



Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by

No. 3335



THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. VI.

List of Contributors to Volume VI.

- VERNON BARTLET, M.A.
REV. PROF. JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL DAVID BROWN, D.D.
REV. J. G. CARLETON, B.D.
VERY REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
REV. JOHN A. CROSS, M.A.
REV. R. W. DALE, D.D., LL.D.
REV. J. M. DANSON, D.D.
REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. J. LEWELYN DAVIES, M.A.
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D.
RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.
THE LATE REV. PROF. W. G. ELMSLIE, D.D.
RIGHT REV. W. WALSHAM HOW, D.D.
MRS. JOHN MACDONELL.
REV. PROF. J. T. MARSHALL, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. MILLIGAN, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL R. RAINY, D.D.
REV. PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROF. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, M.A.
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. JOHN TAYLOR, D.LIT., M.A.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FOURTH SERIES.

Volume VI.

London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCII.

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

JONAH.

THERE is probably no story in the Old Testament that is more frequently spoken of with mocking incredulity than the story of Jonah and the whale. But I think it likely that of those who make merry with the story, there are very many who have never read the book which contains it; and further, that of those who have read the book, a very small proportion have thought seriously enough about it to discover its wonderful meaning. For the Book of Jonah is one of the most wonderful books of the Old Testament. It is a book which no Jew would ever have written except under the teaching of the Spirit of God.

I.

First: let us consider to what description of literature the book belongs. It is placed among the books of the prophets, but we see at the first glance that it is very unlike Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Micah and the rest of the books of the same class. It is a history, not a prophecy; it is the story of a passage in the life of a prophet, not a collection of the messages which a prophet delivered in God's name to the Jewish people.

It is a history, I say, not a prophecy; but it is not placed among the historical books. Nor is it a poetical book like Job; with the exception of the Psalm in the second chapter it is a prose composition. To what class then does it belong?

Shall we say that it is a fragment of history, but mis-

placed, and that it ought to have been put with the Books of Kings and Chronicles, Nehemiah and Ezra ?

I think not. It does not read like plain history.

I suppose that when we were children and read the *Pilgrim's Progress*, we all thought that somewhere in the world there was a certain City of Destruction, and that Christian with his wife and children lived in a plain house in one of its streets. The Slough of Despond and the Wicket-gate and By-path meadow, and the Interpreter's house—we thought that they were like the ditches and the paths and the gates and the farm-houses that we had seen in our country walks. As we grew older we learnt that the form of the wonderful story was imaginative; but this did not destroy its truth. To many of us Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is far truer to-day, and truer in a deeper sense, than when we imagined that the City of Destruction was like Paris or Hamburg and ought to be found in a map.

I have long thought that this Book of Jonah is a book of the same kind as Bunyan's great allegory, although unlike the *Pilgrim's Progress* there are some historical facts at the root of it. It is an imaginative creation, as the Book of Job, though based, I suppose, upon the misfortunes which really happened to a wealthy man, is an imaginative creation; but the Book of Job is a poem; the Book of Jonah, like the *Pilgrim's Progress*, is prose.

If you asked me why I have come to this conclusion, I should answer: Very much in the same way in which you have come to the conclusion that the *Pilgrim's Progress* is a work of the imagination. When we know what real life is, Bunyan's story does not look to us like a story of real life. And so quite apart from the story of the great fish which swallowed Jonah, and which after three days discharged him alive on the dry land, this book does not look to me like a plain story of events which really happened. I

receive without the shadow of a doubt many miraculous stories as being stories of actual facts, but this book on the whole looks to me unlike a story of actual facts. It is, like the *Pilgrim's Progress* which charmed our childhood, a statement of certain great truths in an imaginative form. So much for the literary character of the book.

II.

But though the book seems to me an imaginative creation, there was really a prophet named Jonah, the son of Amittai, who prophesied in Israel in the reign of Jeroboam. This is what the Book of Kings says of him: "*He [Jeroboam] restored the border of Israel from the entering in of Hamath unto the sea of the Arabah, according to the word of the Lord, the God of Israel, which He spake by the hand of His servant Jonah, the son of Amittai the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher*" (2 Kings xiv. 25).

Jeroboam began to reign 825 B.C., and reigned for forty-one years. As Jonah prophesied that he would recover the territory which Syria had taken from Israel, Jonah could hardly have lived late in the king's reign; so that we may place Jonah about 800 years before Christ. He was the contemporary of Amos and Hosea, and lived long before Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and all the rest of the prophets whose books are collected in the Old Testament. And beyond the brief notice of him in the Book of Kings there is not a word about him in any of the Old Testament books, except that which bears his name.

Now there may have been—I think there was—a tradition that Jonah was charged by God to warn Nineveh of its doom; there may perhaps have been a tradition that Jonah refused to fulfil the charge. I hardly think that a writer with such fine and generous feeling as the

author of this book must have had would have condemned Jonah to perpetual dishonour by making him the hero of the story, unless there had been some foundation for the story in fact. I therefore think it likely that Jonah was really charged by God to warn Nineveh of its doom and refused to do it. How much more of the story was literal fact, I cannot tell. But if the remarkable events recorded in this book had actually happened—if Jonah had been swallowed by the fish and had been miraculously kept alive in the fish's belly and then cast out on to the shore—and if his preaching had produced so immense an effect on the inhabitants of the capital of Assyria—I think that we should have been certain to have found some reference to these extraordinary facts in the writings of the prophets who followed him. But his name is never mentioned in any of them.

The first mention of him is in the book of Tobit, one of the apocryphal books, written perhaps about 350 B.C., perhaps later. But take 350 B.C.—that was 450 years after Jonah's days—and 450 years is a long time. It is about 450 years in round figures since the insurrection of Jack Cade and the beginning of the Wars of the Roses. And what is curious is that while the writer of the Book of Tobit seems to have heard that Jonah was charged to denounce the judgment of God against Nineveh, he says nothing about the repentance of Nineveh. So that even then—350 B.C.—it is probable that this Book of Jonah was not written; it may not have been written till some time afterwards.

I regard the book, then, as an imaginative creation, based on the tradition that Jonah—an old prophet of Israel who lived 450 or 500 years before it was written—was charged to warn Nineveh of coming judgments, and that he refused to do it.

III.

Before passing to the story itself, let us look at the historical framework of it. In Jonah's time, 800 years before Christ, the great empire of Assyria, of which Nineveh was the capital, was gradually extending its power westwards. It had reached Damascus, and broken the strength of the kingdom of Syria. One of the first results of this is narrated in the Book of Kings. Damascus had taken some of the territory of the northern kingdom, the kingdom of Israel; Jonah prophesied that this territory would be recovered; and when Damascus was enfeebled by Assyria, Jeroboam recovered it. Assyria, therefore, seemed for a time to be, under God, the instrument of good for Israel. But any clear-sighted statesman might see that the great empire which had crushed Damascus and Syria would soon reach Samaria and Israel. Even before Jeroboam's death the king of Israel seems to have paid tribute to the Assyrian king; and Hosea, who was a contemporary of Jonah, but a little younger, prophesied that Israel would be carried captive to Assyria. This happened sixty or eighty years later.

That is the historical framework of the story. The writer of it takes as his hero a prophet who lived eighty years before the people of Israel became captives in Assyria. As yet that great empire was only a menace to the Jewish people; but to a wise statesman, and much more to a prophet, it was a serious menace. The dark shadow of the storm was moving westwards. It had reached Damascus—sooner or later it would reach Samaria. Just then a Jewish prophet is commissioned to go to the capital of Assyria and warn it that unless it repents of its sin it will be destroyed.

IV.

Observe, Jonah is not commissioned to console the Jews by prophesying the downfall of Nineveh, as Isaiah pro-

phesied the downfall of many of the surrounding nations. Jonah would not have refused to do *that*. He would have done it with exultation and pride. To predict the ruin of the great heathen kingdoms which threatened or had actually assailed the independence of the Jewish people,—this was the common work of the prophets; such predictions were the solace and support of the Jewish nation in its distresses.

But Jonah is sent to preach to Nineveh itself. The Divine intention is clear. God desires the people of Nineveh to repent of their sin, to forsake it, and so to escape their doom. Jonah, as Dean Stanley puts it in one of his most felicitous phrases, is “the first Apostle to the Gentiles”—the first great missionary to heathen men, warning them to escape from coming wrath. The Jewish race supposed that they and they alone were regarded with pity and compassion by God; but the story of Jonah is so told by the writer of this book as to make it clear that God cares for the heathen as well as for the Jew; that His pity and His grace extend to all mankind; that it is His will that all men should repent, should forsake sin, and should know and obey the living and true God. That is the central idea of the book. Think of the glory of it, the height and the majesty of its conception of God; and yet the book in which this great truth is so nobly illustrated is assailed incessantly with mockery and contempt.

It was a hard commission for Jonah. To have been sent as a prophet to *any* heathen nation would have been hard enough. Why should the heathen be warned to repent of their sin? Why should they not be left to perish in their idolatry? But to be sent to Nineveh, the capital of the empire which was threatening the kingdom of Israel with extinction, which had crushed Israel’s nearest neighbour, Damascus, and was perhaps already receiving tribute from Samaria—to be sent to Nineveh, that Nineveh might

repent and escape the judgments of God, this was intolerable. Let the judgments descend on the haughty heathen city, let the empire of which it was the capital receive a mortal wound—a wound in its very heart, and then Israel will be safe.

In Jonah, as set forth in the story, the Jewish people might see an illustration of their own temper and spirit. The original thought and purpose of God had been that in Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed; but the Jews had regarded the great revelations of God which had come to them, not as a trust for all mankind, but as the constituent elements of their own power and glory; the heathen might be damned if the Jews continued to enjoy the favour of heaven. Jonah determines that he will not go to Nineveh; he will leave his commission to the heathen undischarged. That was precisely what the Jews had been doing throughout their history. In the guilt of the prophet, and in his punishment, the Jewish nation might see its own guilt and its own punishment.

V.

Instead of going to Nineveh Jonah goes down to Joppa, and there he finds a ship—one of the Phœnician vessels, I suppose, which in those days carried on a great part of the Mediterranean trade—bound for Tarshish, a Phœnician settlement on the south coast of Spain. He had received the Divine command to go to Nineveh, which was in the remote east; he attempted to go to the remote west.

A storm rises, and the vessel in which the fugitive prophet is sailing is in great danger. The sailors believe that the storm is sent by some offended god; they pray to their own deities, and still the storm rages; then they rouse the passenger who is sleeping below deck and entreat him to take part in their devotions and to call on his

God. They cast lots, in order to discover the guilty man whose presence has drawn upon the ship the Divine anger, and the lot falls on Jonah. When he is questioned as to his country and his occupation, he declares that he is a Hebrew, that he worships the Creator of the sea and the dry land, but that he has fled from God's presence; and he tells them that if they cast him into the sea the storm will cease. But notice the fine feeling attributed to these heathen sailors. They are unwilling to sacrifice Jonah in order to save themselves. They row hard to get back to land, and when all their labour is defeated, and the storm becomes still more violent, observe their appeal to God—protesting their unwillingness that Jonah should perish. They cry to the God of the Hebrew stranger, "We beseech Thee, O Lord, we beseech Thee let us not perish for this man's life, and lay not upon us innocent blood; for Thou, O Lord, hast done as it pleased Thee." They meant that they only submitted to the Divine will in casting Jonah into the sea, that they did it reluctantly, that God had resolved that Jonah should perish, and that whatever they did or refused to do, Jonah would not be saved; and yet they shrank from being the instruments of his punishment; they felt as if his blood was upon them. What a striking contrast this is with Jonah's impatience and resentment in the latter part of the book because the Divine menace against Nineveh was *not* fulfilled. These heathen men imperilled their own lives to save Jonah from the wrath of his God; Jonah was angry because the wrath of his God did not descend upon a great city which had repented of its sin.

As soon as Jonah was cast into the sea the tempest ceased, and the heathen sailors offer a sacrifice to the true God.

VI.

A great fish receives Jonah, and Jonah remains in the belly of the fish for three days and three nights. While he is there he is represented as offering prayer to God, or rather thanksgivings, which are a selection of passages from the Psalms. The idea of the writer of the book seems to have been that Jonah, while still in the belly of the fish, expressed his confidence in God; since he was still alive, he was sure that he would be delivered.

It is not unreasonable, I think, to suggest that in this part of the story the writer was thinking of those dreary years when Israel and Judah were in exile in Assyria and Babylon. The nation was swallowed up by great heathen powers for its criminal want of fidelity to the trust it had received from God; but during that desperate time it was still surrounded by the Divine protection, and at last was brought back to its own country that it might have another chance of fulfilling its commission. Josephus, when he is telling the story of the Garden of Eden as given in Genesis, says, "Here Moses allegorizes"; and we may say, Here the writer of this book allegorizes.

VII.

When Jonah escapes from the fish, the word of the Lord comes to him a second time, and now he obeys it. He reaches Nineveh and warns it of its coming destruction: "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." This is the message which the Hebrew stranger delivers time after time as he passes through the streets of the great city. It is in this manner that remarkable religious teachers have been accustomed to preach in eastern lands: they have gone into the streets and declared in brief, impressive, startling words the duty, the guilt, or the doom of the city or the nation to which they believed they had been sent by the gods.

The most amazing thing in the book is, not the story of the fish, but the story of the impression which was at once produced by Jonah's warning on men of all ranks in Nineveh, from the king to the humblest of his subjects. The message filled the great city, which had a population of many hundred thousands of people, with fear; they fasted, and they prayed for mercy to the God who had sent His prophet to warn them. Nor were they satisfied with prayer and fasting. In the king's proclamation there are these great words: "Let them turn every one from his evil way and from the violence that is in their hands. Who knoweth whether God will not turn and repent and turn away from His fierce anger that we perish not." And the story goes on to say that God saw their works that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil which He said He would do them, and He did it not.

VIII.

And now the dramatic and religious interest of the wonderful book deepens. Jonah learns that the storm of Divine anger which was gathering over Nineveh is drifting away; the black clouds are disappearing, the clear sky is seen once more. Is he filled with joy and thanksgiving? Does he bless God that the city is saved? Ah, no. "He was angry, and He prayed to the Lord and said, I pray Thee, O Lord, was not this my saying when I was yet in my country? Therefore I hastened to flee unto Tarshish: for I knew that Thou art a gracious God, and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy, and repentest Thee of the evil. Therefore now, O Lord, take, I beseech Thee, my life from me; for it is better for me to die than to live."

How are we to explain this extraordinary outburst of passion?

Something must be attributed to the wounded self-

esteem of the prophet. He had been charged to warn Nineveh that in forty days it would be destroyed; but he knew that neither the promises, nor the threatenings of God were absolute, and that God's threatenings against the wicked might be averted by repentance, and God's promises to the righteous lost by unfaithfulness. He always thought that it was possible that his word—though God had given it to him—would not be actually fulfilled. But might not his self-esteem have been more than gratified by the immense moral impression produced by his preaching? It appears not. And I think we can understand the reason.

Imagine what would have been his position if Nineveh had not repented and if the destruction had come. The greatness and the power of the city were known throughout the east; and if by some awful catastrophe it had perished, the report of the warnings of the Hebrew prophet would have travelled everywhere with the report of the calamity. When Jonah returned to his own country, he would have been received with exultation and reverence as a prophet whose word had been confirmed by the terrible judgments of the Most High. He would have been pointed at as the man who had been the messenger of the Divine wrath against Assyria.

But the report of a moral reformation in Nineveh would not produce a similar impression. The reality of the reformation—for it was only temporary—would be questioned. Jonah's part in producing it, therefore, would win him no glory. The self-esteem of the prophet was wounded.

The book has a special power for preachers. It should lead us to search our hearts to discover whether we care more for our own honour and reputation than for the glory of God and the salvation of men. In Jonah this terrible sin is so exhibited as to create terror and indignation; but the same sin may exist in other and less tragic forms, and wherever it exists it involves a man in awful guilt.

It was not his personal pride alone that was wounded, but his patriotism. Nineveh was the capital of a mighty heathen empire, from which Israel had reason to dread great evil. If—if it had only perished, one great danger which threatened the elect race would have passed away.

And yet it is clear that according to the writer of the book *Jonah* ought to have rejoiced that by its penitence and reformation Nineveh—for the time—escaped destruction. The story is an anticipation of the great words of Christ: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust."

IX.

The story is not yet ended. *Jonah* has learnt that the Divine vengeance—provoked by the sins of Nineveh—is drawing off now that Nineveh has repented, but he will wait and see whether, after all, the doom does not descend. He has finished his preaching. The king and the people who have been so deeply impressed by his warning treat him simply as a messenger from his God: they have heard his message; they have profited by it; but the messenger is a person of no importance; they show him no personal honour; they leave him to himself. And so he goes out to the east of the city where there is some rising ground, and there he sits in the heat to watch the great city which stretches, with the fields and gardens enclosed within its walls, over a great extent of country. He breaks off branches from the trees to make a booth—a summer-house—for himself while he sits there. As soon as the branches are broken off the leaves begin to wither in the burning sun and the heat beats down on the prophet and makes him faint. Then God is represented as causing a gourd—a plant of rapid growth and with large leaves—to

spring up and cover the booth so as to give Jonah an effective shade; and Jonah is exceeding glad because of the gourd.

But the relief soon passes. The next morning a worm begins to feed on the gourd, and it withers; and then came that terrible hot wind from the east, which all travellers in Syria and its neighbourhood remember—a wind like the fierce rush of heat from the mouth of an oven, and Jonah fainted, and entreated that he might die; it was better for him to die than to live.

This is followed by the most subtle touch in the whole story—a touch full of warning to all of us. God said to Jonah, “Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd?” And Jonah said, “I do well to be angry, even unto death.” And the Lord said, “Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night: And should not I have pity on *Nineveh*?”

“*Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd?! I do well to be angry even unto death.*” But was Jonah really angry for the gourd? Was it the gourd that he was pitying? He was willing to believe it; he accepted this interpretation of his anger as soon as it was suggested.

But it was his own physical misery, following his disappointment that Nineveh had not perished, that really made him angry. He was in a most villainous temper, a temper showing the basest selfishness. Yet he was quite ready to attribute it to a beautiful feeling of pity for the gourd! Have you never caught yourself in an act of self-deception like that? Ascribing mere personal resentment, wounded vanity, impatience, pique, envy, to the highest and purest motives? Have you never caught yourself covering an outbreak of temper with the plea that you were zealous for righteousness?—personal ambition with the fair colours of a desire for the glory of God?

Ah, the windings and deceits of the human heart fill

one with fear! "Who can discern his errors? Cleanse Thou me from secret faults."

X.

The book closes with a passage in which irony is blended with a most noble and pathetic representation of God's relation to His creatures. God is represented as saying to Jonah, "*Thou hast had pity on the gourd; the claim shall not be contested; it was an unselfish compassion for the death of an unconscious plant that provoked thine anger. Let it be so; should not I have pity on Nineveh?*"

And notice the contrasts which are suggested between the gourd and Nineveh. The gourd came up in a night and perished in a night. Nineveh was an ancient city, the growth of many centuries. The gourd was only one of millions of similar plants; its growth had been unobserved except by Jonah, and its disappearance would be unobserved. Nineveh was a great city, its destruction would be a vast catastrophe, and would be followed by immense results extending over a large part of the world. "*Thou hast had pity on the gourd . . . Should not I have pity on Nineveh?*"

Still more impressive is another element of the contrast: "*Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured, neither madest it to grow. Should not I have pity on Nineveh?*" suggesting that the great city had been the object of the Divine thought and care—had not grown up of itself or under the friendly protection of the false gods whose images were worshipped in its temples, but under the guidance and defence of the living God, who had revealed Himself to Abraham and his descendants. That was a startling truth to affirm in an ancient Jewish book. It gave a conception of God's relations to the human race of a widely different character from that to which the Jewish people had passionately clung.

The unknown author of this wonderful book teaches his fellow-countrymen that it was not the Jewish commonwealth alone that had been built up by the providence of God, but that a great heathen city like Nineveh and the empire of which it was the capital, had their place and their value in the Divine order of the world. Nineveh was a plant for which God had laboured, and which He had made to grow. He had the kind of care for it which men have for the trees and the plants on which they have spent their thought and their strength, and whose growth they have watched with interest and delight. Having laboured for Nineveh and made it great, God could not let it perish without a feeling of sorrow and a sense of loss. Is not that, I say, a wonderful passage to be found in an ancient Jewish book? Have we ourselves learnt the truth that it reveals? Have we thought of France and Germany and Spain and Russia, yes, and of states like Turkey, as plants for which God has laboured and which God has caused to grow? Have we thought of them as powers for which He has a use, and which He has gradually prepared—by a discipline extending over many centuries—for the service to which they were destined. Have we thought of the famous statesmen and the famous soldiers to whom they have owed their greatness as men who received their genius from God for the express purpose of giving to these nations their strength and their glory? When we have read of the oppressions and crimes of which great States have been guilty, and which have been followed by the wasting away of their life and power, have we thought of the Divine disappointment? When we have read of the calamities which have come upon them, have we remembered that God, who had laboured for them and made them grow, was troubled and pained by their destruction?—that by their destruction He had in a way lost His labour? It seems to me that the book at which

men have been accustomed to mock as the legendary creation of a race delighting in grotesque and impossible wonders contains truths so lofty that we ourselves have as yet hardly grasped them.

XI.

The closing words touch one of the darkest and most perplexing aspects of the order of the world. "*Should not I have pity on Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand?*" There were a hundred and twenty thousand children in Nineveh less than five or six years of age; the grown people might be guilty of great sin, and deserve to suffer heavy punishment, but the children,—they have committed no fault; and yet if Nineveh perishes, they must perish too. It is as if God were thinking with agitation and distress of what necessarily happens when the punishment of great crimes comes upon cities and nations. The innocent suffer with the guilty; it must be so. The whole order of human life rests on the principle that, for good or evil, men share each other's fortunes; and on the whole, the solidarity of human life is favourable both to virtue and happiness. But sometimes the law seems to work cruelly. God Himself, according to this book, does not look upon the calamities which descend upon the innocent unmoved. He will hold back His judgments on national iniquity as long as He can. He will accept, shall I say, any excuse for delay. "*Should not I have pity on Nineveh, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left?*"

"*And also much cattle!*" Yes—God pities the cattle too. He shrinks from inflicting on Nineveh the disasters which would justly punish the crimes of its people, because the cattle, which have not shared the crimes, would share the

suffering. *The tender mercies of God are over all His works.* God Himself is sensible of the confusions of the world. How it is, why it is, that so much apparent injustice is permitted to exist; that so much pain is permitted to come not only upon innocent children, but upon innocent cattle,—upon horses, sheep, oxen,—we cannot tell. Whether there is some divinely appointed compensation for their suffering, we cannot tell. As yet we see only a single act in the great drama of Providence, and we cannot foresee how the tragedy is to close. But to the writer of this book it had become certain that the sufferings of cattle as well as of men touched the Divine heart; and the cattle that were in Nineveh made a mute appeal to God to have pity upon the city that *they* might not suffer the horrors of fire, famine, or siege. There the book closes. God's pity for cattle is the last word of the unknown writer.

I have gone over the story rapidly. There are many passages in the book which almost clamoured for fuller exposition, but I wanted to give a fair impression of it as a whole.

While there is very much besides in it that is profoundly interesting, its supreme interest lies in the fact which Dean Stanley has emphasized in the phrase I have already quoted—Jonah is the first Apostle to the Gentiles. But he was a reluctant apostle. In how striking a contrast he stands to Paul, who exclaimed, "To me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ"! Jonah's fall is a warning to ourselves, who are entrusted, as he was, with a great word from God to heathen men. Jonah shrank from his mission, and declined to discharge it, and there came upon him the terrors of the Divine anger. His punishment is perhaps the symbolical representation of the ruinous storms which broke

upon the Jewish nation because they were unfaithful to their trust, and of their captivity to that heathen empire to whose people they had refused to make known the true and the living God. Over us, too, as Churches, over England as a nation to which God has given unprecedented resources for evangelizing the world, similar judgments may be impending unless, with new energy and zeal, we endeavour at last to discharge our duties to mankind. It may be that the hour is at hand when repentance will be too late; but as yet the supreme opportunity has not passed by; by grasping it, we may both save ourselves and save mankind from destruction.

Birmingham.

R. W. DALE.

THE FIRST MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISH.

LUKE V. 2-11.

THIS miracle, like that of the healing of the nobleman's son, suggests the question whether there is confusion between the narrative and another, namely, that which is found in Matthew iv. 18 and Mark i. 16.

In this case the affirmative answer is given by great commentators and doctors of the Church. But the weight of opinion in its favour is seriously exaggerated when a recent valuable work declares that "the only commentator of note who insists that this is not the case is Alford." St. Augustine, Greswell, Stier with his usual vehemence, apparently Olshausen, and with hesitation Plumptre, must be added to the list.

But the question is not one of authority. We have to ask, What do the narratives assert? and what reason is there for supposing that they give us inadequate or confused reports? Evidently the answer to this latter question turns upon another, namely, how far does it appear that

the utterance recorded in St. Matthew—it is little more than an utterance after all—is incompatible with the subsequent occurrence of the miracle and the words in St. Luke ?

We have already seen how natural it is that similar events should follow one another, if the first leads up to the second, as the healing of the nobleman's child led directly to the petition of the centurion, by inspiring his faith in a distant cure.

It is the same mental connection which explains, what careful readers must have observed to be habitual, the use by our Lord of the same illustrations over again, set in new lights and carried to further developments.

The parable of the talents tells us that zealous labour will have its full reward even if opportunity is brief ; but when it is retold as that of the pounds we learn that when opportunity is equal, the reward will be proportionate to the depth and efficiency of zeal.

The feast which is forfeited by neglect becomes a royal and official entertainment, the neglect of which is treason and entails destruction.

It is a strong evidence for the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, and one which has been too little considered, that we can trace this characteristic process of the mind of Jesus, the setting of familiar illustrations in a new light, acting and reacting between it and the synoptics. In the very first parable, His work resembles the sowing of grain. And when Greek self-culture is attracted to the Lord of all self-sacrifice, His thought is of the corn of wheat which must die or else remain barren. The discourse about the Bread of Life leads naturally to the symbolism of the Eucharist. The shepherd who carries home the lost sheep in St. Luke, is the good shepherd who giveth his life for the sheep in St. John.

Plainly we are studying the words and actions of a

Teacher the most original who ever lived, but whose originality was too simple and spontaneous to shrink from using the same thought a second time.

We observe in the next place that the capture of fish was among these familiar symbols, since it is employed as such in the parable of the draw-net, and in removing the fears of Peter after this miracle. With its spiritual import thus avowed, He repeated the sign after His resurrection, as a final object-lesson to those who must henceforth cast their nets into the waters of our mortal life, while He is undiscerned upon the shore. It is therefore undeniably a phrase in that symbolic language which He loved so well, and which made His teaching so marvellously concrete and vivid. And we may therefore expect it to recur.

Once more, we must consider that His choice of the apostles was not an abrupt summons, miraculously effective, though addressed to persons unknown before. The Twelve were summoned to a closer fellowship and more active service from among the great multitudes whom He had attracted. And in particular, His intimacy with Peter and Andrew began when, the Baptist having pointed out the Lamb of God, Andrew announced to his brother that they had found the Christ. Now, on any supposition, one event was interposed between the first interview and the final call. Jesus had certainly said, "I will make you to become (hereafter) fishers of men." Is it wonderful that He should also tell them when this work was to begin?—that having in remembrance the promise that they should one day become fishers, He should presently add, That time has now arrived; from henceforth ye shall catch men?

"Can any one suppose," asks Godet, "that Jesus twice addressed the same persons in the same terms, 'I will

make you fishers of men' ; and that they should have twice left all in order to follow Him?" This indeed cannot be supposed, but then it is not the supposition: what is asserted is much the contrary. The promise ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων is a very natural precursor for the announcement ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν, the advance to which is as distinct as that from betrothal to wedlock. The statement that on a given occasion they left the nets and their father, approaches somewhat nearer to collision with the statement that they subsequently left all. But where are we to suppose them to have been, in the intervals of their absence from Jesus, while as yet they had no independent activity?

It is certain besides that Peter, after leaving the nets and his father, retained his house, for in it Jesus healed the mother of his wife.¹ How then can we fancy it impossible for him, at any later period, to leave all and follow Jesus? Even after the resurrection, when unoccupied in spiritual duties, he thought it no shame to go a fishing. And there is no more genuine contradiction between these accounts of progress in severance from his old calling, than between the assertions that the nobleman believed when Jesus said, Thy son liveth, and that he believed when his servants told him their good news on the next day.

In fact, the difficulty of dividing the narratives is greatest at a hasty glance. But the difficulties in the way of their identification increase in proportion to the closeness of our scrutiny. In Matthew, Jesus finds the brothers, not when He is preaching, but when walking on the shore. They are already casting a net, instead of expressing surprise when bidden to do so. And their partners, instead of coming up

¹ So even Edersheim arranges the events, quite oblivious that he had already written, "the call . . . necessitated the abandonment . . . of all earthly ties," before bidding us "follow the Saviour . . . to Peter's wedded home."—*Life*, i. pp. 474, 485.

to fill their boats also to the sinking point with fish, are espied by Jesus as He goes on from thence sitting in their ship and mending their nets. This latter statement reduces to desperation the most ingenious efforts to amalgamate the accounts, and it is simply ignored in such an account as this: "The Lord said unto him, 'Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men,' and to the others *who were beside him* (the Greek of this is *προβὰς ἐκείθεν εἶδεν*), 'Follow Me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.'"

Nor does the chronology favour such a consolidation. The call in the first two Gospels is very early, and distinctly before the healing of the Peter's wife's mother, which however is prior to the call in Luke, where the whole connection is different, and where the quiet walk is replaced by the pressure of a crowd, from which He takes refuge on board Peter's vessel.

It is illegitimate indeed to lay stress on the different word by which St. Luke designates their nets (*τὰ δίκτυα* instead of *ἀμφίβληστρον*), for St. Matthew presently calls the nets, when they left them, *δίκτυα*; and in any case they are sufficiently identified as being the implements of the same fishers. But it is different with the remarkable phrase which Jesus employed (if we suppose that it is either His word or adequately renders it), "from henceforth thou shalt catch men" (*ἀνθρώπους ἐση σωγρῶν*), an expression which only occurs once more, in palpable reference to this promise, when St. Paul speaks of men whom Satan had entrapped, now taken alive by the servant of God (*ἐξωγρημένοι*, 2 Tim. ii. 26). In St. Matthew, the word is simply "fishers of men."

Thus the narratives are different; the occasions different; the reproduction of an expression already employed is quite in the manner of Jesus; and there is just such an advance when it reappears, such added stringency of meaning, as to prevent the reiteration from being tame. And if we reflect

that on the second occasion there is not only the phrase but also the embodiment of it in a symbolic action, we have just such a transition as from the discourse about living Bread to the institution of the Eucharistic feast.

On these grounds therefore, without the slightest desire to force the narratives, but protesting against an uncalled for identification because it forces them, we regard the incident recorded in the earlier Gospels as a preparation for the later and miraculous event recorded by St. Luke.

First, from St. John, we learn how the brothers were attracted to Jesus as disciples. Secondly, from St. Matthew and St. Mark, we learn that the hope of winning others, of being called, sooner or later, to this as a life-work, was inspired in them. Such is the manner of the Divine working, patient and gradual as the development of seed, and making of each lesson, well learned, the starting-point for a further advance. Thirdly, we have now to learn by what events, in what temper and frame of mind, they were led to the decisive hour.

It was after a night of failure. Their discouragement is evident in the words "we have toiled the whole night, and have taken nothing." Human nature is the same everywhere, and in the disquiet and disappointment of the baffling of earthly hopes, we are prepared for higher things. Nor is this to our discredit. It is not merely that men take refuge in religion because they must take refuge somewhere: rather it is because the heart, disillusioned, saddened by the meanness and poverty of secular things, recognises that life is not only partially a defeat but always, in itself, a dissatisfaction. The melancholy of a lost effort makes us conscious of the latent melancholy which clung even to our successes, and prepares us to believe that the secret of life must be outside and above it. Some meaning

we feel that it has, since all the universe has its design; and yet events mock our folly in supposing that life is justified by itself. We are then ready to admit the claim of the supernatural to interpret all.

Is it too fanciful to connect such feelings with the fishermen of Galilee? They were men chosen to turn the course of history and elevate the soul of humanity. They were full of large Messianic hope and aspiration; and Jesus drew them to follow Him by the hope of a larger destiny, the fishing for men.

The promise of their vocation came just when they had rendered a small service. Men are ambitious of great things, and would gladly follow any chieftain who could secure to them a high position. But Christ chooses His captains among the lowly. He that would be greatest in the kingdom must be the least and the servant of all. And Jesus asks that a fishing boat may be thrust out from shore to serve Him for a platform, before bestowing His commission. His courtesy is noteworthy. He neither claims nor commands the service, but simply prays it, of men who little dream what consequences for themselves are waiting upon their answer. Who does not know that great things are constantly involved in what seems pettiest? A random word to an acquaintance, a small service rendered, or a trifling inconsistency committed when one is disappointed like these fishermen, but, unlike them, rendered irritable by disappointment—these things make destinies and mar them.

But where Jesus is received He will not long abstain from ruling. He who "prayed them" to accommodate Him with a platform whence to teach, presently gives them directions, absolute and unconditioned, with regard to their own trade. It is thus that whenever men come unto Him, attracted by the gentle words, "I will give you rest," He

says to them, "Take My yoke upon you." And the question, What will we do for Jesus? always, in loving hearts, leads up to the necessity of self-surrender.

They are taught, moreover, to think of Him as the Governor of the world and its affairs. Where lately He prayed to be received, He soon assumes the command even of what is secular and earthly. In this also He is concerned. He may teach His disciples to leave all for His sake, yet He does not despise their poorest interests; He is the first philosopher who ever said, "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." His command is that they should launch out into the deep and let down again, in broad daylight, the nets which had enclosed nothing in the dark. And Peter's answer expresses at once how poor is the prospect of success, and how ready his own obedience. Whereupon they enclosed such a draught that the nets were breaking, and would have broken had they been strained, just as the boats would have sunk if loaded further. And they silently beckoned to their partners, overawed, unable to raise the glad shout with which successful fishers invoke aid.

As for Peter, it is the spiritual side of the marvel which impresses him: he no more asked than we can tell whether the marvel was one of power to discern or to direct the silent creatures of the deep; but he well knew it to be supernatural. Moreover, he felt in it the supernatural pressing him close home. What had happened might not be more marvellous than the miracle of Cana or the healing of the nobleman's son, but it reached the very centre of his daily life, it "beset him behind and before." And this realized nearness of the Divine has been dreadful to flesh and blood ever since Adam and his wife hid themselves among the trees. The coming of God into our familiar life wakens us up to realize how unworthy, how

stained that life is. Therefore one says, We shall surely die because we have seen the Lord; and another, Now mine eye seeth Thee, therefore I abhor myself; and yet another, Woe is me, for I am undone, for I am a man of unclean lips . . . for mine eyes have seen the King.

And therefore he, who afterwards so nobly refused to depart from Christ, saying, Lord to whom should we go? cried out to Christ to depart from him. His unworthiness was too great. He could not brook that awful presence. His very language betrays his reverence. Christ, who was Master when he let down the nets, is now Lord [*Ἐπιστάτα*, v. 5; *Κύριε*, v. 8], and if one suspects the dawn of a supreme consciousness in this latter somewhat ambiguous word, the suspicion is not lightened when we observe that he states his own unworthiness not only as a sinner but as a man (*ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, Κύριε*). It is only a suspicion, however, and the same phrase, but with somewhat less emphasis, occurs afterwards, where no such significance can belong to it, when they murmured because He went in to eat with a man that is a sinner (*ἁμαρτωλῶ ἄνδρὶ*, xix. 7).

But this self-condemnation is a grace, and the best of all preparation for dealing with other hearts, when it throws a man at the feet of Jesus, to confess his anguish there. Never, even at the express bidding of words which utter the alarm of a soul, but conceal its longing, never will Jesus forsake any who has not first forsaken Him. To Peter He does not even speak of pardon, but of high vocation, and his humiliation marks the attainment of his vocation. It is from henceforth that he shall capture men.

G. A. CHADWICK.

*THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.*

VI. OTHER TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

IN two earlier papers I have endeavoured to expound the teaching of St. Paul about the Death of Christ as set forth in the Epistle to the Romans. And we found it to be a logical development of one central idea, viz. that God gave up His Son to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of sinners. This result we shall now compare with the teaching of the other Epistles of the great Apostle.

Already I have referred to Galatians i. 4, "who gave Himself for our sins"; to chapter ii. 19-21, "through law I died to law, that I may live for God. With Christ I am crucified. . . . If through law cometh righteousness, then Christ died in vain"; and to chapter iii. 13, 14, "Christ bought us off from the curse of the Law, having on our behalf become a curse, (because it is written, 'Cursed is everyone that hangeth upon wood,') in order that to the Gentiles may come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus in order that we may obtain the promise of the Spirit through faith."

This last passage asserts plainly that Christ died in our stead. For we are told that He rescued us from the curse of the Law by placing Himself under a curse pronounced in the Book of the Law; and that He did this in order that in Christ by faith we may obtain the blessing promised of old to Abraham and to his seed. In other words St. Paul teaches that had not Christ died we should have remained under the curse pronounced by the Law against all who break its commands.

In Galatians vi. 12 we read of some who sought to make

proselytes to Judaism only in order that they might not be persecuted for the cross of Christ. This casual expression reveals the large place of the death of Christ upon the cross in the teaching of the Apostolic Churches. Still more remarkable is the joyous outburst in verse 14, "far be it from me to exult except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which to me the world is crucified, and I to the world." We here see a man who is unmoved by all the objects which arouse in others confidence and joy. Yet the heart of the patriot who is almost willing himself to tremble under the curse of God in order to save his nation is kindled into a glow of emotion by a symbol of his nation's degradation, (for the cross was a Roman punishment,) by the cross on which his beloved Master died a painful and shameful death.

The explanation of this strange exultation is even more wonderful than the exultation itself. St. Paul glories in the cross of Christ because on that cross the world has been crucified to him and himself to the world. These strange words assert most emphatically that through the violent death of Christ St. Paul had been rescued from degrading bondage to the men and things around.

Somewhat similar is Romans vi. 3-6: "so many of us as were baptized for Christ Jesus were baptized for His death? we were buried with Him by the baptism for death, in order that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so also we may walk in newness of life. For, if we have become united in growth with the likeness of His death, we shall be also in that of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him in order that . . . we should no longer serve sin." Also Colossians ii. 20: "if ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world." This remarkable phraseology, which is peculiar to St. Paul, proves how completely the death of Christ upon the cross

had moulded his entire thought about the way of salvation.

In 1 Corinthians i. 17, 18 we read that Christ sent Paul "to preach the Gospel, not in wisdom of word, lest the cross of Christ become an empty thing." He then speaks of the Gospel as "the word of the cross." So verse 23, "we preach Christ crucified"; and chapter ii. 2, "I determined not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified." These passages prove that the death of Christ was an essential and conspicuous element of the salvation announced by Him.

In 1 Corinthians v. 7 we read that "Christ our passover has been sacrificed"; in close harmony with John i. 29. In 1 Corinthians vi. 20, vii. 23 we have a cognate, but simpler, form of the word used in Galatians iii. 13: "ye were bought with a price." Very similar to Romans xiv. 15 is 1 Corinthians viii. 11: "the brother because of whom Christ died."

Specially significant is 1 Corinthians x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a partnership of the blood of Christ?" Such partnership in His blood might justly be laid at the doors of those who joined together to slay Him. The words before us describe evidently a partnership in the benefits resulting from His death. They thus point to the death of Christ as a means of great blessing. The same is true of chapter xi. 25, "this cup is the New Covenant in My blood," words already expounded on page 8 of my first paper. In chapter xv. 3 St. Paul begins a summary of his personal teaching at Corinth by the assertion that "Christ died for our sins." The preposition *ὑπέρ* suggests the benefit derived from deliverance from sin.

The references in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians to the death of Christ as the means of our salvation are not so numerous as in the Epistles already referred to; but two

of them are very important. In 2 Corinthians v. 15 we read: "The love of Christ constraineth us, having judged this, that one died for all, therefore all died; and on behalf of all He died in order that they who live may live no longer for themselves, but for Him who on their behalf died and rose." Here we have Christ represented as dying, not by accident or merely as a martyr, but with a deliberate purpose, viz. to rescue men from their own selfishness and to inspire them with a new life of loyalty to Himself. This implies that the death of Christ had a definite moral aim and was an essential part of the purpose of salvation.

The same is implied in 2 Corinthians v. 21: "Him who knew no sin, on our behalf He made to be sin, in order that we may become righteousness of God in Him." By giving Him up to suffer death, which is the threatened penalty of sin, God made Christ to be in some sense an impersonation and manifestation of sin. And, if so, He died in our stead. The Sinless became a personal manifestation of the deadly nature of sin, in order that sinners may become righteous. That these words are added as a sort of comment on St. Paul's embassy of reconciliation, suggests or implies, in complete harmony with Romans v. 10, Ephesians ii. 16, Colossians i. 20, that the death of Christ was the basis of this reconciliation.

In the earliest group of St. Paul's Epistles we have no express mention of the death of Christ as the means of salvation. Nor have we definite teaching on the same subject in the beautiful Epistle to the Philippians. But in the picture of the humiliation of Christ given in Philippians ii. 8 we read that He was "obedient even to death, to death upon a cross." The significance of the death of Christ is also attested in chapter iii. 10: "to know Him and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death."

In my last paper we noticed the conspicuous place of the death of Christ upon the cross as the means of our reconciliation in Colossians i. 20, 22: "having made peace through the blood of His cross . . . you hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death." Somewhat startling are St. Paul's words in verse 24: "I rejoice in these sufferings on your behalf, and I fill up the deficiencies of these afflictions of Christ in my flesh on behalf of His body, which is the Church." He probably means that, when Christ breathed His last upon the cross, all the sufferings needful for the establishment of the kingdom of God had not yet been endured. For the full accomplishment of God's purposes, it was needful, not only that Christ should die for the sins of the world, but that the Gospel should be preached to all nations. This involved, owing to the wickedness of men, hardship and sometimes death to the preachers. This hardship St. Paul willingly endured to save others. Consequently, just as the life on earth of the servants of Christ is in some sense an extension of His incarnation, (for in them He lives, Gal. ii. 20,) so the sufferings of St. Paul were in a similar sense a continuation and completion of the sufferings of Christ. But this by no means implies that St. Paul's sufferings were in any sense propitiatory or that Christ's sufferings were not so. For the one point in common here mentioned and made conspicuous by repetition is suffering on behalf of another. Propitiation for sin is here entirely out of view.

The death of Christ as the means of salvation is prominent in Ephesians ii. 13: "but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who formerly were far off have become near in the blood of Christ." This prominence is increased by the words following in verse 16: "that He might reconcile both in one body to God through the cross, having slain the enmity in it." Reference has already been made to Ephe-

sians v. 25, 26: "Christ loved the Church and gave up Himself on her behalf, that He may sanctify her."

In close agreement with Matthew xx. 28, "to give His life a ransom instead of many," we read in 1 Timothy ii. 5, "who gave Himself a ransom on behalf of all," and in Titus ii. 14, "who gave Himself on our behalf that He may ransom us from all lawlessness." In these passages we are again taught that Christ died, not by sad misfortune, but with a deliberate purpose and with a definite aim.

Such in scanty outline is the teaching of St. Paul about the death of Christ. It is in harmony with, and includes whatever else the New Testament teaches on the same subject. At the same time it contains forms of expression and definite and important elements of teaching unknown, except in the Epistle to the Hebrews which we have not yet considered and which emanates from the school of St. Paul, to the other writers of the New Testament. And these new elements of teaching mark a definite advance in the doctrine of the Atonement.

St. Paul, and he only, teaches that the need for the death of Christ as the means of man's salvation from sin lay in the Justice and the Law of God. This he asserts in the great passage in which, as a part of his exposition of the Gospel of Christ, he describes the purpose of the death of Christ: "that He may be Himself just and a justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." It is asserted or assumed in several other passages which describe men as delivered by means of His death from the claims of the Law. And it underlies the teaching, peculiar to St. Paul, that through the death of Christ men are reconciled to God.

This legal aspect of the doctrine of the Atonement is in close agreement with St. Paul's mode of presenting other doctrines of the Gospel. He alone (except a casual word in Luke xviii. 14) uses the legal term *justify* to describe the pardon of sin, and the legal term *adoption* to describe a

sinner's entrance into the family of God. Manifestly we owe to the mental disposition of the great Apostle, and to his training at the feet of one who is described as an "honoured teacher of the Law,"¹ the important element of doctrine now before us.

Already we have seen that this element of doctrine explains all else that St. Paul says about the death of Christ; and all else that we find in the New Testament. For if to pardon sin be inconsistent, apart from the death of Christ, with the justice of God, then was the death of Christ absolutely needful for salvation. And if so, it may be described as the redemption-price of man's salvation, as a propitiation for his sin, and a means of reconciliation to God. We understand also, in some measure, the necessity which lay upon Christ to go up to Jerusalem and put Himself in the hands of His enemies, and the many passages which assert that He died by His own deliberate purpose. Thus in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the specific element now before us we reach the fullest teaching of the New Testament about the relation of the death of Christ to the salvation of men.

It must however be admitted that even this fullest teaching of St. Paul does not answer all our questions and remove all our difficulties. We ask, Why could not the mercy of God forego the claims of justice? And with still greater perplexity we ask, How did the death of an innocent victim harmonize with the claims of justice the pardon of the guilty? Such substitution seems to contradict the very essence of law, which is to protect the innocent and to punish only the guilty. It would not be tolerated in human administration. In other words, we ask, How can the teaching of St. Paul, involving as it does the teaching of the entire New Testament, be harmonized with those conceptions of justice which are interwoven in the moral sense

¹ Acts v. 34.

of men? This difficult question will, in a later paper, demand further attention.

In my next paper we shall consider the abundant and important teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

CARDINAL NEWMAN.

II.

ALL this reveals the weak place in Newman's mind. He eagerly acted on what he took to be the moral signalling of God,—the beckoning of His finger—and counted on finding the facts conform to his anticipation. But when facts are accessible to patient study, we shall not be allowed to succeed in this method of settling them beforehand.

And yet, all through we must own in Newman a real intellectual continuity and consistency. He had undertaken to carry through a principle about the source of Christian knowledge, and about the administration of salvation. It seemed to him to be the only valid and the only safe principle, and he thought and hoped it was the principle legitimately dominant in the Church of England. He set out to make that good. But the truth was, that on these subjects two heterogeneous principles—not one only—are represented throughout the literature and in the precedents of the English Church; and many of her sons have thought it wisest to disclaim absolutely neither way of it, but to contend on both grounds against Rome on the one hand, against Puritanism and dissent on the other. The Bible accepted in the Protestant way, and tradition operating in what we may call the non-Protestant way, were worked alternately. Usually, care was taken not to drive conclusions from either side, so as to bring about fatal collisions. On either ground a great deal could be said in favour of forms of doctrine agreeing well enough with the

position and tendencies of the English Church. On either ground a great deal could be said, truly or plausibly, against Rome and against the dissenters. If either principle, fully carried out, should demand things which the Church of England had not, or condemn things which she had, why no Church is perfect : and it was easy to teach both Papists and Puritans that they lived in glass houses and should not throw stones. Moreover, in most of these cases, if you could not stand very well on the one leg, you were all the firmer on the other. But Newman and his friends had faith in principles; they wanted one principle, broad, simple, and distinctive, that would represent the Divine revealing process, and that would sustain and inspire a cause. It is not only intellectual scorn, but intellectual conscience, that spoke in Newman when he denounced men who balanced one admission against another without putting forward a clear principle,—who hold that Scripture is the only rule and yet the Church is to be deferred to—that bishops are a Divine ordinance, yet those who have them not are in the same religious condition as those who have—“the safe men to guide the Church through the channel of no meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of Aye and No.” And that was all well for himself if he was so persuaded; but if one insists on carrying abstract principles so faithfully through the life of the Church, it must at least not be attempted in Churches which by the circumstances of their origin have become the embodiment of a practical compromise. A man like Newman had, in the end, to leave the Church of England and go elsewhere.

I have found it difficult to dismiss as rapidly as I should have desired, matters which after all bear merely on domestic concerns of the Church of England. A question of far more Catholic interest and more worthy is raised by the great decision of Newman's life. Did he rightly

discern the conditions of faith? did he truly see the problem for a believing man? For Newman there was in the end one refuge only—Rome. He thought so. And it seemed to him that his experience ought to weigh with other minds. How far then does Newman's case throw reliable light upon the great problem? We are here in the presence of another question, *viz.* whether Newman was a man of an essentially sceptical nature, who threw himself on the infallible Church in order to lay spectres of doubt which otherwise he could not lay. It is this (it is said) that appears when he maintains that a perfectly consistent mind must embrace either Atheism or Catholicism. "I am a Catholic," he said, "by virtue of my believing in a God." And sometimes he prosecuted that argument in a way which, I believe, did great harm, and drove into Agnosticism men whom he desired to send quite another way. Hence Mr. Huxley has said that if he were going to compile a Primer of Infidelity, he would save himself trouble by making a selection from Newman's works. All this brings us back to the point: How are we to understand the manner in which Newman's mind reacted in the presence of the Christian religion, and how are we to appreciate the method in which he worked his conclusions out.

It does seem to me very clear that, especially from the time when religion became a serious interest with him, at the age of fifteen, Christian religion commended itself to Newman as wholly worthy to be received. Christian religion rose before him as that which had and which alone had the right to hold him. From the time when he so vividly realized the thought of "two, and two only, supremely and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator," the religion of redemption, as well as the records that embody it, received his entire assent and never lost it. It held him in all its main features for years before his "Church" period set in. And his subtle under-

standing was quite as likely to employ itself in overcoming any difficulties that might appear, as in sustaining them. So far, I should say that Newman was eminently believing—predisposed, by all his ways of conceiving the world and its Maker, to make room in his thoughts for the Christian teaching.

But then, on the other hand, Newman's mind was not one which easily came to rest with reference to debates which any way concerned the details of *this world*, its history, or its laws. The higher—the moral and spiritual world—disclosed to him great certainties, betokening a whole order of like steadfast certainties in that quarter. But of what may be called the material concrete certainties of the lower sphere he had a slight hold. This world might be all a dream, or it might be an allegorical fringe to the spiritual world. His singularity, or originality, involved among other things this, that in the lower region he lay open to endless possibilities, to which ordinary men would refuse a hearing. The probabilities which rose into his view in the moral world, were great, permanent, decisive; but in the lower region they were slight and debatable, subject to easy subversion. Newman had quite extraordinary power of putting a case, of marshalling materials so as to impress his jury. That is a quality that sometimes carries with it a difficulty for the man himself in coming to rest. The man who can put a case so well, feels how forcibly *any* case can be put. He does not like to rest his great interests in that region or on that foundation, for the ground moves under his own foot.

Well. Let it be considered that every believer, even if Christianity has struck him as a most credible whole of supersensible good, must come to the question of the standard of believing. For the question arises, how much to believe, within what limits to believe, how far to graduate belief, how to place oneself in the position

divinely intended so as to continue to perform duly, and also safely, the *duty* of believing. Whether the oracle is to be conscience, or Bible, or Church, or any combination of these or other elements, still the question rises about the standard.

The standard for Newman in the early days of his religious life was the Bible, into which was thrown no doubt the influence of the Church, that is, of the believing life of the Church of England as he then felt it. But by and by he passed, of course, into the region in which opinions and faiths are challenged—an experience which we may connect with his entrance on college life. He had to become more familiar with the debates which have gathered about the great truths—Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, Judgment,—truths which he has declared were all along of the essence of Christianity as he received it. He had to encounter also the debates that have gathered round the Bible itself. He was quite likely to look at these questions keenly. And there is no reason to suppose that his strong and subtle intellect, in the service of his faith, would find difficulty in arguing them out on his own side. But one can conceive the distaste with which he would find himself, however successfully, working out a case for Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, on the detailed material of texts and arguments, giving and taking, and, as it were, bargaining for his life on that field—the field of debate, where evidence is gathered by items. The like distaste would attend the process of debating and bargaining for his Bible, the Bible which he loved, on the field of history and of criticism. It is not that he would find any serious difficulty in building his argument. But then, what is the worth of any such argument? It is invaluable for repelling objections, if they are brought, and meeting difficulties if they are suggested; you can always put your adversary to the worse; but will that ground the kind of

faith one needs? For as to texts, does not that run you down to questions of words, and is not the human mind interminable in its ways of understanding words? And as to facts of history and criticism; is not all this concrete world a shadowy dubious business in which you cannot lay any foundations that will prove secure? There is no indication that on these points Newman feared debate or flinched from it. He kept the infidel writings of the period by him, and had studied them; indeed he had read Paine, Hume, and something of Voltaire, while he was still a boy. But there is much to indicate that he might detest the idea of having to make good his own right in a field like that, and in a method like that. So when in Dr. Hawkins' university sermon Newman found the view that Scripture was never meant to *teach* the fundamental doctrines, but to be the Church's means of proving them, while *she* teaches them by her Catechisms, Creeds, etc., he might at once begin to extend that view, and to think that this way lay an order of ideas full of satisfaction and relief.

Christianity was Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, Judgment, but it was also *Church*: not only great truths sent into the world and great forces, but a great form. The convincing force of the Christian religion might be held to apply to it in this form, as well as in any other view of it. Take it so; take Christianity in this form, in the living concrete Church, as it comes before you at the date when first it is fully revealed in history; when it has issued from the shadowy period of the first two centuries; when its embryonic time has passed; when it manifestedly knows and shows its own mind; when it has had time to assert its character, publish its message, and take ground in the world. Take it so, and you have the great Christian Church holding out to you the Bible, asserting the fundamental faiths, administering Christian grace. Is not this, historically, the Christian religion? Assume that the

Church was authorized to do that—to do what she did and to be what she was,—and then, many things may still be disputable, but not the main things. You may dispute about the first century or the second; but some things are plain on the face of the fourth. The Church is there, the Bible, the Trinity, the Incarnation, Redemption, the Sacraments. Own Christianity *in this form*, own it on those broad moral and spiritual grounds, in which you see the finger of God pointing you to this religion, but own it *in this form*, take it from history that this is Christianity in God's conception of it, written broad on the face of history, and how secure the great interests become! Now, while history, and criticism, and interpretation, and polemics pursue their interminable babel of conflicting speech, you simply feel secure that they shall never shake your certainties. How idle now the busy process that pursues its way, with no end of arguments, no end of conjectures! "They say, let them say." Easy enough it will prove, when you think it worth while, to knock down one dexterous argument with another. But you don't seek your main certainties in this field. For your faith this is all pure surplusage. Your faith regulates itself by a standard, which, upon the main points, has no ambiguity at all.

Later, Newman became convinced, that the Church of which all this held in the fourth century, the Church of which it holds still, was and is, exclusively, the Church that is in communion with the Roman See. But my point is, that his alternative, "Catholicism or Atheism," is first of all this, the Authoritative Church or Atheism. Now he reached that by postulating that the main dogmatic certainties of the Christian religion must be certified, or measured, by a standard that admits of no debate. That alone is Revelation. Without that you have no revealing God. It is only if he is right here that his further experience is authoritative. Therefore I have tried to indicate

the features of his mental constitution which peculiarly disposed him in this direction.

The course which Newman's mind took on a large class of topics corroborates this view now given. He took little interest in historical or critical questions; as far as concerned his own faith, apparently none at all. He had reached, on wings, the accredited Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, of which he subsequently came to think the Roman was the sole authentic continuation. But, apart from the special studies he had made in those two centuries, he did not care about minute and accurate knowledge of the Church's history; Döllinger and he, when they met, found little common ground. So he read his Bible, which he loved, without troubling himself about criticism of text or otherwise. Both in history and in criticism he held the keys which are possessed by men of general culture; and he was quite willing to enquire so far as to take up provisional positions on debated details, and provide shelter for the faith of people that might be open to dangers on this side. That he could do with great acuteness. But for himself, it did not seem to interest him. He took history and he took his Bible wholesale, as sufficiently guaranteed.

Looking to the history of Newman's mind on the main question, one asks, Was this a convincing experience? I may have leave to say that to me it is not convincing; indeed, the very process of Newman's mind is proof to me that such a Church as his principles require does not exist and never did exist. More particularly it is very irrational to assume that a Revelation and a Rule of Faith must be such as sin and folly cannot misapprehend, or involve in debate. I am not going to dilate on it. Here I can only refer in a sentence to the other way of viewing things. According to it faith begins with Christ, who reaches us through His word; and Scripture becomes authoritative as the authentic witness to Christ and the embodiment of His Spirit's teach-

ing. On this view too a great place may be given to the Church. But it is supposed that the Church's work is to show to men how the Scriptures, with Christ in the centre, authorize what she holds and teaches, that their faith may rest there. On these terms it could be argued that a discipline in revealed truth and duty will proceed, more divine at once, and more human than Newman's thought supplies. But that argument would carry us much too far.

