern situation will be interested in this discussion and will do well to lay aside any pro-Japanese prejudices so far as to give proper considera-

tion to the phases of the question here presented.

W. O. CARVER.

The Negro and the Nation.—A History of American Slavery and Enfranchisement.

By George S. Merriam, New York. Henry Holt & Company. 1906. 340 pages.

That Mr. Merriam has made an extensive study of the Negro, and that he has sought to maintain a spirit of judicial fairness to all parties involved, seems apparent enough. His accuracy and his calmness alike call for admiration though his effort to be calm frequently becomes an index of deep feeling.

Through forty chapters we have traced for us the history of slavery and enfranchisement and of adjustment of the emancipated enfranchised. This history has not been written for the sake of the history but for the sake of applying it to the question of the working out of the relation of white and black races in America. The solution of all the vexing questions as to the Negro in America are easy of solution when one seeks "not to predict what will be, but to see what ought to be, and what we (who?) purpose shall be." "The saving principle is as simple as the multiplication table or the Golden Rule. Each man must do his best, each must be allowed to do his best, and each must be helped to do his best. * * * The situation is less a puzzle for the intellect than a challenge to the will and heart." So indeed it will seem to the theorist, but a rather complicated puzzle it is proving for the intellects of sincere men dealing practically with the problems. When one begins to apply the principle, so admirably stated, to practical working in "industry, education, politics, and social relations," and then asserts that this means equality everywhere, he has assumed an equality in materials that remains undemonstrated.

This important study is frank, courteous, courageous, suggestive. It appeals to Christian principle and sentiment, as the author understands these. W. O. CARVER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Cynics Dictionary, by Harry Thompson. Henry Altemus Co., Philadelphia.

The Cynics Rules of Conduct, by Chester Field. Henry Altemus & Co., Philadelphia.

The Ten Diskers, by Lloyd Osbourne. Henry Altemus & Co., Philadelphia.

The Watermead Affair, by Robert Barr. Henry Altemus & Co., Philadelphia.

What a Young Girl Ought to Know, by Mrs. Mary Wood Allen. Vir Publishing Company, Philadelphia.

Thirty-one Thoughts from an Invalids Bible, by Mrs. Anna Ross. Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia.

The Gospel According to St. Luke, by William Williamson. Methuen & Co., London.