Still looking, however, to the question whether Cardinal Newman's experience is a convincing one, I ask whether it was not at least misleading, in so far that it led him to that indifference to history and criticism, which distinguishes his mode of view. Doubtless all Christian men are agreed in the heart of the business. There is a vision of Divine righteousness and Divine love relating themselves to human nature and human need, which holds and masters them all. And it may be felt a painful and a perilous necessity to come down from it to debate questions of interpretation and of history and of criticism, and even to ask sometimes how far these threaten to be life questions. It may be painful; but not without a Divine wisdom and a Divine purpose was the true religion made as no other is, a historical religion, woven into the texture of human story, and meeting us everywhere on the plane of facts, of events, of actual forces. In claiming this place Christianity has contracted heavy responsibilities. Yet how much of its life and power and glory depend on this! The good cause may indeed seem to incur anxiety, nay loss, in the relentless processes which take place here. But in reckoning with this side of things Christians are going through a needful part of their spiritual discipline; and in resigning her pretensions here Christianity would renounce her concern in the currents of thought that most deeply move the minds of modern men.

When Newman had passed into the Church of Rome,

he became a student of their theology—never, it is understood, a great master of it in the technical sense—and in due time a priest. He elected to enter the order of Priests of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and became the head of a house of that order in Birmingham.

He continued to be an impressive preacher,—according to Mr. R. H. Hutton, preaching with increased fire and verve, as if he had thrown off a burden—but I should say, also, with less power to charm and hold thoughtful ears. He took part for a time in founding the Catholic University in Ireland, which gave rise to his lectures on the idea of a University. His power of putting a case was illustrated in various controversial utterances; for example, in “Lectures on Anglican Difficulties,” which was a reasoning with his old friend in the English Church on the position they continued to occupy. In his *Grammar of Assent* he once more discussed the subject which had exercised his mind from youth to age—the process of the mind in its assent to truth. In *Callista*, a tale of Christianity in the third century, he entered with ease and grace on a new field. And in the *Dream of Gerontius* he produced a poem more sustained than any of his earlier efforts, and in power, unity, and impressiveness, certainly very remarkable. Also there was the *Apologia*. Especially the latter two among these efforts are very distinguished, each in its kind. Without undervaluing the ability of the others, I should venture to say that the change of position had carried with it a certain relaxation. His utterances *had* been in a manner events, and now they had ceased to be so. Of that freer play of faculty alluded to by Mr. Hutton, a proof occurs in the development of his satirical powers. He comes not far short of Pascal in this gift; and perhaps it was not the only point in which he resembled him.

Here, for instance, is his remonstrance with those who had agreed with him in the common principles of the party,

who found, like him, that the teaching of the Fathers went farther than they at first supposed, found also that they could not claim the authority of the Church of England for their way of it, but who still refused to join the Church of Rome. They proposed, Newman thought, to live on as a party in the English Church, occupying ground not supplied to them by that Church, nor by the Church of Rome, nor by any Church. And yet they had started with him, as disowning private judgment, and as professing in all matters to hear the Church. How was their attitude to be regarded now?

“You seem to say, I began myself with doubting and enquiring; I departed from the teaching I received; I was educated in some older type of Anglicanism, in the school of Newton, Cecil and Scott, or in the Bartlett Buildings school, or in the Liberal Whig school. I was a dissenter, or a Wesleyan, and by study and thought I became an Anglo-Catholic. And then I read the Fathers; and I have determined what works are genuine and what are not; which of them apply to all times and which are occasional, which historical and which doctrinal, what opinions are private what authoritative; what they only seem to hold, what they ought to hold; what are fundamental, what ornamental. Having thus measured, and cut, and put together my creed, by my own proper intellect, by my own lucubrations, and differing from the whole world in my results, I distinctly tell you, I solemnly warn you, not to do as I have done, but to accept what I have formed, to revere that, to believe that, to use that, for it is the teaching of the old Fathers, and of your mother, the Church of England. Take my word for it, that this is the very truth of Christ; deny your own reason, for I know better than you, and it is clear as day that some moral fault in you is the cause of your differing from me. It is pride, or vanity, or self-reliance, or fulness of bread. You require some medicine for your soul, you must fast, you must make a general confession, you must look very sharp to yourself, for you are already next door to a rationalist or an infidel.’ My dear brethren, what am I to say in answer to conduct so preposterous? Say you go by any authority whatever, and I shall know where to find you, and I shall respect you. Swear by any school of religion, old or modern, by Ronge’s Church, or by the Evangelical Alliance, nay, by yourselves, and I shall know what you mean, and will listen to you. But do not come to me with the latest fashion of opinion the world has seen, and protest to me that it is the oldest.” . . .

“In some points you prefer Rome, in others Greece, in others England, in others Scotland, and of that preference your own judgment is the ultimate sanction. Life is not long enough for such trifles.”

We need not meddle with Newman's relations to questions and parties in the Church of Rome. There is reason to believe that he was not much in favour at head-quarters in the days of Pio IX. ; and the approving recognition of the present Pope came to him as a very grateful experience in his latter days. An idea existed, and was once or twice expressed, that he chafed under the obligations of Romish faith. He energetically repudiated that imputation, and there is really no reason to believe it. Newman was not a man to find difficulty in believing on authority, if the authority had been accepted as competent. His acuteness was then employed, when necessary, in clearing away difficulties, and none could do it more ably. But it is true that he desired to maintain in the Church of Rome as much of theoretic liberty as possible. He wished champions of the Church, himself included, to be unembarrassed in the cause they had to plead ; he wished to have no needless difficulties, and to leave all doors open. But he did not want this liberty for himself—it was only for other people.

Still, with all his genuine loyalty to the authority he had owned, and even a great apparent satisfaction in throwing himself without reserve into the ways and worship that were approved, whether positively prescribed or not, Newman's singularity was always felt. He was from the beginning set on a key of his own ; his habits of thought and feeling had been worn deep, and he had long been accustomed to set the law for others. His special friendships continued to lie in a circle that was exclusive, and the old imperiousness and indisposedness to be troubled with opposition, came curiously into manifestation. Also in the Church of Rome as in the Church of England, while his

high sincerity was above all impeachment, yet his subtlety of thought, and some peculiarity in the way in which his mind met other minds produced an impression of difficulty in being sure where one stood with him. Recently Dr. Abbott has borne hard on his treatment of ecclesiastical miracles, as having all the effect of deception while no doubt intended in good faith. And that, whether a just imputation or not, may illustrate the kind of questions which sometimes arose about Newman, even in his own Church.

An admirer of Newman, and a very competent judge, has rated him as one of the greatest men of our time—appealing especially to this as the standard of greatness, *viz.* the ardour and energy which a man devotes to adequate objects.

He asks where we can find a more striking example of this than Newman. And in special illustration he points to the fact that a man possessing gifts so remarkable as a writer and a poet, should during a great part of his life have refrained from putting them in play, simply because they did not fall in the line of his main object. For even his early poems would have remained, for the most part, unwritten, had not his journey with Froude separated him from his usual work, and rendered poetry on sacred themes, as it were, the proper industry of some spare hours. I have a very deep impression of the unity of Newman's life and the consecration of his powers, very uncommon powers certainly, to the question of faith. I acknowledge also that everywhere Newman strikes one as unique, having something that separates him from other men. But I am withheld from setting him so high as this writer does by the consideration that so long a devotion to the highest themes does not appear to me to have yielded, in his case, any remarkable contribution of fresh and original thought. His conception of the way of approaching human minds by

preaching was certainly fresh and most effective ; but that applies rather to method than to material. The only achievement that catches the eye, of the kind I speak of, is the *Essay on Development*. I by no means underrate the skill and suggestiveness with which he handles that theme. But his whole situation, with its difficulties, precisely shut him up to development as the clue of escape. And Petavius and Möhler had substantially shown him the way. It appears to me rather that Newman's characteristic was the insight with which he selected his line, among the lines that were available ; and when he had selected it, the intensity with which he threw himself on it, so as to make it more significant, more operative, more available for many minds, than ever it had been before. That is significant of great moral force and great intellectual keenness.

After all has been said one comes back to that which from youth to age governed the activities of that singular and busy mind. He lived a life not only true to his highest convictions but devoted to them. He lived as in God's presence, and the common interests of life were all but nothing to him. His strength was given to a public purpose of Christian usefulness with a rare persistency ; and that purpose was meant to draw its inspiration from a fresh and higher vision of Christian truth and Christian institutions. It cannot be said that he succeeded. In its first form his effort became a confessed mistake ; he found himself wrong in his theory. In his second stage, if his theory became satisfactory to himself, results seemed denied him. But this broken life has still its laurels and its sheaves. He served two great Churches, of England and of Rome. That such a man came to her feet is a legitimate boast to the second of them. That the great party in the first, which once followed Newman, has united with its more debatable qualities so much of high faith and high purpose, so much

devotedness, and diligence, and achievement, is surely in some part due to their early leader. He built on the foundation much that some of us must reckon to be wood and hay and stubble; but at least, he never forgot, nor suffered those whom he influenced to forget, that the things which are seen are temporal, the things which are not seen are eternal.

ROBERT RAINY.

*THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY
LAND.*

V. SAMARIA.

FROM Judæa we pass to Samaria. Halves of the same mountain range, how opposite they are in disposition and in history! The northern is as fair and open as the southern is austere and secluded, and their fortunes correspond. To the prophets Samaria is the older sister,¹ standing nearer to the world, taking precedence alike in good and evil. The more forward to attract, the more quick to develop, Samaria was always the less able to retain. The patriarchs came first to Shechem, but chose their homes about Hebron; the earliest rallies of Israel's worship and patriotism were upon Mount Ephraim, but both Church and State ultimately centred in Jerusalem; after the disruption of the kingdom the first prophets and heroes sprang up in the rich life of Northern Israel, but the splendour and endurance both of prophecy and of kingship remained with the barer Judæa. And so, though we owe to Samaria some of the finest of Israel's national lyrics, she produced no literature of patriotism, but the bulk of the literature about her is full of scorn for her traffic with foreigners,

¹ Jeremiah iii.; Ezekiel xvi. 46, and especially xxiii.

for her luxury and her tolerance of many idols. "Pride, fulness of bread and prosperous ease," then rottenness and swift ruin, are the chief notes of prophecy concerning her. And so to-day, while pilgrims throng on either hand to Judæa and to Galilee, no pilgrim seeks Samaria save for one tiny spot of her surface—that was neither a birthplace nor a tomb nor a battlefield nor a city, but the scene of a wayside saying by Him who used this land only as a passenger.

But if hardly Holy Land—if hardly even national land—there is no region of Syria more interesting and romantic. The traveller, entering from Judæa, is refreshed by a far fairer landscape. When he reaches the Vale of Shechem he finds himself at the true physical centre of Palestine, from which the features of the whole country radiate and group themselves most clearly. Historical memories, too, burst about the paths of Samaria more lavishly than even those fountains, that form such a contrast to Judæa:—the altars at Shechem and Shiloh, the fields round Dothan, the winepress of Ophrah, Carmel and Gilboa, the columns in Samaria, the vineyard of Naboth, the gates of Jezreel and Bethshan, the fords of Jordan; the approach of the patriarchs, Elijah's apparitions, Elisha passing to and fro, John baptizing at Ænon near to Salim; Gideon's campaign, Jehu's furious driving, Judith and Holofernes, battles of the Maccabees, the strategy of Pompey and of Vespasian.

I have already shown how the southern frontier of Samaria fluctuated from the Vale of Ajalon to the Wady Ishar and 'Akrabbeh.¹ The northern was more fixed, and lay from the Mediterranean to Jordan, along the south edge of Esdraelon, by the foot of Carmel and Gilboa. If we shut off Carmel, the edge of Sharon was the western

¹ See EXPOSITOR, vol. v., p. 303.

boundary; the eastern was Jordan. These limits enclose a territory nearly square, or some forty miles north and south by thirty-five east and west,—the size of a larger English shire.¹

The earliest name given to this section of the Central Range (I still exclude Carmel) was *Mount Ephraim*:² just as the whole tableland of Judah was called *Mount Judah*.³ When you stand off the country you see the propriety of the singular name *mount* as you do not when travelling within it. Broken up as Samaria is into more or less isolated groups of hills, yet when you view her from Gilead, or from the Mediterranean, she presents the aspect of a single mountain *massif*, with entrances indeed, but apparently as compact as even the tableland of Judæa.⁴

Take first the western flank. Here from summits of 3,000 feet, and an average watershed of 2,000, *Mount Ephraim* descends upon *Sharon* by uninterrupted ridges.

¹ The exact distances are these. From Bethel to Jezreel, 42 miles; from the edge of Sharon to Jordan varies between 33 and 36 miles; but from the point of Carmel to Bethshan is 40 miles; and to the S.E. corner of the province (east of Bethel), about 67 miles. Without Carmel Samaria is about 1,400 square miles; Carmel represents about 180 or 200 more. Judæa, it may be remembered, was estimated at 2,000 square miles, of which only about 1,400 were habitable.

² הַר אֶפְרַיִם, Josh. xvii. 15, xix. 50, etc. Judges iii. 27, iv. 5, etc.; 1 Sam. i. 1, ix. 4., etc. That the whole district known as Samaria is covered by the name is proved by the fact that between Ramah and Bethel is styled as being in *Mount Ephraim* (Judges iv. 5); also *Shechem* (1 Kings xii. 25; Josh. xx. 7, etc.); and that in Jer. xxxi. 6. *Mount Ephraim* stands parallel to *Mountains of Samaria* (v. 5). Of course the name spread originally from the hill country immediately north of Benjamin's territory, which fell to the tribe of Ephraim, and in which we must seek for the site of the *city called Ephraim* (2 Chron. xiii. 19, 2 Sam. xiii. 23, John xi. 54)—perhaps the modern et-Taiyibeh (Pal. Expl. Fund Map).

³ Josh. xxi. 11, where it is translated *hill country of Judah*.

⁴ From the hills above Pella, or from the great view-point of Kulater Rubad, the passes from Jordan into Ephraim are apparent, yet not so broad as to break up the range; while from *Mount Pisgah* they are hidden, and to the spectator standing where Moses stood *Mount Ephraim* presents the appearance of one high-piled mountain, with few corries upon it.

The general aspect is "rocky and sterile"; with infrequent breaks of olive-woods,¹ fields, and a few villages. This is not because of steepness; on the contrary, the unbroken descent is gradual—only some 1,800 feet in eighteen miles. The slope stands out in contrast to the defiles and precipices which flank Judæa; and whether you ascend by its valleys or by its broad ridges, you find the way easy and open. That little or no history was enacted upon this flank of Mount Ephraim seems to be due to—besides the sterility of the soil—the impossibility of anywhere making a stand, the uselessness of anywhere building a fortress.

On the watershed above, the one pass conspicuous from the sea is that in which Shechem lies between Ebal and Gerizim. It crosses to the eastern side of the range, and is thence continued by a valley with a strong southerly trend, the present Wady el Ifgim, which runs out upon the Jordan below the Horn or Promontory of Surtabeh, and divides the eastern flank of Mount Ephraim into two distinct sections. South of this Wady el Ifgim, Mount Ephraim presents to Eastern Palestine a high bulwark of mountain closely piled, with wild chasms running up through it—the most difficult corner of the whole frontier. Seen from Nebo, it looks quite inaccessible. The descent is over 2,800 feet in nine miles or three times the gradient of the western flank. But north of the Wady el Ifgim and the Horn of Surtabeh the flank of Mount Ephraim opens out, and a series of broad valleys descend it from the interior. From the watershed the level drops 2,500 feet in ten miles. Opposite the centre of the province the hills fall close on Jordan, but further north they recede to a distance of five miles, and at Bethshan they turn away westward in the range of Gilboa, leaving the valley of

¹ Robinson, *Later Researches*, 135.

Jezreel to run up on the north of them towards the Mediterranean.

Within these compact bulwarks Mount Ephraim surprises us with its openness, its number of plains, meadows and spacious vales. To begin with, there is a gap between Carmel and Gilboa, through which a broad gulf of Esdraelon runs up for seven miles to Genin. Thence a succession of level spaces, more or less connected, spreads southwards through the centre of the province to a few miles of its southern border. First is the plain of Dothan¹ reached by an easy pass through low hills; thence another easy pass leads to a series of spacious meadows crossing the country from the south end of Mount Gilboa, and the top of a broad valley to the Jordan, to the range of hills that bulwark the city of Samaria on the north;² and thence another easy pass leads to a third series of plains running south past the vale of Shechem into the great Sahel Mukhneh, with its eastern offset, opposite Gerizim. Now upon this succession of level lands running south from Esdraelon, there emerge valleys,—both those that come up from Sharon and those that come up from Jordan. Of the former the chief is the broad Barley-Vale, Wady esh Sha'ir, that sweeps up past Samaria upon Shechem. In this direction, too, the gentle ridges offer almost everywhere easy access from the coast. Of the valleys from Jordan there are the Wady Far'ah, that runs down from a little south of Shechem to opposite the Jabbok,—the trunk road to the East and Jacob's road to Shechem, later a Roman highway, and to-day partly the route of the telegraph wire from Nabulus to Es-salt. Further north the Bukeia, or Little-

¹ The modern Sahel 'Arrabch. Robinson (*Phys. Geogr.*, 122) describes it as a bay or offset of the plain of Esdraelon; but it is separated from the latter by low hills.

² Cf. Trelawney Saunders, *Introd. to the Survey of Western Palestine*, p. 136. Of these meadow lands the Merj el Ghuruk was in the summer of 1891, when we passed along it, a great shallow lake: cf. Robinson, *Bib. Res.*, III. 153.

Dale; then the Salt-Vale, or Wady el Mâleh, that issues at Abel-Meholah, and lastly the Wady el Khashneh, with the ancient road from Shechem to Bethshan, up which came both Pompey and Vespasian. All these are *the outgoings of Mount Ephraim*,¹ broad, fertile and of easy gradients. But besides these, and even where the mountains crowd most thickly together, in the south-east corner of the province, there are frequent meadows and corn lands. Travellers from Judæa will remember the open vales they crossed before they reached the Mukhneh; and of the less explored country to the east, Robinson says: "It was a matter of surprise to us to find in this great *break-down* of the mountains so much good land; so many fine and arable though not large plains."²

1. Therefore the OPENNESS of Samaria is her most prominent feature, and tells most in her history. Few invaders were successfully resisted. It is a singular fact that we have no account of the invasion by Israel themselves. Bethel falls, and after that the tribe of Joseph, to whom the region is allotted, express no fear, record no struggle, till they come to the plain of Esdraelon and the cities of the Canaanites at Bethshan and Jezreel.³ Under the invasion of the Canaanites Israel's native law could be administered only in the extreme north-east, between Ramah and Bethel, where stood the palm tree of Deborah,⁴ a curious exotic in so high a region. In the days of Gideon the Midianites swept north from the plain of Esdraelon, so that the use of the open threshing floors was impossible even at Ophrah.⁵ In Elisha's time, the Syrians, by apparently annual invasions, swept westward as far as the citadel of Samaria, behind the watershed. The Assyrians overwhelmed the land, and carried off, it would

¹ Josh. xvii. 18.

² *Later Researches*, 296.

³ Josh. xvii. 14.

⁴ Judges vi. 11.

⁵ Perhaps Ferata, south-west from Shechem (Conder).

seem, the whole population. In spite of every obstacle offered him by the Jews, Holofernes brought his army from Esdraelon by the series of plains mentioned above, and was overthrown only through the stratagem of a woman.¹ Pompey marched from Bethshan to Korea,² ten miles south of Shechem, and from Korea to Jericho without opposition.³ Vespasian seeking to blockade Judæa, marched from Antipatris by Shechem to Korea, and thence to Jericho and back again, and then to Gophna, Ephraim and back again, incredible as it seems, within a week.⁴ And Titus came easily upon Jerusalem from Cæsarea past Gophna and Bethel.⁵ How different all this reads from the history of the invasions of Judæa, by her narrow defiles, the sallies from the hills, the ambushes of the Wady 'Ali, the routs down by the two Bethhorons and Ajalon!

One very interesting effect of the openness of Samaria is the frequency with which the chariot appears in her history. In the annals of Judah chariots are but seldom mentioned.⁶

¹ Book of Judith. Bethulia, Judith's town, must be sought for somewhere about the Merj el Ghuruk; Meselieh (Conder), Meithalium or Sanur?

² Kuriyat.

³ Josephus, xiv. *Antt.*, iii. 3, iv. 1.

⁴ *Id.*, iv. *Bell. Jud.*, viii., ix., x.

⁵ *Id.*, v. *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 1.

⁶ Judah's progress in the matter of chariots is interesting. Joshua houghed all horses and burnt all chariots taken in war (*Josh.* xi. 6, 9). David houghed most of the horses but kept a hundred for himself (2 *Sam.* viii. 4). Solomon had 1,400 chariots which he placed in chariot cities and also with the king at Jerusalem (1 *Kings* x. 26). That is to say: there would be but few at Jerusalem where the ground was quite unsuitable for their manœuvre, and the depôts of them were at cities in the Arabah or Shephelah, where they would be of more use. The only two instances of chariots driving into Jerusalem are mentioned below. But see Isaiah xxii.

Wheeled vehicles were used in agricultural operations in Palestine from the earliest times (1 *Sam.* vi. 10) as they are to-day, even where there are no proper roads for them. On the east of the Jordan, in 1891, we met a number of Circassians driving bullock carts all the way from Damascus to Gerash and Rabbath-Ammon. Chariots were introduced from Mesopotamia and later from Egypt (who herself had the horse and chariot from Asia). The Syrians, owing to the flat plains south of Damascus, were strong in chariots, and no doubt Samaria received her first chariots through her close connection with the

All the long drives of the Old Testament are in Samaria,—the race of Ahab against the storm from Mount Carmel to Jezreel; ¹ his long funeral in his battle chariot stained with his life-blood, from Ramoth-Gilead to Samaria, *and they washed his chariot by the pool of Samaria and the dogs licked up his blood*; ² the furious drive of Jehu from Ramoth-Gilead past Bethshan and up the valley of Jezreel, and as he came near, *the watchman in Jezreel told, saying, . . . the driving is like the driving of Jehu the son of Nimshi, for he driveth furiously*; and Joram said, *Yoke, and they yoked his chariot, and Joram king of Israel and Ahaziah king of Judah went out each in his chariot to meet Jehu, and found him in the portion of Naboth the Jezreelite*; the chariot race from there between Jehu and poor Ahaziah *by the way of the garden house, the ascent of Gur, which is by Ibleam, where Ahaziah was smitten, and Megiddo, where he died, and his servants carried him in a chariot to Jerusalem*; ³ Jehu's drive again from Jezreel to Samaria, *and he lighted on Jehonadab the son of Reehab coming to meet him, and he gave him his hand, and took him up into the chariot, and said, Come with me and see my zeal for the Lord*; ⁴ and the long drive of Naaman from Damascus, across the level Hauran, over Jordan and up Jezreel, *with his horses and his chariots, to the house of Elisha, presumably at Samaria, and the drive back again, and the pursuit by Gehazi, and when Naaman saw one running after him, he lighted down*

Syrians. In later times the great highways which the Romans built, chiefly in the time of Marcus Aurelius and his successors, rendered driving easy all over the land. The great change in modern times,—till very lately there was neither a good road nor a real carriage in Palestine,—was due of course to the conquest of Syria by nomad and desert tribes, whose only means of locomotion were animals. The few roads and carriages now are entirely due to the Franks. The Circassian colonies will naturally increase them. But Palestine has already one railroad, and another is projected across Esdraelon and Jordan,—in the course of Jehu, the son of Nimshi, who drove furiously!

¹ 1 Kings xviii.

² 1 Kings xxii. 29 ff.

³ 2 Kings ix. 16 ff.

⁴ 2 Kings x. 12, 15 ff.

from his chariot to meet him.¹ Contrast all this with the two meagre references to chariot driving in Judæa—in the one case the chariot carried a corpse, in the other a dying man,²—and you get an illustration of the difference between the level stretches of Samaria, and the steep tortuous roads of her sister province. Perhaps the prophet Zechariah intends to emphasise the contrast in his verse: *I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem.*³

Far more important than chariots, more important even than the easy invasion of enemies, was that effect of Samaria's openness, to which allusion was made in the beginning of this paper. Judæa, earning from outsiders little but contempt, inspired the inhabitants, whom she so carefully nursed in seclusion from the world, with a patriotism that has survived two thousand years of separation, and still draws her exiles from the fairest countries of the world to pour their tears upon some of the most barren dust the world contains. Samaria, fair and facile, lavished her favours on foreigners, and was oftener the temptation than the discipline, the betrayer than the guardian of her own. The surrounding paganism poured freely into her ample life; and although to her was granted the honour of the first great victories against it—Gideon's and Elijah's—she suffered the luxury that came after to take away her crown. From Amos to Isaiah the sins she is charged with are those of a civilisation that has been ripe, and is rotten—drunkenness, filthy luxury, clumsy art, servile imitation of foreigners, thoughtlessness and cruelty. To these she succumbs, and her summer beauty is covered by the mud of a great deluge. *The crown of the pride of the drunkards of Ephraim is trodden under foot, and the fading flower of his glorious beauty, which is on the head of the fat valley, shall be as the first ripe fig before the summer,*

¹ 2 Kings v. 9 ff.

² 2 Kings ix. 28; 2 Chron. xxxv. 24.

³ Zech. ix. 10.

*which when he that hath caught sight of it, seeth it, while it is yet in his hand, he eateth it up.*¹

2. The second striking characteristic of Samaria is her CENTRAL POSITION. Jerusalem has acquired such stupendous historical importance that we are apt to imagine her as the natural head and centre of the country. But nothing comes with greater surprise upon the visitor to Palestine than to find that Mount Zion and Jerusalem, with all their advantages of defence, are still in an out-of-the-way and uncomfortable place, and that both natural and historical precedence have to be given to Mounts Ebal and Gerizim, with Shechem between them.

I have already said how this even suggests itself to the traveller before he has touched the land. The only sign of a pass in the great central range of Judæa and Samaria, as you view it from the sea, is that between Ebal and Gerizim. The only avenues into the range, that are apparent as you see it from the east, are the glens which draw up from Jordan upon the same point. But the fact is much more impressive when you visit Shechem itself, and climb one of its two hills. Gerizim is the more famous historically, but for prospect Ebal is the more commanding. The view from Ebal virtually covers the whole land—all the five zones, nearly all the borders, representatives of all the physical characteristics, and most of the famous scenes of the history. If I were to write a geographical manual of Palestine, I would set for introduction a description of the view from the top of Mount Ebal. It is this.

Looking south, there lies at your feet the valley with Nabulus, once Shechem, then across it the mass of Gerizim, with a ruin or two; then twenty-four miles of hill tops, at the back of which you dimly discern a tower. That is

¹ One interesting proof of how Samaria was permeated by Paganism is shown in Beit Degan, *i.e.* the House of Dagon, the name of a village six and a-half miles S.E. of Shechem. Cf. also the name Amalek (Judges v. 14, xii. 15).

Neby Samwil, the ancient Mizpeh, and Jerusalem is only five miles to the S.E. of it. Turning to the west, we see the central range letting itself down by irregular terraces and undulations on the plain; then the plain itself, flattened by the height from which we view it, but in reality undulating to elevations of two hundred feet; beyond the plain the gleaming sandhills of the coast, and the blue sea. Joppa lies S.W. thirty-three miles, Cæsarea N.W. twenty-nine. Turning northwards, we perceive the ridge of Carmel running down towards us from its summit, perhaps thirty-five miles distant; over the rest of the Central Range the hollow of Esdraelon; over that the hills of Galilee in a haze, and above the haze the glistening flank of Hermon at seventy-five miles of distance. Sweeping south from Hermon the eastern horizon is the edge of the Hauran, above the hollow of the Lake of Galilee, continued by the edge of Mount Gilead and the edge of Moab. It is maintained at a pretty equal level, slightly below that on which we stand, and is unbroken save by the incoming valleys of the Yarmuk and the Jabbok. This horizon is only twenty-four miles away, and on the near side of it lies the Jordan valley, for the great width of which I was not prepared. On this side Jordan the foreground is the hilly bulwark of Samaria, penetrated by a great valley coming up from Jordan into the plain of the Mukhneh, which, covered with corn, lies at our feet.

The view is barer than a European eye desires, but softened by the haze the great heat sheds over all. White clouds hang stagnant in the sky, and their shadows crouch below them among the hills, as dogs that wait for their masters to move. The hills are brown, with here and there lighter shades, here and there darker. Look through the glass, and you see that the lighter are wheat-fields ripening, the darker are olive groves, sometimes two miles in extent, not thickly planted like woods in our land, but with the

trees wide of each other, and the ground broken up beneath. Here and there in valley beds or on the brow of a steep slope, but mostly occupying the tops of island knolls, are the villages. There are no farmsteads, villas, or lonely castles, for the land is still what from Gideon's time it has more or less been, an insecure land, where men cannot live safely apart. In all the wide prospect, the one considerable town, the most verdant valley, lie at your feet, and the valley flows down on the east to a great sea of yellow corn that fills the plain below Gerizim.

Thus the most conspicuous, the most central, and one of the most pleasing spots in the Promised Land—visible from most of its entrances, and offering a view of nearly all its borders—it is no wonder that Shechem is the first town of Palestine mentioned in Scripture, the first goal of the patriarchs when they came to possess the land, the only sanctuary expressly named to Israel before their arrival. Its one drawback is its military weakness. Open to east and west, and dominated by the cliffs of Gerizim, Shechem is an impossible fortress. Hence, even when after the disruption it was restored to a chief place, its triumph was short, and the kings of Northern Israel shifted their court to Tirzah, to Jezreel, to the city of Samaria. But because Shechem is so rich in water, and stands so well on the main line between east and west, it continues to flourish centuries after its rivals have sunk to the level of villages. To-day it is the seat of the government of the province, and—eloquent homage of civilisation to its immemorial rank—it is the connecting link of the telegraphic systems of the east and west of Jordan.

It is on Mount Ebal that one best realises the size of the Holy Land—Hermon and the heights of Judah both within sight, while Jordan is not twenty, the coast not thirty, miles away—and that one most strongly feels the wonder of the influence of so small a territory on the history of the

world. But the explanation of the wonder is also within sight. Down below, where the telegraph wire issues from the vale and speeds eastward by the route the patriarchs took on their entrance, there lies a brown heap of stones. It is Jacob's well—the spot where the long revelation culminated of which this little land was the floor, where the charter was granted of that spiritual and universal religion that is filling the world: *Neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father; but the hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth.*

3. The third feature of Samaria is her CONNECTION WITH EASTERN PALESTINE.—This connection has existed from the earliest times, with the one great interruption of the Samaritan schism, down to the present day. Both Abraham and Jacob came from the East to Shechem. Israel, leaving to Ammon and Moab the regions of Eastern Palestine, which are opposite Judah, herself occupied those which march with Samaria. In this latitude, one tribe, Manasseh, was settled on both sides of the river:¹ another, Ephraim, gave its name not only to the western mountains, but to a *wood* or *jungle* on the eastern side;²

¹ Some hold it probable that Manasseh did not get any territory east of Jordan till after the death of Moses and the occupation of Western Palestine. "The older portions of the Hexateuch speak not of two and a half, but only of two trans-Jordanic tribes, and exclude Manasseh. In the Song of Deborah, Machir is reckoned among the western tribes" (Wellhausen's *Israel*, § 2). Neither of these statements is certain; and on the other side are the genealogies of Manasseh (Num. xxvii., Josh. xvii.). Both make Gilead the father of Abiezer and Shechem, towns to the west of the Jordan, and therefore older than they. And in the story of Jephthah (Judges xii. 4), while it is remembered that the Gileadites are late comers into their territory from the western side of the Jordan, *fugitives of Ephraim*, it is assumed that Manasseh always occupied its territory.

² *Forest or Jungle of Ephraim*, in which the battle took place between David and Absalom (2 Sam. xviii. 6). Reuss (*in loco*) insists that a forest with the name Ephraim could have lain only west of Jordan. He claims that this position agrees with the course of the narrative, which represents the bearer of the news to David, who was at Mahanaim, taking the direction of the Jordan

for a time in the days of the Judges Midianites, *sons of the East*, swept annually across Jordan and up to the recesses of Mount Ephraim; Gideon drove them back, and the rout extended from Esdraelon to Heshbon; it was from a rendezvous in Ephraim that Saul, though a Benjamite, marched to the relief of Jabesh Gilead.¹ As before the disruption, the trans-Jordanic provinces were connected with the tribe of Joseph, so after it they fell to that tribe's successor, Northern Israel; as formerly, the Midianites made yearly incursions across the river, so now the Syrians. Jeroboam, the first king, fortified Penuel after fortifying Shechem,² and Ramoth Gilead, was a garrison and outpost under Ahab, from which chariots drove to Jezreel and Samaria.³ Elijah, the prophet of Samaria, was from Tishbeh in Gilead; Elisha crossed Jordan to anoint Jehu. After the exile, the impotence and seclusion of the Samaritans naturally broke the connection of their territory with the land over Jordan, and Perea, as the latter was now called, formed the link between

valley, which he naturally would have done had he started from the west of the river, and explains the absence of any mention of David's force recrossing the river to meet Absalom by supposing gaps in the narrative. Putting aside this arbitrary hypothesis by which one might prove anything, I may point out that *both* messengers had to run from the scene of Absalom's defeat to David, and ask, if that was on the west of the Jordan, why is it said that only one ran from it by way of the plain (v. 23)? This disposes of Reuss' conjecture, and proves the *forest* to have been east of the river. Lucian's recension of the LXX. gives *Maawav* (for מַאָוָוַיִּם) instead of Ephraim as the name of the forest. But this is just the kind of correction Lucian would make to relieve a difficulty. And, indeed, why should it be thought unlikely that the name Ephraim should have crossed the river and fastened on the eastern bank? In the course of the history of that tribe, especially in the days of the Judges, a hundred adventures were likely to occur to cause the Ephraimites, who so frequently passed over, to leave their name behind them when they went back. Or a colony may easily have settled there. And in fact, we do read of Ephraimites settling in Gilead in such large numbers, that the western Ephraimites call the Gileadites fugitives from Ephraim (Judges xii. 4).

¹ From Bezek, probably Khurbet Ibizik, thirteen miles N.E. from Shechem on the road down to Bethshan.

² 1 Kings xii. 25.

³ 1 Kings xxii., 2 Kings ix.

Galilee and Judæa.¹ But in modern times the old relation has reasserted itself, and the eastern table-land is again governed from Nabalûs.

The reason of this immemorial connection is very clear. We have seen that a number of valleys lead down through Mount Ephraim upon Jordan, while the Plain of Esdraelon, with its offsets into Northern Samaria, presents a still more easy highway in the same direction. Now, to Esdraelon and those passes, the Jordan, dangerous river as it is, offers an extraordinary number of fords; while further south, where the passes into the Western Range are few and more difficult, there are in Jordan hardly any fords.² The passage, therefore, from Samaria to Gilead was a comparatively easy one at many points; hence their frequent invasions of each other, and their long political union. With this contrast the separation of Judæa from the east by the valley of the Dead Sea.

A question arises in connection with the chariots above mentioned—Ahab's, Jehu's, Naaman's. How did they get across Jordan? There were no bridges. Like the name for *port*,³ the name for *bridge*, if it existed among the Hebrews, does not occur in the Old Testament, probably because the thing itself was unknown. Either the body of the chariot was floated across the river, or such broad ferry-boats existed as Caesar found in use on the rivers of Gaul.⁴

4. The fourth feature of Samaria is her CONNECTION WITH CARMEL. To Samaria Carmel holds much the same place on the west as Bashan or Gilead fills to the east. From Ebal they stand on either hand of Mount Ephraim, carrying the eye along the only high and sustained skylines within

¹ Though Bethshan went with Decapolis.

² On the survey map not more than *five* fords are marked south of the Horn of Surtabel, but at least *twenty-two* north of this.

³ See EXPOSITOR for February, p. 146.

⁴ *Bell. Gall.*, iii. 29. Baggage is floated across Jordan to this day on inflated skins.

sight, forming with Lebanon the three dominant features of the view. Both of them, too, have always been better wooded than Mount Ephraim. And so, because they thus stand out in similar relation and in similar contrast to Samaria, it does not surprise us to find them, though at opposite sides of the Holy Land, frequently mentioned together. *Bashan and Carmel shake off their fruits. Israel shall feed in Bashan and Carmel. Feed thy people . . . in the forest in the midst of Carmel: let them feed in Bashan and Gilead.*¹ Sometimes Lebanon is added: *Bashan languisheth, and Carmel, and the flower of Lebanon languisheth.*²

Though of the same rock as the Central Range, Carmel, as we have seen, is separated from the latter by a softer formation, in which the more denuded hills offer easy passes from Sharon to Esdraelon. Carmel was, therefore, never an integral part of the body politic of Samaria, as Gilead was, nor was it a threshold of the land; it could not be used for invasion like Gilead; and though cultivated and with many villages³ it gave no occasion for a large town. So Carmel has neither political nor military history. But throughout the Old Testament it appears as a symbol or a sanctuary. The mass of it, visible from so many quarters of the land, standing firm and clear over the sea and against the sky, is the symbol of all that is fact and no dream. *Pharaoh is but a rumour, do they say? As I live, saith the Lord, surely like Tabor among the mountains, and like Carmel by the sea, so shall he come.*⁴ Its excellency is now the figure of human beauty and satisfaction,⁵ and now the mirror of

¹ Is. xxxiii. 9; Jer. l. 19; Micah vii. 14.

² Nah. i. 4.

³ As proved to-day by the numerous wine-presses left in the rock.

⁴ Jer. xlvi. 18. No one who has seen that magnificent bowline of mountain against the sky by day or night, that firm promontory standing out upon the sea, can fail to feel the force of the prophet's figure. Carmel is a great big fact.

⁵ Song of Solomon vii. 5; Isa. xxxi. 19.

the lavish goodness of God.¹ That Carmel should languish is the prophet's most desperate figure of desolation.

But it is as a sanctuary that the long hill is best remembered in history. In its separation from other hills, its position on the sea, its visibleness from all quarters of the coast²; in its uselessness for war or traffic; in its profusion of flowers, its groves and high platforms with their glorious prospects of land and sea, Carmel must have been a place of retreat and of worship from the earliest times. It was claimed for Baal; but even before Elijah's day an altar had stood upon it for Jehovah.³ About this altar,—as on a spot whose sanctity they equally felt—the rival faiths met in that contest, in which for most of us all the history of Carmel consists. The story in the Book of Kings is too vivid to be told again; but it is not without interest to know that the awful debate, whether Jehovah or Baal was supreme lord of the elements, was fought out for a full day in face of one of the most sublime prospects of earth and sea and air and light. Before him, who stands on Carmel, nature rises in a series of great stages from sea to Alp: the boundless Mediterranean, the long coast to north and south, with its hot sands and palms; Esdraelon covered with wheat, Tabor and the lower hills of Galilee with their oaks,—over the barer peaks of upper Galilee and the haze that is about them to the snow of Hermon, hanging like an only cloud in the sky. It was in face of that miniature universe that the Deity who was character was vindicated as Lord against the deity who was not. It was over all that realm that the rain swept up at the call of the same God who exposed the injustice of the tyrant and avenged the wrongs of Naboth.

¹ Isa. xxxv. 2.

² Carmel is visible not only from the hills of Samaria, from Jaffa, from Tyre, from Hermon, from the hills of Naphtali, but also from the hills behind Galara, east of Jordan, and from many other points in Gilead.

³ 1 Kings xviii. 30.

5. The last great feature of Samaria was her FORTRESSES, the large number of which lay all round and across her. They were due to the open character of the land and to the fact that, unlike Judah, Samaria had no strong bulwarked centre, on which her defence could be drawn in. But the description of these fortresses must be left for another paper.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS:

ITS GENESIS AND CORRUPTIONS.

THERE are two directions in which the genesis of a doctrine may be traced—onward or backward. We may begin at its birth, or even at an ante-natal period, when it is but a *rudis indigestaque moles*, and its rudimentary parts are only feeling after cohesion and organization. As yet they are not informed by the unifying consciousness which shall determine their ultimate character and organic life. At this early stage we can say nothing but that the embryo is "*congestaque eodem non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum.*" You know not whether this or that factor shall be its chief feature; whether it will ever see the light at all; or if it do, whether it will be a healthy thing, or a monstrosity, or give up its feeble ghost in the infancy of its existence. If it do come to life, the historian has only to follow its course onward through the length of its career.

Or on the other hand, we may begin at its death, and taking its epitaph for our text, write its history backward from the tomb to the cradle.

With my present subject however I propose to adopt neither of these methods, but to commence in the very prime of its life, and after showing what it was *then*, to trace first its ancestry and early life, and afterwards to sketch briefly the weakness of its old age and its dishonourable death. Death, I mean, not of the imperishable Logos

of the Catholic Faith, which is none other than the Doctrine of the Incarnation, but death of that doctrine when sublimated into Rationalism, or lost in the fantastic speculations of the Gnostics.

I need not say that my starting point will be in the writings of St. John. Without foreclosing the enquiry just now, whether the use of the word Logos in its personal and dogmatic sense is S. John's and S. John's alone among the writers of the New Testament, there can be no doubt that it is *pre-eminently* his. Four times in rapid succession it comes in the preface of his Gospel in a sense indisputably personal. Once in the great Intercessory Prayer it is used by the Logos Himself, scarcely less obviously, in the same sense: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Logos is truth." Strangely enough in this passage the Vulgate has translated the word *λόγος* by *sermo*, although in the preface to S. John's Gospel it has invariably rendered the same word *verbum*. But surely He who had already declared *Himself*, and not His words, to be the way, the *truth*, and the life, must here mean that His personality, and not His teaching, is to be the source of His disciples' sanctification.¹

S. John returns to this assertion that Christ's Person is the fountain of all truth. I can, at all events, take no other view of that passage in the First Epistle of S. John in which the Evangelist of the Logos declares first that "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," and then immediately afterwards: "If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His Logos is not in us," (here the Vulgate has "verbum"). The words "Him" and "His" evidently refer to the Eternal Father (1 John i. 8, 10).

¹ Compare Bersier's words upon the text, "I am the light of the world": "Et remarquez qu'en prétendant l'apporter aux hommes, il ne dit pas: 'J'annonce la lumière, je révèle la lumière,' mais bien, '*Je suis la lumière,*' ce n'est pas sa doctrine seulement, c'est sa vie, c'est son être tout entier qu'il expose aux regards des générations humaines et dont il prétend faire le foyer éternel dont la clarté doit illuminer leurs ténèbres."—*Sermons*, vol. v. p. 4.

Again, I would interpret in the personal sense 1 John ii. 14: "I have written unto you young men, because ye are strong, and the Logos of God abideth in you." For did not the Logos Himself say, and the same writer record, "Abide in Me and I in you"? Once more, that other passage at the beginning of the First Epistle of S. John: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Logos of Life," clearly indicates a personal Logos, with Whom the disciples had lived in closest communion.

Turning to the only remaining Johannine portion of the New Testament, we find in the Apocalypse (xix. 13) that "He that sat upon the White Horse, who was called faithful and true, whose eyes were as a flame of fire, and on whose head were many crowns, was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and His Name is called the Logos of God,"—a passage requiring no discussion. Having now exhausted S. John's use of the word Logos, let us see whether the other writers of the New Testament were familiar with or employed the same title.

And first with regard to the Synoptic Gospels. I have gone through them carefully, but have failed to find any instance of the personal use of the word, unless it be in S. Luke i. 2: "Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the λόγος," and unless, as some maintain, the λόγος of the Parable of the Sower may be thus interpreted. I will not deny that the Logos of the Parable is capable of such a construction, but as its traditional sense seems to harmonize with the context, there is no need to press urgently for a Johannine one. Nor can I find in the Acts of the Apostles more than one place in which the word may be fairly construed in the sense of our Gospel. In Acts xx. 32, S. Paul says to the presbyters of Ephesus: "And now, brethren, I

commend you to God, and to the Logos of His grace, who is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." I think the passage an open one. And yet the very offices—*edification and salvation* in its highest sense—here attributed to the Logos, are of course pre-eminently the personal works of Christ, and their mention in connexion with the Logos gives, I think, a presumption in favour of the *personal* sense of the word being the true one.

The Epistles of S. Paul, unless we ascribe the Epistle to the Hebrews to his pen, are absolutely free from the Johannine use of *λόγος*. Nor need we wonder at this if we remember that most of his writings were addressed to Greek-speaking peoples, who might have attached to this word incongruous associations gathered from their own philosophers. In the Epistle to the Romans there was no need for its use, for Logos is a word specially connected with the *Incarnation* of Christ, whereas the great theme of this epistle is the justifying power of the *Atonement*. But in the Epistle to the Hebrews, whoever be its author, the writer seems free to use the title as personally as S. John. Thus in Hebrews iv. 12, 13 we read: "For the *λόγος* of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight, but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." Bishops Sanderson,¹ Bull,² and Wordsworth,³ Dean Jackson,⁴ and Dr. Newman,⁵ all interpret the Logos here to mean the Eternal Son of God. Again, St. James (i. 1) writing also to Hebrews, "to the twelve tribes which

¹ iii. 20.² Sermon x., vol. i. 243.³ hoc loco.⁴ Vol. x. pp. 216-218. [Creed.]⁵ Parochial Sermons, *passim*.

are scattered abroad," seems once and again to give this personal meaning to Logos. In chapter i. 18, he declares, after speaking of "the perfect gift that is from above," that "of His own will begat He us with the Logos of truth," a passage singularly like S. John's sublime words (i. 12): "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This interpretation gains much force when we look at the expression in verse 21, τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον, "the engrafted Word" (A.V.), "the implanted Word" (R.V.), "the inborn Word" (R.V. margin), "which is able to save your souls." In what sense half so full and adequate can we take these attributes of the Logos as that which would apply them to the Incarnate Word grafted upon the stock of humanity, regenerating us ("begetting us"), as in verse 18, and eternally "saving" us, as in verse 21?

So far as I know, I have set forth all the Logos passages in the New Testament which seem to me capable of a personal construction. I have followed no commentary upon them in detail, but have sought rather to allow them to throw light upon each other. Let us now try to take their collective sense, and this may help us to discover the true ancestry of the one word which unites them all.

1. The Logos was ἐν ἀρχῇ, and therefore eternal.
2. The Logos was πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, *i.e.* in intimate relations with the Eternal Father.
3. The Logos was Deity absolutely, Θεὸς ᾧν ὁ λόγος.
4. The Logos was the Creator of all things both by counsel and co-operation.
5. The Logos was also eternally πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.
6. In the Logos was life capable of illuminating men.
7. This immanent Light became eminent, *i.e.* went forth out of Himself into the outer darkness, which however would not allow the Light to penetrate it.

8. He gave to the recipients of this Light sonship divine.
9. This Logos also became flesh, and "tabernacled" with man, full of grace and truth. And His glory was seen by man as that of the Only Begotten of the Father.
10. He is the source of sanctification and is the essential Truth, and makes us realize that sin is within us all.
11. He is now crowned with glory and is called Faithful and True.
12. He builds up His Redeemed ones and co-opts them to His own felicity.
13. He scrutinizes and reveals our inmost hearts.
14. He is grafted upon our stock, and gives us eternal life.

And now it is time to ask in what direction shall we look for the parentage of this New Testament Logos, to whom so much is attributed of personality and work? Shall we seek the root of the idea in the philosophies of the West, or in the theosophies of the Semitic races? Here arises a real obstacle in our path. For "the doctrine of the Logos has run in two parallel lines,—the one philosophical, the other theological; the first expressing *reason*, the second *word*; the one is Hellenic, the other Hebrew." Sketched in brief, the Greek Logos appears to us in three well-defined stages, marked off by the names of Heraclitus of Ephesus, the Stoics, and Philo the Hellenized Jew.¹

(1) In the theories of Heraclitus, which are mainly in the realm of physics, the Logos seems to have the function of correcting deviations from the eternal law that rules in things. It is neither above the world, nor prior to the world, but *in* the world and inseparable from it. Man's

¹ *Vide* Professor Salmond's article "Logos," *Encyc. Brit.*, 9th ed., vol. xiv., for several historical points here and below.

soul is a part of the Logos. It conducts the antagonisms that go on in nature. It gives order and regularity to the movement of things, and makes the system rational; but it is not clear whether it itself was possessed of consciousness or not. The Logos of Heraclitus is thus removed *longo intervallo* from the Logos of S. John.

(2) Between Heraclitus and the Stoics, there intervenes the Logos of Plato and Aristotle. And here a word of caution may not be out of place against trusting to Christian apologists who are determined at all hazards to find in the writings of Plato a clear pre-intimation of the Logos of the Gospels. Thus *e.g.* Auguste Nicolas in his "*Études philosophiques*,"¹ professing to quote from the *Timæus* of Plato, says that the Logos is therein called the "Saviour God," and that *Timæus* thus invokes Him: "At the commencement of this discourse let us invoke the Saviour God, that by an extraordinary and marvellous teaching He may save us by instructing us in the true doctrine."² But most people will, I think, agree with Dr. Jowett in his introduction to the *Timæus*, "that there is no use in attempting to define or explain the first god in the Platonic system, who has sometimes been thought to answer to God the Father; or the first world or eternal soul, in whom the Fathers of the Church seemed to recognise 'the first-born

¹ Tome ii. 121: "Du reste, en maint endroit des œuvres de Platon on trouve exprimée la doctrine d'un médiateur qu'il appelait le verbe (*λόγος*), par l'entremise duquel devait s'établir un rapport d'enseignement divin entre l'homme et Dieu, et qu'à cet effet il appelait *Sauveur, Dieu, Fils de Dieu.*"

² French writers are notoriously free in their renderings of classical authors, and I am quite unable to identify the invocation in the *Timæus*, relied upon by the amiable and able French *magistrat*. I do not think there are more than two passages even remotely resembling his version:

Ἄλλ', ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῦτό γε δὴ πάντες ὄσοι καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ σωφροσύνης μετέχουσιν, ἐπὶ παντὸς ὁρμῆς καὶ σμικροῦ καὶ μεγάλου πράγματος θεὸν αἰεὶ πῶς καλοῦσιν. ἡμᾶς δὲ τοῖς περὶ τοῦ παντὸς λόγου ποιέσθαι πῆ μέλλοντας ἢ γέγονεν ἢ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ παντάπασιν παραλλάττομεν, ἀνάγκη θεοῦ τε καὶ Θεοῦ ἐπικαλουμένους εἶχεσθαι πάντα κατὰ τοῦν ἐκείνοις μὲν μέλιστα, ἐπομένως δὲ ἡμῖν εἰπεῖν. (Plato, vol. vii. 251. Valpy, London, 1826.) See also *cap.* xxii. *Timæus*, last four lines.

of every creature.'” In point of fact the order-keeping spirit of this world was, according to Plato, *νοῦς* or *σοφία*, not *λόγος*. The *λόγος* was only a subordinate principle scarcely attaining to personality.

Coming to the Stoics, we find a distinct advance upon the doctrine of Heraclitus. The Logos of the Stoics is an intelligent reason, analogous to the reason in man. It determines the world and lives in it. Regarded as the law of generation, it is called the *λόγος σπερματικός*, and works in dead matter. The *unexpressed* thought in man is *λόγος ἐνδιύθητος*; *expressed*, *προφορικός*.

(3) The third stage of the development of the Logos is attained in the writings of Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, descended from a noble and sacerdotal family, and pre-eminent among his contemporaries for his talents, eloquence and wisdom. He was born about 25 years B.C. He was of the sect of the Pharisees, and was deeply versed in the scriptures of the Old Testament, which he read in the Septuagint Version, being a Hellenistic Jew, unacquainted (it is supposed) with Hebrew. He wrote also in the Greek language. He is not known ever to have visited Judæa, and cannot be shown to have any knowledge of the events of our Lord's life there transacted. It cannot be supposed that he was a convert to Christianity when we remember that the Gospel was not extensively and openly promulgated out of Judæa until ten years after the resurrection of Christ, and that there is not the most distant allusion to him in the New Testament. In a paper of my present dimensions, I cannot discuss at length the nature of the Philonian Logos. A sufficiently exhaustive conspectus of it will be found in the Introduction to Dorner's *Person of Christ*, or, in a more interesting fashion, in Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus*. It is, however, necessary to my present purpose to summarize Philo's views, and to distinguish them from the Logos of the New Testa-

ment. And, first, it must be admitted that not only does he call the *λόγος* the world-thinking and world-making power of God, but also Son, First-born of God, the link between God and the world; the Mediator, High-Priest, Advocate, Surety, Archangel, Pillar. But he also calls the *world* "a son of God," and so prevents us from necessarily attaching personality to his *λόγος*.

(1) With Philo, the *λόγος* is first a Divine *faculty*, of thought, or creation, or both. But if this *λόγος* be distinct from God, and contains all wisdom and thought and power, the Father of the Logos is left without one or other of these.¹

(2) The Logos of Philo is *activity*—which both thinks and creates. But he goes on to explain that this Logos is only the place (*ὁ τόπος*), the store-house in which are lodged the archetypal ideas of the first creation—the scroll of paper upon which the Divine Architect mapped out His creative plan.

(3) Again the Logos is the ideal world, the original plan of the present world, and therefore cannot be a person.

(4) And lastly the Logos is the active Divine principle of the sensible world. This might be mistaken for personality. But if we begin to suppose that this Logos was derived by a true sonship from God the Father, as the Logos of S. John was begotten of the Eternal Father, we are met by the difficulty already mentioned, that the sensible world is again and again called the "younger son of God," just as the Logos is called His "elder Son."

In a word, the Logos of Philo wavers between attribute and substance, between the personal and the impersonal.

¹ Cf. Sartorius, *Die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe*, p. 9: "Nicht als wäre der Sohn, oder hätte er ein anderes Wesen neben dem unendlichen Vater; dann hätte ja jeder das Seine für sich selbst, dann hätten sie ja nicht Alles gemein, dann ständen sie sich in gegenseitiger Begränzung dualistisch einander gegenüber, die Unendlichkeit gleichsam halbirend, nicht allmächtig, sondern halbmächtig als zwei Halbgötter."

And yet this is the Logos whom S. John has been accused of stealing and transplanting into the Gospel of Christ!

Not then by ascending the Hellenic stream have we found the true source of the Johannine doctrine. For S. John's is not a Logos of abstract, impersonal reason, but the all-making, God-revealing, Flesh-assuming Word. Let us then like the African explorers in patient search of the wells of the Nile, once more launch our boat in a new essay, and pray the Spirit of Truth "*timide dirige navis iter.*"

But before we set sail on the waters of Israel, let us pause and speculate a little on our chances of success. And first, we have noticed that the New Testament writers who make use of our word are engaged mainly with *Hebrew* disciples. This is especially clear in the Revelation of S. John, a book literally steeped in Hebraisms, *e.g.* "New Jerusalem," "the doctrine of Balaam," "that woman Jezebel," "the key of David," "Abaddon," "Gog and Magog." The Epistle of S. James and that to the Hebrews bear on the face of them for what people they were primarily intended. Even this then, that the word Logos was a word specially to and for the Hebrew converts, affords a considerable presumption that our present voyage is more hopeful than our Greek adventure. But to my mind we have a still far richer promise of success when we consider the fundamental difference between the Oriental and Occidental conceptions of the means of uniting God and man. The East sets out from God the Infinite; the West from man the finite. Hence in all Indian religions, the doctrine of frequent incarnations of God in human form, for the purpose of teaching men the truth, and re-conducting them to heaven. In Greece, on the other hand (as also in the religions of Rome and the north), men become gods, and ascend Olympus by virtue and valour. The Eastern is salvation from without, the Western from within. In the

West man celebrates his own apotheosis ; in the East man glorifies the mercy of God which stoops to manhood. Now the Hebrew religion on its natural side belongs to the great family of Eastern religions, the religions of incarnation. Inasmuch then as the Logos of S. John is distinctively an incarnation, we are far surer of finding its source in Hebrew than in Grecian lands.

Briefly stated, S. John's Logos, as applied to Christ, is the sum and climax of three Hebrew conceptions : (1) The active, creative word whereby God made all things, and revealed His will to His people ; (2) the Angel of the Covenant or Angel of Jehovah ; and (3) the Chokmah or Wisdom of God. Of course, I do not mean the bare total of these conceptions, but their union and *coronation*.

I.

THE MEMRA.

(1) *The Creative and Revealing Word*. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." Psalm xxxiii. 6, cf. S. John i. 3.

(2) *This Memra executes Divine judgments*. "I have slain them by the words of my mouth." Hosea vi. 5, cf. John v. 22.

(3) *Heals the sick*. "He sent His Word and healed them." Psalm cvii. 20. In all accounts of the miracles, Jesus *speaks*.

(4) *Has qualities almost personal*. "His Word runneth very swiftly." Psalm cxlvii. 15. "My Word that goeth out of My mouth shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please." Isaiah lv. 11, cf. S. John xvii. 4 : "I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.

II.

THE ANGEL OF THE COVENANT.

By different names is the great Theophany known. Now the Angel of the Covenant, now of the Presence, now of Jehovah. Sometimes He is identified with Jehovah or Elohim, as when speaking to Moses at the burning bush; at other times He is distinguished from Him, as to Abraham on Mount Moriah. And again He appears in both aspects, as in Judges ii. 1: "And the angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, . . . and I said I will never break My covenant with you"; and in Judges vi. 22: "And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of the Lord, Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God! for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face." May we not see in this varied presentation of the Theophany a foretoken of the Logos, who at times shrinks not from saying, "I and my Father are one," and yet at others declares, "My Father is greater than I?"

III.

THE CHOKMAH OR SOPHIA, OR WISDOM OF GOD.

The Doctrine of Wisdom appears in the Books of Job, Proverbs and the Apocrypha. At times this Chokmah or Wisdom of God appears to take the place of the Word of God in creation; thus in Proverbs iii. 19: "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth." At another time it is strongly personified, as in Proverbs viii. 22 sqq.: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was. . . . Then I was by Him as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him." The wisdom of God develops the hypostatic notion still more clearly. "She

is the worker of all things: in her is an understanding spirit, holy, only-begotten, manifold, subtle, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good, kind to man, steadfast, sure, free from care, having all power, overseeing all things. For she is the brightness of the Everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of His Person.”¹ Compare with this such passages as Ephesians iii. 10: “God created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the *manifold wisdom of God*”; and Hebrews i. 3: “Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His Person, and upholding all things by the word of His power.” The wise man continues, “She is the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty; in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God and prophets. Wisdom reacheth from one end to another mightily; and sweetly doth she order all things.” And again in Proverbs viii. 5, she cries: “Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled,” with which we may compare the sixth chapter of S. John.

It is, then, I venture to think with many modern writers, in the combination of these three Hebrew mysteries, and not in the philosophy of Greeks or Hellenized Jews, that S. John sees the parentage of his own *λόγος*,—eternal, creative, life-giving, incarnate and adoptive. The very heart of his evangel is that “the Logos was made flesh and dwelt among us.” I do not mean, I repeat, that S. John merely collects into his Logos the attributes of the Memra, the Angel and the Wisdom. But the sum of these is his starting-point from which to unfold the redeeming work of the Logos made flesh.

¹ Wisdom vii. 22–viii. 1.

There remains to us now the sadder task of tracing the corrupted and therefore decaying old age of this glorious doctrine of the Gospel; and we have not long to wait before finding the influence of the Greek idea in both the early Christian writers, and, in wilder forms, in the heretical schools.

The first important philosophical epoch in the post-apostolic age is the rise of the Gnosis, or Gnosticism. We have seen how sparingly the term Logos was applied to our Lord in the New Testament. But in the metaphysics of the Gnostics, the supreme tendency was towards complete idealism. One can easily see that to men who denied all objectivity, such a subtle doctrine as the Logos would prove an invaluable organ in the order and government of a purely spiritual world. To them, of course, such a phrase as "the Logos became flesh" must have been an ineptitude and an offence.

Basilides held that the Logos emanated from the *νοῦς* as the *νοῦς* emanated from the Father.

According to Valentinus the Logos was the child of the Nous and Truth.

Cerinthus taught that the Logos descended upon Christ at His Baptism.

Of more orthodox writers, Justin Martyr, a Samaritan by birth, attempted, like many writers of our own time, to gather up into one conception the Hebrew and Hellenic ideas—the "reason-Logos" and the "word-Logos." Origen, with his characteristic disregard of traditional restraints, not only calls the Logos "a second God," but seems to insinuate that this Logos dwelt in Jesus only in a more complete and perfect way than in other men,—a tenet at once Arian and Socinian. Returning for a moment to the category of men who corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel by their jangling disputations and endless sophistry, the Sabellians taught that the Logos was a faculty of God,

the Divine reason, immanent in God eternally, but without distinct personality until its historical manifestation in Christ.

Practically this is the end of Logology as a shibboleth in the history of heresy. Doubtless in Spinoza and Socinus there is a partial disinterment of its remains.

In one sense then the doctrine of the Logos has died. But truth can never die. Caricature and corruption find their grave at last. But the spirit of truth survives them in "an ampler æther, a diviner air." And so at her altars the Church doth ever sing her Gloria in Excelsis to the Logos of S. John, "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and WAS MADE MAN." And her holy psalmists take up the strain of Adam of St. Victor :

Verbum vere substantivi,
Caro cum sit in declivi
Temporis angustiâ,
In æternis verbum annis
Permaneri nos Johannis
Docet theologia.

J. M. DANSON.

BREVIA.

The Canon of the Old Testament, by Herbert Edward Ryle, B.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London, Macmillan, 1892.

Professor's Ryle's investigations into the question of the Canon were to all intents completed and his work written before the appearance of Buhl's book on the same subject, and in the light of this fact the virtual identity of his results with those of Buhl becomes the more significant (EXPOSITOR for April). A better guarantee of the general trustworthiness of their conclusions, so far as there is evidence to go on, could hardly be got. Buhl's book is somewhat scholastic in manner and intended rather for the pro-

fessional student, while the broader treatment of the subject and the literary excellencies of Mr. Ryle's work will make it attractive to every class of readers. This wider scope of the book also opens up many interesting questions connected with the thought of the people of Israel and their literary activity.

Though technically outside the question of the Canon, a very useful part of Professor Ryle's work consists of the sketches given of the rise of the three divisions of the literature, Law, Prophets and Writings, and the several books belonging to them respectively, and of the estimation in which such books were held before the voice of revelation ceased to be heard. These instructive sketches supply the reader with just the amount of information from the science of Introduction necessary to enable him to follow with intelligence the more circumscribed questions of the Canon, and make the author's work very complete. The Appendices on the part assigned by tradition to Ezra in the formation of the Canon and on the men of the Great Synagogue are full of curious information, though they do not tend to heighten our respect for the historical sense of our ecclesiastical ancestors.

The author's work is historical, and it did not fall within its scope to treat certain questions of the Canon which are more theological, such as the relation of the Church of to-day to the conclusions of the Old Testament Church, or the principles on which the Church of every age must regulate her attitude towards the books of the Canon. His remarks on the *Antilegomena* of the Canon, *e.g.* Esther, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes, are fair and judicious, and free from what must be called the special pleading of Wildeboer on the same subject. Scholars are indebted to Professor Ryle for having given them for the first time a complete and trustworthy history of the Old Testament Canon.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.

ITS CONTENTS.

WHEN the indications of the existence of an Aramaic source as the basis of much of the common matter of the Synoptic Gospels had been laboriously collected, there were two possible methods in which the evidence might effectively be exhibited. It was possible to *classify* the evidence, and to show that the divergences which we assume to have taken place in the transcription of the Aramaic text were of the same *kinds* as we find in other Semitic texts; or it was possible to take each discourse or narrative separately, as given in the respective Gospels, and to show how large a proportion of the divergences, in those parallel accounts that give evidence of having belonged to the primitive gospel, are due to various readings in the Aramaic original. The former of these methods seemed to us the preferable one, as being best suited to the pages of a Magazine. We do not regret the decision. It has yielded us valuable results. We have appealed to three sources for information as to the *kinds* of error to which Semitic scribes are specially liable. (1) We appealed to the Old Testament quotations which are found in the New Testament, and ascertained that the divergences between the two are for the most part explainable on the supposition that the Hebrew MSS., from which the New Testament quotations were made, differed slightly from the text which the Masorites have preserved for us. (2) We have also directed attention to the variations which occur in the two recensions of the same psalm, as preserved in Psalm xviii. and

2 Samuel xxii.; and (3) we have compared the manner in which Proper Names are spelled in the First Book of Chronicles with their spelling in the earlier books of Scripture. From these investigations we received concurrent testimony that the frailties of Semitic scribes, in their tedious employment, admit of a fourfold classification: 1. the insertion of different vowels. 2. The misreading of a letter. 3. The omission of a letter. 4. The transposition of two adjacent letters. We then set ourselves to show that the assumption of these very *kinds* of divergence, in writing or reading a primitive Aramaic text, explains a large number of the variations which occur in parallel passages of the Synoptic Gospels.

But more than this, it has recently occurred to me, that there is a tolerably constant ratio in the numbers of these kinds of "errors of the Scribe." In the three sources from which our illustrations have been drawn, speaking generally, the numbers of errors which fall in classes 1 and 3 are about equal; those in class 2 are about as numerous as 1 and 3 together; and those in class 4 are very few. Here evidently is law at work. And is it not a remarkable proof that our hypothesis is a *vera causa*, when we can show that the same ratio is discernible in the classes of various readings which we claim to have discovered as existing in MSS. of the Aramaic Gospel. The number of cases that we have claimed to find of diverse vocalization are about equal to those of omission of a consonant; those of misunderstanding of one letter are about equal to these two together; while the cases of transposition of two letters are but four. In the sixty-two instances of various reading in the Proper Names in the first Book of Chronicles, as compared with the earlier books, thirteen belong to class 1; twenty-eight to class 2; eighteen to class 3; and three to class 4. Now I admit that it would have been a shock to my confidence, if, when the mass of evidence came to

be analysed, it had appeared that the ratio between the number of instances of the several *kinds* of divergence was widely different from that which occurred in the transcription of other Semitic texts. If, for instance, in order to explain the divergences in the Greek, it had been thought necessary, in numerous instances, to *transpose* the letters in the hypothetical Aramaic word, it might with reason have been expected that there had been some unwarrantable manipulation of the Aramaic words; but when we only profess to find *four* out of a round hundred, and in 1 Chronicles there are *three* in sixty-two, and the other cases are in the same ratio, it must be conceded that so far as this line of evidence goes, we seem to be in the right vein; especially when it is stated that the idea of comparing the kinds of divergence in our assumed Aramaic Gospel with those in the Hebrew did not suggest itself until our cases in evidence had been fully collected.

Speaking for myself, however, I confess that the second mode of presenting the argument is the more impressive; that is, to examine each several narrative or discourse as a whole, exhibiting the homologous passages from the Synoptic Gospels in parallel columns. To study the homologues, line by line, and to find that almost every divergence in the common matter yields to our solution, brings overwhelming conviction to my own mind, and I am hopeful that by and by it will gain for the theory universal acceptance. It is surely a significant fact that wherever the indications of translation exist, they swarm. There are, as we have often remarked, many portions of the Synoptic Gospels in which the divergences stoutly refuse to yield to our hypothesis, but (unless the passage be a very short one) we never find solitary indications. If the parallel passages give any indication at all of translation work, we may confidently expect that almost all the divergences are explicable by our theory. And when it is remembered that

thus far the labours of but one lone student have been directed to this field of inquiry, it may confidently be expected that a richer harvest will be reaped when other and abler scholars bring their learning to bear on this important theme.

It would occupy too much valuable space in the pages of THE EXPOSITOR to do full justice to the evidence by deploying the parallel passages side by side with the homologous phrases on the same line. By and by it is my intention to do this in a separate volume. In the meanwhile, I would strongly advise those who wish to appreciate the force of the argument, to mark in the margin of some Harmony of the Gospels the instances which we have explained on our hypothesis, especially in the Parable of the Sower, the Sermon on the Mount and its parallels scattered in various parts of the Gospel of Luke, the healing of Jairus' daughter, the Gadarene demoniac, and some others, from which so many of our illustrations have been drawn. We venture to think that the *tout ensemble* will be far more convincing than the reading of each case separately. In none of the pericopæ just named are there less than twelve to fifteen instances in which the divergences are explicable on our hypothesis, and numerous other differences which can hardly be called divergences are all in harmony with the theory.

And now we address ourselves to a very important question: What were the contents of the primitive Gospel? The Church Fathers without a discordant voice affirm that Matthew wrote *Ἐβραϊστί*—which word in the New Testament always means “in Aramaic.” That which he thus wrote is called by Papias, *τὰ λόγια*, which rigorously means “the utterances,” but is used by the apostle Paul to designate the whole Old Testament—“the oracles of God” which were entrusted to the Jews (Rom. iii. 2). The usage

of the word therefore leaves it quite an open question, whether the *Logia* consisted solely of discourses, or a mixture of discourse and narrative, such as is found in the Old Testament, and also in our present Gospels. In our paper of last February, a *résumé* was given of the varied ways in which it had been sought to recover the contents of the primitive Gospel, as to the existence of which, within our present Gospels, there has been a growing consensus during the past few years. We then announced as a new criterion for the determination of the problem, a linguistic test. Those parallel passages in the Synoptists which present phenomena compatible with translation from a common source, and in which the divergences can be explained by the assumption of very trifling and common variations in an Aramaic exemplar, must be assigned to the *Urevangelium*. I am free to confess that at the outset I had no idea that the theory would apply to more than the discourses of the Lord Jesus; but after a time, when the method was applied to the narratives, they disclosed in some cases more numerous indications of translation than some of the discourses. Having taken the clue into our hands, we were, of course, obliged to follow its guidance implicitly.

The list which we now subjoin is at best but tentative. It is a list of those passages in which the present writer has detected indications of translation. If the further researches of Semitic scholars should reveal the fact that some other portions of the Gospels comply with these conditions, these will of course need to be added; and, on the other hand, if it should occur that in any pericope all the indications claimed should finally be voted untenable, such passage will need to be omitted.

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
The Baptism of John	iii. 1-6	i. 1-6	iii. 3-4
John's testimony to Christ	11	7, 8	16
The Baptism of Christ	16-17	9, 11	21-23
* ¹ The Temptation	iv. 1-11	12, 13	iv. 1-13
Return to Galilee	12, 17	14-15	14-15
The Capernaum demoniac		21-8	31-37
Simon's wife's mother	viii. 14-16	29-34	38-41
The desert place		35-39	42-44
Healing of the leper	2-4	40-44	v. 12-14
*Healing of the paralytic	ix. 2-8	ii. 1-12	17-26
The call of Matthew	9-13	14-17	27-32
The withered hand	xii. 9-14	iii. 1-6	vi. 6-11
The call of the Twelve	x. 2-4	13-19	12-16
The Sermon on the Mount	v.-vii.		17-49
			<i>et passim.</i>
The parable of the sower	xiii. 1-23	iv. 1-20	viii. 4-15
The lamp and the bushel		21-5	16-18
The mustard seed	xiii. 31, 32	30-32	xiii. 18, 19
The storm at sea	viii. 18, 23-7	35-41	viii. 22-25
The Gadarene demoniac	28-34	v. 1-20	26-39
Jairus' daughter			
The woman with the issue.	ix. 18-26	22-43	41-56
The mission of the Twelve	x. 1, 5-15	vi. 7-11	ix. 1-6
"Beware of men"	17-20	xiii. 9-13	xxi. 12-17
"The disciple not greater," etc.	24-5		vi. 40
"Fear them not"	26-33		xii. 2-9
"Not peace but a sword"	34-6		51-3
Cross bearing	x. 37-38		xiv. 25-27
	xvi. 24-27	viii. 31-38	ix. 23-26
"Whoso receiveth me"	x. 40		x. 16
*The five thousand	xiv. 13-21	vi. 30-44	ix. 10-17
Peter's confession	xvi. 13-20		
The transfiguration	xvii. 1-8	ix. 2-8	ix. 28-36
The demoniac boy	14-21	14-29	38-42
"One of these little ones"	xviii. 6-9	42-59	xvii. 1-2
Divorce	xix. 3-6	x. 2-9	
The rich young ruler	16-22	17-22	xviii. 18-23
The blind man near Jericho	xx. 19-34	16-52	35-43
Tribute to Caesar	xxii. 15-20	xii. 13-17	xx. 20-26
*The last things	xxiv.	xiii.	xxi.

¹ As to those passages marked thus (*) it is doubtful whether they existed in the Aramaic Gospel in their present form.

I must again repeat that this list of contents is merely tentative. It claims to be nothing more than a list of those passages which seem to me to yield indications of translation from a common Aramaic source. It possesses many features in common with other lists of the contents of the *Logia*, but coincides most closely with the results of Dr. B. Weiss. In our paper of February, 1891, it was shown that his Method was totally different from the one here adopted, and yet in the main he assigns the same sections to the "Source" as are found above. As regards those portions of the Synoptic Gospels which were not included in the *Logia*, it may be well that I should state that I see no reason for ascribing to them an inferior historic credibility on that account.

Further, it is quite possible that the list is incomplete, especially as regards those passages which only occur *once* in the Gospels. Our method works by means of comparison. When two divergent Greek words in parallel passages yield the same, or two slightly different, Aramaic words, then our method comes into play. Those pericopæ which only occur once, our Method leaves for the most part undecided. There are only two conceivable ways in which the criterion can be applied to such passages. 1. If there be any *various readings*, which are so ancient as to go back to the very days when the Aramaic Gospel might well be supposed to be still in use, and which can be shown to be explainable as translations of the same or a slightly different Aramaic text. 2. If there are confessedly *obscure words* in those passages which are only found once in the Gospels, and a retranslation of such words into Aramaic, slightly altered, produces a new meaning, lucid and contextual, such passages we shall claim for the *Logia*. These indications are decidedly inferior in demonstrative force to those which we can adduce from the passages which occur twice or thrice, and yet they are

worthy of notice, as the best evidence we can have in the circumstances.

One or two illustrations may be here introduced as specimens of what may be done in this direction.

I. Various readings in the Greek Testament.

(a) We have already alluded to the very ancient various reading in Matthew xix. 17, where the Textus Receptus reads, "Why callest thou Me good?" but the Greek MSS., which are usually, in their unison, most reliable, read, "Why askest thou Me concerning the good?" We have also shown that in Aramaic the former is

לְכִּינָא אֲכִיר אֶת לִי טַב

the latter לְכִּינָא אֲכִיר אֶת לִי לְטַב or לְטַב לִי לְכִּינָא אֲכִיר

If the theory advocated in these papers be established, the evidence of the Aramaic must have a voice in the decision of questions of criticism; and in the case before us it is by no means certain that the later Greek MSS. have not preserved for us the correct text, especially as this is presumably the translation of the original Aramaic in Luke xviii. 19, and Mark x. 18.

(b) In Matthew vi. 1 we have a very old various reading. The Revised Version reads: "Take heed that ye do not *your righteousness* (τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν) before men, to be seen of them," instead of "*your alms*" (τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ὑμῶν). There is no doubt but that these two Greek words are translations of the one Aramaic word צְדָקָתָא, which means both "righteousness" and "almsgiving." The fact that the one word should possess both these meanings is of itself an indication of the value which later Jewish Theology attached to almsgiving, as constituting the essence of righteousness. There is a tendency in the Hebrew צְדָקָה to assume the meaning of "mercy" rather than of "justice" or "righteousness." The LXX. recognised this by rendering צְדָקָה nine times by the Greek word ἐλεημοσύνη,

which means (1) "mercy," (2) "almsgiving." The Jewish Rabbis were more free than the LXX. in giving this meaning to ܩܪܘܢܐ: *e.g.* in Proverbs xi. 4, "Riches profit not in the day of death, but ܩܪܘܢܐ delivereth from death"; and in Proverbs x. 2, "Treasures of wickedness profit nothing, but ܩܪܘܢܐ delivereth from death"—in these passages the Greek is *δικαιοσύνη*, but the Rabbis interpreted ܩܪܘܢܐ to mean "alms"; and it is not uncommon even now for alms to be collected at Jewish funerals while the collectors recite the words, "Almsgiving delivereth from death." In these circumstances, it remains an open question whether BDN have, in Matthew vi. 1, as accurately represented the meaning of our Lord by *δικαιοσύνη*, as the Curetonian Syriac and the rest of the Greek MSS. by "almsgiving," *ἐλεημοσύνη*.

(c) In the closing words of the "Sermon on the Mount" we have in Luke's Gospel two readings, both of which are very ancient: *τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν* = "because it was founded upon a rock"; and *διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομηθῆσαι αὐτήν* = "because it was well built." It will be conceded that the difference between *γὰρ* and *διὰ* is precisely what we should expect in translation from a common source, and the difference between "founding" and "building" is not too great to be compatible with the same theory. But can we explain *καλῶς* and *ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν*? Let us see. The picture presented is that of a house built near a wady. The rugged weather-worn cliffs which form the side of the torrent-bed are on the top coated with soil and marl, through which the wise man digs till he reaches the solid cliff. Such a region is suggested by the word ܩܪܘܢܐ in Proverbs xiii. 15, "The way of transgressors is *hard*." R.V. "*rugged*." Perhaps better still, "*rocky*." The Mishna interprets the word to mean, "a strong rushing wady": but it is probable that the reference is rather to the ruggedness of the rocky path along the wady, than to the "deceitful brook." The Targum renders the passage

thus : **וְאֶרְחָא תְּקִיפָא דְּבִזְוִי תִּיבֵר** "The rocky way of spoilers shall perish," or, "lose itself." In Job xviii. 4 the Targum of Buxtorf gives *two* traditional translations of the clause : "Shall the *rock* be removed out of its place?" In the one, the word **טִיָּר** is, as frequently, used for "rock" : in the other we have **תְּקִיפָא**. That is to say, the form which is usually an adjective, meaning "firm," "strong," "hard," "rocky," here becomes a substantive, "the rock." This is interesting, as the Targum of Job is written in Palestinian Aramaic. If now we may suppose that the Lord Jesus used this word, the rendering of the expression, "upon the rock" would be **עַל תְּקִיפָא**. But as **תְּקִיפָא** is rarely used as a substantive, the words **עַל תְּקִיפָא** in an Aramaic document would more readily suggest an adverbial phrase, "strongly," "firmly." Hence, we conjecture, arose the various reading : "It was WELL built."

Now let us consider what is implied in the phenomenon before us. We have presumably several Aramaic MSS. in existence ; and an authoritative translation is made by the Evangelist, but some scribe is acquainted with another reading in the Aramaic or with a current Greek rendering thereof, which he prefers to the Greek of his copy, and he inserts that instead of what he has before him. The thing can be detected, because both the better and the inferior renderings have come down to us. But is it not conceivable that in some cases the original translation of the Evangelist may have been lost, and the inferior substitute alone have survived, especially in passages which occur but once in the Gospels? The occurrence of some very obscure passages confirms this opinion. We pass on now therefore to some few conjectural emendations which we advance with unfeigned diffidence.

II. Conjectural emendation of some obscure Greek words.

(a) In Matthew xvi. 18 we read, "On this rock I will build my church, and the *gates* of Hades shall not prevail

against it." The word "gates" in this connexion is startling; and a glance at the commentaries shows that no one seems satisfied with his interpretation. Can it be that the word "gates" is not original, but a second-rate rendering inserted by a later scribe? Very probably so. The regular word for "gate" in Aramaic is **תַּרְעָה**: plural, **תַּרְעֵינָא**. But the verb **תַּרַעַ** means to assail, devastate, ravage, make inroads. So the noun **תַּרְעֵינָא** means, ravages, inroads. It is used of the irruption of an army into a city, and of an inroad of the sea. We respectfully submit whether our Lord did not intend the latter meaning. The church is described as a city built in an enemy's country, or liable to the assaults of the enemy. Is it not probable that the thought of our Lord was: "The *ravages* or *inroads* of (the hosts of) Hades shall not prevail against it"?

(b) Mark x. 29, 30: "There is no one who hath left house or brethren . . . who shall not receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brethren . . . and lands *with persecutions*; and in the world to come eternal life." The strange way in which persecutions are dashed across the fair picture, which is, by the way, so lusciously overdrawn in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is felt by all to be a difficulty. If we retranslate the word "persecution" however into Aramaic, it yields us almost certainly **רְדִיפָא**. The change of one letter gives **רְדִינָא** = fine raiment: used specially of the costly fine wrap worn on the head and neck. It is the name of the "veil" in which Rebekah adorned herself when she was about to see Isaac for the first time (Gen. xxiv. 65); and it formed part of the array in which, according to the Second Targum of Esther, Haman was to adorn Mordecai (Esther vi. 8). When it is remembered that to an Oriental, raiment is a part of wealth, it cannot be alleged that the word is too sensuous, especially as it stands in conjunction with houses and lands.

III. There are few passages in the Gospels which have more taxed the ingenuity of translators than the words of Matthew vi. 16, ἀφανίζουσι γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν. It is usually rendered, "For they *disfigure* their faces." No one pretends however that this word means "to disfigure" elsewhere. Its primary meaning is to cause to disappear; hence ordinarily it means, to make away with, destroy utterly. In the present passage, it is claimed that from the idea of causing to disappear, the word means to bedaub the face with ashes and dirt, so as to render it invisible (cf. Meyer *in loco*). Let us now see how this is confirmed by our Aramaic theory. The word ἀφανίζουσι (Vulgate, *exterminant*) would be in Aramaic ܐܦܢܝܙܘܫܝ, 3 pl. of ܐܦܢܝܙܘܬܝ. But if we change ܐ into its cognate ܫ, we obtain ܫܦܢܝܙܘܫܝ, 3 pl. of ܫܦܢܝܙܘܬܝ, to bedaub, beplaster. The word is used of the slabs which were to be placed on Mount Ebal, and on which, when "plastered with plaster," the law was to be written (Deut. xxvii. 2). In the Mishnic tractate *Shabbath*, it is used of daubing the face with depilatory, in order to remove superfluous hairs. We would suggest then that the correct reading of the Aramaic was ܫܦܢܝܙܘܫܝ = they *bedaub* their faces. We thus obtain the very meaning which Meyer contrived to read into ἀφανίζουσι.

Conjectural emendation ought to be undertaken very sparingly and very cautiously. These are the only cases in which we can confidently recommend its application. The cases adduced are interesting, but their value is merely subjective. Those who admit them in evidence will recognise that they point clearly in the same direction as the other arguments we have adduced in favour of a written Aramaic Gospel.

A large part of the Sermon on the Mount is only found once in the Gospels. When however any part of Matthew v.-vii. is reproduced in Luke, we invariably notice that the divergences yield to our hypothesis, and therefore we feel

justified in inferring that the whole was contained in the original Aramaic Gospel.

At this point we may allude to a difficulty which has been raised by one or two kind friends. "We admit," it is said, "the probability of your hypothesis to account for the divergences, but how do you explain the *coincidences* in the passages where divergences exist?" Dr. B. Weiss felt this difficulty, and met it thus: "The writing which lies at the basis of our three Gospels cannot have been the primitive Hebrew work of Matthew itself, since they agree so closely in many instances in the Greek wording, but can only have been an old Greek translation of it."¹ It should be noted that Dr. Weiss here uses the term "Hebrew" laxly as the language of Palestine; for elsewhere² he speaks of "the Aramaic source" as equivalent to the above. Thus he postulates (1) the Matthæan *Urevangelium*; (2) A Greek translation of this used by the several canonical evangelists. For my own part, I have felt no necessity for this multiplication of documents; but would rather invoke the aid of oral or catechetical instruction. A current Greek rendering of the Aramaic, with which each Evangelist was familiar, while he translated from the written document, supplemented from time to time by personal information, amply explains all the phenomena.

As one practical outcome of our researches, the *contents* of the Aramaic Gospel will be to many a matter of deep interest, and our list will be scanned very closely. It cannot be denied that the criterion used to decide as to its contents has the immense advantage of allowing no play to subjectivity. We have been guided solely by linguistic considerations. Those parallel passages which bear indica-

¹ Weiss' *Introduction to the New Testament*. English translation in Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's Foreign Biblical Library, page 235.

² Weiss' *Life of Christ*, vol. i. chap. ii., in Messrs. Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

tions of translation-work, we include; those which do not, we exclude. And what is the conclusion at which we arrive? In the main it is this, that in its narratives the primitive Gospel is closely followed in the Gospel of Mark; but at the same time it contained most of the earlier discourses of Matthew. At all events this much is to my mind certain, that these narratives and discourses both existed originally in Aramaic, and from this were translated into their present form; and the examination of the language gives no ground for the surmise that there were two Aramaic *Urevangelia*—an “Ur-Marcus” and an “Ur-Matthæus.”

Those who have any acquaintance with the criticism of the Gospels as conducted in Germany, well know how hotly the dispute has raged, as to whether the longer or the shorter form of the narratives is the earlier. Did Matthew condense the narratives? or did Mark amplify? The result of our investigations leads us unhesitatingly to the conclusion, that the *longer form of the narratives is the original*. The design of the first Gospel is different from that of the second. Speaking generally, we may say, the first Gospel abbreviates the narratives; the second abbreviates or omits the discourses.

We see further that the Aramaic Gospel was chiefly a record of the Galilean ministry. In our paper of last September we endeavoured to show that there were indications that the first Gospel was written in the Galilean dialect. According to all ancient testimony it was written by a Galilean—the tax-gatherer Matthew; and therefore it is antecedently probable that provincialisms would occur in his literary productions. The concurrence of these two lines of evidence furnishes a weighty argument for the truth of our position. This is confirmed again when we discover that the work thus written was largely the Galilean Gospel; that is, the record of Christ's deeds and words

in Galilee. In connexion with this, it is interesting to note, that the central part of the Gospel of Luke, from ix. 51 to xviii. 14, is largely occupied with a Samaritan ministry. It is here alone that we read of the mission of the seventy, who were *not* forbidden to enter into the cities of the Samaritans (x. 1-24). Here only do we read of the repression of the misguided zeal of the Sons of Thunder in a Samaritan village (ix. 52-6). Here only do we find the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 25-37); and the record of the ten lepers, of which the only grateful one was a Samaritan (xvii. 11-19). This seems to render it probable that of the "many who had taken in hand to draw up a narrative," more or less fragmentary, of our Saviour's history, and to whom Luke acknowledges his indebtedness (Luke i. 1-4), one had written specially on the Samaritan ministry, and that work may have included many of the unique events and discourses found in the centre of the third Gospel.

It will be observed that the Aramaic Gospel gives no certain evidence of having contained an account of the Nativity. It seems to have opened precisely as the second Gospel does. We are free, however, to confess that inasmuch as the first two chapters of Matthew are not found elsewhere, and as our method is almost inapplicable to events not narrated twice, it *may* be that this in whole or part was found in the primitive Gospel. It will be observed also that there is no mention of the ministry in Jerusalem. On this point we can speak confidently, because we have a triple, indeed fourfold, account of the Passion; and the divergences give no indication of an Aramaic original. It is also noteworthy that there are no discourses of our Saviour which manifest phenomena so diverse from those on which we rely for inclusion in the Aramaic Gospel, as our Lord's predictions concerning His death.

Can we now venture to suggest a date at which the

Aramaic Gospel was probably written? This may most satisfactorily be answered if we ask, When did it happen that it was desirable or necessary that the Galilean ministry should be committed to writing, although there was as yet no need to write the history of the Judean ministry? The most probable answer to this question is that the Church at Jerusalem would need a written record as an authoritative standard *when the apostles left Jerusalem*. The advocates of the oral Gospel lay great stress on the excellent memories of the Orientals, and their ability to commit to memory much longer portions than our Gospels. But it was not because the conservative and reproductive faculties of the Orientals were defective, that a written Gospel was desirable, but because their imaginative faculty was exuberant; and the way in which fancy ran riot is clearly seen in the Apocryphal Gospels. The Galilean apostles did not leave Jerusalem for some few years after the resurrection; but unless church tradition is to be distrusted, there came a time when they did all leave. Indeed we gather from 2 Corinthians x., xi., that at that time it had come to be regarded as one of the marks of a genuine apostle that he should break up fallow ground, and preach the gospel where previously it was unknown. We would suggest then that the Gospel of the Galilean ministry was written in Aramaic within twenty years of the death of Christ, at a time when those who were members of the Church at Jerusalem, could well remember the circumstances of the Saviour's death, and there was no immediate need for committing *them* to writing, but when it was desirable to have an authorized record of what took place in Galilee, and to have our Lord's words reduced to fixed and definite form. This would most probably occur before the Twelve left Jerusalem on their respective apostolic missions.

It must be conceded that this investigation has throughout been conducted in the scientific spirit. We have

applied a test which satisfies the demands of literary criticism ; and we have applied it unflinchingly, without allowing any predispositions to influence our decisions ; and yet when calmly regarded, our investigations are a decided gain to the Christian faith. We have furnished an oft-wished-for explanation of many of the bewildering divergences in the Synoptic Gospels—an explanation at once in harmony with the principles of textual criticism, and also with Inspiration, as rightly understood. But we have done more than this. We have shown (and hope to do so more fully by and by) that a written account of our Lord's life existed many years before our present Gospels were penned. There is at the present time a decided disposition among scholars to date our Greek Gospels much later than was once supposed. But whensoever our Greek Gospels were written, many years must have elapsed between that time and the composition of the Aramaic Gospel ; otherwise the errors of the scribe, which we find somewhat numerous, would not have had time to creep into the MSS. On this account our studies have an apologetic value. They carry back the existence of a written record some twenty years nearer the occurrence of the events than our present Gospels. The most wonderful of the miracles are there narrated—and not in an abridged form, but usually in the full form of the Gospel of Mark. We thus rejoice that the final outcome of our researches tends by carrying the date of a written Gospel further back than has hitherto been thought admissible, and by thus removing the possibility of the incrustation of legend and of myth, to strengthen the foundations of our holy faith.

J. T. MARSHALL.

*SAMUEL.*¹

SAMUEL is often called the last of the Judges, but whether he or Eli be so reckoned, there can be no doubt that Old Testament history counts Samuel one of the very greatest figures in its panorama of heroic and noble statesmen. Whenever in the Old Testament you find the childhood of any character that figures in the drama elaborately described, you may take it for certain that the historians consider the man so depicted to be the maker of a new epoch. The story of the infancy of Moses is a familiar example. On reading the first chapters of the Book of Samuel you will instantly receive the impression that Samuel holds a place in the history of God's chosen people probably second only to that held by Moses, the creator of Israel and the founder of Israel's religion.

The history narrated in the Book of Samuel is not written by Samuel himself. It is not even put together at the time Samuel lived or immediately after. The book is manifestly a compilation of one, two, or three older masses of tradition. We can detect differences in the language and in the description of the pervading interests, political or religious, which betray the composite origin of these sections which, grouped together, make what we count the continuous story of Samuel. Moreover, Bible scholars are no doubt right in saying that these stories about Samuel that we possess in our book cannot be altogether reconciled to one another, as we have them. Sometimes a period in the life of Samuel is taken from one history, and then again the next from another; and we have not the proper beginnings of either narrative. Besides, one at least of those old histories has been decidedly coloured by the religious bent of the mind of the

¹ A Lecture.

man who wrote it. He tells the story of olden days for the purpose of letting you see the workings of Providence, the designs of God. He is not content to tell you of the mere germs, the beginnings, of impulse or of aspiration. He describes the development of new ideas in the light of what has issued from them: he works them out and shows you all that was contained in those germinal springs and fountains of new life and new faith.

It is, therefore, not altogether easy to settle in our own minds with certainty what were the actual events in Samuel's life. One thing, however, we can say with perfect confidence, and that is, that it fell to him to watch the very death-throes of one great epoch of Israel's history, and to usher in a new life, a remarkable reorganization of Israel's political and religious career. What we have deposited within the compass of Samuel's career is nothing short of the greatest revolution that took place in the story of Israel.

I must go back to the beginning of our course of lectures and ask you to recall what was the formative, the creative ideal, as later historians have worked it out for us, that shone before the eyes of Moses, and of Joshua, and of all the religious souls that were in Israel at the time of the conquest of Canaan. The ideal was this: to take possession of a chosen, specially adapted portion of this earth's surface to be the home and seat of a people absolutely devoted to the one true God. In the face of all modern criticism and questionings, I stand by that. I cannot otherwise account for the magnificent enthusiasm and might with which those wandering, nomad tribes of the desert seized upon Palestine, getting, ultimately, full possession of the land, I cannot otherwise explain the tenacity with which they resisted all the forces that played upon them, that tended to break down their religious faith, to destroy their own peculiar national character, and to cause them to sink to the level of the old inhabitants. I cannot account

for the extraordinary drama which their history presents except by the explanation that it had its deepest and ultimate root in great religious enthusiasm. It is quite possible that there was a great deal of ignorance, earthliness, fanaticism, superstition, and weakness in the mass of the people. That has been the history of the Christian Church through centuries; it has been the condition of Christendom itself. Only the leaders, the great outstanding thinkers and believers, may have grasped the inner heart and life of their religion; but they were able all the same to permeate the mass of the worshippers with an immense enthusiasm that stirred them to warlike deeds, which were in the designs of God, though as a mass they only half understood their religion, not having any grasp of what really lay at the heart of it.

The purpose, plan, and goal aimed at in the conquest of Canaan was to hold the land peaceably, to settle down in the farms, in the vineyards, in the sunny homes there, and live a happy, quiet life, secure under the protection of Jehovah. The original plan, as sketched out by Moses, and held before the people by Joshua and other leaders, must, humanly speaking, have secured them that. Had they been thoroughly loyal to Jehovah and to one another, tribe standing fast by tribe; had they carried to its complete issue the task of subjugating Canaan and driving out their enemies, then probably they might have held their own without being exposed to constant attacks. They might have developed material prosperity that would have been a platform for wonderful spiritual growth and progress. But in all these points they failed utterly.

The actual fact was very different from the ideal that had brightened the soul of Moses, and that had shone before the faces of the early leaders of Israel. The Hebrews failed to take thorough possession of the land. Everywhere they left cities in the hands of the old Canaanites.

Right through the middle of the country there ran a wedge of Canaanite Pagan towns. Their selfishness rapidly severed the tribes from one another. Every man looked after himself, every community lived for its own interest. It was excessively difficult at any time to get them to take any action to realise their common brotherhood under the Divine Fatherhood of Jehovah, consequently it was impossible that as a nation they could come to any good. It has always been impossible to get a people, broken into separate communities, not welded into one great nation with a fixed authority and government and a throne held by a powerful monarch, to do anything great or magnificent in the world's history. In a crisis some great leader springs up, works upon their fears, welds them together into a powerful army, strikes a blow that destroys a wanton invasion. Then he plans to go and crush the danger at its seat; but that is impossible. The moment the danger is over, each tribe, regiment, community, sets off home to till their fields and make money again. And so everywhere, throughout the period of the Judges, great victories are achieved, splendid deeds are done; but all the same there is no large conquest of territory still held in alien hands, there is no extension of Israel's sway over the surrounding powers.

How came Israel to miss its lofty destiny and to lapse into this condition of impotence and weakness, this moral and religious paralysis, that we find at the end of the period of the Judges? No doubt it all came from its first blunder, its failure to reach the height of its Divine vocation. But that is not quite a complete account of it. Strangely enough, what of faithfulness to their high calling remained in their hearts worked most disastrously for Israel. Since they would not answer to their ideal wholly, they would have done better, humanly speaking, to cast it wholly away. For by their ineffective attachment to it

the best men, the inspired religious leaders of Israel, were set against those human expedients and measures, which if adopted at the beginning of that epoch, might have given to the Hebrews a powerfully developed national unity, organization, and government. All through that period there was a strong recoil from the idea of breaking down old tribal distinctions, a great repulsion against the idea of a king of a centralized government; and that dislike of a king and a kingdom had its root in their very magnificent religious ideal. They felt that it would be a declension from the grandeur of the Israelites' calling, if between them and their God there came in any human representative or mediator. They were determined to have no visible centre of government among them. Their grand idea was to do their duty to their country and to God at the direct bidding and inspiration of Jehovah Himself. Now that was a magnificent and majestic thought, a thought which we ought to keep before us still, in political government, and, above all else, in our Church life and Church government, as well as in our own personal religion. It was a grand conception that Israel was ever to be so passionately devoted to their God, to be so keenly sensitive to the appointment of His will and wish in every emergency of their national fortunes, that they should need no human rule or government to compel them to do the right thing. It seemed a grand and glorious thing to live every day in immediate intercourse with God, and dependence on God. And if they had been able to live up to that ideal, they would have needed no king and no centralized human government. If every epoch could have produced one great heart and intellect to grasp the necessity of the time, with an arm powerful to lift the sword or the sceptre, to gather by an impulse felt everywhere, and obeyed, the whole power, manhood, soul, and heart of the people around him, then that would have been an infinitely more

glorious life, more strong, more noble, more true to the ideal of God's kingdom on earth, than any earthly kingship could have given them. The Book of Judges shows us the breakdown of that lofty ideal. Israel was not noble enough to realise it; they came far short of their calling and fared worse in regard at least to the earthly things which drew them away from it, than if they had utterly rejected it at the first.

Accordingly, instead of a nation moving like one man at the Divine impulsion towards divinely ordained ends, we find a totally different state of things. In certain great crises, powerful military dictators are raised up, who for a time unite the people together through the prestige and influence gained by their deliverance of the nation, or parts of the nation. They establish a certain not official, but moral authority and rule, and during their lifetime the land has the benefit of increased centralization, entirely in the name of God. At their death, the old selfish dissension reappears and the same process has to be repeated, until, as years go by, the possibility of that grows less and less. And so we come to a point where, if the Hebrews are to be delivered at all, it must be done by individual men whose very personality is lifted above the ordinary natural level. Men utterly consecrated to God and Jehovah in their whole soul and their whole being. Such, for example, was Samson, with all his defects. His final victory was not one of force of arms, it was a religious victory. Jehovah had showed Himself mightier than their gods. Consequently though Israel became more and more utterly impotent to hold its own, though the history of the period of the Judges is the history of a steady, persistent, material and political decline in Israel; yet underneath that external material degradation there is a gradual development in the inner kernel of loftier moral and religious life of which Samson's triumph was a sign. As you reach the

end of that period in the Book of Judges, you find that moral and religious force is coming to the front. The course of things therefore was that there arose great warriors inspired by God, and winning victories for Israel. Then, when the people are no longer fit to help themselves, you have deliverance wrought by single inspired individuals like Samson the Nazarite.

That method in its turn proved insufficient to preserve and recover the old religious and national idea. Then, as if instinctively the heart of the nation, all that is noble, living, all that has faith and fire in it, gathers round the central sanctuary; and so the next figure that appears on the scene, standing out in defence of God, is the high priest Eli at Shiloh, where the Ark of God is. Nazaritism has done its best and has come short. Now, priesthood, the professional embodiment of religion, is to have the opportunity to make its experiment, and see whether, through a priest of God, Israel can reach its proper ideal. History shows us that this also failed. Then appeared another new element and force. The strange, mysterious power of the prophet takes up the work and does mighty achievements, but it too is proved incompetent, not through its fault, but through the necessities of the situation, the actual facts and conditions of the problem. But prophecy, while owning itself defeated, and while laying down its claim to be Israel's deliverer, had yet creative might in it. It evolved from its own bosom that earthly instrument, office and power, that secures for Israel the perpetuity and dignity of its national existence, which though not in itself a fulfilment of Israel's ideal, is the condition of its final fulfilment in quite undreamed-of ways.

I will now sketch the character and career of Eli and Samuel. I first take the story of Eli, to show what Samuel had to work upon in making certain required changes. I have already given the key-ideas of the history, and need

only add that Eli is one of the most unfortunate men in the Bible. I think, if he could bring an action for libel against preachers and commentators, he would get enormous damages. We are all mentally so very indolent that we do not like complicated problems. As a matter of fact most men's characters, and most men's lives, are great mixtures. One of the most fruitful sources of our blunders just lies in the fact that we cannot face the honest truth of God; that men have got evil in them. There are some men whose will votes for the evil, and they are against God; but there are others whose heart and will, at least, side with the good and the best, and they are making for God. These men we may find in heaven at last, if we get there ourselves.

Eli was very far from being a bad man. It was his misfortune to reap the harvests of mischief that had been sown through centuries. He came at the end of a chain of impotent endeavours to realise a great good with imperfect instruments and imperfect methods; and we blame him for all the faults of the centuries. We constantly hear Eli described as a weak, worthless father, full of corruption, allowing his sons to commit all kinds of sacrilege, blasphemy, impurity, and himself a mere worldling with no heart or soul in him. The Bible on the contrary holds Eli up as a great man of God.

He was a priest, and as a priest he had proved himself a true lover of God. As a judge of Israel, certainly, he had done good and noble service to his people, and fought battles for God. What had happened was this. When he got to be an old man, when his bodily strength was going, when his mental vigour and the energy of his will were sapped, then, under the terrible pressure of adverse circumstances, he held the reins of priestly rule and government with a slack hand. He was over ninety years of age when he died. It was in those last years that he

allowed his sons to perpetuate such abuses in their administration. But why do we forget the magnificent life that had gone before? There is many a man who has done a noble work when strong, brave, and clear-minded, to which the generation that sees him die does not do justice. Eli, when told that God's punishment must fall on his house, said to the lad that was to replace him, "It is God's will; let Him do what is right." That man was a good man, but broken for all effective administration. Again, when he heard of his son's death, his face blanched, yet he still sat erect. When he was told that the Ark of God was taken, he fell down insensible and died. That is not a man without heart, not a man without soul. That is a true man of God.

Eli, it is said, drove his sons to wickedness by the weakness of his personal management; his tuition was so bad and defective that they turned out ill. Is that fair treatment of Eli as a nurturer of youth? Who was it that trained the child Samuel? Who was it that taught Samuel his early religion, and those splendid dreams for Israel and of Israel's God? If you give him the discredit of his bad sons, at least honour him with the credit of bringing up the child Samuel. Besides, there were plenty of people to corrupt Eli's sons. Nor should it be forgotten that Samuel, whom Eli taught, became the strong, powerful Samuel who crushed abuses and corruptions, drove out idolaters, and won battles for Israel.

It is not, however, my purpose to be wholly laudatory of Eli, for there was a dreadful flaw in his character; this, viz., that as he grew older, he grew far too amiable. It is not a common fault, but all the same it is a worse fault than too great firmness in a man that holds the reins of government. We want our rulers to stand firm and strong. You cannot manage to rule the world by good nature: there must be justice and retribution as well as pity,

affection and love. Through his dislike to do painful things, through that amiable indolence that made him hope that all things might right themselves, he got himself entangled in the evil of other men's lives. The result was that the people were demoralized more and more. All zeal for God, all pride in their own national existence, were destroyed in them, so that, when they had to confront the Philistines in battle, they had no manhood left. The Philistines, after an immense massacre, captured the Ark of God, and immediately after that they pressed forward, took Shiloh, and utterly destroyed and left in ruin the Temple of God there. And so the end of Eli's government as high priest of Israel was the utter destruction and annihilation of anything that approached centralization, and of everything that gave unity and focus to the national and religious life and faith. In short, it was the utter downfall and destruction of that great experiment, the rule by Judges.

The real crisis had been reached: there was no sanctuary; the Ark was gone; Israel had lost its God, lost its own national existence. It was at this stage of moral and religious paralysis, when all existing machinery had broken down, that Samuel came upon the scene. As to Samuel's childhood, mark how the historians depict the combination in him of all that was hopeful and loving that came out of that great epoch. Though there had been in the mass declension, nevertheless, there was an inner kernel of the people who, impressed by the spectacle of failure and decay, were driven nearer to God, and were discovering that only in living and direct contact with God was there any hope for Israel. Of these Samuel from his youth was the representative. First of all, Samuel in his birth was a Nazarite, and so one that will be recognised as a brother and rightly claimed as a brother by those rigid ascetics who were pledged

against idolatrous indulgence within God's land. Then Samuel is taken early to the sanctuary, he is received into the priesthood, though not born to that office; especially received, out of regard for the vow of his mother. He performs, at all events, certain priestly functions. He, after the great disaster, remains hand and glove with the priesthood: so that he is once again allied to another powerful class and factor in the national and social life. But the supreme thing about Samuel is that he stands out transcendently as a prophet of God. As such he re-created the national life and constitution. Samuel stands out as a prophet of the very first rank: a man possessing a knowledge of God at first hand, knowledge of a supernatural character, and therefore he appears vested with new and creative powers. There is a great deal in the history to justify that conception of Samuel: a great deal to induce us to say that the new period of national progress and success initiated by Samuel has its root in a sudden outburst of original prophetic power and capacity among the Hebrews. Samuel was a man taken into the secret council of Jehovah, and he found the nation broken to pieces, utterly shattered, trampled beneath the feet of the Philistines; the nation's God degraded, the sanctuary gone, all national organization, rule, and authority utterly demolished. His commission was to restore, but he could only begin slowly. His great power lay in his character as God's prophet. Probably for twenty years he wielded that power only. Not as a military dictator, not as a great deliverer, not as a priest, nor even as a Nazarite did he work, but as a man who knew the will of God, as a man in whom God's spirit dwelt. He went about among the people, everywhere fanning the flame of old memories of Israel's greatness, everywhere making men, in spite of all the external shipwreck and ruin, feel a strange inner certainty that God had not forsaken them, but that He had

great things in store for them, and that the way to reach God's heart was to come back to God Himself.

Everywhere Samuel, Nazarite and prophet, led a crusade against heathen worship, against sensual practices, against idolatry: everywhere he fanned a great fire of absolute religious enthusiasm in the people. Then, at last, a day came when his hold of the nation was strong enough to justify the experiment, and he raised the standard of revolt against the Philistines. The Philistines, in the midst of a providential storm, are thrown into confusion, and he wins an easy victory. It was God's deed: it for ever confirmed Samuel's claim to be God's prophet; it renewed, by a visible token, Israel's confidence in God's presence among them. A new era in national growth begins.

I think the likeliest reading of the later history is this. When the first enthusiasm had died out the measure of prosperity regained produced the old engrossment in material pursuits, and the mind of the people began once more to sink into apathy and weakness. Bit by bit the Philistines recovered their hold upon the people. Precisely because Samuel had stirred the life in the core of the national existence, precisely because he had shown them the possibility of a great career, precisely because inside that mass of apathetic, worldly-minded men he had established great and powerful classes of men devoted to religion, to patriotism, to God,—the Nazarites and the schools of the prophets; men of ecstatic fervour, an inspired brotherhood, with a wild zeal like that which animated the monks of the early Christian ages: precisely because he had formed within the nation that inner core of vitality, of religion, of patriotism, the nation did not succumb as soon as this new danger made itself thoroughly felt. On the contrary the leaders, the elders, the chiefs of all the towns and the districts consulted together. The firm conviction had grown up within them that, if they were to hold their

own, then they must have a more closely-knit national organization, a more intense centralization of public spirit and of public government: in short, they must cease to be tribes, cease to be small communes united together only in the presence of a common enemy for a common advantage; they must become a military nation, and for that they must have an elective hereditary monarchy. And so they come to Samuel. "The whole system has been found wanting," they said; "a king ruling in the name of Jehovah we must have, if we are to hold our own against the neighbouring nations." But Samuel disapproved. First of all, that demand was a moral and religious declension. It was a confession, on the Israelite's part, that they could not realise the full grandeur of their destiny. It meant a deliberate acceptance of the second best, instead of the very best. The details of what happened is worked out fully in the narrative of the eighth chapter.

Moreover there were a great many drawbacks, which I will merely catalogue, to be set against the advantages. The advantages were that undoubtedly Israel would gain in mass and force to withstand attack, that it would be able to develop the internal resources of its own country by this step. United under a king, Israel would moreover be able to seize territory that hitherto had not been conquered by other communities and tribes; it would have an intenser sense of its own national spirit; it would form a wider idea of its own place in the world. Undoubtedly Israel would gain in many ways. But, on the other hand, Israel would lose. Instead of the old independence, the rank and file of the citizens would be reduced to comparative insignificance. That is the great evil always of a strong centralized government, as distinguished from decentralization; and undoubtedly the aim of all social existence should always be to preserve the advantages of

a powerful central government, but at the cost of as little sacrifice as possible of local home rule. That is a problem which our own country still has to work out. With a king, court and metropolis, the equilibrium of the land would be disturbed. A king must make his state magnificent, and taxes must be imposed on farmers and merchants everywhere to support that royal dignity. A standing army, too, must be maintained, and the cost of that, too, would fall on the land. The natural effect of having a king would be to develop large towns; not merely the metropolis, but towns everywhere; also to establish a class of professional governors, of high-born military leaders, of local governors, of tax-collectors. Invariably it has been seen that a people broken up into tribes maintains a considerable uniformity in the distribution of wealth; and that, wherever empires or kingdoms are formed, and a central government is established, you have at once a large development of all activities, material, industrial, and physical; but at the same time you have a rapid increase of wealth in a few hands and of impoverishment in the hands of the mass of the people.

Now do justice to the grandeur of Samuel. Mark what the request for a king meant! It was a public declaration that Samuel had failed, and no great man likes to hear that verdict pronounced upon him by his countrymen, the men he has worked with and fought for, before he lies down and dies. It was heart-breaking to Samuel, and yet I think that, with his statesmanlike eyes and intellect, he saw the necessity of it. He had tried so bravely, so magnanimously; and the people now came to him in his old age and told him that he had failed utterly. They asked him, as it were, to dethrone himself, to set himself aside, and to give them something new, and something different.

I think that one of the most magnanimous, and majestic,

and heroic deeds ever done in our world's story was done by Samuel, when, convinced that it was the will of God, he set himself to do what no other man could do: to forsake all his past, to abandon all the lines of action on which he had worked through the best years of his life, and to put into other men's hands fresh possibilities. That meant the condemnation of all his efforts. Think what it was for this great statesman to have seen what was the ideal of his country's greatness, moral and material, to have struggled for a life-time to give effect to that ideal, to have done a good deal to have established it, and then to have the grandeur, the honesty, the detachment from self and pride, to come forward publicly and confess that his whole policy had been a failure; not because it was wrong, but because, through ancient evils making the realisation of his high ideal impossible, the only thing that could be done was to accept something inferior. Quite willingly, cordially, and heartily, without himself becoming the leader of the new movement and unsaying all his past, he was ready to do what in him lay, loyally, with God's might and strength, to make the new departure a great success.

I call that conduct magnificent. But Samuel had been providentially prepared by God to make that dangerous transition. Think what it meant; if Samuel had stubbornly said, "I cannot do it," it could not have been done. But though grieved in his soul, and recognising that there was a moral declension in this new departure, foreseeing too that it would be but a partial success, he yet saw it was the one thing to do, and generously, nobly, used that marvellous, unprecedented position of his, as Nazarite, priest, prophet, judge of Israel, to abdicate his own position, to give up the struggle of his whole life, and to give birth to a wonderful new epoch in which he would have little or no part, but to which he looked for the realisation

of what he could not himself do ; and this for God's glory and for Israel's welfare.

I ask those who know Hebrew history to recall the wonderful part the kingship played in Israel's history : Saul, David, Solomon ; Solomon with his immense wealth, prestige, wisdom, and with a happy nation around him. Look at the period of the Judges, with its poverty, its sordidness, its helplessness, its impotence. Samuel was the creator of Israel's monarchical glory. Several kings, one after another proved failures ; but all the same through those centuries of monarchical government, the prophets gained time to rise from the material into the spiritual, the true idea of God's kingdom on earth. And that was not all. This second best, the demand for which had grieved Samuel, became the symbol and promise of that divine Kingship which was to meet the desire of all the nations. Israel learned that God's kingdom was one which never could be won by sword nor built up by legislation ; that it was a spiritual kingdom, which must be in every man's heart and soul. They learned too that the true king must be the Son of God, with the whole heart of God in Him ; not a warrior, not a priest, not a prophet, not a hero-judge, but righteous, pure, sinless, doing the will of God perfectly, because God is in Him, as God was in Jesus Christ our Lord.

W. G. ELMSLIE.

A GROUP OF PARABLES.

I.

THE parables of our Lord above referred to, and which I have spoken of as a group of parables, are those in chapters xvi. and xvii. of the Gospel of St. Luke: the Unfaithful Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, and the Unprofitable Servant. The first of these I have called the "Unfaithful," rather than, as it is commonly called, the "Unjust," Steward. It is true that unfaithfulness is injustice, or that, at all events, where there is unfaithfulness to any trust that has been put into our hands by God, it leads to injustice towards our fellow creatures, and to a declinature on our part of the obligations under which we lie to them. But, when we take injustice in the natural and strict sense of the term, we think of something different from what is brought before us as the particular offence of the chief character of the first parable, or even of something marked by more aggravated sinfulness than his. Besides this, the *unfaithfulness* of the steward is obviously that which our Lord has mainly in view in warning us against his conduct, and in inculcating the opposite virtue. We see that it is so in the simple fact that the man was a *steward*, for "it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful" (1 Cor. iv. 2). We see it still more in our Lord's words when He applies the lesson of the parable, "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much, and he that is unrighteous (that is here, in the way of unfaithfulness) in a very little is unrighteous also in much. If, therefore, ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?" (chap. xvi. 10-12). Unfaithfulness is that which our Lord condemns; faithfulness

is that which He commends. The parable would be better described as the Unfaithful than as the Unjust Steward.

In a similar way objection might be taken to the name usually given to the third parable—The Unprofitable Servant. But as the propriety or impropriety of so naming it depends upon the interpretation, and that interpretation must be immediately explained for a more important purpose than the correction of the name by which the parable is known, more need not be said of it at present.

I have spoken of a group of parables, thus implying that there is an intimate connexion between each and the other two members of the group. That this is the case with the first and second parables is generally allowed by commentators. Nor is it easy to deny it. No sooner has the first parable closed than we read, "And the Pharisees, who were *lovers of money*, heard all these things; and they scoffed at Him" (ver. 14). The verbs are in the imperfect not the aorist tense, showing clearly that the scoffing was not confined to the moment when the parable of the Unfaithful Steward was delivered, but that it was frequently repeated at the time. It naturally, therefore, drew forth more teaching from our Lord, and that a teaching which had reference to His hearers as "*lovers of money.*" This, accordingly, leads first to the thought of the means by which they gained their respectable standing, and had come to think themselves entitled to despise and domineer over the poor. As the recognised guardians and interpreters of the law of Moses they had increased their influence, and with their influence their wealth, by magnifying the finality of the law, instead of seeing in it a temporary dispensation, which was to give way to the higher dispensation introduced by Him to whom John the Baptist pointed (ver. 16). Had they felt themselves, with their knowledge and power, to be stewards of God and servants of their nation, they would have penetrated to the truth that a kingdom of God was

come in Jesus worthy to be sought with all eagerness by every man (ver. 16). A recognition of that kingdom would indeed have diminished their own importance, and have taught them to be, like its King, poor. They could not tolerate the thought. They cast away the fulfilment, they clung to the letter, of the law (vers. 17, 18). They justified themselves in the sight of men. Under the guise of reverence for religion they were really advancing their own selfish ends. They were using that revelation of God which they possessed as a trade by which to prosper in the world. They were, in short, "unfaithful stewards," diminishing the obligations which they had been commissioned to enforce, in order that they might make their own path easy, and might have, whatever came of eternity, "friends" for time (ver. 15).

It is not necessary to suppose that all this passed at one special instant, or that the words of ver. 15 to ver. 18, and no others, were then spoken by Christ. For aught we know some time may have elapsed, and much more than is here recorded may have been said. What we have to do is to try to discover whether there is any distinct line of thought in the mind of the writer of these verses which leads him by an easy transition from the parable of the Unfaithful Steward to that of the Rich Man and Lazarus. I urge that, looking carefully at these intervening verses, we may without difficulty see that there is. When St. Luke comes to ver. 19 he has still in his mind the same general subject which had occupied him in the first thirteen verses of the chapter.

Not only, however, may this be said. We reach the same conclusion by comparing the two parables of chap. xvi. with one another. They are not so different as we might at first imagine. At the very first blush of the matter *Dives* is an unfaithful steward. Had he been merely a rich man, there would have been no need to lay down

Lazarus at his gate in the miserable condition in which we find him. It would have been enough to set the Rich Man himself before us, in the splendour of his estate and in his luxurious living. The presence of Lazarus adds an entirely new feature to the scene. The Rich Man is now not merely rich: he is a *steward*. That clothing in purple and fine linen, that sumptuous fare which he partakes of every day, and which is so splendid that it attracts the attention of all who pass by his house (*λαμπρῶς*), the opportunities which he so abundantly enjoys for leading an easy life, and last of all what, in contrast with the silence maintained as to the burial of Lazarus, is evidently intended to be thought of as his imposing funeral,—all these things testify to the abundance which God had given him, and which, by the very fact of giving it, He had shown was intended to be used in His service, and for the relief of others less favoured than himself. But *Dives* is not only a steward: he is unfaithful in his stewardship. No Jew could have heard the description of Lazarus laid at the rich man's gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table but not obtaining them, without the feeling that he who permitted all this, when he could have so easily prevented it, was an unworthy son of Abraham, selfish, worldly, irreligious, and faithless to his gifts. Whatever may have been the case with the Scribes and Pharisees, who "devoured widows' houses," the Jewish people as a whole were deeply alive to the claims of the stranger and the poor. They felt that the goods of this world were a sacred trust. Their whole economy, their institutions, their psalmists, and their prophets had taught them this. At their entrance into Canaan they had been commanded to take a basket filled with the firstfruits of their land, and to give to the priest at the place which the Lord their God should choose; and then, recalling the fact of their own great deliverance from Egypt, they were to

rejoice in every good thing which the Lord had bestowed upon them, giving in their turn to "the Levite and the stranger and the fatherless and the widow, according to all God's commandments which He had commanded them" (Deut. xxvi. 1-13). When settled in Canaan they had been forbidden to gather the gleanings of their harvests or of their vineyards; they were to leave them for "the poor and stranger" (Lev. xix. 9, 10). Their interest in the stranger, so that they should not oppress him, had been deepened by the touching memory that they had themselves been "strangers in the land of Egypt" (Exod. xxii. 21). It had been among the most beautiful of the recollections of the patriarch Job, as he compared the days of his former prosperity with those of his present desolation, "When the ear heard me then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me it gave witness to me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me: and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy" (Job xxix. 11-13). David had sung, "Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble" (Ps. xli. 1); and, in passages far too numerous to quote, prophet after prophet had denounced in the severest terms everything like indifference to, or oppression of, the poor. The whole Old Testament is full of sympathy for the poor; nor is there in it any aspect of the Divine character more frequently or more earnestly dwelt upon than that in which it is said of the Almighty, that He will arise for the oppression of the poor, and the sighing of the needy (Ps. xii. 5). The natural effect of all this had been produced upon the Jewish mind, and that to such an extent that, when our Lord related the parable of the Good Samaritan, and asked, "Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers?", the lawyer, who had given occasion to the

parable, though he could not bring his lips to pronounce the word "Samaritan," was constrained to answer, "He that showed mercy on him" (Luke x. 36).

Let us now remember all this; and, placing ourselves for the moment in the midst of a Jewish audience listening to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, let us ask in what light will the rich man appear to them? Is there a single person who will hesitate as to the answer? He is an unfaithful steward.

There is another interesting trait in the second parable showing its connexion with the first that ought not to be passed over. When the rich man is in Hades he cries and says, "Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip his finger in water and cool my tongue," to which he receives as part of Abraham's answer, "And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they which would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us" (vers. 24, 26). What is this but the direct contrast to the words of our Lord in the first parable, "And I say unto you, Make yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they (*i.e.* those whom you have thus made friends) may receive you into the eternal tabernacles" (ver. 9). Precisely what *Dives* had not done; and the novelty of the expectation suggested by the words makes them the more remarkable. We seldom think of it. We seldom sing,—

There are little ones glancing about in my path,
 In want of a friend and a guide;
 There are dear little eyes looking up into mine,
 Whose tears might be easily dried.
 But Jesus may beckon the children away,
 In the midst of their grief or their glee—
 Will any of them, at the beautiful gate,
 Be waiting and watching for me?

There are old and forsaken, who linger awhile
In homes which their dearest have left;
And a few gentle words or an action of love
May cheer their sad spirits bereft.
But the Reaper is near to the long-standing corn,
The weary will soon be set free—
Will any of them, at the beautiful gate,
Be watching and waiting for me?

In their utter want of appreciation of this novel but beautiful conception the unfaithful steward and the rich man closely correspond. The one had made himself friends in the worldly, but not in the heavenly sphere. So also had the other: and each, when he died, found himself separated from the beautiful gate and the happy spirits within whom he might have made, but had not made, "friends."

It is unnecessary to say more. The first two parables are evidently connected by a very intimate bond with one another. Let us turn to the third in chap. xvii.

That chapter begins with six verses which, like those intervening between the two parables of chap. xvi., appear at first to discredit the idea of any connexion with what follows. Godet, referring to chap. xvii. 1-10, even goes the length of saying, "This piece consists of four brief lessons placed here without introduction, and between which it is impossible to establish a connexion." Such a view must be utterly dissented from, and it hangs together with what seems to be the very doubtful interpretation of the third parable generally adopted. Let it be remembered, as before, that we are by no means bound to believe that every word interchanged by our Lord with His disciples is here recorded. What we have to ascertain is, whether there may not be enough to enable us to trace the thread of St. Luke's thought as he gathers together what he does. It would seem as if there were, notwithstanding what Godet and Hofmann (who in this particular supports Godet) have said to the contrary.

The Evangelist represents our Lord as speaking of *σκάνδαλα*: "It is impossible but that the (mark the definite article leading to the thought of something already in the mind of the disciples) occasions of stumbling should come; but, woe unto him through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble" (vers. 1, 2). Now in New Testament usage a *σκάνδαλον* appears always to refer to some inner truth of our Lord's Divine kingdom which His disciples failed to make manifest, while by their failure they weakened the power of that kingdom over such as might otherwise have owned it. Not so much actual disciples, as those who might be disciples or were only in some initiatory stage of discipleship, are affected by it. Here the occasion of stumbling is not given by disciples to disciples, but by disciples to "little ones," and it is supposed to be given by the fact, that some disciples might not exhibit that spirit of self-denying love which forgets itself in others and which is ever ready to sacrifice itself for others' good. Of that love the unfaithful steward had had none. He had been concerned about himself alone, and about himself alone only in regard to his worldly interests. The same thing might be said of *Dives*. But there is a natural tendency to such a disposition in all men. The "disciples" therefore must be warned against it. It is one of the great laws of the kingdom of Christ that Christian love exhibited in action shall be its chief convincing and converting power; and that the want of this shall be the main stumbling-block alike to the world and to those little ones, whether they cannot yet break with the world or have just begun to break with it, in whose hearts a faint consciousness has begun to dawn, that there is a brighter light than that of earthly suns, and better riches than those of earthly treasure-houses. Well

may our Lord with all sternness warn against it. But that same self-forgetfulness, that same indisposition to dwell upon our obligations to others rather than our rights, is to be seen not only in our throwing no obstacles in their way, but in our heartily forgiving offences, whether against God and the Christian standing of those who commit them, or directly against ourselves, however often they may be repeated, "Take heed to yourselves; if thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him; and if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him" (vers. 3, 4).¹ The thought, in short, of that self-denying love which the Unfaithful Steward and *Dives* had failed to exhibit lies at the bottom of all the words of our Lord quoted by St. Luke, till we reach the end of the fourth verse of chap. xvii.; while at the same time the Christian propriety of a course of conduct marked by love of this truly Christian kind is positively enforced.

The "Apostles" who heard the discourse, and who, we may easily suppose, were more susceptible than the general body of the disciples, felt this; and, struck with a certain beauty in the words of their Master, they said, "Lord, increase our faith" (ver. 5). The answer of Jesus, however, in the next verse shows that they either did not well know what they asked, or that they asked for a faith wholly different in character from that true faith which they ought to have, and which ought to show itself in such love to God and man as had just before been spoken of, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed you" (ver. 6). There

¹ The interesting remarks of Hofmann on the difference between ἀμαρτία in ver. 3 without εἰς σέ, and ἀμαρτήσῃ with εἰς σέ in ver. 4, tend to confirm the interpretation here given, the first of these leading to the thought of sinning against Christian duty and dishonouring the Christian name. (See Hofmann *in loc.*).

still clung to them for the moment at least, even while they were carried away by the words of Jesus, those outward and carnal ideas of His kingdom and of the rewards offered in it which it needed the gift of the Spirit after the day of Pentecost to dispel. When Jesus therefore replies to them in the words of ver. 6, it is as if He had said, "You have asked for an increase of faith, and you thereby show your belief that you already have some measure at least of that faith which I require. Yet by the manner in which you have asked for more I see that your minds are dwelling upon great deeds that you will then be able to accomplish, upon great impressions which you will then make upon worldly men, though leaving them still worldly, upon great honours to which they will exalt you. Such is not the faith of which I speak; such are not the rewards that I would bid you anticipate. If indeed you had the smallest measure of the true faith which I require, the greatest difficulties would be easily overcome; you would accomplish far harder things than you at present dream of; and you would gain a reward which, though its real nature be hidden from you now, will yet in the experience of it be richer, sweeter, than all the honours that earth can bestow upon its votaries. You have less need, therefore, to pray, 'Lord, increase our faith,' than to pray for a deeper, more inward, and more spiritual faith than you are thinking of." Then follows the third parable of our group. What does it mean?

The facts are simple enough. A master has a bond-servant whom he sends out to the field to plough or keep his sheep. After a time the servant returns, having obviously executed his task with fidelity and success. No fault is found with him; he had done that which it was his duty to do. Yet he does not return home to rest. On the contrary he returns to additional work. His master seems to take no thought that after his day's toil he needs

refreshment, but with a sharp word of command tells him to make ready wherewith he himself may eat, and to gird himself and serve him: after that his turn will come to eat and drink. The lesson, it is said, is that however diligently and faithfully we work, we have no ground of complaint if, instead of our work being acknowledged, we are put to more work; if, after our best and most continued efforts, we are told that we are unprofitable servants, meriting no reward. If this be the lesson, it can hardly be denied that it is somewhat gruffly taught, that it contradicts the instincts of our nature, and that we should hardly like to deal thus with any servant of ours. Nor does it seem to make any difference that the servant of the parable was a "bond-servant," instead of one on hire, that he was in no sense and to no extent his own master, but that he owed everything to him who had purchased or inherited him as a slave. Rather would the opposite appear to be the case. Though as a slave he could claim nothing by law, he could claim all the more by grace; and St. Paul is never more convinced of his own high standing within the Christian covenant than when he applies to himself the epithet *Χριστοῦ δοῦλος* (Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 10). This consideration therefore, though urged by one (Von Gerlach) surpassed by few for his insight into Scripture, does not help the matter.

The key to the explanation of the parable seems to be given by our Lord Himself in an earlier and remarkable passage of this Gospel. At chap. xii. 35 He is engaged in exhorting and encouraging to preparation and patient waiting for His coming, and He exclaims, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning; and be ye yourselves like unto men looking for their Lord, when He shall return from the marriage feast; that when He cometh and knocketh they may straightway open unto Him. Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall

find watching; verily I say unto you, that He shall gird Himself, and make them sit down to meat, and come and serve them" (chap. xii. 35-37). It is impossible to mistake the similarity of the two passages, or to doubt that the very peculiar expressions of the one must be taken advantage of in order to interpret the similar and equally peculiar expressions of the other. In the earlier passage then we find our Lord describing Himself as one who, in the moment of His own greatest reward and highest glory, girds Himself as a servant to serve those who have waited for Him, at the banquet which He has prepared for them in His heavenly kingdom. In other words, at the moment when His work is done, when His sufferings are ended, when His Church is gathered to Him in glory, His reward is *service*! It had been so upon earth. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). It is so in heaven. The Son of man seen in vision by St. John, and who says of Himself, "I am the first and the last, and the living one; and I was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore," was beheld by the apocalyptic seer "clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about at the breasts with a golden girdle" (Rev. i. 13); that is, He was clothed like a priest engaged in active service. The glory of our Lord in Heaven therefore is still the glory of service, and in promoting the happiness of all whom He has redeemed He finds His own most blessed reward.

Let us transfer this, as transfer it we must, to the parable we are now considering, and the whole description of what is said to the ploughman or shepherd who returns from well-done work assumes a different aspect from that in which we commonly regard it. It is not the unthanked work of a menial, all whose work the master represents himself as entitled to claim, and which is at the best "unprofitable." It is work so faithfully and well done

that the master will bestow upon it His best reward,—the reward of progress in the line of things to which it has belonged, the reward of further service. This making ready, therefore, his master's supper, after the servant comes home expecting rest, is not humiliation but exaltation, is not depreciation of his day's work, but its recompense and reward. In the kingdom of Christ labour is rewarded with further labour and one cross well borne with another to be equally well borne; and no one who has entered into the spirit of that kingdom complains.

Labour is sweet, for Thou hast toiled;
 And care is light, for Thou hast cared;
 Let not our works with self be soiled,
 Nor in unsimple ways ensnared.
 Through life's long way and death's dark night,
 O gentle Jesus, be our light!

If what has now been given as the interpretation of the third parable of our group be correct, it will follow that, instead of being designated the Unprofitable Servant, it ought rather to be known by some such title as The Reward of Faithful Service, or Service the Reward of Service.

The relation to one another of the three parables with which we have been dealing will now be seen. So far from being unconnected there is among them a very close bond of connexion. They relate to one subject, which is presented to us in different aspects and from different sides,—the odiousness of unfaithfulness and the value of faithfulness in the stewardship with which we have been put in trust by God.

At this point we may pause for the present. The use to be made of what has been said in vindicating the Gospel of St. Luke from hasty and inconsiderate charges will appear in another paper.

WM. MILLIGAN.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

IN the valuable series of articles on the Johannean Question which Professor Sanday has been contributing to the *EXPOSITOR*, for which many of us will feel grateful to him, there is one point which appears to require fuller consideration than he has given to it. Following in the steps of the late Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, Dr. Salmon, and other English scholars, he appears to have gone on the assumption that the Gospel must have been entirely due to direct personal recollection, or else that it was a pure romance composed in the second century. It is not until the end of his last paper that he mentions another possible opinion, which he then mentions only to reject it, that the Gospel may be to some extent founded on traditions related to the synoptic traditions but not identical with them. This opinion has been held by eminent scholars, and would certainly explain some of the phenomena of the Gospel, especially of its relation to the synoptics. I would like to plead therefore for a fuller consideration of it. It appears to me too that some of the reasons for rejecting it which are given on pp. 385 foll. are not conclusive :—

“The striking thing about the Gospel is that its characteristics are not those of a second-hand work. The kind of details which it contains are not such as would survive in a tradition” (*EXPOSITOR* for May, 1892, p. 385).

“Two alternatives only are possible. Either these scenes derive their vividness and particularity from the fact that the author is reporting what he had himself heard and seen, or in which he had stood in connexion so close that it is as if he had heard and seen them, or they are the product of pure imagination” (p. 386).

“We can understand how tradition might hand down the five barley loaves and two small fishes, the two hundred denarii worth of bread, etc. . . . These are all details of the same type as those in the synoptics. But why should it be noted that it was the tenth hour when the disciples left John to follow Jesus, or the sixth hour when He sat down by the well? Why should we be told that John baptized

in Ænon because of its plentiful springs? Why that such and such a speech was made in Solomon's porch at the feast of dedication in the winter? Why that Jesus retired to the place where John at first baptized, or that He went to Ephraim while the Jews were going up to purify themselves before the Passover? Why that the Sanhedrists would not enter Pilate's house for fear of defilement, or that the purpose with which Judas was supposed to have made his exit was to buy necessaries for the feast?" (pp. 386, 7).

There is no doubt, as Professor Sanday says, a difference between the Fourth Gospel and the others in the use of details. It is the habit of the writer of the Fourth Gospel to give the date both in time and place of each incident which he records. It is the exception when he does not do so. In the synoptics, on the contrary, the rule is not to give time or place, the exception is to give them. This frequency of the notes of time and other details in the Fourth Gospel is perhaps a difficulty in the way of supposing that these details were all due to tradition. But would not the completeness of the narrative in this respect be also a difficulty in the way of supposing that its details were due to the personal recollection of things that had occurred half a century before? I do not see that the particulars to which Professor Sanday appeals are in themselves different in character from some which have been preserved in the synoptic tradition. Why might not tradition preserve the names of the places mentioned in the Fourth Gospel—of Cana in Galilee, of Sychar and Jacob's well, of Bethany beyond Jordan, of Aïnon near to Salim, of Ephraim in the country near the wilderness, or of the Treasury or Solomon's Porch as the places where discourses were delivered or other things happened, when it has preserved the names of Nain, of Emmaus with its distance from Jerusalem, of Capernaum and its position by the seashore, of the country of the Gadarenes "which is over against Galilee," of Bethsaida, Nazareth, or many more, or when it tells us that one of the synoptic discourses was delivered in the house at Caper-

naum, or another on the mountain, or by the seaside, or in the boat as they were crossing the lake?

There seems an obvious reason also for each of the hours of the day that are mentioned which might fix them in a tradition. The Wayfarer sat by the well tired and thirsty because it was about noon.¹ The disciples naturally remained with Jesus for the remainder of the day, since it was within two hours of nightfall, "about the tenth hour," when they reached his abode. It is not St. John, but the synoptic tradition which tells that "the day was far spent" and "it was evening" when Jesus refused to allow the hungry multitude to depart to their own homes until He had supplied their wants, and that it was "toward evening" and "the day was far spent" when the two travellers to Emmaus pressed their unknown companion to abide with them (Matt. xiv. 15, Mark vi. 35, Luke ix. 12, and xxiv. 29).

It also seems natural that Judas should have been supposed to have gone to provide what was needed for the feast, if it was "before the feast of the passover" (John xiii. 1). And why should it be thought strange that tradition should remember the scruples of the Jews about entering Pilate's judgment hall? Tradition did not forget how, when another Jesus was slain in the temple by the high priest who was his own brother John, and the Persian general came to avenge his death, the Jews objected to his entering the temple, and how the Persian asked them if his presence would be a worse defilement than the corpse of the murdered man (Jos., *Antt.* xi., viii. 7).

One of the passages just referred to reminds us of a difficulty in the way of the eye-witness argument which does

¹ "A description of one day's journey may answer for all the rest. . . . You ride on until the noonday heat and glare compel you to seek a little rest beneath some friendly shade, if there is any to be had. . . . After lunch the march is resumed," etc. (E. H. Palmer, *The Desert of the Exodus*, pp. 32, 33.)

not seem to have attracted the attention of its advocates. In the synoptic account of the feeding of the five thousand Jesus had been teaching the multitude and healing their sick, and when the day was declining the disciples came to Him and asked that they should be sent away as they had nothing to eat and many of them had come from far, and then Jesus said, "Give ye them to eat." In the Fourth Gospel all these interesting details are omitted. We are only told that Jesus, lifting up His eyes and seeing a great company come (*ἔρχεται*) unto Him, said unto Philip, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?"

There is another place in which we find the same kind of difference distinguishing the synoptic narrative from that of the Fourth Gospel. In the synoptic account of the triumphal entry Jesus is journeying to Jerusalem attended by a great multitude of people. Having passed through Jericho with His following, He goes up towards the city. When He approaches Bethphage and Bethany on the Mount of Olives, He sends two of His disciples into the village over against them, and they return with the ass's colt. They cast their garments upon the colt, and set Jesus thereon, and as He rides in lowly state into Jerusalem others throw down their garments in the way, or strew the road with branches which they cut from the trees or the fields, and the whole multitude join in singing the praise of the King that cometh in the name of the Lord. In the Fourth Gospel we read only that a great multitude of people who had come to the feast, hearing that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took branches of palm trees and went forth to meet Him, and cried, "Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord," and Jesus, when He had found a young ass, sat thereon; as it is written, "Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt."

In a third instance, the description of the occurrences

in the garden of Gethsemane, the Fourth Gospel passes by much that is related with some fulness of detail by the synoptics. We are told nothing of the agony in the garden, of the sleeping disciples, of the traitor's kiss, but only that Jesus went forth to the garden with His disciples, and that Judas who knew the place came with his company, and that Jesus, "knowing all things that should come upon Him, went forth and said unto them, Whom seek ye?" When they answered, Jesus of Nazareth, "Jesus saith unto them, I am He."

In each of these three cases the advocates of the eye-witness argument have to face the perplexing fact that it is the synoptic tradition, not the eye-witness reporter, that has preserved the detailed and life-like narrative. They cannot escape the difficulty by supposing that the fourth evangelist merely summarized the synoptic accounts. Even in his short summary he varies from them too widely. In one case, at least, the variation amounts to a clear contradiction. The fourth evangelist places the triumphal entry after the anointing at Bethany, while the First and Second Gospels place it some days before. And St. Luke, though he does not mention the anointing at Bethany, agrees with the other two in representing the triumphal entry as taking place on the arrival of Jesus from Jericho.

JOHN A. CROSS.

*THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.*

VII. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CLOSELY related to the Epistles of Paul, but almost certainly by another hand, is the Epistle to the Hebrews. In this interesting and most instructive document the death of Christ as the divinely appointed means of man's salvation from sin is perhaps even more conspicuous than in the writings of St. Paul. This important element of the teaching of the New Testament demands now our best attention.

In Hebrews ii. 9 we see Jesus "crowned with glory and honour, in order that by the grace of God on behalf of every one He might taste death." The words ὅπως . . . ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσῃται θανάτου assert in plainest language, in close agreement with the rest of the New Testament, *e.g.* 1 Corinthians v. 15, "on behalf of all He died, in order that they who live may live for Him," that Christ's death was no mere accident, but was by deliberate purpose and for the good of men. And this purpose is emphatically traced to the "grace of God." The writer goes on in the next verse to say that "it was fitting for Him . . . to make the Leader of their salvation perfect through sufferings." This I understand to mean that only through His suffering of death did Christ become a sufficient Saviour of men, and that the sufferings of Christ as a means to this end are in harmony with the nature of God. In *v.* 14, the purpose for which the Son took part with men in blood and flesh is said to be "in order that through death He may bring to nought him that hath the power of death . . . and set free so many as by fear of death were held fast in bondage." These words again assert, and by repetition emphasise, that Christ died by deliberate design, in order to save men.

In verse 17 we read, in close agreement with Romans

iii. 25, that the Son became in all things like His brethren "in order to propitiate the sins of the people": εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. The foregoing references to the death of Christ leave no room for doubt that the writer means that, just as under the old Covenant propitiation was almost always made by the blood of an innocent victim, so Christ by His own death saves His people from the penalty due to their sins.

An accusative following ἰλάσκεσθαι and denoting the sin forgiven is found in Ps. lxiv. 4, τὰς ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ ἰλάση. The same construction is not uncommon with the (in LXX.) more frequent word ἐξιλάσκεσθαι. So Sirach iii. 3, "he that honoureth his father will *propitiate* sins"; and verse 30, "mercy will *propitiate* sins," i.e. a merciful man will be forgiven. The accusative is also occasionally used to describe the object to be purified by the propitiation: e.g. Leviticus xvi. 16, "and he shall *propitiate* the holy place from the uncleannesses of the sons of Israel and from their unjust acts touching all their sins"; also verse 33, "he shall *propitiate* the holy of holies, and the tent of the testimony and the altar he shall *propitiate*, and touching the priests, and touching all the congregation he shall *propitiate*."

The phrase *propitiate God* in the sense of deprecate the anger and regain the favour of an offended deity is common in classical Greek. So Homer, *Iliad*, bk. i. 147, "in order to propitiate for us (ὄφρ' ἡμῖν . . . ἰλάσσει) the Far-darter by performing sacred rites"; similarly lines 386, 444, 472. In each of these cases the name of the deity whose anger is turned aside is put in an accusative case governed directly by the verb *propitiate*. But this construction is found, in reference to God, only once (Zechariah vii. 2) in the LXX. and then as a solitary rendering of an altogether different Hebrew word. Similarly Jacob says of Esau in Genesis xxxii. 20, "I will *propitiate* his face

with the gifts": and Proverbs xvi. 14, "a king's anger is a messenger of death; but a wise man will *propitiate* it." Similarly, Clement of Rome I. 7: "the Ninevites . . . *propitiated* God by making intercession, and obtained salvation."

This grammatical distinction, so remarkably maintained, notes an important difference between the Biblical and the pagan conceptions of God. The Greeks looked upon their gods as needing to be appeased, as one man endeavours to turn away the anger of another. The change needed was in the mind of the god, who is therefore the direct object of the verb *propitiate*. But both ancient Israel and the Apostles of Christ knew that God's anger is not a vexation with an individual which needs to be changed, but an unchangeable opposition to sin. From that anger the sinner needs to find escape. But the propitiation he needs is not one which will change the mind of God, but one which will shelter the sinner from the punishment due to his sin. This is the etymological meaning of the Hebrew word used in the passages quoted above and in those quoted in my former papers: and in this sense we may interpret its Greek equivalent when used in the New Testament.

In Hebrews ix. 12, we read that Christ, "by means of His own blood entered the holy places, having found an eternal redemption." These last words, *αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος*, recall familiar teaching in other parts of the New Testament. They assert plainly that our deliverance is brought about by the death of Christ. In contrast to the blood shed in the ancient sacrifices, referred to in verse 13, we read in verse 14 that "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself spotless to God, will cleanse your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God. And in verse 15, as in verse 12, the death of Christ is spoken of as a means of *redemption*: ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ

παρὰβίσεων. We have here a close agreement with Romans iii. 24, Ephesians i. 7, Titus ii. 14, 1 Timothy ii. 6, where the same word or a cognate word is used.

That Christ's death is a means or condition of our salvation, dominates the remainder of Hebrews ix. In verse 16, this idea finds a new and remarkable expression based upon the double meaning of the word *διαθήκη*, the almost constant rendering in the LXX. of the Hebrew word used to describe God's *covenants* with Abraham and with Israel. This use of the word *διαθήκη*, peculiar in the Greek Bible to this passage, deserves further attention.

The common Hebrew word rendered *covenant* denotes always an agreement in which each of two contracting parties binds himself to certain action on condition of certain action by the other party. A covenant thus unites two parties in a definite relation involving mutual obligations. As examples, we may quote Genesis xxi. 27, 32, where Abimelech makes a friendly agreement with Abraham about a well; and chapter xxvi. 28, where Abimelech makes a similar covenant with Isaac. So in chapter xxxi. 44 Laban says to Jacob, "Come now, let us make a *covenant*, I and thou; and let it be for a witness between me and thee." The express stipulations are given in verses 50-52. Another good example is found in Joshua ix. 6, 7, 11, 15, 16: "and Joshua made peace with them, (*i.e.* with the Gibeonites) and made a *covenant* with them to let them live: and the princes of the congregation sware to them." These covenants were voluntary engagements by two contracting parties, engagements which either party might have refused, but which when once made were binding on both.

A very conspicuous feature of the Old Testament is the series of covenants of God with Noah, with Abraham, and with Moses as the leader and representative of Israel. So Genesis vi. 18, ix. 9-17; also xv. 18, xvii. 2-21; and

Exodus vi. 4, 5, xix. 5, xxiv. 7, 8. This last passage is expressly quoted in verse 20 of the chapter before us. In these covenants God graciously bound Himself to bestow certain benefits on certain conditions, and laid upon those to whom the covenant was given, apart from any choice of their own, the strongest possible obligation to fulfil the conditions.

That the same word is used in these two cases, must not be allowed to obscure the great difference between a covenant of man with man, and these covenants of God with man. The former becomes valid only by the agreement of both parties. Either party might have refused the agreement, and would then have been free from its obligations. But for man to refuse a covenant offered by God, is disobedience and rebellion. For his obligations rest, not in the least degree on his own consent, but simply and only on the command of his King and Creator. For God can do what He will with His own. Consequently, the Covenant of God is practically the same as the commandment of God. So Joshua xxiii. 16, "the Covenant of Jehovah your God, which He commanded you." And Jeremiah xi. 3-5, "Cursed be the man that heareth not the words of this Covenant which I commanded your fathers . . . saying, Obey my voice, and do them according to all that I command you: so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God: that I may establish the oath which I sware to your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey." Doubtless the word *covenant* was chosen, in spite of this important difference, in order to emphasize the great truth that God had taken man into special and friendly relation to Himself, and had graciously bound Himself to bestow upon him definite and specified benefits on definite conditions. But the difference must not be forgotten.

This example warns us to interpret with utmost caution the analogies underlying the words of the Bible. For the

correspondence between things human and things divine is only partial. Yet only by this partial correspondence can we understand things divine. In each case the analogy holds good only in the point which the writer or speaker has in view.

In Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34 (see my first paper, vol. v. p. 9), God foretold that in days to come He would make a new covenant with men, a covenant pledging Him to pardon their sins and to write His law upon their hearts. And at the Last Supper, in the words of its institution, Christ announced the immediate ratification of this covenant in His own approaching death. This New Covenant is an exact counterpart of that given through Moses, differing from it only and exactly as the Gospel differs from the Law. He who graciously bound Himself to Israel by a special engagement again bound Himself to men in later days, through the Incarnate Son, in a still closer relationship, promising to give pardon and purity and eternal life to all who turn from sin and bow to Christ and believe the good news announced by Him. And, like the Old Covenant, this New Covenant lays upon all who hear the Gospel the strongest possible obligation to fulfil its conditions, an obligation which no refusal of man can set aside. For every covenant of God implies express command.

The ordinary Greek word for an agreement or covenant between men or nations is *συνθήκη*, a word found in Isaiah xxviii. 15, Daniel xi. 6, as a rendering of two Hebrew words each quite different from the word discussed above, and in Wisdom i. 16, xii. 21, 1 Maccabees x. 26, 2 Maccabees xiii. 25, xiv. 26, but not elsewhere in the Septuagint. Notice carefully that in Isaiah xxviii. 15 *ברית* is translated by *διαθήκη*, as almost always in LXX.; while in the same verse *συνθήκη* is given as a rendering of another Hebrew word. This reveals the reluctance of the translators to translate *ברית* by *συνθήκη*. Instead of this common and appropriate Greek

equivalent, the LXX. use, almost always, the apparently less suitable word *διαθήκη*, for covenants between man and man, and for the Old Covenant between God and Israel. In this sense the word *διαθήκη* is, so far as I know, found in classical Greek only in Aristophanes' *Birds*, line 440. Its ordinary use is to denote a testamentary deed by which a man disposes of his property after his death, and which becomes a valid legal document only by the testator's death. Why the Septuagint translators rejected a common Greek word, and put in its place a word very seldom, if ever, used in the sense intended, is not evident. Had the word *διαθήκη* been used only for the Covenant of God with man, the selection of this rendering might have been explained by the above-noted imperfection of the metaphor underlying the word *covenant* as applied to God. But this suggestion is overturned by the fact that the same Greek equivalent is used also for agreements between man and man, as in the examples quoted above.

Explain the selection of the word as we may, the fact remains that the Greek word constantly used in the LXX. for God's covenants with Abraham and Israel, and adopted by Christ as recorded in 1 Corinthians xi. 25 etc. to describe the new compact of God with man involved in the Gospel proclaimed by Christ, denotes almost always in classical Greek a testamentary deed which becomes legally valid only by the testator's death.

This word, with these associations of thought, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews accepts with special reference to its classical meaning, as setting forth the relation between the death of Christ and the salvation announced by Him. He says in chapter ix. 15, 16, "Because of this He is Mediator of a New *Covenant*, (*διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης*;) in order that, death having taken place for redemption of the transgressions under the first Covenant, they who have been called may obtain the promise of the eternal inherit-

ance. For where a *covenant* (or *testament*, *διαθήκη*) is there must of necessity be the death of the *testator* (*διαθεμένου*). For a *testament* is of force over the dead: for doth it ever avail while the testator liveth?" This special reference to the classical meaning of the word *διαθήκη* implies that this meaning sets forth an aspect of the New Covenant. And manifestly the aspect is the absolute necessity of the death of Christ for the legal validity of that Covenant. For to this legal necessity special attention is called in verse 16. It is as though the writer said that the New Covenant is a *διαθήκη* in both senses of the Greek word; that it is an engagement by which God graciously binds Himself to confer certain blessings on certain terms, and is also a testament which obtains legal validity only by the death of Christ. This play upon the double meaning of a Greek word thus involves important theological teaching.

We have here a most important coincidence with St. Paul's teaching in Romans vii. 4 and Colossians ii. 14 that through the death of Christ has been removed a legal obstacle to the justification of believers. The coincidence is the more remarkable because, except in this passage, this teaching is found only in the writings of St. Paul, and because in this passage it finds expression in phraseology and modes of thought very different from those of St. Paul.

That Christ died in order to save men from their sins, is very prominent in Hebrews ix. 26, "for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself"; and in verse 28, "once offered in order to bear the sins of many." We have similar teaching in chapter x. 12, "having offered one sacrifice on behalf of sins," *i.e.* in order to benefit the sinner by saving him from his sins and their consequences; and in verse 29, "having counted as a common thing the blood of the Covenant in which he was sanctified." So also in chapter xiii. 12, "Jesus, in order that He might

sanctify the people through His own blood, suffered outside the camp.”

It is now evident that St. Paul's important and very definite conception of the death of Christ in its relation to our salvation is reproduced almost to the full in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its writer held that Christ's violent death upon the cross was the means of man's salvation, and that for this end He died. He speaks of it twice as a means of “redemption,” and of Christ as making “propitiation for the sins of the people.” And, still more remarkably, he uses a comparison which implies that the death of Christ was needful for the legal validity of the Covenant which in God's name he made with men. He thus implies that the need for the death of Christ as a means of salvation lay in the justice of God.

Such is the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ in its relation to the salvation of men. We have seen that each of the four Gospels, the Epistles of Peter and of John, nearly all the Epistles of Paul and that to the Hebrews, and the Book of Revelation assert conspicuously and frequently that the death of Christ upon the cross is, even as compared with His spotless life and His matchless teaching, in a special sense the means of our salvation; that it was absolutely needful for our salvation; that for this end He deliberately laid down His life; and that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in man's sin. We have also seen that St. Paul, followed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, goes beyond the other writers of the New Testament in teaching that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of believers; or, in other words, that the need for this costly means of salvation from sin lay in the justice of God. This teaching he confirms by asserting in various ways that through the death of Christ we are

liberated from the claims and the curse of the Law. A similar confirmation is found in a legal metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All this implies that in the righteousness of God there was a hindrance to the forgiveness of sin, and that this hindrance was removed by God through the death of Christ.

From the above it appears that the various and very different writers of the New Testament are in complete agreement touching the relation of the death of Christ to our salvation. They differ only in that St. Paul traces the need for this costly means of salvation not only to man's sin but to the justice of God. But this further development is in close accord with St. Paul's general conception of the Gospel, in which the righteousness of God and the Law occupy a large place. Moreover, this further development is a legitimate inference from the teaching common to nearly all the writers of the New Testament. For righteousness is that attribute of God which takes special cognizance of sin. Consequently, a need created by sin must have its root in the justice of God.

The remarkable agreement just noted reveals the common source of the various types of teaching embodied in the New Testament. It proves indisputably that the elements common to its various writers are due to the Great Teacher at whose feet they all sat. In other words, the documentary evidence we have examined compels us to believe that as matter of historical fact the Author of the great religious impulse which has saved the world taught that the forgiveness of sins which He indisputably announced for all who believe His words was to come through His own approaching death and that for this end He was about voluntarily to die. This we must now accept as well-proved historical fact.

This result of our research leaves us only one alternative. Either the remarkable doctrine of salvation through the

death of Christ which we have now traced to the confident belief of the earliest preachers of the Gospel and to the actual teaching of Christ is true ; or, the men who gained for Christ the homage of the world and thus saved it from the ruin into which in His day it was sinking were in deep error touching the work of their Master, and the great Master Himself was in error touching His own mission to mankind. Such error is in the last degree unlikely. And its extreme unlikeliness is a very strong presumption that the doctrine believed so firmly by the Apostles and attributed so confidently to Christ is true.

It is at once evident that St. Paul and his colleagues accepted this remarkable doctrine as true because they believed that it was taught by Christ. It would be easy to show that they accepted it at His word because they believed Him to be infinitely greater and nearer to God than the greatest of men or angels, and that they gave to Him this august dignity because without a shadow of doubt they believed that He had trampled death under foot and come forth living from the grave. If Christ actually rose from the dead, we shall not refuse His claim to be in a unique sense the Son of God ; and, if this claim be just, we shall accept His teaching about His own death. If we refuse this teaching and this claim, and reject the belief of the Apostles touching their Lord's resurrection from the dead, we must be prepared to admit that Christianity and its wonderful effect upon the world, attested by the unique superiority of the Christian nations to-day and during long centuries past, are results of a complicated tissue of delusions.

Teaching about the death of Christ practically the same as that expounded in these papers has been held in all ages by an overwhelming majority of the followers of Christ. It is a distinctive and conspicuous feature of the Christian religion. To its all-controlling influence on Christian

thought and life, all Christian art and literature bear witness. It has been the inspiring conviction of martyrs and missionaries, and of unnumbered myriads in all positions of life. Even in a world where all are doomed to die, a world stained with the blood of martyrs and heroes, the death of Christ stands without a parallel.

My task is not yet accomplished. The evidence already adduced compels us to ask, with profound reverence, Why could not the justice of God forego its claims apart from the death of Christ? and How can the death of the Innocent harmonize with the justice of God the pardon of the guilty?

These supremely difficult questions will demand attention in my next paper.

JOSEPH AGAR BEECH.

DORA GREENWELL.

A MEMORIAL SKETCH.

PART I.

Per te poeta fui, per te cristiano.—*Dante*.

IF any one were called upon to say what most upheld his trust in the Divine government of the world, he would point to some man or woman he had known. "There, he would say, was one whose ways and words had a meaning beyond what he himself knew or aimed at. The equipoise of his belief and conduct forever stamped on my mind a sense of the nearness, the reality, and power of God in the soul. In knowing this man I knew *goodness*, saw its serene eye, felt its very touch. His whole character, that mysterious *summum bonum*, so complex, yet so clear, witnessed to something beyond himself. He seemed more than his own qualities combined. He bore about with him the looks and tones of another and better country, and, as the plenipotentiary of a Greater Power, seemed to draw others into allegiance to it."

The memory of my friend Dora Greenwell must remain this to me. With no intention of writing a sketch of her life, I inscribe her name at the head of this page. There exists a sympathetic biography written by the Rev. W. Dorling, which gives to those who desire them, particulars of her career. Much as to her youth and early associations, of which she talked to me with the frankness of friend to friend, I have no desire to narrate. She had a strong sense of the sacred quiet which should close over every grave, unless the strongest reasons to the contrary should exist; and she expressed the belief that, for many reasons, her own life was best left unwritten. I wish to present her to others as she was to me, giving only such details of her life as will serve to show her character. If I can make

any one feel, in some degree, the charm of her nature, or lead any who have not read her poems and essays to do so, I shall have done what I desire.

The reserve which made her deprecate any proposal of writing her life, did not affect her sense of the value which her works must have to many. "I have," she said to me, "written some things which I hope will be read, and which must help some. I know that no one else has said what I have said, because these things have come out of my own soul. They are valid; they are warm with the warmth of my own life."

My knowledge of Dora Greenwell began shortly after my return from a long visit to America. It had been my good fortune to meet what is most delightful in American society, to which women lend so great a charm. I had in my mind several brilliant and most lovable American women, as I met Miss Greenwell; but they were recalled by contrast.

She seemed, at first sight, an embodiment of purely English life and ways of thinking. She was an English gentlewoman before the type had been touched for better and worse by the higher education of women. Born in a beautiful ancestral home; bred under the shadow of a cathedral, allied to its services by blood and association, what she had gained from the atmosphere of learning and scholarship always surrounding her did not come through lessons and lectures, or any of the stimulants which are offered to girls nowadays, but had been won by her ardent mind fastening on all knowledge within reach with passionate eagerness, and by the companionship of two very gifted brothers. There was force and flavour in her talk; though still bearing about her the subtle and delicate charm of what is best in conventional bearing, she seemed to have a free, even daring mind. The antique setting of her

character seemed to enhance its brilliance and variety. In five minutes you were at home with her. There were no barriers, no preliminaries to be gone through. Very soon you began to perceive that it was not so much the grace of a woman of the world which procured your ease, as that transparent simplicity which seems to be the joint gift of genius and childhood. The restrictions I speak of were shown in an avoidance of some subjects which, from the effect perhaps of wider knowledge, have lately pushed their way into the interests of some very excellent people; an almost nervous dislike of slang phraseology and exaggerations of speech, and a certain severity in discountenancing evil-doing. Once, when staying at a friend's house in the country, she took curious means to avoid meeting a great lady suddenly announced,—one whose wrong-doing had been condoned by the world—as Miss Greenwell thought—because of her wealth and position. In spite of the remonstrances of her good-natured host (who perhaps enjoyed the curious conjunction of things), Dora maintained her point. She would *not* meet Lady —; and, no other retreat offering, she went into a butler's pantry, which opened off the room were they then were, and there sat among the knives and trays till the visit was over. “I will confess, dear,” she said to me in telling the story, “that I *did* peep through the crack of the door, and,”—with a voice softening to great feeling,—“she was a beautiful creature, poor thing!” I could multiply instances still more striking of old-world austerity towards fashionable laxities and shortcomings which sometimes cost more courageous action than merely going into a cupboard. All this was in contrast to her compassionate outgoings towards many whom the world is very ready to punish and avoid; what she often said and did to such, would be likely to startle even those inclined to be what is called “liberal.” Very gentle in manner as she was, I remember an occasion

when she showed uncompromising severity in sweeping aside a discussion of what she thought lay outside decent human interest. She believed it would often be found that the feeling of the working classes, in spite of rougher candour of speech, was more wholesome and reverential towards the mysteries of life than that prevalent among a class of the much better educated.

Akin to her reverence for purity of manners, was her sense of the beauty of language as language, and her dislike of slipshod talk and affectations of speech. Speaking of the indignities and familiarities of what is called "colloquial writing," she once said, "Be simple, but not colloquial. It greatly offends me to meet with contractions such as 'don't' and 'can't' in a book. Every book is and must be a book, and ought not to pretend to come walking up and free and easy, holding you by the button."

My friendship with Dora Greenwell began in 1869, and lasted till her death in 1882. Our first meeting was when she came to call on my mother at Beckenham. We all remembered well the talk of that long summer's afternoon,—for her visit lengthened on till twilight,—and we seemed to part with an old friend, when, at last, we accompanied her and my brother-in-law, who had brought her down to see us, to the gate. Her tall figure wrapt in an Indian shawl worn with a point behind, had, I know not what, air of peculiar old-fashioned grace. We understood the meaning of the look which James Macdonell threw back at us as, with her leaning on his arm, he walked down the road. He was a young man then, she some twenty years older than he. Then, and to the end of his life, he felt for her the most tender and admiring devotion, a devotion shared in by his wife when he married, and which was echoed in the pathetic poem, *The Threefold Chord*, written by Dora Greenwell on his death.

This visit happened during one of her sojourns in London,

but while her home was still with her mother at Durham. Our intercourse during the years that followed went on by means of interchanging visits, and pretty constant meetings when, later on, she settled in London. London habits never cooled her north country warmth in welcoming a guest, and the entire elasticity of her domestic arrangements seemed to make meals come, when they were wanted, and not otherwise. She was often ill—I must, alas! many times refer to the physical weight which frequently bore her down, but in intercourse this was never apparent. Her mood was ever eager, tender, *glowing*; her mind responding to every touch from outside.

During her first visit at Beckenham there was much talk of American matters. She had many readers and friends in America, and had followed the course of the civil war and showed a knowledge of the contest very unusual in “polite” England of that day. Her sympathy was on the side of the North, the success of which, as she rightly had divined from the first, was involved in the abolition of slavery. I remember how after breakfast, till late in the morning, or during the long summer twilights, the talk flowed on on many subjects, her part in it,—always a large one,—exercising a charm over all. Her voice was low and pleasant. She had a little hesitation in speaking which did not fret or obscure the sense, and could not be called a stammer. It seemed more like a tremulous earnestness, and, coming as it often did, before some word of happy fitness, gave a certain sense of discrimination and care to the phrase, as when, speaking of the gifts of a certain dignitary of the Church, whose great position, learning and scholarship left little room perhaps for humility, she added, “But to be with him—is—is a *solvent* to faith.”

Whatever it might begin with, the talk was likely to drift towards the region of what may be termed Christian metaphysics, which was always “the ocean to the river of

her thoughts." But there were a thousand springs to start from, and the course might be long. Her talk was not a "calculable quantity." It was difficult to predict more of it than that it was sure to cover much ground, flowing like a river "at its own sweet will," rounding and doubling on its way, pausing and subsiding as it were into quiet contemplative pools, and then starting afresh with new energy in another direction. It was always to be noted, however, that though her wandering and digressing might be far as the south pole, she would never fail to return tranquilly to the main course. Sometimes, in illustration, she would narrate a family history, anecdotes of her youth, tales of Durham miners; these would be full of minute, often vivid, descriptions of persons among those she had known, both gentle and simple. There were touches of humour in these stories, as there must be in the narratives of any thoughtful person speaking of their species, but they usually bore on the ideal, often on the tragic side of life, never on the merely trivial, which is the vulgar. The merely trivial in life neither fretted nor pleased her; it did not indeed exist to her. Only the simple permanent interests of life, the joys and sorrows interwoven with a thousand threads with marriage, birth, and death, which to her mind veiled, but only veiled, the sacramental meaning behind, touched her. She would often seize on a poem, or a sentence in a book she was reading, and it would serve as a pivot for the talk of a whole afternoon to turn on, and her frequent phrase, "I have been thinking, dear, of what Hooker—or Goethe—or Vaughan—or Victor Hugo says" (it was impossible to say whence the inspiration would come), would usher in a discourse very like a chapter from the *Two Friends* or *Colloquia Crucis*, as she saw the subject expand, and, in the great order of spiritual life, lay hold of other truths. Things from outside often also served the purpose. Living alone, her work and thoughts keeping her much

among abstract things, she seemed to feel more quickly than most people the sweetness and power of the world of beauty and feeling; a flower, an incident told of human goodness, patience or heroism, a sensible or high-minded political speech, all roused and interested her. Towards all that belonged to the moral life and government of the world every fibre of her being responded. Her artistic instinct was strong; beauty in literature, in art, and music kindled her, but it was in the moral and spiritual world of God's kingdom in which her heart lived, and desired to live. Speaking to me once of the depths of delight stirred within her by a Velasquez of great grandeur which we were looking at at Leigh Court, she added, "But I hope I could see it *burned* without a pang if its preservation involved a moral wrong—a wrong which could be set right by its destruction." This must sound as vandalism to many ears. But perhaps it may be doubted whether any true art ever grew till there was in the hearts of men some love of things beyond it such as this.

She had the (unconscious) logician's love of clear language, the true gestures of the mind, and the delicacies and subtleness of fine translation were pleasant to her. She loved Latin; the very sound gave her pleasure. She gave to very many of her poems Latin names, and they do not seem pedantic. Something in the sound of that tongue, the language of law and religion and learning, strong in itself and full of the echoes of greatness, is not unfriendly to the solemn and mystic subjects of all her poems.

She liked to see new books, and was a generous critic, generally able to lay her finger upon the excellencies of any book which possessed worth at all. But she by no means loved everything. Speaking one day of an imaginative work of a young author belonging to a certain school which one is inclined to think hides much barrenness.

under a wordy enthusiasm for the lawless and unsavoury—a sort of *amateur* Satanic school—she said, “But it is not worth picking out of the gutter, dear.”

It was when the talk moved into higher planes that she was at her best. Her mind then seemed to put on new energy, and some of her phrases would be clear and sharp, nailing an idea unforgetably into the mind. When the subject lifted and warmed her, bright and excellent things came. They were spoken with a tremulous eagerness and hesitation, as if she herself were awed by what she saw revealed of sacred truth. The habit of italicising certain sentences in her writings recalls her manner of speaking. Her talk was as far removed from trick or affectation as it was from method. Cheap aphorisms, neat paradoxes, were not in her way. She was too serious, too self-forgetful for such clevernesses. She had nothing in common with the professional talker, nothing in her manner showed expectancy of triumph, or desire even to be heard. But in a group of two or three, with a subject of real interest, it was curious to see how what *she* said gradually gave colour to the whole.

It was best to be alone with her. She had for a time a little house in Westminster, beyond the Poets' Corner, looking unto the buttresses of the Abbey and the green-sward of the cloisters. I used to go there at any odd hours of the day I could spare, or when a line of summons came from her. How many hours of unpremeditated happiness shone there! Sometimes when I arrived she had not left her bedroom (her health was then very frail), and then was dressing. With the door open between us, we would converse till she appeared, always fully dressed, and with charming neatness and completeness in every particular. She would lie down on the couch with its back towards one window, and set me in a low chair near her. The little white tablet which hung on the window shutter and on which she

jotted down her thoughts, subjects for conversation, questions of household economy,—a quaint jumble!—was sometimes consulted, and some of its contents discussed. If it happened to be a difficulty or worry, it was settled quickly, often made the subject of fun. “If one may not laugh over one’s misfortunes,” she said, “one would be often badly off for a joke in this world.” Greater misfortunes never absorbed place in her talk either. In conversation or writing she never dwelt on the altered fortunes which had thrown her and her family out of the beautiful home in which the Greenwells had lived without a break since the fifteenth century. Only once do I remember her referring to it, and then it was in telling of the extreme gentleness and goodness of her father under misfortune, and the devoted love with which he was regarded by rich and poor.

In this dignity of bearing Dora Greenwell resembled her mother, who was a remarkable person in many ways. Miss Ingelow describes her as having “an almost Roman air of decision and energy.” Mrs. Greenwell died shortly after I became acquainted with her daughter, and I never saw more than her likeness, and a photograph taken after death. This might have been from some piece of classic sculpture, so rare was the mixture of beauty and repose on the strong features. Of her mother she often talked. The relationship between them was on one side authoritative and affectionate, and on the other always tender and considerate, and in the later years, when Mrs. Greenwell was broken in spirit and body by illness, self-forgetfully devoted. Mrs. Greenwell was of the old high and dry school of the Church of England, and would never have yielded an inch to the arguments of either Papist or Dissenter. She showed this on one occasion which Dora described to me. An impoverished Roman Catholic gentleman used to make the rounds among the gentry of Durham and the neighbouring counties, selling, in a quiet way, lace and haberdashery.

At Greenwell Ford he was always received with kindness and hospitality. His pack was lightened of its wares, and he was welcomed as a guest. On one of these occasions, at lunch, he was telling a story of the cruel disabilities and wrongs under which Romanists had suffered. Mrs. Greenwell expressed warm sympathy with the sufferings of the victim of oppression he had described, "But," she said, striking her hand emphatically on the table, "remember, Mr. —, if I had the power, I would put those laws into force again."

When sickness fell with a heavy hand on this proud woman, it brought one of those strange moral changes which occur in some diseases. The strong affection she had always felt for her daughter now found outward expression as it had not done before. When, after a period of unconsciousness, she began gradually to regain her powers, she seemed to have changed her nature. She was caressing and playful. Miss Greenwell described the overflowing of her heart with joy as one day, as she knelt by the bedside, her mother, using her still active hand to raise her paralysed arm, wound it about her daughter's neck with a little laugh of tenderness and pleasure. For a brief space this new spirit lasted, pouring a sort of exquisite sunshine into the gloom of sickness. Then, as the invalid regained her powers, this playful tenderness faded away, and she became once more her old self. But by her daughter the memory of this time was cherished always as a glimpse into the inner shrine of her mother's nature, a hope for the future life.

During her last illness Mrs. Greenwell craved spiritual aid, and not such as she had always had within her reach in the Church, and in the tender ministrations of her daughter. A young scripture reader—not a highly gifted person—was her chosen minister. Dora used to sit by, listening to the well-meaning commonplaces of the mis-

sionary, and praying out of the passionate abundance of her own heart for both him and her mother. "It might seem strange to me that she should find anything in it. But God chooses his own instruments," she said with all the meekness of true affection.

One thing more, while speaking of this strong and upright woman. It was surely an inheritance of her unbending virtue which gave Dora her unusual severity and high feeling with regard to money, that subtle test of character, representative of the value of all things mundane! About money matters she was scrupulous and sensitive. She had the generosity which is never careless of other people's small expenses, rigorously mindful of her own. This, in one lavish by nature, and indifferent as St. Paul himself to money as money, is worth recording.

For three months in 1879 she took rooms near us at Denmark Hill, and we met daily and at all hours. For an hour or two every afternoon I would sit by her as she lay on her couch by the fire, her servant reading, or at work in the large bow-window. Sometimes she came to me, but that was rarely. She liked to see my little girls playing among the daisies on the lawn, or dancing to the airs of an organ, which was invited into the garden for their amusement once a week, and her eyes filled with soft benediction as she looked at them. But she was then too weak to bear the noise and vivacity of young life, except to contemplate it, and the times we were together were usually in her sunny sitting-room. Often, too, when my husband was detained late at the Temple or the *Times* office, and when my children were asleep, I went and sat with her till midnight—for she never slept till towards morning, and was glad to talk out the somewhat weary early hours of the night. Some of my happiest memories of her are of this time. Often as I went home—it was but a moment's walk from her house to the little door in our garden wall, which

was left open for me—I used to feel, late as it was, and often the end of a busy day, an inward refreshment and lifting of heart, which made the starlit heavens seem more familiar and near.

The people of the house where she lodged were Germans—quiet and gentle people. While she was there, a child was born to them, the first after ten years of marriage. It only lived a few hours, and in the night, hearing it was dying, and the parents in deep distress, Miss Greenwell went upstairs and sat by the poor mother, and to her infinite consolation, taking the new-born child in her arms, she administered the rite of baptism. The sacrament was, to her, the seal of divine recognition of the mystery of birth, placing once more in the protecting arms of God the marvellous gift of His love.

AGNES MACDONELL.

ON SOME POINTS IN PROFESSOR ROBERTSON
SMITH'S LECTURES ON THE OLD
TESTAMENT.

DR. DRIVER'S forthcoming review of the second edition of Prof. Robertson Smith's well-known work will doubtless make it superfluous for me to show by details the exceeding merit of the book. Strictly speaking, indeed, it is above both eulogy and criticism, in so far as it reproduces those admirable lectures which to so many, even of those who now sit in the professor's chair, have been delightful companions. Yes; not only the higher criticism of the Bible, but this excellent introduction to the study, has proved its life, "like Dante among the shades," by moving what it touches. It is however worth while for some of us to confer with the author, as with an old friend, on some of the new pages of his book. I shall not speak of the important additional matter in Lectures V. and XI., nor of the new concluding lecture, and only incidentally of the re-written seventh Lecture which has to do with the Book of Psalms. Two of the six appended notes will

form the subject of this short article; it were easy to expatiate upon them at length, but the author at any rate will understand why I confine myself to a brief statement of the impression which he has made upon me. Note A relates to the text of I Sam. xvii. Prof. Robertson Smith is no more moved by the arguments of Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Budde, who hold that the omissions of the Septuagint are due to an attempt to remove difficulties, than Cornill, whose valuable *Eiuleitung* is attaining such a well-deserved popularity. On the other hand, there are some scholars who hold out even against such able writers as Cornill and the author, and to the number of these both Dr. Driver (presumably) and myself (*Aids to the Study of Criticism*, p. 90) belong. The author's exposition of his critical theory is most lucid, and as one reads it one is more than half disposed to agree with him. But when we turn back, and ask if the difficulties pointed out, e.g. by Budde, in such theories as the author's have been removed, we hesitate to reply in the affirmative. I am afraid that if I followed the author, I should be led into an arbitrary, subjective criticism which I could not justify. Look at the form given to the seventeenth chapter of Samuel by Klostermann. The author is bold, rightly bold, but I feel sure he would rather give up the whole problem as insoluble than venture on such a thorough analysis as could alone prove his theory to be correct.

Some of Prof. Robertson Smith's observations are undoubtedly correct; but the roughnesses in the text can be accounted for differently. For instance, there is great awkwardness in verse 12; but the text appears to be not quite in order, and in verse 31 the author and Klostermann are evidently right in following Lucian's Septuagint, which appends *καὶ εἰρήγαγον πρὸς Σαοὺλ*. He is also I think right, in company with Klostermann and Budde, in the conjecture that verse 12 should begin with the words, "And there was a man, an Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whose name was Jesse." This view does not however force us to hold that verses 12-31 (I put aside the question of glosses in this portion) come from a different source from xvii. 1-11. I should not have been surprised if the author had also been attracted by another theory of Klostermann, which substitutes Jonathan's armour for that of Saul in verse 38 (cf. *Aids*, p. 105). I cannot at present follow him however in his own view of Israelitish armour-bearers. Prof. Robertson Smith's familiarity

with Arabic historians gives to him no doubt a special authority on Semitic military matters. But must an armour-bearer necessarily have been inexpert in the use of arms? This seems to me (I speak under correction) a gratuitous assumption. I agree however with the author that the whole story of Goliath implies that David was only a stripling. He was, in fact, a shepherd boy according to this narrative; Prof. Robertson Smith adds, and also Saul's armour-bearer, and (like Klostermann) explains the sword in verse 51 as David's (which is plausible). I cannot however as yet venture to follow him. If it is a bold hypothesis that the words "who is with the sheep" (xvi. 19) are interpolated, I am not sure that it is not justifiable under the circumstances (see Budde, p. 211). The author is hardly less bold in another way when he asserts that the words of Saul's servant in xvi. 18 may be taken proleptically. To me they rather suggest that it was an honour even for a brave and dexterous warrior to act upon some occasions¹ as the king's armour-bearer. If I may not hold this view, I see no choice but to fall back upon the difficult theory (suggested but rejected by the author) that xvi. 14-23 is itself of composite structure.² At any rate, the author and I both agree with Ewald, that this fine story was "told and retold with infinite delight and frequency"; hence the chief difficulties of the text.

I now pass to the note on Maccabaean psalms in Books I.-III. of the Psalter. I have already ventured to express the opinion (EXPOSITOR, March, 1892, p. 231) that Prof. W. R. Smith's article on the Psalms in the *Encycl. Britannica* is still the best general introduction to the subject, and I am heartily glad that the substance of it is republished in the present volume. There is so much in it with which I agree, so much which needs to be emphasized as practically certain, however much it may be disputed, that if I thought the criticisms which I am about to offer would strike the reader as hostile, I would suppress them. They are in fact rather questions than criticisms, and will at least testify to

¹ For I suppose that Saul, as well as Joab (2 Sam. xviii. 15), may have had several armour-bearers.

² I do not understand the remark that xvi. 14-23 may conceivably present traces of a narrative which introduced David to Saul as a full-grown warrior, "especially in view of 2 Sam. xxi. 19." Is Elhanan regarded as another name of David (Böttcher's and Prof. Sayce's view)?

the interest with which I have read this note. That references to a king in psalms which appear to be post-Exilic are surprising, is admitted on all hands. Prof. Robertson Smith thinks that Psalms lxi. 7-9, and lxiii. 12 are liturgical additions. I suppose he means that these psalms were originally the songs of an individual, and adapted for the use of the Jewish Church by these closing verses. But who in this case was meant by the king? Does the author suppose the Messianic king to be meant? This seems to me more difficult to realize, and less supported by external evidence, than my own theory (which may, of course, be united to the individualistic interpretation of the rest of these psalms). And this reminds me that on the next page the author explains Psalm lxxii. I thus: "Entrust thy judgments to a king, and thy righteousness to a king's son," which "may very well be a prayer for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty under a Messianic king according to prophecy." I do not forget the simple מֶלֶךְ in Isaiah xxxii. 1, xxxiii. 17, and I know that many difficult things have to be admitted, but I cannot as yet take in this theory. Nor can I, without some entirely fresh considerations being offered, admit that Psalm xlv. is most easily understood as pre-Exilic, and I am surprised that Prof. Whitehouse (*Critical Review*, January, 1892, p. 10) should be attracted more by the theory of Psalm lxxii. offered in my *Lectures* than by that of Psalm xlv. Special stress is once more laid by the author on his theory (which is closely allied to Ewald's former theory) of Psalms xliv., lxxiv., lxxx., and lxxxiii. It will be a great satisfaction to me, should I be able to follow him, more especially as regards Psalms lxxiv. and lxxix. For I cannot help believing that the critics of the Book of Isaiah will have sooner or later to admit that Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxvi. 24 belongs to the terrible times of Artaxerxes Ochus.¹ Now if it may be accepted as probable that the temple was burned and Jerusalem laid waste by the Persians, irritated at the part taken by the Jews in the Syrian and Egyptian revolt, we can place Psalms lxxiv. 7 and lxxix. 1 by the side of Isaiah lxiv. 10, 11 (Heb. 9, 10). At present I see difficulties. It is very bold to transform the story of Bagôses so completely, nor should we altogether neglect the statement in Solinus, that not Jerusalem but Jericho was "subdued"

¹ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, October, 1891, pp. 104-111, where Prof. Robertson Smith's article "Psalms" is duly referred to. On the Syrian and Egyptian campaigns of Ochus, see also Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien* (1892).

by Artaxerxes.¹ The commercial importance of Jericho may well have enabled it to overshadow Jerusalem; we know the importance of this city under Herod. As Hitzig remarks, Jews and Syrians probably dwelt together at Jericho, and shared the lot of captivity which Jerusalem, immersed in religion, may have escaped. Nor am I sure that the revolt of the Jews (or of a part of the Jews) can have had a theocratic character to such an extent as to explain Psalm xlv., and neither the expression "our hosts" (c. 9) nor the Psalmist's consciousness of Israel's innocence (contrast Isaiah lxiv. 5-7, and see Josephus) seems to me quite intelligible on Prof. Smith's theory. And the author is, I think, unjust to the Persian kings. It is perhaps a more satisfactory estimate of them which is given by Prof. Gardner, when he says that they "were usually very tolerant of the religions of those they conquered."² And if there was any country where the Persians were unlikely to commit acts of sacrilege, it was the land of the Jews; what was there in the temple to irritate Mazda-worshippers? Nor must we rely on the citation from Pseudo-Hecataeus, which does not in the least prove that the Jewish religion was persecuted by the Persians. And lastly, Gutschmid's theory respecting the Holophernes of the Book of Judith is no doubt possible, but is not at present widely received among scholars.

As to Psalm lxxxiii., Prof. Robertson Smith's date (after B.C. 350) comes very near my own. Still, with Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12 in my mind, I can hardly believe it to be correct, and 1 Macc. v. seems to me to throw a bright light on the psalm. The statement of Pseudo-Scylax which gives Ascalon to Tyre (cf. Gutschmid's art. "Phœnicia" in the *E. B.*) is strange; and is Ascalon equivalent to Philistia? I wonder that the author does not add a reference to Isaiah xxv. 10-12 (Moab), for Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. is probably of the second Persian century. Psalm lxviii. is also stated to be of the close of the Persian age. But in this case I cannot understand why Israel should pray for a "rebuke" to Egypt, which was battling so manfully for its independence against the tyrant Oehus. But to all my doubts and questionings there is one sufficient answer if Books I.-III. *must* have been com-

¹ "Judæa caput fuit Hierosolyma, sed excisa est. Successit Hierichus: et hæc desivit, Artaxerxis bello subacta." Solinus, § 35, 4 (Mommsen).

² *New Chapters in Greek History*, p. 246.

pleted before the Maccabee period. It is too true that we have but the most fragmentary and second-hand accounts of the fateful years which preceded the catastrophe of Persia. If the psalms in question *must* be Persian, then we may reconstruct a history to suit them. But I am not sure that they must, and I have reverence even for the echoes of historical events in Diodorus and Solinus.

Of course, it is gratifying to me to know that this prince of English critics is entirely on my side on the point to which I attach the highest importance, viz. that the Book of Psalms is not a record of many different ages, to be laboriously puzzled out by the critic, but upon the whole a monument of the Church of the Second Temple, so that he who would study Jewish religion—the religion of a few exceptional men, but that of the Church—must work hard at the psalms. I have looked on with astonishment at the failure of English reviewers to take in this idea, and I am pleased to have on my side one who, for his acuteness, learning, and devout spirit, ought to be respected by them all.¹

T. K. CHEYNE.

¹ I subjoin two little notes. (1) On p. 212 the author states that the point of Psalm cxxxiii. is missed in all the commentaries that he has examined. I have not the *E.B.* at hand to see if this sentence is but reprinted, but surely all those commentators who regard this as a pilgrim psalm hold just the same view as that which is here so well expressed. What is the property of the author is the beautiful interpretation of verses 2 and 3 which follows. (2) It is not perhaps wise to reject the situation proposed by me (after Hitzig) for Psalms xlii., xliii., because it is "fanciful" (p. 439). Unvivified by the imagination, the facts of exegesis tend to be insipid. Milton has taught us that there is a true fancy and a false (*Paradise Lost*, Book V.), and the author himself is, happily, well furnished with imaginative power. (3) My present view of Psalm lxxviii. 31 (A.V. 30) is to be found in *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism*, p. 341. The verse, as I now interpret it, suggests placing the psalms at a time when Egyptian mercenaries were dangerous to Syria (see *Jos., Ant.* xii. 3. 3).

ST. PAUL'S FIRST JOURNEY IN ASIA MINOR.

II.

THE notes which follow may perhaps seem to be unnecessarily minute ; but their sole reason for existence lies in the fact that it is important to weigh accurately and minutely minute details. Fidelity to the character and circumstances of the country and people is an important criterion in estimating the narrative of St. Paul's journeys ; and such fidelity is most apparent in slight details, many of which have, so far as I can discover, hitherto escaped notice. The writer's subject is restricted to the country with which he has had the opportunity of acquiring unusual familiarity, and about which many false opinions have become part of the stock of knowledge, handed down through a succession of commentators. Even that most accurate of writers, the late Bishop Lightfoot, had in his earlier works not succeeded in emancipating himself from the traditional misconceptions ; we observe in his successive writings a continuous progress towards the accurate knowledge of Asia Minor which is conspicuous in his work on Ignatius and Polycarp. But in his early work, the edition of the *Epistle to the Galatians*, there is shown, so far as Asia Minor is concerned, little or no superiority to the settled erroneousness of view and of statement which still characterises the recent commentaries of Wendt and Lipsius ;¹ and only a few signs appear of his later fixed habit of recurring to

¹ Wendt's sixth (seventh) edition of Meyer's *Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1888 ; Lipsius' edition of *Epistle to the Galatians* in Holtzmann's *Handcommentar zum N.T.*, ii. 2, Freiburg, 1891. These works are referred to throughout simply as Wendt and Lipsius.

original authorities about the country and setting the words of St. Paul in their local and historical surroundings, a habit which contrasts strongly with the satisfied acquiescence of Lipsius and Wendt in the hereditary circle of knowledge or error. The present writer is under great obligations to Wendt especially, and desires to acknowledge his debt fully; but the vice of most modern German discussions of the early history of Christianity, viz., falseness to the facts of contemporary life and the general history of the period, is becoming stereotyped and intensified by long repetition in the most recent commentators, and some criticism and protest against the narrowness of their treatment of the subject are required.

I regret to be compelled in these papers to disagree so much with Lightfoot. Perhaps therefore I may be allowed to say that, sixteen years ago, the study of his edition of Galatians marks an epoch in my thoughts and the beginning of my admiration for St. Paul and for him.

In order to put the reader on his guard, it is only fair to state at the outset that the paper has a definite aim, viz., by minutely examining the journeys in Asia Minor to show that the account given in Acts of St. Paul's journeys is founded on, or perhaps actually incorporates, an account written down under the immediate influence of Paul himself. This original account was characterised by a system of nomenclature different from that which is employed by the author of the earlier chapters of Acts, viz., i.-xii.: it used territorial names in the Roman sense, found also in Paul's Epistles, whereas the author of i.-xii. uses them in the popular Greek sense; and it showed a degree of accuracy which the latter was not able to attain.¹ In carrying out this aim, it will be necessary to

¹ The general agreement of this view with that stated by Wendt, pp. 23 and 278, is obvious; and certain differences are also not difficult to detect. He dates the composition of Acts between 75 and 100 A.D., and holds that the original document alone was the work of Luke.

differ in some passages of Acts from the usual interpretation; and the reasons for this divergence can be appreciated only by careful attention to rather minute details. For the sake of brevity, I shall, so far as regard for clearness permits, venture to refer for some details to a special work,¹ whose results are here applied to the special purpose of illustrating this part of the Acts; but I hope to make the exposition and arguments complete in themselves.

As this idea that the narrative of St. Paul's journeys, beginning with chapter xiii., had an independent existence before it was utilised or incorporated in Acts, must be frequently referred to in the following pages, the supposed original document will be alluded to as the "Travel-Document." The exact relation of this document to the form which appears in Acts is difficult to determine. It may have been modified or enlarged; but I do not feel certain that in the parts relating to Asia Minor, to which this paper is restricted, any verses can be with confidence characterised as pure additions.

I hope to show that, when once we place ourselves at the proper point of view, the interpretation of the Travel-Document as a simple, straightforward, historical testimony offers itself with perfect ease, and that it confirms and completes our knowledge of the country acquired from other sources in a way which proves its ultimate origin from a person acquainted with the actual circumstances. If this attempt be successful, it follows that the original document was composed under St. Paul's own influence,² for only he was present on all the occasions where the vividness of the narrative is specially conspicuous.

The impression conveyed in the preceding paragraph

¹ *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, where I have discussed the points more fully.

² I wish to express his influence in the most general terms, and to avoid any theorising about the way in which it was exercised, whether by mere verbal report or otherwise.

differs from that of my words in the EXPOSITOR, January, 1892, p. 30, which I wish to correct to some extent by better knowledge. It has cost me much time and labour to understand the account given in Acts;¹ and it was impossible to understand it so long as I was prepossessed with the idea adopted from my chief master and guide, Bishop Lightfoot, that in St. Paul's Epistle the term Galatians denotes the Celtic people of the district popularly and generally known as Galatia. To maintain this idea I had to reject the plain and natural interpretation of some passages; but when at last I found myself compelled to abandon it, and to understand Galatians as inhabitants of Roman Galatia, much that had been dark became clear, and some things that had seemed loose and vague became precise and definite.² As the two opposing theories must frequently be referred to, it will prove convenient to designate them as the North-Galatian and the South-Galatian theories; and the term North Galatia will be used to denote the country of the Asiatic Gauls, South Galatia to denote the parts of Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia, which were by the Romans incorporated in the vast province of Galatia.

The discussion of St. Paul's experiences in Asia Minor is beset with one serious difficulty. The attempt must be made to show clearly the character of the society into which the apostle introduced the new doctrine of religion and of life. In the case of Greece and Rome, much may be assumed as familiar to the reader. In the case of Asia Minor, very little can be safely assumed; and the analogy of Greece and Rome is apt to introduce confusion and mis-

¹ Among other things I was obliged to rewrite the sketch of the history of Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia given in *Hist. Geogr.*, p. 371, where I wrongly followed M. Waddington against Prof. Mommsen in regard to the coins of M. Antonius Polemo. This error vitiated my whole theory.

² Fortunately none of the details on which my opinion has been altered have come under notice in the preceding part of this paper.

conception. C H have attempted,¹ in a most scholarly way, to set forth a picture of the situation in which St. Paul found himself placed in the cities of Asia and of Galatia. But the necessary materials for their purpose did not exist, the country was unknown, the maps were either a blank or positively wrong in regard to all but a very few points; and, moreover, they were often deceived by Greek and Roman analogies. The only existing sketch of the country that is not positively misleading is given by Mommsen in his *Provinces of the Roman Empire*; and even it is only a very brief description of the provinces during a period of several centuries. Now the dislike entertained for the new religion was at first founded on the disturbance it caused in the existing relations of society. Toleration of new religions as such was far greater under the Roman Empire than it has been in modern times: in the multiplicity of religions and gods that existed in the same city, a single new addition was a matter of almost perfect indifference. But the aggressiveness of Christianity, the change in social habits and everyday life which it introduced, and the injurious effect that it sometimes exercised on trades which were encouraged by paganism, combined with the intolerance that it showed for other religions, made it detested among people who regarded with equanimity or even welcomed the introduction into their cities of the gods of Greece, of Rome, of Egypt, of Syria. Hence every slight fact which is recorded of St. Paul's experiences has a close relation to the social system that prevailed in the country, and cannot be properly understood without clearly grasping the general character of society and the tendencies which moulded it. The attempt must be made in the following pages to bring out the general principles which were at work in each individual incident; and such an attempt involves minuteness

¹ I use C H and F as before to indicate Conybeare and Howson, and Farrar, respectively.

in scrutinising the details of each incident and lengthens the exposition. It will be necessary to express dissent from predecessors oftener than I could wish; but if one does not formally dissent from the views advocated by others, the impression is apt to be caused that they have not been duly weighed.

The city of Antioch was the governing and military centre of the southern half of the vast province of Galatia, which at this time extended from north to south right across the plateau of Asia Minor, nearly reaching the Mediterranean on the south and the Black Sea on the north. Under the early emperors it possessed a rank and importance far beyond what belonged to it in later times. This was due to the fact that between 10 B.C. and 72 A.D. the "pacification," *i.e.* the completion of the conquest and organisation, of southern Galatia was in active progress, and was conducted from Antioch as centre. Under Claudius, 41-54, A.D., the process of pacification was in especially active progress, and Antioch was at the acme of its importance.

In the Roman style, then, Antioch belonged to Galatia, but, in popular language and according to geographical situation, it was said to be a city of Phrygia. Even a Roman might speak of Antioch as a city of Phrygia, if he were laying stress on geographical or ethnological considerations; for the province of Galatia was so large that the Romans themselves subdivided it into districts (which are enumerated in many Latin inscriptions), *e.g.* Paphlagonia, Phrygia, Isauria, Lycaonia, Pisidia, etc. It is commonly said that Antioch belonged to Pisidia, but, for the time with which we are dealing, this is erroneous. Strabo is quite clear on the point.¹ But after the time of Strabo there

¹ See pages 557, 569, 577. Ptolemy mentions Antioch twice, v. 4, 11, and v. 5, 4 (this error, of which he has often been guilty, is founded on his use of two different authorities in the two passages); in one case he assigns it to Pisidia, in the other to Pisidian Phrygia.

took place a gradual widening of the term Pisidia to include all the country that lay between the bounds of the province of Asia and Pisidia proper. It is important to observe this and similar cases in which the denotation of geographical names in Asia Minor gradually changes, as the use of a name sometimes gives a valuable indication of the date of the document in which it occurs.

The accurate and full geographical description of Antioch about 45-50 A.D., was "a Phrygian city on the side of Pisidia" (*Φρυγία πόλις πρὸς Πισιδίᾳ*). The latter addition was used in Asia Minor to distinguish it from Antioch on the Mæander, on the borders of Caria and Phrygia. But the world in general wished to distinguish Antioch from the great Syrian city, not from the small Carian city; hence the shorter expression "Pisidian Antioch" (*Ἀντιόχεια ἡ Πισιδία*),¹ came into use, and finally, as the term Pisidia was widened, "Antioch of Pisidia" became common. The latter term is used by Ptolemy, v. 4, 11, and occurs in some inferior MSS. in Acts xiii. 14. Pisidian Antioch, however, is admittedly the proper reading in the latter passage.

From these facts we can infer that it would have been an insult to an Antiochian audience, the people of a Roman Colonia, to address them as Pisidians. Pisidia was the "barbarian" mountain country that lay between them and Pamphylia; it was a country almost wholly destitute of Greek culture, ignorant of Greek games and arts, and barely subjugated by Roman arms. Antioch was the guard set upon these Pisidian robbers, the trusted agent of the imperial authority, the centre of the military system designed to protect the subjects of Rome. "Men of Galatia" is the only possible address in cases where "Men of Antioch" is not suitable;² and "a city of Phrygia" is the

¹ Compare Ptolemy's *Pisidian Phrygia*, quoted in the last note.

² "Phrygians" was also an impossible address, for Phrygian had in Greek and Latin become practically equivalent to slave.

geographical designation which a person familiar with the city would use if the honorific title "a city of Galatia" was not suitable. These accurate terms were used by the Roman Paul, and they are used in the original document employed by the author of Acts, though in one case the looser but commoner phrase, "Pisidian Antioch" is used to distinguish it from Syrian Antioch.

As to the route by which Paul and Barnabas travelled from Antioch to Iconium, widely varying opinions have been entertained by recent authorities. Professor Kiepert, the greatest perhaps of living geographers, who has paid special attention to the difficult problems of the topography of Asia Minor, has drawn the map attached to Renan's *Saint Paul*, and has concluded that in all his three journeys Paul travelled between the two cities along the great Eastern Trade Route,¹ a section of which connected Philomelium and Laodicea Katakekaumene: according to Kiepert, Paul crossed the Sultan Dagh to join this route at Philomelium, and left it again at Laodicea to go south to Iconium. C H indicate his route along the western side of Sultan Dagh, until that lofty ridge breaks down into hilly country on the south, across which the route goes in as direct a line as possible to Iconium. F indicates a route midway between these two, passing pretty exactly along the highest ridge of the Sultan Dagh.

The line marked out by C H, though not exactly correct, approximates much more closely than either of the others to that which we may unhesitatingly pronounce to be the natural and probable one. But, partly in deference to Professor Kiepert's well-deserved and universally acknowledged authority, and partly on account of an interesting problem of Christian antiquities which in part hinges on

¹ Of this road, which came into use during the later centuries B.C., and which was the main artery of communication and government in Asia Minor under the Roman Empire, a full account is given *Hist. Geogr.*, chaps. iii., iv.

this question, it is necessary to state as briefly as possible the main facts.

According to Kiepert, Paul in each case preferred to cross the lofty Sultan Dagh. There is no actual pass across that lofty ridge. The path climbs a steep and rugged glen on one side, crosses the summit of the ridge, fully 4,000 feet above the town of Antioch, and descends a similar glen on the other side.¹ On the map Antioch seems very near Philomelium; but six hours of very toilsome travelling lie between them. Then follows a peculiarly unpleasant road, twenty-seven hours² in length, by Laodicea to Iconium. Except in the towns that lie on the road, there is hardly any shade and little water along its course. It is exposed to the sun from its rising to its setting; and, if my memory is correct, there are only two places where a tree or two by the roadside afford a little shadow and a rest for the traveller. This road makes a circuit, keeping to the level plain throughout; but it would not be used by pedestrians like Paul and Barnabas. If they went to Philomelium, they would naturally prefer the direct road thence to Iconium through the hill country by Kaballa. This path is nowhere very steep or difficult, is often shady and pleasant, and is shorter by an hour or two than the road through Laodicea: it is in all probability older than the great Trade Route, and was undoubtedly used at all periods for direct communication by horse or foot passengers between Philomelium and Iconium.

But there is no reason to think that Paul ever crossed the Sultan Dagh. The natural path from Antioch to Iconium went nearly due south for six hours by the new Roman road to Neapolis, the new city which was just growing up at the time.³ Thence it went to Misthia on the

¹ See the description given of the crossing by my friend, Professor Sterrett, in his *Epigraphic Journey in Asia Minor*, p. 164.

² The "hour" indicates a distance of about three miles.

³ On the history of Neapolis, see *Hist. Geogr.*, pp. 396-7.

north-eastern shores of the great lake Caralis. A little way beyond Misthia it diverged from the Roman road, and crossed the hilly country by a very easy route to Iconium. The total distance from Antioch to Iconium by this route is about twenty-seven hours,¹ as compared with thirty-one or thirty-three by way of Philomelium. This route is still in regular use at the present day.

The line indicated in the map of C H is straighter, and I believe that it is actually practicable; but it has never been traversed by any explorer, and I know only part of the country through which it runs. It would pass east of Neapolis, and may possibly have been a track of communication in older time. But in B.C. 6 Augustus formed a series of roads to connect the Roman colonies which he founded as fortresses of defence against the Pisidian mountain tribes.² Hence we might feel some confidence in assuming that Paul and Barnabas would walk as far as possible along the Roman road. This road indeed was not the shortest line between Antioch and Iconium, because its purpose was to connect Antioch, the military centre of defence, with the two eastern colonies, Lystra and Parlais; and it did not touch Iconium. But communication would be so organised as to use the well-made road to the utmost; all trade undoubtedly followed this track, entertainment for travellers was naturally provided along it, and the direct path, though a little shorter, would be less convenient and would no longer be thought of or used. We are not, however, left in this case to mere probabilities. We have the express testimony of an ancient document that Paul used this Roman road; and my object in giving this minute

¹ Arundel, *Asia Minor*, ii. p. 8, gives the distance as twenty-eight hours by report; neither he nor Hamilton traversed this route. No description of the road is, so far as I remember, published.

² The existence of a system of military roads may always be assumed, according to the Roman custom, connecting a system of fortresses (*coloniae*); on these roads, see page 172.

and perhaps tedious description of the road and of its origin has been to bring clearly home to the reader the exactness with which this document describes the actual facts.

The document in question is one of the apocryphal Apostle-legends, the *Acts of Paul and Thekla*. The general opinion of recent scholars¹ is that this tale was composed about the latter part of the second century. In that case it would have no historical value, except in so far as it quoted older documents. I hope soon² to go into the whole question of the date and character of these Acta; but at present we are concerned only with one passage, in which the road from Antioch to Iconium is described.

In the opening of the Acta a certain Onesiphorus, resident at Iconium, heard that Paul was intending to come thither from Antioch. Accordingly he went forth from the city to meet him, and to invite him to his house. And he proceeded as far as the Royal Road that leads to Lystra, and there he stood waiting for Paul; and he scanned the features of the passers-by.³ And he saw Paul coming, a man small in size, with meeting eyebrows, with a rather large nose, baldheaded, bowlegged, strongly built, full of grace, for at times he looked like a man, and at times he had the face of an angel. This plain and unflattering account of the apostle's personal appearance seems to embody a very early tradition.

¹ There are some exceptions. I have not yet had the opportunity of seeing M. Le Blant's paper on these Acta.

² In a work on *The Church in the Roman Empire*, now nearly ready.

³ The Greek text is usually and naturally translated, "he proceeded along the Royal Road," but the following *εἰστήκει* implies that the first clause indicates the point to which Onesiphorus went and where he stood. The Syriac translation makes the sense quite clear: "he went and stood where the roads meet, on the highway which goes to Lystra." Lipsius, in his recent critical edition, omits this Syriac passage, which is of cardinal importance. In many cases he shows a preference for the easiest, the least characteristic, and therefore the worst reading; e.g., he here prefers *ἐρχομένους* to *διερχομένους*.

The "Royal Road" (*βασιλική ὁδός, via regalis*) that leads to Lystra is obviously the Roman road built by Augustus from Antioch to Lystra. The epithet is a remarkable one, and very difficult to explain. The first impression that any one would receive from it is that it denotes the Roman road built by the Basileis, as the emperors were commonly called in the second century, and that it points to a second century date more naturally than to any earlier period.

So far as I can judge, this argument as to date would be unanswerable, were it not for an inscription discovered in 1884 at Comama, the most western of Augustus's Pisidian colonies, a city whose name had entirely disappeared from human knowledge until this and other Latin inscriptions were found on the site. It was then observed that numerous coins of the city existed, but had been misread and attributed to Comana in Cappadocia; it also appeared that the city was mentioned by Ptolemy and other authorities, but that the name was always corrupted.

In the ruins of Comama there still lies a milestone, with the inscription—

"The Emperor Cæsar Augustus, son of a god, Pontifex Maximus, etc., constructed the Royal Road by the care of his lieutenant, Cornelius Aquila."¹

The roads built by Augustus to connect his Pisidian colonies² were doubtless built with a solidity unusual in the country. They are two in number, one leading to Olbasa Comama and Cremna, the other to Parlais and Lystra. The former is called *Via Regalis* on a milestone, the latter in the *Acta*.

¹ C. I. L., III., Supplem., No. 6,974. The reading *Regalem*, suggested tentatively by Mommsen, suits the copy in my note-book even better than appears from the printed text.

² The name "Pisidian" is convenient, though they were not all in Pisidia. Augustus in enumerating his colonies seems to sum them all up as in Pisidia. (Mommsen, *Monumentum Ancyranum*, p. 119.) But colonies on the Pisidian frontier to keep under control the Pisidian mountain tribes are readily called Pisidian. Thus we have above explained the term "Pisidian Antioch."

The original Acta then described the scene with a minute fidelity possible only to a person who knew the localities. Onesiphorus went out from Iconium till he came to the point a few miles south of Misthia, where the path to Iconium diverged from the built Roman road that led from Antioch to Lystra; and here he waited till he observed Paul coming towards him. I am far from assuming that the facts here narrated are historical; but I do hold that the tale was written down by a person familiar with the localities, and that the route now employed for traffic between Iconium and Antioch was used to the exclusion of any other at the time when he wrote.

It is therefore proved that the term Royal Road in the Acta furnishes no proof of a second century date. It may even be proved that the term is not consistent with an origin later than the first century, because the very name *Via Regalis*, denoting the road from Antioch to Lystra, was soon disused. The sentence where it occurs was written¹ before the name passed out of use. Can we fix approximately the date when the name ceased to exist, and before which some written authority for the tale must have come into existence? Several arguments point decisively to the conclusion that the name did not survive the first century, but belonged to a state of the country which characterised the first half of the first century and then ceased to exist. As this subject is of great consequence in our attempt to realise the circumstances in which Paul's journey was made, and has never been properly described or understood, I shall try to state briefly the main facts.

The purpose of Augustus's roads was to keep in order the recently subdued Pisidian mountaineers. When the paci-

¹ No mere tradition can be so strong as to fix in the memory of posterity verbal peculiarities which no longer correspond to actual facts. It will appear in the following paragraphs that the name *Via Regalis* was retained in the MSS. long after it had ceased to be understood.

fication of Pisidia, and the naturalisation of the imperial rule and the Græco-Roman civilisation in the country had been completed, the need for these roads disappeared; they were no longer maintained by the imperial government with the care that was applied to roads of military importance, and they were merged in the general system of communication across Asia Minor.¹

The period when this pacification of Pisidia was taking place can be determined precisely from the evidence of coins, of inscriptions, and of authors, and from the dates at which the constitutions of cities on the northern frontiers were fixed. I need not weary the reader by enumerating here the long lists of facts which show that the earlier emperors from Augustus to Nero directed close and continuous attention to this district of Asia Minor, and that in the reign of Claudius the process of organisation was in specially active progress. Vespasian in A.D. 74 remodelled the government, separated great part of Pisidia from the province of Galatia, and attached it to Pamphylia.² This marks the end of the Pisidian colonial system and military roads. Antioch, the centre of the system, was now entirely separated from at least three of the colonies,³ which were transferred to a different province. Moreover there were no soldiers in the province Lycia-Pamphylia, as there were in Galatia: Pisidia would not have been united to the unarmed province, unless all possible need for soldiers and garrisons had been considered to be at an end.

Lystra, the most easterly point of the colonial system, must have been a place of great importance under the early emperors; but after 74, it sank back into the insignificance of a small provincial town with nothing to distinguish it.

¹ This opinion was arrived at as the natural explanation of the known facts, and published before its application to the present case had become apparent. (See *Hist. Geogr.*, pp. 57-8.)

² He made Lycia and Pamphylia a single province.

³ Comama, Cremna, and Olbasa were henceforth attached to Pamphylia.

Direct communication between Antioch and Lystra had previously been maintained only for military and political reasons; no commerce could ever have existed between them. After A.D. 74 therefore the road from Antioch to Lystra ceased to be thought of as a highway, and must have disappeared from popular language. Iconium, not Lystra, was the natural commercial centre, and has maintained that rank from the earliest time to the present day. Thus the road from Antioch to Iconium was, after the year 74, the only one present to the popular mind; and it ceased to be possible that a traveller from Antioch to Iconium should be described as going along the road to Lystra for a certain distance and then diverging from it.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND.

VI. THE STRONG PLACES OF SAMARIA.

AT the close of my last paper I gave as the fifth feature of Samaria her fortresses, the large number of which was due to the openness of the land and to the fact that, unlike Judæa, Samaria had no central position upon which her defence might be consolidated. The fortresses of Samaria lay all around and across her, but chiefly as was natural upon those passes that draw up to her centre. They occupied the high isolated knolls or mounts which are so frequent a feature of her scenery.

1. Of those strong places the chief was that which was so long the capital and gave its name to the whole kingdom. *The head of Ephraim is Samaria.*¹

¹ Isa. vii. 9.

It was Jeroboam himself who discovered the impossibility of Shechem as a fortress, for even in his reign we discover the court at Tirzah,¹ a strong position at the head of one of the eastern passes. Tirzah was also held by the following dynasty, but when the next usurper, Omri, had time to shape his policy, he turned westward, and chose him a virgin site in the valley that leads down from Shechem to the coast, the present Wady esh-Sha'ir or Barley Vale. Here, in a wide basin that is formed by a bend of the vale and an incoming glen, rises a round, isolated hill over three hundred feet high. It was not already a city, but probably, as it is to-day, covered with soil and arable to the top. Omri fortified it and called it Shomeron, Wartburg, the Watch Tower.² The name was obviously appropriate. Although the mountains almost entirely surround and overlook it on three sides, to the west Samaria commands a great view. The broad vale is visible for eight miles, then a low range of hills, and over them the sea. It is a position out of the way of most of the kingdom, of which the centre of gravity lay upon the eastern slope; but it was wisely chosen by a dynasty, whose strength was alliance with Phœnicia. The coast is but twenty-three miles away. In her palace in Samaria, Jezebel can have felt far from neither her home nor the symbols of her ancestral faith. Within sight was the path of her father's galleys, and there each night her people's god sank to his rest in the same glory betwixt sky and sea, which they were worshipping from Tyre. But the position has more advantage than its western exposure. "Though it would now be commanded from the northern range, it must before the invention of gunpowder have been almost im-

¹ 1 Kings xiv. 17.

² שְׁמֵרֹן, from שָׁמַר, to watch, with the termination ון so frequent in Hebrew place-names. The Aramaic is שְׁמֵרִין, and it is from this the Greek Σαμάρεια and Latin Samaria were formed.

pregnable.”¹ The sieges of Samaria were therefore always prolonged. In Elisha’s day there was the blockade by the Syrians; when, *behold, they besieged it, until an ass’s head was sold for fourscore shekels, and the fourth part of a kab of dove’s dung for five.*²

In 723–721 B.C.³ the overthrow of Samaria cost the Assyrians three years, and in 120 John Hyrcanus was unable to take it under one.⁴ He demolished the city, but it was rebuilt and strengthened by, among others, Gabinius, the Roman general, who came after Pompey. And then as the site had suited the Phœnician alliance of Ahab, so it fell in with the Roman policy of Herod, and especially with his plan of building a large port at Cæsarea, and holding the roads from Rome to the interior. Augustus gave Samaria to Herod, who fortified and embellished it in honour of his patron, and as upon some other high places in Syria a temple to Cæsar arose where there had been a temple to Baal.⁵ Herod called it Sebaste, the Greek for Augusta, and it is this name which has survived till now with the remains of his splendid colonnades and gateways. There is also the ruin of a Gothic church, in which the Crusaders restored the episcopal see of Sebaste, that was here before the coming of Islam. But since then the town has sunk to a miserable village. For as long as there ruled in the land a power with no interests towards the coast and the sea, Samaria was certain to yield again to the more central Shechem the supremacy which Ahab and Herod, with their western attractions, had stolen from Shechem to give her.

¹ Major Conder.

² 2 Kings vi. 25.

³ *Ib.*, xvii.

⁴ Joseph, XIII. *Antt.* x. 2, 3; I. *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 7. The account of how Hyrcanus demolished Samaria is very interesting: “He destroyed it utterly, and brought streams to drown it, for he made such excavations as might let the waters run under it: nay he devoured the very signs that there had ever been so great a city there.” This can only mean that there was a good part of the city below the hill.

⁵ Compare 1 Kings xvi. 32 with I. *Bell. Jud.*, xxi. 2.

To-day, amid the peace and beauty of the scene—the secluded vale covered with cornfields, through which the winding streams flash and glisten into the hazy distance, and the gentle hill rises without a scarp to the olives waving over its summit—it is possible to appreciate Isaiah's name for Samaria, *the crown of pride of Ephraim, the flower of his glorious beauty which is on the head of the fat valley*.¹ But it is very hard to realise how often such a landscape became the theatre of war and famine and of the worst passions of tyranny and religious strife. On that hill a city was shut up to hunger—till mothers devoured their infants and dung was bought for food—in face of harvests ripening all around. Sinister fate to have been associated with both Ahab and Herod! There by the entrance of the gate Ahab drew his sentence of death from the prophet of Jehovah; and there they washed his blood from his chariot, when they had brought him back to his burial.² There Jezebel slew the prophets of Jehovah and Jehu the priests of Baal.³ There Herod married Mariamne, and when in his jealousy he had slain her for nothing, there she haunted him, till his remorse “would frequently call for her and lament for her in a most indecent manner, and he was so far overcome of his passion that he would command his servants to call for Mariamne, as if she were still alive and could still hear them.”⁴ There, too, he strangled his two sons.⁵ Like most of Herod's magnificent palaces, Sebaste was but a family shambles. It is not without fitness that a tradition, otherwise unjustified, should have localised in this place of blood the execution of John the Baptist. The church was dedicated to him, and his tomb is still pointed out in the rock beneath.

On the other roads from Shechem to the coast, there was,

¹ Isa. xxviii. 1.

² 1 Kings xviii. ; 2 Kings x. 17 ff.

³ *Ib.*, XVI. *Antt.*, xi. 7.

⁴ 1 Kings xx.

⁵ Joseph., XV. *Antt.*, vii. 7.

so far as we know, no second town of importance.¹ But on the extreme S.W. corner of Mount Ephraim there is Gufna, which, though not mentioned in the Old Testament,² must at all times have played an important part in the defence or invasion of Samaria. Gufna is without doubt the Gophna of Josephus. It lies by the junction of two great roads, both leading to Bethel, the one from Shechem, the other coming up from Sharon. Judas Maccabeus fell back on Gophna after his defeat by Antiochus Epiphanes;³ and it was occupied both by Vespasian in his blockade of Judæa and by Titus in his advance upon Jerusalem. Whether Paul was taken to Cæsarea by this way or by Bethhoron is uncertain.⁴

The southern frontier of Samaria was defended, when it lay so far south, by Bethel, and by the city of Ephraim or Ephron,⁵ if the conjecture be correct that the latter is the present strong village Et-Taiyibeh, on the road up from Jericho. Behind these outposts, the avenues northward are covered by a series of strongholds, chiefly on the tops of high knolls, like Gilgilia, probably the Gilgal of Elijah's last journey,⁶ Singil, a Saint Giles of Crusaders' times, and Kuriyat, probably the ancient Corea which Pompey occupied on his march through Samaria. Somewhere near lay the Hasmonean fortress of Alexandrium—"a stronghold fortified with the utmost magnificence and situated on a high mountain."⁷ Alexandrium played a frequent part in the civil wars of the Jews, in the Roman invasions, and in

¹ Unless Pir'athon, Judges xii. 15, is to be identified with Fer'on due west of Sebaste, Gideon's 'Ophra with Fer'ata near the Joppa-Shechem road, and Baal-Shalisha (2 Kings iv. 42) with Kefr Thilth on the Wady Kanah. But these are uncertain—the second very unlikely. More probable are the conjectures which place on this same slope Joshua's Timnath-Heres at Kefr Haris, and Gibbethon (1 Kings xv. 27) at Kibiah among the hills N.E. from Lydda.

² Unless it be the 'Ophni of Benjamin (Josh. xvii. 24).

³ 1. *Bell. Jud.*, i. 5.

⁴ Cf. Robinson, *Bib. Res.*, iii. 77 ff. ; *Later Researches*, 138.

⁵ 2 Sam. xiii. 23 ; 2 Chron. xiii. 19, Ephraim ; John xi. 54.

⁶ 2 Kings ii. 1.

⁷ 1. *Bell. Jud.*, vi. 5.

Herod's life. Pompey came by it; Mark Antony distinguished himself in front of it during the siege by Gabinius.¹ Herod confined Mariamne within it,² and buried his two strangled sons there, "where their uncle by their mother's side and the greatest part of their ancestors had been deposited."³ The site of this Hasmonean fortress and mausoleum has not yet been identified. It was near Corea, not far from Jericho,⁴ and on the top of a high mountain. If Corea be Kuriyat, Alexandrium may be the Mejdael Beni Fadl above an ancient road leading down by the Wady Fusail to the Jordan; but neither there nor anywhere else has a trace of the name been discovered.

We are now round upon the eastern flank of Samaria. In ancient times the passes penetrating this do not seem to have had fortresses at their mouths in the Jordan valley; it was reserved to Herod to build Phasaelis there at the mouth of the present Wady el Ifgim, and to Archelaus to build Archelais at the mouth of the Wady Far'ah. The ancient kings had held both sides of the river and built their fortresses to the east of it.⁵ But at the upper end of the passes leading down to Jordan stood a number of Old Testament strongholds, like Bezek on the high road from Shechem to Bethshan, Tirzah (if Tirzah be Teiásir, and not, as is more probable, Tulluzah) at the junction of the Bethshan and Abel-Meholah roads, and Thebez at the top of the road down the Bukei'a. Some fortress must surely have covered the top of the Wady Far'ah—Pir'athon, I would suggest, the name of which contains the same radicals as Far'ah, and is probably the same as the Pharathoni that is combined in First Maccabees with Thamnatha,

¹ XIV. *Antt.*, v. 1.

² XV. *Antt.*, vi. 5.

³ XV. *Antt.*, xi. 7.

⁴ XIV. *Antt.*, v. 2; XVI. *Antt.*, x. 4.

⁵ Like Jeroboam's Penuel, and Ahab's Ramoth.

another name of which there are echoes in the district.¹ At the top of Wady el Ifgim stood Taanath-Shiloh.²

The northern avenue of Samaria leading up from Esdraelon to the interior is guarded by a number of strongholds, of which one far in was BETHULIA, that kept the army of Holofernes in check—Bethulia may be the modern Meselieh, or Meithalûn, or perhaps Sanûr—a second was DOTHAN, *a mount* at the south of the plain of Dothan;³ and a third by the very mouth of the avenue was Jezreel. JEZREEL stands well forward upon a cape of Gilboa, with a view that sweeps Esdraelon east and west, and looks up the great gulf which the plain throws south as far as Gennin. To Ahab's dynasty, who built it, it was useful for the same reason that Samaria suited them; it lay convenient to the west. It covered also the highways from the coast to Jordan and from Egypt to Damascus.

As you look from Jezreel eastward, there is visible in the distance down Esdraelon⁴ another fortress, BETHSHAN, the position of which and its peculiar relation to the province of Samaria and to the whole of Western Samaria require some description.

The broad vale of Jezreel comes gently down between Gilboa and the hills of Galilee. Three miles after it has opened round Gilboa to the south, but is still guarded by

¹ For Pirathon, פִּרְעָתוֹן, see Judges xii. 13–15. τῆν θάμναθὰ φαραθῶνι (1 Macc. ix. 50) is evidently one place; and the θάμναθὰ, Timnah perhaps, may be still recognised in the name Tammûn, so common now at the head of Wady Far'ah.

² Josh. xvi. 6: Identified by Van de Velde with Ta'ana.

³ 2 Kings vi. 13, the Dothaim of Judith iv. 6; vii. 3, 18; viii. 3; the passage in iv. 6 is worth transcribing. When Holofernes reached Bethshan *Joachim the high priest wrote to them that dwelt in Bethulia, and Betsmestham which is before Esdraelon, toward the plain, which is near Dothaim, charging them to hold the passes of the hill country, for through them was the entrance into Judea, and it was easy to stop them as they came up, the pass being narrow, in double file at most.*

⁴ In 1 Kings iv. 12 *all Bethshan, which is by Zartamah, is described as beneath Jezreel.*

the northern hills, it suddenly drops over a bank some three hundred feet high into the valley of the Jordan. This bank or lip, which runs north and south for nearly five miles, is cut by several streams falling eastward in narrow ravines, in which the black basalt lies bare and the water breaks noisily over it. Near the edge of the lip and between two of the ravines rises a high commanding mound that was once the citadel of Bethshan, the other quarters of which lay southward, divided by smaller streams. The position, which might be further fortified by damming the abundant water till marshes were formed,¹ is one of great strength and immense prospect. The eye sweeps from four to ten miles of plain all round, and follows the road westward to Jezreel, covers the thickets of Jordan where the fords lie, and ranges the edge of the eastern hills from Gadara to the Jabbok. It is about the furthest-seeing, furthest-seen fortress in the land, and lies in the main passage between Eastern and Western Palestine. You perceive at a glance the meaning of its history. Bethshan ought to have been to Samaria what Jericho was to Judæa—a cover to the fords of Jordan, and a key to the passes westward. But there is this difference. While Jericho lies well up to the Judæan hills, and has no strength apart from them, Bethshan is isolated, and strong and fertile enough to stand alone. And alone it has stood—less often an outpost of Western Palestine than a point of vantage against it. The one event by which this town becomes vivid in the Old Testament—the hanging of the bodies of Saul and Jonathan upon its walls—is but a symbol of the standing menace and insult it proved to Israel, from its proud position across the separating plain. In the earlier history Bethshan sustained an enclave of Canaanites in the midst of Israel's territory; in the later it belonged neither to Samaria nor to Galilee, but was a free city, chief of the league of Decapolis,

¹ As the Byzantine army did against the Mohammedans in 634 A.D.

with an alien and provoking population.¹ Many successful invaders used it as a base of operations against Samaria—for example, Holofernes, Pompey, Vespasian. On the only great occasion on which Bethshan was employed for an opposite purpose, the defence of Western Palestine, it proved through the stupidity of its defenders of no avail. In 634 A.D. the Byzantine army, having been beaten on the banks of the Yarmuk, fell back across Jordan, fortified the bank on which Bethshan stands, and scattered the water into marshes, which the Moslems found impassable. The latter sat down in blockade for some months, hoping that summer would exhaust the streams. But long before this the Byzantines rashly attacked them on their own ground, and suffered a second and decisive defeat. The battle was called the battle of Fahl, after the Arabic name for Pella, which lies on the opposite side of Jordan; but in the history of Islam, the day lives as the Day of Beisan. It settled the fate of Western Palestine.

From its position upon the high-road between Damascus and Egypt, Bethshan must have seen many other famous sights and persons of great name in history. It can scarcely have failed to fall in the way of Thothmes III²; but the earliest note of it in Egyptian literature occurs in the fourteenth century B.C. in the travels of the Mohar, who passed through it in his chariot: “represent to me Baita-sha-al as well as Keriathaal: the fords of the Jordan—how does one cross them?—let me know the passage to enter Mageddo.”³ The name does not occur, I believe, in the lists of Assyrian and Babylonian conquests, but Holofernes rested here, and if both he as well as Pompey and Saladin—all three while

¹ Jos., II. *Bell. Jud.*, xviii. 3. In 164 B.C., however, Judas Maccabeus found the men of Scythopolis friendly to the Jews.

² In the list of places conquered by him in Palestine is a Bathshal; but neither Mr. Tomkins nor Prof. Sayce identify this with Bethshan.—II. *Rec. of Past*, v. 52.

³ I. *Rec. of Past*, ii. 112; cf. ii. *Id.*, v. 52.

advancing from Damascus to invade Western Palestine—occupied Bethshan, then Tiglath Pileser and Sargon, with the same line of march, very probably did so too. Then Cleopatra visited Bethshan when she made her treaty with Alexander Janneus;¹ and Vespasian caused his legions to winter in its warmth.² Josephus says that in his time Bethshan, then called Scythopolis, had forty thousand inhabitants. The ruins that remain to-day attest a high degree of wealth and culture. Several temples have been traced; and there is a large amphitheatre, of which so much is still preserved, that it requires little effort, as you stand in the arena, to summon up about you the throng and passion of the city in its Greek days. Twelve black basalt rows of benches for the citizens—semicircles of nearly two hundred feet in diameter—rise eastward just so high as to let the actors upon the arena see, over the mass of faces that looked down upon them, the line of the Gilead hills on the other side of Jordan. There are fourteen entrances—for spectators, for actors, for wild beasts—and behind these, beneath the seats, the passages and exits are still well preserved. Half way up the benches are certain recesses, which are said to have contained brass sounding tubes.³ The citadel frowned over all from the north. In Christian times Bethshan was an episcopal see, sent its bishop to Nice and other councils of the Church, became full of monks,⁴ and gave birth to a little Christian literature of its own.⁵ The country around was well cultivated, being full of palm trees, and a lively trade was done with Damascus and the coast. Then the Moslems took Bethshan, and almost ever since, except for a few years of Christian occupation before 1187, when Saladin again reduced it, Beth-

¹ Jos., XIII. *Antt.*, xiii. 2.

² Bethshan lies 320 feet below the level of the sea.

³ Irby and Mangle's *Travels*, pp. 301, 302. Cf. also Robinson's *Later Res.*, 328.

⁴ Sozomen's *History*, 8. 13.

⁵ Basilides and Cyril.

shan has been little more than the squalid village which now gathers to the south of the unoccupied citadel. There are few sites which promise richer spoil beneath their rubbish to the first happy explorer with permission to excavate. But meantime, under shadow of the high mound, where the streams rattle down in the beds they have worn deep for thousands of years, and Jordan lies before you, and Gilead rises over Jordan, it is possible to dream very vivid dreams of a past in which Saul and Judas Maccabeus, Pompey, Cleopatra and Vespasian, the Byzantines and first Moslem invaders, the Crusaders and Saladin have all had a part.

With regard to the names of this town, it is well known that it had two. In the Old Testament it is Beth-sha'an or Bethshan. In the second Book of Maccabees and in the Septuagint it is also called Scythopolis. Both names were extant till the Crusades, since which an Arabic contraction of Bethshan, Beisân, has prevailed. Beth-sha'an in the longer of the two forms in which it is given in Hebrew, means the House of Security, or Tranquility, or even in a bad sense, Self-confidence; any of which would be appropriate to the natural strength and fertility of so self-contained a site, while the last might well have been bestowed by the Hebrews upon a city that so long defied them.¹ This, however, is uncertain; and it is possible that we have here simply the name of some deity, as in Beth-Dagon and Beth-Peor. The origin of the name Scythopolis, or Scytopolis, is even more obscure.² The most obvious derivation of course is that explicitly made in one or two occurrences

¹ בית ששן, Josh. xvii. 11, 16; Judges i. 27; 1 Kings iv. 12; 1 Chron. vii. 29—*from which verse we see that Bethshaan was a district as well as a town.* But בית ששן, 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 12; 2 Sam. xxi. 12.

² Σκυθόπολις, Joseph., XII. *Antt.*, viii. 5; XIII. *ib.*, vi. 1. But Σκυθῶν πόλις, Judges iii. 2; II. Macc. xii. 30. Scytopolis, *Totius orbis descriptio* (of the fourth century) quoted by Mommsen, *Provinces of Roman Empire* (Eng. Trans.), ii. 137, 138.

of the name as *Σκυθῶν πόλις*, or, City of the Scythians, who are said by Herodotus to have invaded Palestine in the reign of Psammetichus.¹ Bethshan lies on the line of such an invasion. It has also been suggested that Scythopolis is Succothopolis²—the name Succoth occurring in the neighbourhood—but Robinson naturally objects to the probability of such a hybrid, the like of which indeed does not elsewhere occur. It may, however, easily have happened that the Greek colonists, hearing some Semitic name in the district, should have wrongly supposed it to be the same as Scythian. This Semitic name may have been Succoth; or it is just possible that it was that word of similar radicals to Succoth, which is used in the Old Testament as a synonym for the second syllable of Beth-sha'an, if Beth-sha'an be really the *House of Security*.³

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

A GROUP OF PARABLES.

II.

IN a recent paper in *THE EXPOSITOR* an effort was made to point out the relation in which the three parables of chaps. xvi. and xvii. of the Gospel of St. Luke stand to one another. Instead of there being little or no connexion between them, and especially between the third and the first two, we saw that the interrelationship of the three was of the closest kind, and that they all relate to varying aspects of the same great topic—faithfulness to a steward-

¹ Herod., i. 103, 105. It is absurd to give the statement of G. Syncellus, a historian of the eighth century A.D., in support of this.

² By Reland, with whom Gesenius agrees. *Thesaurus*, sub voce בית יִסְאָן.

³ סִכְתָּה, to be *still* or *silent*, is related to שִׁכַּת, sh'k't, which is synonymous with יִסְאָן. It is used like יִסְאָן of land as well as men. See Judges iii. 11 and parallel passages. The two words occur together in Jer. xxx. 10 and xli. 27: וישקט וישאן.

ship committed to us, to a work given us to do. It remains now to apply what was said to a serious but not un- plausible charge often brought in recent times against the author of the third Gospel.

St. Luke, it is said, was a democrat, or rather a socialist, to whom the possession of private property was obnoxious, and who beheld in riches what was offensive, in poverty what was acceptable, in the sight of God. We are invited to notice the different forms in which certain portions of the Sermon on the Mount are given by the first and the third Evangelists. In particular, while St. Matthew quotes our Lord as saying, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 3), St. Luke quotes Him as pronouncing His blessing upon those who are simply poor, "Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God" (Luke vi. 20). Not poverty of spirit, but poverty in itself, makes men children of that kingdom the coming of which had been announced by Mary in the words, "He hath put down princes from their thrones, and hath exalted them of low degree. The hungry He hath filled with good things; and the rich He hath sent empty away."

The chief ground, however, upon which this view of the third Evangelist rests is the second of the parables spoken of in our former paper, that of the Rich Man and Lazarus. No language can be more explicit than that in which Schwegler asserts that the guilt of the rich man was his riches, the merit of the poor man his poverty, and that the standard by which the recompense of a future world was to be adjudged to them was not the good or evil done in life, but the degree in which happiness or misery had fallen to them here.¹ He proposed therefore a symbolical interpretation of the parable to which it is at present unnecessary to make further reference. Then Baur came in, and in his

¹ Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeitalter*, ii. 59.

most remarkable, perhaps at the same time his ablest work, that on the Canonical Gospels, allowed that the circumstance in the parable giving most offence, and therefore most needing explanation, was this very strength of contrast between the estimate of riches and poverty taught in it as Divine. He saw no need, however, for a symbolical interpretation. It was enough to refer to the Ebionite conception of the relation between riches and poverty, and to the opposition (*Gegensatz*) resting upon this of the present and future worlds.¹ Baur saw indeed that such an interpretation would not suit the latter portion of the parable beginning with ver. 26, where elements of an altogether different kind are introduced. Yet the remedy was easy. He adopted the opinion of Schwegler, that this part of the parable does not belong to its original form. It was a later addition, intended to point out the guilt of the Jews, who amidst all the rich store of their religious blessings, revelations, and prophetic teachings, had failed to penetrate to what was their true meaning—Jesus the promised Messiah risen from the dead. The rich man becomes the symbol of Judaism, the poor man of heathenism; and Judaism and Pauline Christianity are contrasted with one another. No real attempt is made to explain how these two most heterogeneous pieces of the parable came to be attached to one another, unless it may be thought that the words of ver. 26, *καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῦτοις κ.τ.λ.*, are of themselves a sufficient explanation, and that nothing further need be said. Strauss, as might be expected, followed on the same lines, and then Renan gave support and popular impulse to the view. In his preliminary remarks to his *Life of Jesus* he finds in the parable of which we speak his first authority for his verdict on St. Luke. “He is an exalted democrat and Ebionite, that is to say, he is very much opposed to property, and is persuaded that a time of re-

¹ *Die kanonischen Evang.*, p. 443, etc.

tribution for the poor (la revanche des pauvres) is at hand" (p. xli.). Thus the Ebionite view of the parable gained ground, and that not on the Continent only but in England, until expression has of late been given to it in its most distinct form by a well-known minister of the Church of Scotland, the Rev. Colin Campbell, Dundee. Referring in his "Critical Studies in St. Luke" to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Dr. Campbell says:—

In this one parable, peculiar to Luke, is concentrated, as in a powerful picture, the whole Ebionite doctrine of the Gospel. The contrast, both in this world and the next, in the condition and fate of the two actors in the drama, is complete. The one, a certain rich man, the other a certain beggar; the one "clothed in purple and fine linen," the other "thrown down" at his gate, full of sores and no doubt half naked; the one "living in mirth and splendour every day," the other *desiring* to be fed with what fell from the rich man's table; the neglect of the rich man (a remark to which is added the note, "This is not certain, only probable, judging from what follows"), the other cared for only by dogs that licked his sores—thus adding to his degradation, because they were unclean animals. Not one word is said of the *moral* character of either the rich man or Lazarus. The rich man's neglect of Lazarus is rather implied than expressed; yet even if that neglect be taken at the full score, it is the sole moral delinquency chargeable to him; but that is his whole failure. No one has ever ventured to affirm piety of the beggar, or any claim to favour except his misery (p. 274).

And again, passing to the life beyond the grave—

The human life of both Lazarus and himself (the rich man) is over; his chance of making friends with the poor beggar is lost for ever; and therefore the answer comes, Son, remember that thou *in thy life time receivedst thy good things*, and Lazarus in like manner *evil things*; but *now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish*. Here again everything is in perfect contrast. The tables are now turned; the balance is readjusted. . . . The rich man had received a full quittance in the past life; the poor man had received only evil which was not his due; therefore he is comforted, and the rich man is in anguish (p. 276).

It is both an interesting and important question, How far are such representations correct? and it is all the more

so, because it can hardly be denied that, in the above extracts, the first impression produced by reading the parable is correctly stated. Multitudes are unable to read it without the feeling that it does contain a condemnation, from the Christian point of view, of riches in themselves, and a commendation of poverty simply as poverty, when at least it is our natural lot in life, and has not been brought upon us by vices of which we are directly conscious. Men are surprised too when they see that there are no words in the parable expressly pointing out either the depraved character of *Dives* or the piety of Lazarus. Finally, the words of ver. 25, "Child, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things," etc., may readily enough be supposed to mean that, in the eternal world, the balance of earthly wellbeing and earthly misfortune will be redressed, the prosperous here being sufferers there, sufferers here being made happy there. What is to be said?

The aim of this paper, as exegetical, is simply to ask, What is demanded by a fair exegesis of the passage? Were it not so, one might be tempted to dwell upon the palpable absurdity of the supposition that our Lord could mean that His words in ver. 25 were to be understood in the sense attributed to them. There seems to be no foundation for the idea that any sect or any individual of the world has ever really believed that the simple possession of riches here will be followed by unchangeable and everlasting anguish hereafter, or that the simple burden of poverty and want in this life will be rewarded in the life to come with unchangeable and everlasting bliss. Even the Ebionites of the early Christian Church do not appear to have had such a tenet. The most ascetic section of them might unduly magnify the advantages of poverty, and might think that it gained them a higher place in the Divine favour, alike in this world and the next. But that they went the length of holding that the apparently general rule of ver. 25, *minus*

the moral element, was a rule of the Divine Government is an arbitrary and undemonstrated assumption. Yet that rule must be literally, *in all its length and breadth*, understood to be what the words naturally imply, if it is to be regarded as the generalized expression of the principle upon which, without regard to moral considerations, *Dives* is condemned and Lazarus justified. To pass however from this, there are other considerations sufficient to lead to the rejection of the proposed interpretation.

1. Let the reader recall what was said in the former paper upon this subject. Let him mark that the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is one of a group of three parables closely connected with each other; that it is a repetition in another form of the principle of the first of the three which is avowedly moral, and that it leads on to the third which is not less grounded in the central moral root of the Christian dispensation. Lastly, let him bring before him, with any even moderate degree of vividness, the feelings with which the Jews looked upon the poor and the obligations of the rich towards them; and he will find it totally impossible to maintain that He who uttered the parable did not intend, and did not succeed in his intention, to connect moral elements with the characters of the two persons whose lot, both in this life and beyond it, is so strikingly delineated. It is true that the rich man is not expressly said to be godless and selfish, and that no hint is given as to any piety of Lazarus while he lay suffering at the rich man's gate. But some pictures are drawn and coloured with such admirable truthfulness that they do not need to be labelled, and this more particularly when they are hung up to view in the presence of a multitude whose hearts are already full of the lessons which they teach. Such is at least the case with the picture of the rich man here. He is an unfaithful, unrighteous steward. He has lived neither for God nor his fellow creatures, but for ease

and self-indulgence. His character is on the face of the narrative, and it needs no further explanation. When we turn to Lazarus the case is certainly not so clear. But he is obviously painted as in all things a contrast to *Dives*. The contrast is confirmed when we follow the two beyond the grave, and it appears also in the judgment of ver. 25. It may be added too that it is by no means certain that the description of the condition of Lazarus in vers. 20, 21 would not directly suggest to those who heard it the idea of submission to the Divine will, and of patience under the burdens of his lot and the heartlessness of the rich man's conduct. The word used of him is *πτωχός*, and it is to be regretted that, while the word "beggar" is used only four times in the Revised Version, two of these should be found in the present narrative. On the other two occasions when it is employed it is the translation of *προσαίτης* (Mark x. 46, John ix. 8), while in Luke xviii. 35 it translates *ἐπειτῶν* (in each of the three cases note the later readings of the Greek), and rightly. The *προσαίτης* is one who begs. The *πτωχός* does not necessarily do so. He may have no means of providing for himself by labour of his own, and he may live on alms (Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*), but it does not follow that he thrusts himself forward on the charities of others. On the contrary, in every one of the many times that the word is employed in the New Testament it suggests the thought of one who is indeed poor, but whose poverty is associated with a spirit and disposition that only awaken sympathy and command respect. "Blessed are ye poor"; "To the poor the Gospel is preached"; "This poor widow hath cast in more than they all"; "The poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem"; "If there come into your synagogue a poor man in vile clothing" (Luke vi. 20, vii. 22, xxi. 3, Rom. xv. 26, James ii. 2). In all these cases the word used is *πτωχός*—not a clamorous beggar, but simply one in the depths of poverty.

It may well therefore be a subject of regret that, in the Revised not less than the Authorized Version, Lazarus is brought before us as a "beggar" rather than a poor man, bearing, for aught we know, his poverty with faith and meekness, even when it is in immediate contrast with the rich man's splendour.

And this seems to find further illustration in what we are told of him, that he was "*desiring* to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table." The verb "desire" throws no light upon his getting or failing to get these crumbs. It may be used whatever follows (Luke xvi. 21, Rev. ix. 6, Luke xxii. 15); but this much at least is implied, that there was no clamour in the action of Lazarus, no loud complaint of injustice, no attempt to lay hand on what did not belong to him. The moral element, in short, exists in the view presented to us of what he, not less than the rich man, is. Another important consideration bearing upon the same point will be noticed immediately. Meanwhile it is enough to say that the picture embraces in its delineation of its personages, distinctly moral traits, and that it thus corresponds with the other parables of its group.

2. A second point is worthy of notice,—the precise language of ver. 25, where it is said to *Dives*, "Child, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things" (*ὅτι ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου κ.τ.λ.*). It will not be denied that the simple verb might have been here used, and we must ask, Why then the compound? There are many other instances of a similar nature, and grammarians are very much at one as to the effect upon the simple verb of compounding it with *ἀπό*—*γράφειν* to write, *ἀπογράφειν* to make a copy; *ἀρτίζειν*, to get ready, to perform; *ἀπαρτίζειν*, to complete; *λύειν*, to loose; *ἀπολύειν*, to sever by loosening, to set free; *σπάειν* to draw out, or forth;

ἀποσπᾶν, to succeed in drawing out, to draw over to one's own party, comp. Acts xx. 30; ἔχειν, to have; ἀπέχειν, so to have as to have all that is desired, comp. Philippians iv. 18, ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα; and Matthew vi. 2, 5, 16, ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν, they have so as to feel that they wish nothing more. In like manner here, λαμβάνειν, to receive or accept, ἀπολαμβάνειν, so to accept as to be fully satisfied with what has been given us, so that we behold in it our meet reward (Luke vi. 34, xxiii. 41, 2 John 8). The translation, therefore, "receivedst," although it may be as good as the English language will permit, is in this respect defective, that it fails to convey to the reader the full thought which was in the mind of the speaker. Godet says that there is "in the verb ἀπέλαβες the notion of receiving by appropriating greedily for the purpose of enjoyment" (*in loc.*); and though this may be to put rather too much into the word, the remark will certainly stand the criticism of Hofmann (*in loc.*), who denies that it has this egoistical meaning, because the same word is to be applied to Lazarus. Strange that it did not occur to this eminent critic that the form of the verb depends not so much on the following σου, as upon its compound form, and that, in its most expressive sense, it *does* apply to Lazarus as much as to *Dives*. Each had received his good or evil things, and each was satisfied, —the one because he did not look beyond this world for comfort, the other because he felt that "the light afflictions of this life, which are only for a moment, were not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed." What is now urged is that this sense lies, at least substantially, in the parable itself; that the impression of it would be conveyed to the minds of those who heard the Saviour speak; and that that impression is, therefore, the meaning of the parable.

3. There seems to be truth in the remark of Hofmann (*in loc.*) that Abraham so speaks to the rich man in ver. 25 as

to show his expectation that *Dives* will approve of the principle laid down in that verse; in other words, that Abraham expects an affirmative answer from the rich man's conscience to the conditions beyond the grave in which he and Lazarus respectively find themselves. It is indeed difficult to read the passage without this feeling, and it is confirmed by the fact, that there is no rebellion against his fate on the rich man's part. He only pleads for a particular alleviation of his misery. But, if so, how is it possible to imagine that he thought himself condemned simply because he had been rich? Common sense would have at once protested against any such idea. The rich man was surely not one of the Ebionites of whom it may have been sometimes possible to say that they regarded wealth as a token of the Divine anger, poverty as a token of the Divine approbation. The ground of his condemnation was that he had lived in this world an utterly selfish life, never looking beyond the things of time, never concerned about judgment, satisfied with his own pleasure as his all, content to eat and drink "every day" without thinking of the morrow. The *tone* of Abraham's remark to him in ver. 25 shows that the patriarch knew that he would acknowledge the facts, and would allow that his fate was just. He could only expect this upon moral grounds, and we are thus again entitled to say that there is a moral element before us.

4. Once more we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the part of Abraham's answer found in ver. 31, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, although one rose from the dead," is altogether moral, and at the same time wholly incapable of explanation if we suppose that the ground of the rich man's condemnation is his riches. The discipline which, according to the patriarch, is to teach men the right use of life, and to secure them an entrance, when this world passes from their grasp, into the eternal tabernacles, is neither riches on the one

hand nor poverty on the other: it is God's revelation of Himself,—that revelation which makes its direct appeal to the conscience and the heart. The "five brethren" were probably, like the brother who had gone before them, rich and self-indulgent. They could only be reclaimed from this state, not by terror, but by a change of heart. Fear alone would never make them what they ought to be. Even should they give away all their goods to the poor, the requirements of this part of the parable would not be met. Let us accept the Ebionitish view of the first part, and we are here in an entirely different field of thought. Not in poverty, but in listening to Moses and the prophets do we find our guide to everlasting blessedness.¹ We are thus driven from a fresh point of view to the conclusion, either that the parable is no longer what it was when it was first delivered by our Lord, or that the Ebionitish meaning assigned to it is utterly mistaken. There is not a particle of evidence in favour of the first supposition. We have nothing but the assertions of the Tübingen school to lead to it. The second alternative is the only one which it is possible to accept.

Enough has been said to vindicate the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus from the Ebionitish interpretation which it has been attempted to force upon it, and to show that both the persons who form its subject are thought of as possessed of a certain moral character, and not as merely rich or poor. The warp of the parable is penetrated by an unquestionable strain of regard for character; and, when it is said in the most difficult verse in the narrative, "Child, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art in anguish" (ver. 25), we have the clearest evidence that the words do not and cannot mean that eternity stands to time like the top to the bottom

¹ Comp. Dr. Dods in *EXPOSITOR*, third series, vol i. p. 55.

of a revolving wheel, where what was at the top goes to the bottom, what was at the bottom to the top. More, however, must be said. It is not out of the atmosphere of a code of human morals, however high, that the parable is spoken. It comes from the lips of our Lord Himself; and, like the two which precede and follow it, can only receive its full meaning out of the deepest and most peculiar principles of His kingdom. In this respect ver. 25 seems to contain a truth which, so far from being Ebionitish, can only be understood by the light which the Gospel of Christ throws upon all poverty, suffering, and sorrow when we do not, by our own sin or folly, bring them upon ourselves. By the whole spirit of His teaching, our Lord does tell us that these things are dearer to Him than riches or worldly prosperity or joy; that taken in the main, they draw to them a larger measure of His sympathy; and that they are nearer to His heavenly rewards. Not that the rich man may not often be more precious to Him who has no respect of persons, whether poor or rich, than the poor man. He may have more humility, meekness, and gentleness of spirit; he may have reaped more of the fruits of Divine chastening; he may sit more loosely to his overflowing pounds than the poor man to his few pence. But our Lord does not look only at men individually. He looks at them also in the masses which they constitute; and, impersonal as masses of men may be said to be, He addresses them as masses, and speaks of the relation which He occupies towards them as such. And most appropriately, most beneficially for us is this the case. We not infrequently learn what are our difficulties and temptations, or what our encouragements and hopes, by looking at ourselves less in the light of our own individuality than in the light of the community to which we belong. We see better what the snares are that surround us, what the danger of being entrapped by them, what the degree to which we may even be already involved

in them. When, accordingly, we interpret ver. 25 out of the deepest considerations which mark the kingdom of Him by whom the words are really uttered, may we not say that, thus spiritually interpreted, they are literally true? Is it not the case that the Gospel of Christ does sympathise with the poor more than with the rich? that it sees in the one a soil better prepared for its divine seed than in the other? that it recognises in the discipline through which poverty and neglect have to pass in this life a training to which prosperity and ease are a hindrance (though it may be overcome) rather than a help? And that, therefore, looking at things in their broadest aspect, it may announce it as one of its new if startling truths, that "to the poor" it is preached, and that in the plainest and most direct meaning of the words, the cross is the way to the crown? This much at least may be said that, as there ever and again arise times when some error has so taken hold of the thoughts or life of man that nothing but what is extreme will correct it, so men need to be reminded of the contrasted truth in a way which will arrest their attention, and compel them to ask what it can mean. May it not be so here? Has the Church of the Christ in our land thought of the poor and afflicted, has she sympathised with them and helped them as she ought to have done? Has she not been more interested in the inn at which well-to-do travellers were housed than in the stable in which Christ was born? Has not her daily intercourse, whatever may have been her pulpit or platform oratory, been more lovingly given to *Dives* and his splendid mansion than to Lazarus lying helplessly at his gate? Has she not been willing to see in the rich man the image of Christ more than in the poor man? Has she been determined to lift the beggar from his dung-hill, whatever the amount of opprobrium she might incur in doing so? And has she proclaimed in luxurious drawing-rooms, in a way to convince their

inmates of her own belief of what she was proclaiming, that the wealth which furnished them was an obstacle to an experimental knowledge of the Redeemer, and that, in the words of our Lord, as given by St. Matthew, who must also for the moment have become a democrat, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Matt. xix. 24)? It may be well for us to ask ourselves questions such as these. The more sincerely and honestly we ask them, the more will it appear that there is truth, literal, although not to be mechanically interpreted, in those words which come to us from beyond the grave, "Child, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things, but now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish."

WM. MILLIGAN.

*PROFESSOR W. R. SMITH ON THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

ALL readers interested in the subject will welcome the second edition of Prof. Robertson Smith's Lectures on "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Delivered originally in Edinburgh and Glasgow in the winter of 1881, where they were listened to eagerly by large audiences, they were published in the following spring, and at once took rank in the Biblical literature of this country as the standard introduction to an intelligent study of the Old Testament. Luminous, learned, and logical, addressed not to specialists, but to the educated public generally, these lectures carry the reader back from the Old Testament as we at present know it to the period of its growth, illustrating, with especial reference to its historical and legal sections, the manner in which it was gradually built up, and explaining

the character of its component parts. First (Lects. I.-V.), the lecturer takes a survey of the later period of the history of the Old Testament, the period of transmission, during which the text of the sacred books was exposed, from various causes, the operation of which is illustrated and explained, to corruption and error; then, after a chapter on the Growth of the Canon (Lect. VI.), and one on the Psalter (Lect. VII.), the reader is introduced to the earlier stages of its history, the period of its genesis, the period during which the historical books were in process of slow formation, and the different bodies of law now embedded in the Pentateuch were gradually assuming their present shape (Lects. VIII.-XIII.). The stages through which the Hebrew "direction," or *Torah*, passed, before it reached its present form, are illustrated and discussed; and the groups of laws contained in the Pentateuch are instructively compared, both with each other and with the historical books; the teaching of the prophets, and the position taken by them, are indicated in outline (Lect. X.); and the inconsistencies involved in the traditional view of the origin of the Pentateuch are forcibly exhibited. On questions of detail, a divergent opinion is sometimes tenable: to many, for example, it may seem that the author's denial (p. 303, etc.) of the legal obligation of sacrifice in pre-exilic Israel is expressed in too unqualified terms (see Exod. xx. 24f., xxiii. 14-19, xxxiv. 18-23, in the "First Legislation"); but, taken as a whole, his lectures are a masterly and cogent exposition, in their main features, of the critical view of the literature and history of ancient Israel, and of the grounds upon which it principally rests. Prof. Smith rightly emphasises (p. 314) the need of spiritual sympathy on the part of those who would properly understand the Bible; but he insists at the same time, not less rightly, that the Bible must be studied by historical methods; for revelation has itself been a historical process; and its course has been throughout con-

ditioned by the historical relations, and historical circumstances, of those to whom it was in the first instance addressed.

The present edition, in the main, does not differ materially from the first edition; but it has been improved in form, and contains some important additional matter. The Lectures are printed now in full octavo size; and the larger page has enabled the author to introduce at the foot of the text most of the notes placed formerly at the end of the volume, where they were liable to be overlooked. Here and there the phrasing of a sentence has been modified: but in general the text of the lectures has been unchanged; and the omissions do not probably exceed two or three pages. Of course bibliographical notes have, where necessary, been brought up to date. The most important places in which the text is either greatly expanded or altogether new, are pp. 92-103 (on the frequent anonymity of ancient Israelitish literature), 113-122 and 124-148 (illustrations, with reference to the LXX., of the composite structure of the historical books, and examples, partly expanded from pp. 419-422 of the first edition, of the historical method pursued by the Chronicler), 200-225 (on the compilation and date of the Psalter), 332-337 (on the complicated structure of the narrative in Exod. xix.-xxiv., xxxii.-xxxiv., as exemplifying the necessity of a critical examination of the several bodies of law contained in the Pentateuch), and the whole of Lecture XIII., pp. 388-430 (on the narrative of the Hexateuch). Of the shorter additions, the chief will be found on pp. 58-61, 67, 175f., 311 note, 365-7, 380f., 386f.; an additional line or two may also occasionally be noted elsewhere. The volume closes with an appendix of six notes (pp. 431-449), too long to be introduced conveniently at the foot of the page. Of these, B (Hebrew fragments preserved in the LXX., with particular reference to the curious quotation from—as can hardly be doubted—the Book of Jasher in

1 Kings viii. 53, LXX.), C (the sources of Ps. lxxxvi.), E (the fifty-first Psalm), are repeated from the first edition, the only addition being a paragraph at the end of Note B, on the interesting notice of Aphek preserved in Lucian's recension of the LXX., in 2 Kings xiii. 22. Notes A, D, and F, are new. In the first of these the author defends his view against Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Budde, that in 1 Sam. xvii. 1-xviii. 5 the LXX. preserves a more original text than the Hebrew, and does not merely represent a text which has been abbreviated from harmonistic motives. Note D is a criticism on some of Prof. Cheyne's positions in his *Origin of the Psalter*, in particular on the Maccabæan date (which has also had the support of many earlier writers) of Pss. xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxxiii. Note F is on the development of the ritual system between Ezekiel and Ezra.

In the additional pages on the Psalms, Prof. Smith incorporates the main conclusions reached by him in his article *Psalms*, in the 9th edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1886). Though not categorically denying the existence in the Psalter of pre-exilic, or even of Davidic, Psalms, he rightly treats the great majority of Psalms as reflecting the spirit of the post-exilic period. Having demonstrated, from internal evidence, the number of stages involved in the redaction of the present Psalter, he shows that the Korahite and Asaphite Psalms (Pss. xlii.-xlix.; Pss. l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii.) were in all probability the hymn-books of two Levitical choirs or guilds who had charge of the Temple-psalmody between the time of Nehemiah and that of the Chronicler (*i.e.* c. 430-330 B.C.), a period which would also, he remarks, agree with the character and contents of at least many of these Psalms, and consequently be suitable for their composition.¹ The Maccabæan date of Pss. xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxxiii., is questioned by Prof. Smith, on ac-

¹ Prof. Smith does not speak in detail respecting individual Psalms. Ps. xlv., however, is treated by him as pre-exilic (p. 439).

count of the difficulty which he finds in reconciling it with their position in the Elohistie Psalter (*i.e.* in the group of Psalms xlii.–lxxxiii., marked by the preponderance of the name *Elohim* above *Jehovah*), the compilation of which must have been completed, he urges, before the Maccabæan age. He is disposed consequently to refer these Psalms to the reign of Alexander Ochus (B.C. 359–339), when a great rebellion took place in Phœnicia and other western parts of the Persian empire, for complicity in which it is known that many Jews were taken captive into Hyrcania,¹ and when, it is *conjectured*, Jerusalem and the Temple may have suffered in the manner alluded to in Pss. lxxiv., lxxix. The conjecture is an attractive one; but in the scantiness of our information respecting this, as respecting many other periods of post-exilic Judaism, the point is one on which we must be content to remain in uncertainty.² The Third Collection (Pss. xc.–cl.), Prof. Smith points out, must have been formed after the Second Collection (Pss. xlii.–lxxxiii.) had been revised by the editor who substituted *Elohim* for *Jehovah*; hence its compilation will not be earlier than the Greek period: while it is not, of course (p. 212), to be assumed that all the Psalms in this Collection were written in this period, their contents, in the majority of cases, agree with such a date, and some (especially Pss. cxiii.–cxviii., cxlix.) manifestly reflect the enthusiasm evoked by the great victories of the Maccabees, which culminated in the re-dedication of the Temple, B.C. 165. Thus the collection of Pss. xc.–cl., and the completion of the whole Psalter, belong to the early years of the Maccabee sovereignty. The two collections of Davidic Psalms in Books I. and II. (Pss. iii.–xxxii., xxxiv.–xli.; Pss. li.–lxv., lxviii.–lxx.) will have been compiled first, though not earlier than the return from

¹ Comp. Ewald, *History*, v. p. 206.

² Prof. Cheyne's argument in reply may be seen in the *EXPOSITOR*, Aug., 1892, pp. 157ff.

the captivity. Although not generally so late in character as the Psalms in the Third Collection, they contain many Psalms which pre-suppose a date later in some instances than Jeremiah, in others than the exile. These two collections naturally represented to their compilers the oldest tradition of Hebrew psalmody; but there is no satisfactory evidence that the titles connecting them with David are derived by a continuous tradition from the time of David himself: in many cases, indeed, the titles not only assign to him Psalms which in no degree correspond with the situation in which he was placed, but they assign them to him in such a way as to prove "that they date from an age in which David was merely the abstract Psalmist, and which had no idea whatever of the historical conditions of his time." The description of the David of the Psalm-titles as the "abstract Psalmist" is a felicitous one. The belief that David was the author—we do not say of *some*—but of *all*—the Psalms ascribed to him by the titles, must spring from the time when the memory of the great king had been so idealised that the unhistorical conception of his character, which culminates in the Chronicles, was already in process of formation.¹ Individual Psalms, Prof. Smith does not dispute, may indeed be pre-exilic, but it is not these which give the tone even to Book I.—"whatever the date of this or that individual poem, the collection as a whole—whether by selection or authorship—is

¹ It must, however, remain an open question whether the title *of David* really means "written by David"; it may, for instance, have been intended originally to indicate that the Psalms to which it is prefixed were taken from a collection not *written* by David, but associated with his name on account of the manner in which they were used liturgically. As Prof. Smith remarks (pp. 223, 224), Nehemiah speaks of the singers using the "musical instruments of David" (Neh. xii. 36); and in the Chronicles, though mention is made 2 Chron. xxix. 30 of "the words of David, and of Asaph the seer," David is in point of fact brought far more closely into connection with the *music* of the temple than with the hymns which were sung there (see e.g. 1 Chron. xxv., 2 Chron. xxiii. 18, xxix. 27, Ezra iii. 10). The Hebrew preposition used merely expresses *belonging to David*,—not necessarily by means of authorship.

adapted to express a religious life, of which the exile is the presupposition. Only in this way can we understand the conflict and triumph of spiritual faith, habitually represented as the faith of a poor and struggling band, living in the midst of oppressors, and with no strength or help but the consciousness of loyalty to Jehovah, which is the fundamental note of the whole book" (p. 220). It may be questioned, perhaps, whether some of the Psalms bearing this character may not owe their origin to the persecutions under Manasseh, or to the troublous times to which Jeremiah bears witness; but that the great majority of Psalms in the existing Psalter, whether judged by a literary or a religious standard, proclaim their affinity with the later ages of Israelitish history, is a position that may be maintained without fear of contradiction.

On p. 138ff., Prof. Smith has some useful remarks on the characteristics of the later historical narratives of the Old Testament. He points out how, when we have two parallel narratives of the same transaction, it may generally be observed that in the older "the Divine Spirit guides the action of human forces without suppressing or distorting them," while in the later the representation of the supernatural element is more artificial—the narrative is dominated by that "mechanical conception of Jehovah's rule in Israel, which prevailed more and more among the later Jews, and ultimately destroyed all feeling for historical reality, and at the same time all true insight into the methods of Divine governance." This change of view, he remarks, was a corollary of the increased distance from which the later narrator viewed the events to be described. "It requires insight and faith to see the hand of God in the ordinary processes of history, whereas extraordinary coincidences between conduct and fortune are fitted to impress the dullest minds. Hence, when the religious lesson of any part of history has been impressed on the popular mind,

there is always a tendency to re-shape the story in such a way as to bring the point out sharply, and drop all details that have not a direct religious significance." This was especially the case with the Old Testament, which, "taken as a whole, forms so remarkable a chain of evidence, establishing the truth of what the prophets had taught as to the laws of God's government upon earth." Religious students of the past "concentrated their attention in an increasing degree, and ultimately in an exclusive way, on the explanation of events by religious considerations." Hence, particularly after the establishment of the post-exilic theocracy, the tendency asserted itself more and more to view Israel's past as "a mechanical sequence of sin and punishment, obedience and prosperity." Of course, in the Rabbinical literature of post-Biblical times, the tendencies inchoate in the later parts of the Old Testament are much more pronounced, and the mechanical view of God's dealing with men is greatly intensified and exaggerated. Prof. Smith illustrates the difference between the earlier and later Biblical histories from the Chronicles, showing that where, as is sometimes the case, the Chronicler contradicts, for instance, the Book of Kings, a sound historical judgment cannot but give the preference to the older source; while, where some difference of usage between his own time and that of the old monarchy is concerned, a modified and partial value can only be regarded as attaching to his authority. The historian must discriminate in his use of his materials; for "the practice of using the Chronicles as if they had the same historical value as the older books has done more than any other one cause to prevent a right understanding of the Old Testament and of the old dispensation" (p. 148). In this view of the historical value of the Chronicles, the author adopts substantially the same attitude as that taken by Prof. Francis Brown, of New York, in his excellent Lectures on the Historical Books of the

Old Testament, delivered by him recently at Mansfield College.

Lecture XIII. deals with the narratives of the Hexateuch. Here Prof. Smith shows that the strength of the present position of Pentateuch criticism is much increased by the fact that two independent lines of inquiry, the literary and the historical, have converged to a common result. "The historical method compares the institutions set forth in the several groups of law contained in the Pentateuch with the actual institutions of Israel, as attested by the historical books and the prophets: the literary method compares the several parts of the Pentateuch with one another, taking note of diversities of style and manner, of internal contradictions or incongruities, and of all other points that forbid us to regard the whole work as the homogeneous composition of a single writer." These two methods are in large measure independent of one another; literary differences, being the more obvious, were the first to attract the attention of scholars; and in fact the literary analysis of the Pentateuch, in all its broader features, was practically completed before the results gained began to be fully studied under their historical aspects. The appreciation of the fact that the great strata of laws embodied in the Pentateuch are not all of one age, but (though in some instances overlapping) correspond generally to three stages in the development of Israel's institutions, which can still be recognised in the narrative of the historical books, is rightly described by him as the most important achievement of Old Testament criticism. Illustrations follow of the results gained by the two methods indicated. The prophetic and the priestly narratives in Exodus-Numbers are compared, and it is shown how a distinct character and aim prevail in each: the former exhibit the oldest traditions respecting the history of the Mosaic Age, the interest of the latter is legal. "The priestly writing,"

Prof. Smith says, "is only in form an historical document; in substance, it is a body of laws and precedents having the value of law," attached to a thread of history which is so slender that it often consists of nothing more than a chronological scheme, and a sequence of bare names. Our author does not here emphasise so fully as he might do, and as other passages in his volume¹ make it evident that he holds the antiquity of elements included in the institutions of the Priests' Code; but he is right in maintaining that these institutions acquired an increased value in the post-exilic age, and became then "the necessary and efficient means of preserving the little community of Judaism from being swallowed up in the surrounding heathenism," and of "maturing among the Jews those elements of true spiritual religion out of which Christianity sprang" (p. 420 f.).²

S. R. DRIVER.

¹ *E.g.* p. 382 f.: "Though the historical student is compelled to speak of the ritual code as the law of the second Temple, it would be a great mistake to think of it as altogether new. Ezekiel's ordinances are nothing else than a reshaping of the old priestly Torah; and a close study of the Levitical laws, especially in Lev. xvii.-xxvi., shows that many ancient Torahs were worked up, by successive processes, into the complete system as we now possess it." The subject is one on which misapprehensions are apt to prevail; and we are inclined to regret that our author, whose studies in Semitic Religions entitled him to speak here with some authority, has not expressed himself more particularly upon it.

² On the pædagogic character of the Law, comp. also the remarks on pp. 315-317 (in the first edition, pp. 312-316). In the age for which it was designed "the dispensation of the Law became a practical power in Israel. . . . It gave palpable expression to the spiritual nature of Jehovah, and, around and within the ritual, prophetic truths gained a hold in Israel such as they never had before. That the Law was a Divine institution, that it formed an actual part in the gracious scheme of guidance which preserved the religion of Jehovah as a living power in Israel, till shadow became substance in the manifestation of Christ, is no theory, but an historical fact, which no criticism as to the origin of the books of Moses can invalidate."

THE MANY MANSIONS AND THE RESTITUTION
OF ALL THINGS.

THE interpretations of these two phrases which I am about to advocate have this in common,—that they bring into this life and into the past and the present what has generally been put off into another life and the future.

“In my Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you” (St. John xiv. 2). It is admitted that the word “mansions” is not a happy rendering of *μοναί*. Etymologically, indeed, it is an exact equivalent; *mansion* means an abiding or abode, as *μονή* does. But it has acquired in common use a different sense from that which it first bore. But what are the *μοναί* or abiding-places in the Father’s house? I think that in all comments on the passage which I have seen or heard it has been assumed that they are the places to be occupied in the future world by the faithful disciples of the Lord. Bishop Westcott in his note on the passage expounds the words as relating to “the future being of the redeemed,” to “future happiness.” The nature of the *μοναί* will depend upon the nature of “my Father’s house.” According to Westcott, this is “the spiritual and eternal antitype of the transitory temple”: “Heaven is where God is seen as our Father.” There are many references to the house of God or of the Father in the New Testament, and none of them obliges us to think of the future life. The physical and human senses of the word *house* are often blended; as in St. Paul’s fine passage, “So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners (*πίροικοι*), but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God (*οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ*), being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom each

several building [or, all the building], fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Ephes. ii. 19-22). St. Peter uses the image in the same manner, remembering that saying of his Lord of which his name was a witness,—“unto whom coming, a living stone, . . . ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house” (1 Pet. ii. 4, 5). In a passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the word rendered “built” is *κατασκευίας*, it is doubtful whether the writer is thinking of the construction of a material house or of the founding of a human house; but God’s house is to him what it is to St. Paul and St. Peter. “He [Jesus] has been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much as he that built the house hath more honour than the house. . . . And Moses indeed was faithful in all his [God’s] house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were afterwards to be spoken; but Christ as a son, over his [God’s] house; whose house are we, if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm unto the end” (Heb. iii. 3-6). The sacred writers always assume that the Father’s house was the home of themselves and their fellow-believers whilst they were still living on the earth.

Christ went, he tells the Apostles, to prepare a place for them. He “went,” through his death and departure into the unseen world. But he adds “If I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” The most natural sense of these words is, not that the disciples when they severally died should go to Jesus and be with him, but that he would come to them. This return of his began with the Resurrection and was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. Jesus promised that the Spirit should be given: “I will not leave you desolate (or bereaved); I come unto you. Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth

me no more; but ye behold me: because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. . . . If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." Here *abode* is *μονήν*. This is the only other place in which *μονή* occurs in the New Testament, though *μένω*, abide, is almost the key-word of St. John's spiritual teaching.

The Apostles evidently understood their Master to promise that, when he had gone out of their bodily sight, he would come to them again in spiritual presence, and they would dwell with him and the Father in a spiritual home: and after the day of Pentecost they were accustomed to assume that the promise had been fulfilled, and that they were living as the Father's children with the other members of the Divine Family, looking up to the Divine Son as their head. The "many mansions" are places in this household, occupied by the *οἰκείαι τοῦ θεοῦ*. When Jesus had overcome the sharpness of death, he opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers; and they who believe are now citizens of it.

The phrase "restitution or restoration of all things" occurs in the following passage of St. Peter's address, spoken in explanation of the cure of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple:—"Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you,"^s even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began" (Acts iii. 19-21).

The apostolic expectations with regard to the future form a constantly recurring difficulty in the New Testament.

Commentators are apt to assume that when they have adopted the belief that the Apostles expected what did not come to pass the difficulty is disposed of. But that is not so: it remains difficult to know what the expectations were. That difficulty confronts us in this passage. Putting aside what actually occurred in the apostolic age, what are we to suppose that St. Peter meant, and that the author of the Acts understood him to mean? The Apostle seems to assume that, if his hearers turned to God by believing in Jesus as the Christ, the Christ would be sent to them from heaven, and there would be a happy spiritual time; but that the Christ would remain shrouded in heaven "until the times of restoration of all things,"—or, until they, the Jews who heard Peter speaking, should repent. That restoration of all things had been the subject of all the prophets. St. Peter adds presently, that all the prophets had "told of these days," *κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας*. Again therefore he associates the expected revelation, the blessed time, with those days, with the age in which he and his hearers were living. And it is remarkable that the address closes with the statement that the Christ who was to be sent to the people on their repenting had been already sent to them after his death that they might repent. "Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you" (*ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς*). In the Divine history, it would appear, Christ had come. To those who through repentance had eyes to see him, he was present, and had brought his blessings with him; but those who still had a veil on their hearts could not see him or enter into those blessings. The restoration of all things was then taking place in the Divine history, and would be actually accomplished in the general recognition of the Christ who had come.

But the restoration of all things, *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*, cannot be separated from that remarkable saying of our

Lord's, recorded in St. Matthew xvii. After the vision of Moses and Elijah talking with him, Jesus commanded his disciples, "Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen from the dead. And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come? And he answered and said, Elijah indeed cometh, and shall restore all things (*ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα*): but I say unto you, that Elijah is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed. . . Then understood the disciples that he spake unto them of John the Baptist" (verses 9-13). And *ἀποκαταστήσει* is the word used in the Septuagint version of Malachi, where the Hebrew is rendered "turn." "Elias shall restore the heart of father towards son, and the heart of a man towards his neighbour" (Malachi iv. 5). The coincidence can hardly be accidental.

It was the establishment of the Messianic kingdom that the prophets and our Lord and St. Peter had in view. The coming of that kingdom would be the putting right of all things. In being the herald of the Messianic kingdom, John the Baptist, that other Elijah, brought in this reconstitution. The essence of the right establishment of all things was the fulfilment of true spiritual relations. To put hearts right was to put all things right. When men saw and confessed the Son of man reigning at the Father's right hand, all would be right with them; family life, social life, would be perfected in the acknowledging of Christ.

When St. Peter spoke, he knew that the Christ was reigning, and he knew that the blessings of his reign were enjoyed by his true spiritual subjects; and he was convinced that for all his countrymen their Messiah was come and all was put right—if only they would turn to him with their hearts and acknowledge him as their Lord.

J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.

DORA GREENWELL.

A MEMORIAL SKETCH.

PART II.

IT is the pure in heart who see God. Blessed are those in the sanctuary of whose hearts Love Divine shows itself unveiled! But it is theirs also to see more clearly than others the ugliness, the humiliation, the pains of sin, and to be filled with interceding love towards the slaves of sin and the outcasts of the world. They would, like the good St. Vincent, stretch the hand to "the most forgotten soul in purgatory"; and they do reach those who are separated from them, intellectually and morally, by an abyss. "I have touched depths of suffering in my own nature which makes me able to draw near to the worst," Dora Greenwell once said. And she told me that she had sat with a murderer's hand clasped in hers, and felt no fear and no horror. She worked all her life, and steadily, for some of the most difficult and hopeless philanthropic causes, for the outcasts of society among women, for prisoners, for oppressed and tortured animals. Her volume of *Essays* on these subjects, which read now, twenty-five years after their publication, show a penetrating insight into questions still unsolved, and give suggestions which may be instructive at a later date than even our own. An article in the *North British Review*, written by her on the "Education of the Imbecile," has in it matter enough for several ordinary magazine articles. It points to discriminations as to the moral differences among idiots, which might help to direct practical work. The *Liber Humanitatis*—Essays "on various aspects of spiritual and social life"—teems with ideas. But it is the thinking of a woman—one never withdrawn from human touch; one, who even

while reasoning with clearness, is full of pity and tenderness. Her spirit was indeed at times bowed under the burden of what man inflicts on man;—the fact that this short span of life should be used by some to make their fellows sigh and grieve, and to rob them of the little peace and joy that come to all. It was the moral degradation in all this which touched her deepest, and which also raised her indignation and zeal. Wearied and ill as she might be, I never knew her refuse to do her best for any cause that was struggling against wrong, and made an appeal to her. The very last work she did in life was to write with much of her old energy in the cause of humanity outraged by the practices of scientific vivisection. Let it be remembered that this woman, gifted so largely in heart and brain, condemned with unwavering decision all arguments in favour of extending human knowledge—the doubt remains whether it does extend it—at the price of cruelty and oppression. One is indeed astonished as one recalls how much she wrote on themes requiring expenditure of high thought and feeling, on which she put a stamp of originality. Like Mrs. Browning, like Charlotte Brontë, she suffered all her life from incessant ill health—the ill health and distress of a body incapable of meeting the requirements of the ardent soul within; not having strength for the day's work, but with the day's work inexorably and urgently demanded.

She sometimes said her being could be summed up in the word "inadequacy." She had the power to enjoy the glory of life with intensity and passion, but she had to resign herself to contemplate it only. Exertion was paid for by reaction and prostration. Even the common business of life laid a tax on her strength, and every unusual exertion—all literary work—made agonizing reprisals. "My life," she says somewhere,¹ "had been so assailed by the sharp realities of pain, and my senses so haunted by

¹ *Colloquia Crucis*, p. 10.

visions of beauty, that it seemed to me as if I had learned *all* that either had to reveal."

"Where there is most feeling, there is most martyrdom," says truly Leonardo da Vinci. But this "martyrdom" seems often the means of reaching an otherwise hidden knowledge of divine and human things. In none of Dora Greenwell's writings are there personal complaints or introspective details of suffering. But the reader feels most certainly that what wisdom he finds there has been bought with a high price. Every sentence bears the stamp of individual life. No one else could have written a verse or a page. She might have repeated the cry of Bossuet, "Even so, O Sovereign Truth, *I* have not withheld from Thee the sweat of my brow—Thee to whom *I* have devoted my very blood." In reading the *Patience of Hope*, *Colloquia Crucis*, and her other books we may remember what they *cost*—remember it gratefully and tenderly.

In her usual intercourse with others no complaint or even comment on her health ever left her lips. Courtesy, and perhaps even more, the dignity which is wounded by any lapse from self-control prevented this. The old standard of manners, which made it possible for a well-bred person to die, but not to be ill, was hers. Never, even when suffering pain and oppressive languor, did she fail to meet smile with smile and preserve the serenity of entire self-mastery. It is true that, in the series of letters, of which I now give one or two, she often speaks of the weight of suffering which she endured. But the reason is plain; she is striving to help and encourage a friend who suffered in like manner, urging upon him the remedies and alleviations which she has used herself. These letters, covering a space of fifteen years, were written to a young man of considerable attainments and literary accomplishment, cut off by ill health from active life and happiness. They were returned to Miss Greenwell after his death, and were given

by her to me, to use or destroy as I saw fit. In placing one or two of them here, I feel that the reflex record which they give of the mind of the gentle scholar to whom they were written, must be pleasant to all who knew and loved him. The three, which lack of space alone allows me to give here, are not the most interesting, but such as best bear being taken out of the connected series of the correspondence.

DURHAM,

Nov. 30th, (1858.)

MY DEAR T.,—

. . . I am so glad you were pleased with the Longfellow I sent you, partly by way of a letter, and because some of those marked passages expressed so fully what we have both felt and feel, I for my part, in a way which is even physically painful, and might become agonizing,—the pain and bliss of the ideal,—this inner, sweeter, nether world which woos and beckons us. The outward part of me seems now so very weak that I dare not give myself up as I would to these deep overpowering thoughts. You know what Goethe—I think it is—says about an acorn planted in a china jar which, as it grows up, must shatter its frail tenement. This is what I fear and fight against, and I think I must in some of my letters have alluded to the great and singular change which has come across me lately—that of delighting in beauty, and even more I think in greatness for *its own sake*, of which I knew nothing when I was younger; and this has introduced a difficulty, sometimes even an agony, into my spiritual life. “The glory of the celestial is one, the glory of the terrestrial is another. When I was younger, and more likely, it would have seemed, to be led away by all that in which the eye and heart delight, my spirit was so chastened by ill health, and this of a continued and wearing kind, which always kept me a good deal under the shadow of looked-for early death, and afterwards, when I first knew you in Lancashire, kept under by outward crosses and family difficulties, that I seem only to have learnt lately how strong on many points is the opposition between grace and nature. Do you know one of George Herbert’s quaint and lovely pieces in which he speaks of being able in certain moods to contemn the pride and glory of the world as dust; but one day happening to see the two originals drawn up together, and seeing how infinitely the world outshone that of Him in whom there is no outward beauty to be desired, this very dust *flew up into his eyes* and his Christian philosophy was shaken? I feel this—a strong almost irresistible attraction towards a rich yet perilous region. I know—and I can speak this humbly and

confidently, that I shall in the end be a richer and stronger, more useful and helpful Christian for what I am now going through. You know what a *thinness* there is in many religious books, and in much religious talk, because it is so exclusively spiritual, because you know that the writer or speaker knows nothing, and allows nothing, for "that which is natural." So that it is like talking on a scientific subject with some great principle left out. What I miss in these I find in the Bible, that human-hearted book; also, above all, in the human person of our Lord—He who alone knows *whereof we are made*; knows how fearfully and wonderfully. Therefore, above all things, I covet to see more, know more, have more of Him, the *living Christ*. These surely are the days to which a *Man* shall be more precious than gold. The rational, sensitive part of us has grown—so, as it were, outgrown that on which it has to feed—that humanity without Christ is like a flower or fruit too heavy for the stalk it grows on; the richer it is the lower it is dragged and trailed in the dust.

I have often wished to ask you how you feel on this great subject, but the time never seemed fully come; and I have always such a fear of winding up my own or any other spirit to heights which "it is competent" to win, but perhaps not "competent to keep." I feel now however as if it would be well to be *en rapport* with you on this as on other subjects when our feelings meet so entirely. Persons, I think, who for any reason are off the track of life have a peculiar need of Christ, also a peculiar claim upon Christ. They have been called out of the crowd, perhaps, to be healed and blessed by Him. They above all others can appeal to Christ out of the depths, and into the depths of His human nature,—can say with the blind man, "Jesus, *Thou Son of David*, have mercy on me." "Come unto Me, ye that do *not* labour, yet are heavy laden." Are not these words addressed in a peculiar manner to the broken in spirit or in life? Do not such indeed experience the continual tenderness of God in mitigations, in finding from time to time a door opened? Yet still a time comes when more is needed—the substantive, objective Christ and felt communion with Him. Above two years ago I began to seek this earnestly—the claiming of that great promise in John xiv., the reward (is it not so?) of faith and obedience, the more inner revelation of Christ to the believing soul. I have spoken upon it from time to time to some of my most attached friends, and have found *many of them*, like myself, waiting for a life-renewing change, desiring what we may call the natural life in Christ, of which He is at once the mainspring and the end—conscious of their want of spiritual affections, yet conscious also that it was not in themselves to be different. The spirit must *turn* the heart, even as the rivers of waters are turned. We took the 3rd of Ephesians 14th verse to the end, for the basis of a daily prayer, between

the hours of five and six, setting the *lifting up of Christ*, the extension of His kingdom, (deepening and extension,) before us as a quiet, persistent aim, to be pursued without any marked change in outward life. We have now taken the evening of Thursday as our principal time. It has grown, although few of the members are personally known to each other, into a little secret association which is very dear to the hearts of many, and has already been blessed and answered in many ways. When you write again, you can just put in a word to say, "If thy heart is as my heart, give me thy hand." I do not wish to make this the basis of our correspondence, and may not perhaps allude to it again, because I feel the easy, unexciting, yet interesting, pleasingly exciting tone of our present correspondence is so peculiarly safe, happy and good for us. We can return to our flowers, yet feel that they are blooming beneath the shadow of the Rock of salvation—the great Rock in a weary land.

. . . I commend you to the Father, Son and Spirit in many faithful prayers and desire the same from you.

Your affectionate friend,

DORA GREENWELL.

Tell your dear mother and R. how fully I congratulate him and wish him every good. His wife, I am sure, is a happy woman if ever there was one to be found. I am going to write to W., and was in doubt whether to trust my felicitations to him or to you.

T.	W.
poet,	poet,
artist,	artist,
musician.	<i>metaphysician.</i>

This last is so much worse than anything which you are, that a proper message is safest with you.

She writes at the same time of a case she is deeply interested in—"deeply, ardently interested," as she says. "Captain G. is remembered by many of my friends in this neighbourhood, who knew him before he went out to India as a pleasing, thoroughly amiable man; and oh! how does my heart yearn over such a case of awful, unmitigable suffering. His fearful malady, (altogether unknown in Europe,) has increased to an extent, (so a private letter informs me,) which renders his state and aspect such as the mind refuses to dwell on. His wife nurses him with heroic affection. They seem almost without resources. He has been so long ill that I suppose he may have exhausted all that relations and dear friends can do. So we are trying to make his case known a little more widely. He has been unfortunate in money matters—*without blame*—from a bad investment of which I know the

whole history, chapter and verse. However, you are not of those who will need to have every item of misery separately proved to you, or who would have asked how it was that Job and Lazarus came to be so badly off—Job especially, who once had a considerable property."

DURHAM,

July 18th, 1864.

I have thought of you so much since I had your last letter. I know so well what that protracted nervousness is, especially in one fearful characteristic, that it seems, in some strange way, to preclude the action of divine grace upon the soul; so that some of the most blessed texts in Scripture, speaking of affliction as a gain and a good, become a mockery. "Unite my soul to fear Thee, prays the Psalmist; but when restlessness, and that weariness which longs as for something consciously unattainable, and a dreadful involuntary play of the nerves last a long time, it is impossible to fix the mind on any spiritual object, and natural life is made a blank. For I think it is one peculiarity of this state to *submerge* the whole life, to leave memory as little as it leaves hope. The mind fixes only on what is painful, and represents life as having always been what it is now. Oh, my dear T., I sometimes wonder, when I hear religious friends exalt suffering, (and certainly the gospel *does* place it very high,) and even pray for it as a means of grace, if they have ever known real anguish. I do not mean of the heart (for out of that, however keen, one always comes, often with a sense of blissful relief,) but physical, passing into mental, and lasting till pain becomes the note and pulse of life. I have long agreed with Faber that there is no suffering so great as physical suffering—so dumb, obscure, and unalleviated. My own health has for long and long been depressed in this way to the lowest limit. Sometimes I get a sensible lift; but while this cross endures, even the Cross seems scarcely to comfort me—the blessed Cross, the light and comfort and strength of every happy, every endurable hour. At times when, I suppose from some pressure of the brain, without being visibly ill, it seems scarcely possible to live, only one thing comforts me,—the Will of God. All else, even His love, seems only words; but this bare, naked sense of His will being fulfilled in me, stays the soul.

And so your dear mother is better. My best love to her. What a recovered treasure she must be to all your hearts! I send two little books. The Romish ones (poems) in Father Faber are rubbish, the good ones altogether lovely. I have little time for writing now, but am ever,

Your affectionate friend,

DORA GREENWELL.

DURHAM,

April 14th, 1858.

MY DEAR T.,—

I start to-morrow for London. My journey has been so often put off that it has assumed a magnitude in my eyes, much like what it might have done in the days of my great grandfather. I have had so many goodbyes and last words, and last thoughts, that I can only just now find a moment for you, which I feel you ought to take as a great compliment, the best part of my heart—though it appears not quite all of it—being packed into my large trunk, which has absorbed my contemplations all day long. I was enchanted to find from your last letter that you are getting on so well in Spanish. I am ambitious for you to be a thorough scholar, and after that to be versed in the literature. When in London I will try to pick up any information for you that comes in my way. “Fray Luis de Leon,”—you must become intimate with him, the Fra Angelico of Sacred Song. His name is to me as music. When I come back, I intend, if all is well, to give myself up to literature, and then you may expect to hear my voice often calling to you across the green, flowery meadows. I hope we may make and exchange many “treasure-troves.” I want you to cultivate prose. I am sure you have it *in* you to be an excellent writer. Your letters are to me full of interest independent of personal regard, and perhaps, if you carry on photography, you may find it useful to express all you want to say fully. I have found great good from keeping a diary—not a morbidly anatomical one, but endeavouring to seize and detain whatever struck me deeply. A sunset, for instance, a landscape, even a dream. If you write down an interesting thought, or sum up the impression a book makes upon you, you find it is *yours*; you have gained something. I wish I knew more of the structure of language. Tell me if ever you come across anything good in this way. “A Letter to a young Philologist,” in Niebuhr’s *Life* and Whately’s *Rhetoric*, an excellent book, are the only helps I ever had, but one finds out little secrets for oneself by a sort of rule of thumb. I have an exquisite delight in good writing. “The style is the man.” A style, of course, forms itself and cannot be acquired formally; one begins, I think, by labouring too much. (I see that in my *Present Heaven*.) Simplicity and grace come with freedom. . . .

I quite agree with you about the *Theologia*. I have a weariness of that sort of religious writing. Contending with the “I” and trying as Goethe, I think, says, to jump off one’s own shadow. It wants too the central idea of renewed life—the objective Christ. It is all diving in and out of self. Do you know Herbert’s poem of “Aaron”? It is worth a hundred such books.

No more now, from your affectionate friend,

DORA GREENWELL.

No date.

MY DEAR T.,—

I have been a long time in writing to you, and this has been because your letter has struck a chord to which my own life responded feelingly, and I longed for a little time to spare to commune with you fully and freely. These fail, however, and are likely to do for some time to come; as, for these few summer months, we are embarked on the ocean of *friendliness*, and I can scarcely snatch a moment for anything connected. Never at any time of my life did I feel my heart and mind so drawn to that rich world of thought and fancy which is ever near and around us; also my spirit is led in a peculiar manner to rest and live upon the great objects of Christian Faith. I think I mentioned this to you in a former letter, telling you also how my spiritual and mental life were in that connected, that in each a love grows upon me for that which is fixed and external to myself. Do you know what Baxter says of himself in youth? "I then wished to know how I was to attain to heaven, but *now* I had rather hear and read of these things themselves than any other. *I perceive that it is the object which altereth and elevateth the mind; the love of the end is the poise or spring which setteth every wheel agoing.*" Dear T., I must again quote this (to me) seraphic doctor, and in allusion to a passage in your letter which touched deeply, where you speak of the disappointed aspirations after excellence as "a robbery" through which you may possibly be enriched in a higher kind of treasure. My own heart has been deeply exercised to receive that classical saying, "hindrances are from the gods," so much so that I can at least *understand*, if I do not fully receive, those deeper sayings of revelation which tell us of the "losing of life" so that it may be saved unto life eternal, and the laying down of life so that it may be taken up again. Baxter says, many things in life are like frost and snow, enemies to the flower, but friendly to the root. Oh, how I can realize this saying, in my own case and yours, for instance,—a little more of one thing, or a little less of another,—less nervous susceptibility, a fuller share of animal spirits, and the energy that goes along with them, would have made us probably far happier and more (apparently) valuable people—would have given us a bloom and charm of life which we have missed. The flower might have been fairer, but how would it have been with the root—that germ of true, imperishable life? I can only answer for myself, but that answer is certain. Knowing how easily, even as it is, my heart is drawn away and absorbed in the rich and enjoyable part of life, in so far as it opens upon me. How would it have been had I not had a restraining, *disenchanted* discipline? It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. That saying does not only apply to worldly possessions, but to all that in which the natural heart naturally delights. These things absorb, fas-

enate, and deaden spiritual discernment; therefore our Lord especially calls the broken in heart—may I not also say the *broken in life*? You will understand what I mean—those in whom there is a discord (*mal accordo con la vita*) to Himself. “Come unto Me.” There is something in us which He must shatter and break in pieces before the fair structure of renewal in His likeness can arise. Therefore we must rejoice—a solemn joy, yet a true one—in afflictions, in disappointments, in all that perchance we would fain have otherwise. Dear T., does your heart go along with mine in all this? I often feel that we are fitted in a peculiar manner to understand and, *therefore*, to help each. Write to me whenever you are able, and be *generous*, as just now I cannot correspond. I think Quintana overrates the merit of the sonnet. Luis de Leon’s piece is sweet, but does not altogether content me. . . . With all that is kindest,

Ever your affectionate friend,

DORA GREENWELL.

Beside revealing the depth of suffering out of which Dora Greenwell emerged to give hope and help to others, these letters show the resolute cheerfulness with which she caught at any healthy interests falling in her way, and surmounted the limitations of her life. And they tell of the practical philosophy which held her outward life together,—the recognition of the truth that, as Wordsworth says, “life requires an art.”

“Not to fancy what were fair in life,
 Provided that could be, but finding first
 What may be, then find out to make it fair,
 Up to our means.”

The courage “to make the best of things,” rather than show mere resignation under them. She would not have called this philosophy religious faith; but it was certainly the result of it. Spiritual life for her rested on the immovable foundation of truth. In that, for her, centred all. But she recognised the worth of intelligent method in dealing with ourselves, and she spent neither time nor strength in those interior struggles so common to mystics. “I see in the Christian life,” she said, “freedom,

expansion, variety." And so seeing it, she laid hold of what of enjoyment remained to her, and ranged with a free step and open eye, cheering and comforting herself with what books, music, and friendly converse could give her. To her, Christ was the "Restorer," even in this life, "of all that the world withers." She possessed what is called the temperament of genius, the quickness of heart and mind which responds to every touch of the outer world. All her writings show this. Many of her poems glow with a sort of purple depth of feeling, and the images in them are all gathered from the glorious and resplendent aspects of nature.

"Bring me no snowdrops cold,
 No violets dim with dew,
 But flowers of burning hue,
 The rose, the marigold,
 The steadfast sunflower bold
 Before His steps to strew.
 Bring flowers of fragrant scent,
 Grey lavender and musk;
 With clinging woodbines dusk.
 Bring jonquils, and the frail narcissus bent.
 Bring odours, incense bring,
 That I may rise and sing
 A song which I have made unto my Lord the King."¹

Scientific writings also, especially those studies which throw light on the nature of man himself, were to her a source of stimulus and interest. She felt keenly the attraction of what may be called the "new knowledge," which is being poured upon our time like another Renaissance, and was eager to claim all it could give her. But while using all that life offered, she knew well,—no ascetic who has stripped himself of every earthly comfort and joy knew better,—that below the surface of sense and fancy on which these bright earth spirits of poetry and beauty play,

¹ L'Envoi to *Carmina Crucis*.

there is a depth which they cannot reach, and that from this depth arises a cry which they cannot answer; and that no more could the problem of man's spiritual destiny be solved by science. To her the response to that cry of the heart, and these questionings of the soul, was Christ. What she wrote, but, beyond all, what she *was* herself, showed how one, filled with the artist's passion and joy in beauty and life, and believing that she might use these gifts as part of her heritage and right, saw beyond all the sweetness of created things, the immortal beauty of God; and how all this love for the rich, ardent, and resplendent side of nature and life was brought under the yoke of Christ, not by ascetic renunciation, but by ceaseless, often agonized dedication. It is not often that such a soul's progress is revealed.

In spite of the antagonism between the life of nature and the life of grace in the human heart, of which she so often speaks, she believed that all human things must ultimately be brought under this law of Christ. Development, democratic progress, wider rule of the material world, all were guided by a Redeeming Power, and meant to fulfil his ends. God in Christ was to her the key to all truth, that which reconciles all conflicting truths. The redemption by Christ was an entire system, embracing all others, interwoven with the whole moral fabric of the world, subtle and inherent as "natural law," discernible to the human heart, exacting from it submission, and, in return, uniting it to God, and bringing it into new relations of fellowship and understanding with the otherwise discordant creation. As the sun in our natural system holds all together and pours life through multitudinous channels, causing life, growth, destruction, and rebirth, so Christ, the centre of the moral world, rules, restores, and destroys. "Christ is the Key to that secret which nature and humanity alike spread before us, of loss, of waste, of suffering even unto

death, of victory working through them all.”¹ The names given to her works, as well as all in them, show that the Cross lay under her very life itself: *et teneo et teneor*, is the motto stamped on all that she did or was. I have seen the bare thought of the crucifixion suddenly arrest her spirit, and before it her face was bathed in tears. *The Patience of Hope* is a long contemplation of Christ, breathing a high but sober comfort with almost angelic authority. *The Covenant of Life and Peace*, *The Colloquia Crucis*—a communing of two friends, tender as the words of St. Francis to his beloved Philothea—have the same theme. It is the thinking of a solitary, but a solitary in full sympathy with the men of her time. Hers are the valid utterances of a saint of to-day, whose soul is never withdrawn, but rather rushes out into the thick of the struggle full of passion and eagerness.

Yet the style in which her books are written is chiefly notable for its sobriety and restraint. It has an elevation and precision unusual in English, recalling some of the excellent qualities of French writings. Its felicities are rather those of purity and directness than grace or colour. It owes no charm to vague picturesqueness. There is no graceful and skilful hiding behind metaphor; but some sentences have a delicacy and force which make it seem as if the truth they tell was expressed for the first and last time.

Nowhere does the worth of this style appear more than in the *Life of Lacordaire*. It is written from beginning to end with the swiftness and directness of a writer who is *one* with his subject, but whose desire to edify is less than his desire to speak the truth—a spirit often absent in religious biographies where the reader is, from a sense of justice, often turned into the *advocatus diaboli*. Here is the truthful picture of the man of exalted enthusiasm, who burned with two passions equally—love of liberty, love of the Catholic

¹ *Colloquia Crucis*.

faith—who, after a life of unexampled austerities, devotion and activity as priest, monk, journalist, died, to use his own words, “a penitent Catholic, an impenitent Liberal.” The writer pierces into the recesses of that impassioned soul, isolated with God, yet bound to his kind with such intensity of moral sympathy, whose “great felicity” is the consciousness of the communion of souls, which he has bought by the renunciation of all the warmer ties of the natural life. A Frenchman of Frenchmen, a priest of priests, a monk of the order of St. Dominic, Lacordaire is revealed in these pages with penetrating and living sympathy, remarkable at any time, more remarkable as coming from the hand of a woman.

The group of men, Lacordaire’s first disciples as Dominicans, or friends of liberty, are sketched here also with delicacy and discrimination. Ozanam, the man of learning and of the world, of saintly life and purest domestic virtues; De Lamennais, who left the struggle silent and defiant, passing into solitude to study the *Divina Commedia*, Dante’s spacious and sombre genius fit companion for that lonely spirit; Madame Swetchine, the firm and tender friend, whose letters show the lightness of touch, and tact in human intercourse which seem the almost incommunicable gift of noble Frenchwomen; Montalembert, his gallant and ever faithful friend in the world. In reading the copious note on Ozanam, one wishes that Dora Greenwell had written the life of this married scholar, as a pendant to that of Lacordaire the priest.

There is no space here, nor am I competent in any way to discuss the question as to what were Miss Greenwell’s exact theological opinions. But with reference to them one sentence must be noted, after speaking of the depth of her sympathy in dealing with Lacordaire the Dominican, it is right to add what she says with regard to Dominic himself, under whose banner Lacordaire was enrolled as an

obedient soldier. "I believe the best that can be said is, that he was a harsh fanatic, with a savage thirst for personal martyrdom, even courting it in the fire and sword he was so ready to send through the land. But this, far from being admirable, seems only another phase of a diseased and cruel imagination." Of the position of a Roman Catholic, she says (in the same letter to Professor Knight, which I have just quoted and which appears in Mr. Dorling's *Life of Dora Greenwell*): "To be a Roman Catholic,—a Papist,—is to abnegate all power of moral discrimination. You are committed to something which moves altogether, like Woodsworth's cloud, if it moves at all." This moral freedom is the very source whence all her poems and all her writings flowed. That which drew her heart in sympathy towards the Church of Rome—so it seems to me—was not those things which are counted by some as its invincible charm. It was neither grandeur of ritual—high ritual never touched her—nor imposing antiquity, nor perfection of organization. It was the uplifting of Christ as an objective, ever-present and living sacrifice, which the Church of Rome has ever held as the life of her life; and that other doctrine, which strikes deep into the heart and conscience, whereby the Church of Rome permits the Christian to *join* in the work of redeeming love, and declares that voluntary dedicated suffering of man or woman is accepted of God, and permitted by Him to lift the burden of pain from others, to give strength to the tempted, and rest to the afflicted. If this were true, surely it would offer the highest hope or aim towards which the human soul could strain. Altruism, enthusiasm for humanity, philanthropy, must seem but shadows compared to an awful reality of faith, which permits the believer to work with God in the sanctuary of His power, and with Christ bear the cross of redeeming love.

These words, even as I write them, fall on my own heart

like balm. Did not that soul of which I have written, which loved, which endured, which hoped through the long pain, and gathering shadows of life, did it not lift and strengthen other hearts? Did it not bring benediction?

“Facesti come quei che va di notte,
 Che porta il lume dietro, e sè non giova,
 Ma dopo sè fa le persone dotte.”

AGNES MACDONELL.

SURVEY OF RECENT LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—Even from the Cambridge University Press no more beautiful specimen of the printer's art has ever been issued than *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*, by C. Taylor, D.D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. The form of the book, the paper, the printing and the binding, are as delightful to the eye as a fine picture. Dr. Taylor too has given us such proof of his aptitude for the kind of work here undertaken, that his researches are sure to be eagerly followed and his conclusions scrutinized with expectation. Readers of this present volume, however, must not look for the substantial results and booty of learning they found in the Author's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, and *The Teaching of the Twelve*. Dr. Taylor's aim is to show that in the *Shepherd of Hermas* there is strong and convincing testimony to the Gospels, although that testimony does not lie on the surface. Indeed what first strikes the reader of the *Shepherd* is that it is very surprising the words of our Lord should be so little referred to in a devout Christian work which dates from the last decade of the earlier half of the second century. In the Apostolic Fathers great use is made, if not of the Gospels as we now have them, of the sayings of Jesus, but this Bunyan of the early Church could scarcely have made less allusion to these sayings had he never seen a Gospel. But Dr. Taylor proposes in this volume to show that Hermas “says in effect that the number of the Gospels was actually and necessarily four, as Irenæus said after him; and that Irenæus

was indebted to Hermas in respect of that important and remarkable statement, for which the later writer is always taken to be the independent and original authority." Dr. Taylor also gathers up all the allusions, more or less pronounced, to the substance and language of the Gospels which the *Shepherd* contains; and his book thus becomes a valuable supplement to Lardner, Kirchhofer, and other collections of this kind. And the student may at least feel sure that Dr. Taylor has omitted nothing.

Whether he has not included too much and found references where none exist, may reasonably be questioned; and even as regards his main contention, that Hermas anticipates Irenæus in affirming that the Gospels, like the elements, are necessarily four, the evidence he adduces will not be by all accepted as final. The passage on which he founds is that in which the Church appears to Hermas in the form of a lady. At her first appearance she was old and seated on a chair; but in the next vision she was standing as if animated with fresh life; and in the third vision she looked quite young and joyous and was seated on a bench. "For as when to one sorrowing come *good tidings* he straightway forgetteth the former sorrows and giveth heed to nought but the tidings that he heard, and is strengthened thenceforth unto good, and his spirit is renewed through the joy which he received; so ye too have received renewal of your spirits by *seeing these good things*. And whereas thou sawest her seated on a *bench*, the position is a firm one; for the bench has *four feet* and stands firmly; for the world likewise is compacted of *four elements*." The four-footed bench then symbolizes the firm position occupied by the Church as composed of those who, as Hermas goes on to say, are truly penitent and completely renewed. But this firm position has been achieved, according to the tenor of the entire passage, not by the Gospel but by the revelation given to Hermas. If the four feet of the bench then meant anything particular and determinate, they must mean the visions accorded to Hermas and not the four Gospels. But apparently Hermas uses the four-footed bench as a symbol of firmness and security without further asking himself what the four feet symbolized. It is, however, quite possible that Irenæus may have seen and been struck with Hermas' allusion to the four elements; although, after all, it is not in the four elements but in the four quarters of the heavens that Irenæus finds his analogy. And in any case Dr. Taylor

deserves the thanks of all interested in patristic and Biblical studies for the suggestions of his acute and scholarly book.

EXEGESIS.—The most notable contribution to New Testament Exegesis which the present year has yielded is a *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A., Fiudhorn (T. & T. Clark). In this very able work Mr. Macpherson shows himself to be a many-sided and thoroughly equipped commentator. He is, perhaps, primarily a theologian, one of that well-bred stock in whose blood run the vitalizing forces of wide and accurate knowledge, clear apprehension of those theological *nuances* which the lights and shadows of centuries of thought have produced, and an inborn and unquenchable thirst for doctrinal discussion. To this there are superadded the tastes and aptitudes of the scholar, and all the attainments and command of various resources to which these aptitudes lead. Wherever help was to be had for the mastery of this Epistle, there Mr. Macpherson has been. Grammatical and lexical aid, critical and exegetical and doctrinal light have been focussed upon it from the most diverse quarters—patristic, puritan, Greek, Latin, Scottish, English. Neither is there any needless obtrusion of other people's opinions for the sake of refuting them, nor any crude and unassimilated material. Rather the book gives one the impression of mature consideration, although at the same time it is absolutely up to date. The *Introduction* is full and instructive. Especially useful is his list of previous works on the Epistle, with brief discriminating characterization of each. Some will question his deliverance on the address of the Epistle, and will think that here he is overconfident; and some may be of opinion that his account of Ephesus might have been both shorter and more telling. Some may still prefer Ellicott, and some Von Soden, but whoever seeks a commentary on this rich Epistle in which due elucidation of the language is furnished by a competent scholar, and guidance into the substance and marrow of the thought is afforded by a ripe theologian, will find satisfaction in Mr. Macpherson's Commentary. [Is there not a discrepancy between page 234 at the top, and page 34 at the bottom?]

Dr. Hutchison, whose excellent volumes on the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Philippians have made him favourably known to Biblical students, has published an interesting study of the miracles recorded in the Gospel of St. John. *Our Lord's Signs in*

St. John's Gospel, by John Hutchison, D.D., Bonnington, Edinburgh (T. & T. Clark). His aim is to furnish his readers with an accurate exegesis and an explanation of the spiritual significance of each of the eight miracles which that evangelist has seen fit to relate. It is recognised by all who read the Fourth Gospel that the miracles of our Lord are in it viewed from a stand-point which somewhat differs from that of the other evangelists. John records them for the sake of their didactic force. He chooses from among the mass of works of healing and beneficence those which have the most direct bearing upon the claims our Lord made, and he leaves us in no doubt as to the lesson he wishes us to read in each. In healing the impotent man Jesus manifests Himself as able to impart life to "whom He would"; in giving sight to the blind He reveals Himself as the Light of the world. In a word, John views the miracles as "signs," as transparencies through which Jesus may be seen as possessed of a power in the spiritual world similar to that which is exhibited, in the miracle, over the physical world. Dr. Hutchison has made it his aim to unfold this significance, and therefore strikes a rich vein of spiritual truth. He has availed himself of the best exegetical helps; he is himself a scholarly and sound exegete, he is sober and balanced in his judgments, and he writes with ease and lucidity, and illustrates his subject with catholic appreciation alike of Mark Twain and Thomas Aquinas. On several points in his exegesis revision of opinion might be recommended, and his tabular view of the miracles will not prepossess the reader in favour of his insight; but the book as a whole fulfils its purpose; and if any minister is wondering where he can find material for a short course of edifying sermons, this is the book he requires.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.—To this department of study an addition of importance has been made by the Rev. R. J. Knowling, M.A., Vice-Principal of King's College, London, in his *Witness of the Epistles, a Study in Modern Criticism* (Longmans, Green & Co.). In this volume Mr. Knowling takes up the argument for the historicity of the Gospels which has been drawn by previous writers from the acknowledged epistles of Paul, and works it out with great detail and with constant reference to every opinion on the subject which has been uttered by modern criticism. For this task he is evidently well equipped by an extensive and minute acquaintance with the most recent works in French and German

criticism. And so full are his references that were his book nothing more than an historical survey or collection of critical opinions, it would have no small value. But it is much more than this. It gives a clear statement of the argument, and of the points at issue in sustaining it; it pushes the argument into greater detail than hitherto has been attempted; it not only gathers before the reader all the material available for forming a judgment, but it judiciously guides him to the just conclusions, and altogether forms an addition of distinct and decided value to Pauline literature. It will be found especially useful by those who have not time or opportunity to make themselves acquainted at first hand with the many critical works which have recently appeared; but even those who are so acquainted will find it convenient to have in this form all the opinions on one important and many-branched theme, and may even find that they have overlooked significant thoughts, and possibly writings, as valuable as those of Paret, Thenius, and Huraut. The only part of the volume which is of doubtful value is the hundred pages devoted to a criticism of Steck and Loman. Such criticism only serves to revive ghosts which may scare, but can do no harm. Gloël's reply was final; and a brief digest of it as one of the finest specimens of modern critical work should have sufficed.

Dr. Wendt's work on *The Teaching of Jesus* was, on its appearance two years ago, at once recognised both in this country and in Germany as an exceptionally successful treatment of an important subject; and Messrs. T. and T. Clark have conferred a very considerable benefit on English readers by furnishing them with a translation worthy of the original. The English edition has been entrusted to the very competent hands of the Rev. John Wilson, M.A., of Montreux, and every page shows that knowledge, skill, and care have been lavished upon it. The original is written with unusual lucidity and force; and the Author must be gratified to find that nothing of these excellencies has been lost in the transference of his thoughts into an English dress. Only one volume has as yet appeared, but the other is promised in some months and will be anxiously expected by all who possess themselves of the first. For Dr. Wendt's exposition of the teaching of Jesus is not only the most comprehensive and systematic that we possess, but it is written with surprising freshness and vivacity, and abounds in striking turns of thought. There are a few points on which

Dr. Wendt's statements will not command universal assent ; as when he says that "certainly at the beginning of His career, the necessity of His death had not occurred to Jesus, far less the thought of so early and so dreadful a death." But the trend of the book is decidedly conservative. It is needless to offer any detailed criticism of a book which has been accepted as a standard work by all who are interested in Biblical Theology ; but it should be understood that in the preface to his original edition Dr. Wendt expressly says that he endeavoured to throw his material into a form which should make it intelligible to the educated laity. Certainly he has succeeded in doing so, and his lament that the critical part of his work has not been included in the English translation is out of place. The introduction of so large an amount of critical material, however necessary to scholars, would have prevented the book from attaining any circulation among the laity of England. Very cordially do we endorse Dr. Wendt's prayer : "May the loving enthusiasm for this incomparably great and beautiful subject, which has animated me throughout the whole course of my work, be experienced by the reader, and may this book help to contribute somewhat to further on English soil the understanding of the teaching of Jesus." Those who have learned to appreciate the robustness and originality which characterize all the writings of Dr. A. B. Bruce, will not need to be told that his work on *The Kingdom of God*, although not so full as Dr. Wendt's, will not be superseded by it. But with Dr. Wendt's systematic treatment of the entire range of our Lord's teaching, and the true insight into His spirit and meaning which Dr. Bruce gives in his incomparable *Training of the Twelve*, the Biblical student may feel himself well equipped for the understanding of the mind of Jesus.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co. have done a real service to Biblical Theology by producing on this as well as on the other side of the Atlantic *The Soteriology of the New Testament*, by William Porcher Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D., Prof. of Exegesis in the University of the South. The book, although produced in Boston, might have been printed by R. & R. Clark, of Edinburgh, and presents the characteristics which have made Messrs. Macmillan's publications a pleasure to the eye. In the volume now issued the pleasure is not confined to the eye. An unusual treat is provided by Prof. Du Bose for all who find pleasure in original thought expressed in

clear and unaffected English. Few readers perhaps will agree with the writer in all his statements, or even in all his important conclusions, but that reader must be hopelessly impervious to light who does not recognise in these discussions ideas of value which have never before been so clearly set before him. Prof. Du Bose's attitude towards soteriology may be gathered from such a sentence as this: (p. 239) "Our salvation consists *not* in some one's performing a vicarious act or enduring a vicarious penalty which has the effect of a formal and objective satisfaction to the nature, the justice, or the divine government of God for their moral or abstract guilt; *but* it consists in some one's doing, or having done, for us and in us that which will break the power over us of the inherited nature, of the accumulated and consolidated consequences in our nature, which those sins have entailed upon us." Had Prof. Du Bose included both elements in salvation, his soteriology would have been a closer approximation to that of the New Testament. But the one aspect of salvation which he does see, he presents with so much original and profound insight that it seems ungracious to find fault. So too in his handling of the Incarnation, the human nature of our Lord, the Sacraments, he abandons not only the language which theologians have been accustomed to use—this would be readily forgiven—but also some of the conclusions arrived at after controversy and councils. And yet the whole discussion is so reverent, so serious, so thoroughly in the interest of what is real and spiritual in religion, and withal so original and stimulating, that the volume is a distinct and notable gain to theological literature. Prof. Du Bose makes us "ask for more."

MISCELLANEOUS.—That, after all the recent researches into the history of the first Christian centuries, much remains to be done is decisively shown by Mr. Slater's *The Faith and Life of the Early Church*. This title scarcely conveys the right idea of the contents of this important book. It is really a critical history of the Church during the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Ages. Mr. Slater is Biblical Tutor in the Wesleyan College at Didsbury, and is not only familiar with the literature in which the Tübingen theory has been expounded and modified, and with the literature in which the weak points of that theory have been exposed, but he also has a first-hand acquaintance with the facts and has sufficient historical aptitude to suggest a theory which better suits the facts

than any of those which have hitherto been promulgated. His theory, briefly, is that the Church Catholic was not the resultant of Ebionitism and Gnosticism, nor of the Petrine and Pauline communities, but was a development of Gentile Christianity. He holds that the Gentile Church, feeling its own strength, gradually excluded from its communion all Judaizing Christians, and branded them as heretics; and, as against Dr. Salmon, he maintains that there was an organic connection between the Judaizers of St. Paul's time and those of the time of Irenæus, and that there was no break in the continuity of that party in the Church from first to last. Probably it is from Ritschl and Harnack Mr. Slater has received suggestions which have ripened into this theory; but whatever has suggested it, its elaboration has given room for much masculine, independent, and learned thinking. Some chapters are slight and have apparently been written for the sake of giving an appearance of completeness to the book. There are also some bad misprints—"pseudo-elements" for "pseudo-Clementines," p. 202; and on p. 174, "in the time of Domitian, A.D. 98." We hope the public, by calling for a second edition, will soon give Mr. Slater an opportunity of effacing such blemishes, for certainly his book takes us nearer to the truth on several points of early Church History than either the Tübingen critics or their opponents have carried us. (The publishers are Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton.)

In *The Progressiveness of Modern Christian Thought*, Mr. James Lindsay, minister of the parish of St. Andrews, Kilmarnock, has executed a supremely difficult and delicate task with marked ability and judgment. His aim has been to define and to justify the advance made during recent years in theology. To accomplish this object in a satisfactory manner calls for so much knowledge of the history of doctrine, so clear a perception of fine distinctions, such trained accuracy in the use of terms, that we might well have despaired of finding any writer who could undertake it. To state with accuracy the altered relations of philosophy and theology, to show the grounds of the different aspect in which miracles are now viewed, to define with precision the amount and character of the fresh light which has in our day been shed upon the Incarnation, the Atonement, Eschatology, and all the chief articles of the Christian faith, is an impossible task to any but a theologian of solid learning, masculine grasp and fine judgment. Mr. Lindsay has proved himself to be such a theologian, and at one step

has placed himself in the front rank. With singular skill he has discriminated spurious progress from progress that is sound and permanent; and while professing and evincing a perfect sympathy with all the main lines of recent advance in theology, he notwithstanding, or therefore, retains a firm hold on all the articles of the Catholic Christian creed. No book has yet appeared so likely to bring the conservative and liberal parties in theology to a common understanding. None has appeared so likely to scatter the fears of those who think that progress in theology means abandonment of ascertained truth, or to abate the presumption of those who hope to advance theological thought by calling in question all that our fathers believed. The only fault which a reader will find with the book is its style. The sentences are intolerably long, more than once all but a page in length, and once at least a full page. They are ponderous as well as long; and although a certain massiveness of style would suit the strength and compactness of the writer's thought, there should be lucidity also to match the perspicuity of the thinking.

Dr. Maclaren, of Manchester, is one of those exceptional men who can afford to print all they utter. He is the happy owner of an inexhaustible fountain of spiritual wisdom, of sound and lucid exposition of Scripture, and of apt and picturesque illustrations. Nothing more likely to be useful has ever been produced by him than the two volumes of his Bible Class Expositions on *The Gospel of St. Matthew*, published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. These expositions are not broken up by critical remarks or minute explanations, but are continuous, and may be read with profit, as they will certainly be read with interest by all. At the same time the *teacher* will find here more to stimulate his own mind, to give him a firm hold of the meaning of the passage, and to suggest suitable thoughts and illustrations than he is likely to get from books more exclusively devoted to his purposes.

The Rev. E. A. Litton, M.A., of Naunton, has issued the second and completing part of his *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*. It is published by Mr. Elliot Stock. Mr. Litton is a learned and mature theologian. His present work is based upon the Thirty-nine Articles and will certainly be found most helpful to candidates preparing for Holy Orders, or to any studious persons who wish to understand the theological system of the Church of England.

In *The Bridal Song* Mr. James Neil has amplified a part of the Song of Solomon in verse. It is meant to serve as a wedding gift, and is produced accordingly in high art style. The printing is in blue ink and the binding is quite bridal, pale-coloured silk with an embossed design of orange and myrtle in gold. Mr. Neil utilizes his knowledge of the East to furnish some illustrative notes.

We are glad to see that Mr. David Douglas, of Edinburgh, has seen his way to issue in one volume and in a cheap form Dr. Skene's *Gospel History*. Originally delivered as a course of lectures to the senior class in a Sunday school, these lessons on the Life of our Lord were intended to fill up and illustrate the gospel narrative by making use of available knowledge of the views, customs and institutions of the Jewish people. Dr. Skene occupies the position of "Historiographer Royal for Scotland" and the habit of accuracy attained in his ordinary studies has proved helpful in this task. The chronology has evidently been very carefully examined, although it cannot be said that fresh light is thrown upon the obscurities of the narrative. Dr. Skene would have done well to bring his book up to date topographically by availing himself of the identifications made good by the Palestine Exploration. Also, some recognition of the difficulties which recent criticism has started would have won greater acceptance for his book in certain quarters. But after all such deductions, this *Gospel History* remains a volume of great value, giving nearly as much detail as the larger lives of Christ, setting in order and bringing out the significance of the various incidents, while at the same time its cheapness brings it within reach of all.

Of Messrs. Macmillan's re-issue of Dr. Farrar's sermons we have received *Saintly Workers*, a volume containing five Lenten lectures, originally published in 1878, and treating with the author's accustomed picturesqueness and eloquence of the Martyrs, the Hermits, the Monks, the Early Franciscans, the Missionaries. Another old favourite re-appears for the tenth time. It is the volume of sermons preached at Marlborough College between 1871 and 1876. It is entitled *In the Days of Thy Youth*, and contains a great deal of wise counsel judiciously given, and much that cannot fail to stimulate ingenuous youth. No better volume of the kind can be put into the hands of a boy approaching manhood.—No one knows better the difficulties and needs of those

entering the ministry of the Church of England than the Principal of Ridley Hall. His life and work have for many years lain among men preparing themselves for holy orders, and in a volume addressed *To My Younger Brethren* Mr. Moule gathers up the main thoughts he has uttered in "many a lecture in the library where we work together, and many a conversation in dining hall, or by study fire, or in college garden, or on country road." The characteristic excellence of this volume is its practical treatment of the life and work of the curate. The advice is often homely, and perhaps here and there rather too outspoken; punctuality, smoking, intercourse with young ladies, the investment of money, as well as the making of sermons and the discharge of pastoral work are fully and frankly dealt with.

The winner of the "Le Bas" prize for 1891, Mr. F. W. Thomas, of Trinity College, Cambridge, has published his essay on *The Mutual Influence of Muhammadans and Hindus in Law, Morals, and Religion, during the period of Muhammadan Ascendancy* (Deighton, Bell & Co.). Each new book on India only serves to illustrate what worlds of unexplored life and thought await the inquirer in its "raw, brown, naked humanity," and in its civilization sealed with the heredity of a hundred generations. Even a Rudyard Kipling must feel that he has not yet plucked the heart out of the mystery. Mr. Thomas having drunk deep of Sleeman (why does no reprinting publisher give us a cheap Sleeman?) and of many a more recondite source, is inspired with quite the right feeling for India, and has compiled for less leisurely mortals an excellent manual of information with some strongly thought conclusions. The characteristics of Hinduism and Muhammadanism, their mutual influence in government, law, land tenure, religion, and morality, are traced out with great clearness and in an interesting manner. He does not expect that Christianity will be widely accepted, but he believes that the Bible will exercise a potent influence. "Whatever aspect the religion of India will assume, it will without question be deeply impregnated with Christian ideas, and will appeal at every turn to the character and life of Christ; and one of the greatest achievements of Christianity in the West, that of bringing morality into connection with religion, may be repeated under the relaxing climate, and amid the sensuous influences which mould the peoples of tropical India." Mr. Thomas' book is decidedly one that should be read.

Canon Girdlestone, in his *Doctor Doctorum: The Teacher and the Book* (John F. Shaw & Co.), makes a contribution to one of the burning questions of the day, our Lord's relation to criticism. The spirit of the book is wholly to be commended: it is reverent, and although very convinced and earnest, it is also tolerant. There are also many things in the book which deserved to be said and which are well said. But the thesis it is written to support seems equivalent to Docetism. The Logos is everything, the human nature of our Lord nothing, at least so far as knowledge is concerned. "He knew in one sense what He did not know in another." "The most learned of us may consent to be taught things which we knew long ago," and similarly Christ as man consented to learn what He already knew. "The Lord's authority and infallibility as a Teacher are to be accounted for simply and solely on the ground of His original and inalienable relationship to His Father." In short, Canon Girdlestone leaves no room either for a true humanity or for the work of the Holy Spirit in Jesus. According to this writer the human life is reduced to a mere show, the questions asked by Jesus were never asked for information; His surprise, wonder, and so forth must all be explained in a non-natural sense. The perfectness of Christ's knowledge is maintained at the expense of the reality of the Incarnation.

Too late for fuller notice have reached me the two concluding volumes of the lamented Prof. Hugues Oltramare's *Commentaire sur les Épîtres de S. Paul aux Colossiens, aux Éphésiens, et à Philémon*; a work of such acknowledged excellence that probably the announcement of its completion needs no further comment. The publishing house is the Librairie Fischbacher of Paris.

MARCUS DODS.

THE REVISED VERSION.

I AM anxious to put before the readers of the EXPOSITOR some thoughts upon the Revised Version, which I shall venture to make the ground of a practical suggestion. I have long felt, and I feel increasingly, that we have not reaped, and scarcely seem likely to reap, all the fruit which we might fairly have hoped for from the labours and ability of the Revisers. It saddens me to think that a work so eagerly anticipated and so warmly welcomed should have already lost so much of popular interest and have so greatly declined in popular use. I use the word "popular" designedly, for the Revision had for its end and object, not the enlightenment of scholars, for whom the original Greek and Hebrew, with abundant stores of textual criticism, were available, but the information of the ordinary reader of the Bible, whose knowledge of its true meaning is only attainable through a translation. It was certainly expected that a flood of light would be poured upon numbers of passages of Holy Scripture by new translation, and the enormous sale of the New Testament, when the Revised Version appeared, proved that this expectation was very widely entertained. I believe, however, that a great part of the disappointment felt in the results of a project once so full of hope is to be traced to the fact that the Revisers, at all events in the New Testament, seriously exceeded their instructions, and, instead of removing manifest errors and obscurities, were drawn into attempting a new translation; or at any rate fell into the error of over-minuteness of alteration, and encumbered much most valuable work by over-elaboration and hypercritical exactitude.

My first business is to prove this charge, and in order to do so I must trace the history of the movement from its inception, and bring documentary evidence of the intentions of its promoters.

It was on the 10th of February, 1870, that the initial step towards a Revised Version of the translation of the Bible was taken by the adoption in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury of a resolution, proposed by the Bishop of Winchester (Bishop Wilberforce), and seconded by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Bishop Ellicott), in the following words:—

That a committee of both Houses be appointed, with power to confer with any committee that may be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province, to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorised Version of the Old and New Testaments, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall on due investigation be found to exist.

I would call special attention to the words “plain and clear errors.” The committee was duly appointed, and on May 3 in the same year (1870) reported as follows:—

1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version.

3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.

4. That in such necessary changes the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.

5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.

I would again draw attention to certain words in this

document—namely, those of the 3rd clause, which asserts that the committee does “not contemplate any new translation of the Bible or any alteration of the language except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.” This report was, after much discussion, adopted on May 25, with some modifications and amplifications, which will be found in the Preface to the Revised Version of the New Testament. Certain “principles and rules” were finally adopted, of which the first is this—“To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness.”

It will be unnecessary to recall the long and earnest debates which in 1870 and 1871 accompanied the elaboration of the scheme of revision and the selection of the companies of revisers. But it is right to observe that at that period the Convocation of York refused all concurrence with the action of the Southern Convocation, and thus purged itself by anticipation from any complicity with the results of the revision.

On May 17, 1881, the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury was summoned by the Upper House to hear the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol lay the report of the Revisers of the New Testament before the House. The next day—namely on May 18, 1881,—the following resolution was passed by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, after a long debate, by 75 to 8—

That our respectful thanks be tendered to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and his learned colleagues for the labour which, during a period of ten years and a half they have bestowed on the endeavour to make the Scriptures of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ more clear to the humblest of those who speak the English tongue.

No step was taken at once by the Convocation of York on the appearance of the Revised Version of the New Testa-

ment, but on April 3, 1883, the two Houses, sitting together, agreed to the following resolution :—

This Convocation, while declining to express at the present time an opinion as to the Revised Version, desires to give sincere thanks to the Revisers for the arduous and conscientious labours which they have devoted to their work.

It was not till April, 1885, that the Revised Version of the Old Testament appeared. It was at once found that the changes made in the Old Testament were far fewer than in the New, and although its publication excited considerably less interest, yet it was received with unanimous votes of thanks by both Houses of the Southern Convocation. I am not aware that the Northern Convocation has taken any notice at all of the appearance of the Revised Version of the Old Testament. So much for the action of the two Convocations.

As soon as the Revised Version of the New Testament appeared, it was welcomed by an outburst of hearty interest, and, as I have already said, had an enormous sale, which at least proved that Bible students were by no means indifferent to the great help which a revised translation might prove. Of course attention was at first naturally fixed upon the more important of the new readings, and a large number of these were found to be either valuable corrections of faulty translations, or renderings throwing much light upon the true sense of the original. But it was speedily discovered that the Revised Version contained a multitude of minute and unimportant alterations, and by degrees the value of the really important corrections became more and more obscured by the multiplicity of what I fear I must call trivial and unnecessary changes.

I do not think it is necessary to discuss the merits or demerits of the revised *text* of the Greek of the New Testament, even were I competent to do so, because the changes dependent upon it are not very numerous. Some

of them are undoubtedly of great importance, and some, especially the omission of the concluding verses of St. Mark's Gospel, have aroused a great amount of hostile criticism. Of course we must be prepared to accept all emendations where textual criticism leaves little room for doubt.

It is quite plain (whether Dean Burgon saw it or not) that the book which was received with so much interest has forfeited its first popularity, and is now comparatively neglected. I believe the reason of this is the fact that the Revisers largely exceeded their instructions, and did not adhere to the principles they were commissioned to follow. A vast expenditure of time and labour and learning was spoilt by overminuteness. It is felt to be fussy in its multitudinous petty changes. These, I believe, have really robbed us of what might otherwise have been of extreme value. This excess of minute alteration is perfectly natural. Bishop Ellicott, in his little book on the *Revision of the English Version*, published when the scheme was beginning to take shape in 1870, warns us of the danger. His words are worth quoting:—

In revision, as in many other things, there is a continually accelerative and intensifying tendency which increased habitude in the work never fails to develop, but which certainly must be closely watched and constantly corrected.

And again in another place he speaks of alteration always having a tendency to accelerate, and revisers being always dangerously open to the temptation of using with increased freedom acquired facilities. He also lays down as a leading principle in the projected work of revision,—“to introduce as few alterations as may be into the current version.” How completely he himself, as chairman of the New Testament Company, became a victim to the temptation he speaks of may be seen in the following facts. In the little book I have referred to he takes the Sermon on the

Mount as a specimen, and prints it with such alterations as he thinks needed. These amount in all to 75 in the 111 verses, nineteen being due to textual criticism. But when the Revised Version appeared the number of alterations in the Sermon on the Mount proved to be, not 75, but 127, as nearly as I can count them. Let me take the first of the three chapters containing the Sermon on the Mount—namely, the fifth chapter of St. Matthew, and ask whether the following alterations in that chapter fulfil the requirement of correcting “plain and clear errors,” or are such as “in the judgment of the most competent scholars” can be pronounced “necessary.” “They that hunger” is substituted for “they which do hunger”; “reproach” is substituted for “revile”; “a city set on an hill,” for “a city that is set on an hill”; “it shineth,” for “it giveth light”; “pass away from the law,” for “pass from the law”; “accomplished,” for “fulfilled”; “the least in the kingdom,” for “least in the kingdom”; “in no wise,” for “in no case”; “every one who is,” for “whosoever is”; “with him in the way,” for “in the way with him”; “till thou have paid,” for “till thou hast paid”; “last,” for “uttermost”; “not thy whole body,” for “not that thy whole body”; “every one that putteth away,” for “whosoever shall put away”; “by the heaven,” for “by heaven”; “the throne of God,” for “God’s throne”; “smiteth thee,” for “shall smite thee”; “would go to law with thee,” for “would sue thee at the law”; “one mile,” for “a mile”; “it was said,” for “it hath been said” (two or three times); “sons,” for “children” (twice). Here are twenty-one alterations in one chapter which it would, I think, be very difficult to prove corrective of “plain and clear errors,” or “in the judgment of the most competent scholars,” or, indeed, of anybody else, “necessary.” One has only to glance at any chapter to find the same abundance of unnecessary and uninformative alterations.

One can hardly understand how the Revisers were induced to encumber their valuable and laborious work with such irritating trivialities as the change of "lift up herself," into "lift herself up"; "derided," into "scoffed at"; "tormented," into "in anguish"; "believed not," into "disbelieved"; "Moses' disciples," into "disciples of Moses"; "pattern," into "ensample"; "if there is," for "if there be"; and so on. It will be remembered that Bishop Charles Wordsworth, of St. Andrew's, who was a member of the company of New Testament Revisers, was compelled at the last to refuse his name to a testimonial of thanks to the Chairman (a step which caused him much pain) because he held so strongly that the number of minute and unnecessary changes made was in direct violation of the instructions under which the work was undertaken. It is rather a surprise that no others joined in this protest. But one can understand the all-but irresistible temptation to excessive particularity in work of this sort.

The Bishop of St. Andrew's thought the great number of minute and unnecessary alterations would wreck the work. But is there nothing precious which can be saved out of the wreck? I cannot but think there is. In talking this matter over with Dr Liddon some years ago, he expressed an opinion that, if a very careful selection could be made of such alterations in the Revised Version as satisfy the terms of the original instructions, being either corrections of "plain and clear errors," or "in the judgment of the most competent scholars" "necessary," and if these could be printed in a marked and separate type in the margin of an edition of the New Testament prepared for reading in Church, and if some sanction could be given to the adoption in the reading of the Lessons in Church of these selected alterations, the intention of the original promoters of the Revision might yet be fulfilled, and non-critical hearers be greatly helped to the understanding of the Holy Scriptures.

He told me he thought it should be quite optional at first whether the reader should substitute the selected alterations or not, and that no attempt to make them compulsory should be made unless and until usage had stamped approval upon the practice. The subject of the authorisation of the Revised Version for reading in Church was brought before the London Diocesan Conference in April, 1890, and, although the debate turned mainly upon the general adoption of the Revised Version, yet some mention was made by one or two speakers of the possibility of such a selection as that suggested by Dr. Liddon.

It is scarcely necessary to bring forward examples of amendments in the Revised Version which are of the greatest value in correcting errors, or removing the occasion of errors, nor of such as competent scholars would readily pronounce necessary for the elucidation of the true sense of the original. Every one will be familiar with such. Yet I will venture to adduce a few examples taken almost at random. Perhaps one of the most familiar, as it is one of the most obvious, is the removal of the word "damnation" from the sacramental passage in 1 Corinthians xi. The substitution of the untranslated word "Hades" for "hell" in very many passages removes a very serious obscurity and confusion. The correction of proper names—notably of "Jesus" into "Joshua" where Joshua is meant—is no light gain in perspicuity. The alteration of "beasts" into "living creatures" throughout the Book of Revelation removes a very misleading and depreciative conception of the heavenly beings, especially among the uninstructed. In St. John vii. 17, it is a great gain to have "If any man willeth to do His will," for the inadequate "will do." In St. John xiii. 10, a flood of light is poured upon the passage by the substitution of "bathed" for "washed" in translating *ὁ λελουμένος*. In Ephesians ii. 21, a most luminous amendment is made by the correction of "all the building"

into "each several building," this verse and the next then setting forth respectively the individual and the corporate indwelling of God by the Spirit. In 1 Corinthians iv. 4, the curious archaism, "I know nothing by myself," becomes "I know nothing against myself." In Acts xxi. 15, "took up our carriages" becomes "took up our baggage"; and in Acts xxviii. 13, "fetched a compass," becomes "made a circuit." In the Sermon on the Mount the "take no thought" is relieved of its ambiguity by becoming "be not anxious." The word "offend" is constantly misunderstood; it is in many places replaced by "cause to stumble." In St. John x. 16 an unwarranted inference is avoided by the correct translation "one flock" being given in place of "one fold." A most ignorant, but most perilous, abuse of ambiguous words is prevented in 1 Corinthians vii., by the insertion in three places of the word "*daughter*" in italics after the word "virgin," the sense so given being quite clear to the thoughtful student. In St. Matthew xxv. 27, the substitution of "bankers" and "interest" for "exchangers" and "usury," is valuable. In St. Matthew xxvi. 5, "Not during the feast," in place of "Not on the feast day," may remove a difficulty of reconciliation. In 1 Timothy vi. 5, it is an obvious improvement to invert the words "gain" and "godliness." And in 2 Timothy iv. 14, "The Lord will render to him" removes the apparent vindictiveness of "The Lord reward him according to his works."

We are confronted with a much more difficult task when we have to examine large classes of alterations which depend, in a greater or less degree, upon the varying genius and the idiomatic peculiarities of the Greek and English languages. I will venture to touch upon three groups of alterations of this description, which may perhaps be generally described as corrective rather of inaccuracies than of "plain and clear errors." But it is very hard to draw

any line between these, and inaccuracies in certain contexts and relations undoubtedly lead to plain and clear errors.

I will take, first, alterations depending on a more accurate translation of the tenses of verbs. These are exceedingly numerous in the Revised Version. It seems to me, however, that by far the greater number are not necessary for any correction of error or elucidation of meaning. Let me, first of all, adduce certain examples where such corrections certainly are most valuable in these ways. Will any one deny the importance of the correction of "such as should be saved," as the translation of *τοὺς σωζομένους* in Acts ii. 47, even though it may be doubted whether "those that were being saved" is the best possible rendering? Parallel with this, though of less moment, is the correction to "Our lamps are going out," in the parable of the Ten Virgins; and "were going over the sea," in place of "went over the sea," in St. John vi. 17. Many instances could easily be given where the literal translation of the imperfect adds great clearness to the sense, even though it may be doubted whether it can be called "necessary." Probably the gain is more clear in the careful distinction made in the Revised Version between the aorist and the perfect in certain passages of high doctrinal importance. For example, in Galatians ii. 19, "I through the law died unto the law" is an important correction of "I through the law am dead to the law." Again, in chapter iv. 6, "God sent forth" is distinctly corrective, in point of the time in the writer's mind, of "God hath sent forth." The force of the perfect is brought out in chapter ii. 20, by translating *Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι* by "I have been" instead of "I am crucified with Christ." In 1 Corinthians vi. 11, the simple aoristic reference to a past act is made clear to the English reader by the substitution of "were" for "are" in the sentence, "but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified." So, too, in 2 Thessalonians ii. 13,

“God chose” is rightly given instead of “God hath chosen.” In 2 Timothy i. 9, “Who saved us and called us” is a truer rendering of the participles than “Who hath saved us and called us.” I do not know why the Revisers did not translate *τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν* (in Gal. v. 24) by “crucified,” or “did crucify—the flesh” instead of retaining the “have crucified” of the Authorised Version. While, however, it would probably be held “necessary” for the conveying of the true sense to the ordinary reader or hearer to bring out the force of the tense in a certain number of passages, there would appear to be a far larger number in which, while the Revisers have carefully marked the true note of time, it cannot be said that any appreciable gain in accuracy or fulness of meaning is thus achieved. To the non-critical reader I do not think there is any advantage, which can be classed either as corrective of error or necessary for the conveyance of the sense, in the alteration of “He hath put” into “He put all things under His feet” in 1 Corinthians xv. 27; or of “He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition” into the more exact “made both one,” and “brake down the middle wall of partition” in Ephesians ii. 14; or of “Ye have not so learned Christ” into “Ye did not so learn Christ” in Ephesians iv. 19; or, once more, of “have washed their robes,” into “washed their robes,” in Revelations vii. 14. The great difficulty would obviously be to draw any line upon a definite principle. But perhaps we may say that where the past act, expressed in the simple indefinite past in the original, is of continuous force, and from the nature of the case passes on into present fulfilment, there is no occasion to alter the English perfect (which brings up the completed act to the moment of present thought) into the aorist (which throws it back in thought upon the time of its occurrence). I have marked a large number of changes of tense which appear

to me to add nothing to the general reader. Let me give but one more example. We will take the well-known passage as to the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians xv. 14, 16, 17. In the Revised Version it reads thus:—"If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." "For if the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised; and if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain." Would any humble listener receive one new idea or one clearer conception of the argument from these literalisms?

There are many more things I should like to say about tenses, but I will turn to the two other groups of corrections of which I spoke. It is certainly an idiomatic characteristic of the New Testament Greek to use "in" as the preposition in a great many cases where we should use some other preposition, especially the preposition "by." To bring the English into strict accord with the Greek by translating *ἐν* invariably by "in" seems to ignore difference of idiom, and becomes somewhat pedantic. No doubt there are cases in which such translation is a distinct gain in meaning—as, for instance, in 1 St. Peter iii. 19, where "in which" (speaking of the Spirit) is a clear gain upon the Authorised "by which." In places where the "in" implies the sphere of being or of action, it should certainly be given literally, but there are many passages where such is not the case, and I do not, for instance, think it "necessary," or helpful, to substitute "In Him were all things created" for "By Him were all things created" in Colossians i. 16. I suppose a similar distinction might be drawn with regard to the necessity or non-necessity in particular instances of the literal translation of *ἐκ*, *διὰ*, and possibly of some other prepositions.

The other group of alterations I must refer to is that connected with the use or non-use of the definite article. I suppose that difference of idiom must be allowed for again

in this case, but a careful observance of the Greek usage is here of the greatest possible importance. Take only three illustrations. How much we gain by the promise that the Spirit of truth shall guide "into all *the* truth," and not simply "into all truth" (St. John xv. 13). What access of force is given to the sacramental observance when we find that, both in St. Luke xxiv. 35, and in Acts ii. 42, "breaking of bread" is really "*the* breaking of bread." And what enlargement of ethical teaching is imported into St. Paul's argument in the second and third chapters of the Epistle to the Romans by a thoughtful discrimination between "law," as a principle of external regulation of conduct, and "*the* law," as the embodiment of such principle in a revealed code of ordinances.

There are, of course, some alterations which to us seem distinct losses, though resting on evidence it is impossible to ignore. Thus in Galatians iv. 7, I suppose we must accept "If a son, then an heir, through God," *διὰ Θεοῦ* being the true reading, and not *Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ*. Again in Ephesians v. 9, we are compelled to substitute "the fruit of the light" for "the fruit of the Spirit," the true reading being *φωτὸς*, and not *Πνεύματος*. Again, in 1 Timothy i. 4, we must replace "godly edifying" by "a dispensation of God," the word being *οἰκονομίαν* and not *οἰκοδομίαν*. We must not forget that if we are reverting to the true reading, it cannot be really a loss.

There are a few, but very few, cases in which I should myself like the marginal word accepted instead of the textual. Thus in 1 Corinthians vii. 1, I should greatly like to read—"Knowledge puffeth up, but love buildeth up"; especially as this rendering is adopted in other places, as in 2 Corinthians x. 8, "Our authority, which the Lord gave for building you up, and not for casting you down"; and again in Ephesians iv. 12, "Unto the building up of the body of Christ"; and 16, "Unto the building up of itself in love."

And now it is time to ask what would be the probable result of the attempt to select such alterations as alone entirely fulfil the original commission to the Revising Companies? I am omitting all reference to the Old Testament, because the changes in it, though often important, are far fewer than in the New, and the revision is far more faithful to the instructions under which the Revisers laboured. I have, however, somewhat carefully gone through the whole of the New Testament, marking those alterations in the Revised Version which seemed to me to fulfil the conditions imposed in the original commission. We have already taken the Sermon on the Mount as a specimen of revision, and have seen that Bishop Ellicott, before beginning his work with the New Testament Company, made 75 corrections in the 111 verses, but, after the long labours of the revision, recommended 127 corrections. I find that I have marked only 24 in the same 111 verses. If the same proportion is maintained throughout (and I think it is so on the whole), I should not select for adoption in reading quite one in five of the alterations in the Revised Version. In other words, whereas the Revised Version adopts (if we judge by the Sermon on the Mount) one alteration and a seventh in every verse, I would adopt one alteration in every four verses and two-thirds. I believe that, had the Revisers of the New Testament adopted such a restrictive and self-repressive scheme of revision as that which I have ventured very imperfectly to sketch, their work would have been a far greater boon to the Church and the English-speaking race. There never was an occasion in which the old *πλέον ἡμῶν παντός* was more absolutely true. Perhaps it may not even now be too late to carry home the tithe sheaves from the harvest-field in which the Revisers spent such long years of labour. I know not. It may be that the proposal I have made is impracticable. I am not blind to its difficulties. I shall be quite content to have venti-

lated a suggestion which I have pondered over for years, and to leave it to others to mature or to abandon. I think at least my readers will agree with me in holding that it would be an inestimable boon if the uncritical and unlearned hearer could listen to the words he has learnt to love and revere with more intelligent understanding through the removal of "plain and clear errors," whether of reading or of translation, as well as of serious obscurities, without losing his sense of familiarity with the wording and idioms of our old translation, so pure in its diction, so grand in its flowing periods, so priceless in its influence upon all our literature, so faithful in its simplicity, and so dear to thousands and tens of thousands of Christian souls.

W. WALSHAM WAKEFIELD.

*CANON CHEYNE ON KING DAVID AND THE
PSALTER.*¹

To all who are aware of the lines on which theological discussions in England have recently been running the title of this book tells its own tale. The Bampton Lectures on the Psalter by the same author furnished a striking example of what the criticism of the Old Testament is doing, and not a few persons, unprepared for the results therein set forth, believed that an assault was being made on "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." The controversy which has ensued has done something towards dispelling this illusion, but the author of a work round which so fierce a fight has raged not unnaturally desires to show both by example and by precept the manner in which he holds that criticism and reverence can travel hand in hand. Nor is it a mere task of self-defence to

¹ *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism.* By the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

which he is bound. The motive which in many minds underlies the suspicion with which the newer criticism is regarded is worthy of the utmost respect. Men to whom religion is dearer and the central statements of theology more certain than aught beside have a right to demand that the fresh views propounded for their acceptance shall be proved to be, at the least, not subversive of the foundations on which they have built their all. There are teachers of religion also who have not forgotten that if they would continue to teach, they must never cease to learn, to some of whom it has become clear that the more advanced Biblical students have not spoken without a cause, but to whom it is not yet clear how they may utilize critical results without injuring the less instructed. Confidence can only be established by the thorough critic proving successful as a devout teacher. In fairness to the critic, however, the hearer and reader must be careful to dismiss prejudice.

Canon Cheyne's conviction that none of our psalms were composed by David pre-supposes a thorough examination of the narratives in which this king figures in order to ascertain what sort of man he was. Hence the first part of the volume before us, entitled "The David Narratives." The Books of Samuel, in which the majority of these accounts are contained, are made up of documents which differ from each other in origin, date, and value. The list and clear description of these documents which is given in the first essay will prove very useful: a beginner in criticism, or a student who might wish to criticise the critics, would find that its guidance enabled him to see the facts with his own eyes. Having indicated the groups to which the various accounts severally belong, our author is free to reconstruct the character of the hero and tell us what sort of life he really lived. The traditional sweet singer of Israel has disappeared and there remains a man distinguished for patriotism and public spirit, respect for national laws and

institutions, punctuality in the administration of justice, regard for human life, and magnanimity; a man who is neither an Old Testament saint nor a New Testament Christian, yet loves his God, works in harmony with the chief religious authorities of his time, bears affliction with the resignation born of penitential humility and trust. "Nature in him has been touched (as we say) by grace; . . . with all his illusions, he had what is called in Heb. xi. 'faith.'" "Is this all," the onlooker may cry, "all that is left of the complex but fascinating personality which has always contributed so largely to the charm of the Bible?" Not quite. But even if we had lost everything save this, there might perchance be gain in our loss. It is exceedingly desirable that we should have brought home to us the worth of the non-theological virtues. The qualities enumerated above are not sufficient to make us Christians, but the lack of any of them leaves us imperfect Christians. It is an apostle who says, "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." None are in greater need of the injunction than those whose chief interest lies in theology. And let it be added that if the second king of Israel occupies a lower position in religious knowledge than later leaders of Hebrew thought, the study which discloses this exhibits him as standing considerably above his predecessors and the mass of his contemporaries. The river of God's grace waxes broader and fuller with the flow of time. The Bible is not a Chinese picture which has no perspective.

To realize how delicately and reverently the investigation on which these conclusions depend has been conducted, the book itself must be read.¹ Our space will only admit of a

¹ Contrast Renan's tone in all the chapters of his *Histoire* which deal with

reference to two instances in which real help is afforded to lovers of Holy Scripture. Discoursing on the assertion that David was a man after God's heart, Canon Cheyne says: "Let us look at the context. The words which follow our text should remove all doubt as to the writer's meaning. He continues thus, 'And Jehovah hath commanded him to be captain over his people.' A 'man after God's mind' (for 'heart,' as often elsewhere, means 'mind' or 'purpose') is one in whom the God of Israel has found the qualities of a captain or leader, just as 'shepherd according to my heart' (Jer. iii. 15) signifies 'rulers who shall answer the purpose for which I send them.' It is equivalent to 'Jehovah's anointed,' which means one who, whether with or without the sacramental oil, has received the anointing of the Spirit, has had his natural faculty of leadership supernaturally heightened." This piece of straightforward exegesis is more effectual than all apologetic shifts, not only in banishing the unbeliever's "shallow sneer," but also in removing the uneasiness which the strong language of the text has caused to devout souls. An almost equally grave difficulty is disposed of, and this time by means of pure criticism, in the second example which we have selected. Neither "a man after God's own heart" nor even "a verray perfight gentil knight" does he seem who dies "with the words of blood and perfidy on his lips," charging Solomon to put Joab and Shimei to death. No one will accuse Wellhausen or Stade of holding a brief for the old king. But Canon Cheyne has their support when he decides, on critical grounds, that the speech in question is not authentic, originating rather from a narrator "who sought to relieve the pious builder of the temple from the respon-

David. The Frenchman's repugnance has caused him to be unfair and irreverent. The English writer is under no temptation, either to extenuate or to set down aught in malice; he knows too well that good of one kind or another must ensue from the coming face to face with any well-ascertained truth.

sibility of some doubtful acts by ascribing them to the influence of David.”¹

A hearty agreement with the results obtained by these studies of the great king's life, taken as a whole, does not involve the acceptance of every detail. On the one hand David's treatment of Mephibosheth may admit of a more favourable construction. “Thou and Ziba divide the land” scarcely deserves to be characterized as “the iniquitous sentence.” True, “either Mephibosheth was a traitor or not.” But some allowance must be made for the difficulty of arriving at a sure decision amidst the excitement, confusion, and weariness of such a return? And if, as even Renan believes, there were grounds for suspecting the fidelity of the accused man, the sentence, so far from being iniquitous, leaned to the side of mercy. On the other hand, it is a little unsafe to use the statement that his were “wars of Jehovah” as a proof that he did not fight merely for glory. The inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, with their repeated assertions that this and the other campaign were undertaken by the direction of Asshur, and the declarations of Mesha, such as “Chemosh said to me, ‘Go down, fight against Horonaim,’” compel us to recognise that at that period and amongst those peoples all wars were thought of as under the patronage of the national god. And when Canon Cheyne supports his view in a footnote with the words: “The prophet Amos recognises a religious significance in David's conquests (Amos ix. 12, where read ‘which *were* called’),” we cannot help doubting whether there is any justification for this special reference of the prophet's words to victories won so long before his own day.

If the kernel of the David-narratives has been reached by separating the genuinely historical notices from the legen-

¹ It may be remarked, in passing, that the same instrument, criticism, has made it possible to perform a like act of justice to Saul. See pp. 61, 62.

dary, it may be feared that the latter will be thrown aside as worthless. But this is by no means the case. The story of David's encounter with Goliath (1 Sam. xvii.) is ascribed to the prophet Hosea's time, later, that is, than the other account (1 Sam. xvi. 14-23) of the young man's introduction to Saul, which belongs to a document of the tenth or ninth century B.C. Its later origin makes it less likely to be historically true. Moreover its substance is contradicted by 2 Sam. xxi. 19,¹ which tells us that Goliath was slain by Elhanan the Bethlehemite. Tradition has credited its favourite, David, with another man's achievement. But the form in which that tradition has been preserved bears the impress of the divine Spirit, who converted what would otherwise have been mere folk-tales into vehicles of religious instruction for all ages. So, at least, Canon Cheyne believes. He is never weary of insisting that there is a truth of poetry as well as a truth of history. And is he not right? Bald records of events, however correct, fail to convey a just idea of the actors in those events. The poet and the romance-writer bring us into living contact with men of like passions with ourselves. The imaginative insight which goes to the heart of things human and divine, seconded by the plastic skill which embodies ideas in suitable shapes, is one of the best gifts of God. Let the parables of our Lord bear witness! And the exquisite romance which depicts the stripling slaying the giant is too full of "the truth which is the germ of gospel truth, that 'God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble,'" to allow of our doubting for a moment that the Spirit of wisdom guided the writer's mind. The "use of edifying," to which it may be put by a sympathetic student and teacher could not be better exemplified than by the closing pages of the first part of this book: "Like David we must put off all fancied superiorities:

¹ From the same document as 1 Samuel xvi. 14-23.

Saul's armour will be as useless as Goliath's in the day of battle. . . . Do you ask what the sling of the Christian is? It is the mind renewed in the image of Christ, which like the sun-flower turns constantly to the sun. And his stones from the brook are those short, strong, dart-like prayers, fitly called ejaculations, partly those passages of Scripture which in time of need the Spirit of God blesses to his edification. . . . The forces in society which make against the spiritual life are numerous and powerful. But there is a way, as the psalmist tells us, 'to still the enemy and the avenger,' not to extinguish him, but to still the fury of his assault. In describing it, the psalmist uses a strange but expressive figure. The prayers and praises of believers form, he says, a tower of strength, in which God and His people dwell together, and against which no enemy can prevail:—*with the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast established a stronghold.*" How one of the more learned of the old Puritan divines would have delighted in this! How they cherished the power here displayed of reaching an unexpected, beautiful idea by a literal rendering of the Scriptures which they loved so well!

On a considerable portion of the matter contained in the second part of this volume the readers of THE EXPOSITOR may be presumed to have already formed an opinion, seeing that almost all the Psalm-studies have appeared in the pages of this periodical. Those on Psalm li. are indeed the only exception. Fortunately the exception is of such a nature as to furnish an excellent opportunity of considering the principles on which our author everywhere works. We are all familiar with the heading of the poem: "For the chief musician. A Psalm of David, when Nathan the prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bath-Sheba."¹

¹ It should, nevertheless, be observed that in the Hexaplar LXX the title has a shorter form:—*Ἐἰς τὸ τέλος ψαλμοῦ τῷ Δαβὶδ*, and Aquila gives *Τῷ νικοποιοῦ μελῳδῆμα τοῦ Δαβὶδ*. Staerk's article in the current number of Stade's *Zeit-*

Here a definite historical background is supplied. Close scrutiny of the psalm ought to make it possible to determine whether the fallen, but now penitent, king was the writer and, concurrently, to come to some conclusion as to the value of these titles which have been prefixed to the psalms. In the brief compass of this paper we cannot exhibit the force of the argument by which it is shown that the ideas which lie at the root of the poem are those of Jeremiah and the second Isaiah, so that the "I" who speaks must be understood of the Church-nation which was formed after the return from Babylon.¹ If any one doubts whether the community could be regarded as an individual, he has but to read Isaiah xlix. 1-4:² and if he would see how many difficulties are removed, either by this, or, in some cases, by the kindred conception of the "I" as a typical Israelite speaking for others as well as himself, he may be recommended to go through the psalter trying how many psalms will bear its application. Let us turn to one or two of the arguments founded on special expres-

schrift gives a full view of the titles prefixed in the Massoretic Text and the important ancient versions to the psalms which have a heading. The best illustration of the purely subjective considerations which have determined the authors of these headings is furnished by the divergences which are thus made visible. See, for example, how they dealt with Psalm lxxx.

¹ It is to be regretted that there is no translation available for English readers of Smend's essay, *Ueber das Ich der Psalmen*. On some points the paper is open to criticism, but the connected study of the "I" throughout the Psalter is very impressive. For corrections of Smend, see Steckhoven in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1889, Staerk in the same, 1892, and Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 180, 350.

² Canon Cheyne anticipates the objection that ver. 5, "Behold, in iniquity was I brought forth, and in sin did my mother conceive me," must have been the utterance of an individual. Here again the appeal to the second Isaiah comes in:—"Thy first father hath sinned": "Thou wast called 'Rebellious from the womb': "Jehovah hath called me from the womb. . . . And He said unto me, Thou art My servant; Israel in whom I will be glorified." National unity is easily realized amidst national calamities. And the idea of the individuality of the religious community presented itself more naturally to the Jew returned from the Exile or the Hebrew Christian of Apostolic times than to us whose whole religious life is coloured by the consciousness of "unhappy divisions."

sions here employed. On the words "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, etc.," Canon Cheyne says: "The ordinary reference of this verse to David's confession of his sin . . . involves too great a strain upon our faith . . . 'Against thee, thee only,' could only be said by the Jewish Church which made it its chief concern to carry out the precepts of the Law. . . . But how could a just and generous man, like David, after having fallen into the triple sin of treachery, murder and adultery, permit such bold words to issue from his lips? . . . Cruelly oppressed by the kings of Babylon and Persia, against whom it [the Jewish community] had not sinned, it bethinks itself of one greater than they, against whom it is conscious of having deeply sinned, etc." To the present writer this reasoning is conclusive both on the positive and on the negative side. An attempt has, indeed, been made to evade its force by the assertion that "a 'sin' in the Old Testament is always against God." To make this plausible such passages as Genesis xx. 9, Judges xi. 27, Jeremiah xxxvii. 18 have to be explained away; and the attempted explanations entirely miss the main point, which is simply this, "What is the *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament with regard to the word rendered 'to sin'?" Are men called, *no matter by whom*, "sinners" against their fellow-men?¹ And may it not be added that if an Old Testament writer could not entertain the thought that sin against another man was possible he certainly would not need to declare "against Thee *only* have I sinned." On that hypothesis, "he doth protest too much." A second argument for the late date of the Psalm is furnished by the comparison of "Cast me not away from Thy presence," ver. 11, with 2 Kings xxiv. 20, where the

¹ Canon Driver concedes more than is necessary when he says: "An injury to a neighbour is in the Old Testament a 'sin' against Him." Neither the etymology nor the usage of the word requires this. 1 Kings i. 19 is well worthy of notice.

removal of Israel from the Holy Land is thus described:—“For through the anger of Jehovah did it come to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until He had cast them out from His presence.” The language of the historian proves the possibility of the *community* offering the prayer of Psalm liii. The context of this petition bespeaks for it an incomparably deeper and more spiritual meaning than the words bore in the historian’s day. Must not a long interval and much experience have intervened? A word or two remain to be said on the last two verses of the Psalm. Both in the Bampton Lectures and in the *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism* it is maintained that these verses were appended by a somewhat later author. Notwithstanding the deserved authority of such writers as Smend and Driver there is good reason for this view. The former believes vers. 16, 17 to be a denial of the propitiatory power of sacrifice in the time then present and 18, 19 to refer to the acceptableness of the thank-offerings which will be presented in the Messianic future; the two ideas being thus in *contrast*, not in *contradiction*, to each other. The latter sees a *contradiction*, which can only be neutralized by the assumption that the subject is the nation:—“The restoration of Jerusalem would be the sign that God was reconciled to His people (Isa. xl. 2) and would accept the sacrifices in which He had now no pleasure.” It is far more satisfactory to bring the body of the Psalm later down than the indefinite “during the Exile,” to date it immediately before Nehemiah’s time, to look upon 16, 17 as the utterance of one who had pierced through the mere ritual of sacrifice to its inner meaning, and upon 18, 19 as an addendum supplied by one who was deeply interested in Nehemiah’s undertaking and wished to encourage his fellow-toilers. Not that the writer of the bulk of the psalm would have objected to join in the sacrifices to which the author of the addendum looked forward: the early Christians worshipped

in the temple. But there is no "now" in ver. 16; and the contrast—if the word "contradiction" be justly objected to—between the combined negative and positive statements of vers. 16, 17 on the one hand and the sentiment of ver. 19 on the other is too marked to justify our believing in the unity of authorship. One point is clear: whoever penned the closing verses of the psalm wrote when the walls of Jerusalem were laid low.¹

Falsus in uno falsus in omnibus would be too harsh a disparagement of the titles which stand at the head of many of these poems. A candid examination of Psalm li. does, however, justify us in declining to be bound by them. It remains, therefore, to investigate the origin and date of each psalm in the light of the evidence which itself provides. Obviously this requires a delicate linguistic tact, a fine literary taste, a large acquaintance with the history of Israel and the nations with which it came into contact, a mind saturated with Biblical thoughts, and fully made up on the general question as to the order in which those thoughts were given to Israel and, last not least, a deep sympathy with the writers. Cowper's enumeration of essentials² is still worth remembering but it needs many

¹ In the June Number of *The Expository Times* Dr. Almond says:—"The 'restoration' of Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Psalms. What is referred to is the building of Solomon's temple and Solomon's walls." But Dr. Almond knows that where we should employ the compound verb "to rebuild" the Old Testament uses the simple form "to build." And it is not very likely that the Psalmist would have contented himself with such an expression as "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: Build Thou the walls of Jerusalem" if he had been thinking of Solomon's temple and Solomon's walls. It is the city, much more directly than the temple, to which this language points.

² "A critic on the sacred book should be
Candid and learn'd, dispassionate and free;
Free from the wayward bias bigots feel;
From fancy's influence, and intemperate zeal;
But, above all (or let the wretch refrain,
Nor touch the page he cannot but profane)
Free from the domineering power of lust;
A lewd interpreter is never just."

additions in our day. Few of us combine all these qualifications. We must, therefore, examine, candidly, but reverently, the results which experts obtain. It is already well known that the author of the work before us entertains no doubt that with the probable exception of Psalm xviii. and a portion of Psalm lx. the Psalter which we now possess was composed after the Exile. The writer of this notice is free to avow his persuasion that Old Testament scholars will gradually approximate to some such conclusion, and that the Christian public will not find it difficult to learn that no injury whatever is thus done to their "most holy faith." There will not be unanimity as to the groups, Persian, early Greek, Maccabean, to which individual poems belong. But there will be a growing consensus of opinion that the Psalms originated in phases of religious life other than those which prevailed prior to the exile. God's people were led slowly forward. They did not, in the person of such a man as David, reach that almost evangelical sense of the evil of sin which is evinced in the fifty-first Psalm and then fall back into the naturalism which marked centuries of the succeeding history. The imperfect morality and religion of the early kingdom passed by many stages into the spirituality which was only possible after Israel had been torn up by the roots from the holy land, and made, perforce, independent of temple and altar. They were "battered with the shocks of doom, To shape and use." There will be other disagreements. On the precise circumstances out of which individual psalms arose, there is room for much divergence of opinion, and in some cases there can be no such thing as finality. The sixty-eighth, *e.g.*, which the Bampton Lectures date about 198 B.C., has been explained within the last few years in what at first sight seems a bewildering number of ways: the beginning of the war against Syria and Ammon in David's reign; the close of that war; the campaign of Jehoshaphat

and Joram against Moab; Hezekiah's return from a campaign East of the Jordan; events in Zedekiah's reign; hopes of return cherished by the Babylonian exiles; the impression produced by the Battle of Issus; the dedication of the second temple; a festal procession between 220 and 170 B.C.; the rededication of the temple by Judas Maccabeus. Yet the duty of deciding is not so formidable as it looks. The general principles which the student has previously adopted will exclude some or other of these groups. Special considerations, such as an excessive number of textual alterations or an evident doing violence to the natural meaning of words will determine the rejection of others. Meanwhile the reader will, at all events, have been gathering many beautiful illustrations of the psalm he has studied. Canon Cheyne lays great, not unduly great, stress on the duty of endeavouring to get at the history behind the psalm. His psalm-studies sufficiently testify to the profit thus obtained. The complementary duty is that of avoiding dogmatism. In his brilliant attempt to account for the sixty-eighth psalm by the impressions which Alexander's great victory at Issus produced, Hilgenfeld says, "The whole Psalm appears to me to allow of no other explanation." This saying expresses the very temper of mind against which we must be on our guard. To prove that a certain set of historical circumstances correspond to this or that section of the Bible is not quite the same thing as proving that the section originated in those circumstances and no others. We are not so fully informed as to the events which happened and the conditions which prevailed during the period from Ezra to the Christian Era to allow of our asserting that nothing, unknown to us, occurred which would still better explain some of the writings with which we have to deal. And we remember that Ernest Havet, in *La Modernité des Prophètes*, so compared the history of the two centuries

before Christ with the prophetic books as to convince himself that the first Isaiah wrote in the days of Simon Maccabeus and Hosea whilst John Hyrcanus ruled; that the second Isaiah veiled the identity of Herod under the name Cyrus; and, in fact, that none of these works are earlier than the second century B.C. It is, of course, true that Havet was no Hebraist. Yet the beacon-light of his errors may serve to warn off really competent linguists and save them from the rocks. A historical background is valuable: our belief that we have found one must not preclude further inquiry.

Amongst the fresh matter with which this volume is enriched the essay on "The Inspiration of the Psalmists" holds an important place. Not that it provides a new definition of Inspiration. "I have myself no theory of inspiration to offer," is the author's frank confession. But theologians of a much more dogmatic type have felt the same necessity of modesty. "The real question," Archdeacon Lee said,¹ "with which our inquiry is concerned is the result of this divine influence, as presented to us in the pages of Scripture, *not* the manner according to which it has pleased God that this result should be obtained." Would that this feeling of reverent caution had been consistently cherished by the framers of systems of theology! *Est etiam nesciendi quædam ars.* No theory of the mode of communication between the Inspiring and the inspired is verifiable. It is enough if we are presented with "some sufficient reasons for holding the Psalms to be 'inspired.'" Criticism has been supposed to be subversive of this belief. Not unnaturally, therefore, the first reason adduced in the essay is a critical one. Assuming it to be demonstrated that the psalmists lived after the Return from the Exile, they must have written as representatives of the Spirit-bearing community which then came into existence, and the very heart

¹ *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 28.

of their psalms being the prophetic assurance that God had accepted His people's prayers, the men who were the media of these divine assurances must have been inspired. The second argument is that "their words have a greater fulness of meaning than those of other gifted religious poets. . . . The Hebrew poets had in some sense a more direct contact with the inspiring Spirit than any previous or subsequent religious poets." There is a larger proportion of the divine in their works. And, thirdly, "The works of the psalmists have exercised a formative influence over a far greater multitude than any of the 'prophetic masters' of the past or the present." The effects which they have produced, no less than the contents of their songs and the position occupied by the singers, are evidence that "a special creative impulse" has been at work. This is a brief and therefore an inadequate summary of the reasons advanced. But however inadequate for other purposes, it warrants the conclusion that henceforward no one will be entitled to assert that the critic is a disbeliever in Inspiration. His is a real belief in a real Inspiration, although he may not ascribe to it the peculiarity, the absolute uniqueness, with which some readers credit the writers of the Bible. Let such, however, remember in fairness that it is Inspiration, not Revelation,¹ which is being discussed, and that the occasion of the discussion is the Book of Psalms, not the first chapter of S. John's Gospel. Canon Cheyne, however, will not purchase adherents by disguising his convictions. To him Zarathustra, Vasishtha, Pindar, Dante and Browning are inspired. This may be deemed a lowering of the gift, a putting it into

¹ On the distinction between the two see Lee, *The Inspiration*, etc., p. 27. It is, of course, doubtful whether the Oriel professor would speak of Revelation in terms satisfactory to a theologian of the stricter school. His view of the gradual evolution of the doctrine of the Messiah, for example, is removed by a long interval from that which sees in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah a direct prophecy of the sufferings of Jesus. But the time has surely come for an unstinted and hearty recognition of the fact that in the one view as in the other the truth in question is seen to come from God.

the same category as genius. But he is thinking of the extraordinary insight of these men into *moral* and *religious* truth, and the extraordinary force with which they declared this. Nor does he put them on the same line with the psalmists, as the noteworthy words quoted above from his second argument conclusively show. We shall all admit the essence of what he contends for, viz., that every intuition of spiritual truth is given by the Spirit of all truth and goodness. On this, as on many points, there would be less disagreement if we could discontinue for a time the use of technical terms, substituting in place of them descriptive phrases. And whether we find it possible to agree on this or not we may all be profited by the thought which makes itself felt throughout this chapter: "Only through inspiration can we adequately understand the writings of inspired men. Inspiration is an inward state, not only of the writer or writers of a Scripture, but also in their various degrees of its qualified interpreters and readers." The fact of greatest importance to the religious life is the nearness of God to ourselves, with all the possibilities which this involves. A hearty belief in the fact and the possibilities gives reality to the prayer that He may "cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit," and the yet more remarkable Whitsunday collect, which is not careful to discriminate sharply between the light by which the hearts of the faithful were taught at the Pentecost and that by which we may have "a right judgment in all things." Whatever dulls this belief is *pro tanto* atheistic.

It was hardly to be expected that the volume would close without a reference to the grave disputes which have been waged concerning our Lord's use of the cxth psalm. The contribution here made is in the form of a suggested compromise: "While the liberals grant the bare possibility that divine oracles like those in Psalm cx. 1, 4 may have been delivered by Gad or Nathan to David, the conservatives on

their side" are to "admit that the poetical setting of such oracles must have been considerably modified between the times of David and of Simon the Maccabee." The weak point which vitiates such compromises is that each side is uneasily doubtful of its own sincerity and at the same time suspicious of the other's. We fear there is nothing for it but to leave the hostile forces to fight out their battle. It is unhappily too late in the day to urge the late Bishop of Carlisle's plea¹ against the dragging the holy name of Jesus into a literary controversy, but there must be still no inconsiderable number of persons who will exercise their judgment without any reference to this. Their reverence for the incarnate Son of God makes them careful not to invoke His authority in such wise as to imperil it. They will claim the right to investigate the date of a psalm by weighing the evidence appropriate to such an inquiry. They will accept any natural, unstrained explanation of the use to which the Christ put the psalm. And if no such explanation presented itself—which is not the case here—they would not even endeavour to overcome their repugnance to all attempts at probing the intellect of Jesus beyond the point to which He has laid His holy mind open to us.

¹ "I think we have no such knowledge of the limitations, to which the Son of God submitted Himself in His assumption of human flesh, as would justify us in anticipating the attitude which would be assumed by Him with relation to human knowledge of various kinds. No one has a right to say, for instance, that in His humanity all past history was open to the mind of the Lord Christ. . . . If our Lord speaks of a certain document as the work of Moses, or of another as the work of David, according to the current language of His time, I think that His words ought not to be quoted as deciding a modern controversy as to authorship. We have no right to argue that in virtue of His divine nature He *must* have known the truth, and that He *could* not have said anything which was opposed to the truth. Reasoning of this kind appears to some persons incontrovertible; to me it appears delusive and dangerous. Delusive, because it implies that we know the nature of the limitations imposed upon Himself by the Son of God, when He condescended to become man; dangerous, because we imperil a doctrine of supreme importance by submitting it to a test to which there is no proof that it ought ever to have been subjected."—From Dr. Goodwin's last Visitation Charge. *Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit!*

In the June issue of an ably conducted paper we are referred to an article "from which you may learn once for all what the Higher Criticism really is." May we venture to appropriate this language and apply it to the *Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism*? It is a book in which may certainly be seen the Higher Criticism in its best aspect—bold, keen, constructive, reverent, deeply religious. Every page testifies that the use of a strong light need not damage the eyes through which we see the beauty of holiness, that the habit of investigation need not deaden the feelings of humility and love. Can criticism be devout? This book is the answer to the question.

JOHN TAYLOR.

SOME CASES OF POSSESSION.

1. *THE DEMONIAK IN THE SYNAGOGUE.*
(MARK i. 23-27; LUKE iv. 33-36.)
2. *THE WOMAN WITH A SPIRIT OF INFIRMITY.*
(LUKE xiii. 10-17.)
3. *THE MAN WITH A DEAF AND DUMB SPIRIT.*
(MATT. ix. 32-34.)

WE have now reached the most disputed phenomenon in all the Gospel story, and to many reverent minds the most perplexing. It will be convenient to treat, along with the first example of demoniacal affliction, two very minor ones, and after examining the narratives, to consider the abstract question of what is called possession. In doing this it will be wise to observe closely what expressions are used in Scripture.

The first narrative is that which St. Mark has placed foremost of all the miracles in his Gospel. He tells us that the early teaching of Jesus impressed men above all else by its authority, strangely contrasting with the servile dependence of their scribes, not only on the written law, but on the

most whimsical inferences from the letters, and even from the shape of the letters which spelled the precept. And this impression was deepened when a demon was cast out with like authority, by a peremptory mandate, without invocation and without instrumentality. It will soon appear that the same contrast with ordinary methods existed in the authority which wrought the miracle as in that which gave energy to the discourse.

In the synagogue was a man with an unclean spirit (*ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ*, Mark i. 23), a man who had a spirit of an unclean demon (*ἔχων πνεῦμα διαμονίου ἀκαθάρτου*, Luke iv. 33). In the presence of incarnate Purity this hostile influence, hitherto not so refractory as to be excluded from the synagogue, became outrageous. His first word is rather a wild cry of remonstrance than a coherent utterance (*Ἐα* = "Ah," not spoken as a sigh, but indignantly). "Ah, what have we to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art Thou come to destroy us? I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God."

In these words there is already matter for much thought. The calm and elevating presence of Jesus works not as a lofty self-possession is wont to operate on frenzied brains, imparting some healing influence, restoring, at least for awhile, the disturbed reason. Here is something actively hostile, so that what melts the publicans and harlots, and wins the scoffer even on his cross, produces nothing but exasperation. It is some strange wickedness which thus resents the presence of goodness even in its most attractive form, wickedness worthy of him who said, Evil, be thou my good.

Moreover, he is strangely well-informed. How came a crazed vagrant in Capernaum, at so early a period that ordinary observers only said, What new doctrine is this?—to use an appellation so lofty that we do not meet with it again until the great confession in St. John, "We have believed, and we know that Thou art the Holy One of

God" (vi. 69)? It is indeed a remarkable confirmation of the Synoptics by St. John, that Jesus then remembered what impure lips had last made the avowal in which Judas now bore a part, and said, in manifest allusion to it, Have I not chosen you the Twelve, and one of you is a devil? There, however, He spoke of no common demon, but of Satan himself.

The very phrase bears out the narrative. The holiness of Jesus is what most of all torments the unclean spirit. And if, as our Lord taught, the powers of darkness are not divided among themselves, but act in a harmonious league, we can easily understand their widespread knowledge of impending doom, and their passionate outcries, as often as they recognised, in a Being of absolute and aggressive holiness, the conqueror of their champion in the desert. But this is perplexing indeed, when we are bidden to ascribe such penetrating insight to mere disorder of the brain.

Nor does Jesus act as if He had to do with any mere disease. The witness borne to Him is regarded as compromising and an intolerable insult. Never does He suffer the devils to speak because they know Him. In this case He orders the demon to be muzzled and come out from him (*Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*), distinguishing the mischief-maker from the man in a way which no common phraseology made necessary, and which confirmed a superstition, if superstition it was; and substituting for the gentle compassion of the Prince of Grace the stern treatment of an opponent, treatment suited to a fierce animal to be restrained, or a convulsion of nature to be quelled (Mark iv. 39).

Nor is the result identical with what we have already seen of other diseases. They were obedient as soldiers under discipline: when bidden to go, they went. In these cases only is revealed an opposing will, overmatched but still asserting itself. The spirit came out indeed, as it was commanded, but it only just obeyed; and though muzzled,

yet with great outcry, and with convulsion. (*σπαρίσσειν* is used of the tearing of a carcass by dogs, but as a term of medicine it does not of necessity imply the slightest actual rending.) Nothing like this occurs anywhere except with evil spirits, for the progress in the cure of the man born blind is not analogous, and has a deep significance of its own. But with them it is frequent, and in that malignant case which baffled the apostles, it seemed for awhile that the last struggles of the fiend had killed the child (Mark ix. 26). Surely this is the reverse of what myth or legend would have fancied, for ever concerned about the manifestation of power, and especially interested in exhibiting the helplessness of opposing angels. But the object of the gospel is to reveal their fierce hostile volition, eager to hurt even to the last, and the cruel usurpation from which Christ has rescued humanity.

We read that the people marvelled, and inferred the coming of a new doctrine from the authority and power with which He commanded even the unclean spirits.

It is sometimes doubted whether a demoniac could thus have been allowed entrance to the synagogue, or whether, being wild as those of Gerasa, he had burst in upon the congregation in his frenzy. But there is no room for dispute in the case of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (*πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας*). No wild impulses drove her hither and thither. The physical expression of her spiritual thralldom was not convulsion but impotence, and a frame bent down, as base souls are, which look not on things above, but only upon things on the earth. "This is the same disease," said St. Augustine, "from which the Lord released that woman," and without going so far, we may affirm that in the spiritual world the fiends who torment some with convulsions, afflict more with palsy and a downward gaze. We are not told of any direct appeal made by her. But the indignation of

the ruler of the synagogue, who bade the people come on week-days and be healed, perhaps suggests that her presence there was a mute appeal, a special effort made in hope of meeting Christ the Healer. At all events, like every honest attendance in every synagogue, it was an appeal to heaven, and Jesus responded as if it were consciously addressed to Himself. Does any one suppose that no prayers are heeded but such as go up in orthodox form from lips which express exactly the relief that God will grant?

There is great beauty in the behaviour of Christ to women, whether it be the woman of Samaria, whose deep wound He probes so faithfully, yet with so light a touch; or the child of Jairus, to whom He speaks in her own dialect, holding her hand; or the widow of Nain, whom He bids not to weep; or she whose many sins were forgiven her, loving much; or Mary, for whose lavish gift He found so pathetic an apology, "She hath done it unto My burial." This woman He would not heal from a distance, as though an alms were being flung to her,—but neither was it for Him to attend upon her needlessly; such effort as she can yet put forth must be made, and so He calls her to Him, lays His hands upon her, speaks kind words that name not the humiliating cause of her complaint, and even when the adverse criticism of the ruler requires Him to say all, His only thought of her is sympathetic; to Him she is honourable as one of the holy race, and pitiful as, to its owner, a helpless creature that needs drink upon a Sabbath day. He will not refuse release and refreshment to His own. Satan had bound one who belonged by formal covenant to another, and Jesus dwelt with lingering pity on the long period of her thirst, whom He had led away to the watering. "This woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan bound, behold, eighteen years."

It is a beautiful and characteristic incident. But it does not add to our knowledge of the phenomena much more

than this, that Satanic influence lay behind other diseases than violent and outrageous ones, and experience coincided with theory, in affirming that there was gradation in the wickedness even of fiends, so that one could find seven others more wicked than himself.

Nor is there much to dwell upon in the third account. Jesus is on the road when a dumb man is brought to Him "possessed with a devil" (*δαιμονιζόμενον*). And when the demon was cast out, there followed not only tranquility, but the power to speak. And this thorough cure astonished the multitudes, who said, It was never so seen in Israel. It was, as Jesus elsewhere said, far beyond any tranquilizing effect produced by their "own sons." (Matt. xii. 27.)

In two cases therefore, out of three, we find a distinct recognition by the public of something which differentiated Christ's treatment of possession from anything known before. Surely this ought to be taken into account, when people pretend to explain His wonders by the superstitions of his time. Miracles were everywhere. It was impossible that He should escape the imputation of what was ascribed to every popular preacher. But in truth His miracles could not amaze the most critical and scientific age more perfectly than they amazed His own. Instead of saying, We are accustomed to see these inexplicable things, they are quite what we reckoned upon; they said, It was never so seen in Israel. Instead of confounding His treatment of demoniacs with the process which we find in Tobit or Josephus, with invocations, fumigations, mysterious roots, ejection of a fiend so violently as to upset a vessel at some distance, they inferred that a new doctrine had come, because evil spirits were being mastered more thoroughly, by dignified and spiritual methods, with new authority. Here then the attempt to discredit Christ's action by producing sinister analogies breaks down, exactly

as if we should discredit the most scientific treatment of insanity, because oriental physicians apply red-hot coins to the skulls of madmen. The analogy is an antithesis. And it is evident that ludicrous theories of possession cannot begin to disprove the existence of such a thing, until ludicrous theories (religious and irreligious equally) cease to take liberties with all things in heaven and earth.

Undue stress has been laid on the supposed fact that not only are the demons different from that one being who is called the devil, but that these somewhat paltry phenomena are attributed to his inferiors only. It is however plainly said that "Satan" (who is identified with the devil in Rev. xii. 9) bound the woman with a spirit of infirmity. So again, it is right to observe that the phrase "possessed by a devil" is entirely human, not only because the term *διάβολος* belongs to one evil spirit only, but because no expression of Scripture (the most frequent of which are *δαιμόνιον ἔχων* and *δαιμονιζόμενος*) implies any such absolute and permanent usurpation as to be "possessed" asserts. But Dr. Edersheim, for example, laid more stress upon this distinction than it is easy to justify. For it must be allowed that something very like hopeless subjugation is implied in the answer of Jesus to the charge of casting out demons by Beelzebub. If, He said, the chief of the devils is making war on his inferiors, their common dominion will be overturned. But if there is a mere capricious relaxation of their tyranny, this will quickly become evident in a relapse. For there is no power in the victim to bar the door behind his tyrant. A temporary amendment may be apparent, but the house that is swept and garnished is still at the mercy of the merciless, who will re-enter presently with seven demons more wicked than himself. It is hard to see what is involved in the phrase "possessed by a devil" beyond what our Lord sanctioned in the words, "I will return into my house whence I came out."

But what does this dreadful phrase imply? And what is involved in the remarkable fact, that the possessed are usually afflicted with diseases, for the most part of a nervous type, which the expulsion of their enemy removes? Certainly one or other of two inferences. Either the fiend causes the disease or he takes advantage of it. The latter is in some respects the more attractive theory. In the weakness of frames unstrung or unduly excited; in the lamentable reaction of the body on the spirit, so that we seldom discover the perfectly sound mind except in the sound body; in the morbid imaginings of habitual depression or of reaction from violent strain, in any extreme disturbance of "the electric chain wherewith we're darkly bound" the spiritual foes of men would seem to have discovered their opportunity. Every pastor of souls knows that certain diseases are commonly attended with religious depression, and a tendency to despair of grace. We are quite accustomed to instruct such sufferers that their salvation in no sense depends on their mood, and that genuine trust is consistent with extreme despondency, provided the will does not consent to relax its grasp on Christ. St. Paul himself recognised the possibility of spiritual assaults through the body, the innocent frame as distinguished from the lusts of the flesh, when he spoke of the thorn (or stake) in his body as being the messenger of Satan to buffet him.

This power of evil which is not our own, but is attacking us from outside, to use the body as its instrument, may at least illustrate the dread possibility of Satan usurping as his own tool and instrument the body of a man (or a child) in whom volition and energy, not to mention spirituality, had sunk below their proper standard. As a matter of abstract theory, there is no more unreason in believing that a human body may thus fall under a hateful and wicked usurpation, than in accepting what we know of slavery, of Roman Inquisitions, and of the horrible wrongs of woman.

But the matter is not argued only as one of abstract right : it is affirmed that we cannot believe in what we read about possession, because we never see it now. This is the familiar argument of the Persian prince who refused to believe in frost. It is an argument from analogy in circumstances which are essentially not analogous. Did not Jesus say that He was manifested to destroy the works of the devil? and is it rational to expect these works to be just as rampant as before? Even if we concede, what many wise and competent observers utterly deny, that no such phenomena are to be seen anywhere, even in heathen lands, did He not receive gifts for the rebellious also? and is He not the Saviour of all men, though in a higher sense of them only that believe (1 Tim. iv. 10). Surely it is more than credible that the victory over Satan, which is to be consummated when all men bow their wills to Christ, may have already been made good, so far as the human will is not in fault, but only the physical system entangled and enslaved.

What lies behind all these objections, and gives them force, is reluctance even to believe in the existence of the evil one and his followers.

Neither experience nor abstract reasoning appears to give much solid reason for this refusal to accept what is unquestionably the teaching of Scripture, *prima facie*. There is much in our common experience which confirms it. It is certain that we wrestle not (only) with flesh and blood : that evil is pertinacious in its craving even when the spirit condemns it and the flesh is not attracted : in particular, that the smallest concessions to evil are followed by an alarming accession to its urgency, not only when it has proved sweet, but even in spite of disillusion and pain, which ought to estrange mere appetite. It is certain also that men fall into abysses, not only when they throw themselves over, but by being urged and dragged, as really, and in the same sense, as by the most strenuous solicitation of

their fellow-men. Temptation by an unseen tempter, is an experience as familiar to every spiritually-observant man, as rescue by an unseen deliverer.

Nor is there any abstract reason why we should refuse credence to this evidence of our experience reinforcing the evidence of holy writ. All thinkers will agree that our mind is unable to comprehend the origin of evil, and this is no mean confirmation of the doctrine that it did not originate among beings of our rank but was imported to us from other spheres. If so, the question is at an end. And if *our* fall has been able to inflict calamity upon the whole creation which groaneth, why should this principle be confined to us? What abstract reason can be urged against the existence of Beelzebub which would not also disprove the possibility of Heliogabalus, Philip the Second, and the Napoleons? Evil, that is the portent, and not the existence of evil spirits any more than evil men.

And concerning the existence of evil one can only say that Christianity is no more responsible for it than theism, while atheism, the rival of both, can neither explain evil nor good, except by confounding them with the profitable and the injurious, sin with a bad accident, remorse with pain, the joy of an approving conscience with that of a good investment.

G. A. CHADWICK.

ST. PAUL'S FIRST JOURNEY IN ASIA MINOR.

III.

It is characteristic of the way in which the figure of Paul dwarfed that of Barnabas in the memory of later generations in Asia Minor, where the *Acta Thcklæ* was written, that no reference to the latter occurs in these Acta. The companions of Paul are only the treacherous Hermogenes and Demas. I allude to this point because it suggests why

αὐτοῦς was changed to *αὐτόν* in Acts xiv. 1, as it appears in Codex Bezae. The corrector thought only of Paul.¹

According to the route described, Paul and Barnabas entered Iconium from the west, having a good view of the extensive gardens and orchards, which form such a charming feature of the suburbs. C H give a very fair account of Iconium,² of the great part that it played in later history, and of the natural features amid which it is placed, at the western extremity of the vast plains of Lycaonia, with a mountainous country beginning to the west about six miles away, and hills on the north and south at a distance of about ten or twelve miles.

Iconium was in early times a city of Phrygia, situated on the eastern frontier, where Phrygia borders on Lycaonia; but in later times it was called a city of Lycaonia. It is important for our purposes to discover at what period it began to be called a city of Lycaonia and ceased to be Phrygian. Modern geographers all state that no writer later than Xenophon calls Iconium Phrygian; but this is erroneous. In Acts xiv. 6 the apostles, being in danger at Iconium, are said to have "fled to the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Derbe, and the surrounding country." The writer obviously considered that in their flight from Iconium to a town eighteen miles distant they crossed the Lycaonian frontier, and his view is precisely that of Xenophon, who also entered Lycaonia immediately after leaving Iconium.

¹ I hope to discuss the readings of Cod. Bez. relating to Asia Minor in a volume which will shortly appear, and to give reasons which suggest that certain changes were introduced by a reviser familiar with the topography of Asia Minor as it was between A.D. 100 and 150.

² But they ought not to quote Leake's incorrect statement that Mount Argæus in Cappadocia is visible from the outskirts of the city. Hamilton has rightly expressed his disbelief in this statement. The two snowy peaks which Leake saw are the peaks of the Hassan Dagh, a lofty mountain north-west of Tyana, which I have seen from a still greater distance. The summit of Argæus is single, and though it is higher than Hassan Dagh, being about 13,000 feet, it could not possibly be visible from such a distance as Iconium: moreover Hassan Dagh lies right in the way.

The coincidence between the two journeys is perfect: the phrase in Acts is a striking instance of local accuracy and a sufficient proof that even in the first century after Christ Iconium was by the natives reckoned as Phrygian. It is true that Cicero, Strabo, and Pliny make Iconium a Lycaonian city. This constitutes a perfectly satisfactory proof that such was the general usage between at least 100 B.C. and 100 A.D., founded on the fact that for administrative purposes Iconium was united with Lycaonia; but it is quite consistent with the view that the Iconians continued to count themselves Phrygian, and to distinguish themselves from their Lycaonian neighbours even after they were united with them in one governmental district. The witness to this view actually visited Iconium, came into intimate relations with the people, and spoke according to the native fashion.

In the third century another visitor's testimony assigns Iconium to Phrygia. This witness is Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. It is certain that he had visited the city, for he implies that he was present at the council held there about 215 A.D.¹

The supposition that the Iconians clung to their old nationality, after it had become a mere historical memory devoid of political reality, may appear rather hazardous, as the ancients are certainly rather loose in using geographical terms. But one who has studied the history of Asia Minor realises how persistently ethnical and national distinctions were maintained, and how strong were the prejudice and even antipathy felt by each tribe or nation against its neighbours. The Iconians cherished their pride of birth; and in all probability difference of language originally emphasized their diversity from

¹ See Cyprian, Epist. lxxv. 7. On the other hand, Ammianus xiv. 2, 1, speaks of it as a town of Pisidia; the re-arrangement of the provinces about A.D. 297 led to this temporary connexion, which does not concern us. (See *Hist. Geogr.*, p. 393).

their Lycaonian neighbours. It is inconsistent with the whole character of these races to suppose that the Phrygians of Iconium could be brought to call themselves Lycaonians, and to give up the old tribal hatred against their nearest neighbours. It was precisely the nearness which accentuated the hatred.

This tribal jealousy is characteristic of Asia Minor still. The traveller frequently finds the people of two neighbouring villages differing from each other in manners and in dress; they speak the same language, profess the same religion, but they have little intercourse with each other and no intermarriage, and each village regards the other as hateful and alien.¹

But I should hardly have ventured to state this supposition publicly, were I not able to prove it by the testimony of the only native of Iconium whose evidence is preserved to us. In the year 163 A.D. Hierax, one of the Christians associated with Justin Martyr in his trial before the Prefect of Rome, Junius Rusticus, was asked by the judge who his parents were. He replied, "My earthly parents are dead; and I have come hither (*i.e.* as a slave), torn away from Iconium of Phrygia."²

By this single testimony of a native, preserved in such an accidental way, we are enabled to realise that the expression in Acts xiv. 6 was contrary to general usage and peculiar to Iconium, and that it could hardly have occurred except to one who had actually lived in the city and caught

¹ After the "Union of the Lycaonians" was established towards the middle of the second century after Christ, Iconium was not a member; but we are precluded from using this fact as evidence that Iconium still held aloof in social matters from the Lycaonians, for it had been made a Roman colony by Hadrian, and as such it was raised far above the level of the "Union"; the colony Lystra, also, though originally a Lycaonian city, did not condescend to join it.

² Rusticus was prefect in A.D. 163, as Borghesi has shown. Hierax was in all probability a slave of the emperor. It is noteworthy that Ruinart proposed to change Phrygia in the text to Lycaonia, not recognising the importance of this testimony. (See *Acta Justinii*, 3.)

the tone of its population. It is perhaps unnecessary for me to reply to the possible objection that Cicero also visited Iconium, and yet he calls it part of Lycaonia; no one who has comprehended the reasoning would make this objection. Cicero was a Roman governor, who looked on Iconium merely as the chief city of the government district. He did not mix with the natives or catch their expressions. He was devoid of interest in the people, the country, the scenery, and the antiquities; the smallest scrap of political gossip or social scandal from Rome bulked more largely in his mind than the entire interests of Lycaonia. No better proof of the entire change of feeling towards the provincials which was produced by the Imperial government can be found than the contrast between Pliny's letters and Cicero's written from their respective provinces.

The two instances which have been mentioned in this paper, show how accidental is the preservation of the knowledge which enables us to refute negative arguments. But for the answer given in the Roman trial by a native of Iconium in 163 A.D., we should be unable to reply to the argument that the phrase in Acts is inaccurate because Iconium was universally entitled Lycaonian in the centuries immediately before and after Christ; and but for the accident that in 1884 the present writer persevered in minutely examining a hillock in the plain, which had previously been passed by other travellers unnoticed, we should be unable to answer the presumption that the term "Royal Road" as applied to a Roman Imperial road indicated rather a second than a first century date.

Iconium was, under the Persian Empire, a part of Phrygia. Afterwards geographical situation prevailed over tribal character, and it came to be recognised by the world in general as the chief city of Lycaonia. This may probably have taken place during the third century B.C., when it was part of the vast realm ruled by the Seleucid kings of

Syria. It was perhaps in 63 B.C. that a tetrarchy of Lycaonia, containing fourteen cities, with Iconium as capital, was formed. This tetrarchy was given to King Polemo in 39 B.C. by Mark Antony; but soon afterwards it passed into the hands of King Amyntas, and on his death it became a Roman province in 25 B.C. The tetrarchy included Derbe, which was the frontier city of the Roman Empire in this quarter down to the year 72 A.D.

Under the Roman Empire one of the most prominent features in the development of society in Asia Minor was the way in which it was affected first by the Greek and afterwards by the Græco-Roman civilisation. The Greek civilisation was dominant in a few great cities, which had been founded or reorganised by the Greek kings, and into which many foreigners, Greeks, Syrians, and Jews, had been introduced. But it never affected the country very strongly until Roman organisation began to spread abroad that mixture of Greek and Roman ideas which we may style the Græco-Roman civilisation. Few questions relating to Asia Minor during the first two centuries of the Empire can be understood properly without appreciating the true character of this movement, which took the form of a conflict between the native, primitive, oriental, "barbarian"¹ manners of the country and the new European fashion. The western civilisation and spirit spread first through the towns, and at a later time very slowly through the country districts. All who got any education learned the Greek language, adopted Greek manners and no doubt Greek dress also, called themselves, their children, and their gods by Greek names, and affected to identify their religion with that of Greece and Rome. All this class of persons despised the native language and the native ways; and just as they adopted Greek mythology and Greek

¹ The term "barbarian" is of course used in the ancient sense to indicate all that is opposed in character to "Greek."

anthropomorphic spirit in religion, so they often professed to be connected with, or descended from, the Greeks.¹

In Iconium especially, the metropolis of the tetrarchy, the population, we may be sure, prided themselves on their modern spirit and their high civilisation; and they naturally distinguished themselves both from the rustics of the villages, and from the people of the non-Roman part of Lycaonia. Now it is a fact that the latter were called at this time Lycaones; the name appears on the coins of Antiochus IV., who was their king from A.D. 38 to 72.² In contrast to them, the Iconians prided themselves on belonging to the Roman province; for the loyalty of the Asian provinces to the empire was extraordinarily strong. But, if they contrasted themselves with the Lycaonian subjects of a barbarian king, by what ethnic or geographical name could they designate themselves? "Phrygian" was equivalent in popular usage to "slave." There was no possible name for them except that which was derived from the Roman province to which they belonged. I can entertain no doubt that about 50 A.D. the address by which an orator would most please the Iconians, in situations where the term "Iconians" was unsuitable, was *ἄνδρες Γαλάται*, "gentlemen of the province Galatia." This general term was still more necessary in addressing a mixed audience drawn from various towns of the Roman part of Lycaonia.³ Some term applicable to all, yet not calculated

¹ It is characteristic of the inconsistencies and curiosities of "patriotism," that the same persons who stubbornly maintained that they were Phrygians in contrast with their Lycaonian neighbours, also were flattered by any suggestion that they were of the Greek style and kindred. Myths of the Greek origin of Phrygian cities are common (see *e.g.* Synnada, *Hist. Geogr.*, p. 14). It would have been, of course, treasonable to coquet in any way with the name "Roman."

² With a brief interval, 39-41, during which he was deprived of his kingdom by Caligula.

³ But when we take into account that Antioch also was one of the churches addressed, the term "Galatians" becomes still more necessary. In the apostrophe, "Ye foolish Galatians," the adjective is softened by the polite and

to grate on the ethnic prejudices of any, was needed for purposes of courtesy. Besides using this generic term, the skilful orator would also introduce allusions to the Greek feeling and culture of his audience, assuming that they belonged to the more advanced and intelligent part of the population.

This tone of courtesy and solicitude for the feelings of his audience, which we attribute to the supposed orator of the period, is precisely the tone in which Paul addresses the "Galatians"; and he introduces in iii. 28 an allusion to them as Greeks, when he contrasts them with the Jews.

Why then, an objector may urge, does St. Paul countenance the expression, "the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Derbe"? Simply because in the narrative he is expressing himself geographically, and is using the precise words in which his advisers and informants might have described his route to him when he was arranging his flight from Iconium, whereas in the epistle he is using the language of polite address.

The most instructive commentary on St. Paul's way of addressing the Galatians is to be found in the orations of Dio Chrysostom half a century later, addressed to the people of Nikomedea, of Nicæa, of Apameia in Bithynia and of Apameia in Phrygia. In the latter case he pointedly avoids an ethnic term: "Phrygians" had a bad connotation, "Asians" was too general; and he styles them simply "Gentlemen." But he uses the old historic name *Kelainai*, not the modern name *Apameia*, and he speaks of their country sometimes as *Asia*, sometimes by the more precise geographical term *Phrygia*.

An objection may be urged that Christianity was opposed to such a tone as is here implied in the civilised townspeople towards the ruder population of the uncivilised

general ethnic: it would have been personal and rude to say, "Ye foolish Antiochians and Iconians, etc."

extra-Roman districts. But this objection seems not to be in keeping with the facts. The Christian Church in Asia Minor was always opposed to the primitive native character. It was Christianity, and not the Imperial government, which finally destroyed the native languages, and made Greek the universal language of Asia Minor. The new religion was strong in the towns before it had any hold of the country parts. The ruder and the less civilised any district was, the slower was Christianity in permeating it. Christianity in the early centuries was the religion of the more advanced, not of the "barbarian," peoples; and in fact it seems to be nearly confined within the limits of the Roman world, and practically to take little thought of any people beyond, though in theory "Barbarian and Scythian" are included in it.

The account of Iconium by F differs greatly from that which has just been given. He calls it "the capital city of an independent tetrarchy," says that it was not in the province of Galatia, and that "the diversity of political governments which at this time prevailed in Asia Minor was so far an advantage to the apostles that it rendered them more able to escape from one jurisdiction to another." In so far as it concerns antiquities, this view is against the evidence,¹ and in so far as it concerns the character of Paul's action in trying to escape from one jurisdiction to another, is opposed to the theory which is here advocated.

Lystra is about six hours S.S.W. from Iconium. The road passes for a mile or more through the luxuriant gardens of the suburbs, and then across the level plain. It ascends for the first fourteen miles so slightly that it needs a barometer to make the fact perceptible. Then it reaches a range of hills, which stretch outwards in a south-easterly

¹ It would be tedious and unsuitable for the present occasion to discuss the evidence; but the allusion to evidence against him made by F in note 1, p. 378, is sufficient to disprove his own case.

direction from the mountainous country that bounds the vast Lycaonian plains on the west and separates them from the great depression in which are situated the two connected lakes Karalis and Trogitis, now called Bey Sheher and Seidi Sheher lakes (the former the largest in Asia Minor). This range of hills, which entails a further ascent of about 500 feet, gradually diminishes in height as it stretches further away towards the east, and finally sinks down into the plain about ten miles away. After crossing these hills, the road descends into a valley, in breadth about a mile, down the centre of which flows a river ¹ towards the south-east; and on the southern bank of the river about a mile from the place where the road leaves the hills, stands the village of Khatyn Serai, "The Lady's Mansion." The name dates no doubt from the time of the Seljuk Sultans of Roum, when the village was an estate and country residence of some sultana from Konia (as Iconium is now called). Its elevation, about 4,175 feet above the sea and 427 above Iconium, fits it for a summer residence.²

This situation for Lystra was guessed in 1820 by Colonel Leake with his wonderful instinct, and was rejected by succeeding geographers. To Prof. Sterrett belongs the credit of having solved this most important problem by discovering epigraphic proof that Lystra was situated beside Khatyn Serai. The exact site is on a hill in the centre of the valley, a mile north of the modern village, and on the opposite side of the river. The hill rises about 100 to 150 feet above the plain, and the sides are steep. Few traces

¹ This river is wrongly represented in every published map. It has had a considerable course before it reaches Khatyn Serai, draining a large part of the mountain district, in which Kiepert's latest maps represent the water as flowing westwards to Bey Sheher Lake. My friend, Prof. Sterrett, has erred in this point in his *Wolfe Expedition*, pp. 159 and 190. The map in my *Hist. Geogr.* is also wrong: I examined this point in 1891, but the map was complete before that time.

² The heights, which are only approximate, are calculated from my friend Mr. Headlam's aneroid observations.

of ancient buildings remain above the surface. A small ruined church, of no great antiquity, stands in the low ground beneath the hill on the south-west; and beside it a fountain gushes forth from beneath a low arch. This fountain is still counted sacred, and is called Ayasma (*i.e.* *ἀγιασμα*), a generic name in Asia Minor for fountains visited as sacred by the Christians. As Khatyn Serai is a purely Turkish village, this fountain, which has retained its character among the Christians of Iconium, must mark a spot which was peculiarly sacred in ancient Lystra.

A little personal reminiscence, concerning the greatest disappointment of my exploring experiences, may perhaps be pardoned. It gives some idea of the chances of travel, and puts in stronger relief Prof. Sterrett's patience and skill in exploration, to which we owe the discovery of the site of Lystra and all the results that follow from it. When I was travelling in 1882 in the company of Sir Charles Wilson, we had set our hearts on discovering Lystra. Leake's conjecture, confirmed by the fact that Hierocles implies Lystra to be near Iconium, turned our minds to Khatyn Serai; and when we heard that it was reported to contain great remains, we left Iconium with the full expectation of finding Lystra there. But in the village six inscriptions were discovered, four of which were Latin. This preponderance of Latin inscriptions made me certain that a Roman colony must have been situated there; and as Lystra was not a colony, it must be looked for elsewhere. Sir C. Wilson did not admit my reasoning, and maintained his own opinion that Lystra might be there. On the morrow, we rode up the water two hours' distance to Kilisra, and spent great part of the day examining the interesting and really beautiful series of churches, cut in the rock, which prove that an ancient monastery (rather than a town) was situated there. As we returned in the afternoon, our road passed near the ancient

site beside Khatyn Serai, and we thought of crossing the river to examine it. But the day was far spent, and the camp had been sent to a village four hours beyond Khatyn Serai, so that time was short. Had we gone over¹ to the small hill, to a considerable extent artificial, on which the ancient city was built, we should have discovered the large inscribed pedestal on which the colony Lystra recorded the honour which it paid to its founder, the Emperor Augustus, and we should have found that both our opinions were right—Sir C. Wilson's that Lystra was situated at Khatyn Serai, and mine that a Roman colony was situated there. But at that time no evidence was known, no coin of Lystra had been preserved to prove that it was a colony; and the fact remained unknown till 1885, when Prof. Sterrett's exploring instinct guided him to the marble pedestal. Then other evidence came to light: Monsieur Waddington possessed a coin of the colony Lystra, Dr. Imhoof-Blumer another, and the British Museum has recently acquired a third.

Situated on this bold hill, Lystra could easily be made a very strong fortress, and must have been well suited for its purpose of keeping in check the tribes of the mountain districts that lie west and south of it. It was the furthest east of the fortified cities, which Augustus constructed to facilitate the pacification of Pisidia and Isauria;² and for seventy years after its foundation it must have been a town of considerable consequence, proud of its Roman character and its superior rank. As a Lycaonian town Lystra had been quite undistinguished; as a Roman garrison town it was a bulwark of the province Galatia, and a sister city to the great Roman centre at Antioch. A contemporary memorial of this pride of relationship is preserved in the

¹ I must bear the blame for this omission; I had had fever, and was suffering greatly during that part of the journey, and I was ready to take any excuse to get to camp an hour earlier.

² They were really old cities, which Augustus remodelled and reconstituted.

following inscription found in Antioch¹ on a pedestal which once supported a statue of Concord :—

“To the very brilliant colony of Antioch her sister the very brilliant colony of Lystra did honour by presenting the statue of Concord.”

When we consider these facts, we can hardly hesitate to admit that St. Paul might in a letter address the church at Lystra by the Roman provincial title.

Much may yet be discovered at Lystra. We should be especially glad to find some independent proof that a temple of Jupiter before the city (*Διὸς Προπόλεως*) existed there.² From the many examples of such temples quoted by the commentators on Acts, it seems highly probable that there was one at Lystra. The nearest and best analogy, which is still unpublished, may be mentioned here. At Claudiopolis of Isauria, a town in the mountains south-east from Lystra, an inscription in the wall of the mediæval castle records a dedication to Jupiter-before-the-town (*Διὶ Προαστίῳ*). In 1890 Mr. Hogarth and Mr. Headlam visited Lystra along with me; and our hope was to fix the probable position of the temple and perhaps to discover a dedication to the god. In the latter we were disappointed; but there is every probability that some great building once stood beside the pedestal dedicated to Augustus. This pedestal stands near the hill on the south-east side. Looking from the hill down the valley towards the open plain, one cannot fail to see it in front of the city, and the signs of concealed ruins beside it.

The pedestal of Augustus seems not to have been moved from its original place, and there is every probability that the worship of the Imperial founder was connected with the chief temple, as at Ephesus the Augasteum was

¹ Discovered by Prof. Sterrett in 1885; recopied by me in 1886.

² The reading of Cod. Bez. in xiii. 13 is so much more accurate and true to actual usage as to suggest that in this case it preserves a better tradition than the received text.

built within the sacred precinct of Artemis. The other possibility, that the Ayasma marks the peribolos of Zeus and retains the sacred character attaching to the spot in pre-Christian and Christian times alike, is not so probable.

Very little excavation would be needed to verify this identification, and probably to disclose the remains of the temple, in front of whose gates the sacrifice was prepared for the apostles.

The site of Derbe is not established on such certain evidence as that of Lystra. The credit of reaching approximate accuracy about its situation belongs again to Prof. Sterrett. His argument was that "in reading the account [in Acts xiv.], one is impressed with the idea that Derbe cannot be far from Lystra."¹ He therefore placed Derbe between the villages Bossola and Zosta, which are only about two miles distant from each other, and "the ruins of which, being so near together, represent one and the same ancient city." But after visiting the district in 1890, I should say that Bossola is only a Seljuk khan and halting-place on a great road, and that the remains at Zosta are not *in situ*, but have all been carried. The great site of this district is at Gudelissin, three miles W.N.W. from Zosta. Prof. Sterrett rightly observes that "here a large mound, in every way similar to the Assyrian Tels, shows many traces of an ancient village or town." But after thus correctly estimating the antiquity of the site, he proceeds to say with less accuracy that "most of the remains must be referred to Christian influence."²

Gudelissin is the only site in this district where a city of the style of Derbe, the stronghold of "the robber Antipater," could be situated. The remains at Zosta have been taken from it, so that it now presents a bare and

¹ *Wolfe Expedition*, p. 23.

² The site must have been inhabited till a comparatively recent time, as there is a large ruined building of no very ancient date on the upper part of the mound. This building is prominent in the photograph which Mr. Hogarth took of the site.

poor appearance; but excavation in the mound, which is obviously to a great extent artificial, would certainly reveal many traces of a very old city, of the style of Tyana or Zela. The mound belongs to that class which Strabo entitles "mounds of Semiramis," and which are a sure sign of ancient origin and oriental character. On this deserted site excavation would be comparatively inexpensive, the ground could be had for a few pounds, labour in those remote parts costs little, and no difficulty would be experienced with the excavated soil.

Derbe was the frontier city of the Roman province on the south-east, and on this account a certain importance attached to it, which led Claudius to remodel its constitution and to honour it with the name Claudio-Derbe. Probably this took place in the earlier part of his reign; and the hypothesis may be hazarded that Iconium was made jealous by such an honour to another city of the Tetrarchy, and by representations at Rome succeeded in obtaining the same honour towards the end of Claudius's reign, A.D. 50-54.¹

The preceding description of the political situation in Lycaonia in the first half of the first century shows how mistaken are some of the statements which are commonly made about St. Paul's action on this journey. CH consider that "after the cruel treatment they had experienced in the great towns on a frequented route," the apostles retired to a wilder region, "into which the civilisation of the conquering and governing people had hardly penetrated," viz. to Lystra and Derbe. We now see that Lystra was a town of precisely the opposite character, a centre and

¹ The approximate date is assured by C. I. G., 3991, if we may assume that the title *ktistes*, there applied to Papius Præsens, procurator of Galatia about 53-55, implies that the re-modelling of Iconium was conducted by him. The governor of Galatia about this time was Afranius. A coin of Claudio-Iconium bearing his portrait and that of Claudius is preserved at Paris in the national collection, and has been published by M. Babelon (*Mélanges Num.*, p. 57). Governors and procurators regularly held office for a number of years at this time.

stronghold for the "civilisation of the governing people." Paul's procedure was very different from that suggested by C H. So far from going to the less civilised parts, he always sought out the great civilised centres. The towns which he visited for the sake of preaching are as a rule the centres of civilisation and government in their respective districts—Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi. He must have passed through several uncivilised Pisidian towns, such as Adada and Misthia and Vasada; but nothing is recorded about them. He preaches, so far as we are informed, only in the centres of commerce and of Roman life, and among these rank Lystra Colonia and Claudio-Derbe.

This point is one of peculiar importance in studying the effect produced by the Christian religion on the Roman world. It spread at first among the educated more rapidly than among the uneducated; nowhere had it a stronger hold (as Mommsen observes) than in the household and at the court of the emperors. Where Roman organisation and Greek thought have gone, there Paul by preference goes.

Moreover it must be remembered that in the ruder parts of Lycaonia Paul could not have made himself understood. He had to go where Greek was known; and it is pretty certain that at this time Greek was known only in the more important cities, and that there the people were probably for the most part bilingual. In Lystra the Roman settlers no doubt knew Latin as well as Greek, while the native inhabitants, who were much more numerous, spoke both Greek and their native language. Greek then, and not Latin or Lycaonian, would be the common language of these two classes of the population.

In reference to the sacrifice and worship which were tendered to Paul as Hermes and Barnabas as Zeus, it would be quite a misconception to suppose that faith in the old native religion was stronger in Lystra than in more civilised towns, as is implied by C H and F. Where the

Græco-Roman civilisation had established itself, the old religion survived as strongly as ever, but the deities were spoken of by Greek, or sometimes by Roman, names, and were identified with the gods of the more civilised races. This is precisely what we find at Lystra: Zeus and Hermes are the names of the deities as translated into Greek, but the old Lycaonian gods are meant and the Lycaonian language was used, apparently because, in a moment of excitement, it rose more naturally to the lips of the people than the cultured Greek language. It is noteworthy that those to whose lips Lycaonian rose so readily were not converts, but the common city mob.

The commentators aptly compare the pretty tale, localised in these plains, of the visit paid by the same two gods to the old couple, Philemon and Baucis. For the right understanding of the story, we must remember that in this Asian religion Zeus and Hermes are the embodiment of two different aspects of the ultimate divinity, "the god," who was represented sometimes as Zeus, sometimes as Hermes, sometimes as Apollo, according to the special aspect which was for the moment prominent.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

VIII. CERTAIN MODERN THEORIES.

IN earlier papers I have endeavoured to expound the teaching of the various writers of the New Testament about the death of Christ in its relation to the salvation announced by Him. We found that these various writers agree to assert the absolute necessity of the death of Christ for man's salvation and trace this necessity to man's sin; and that St. Paul goes beyond the other Sacred Writers by tracing it to the Law and the Justice of God.

These results at once evoked serious and pressing questions. We asked, Why could not God pardon sin, apart from the death of Christ, by royal prerogative? and, How does the death of the Innocent harmonize with the justice of God the justification of sinners? To these questions, the New Testament gave us no clear and full answer. For an answer to them we now seek.

These questions cannot be set aside as unreasonable. Nor, if asked reverently, can they be condemned as intruding into that which God has not revealed. For many truths are hidden beneath the surface of Holy Scripture and beneath the phenomena around us, in order that they may be the rewards of patient search. Our questions are only an attempt to trace, along lines laid down in the New Testament, the connection between the teaching of Christ and His Apostles and whatever else we know about God's moral government of the world, in order thus to understand this one doctrine as a part of a larger whole. They are prompted by a conviction that, just as the universe is one, consisting of many parts, all related, so every matter of human knowledge stands related to whatever else is known. This deep conviction of the unity of whatever is known, and of whatever exists has grown with the growth of human knowledge; and in all ages it has been a fruitful source of intellectual progress. We may therefore hope to gain, by comparing the teaching of Christ and His Apostles about His death with whatever we know about God's government of men, a fuller knowledge of the relation between the death of Christ and the salvation announced by Him. For all knowledge of broad principles sheds light upon specific cases within their domain.

Notice carefully that the incompleteness of the best answers to these questions does nothing to weaken the foundation of the results already attained. For these results rest on abundant and decisive documentary evidence. Similarly,

we frequently have evidence which compels us to believe that an event has taken place, although we are utterly at a loss to know by what means it has been brought about. So now our loyal acceptance of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles prompts further and reverent research.

We must seek answers in harmony with all the facts of the case; or, in other words, we must seek an hypothesis which, if true, will account for and explain all that the writers of the New Testament say about the death of Christ. If we can find an hypothesis which does this, and which is also the only conceivable explanation of all the facts of the case, we may accept it, so far as it goes, as probably true. To this method of hypotheses tested and verified by facts is due almost all progress of human knowledge. We thus advance from matters of direct observation to broad and deep principles.

Before attempting to construct an hypothesis, I shall in this paper discuss certain modern and popular theories of the Atonement which seem to me to be incorrect or insufficient, yet containing important elements of truth; and in another paper I shall suggest a theory which I think to be in closer harmony with the facts of the case.

The first theory of the Atonement which I shall mention is taken from a well-known published sermon by a great preacher. F. W. Robertson, commenting in Sermon ix., First Series, on the famous words of Caiaphas recorded in John xi. 51, 52, says of the death of Christ, "It was the foresight of all the result of His opposition to the world's sin, and His steady uncompromising battle against it notwithstanding, in every one of its forms, knowing that He must be its victim at the last, which prevented His death from being merely the death of a lamb slain unconsciously on Jewish altars, and elevated it to the dignity of a true and proper sacrifice. We go beyond this, however. It was not merely a sacrifice, it was a sacrifice for sin. 'His soul was

made an offering for sin.' Neither was it only a sacrifice for sin—it was a sacrifice for the world's sin." . . .

"Christ came into collision with the world's evil, and He bore the penalty of that daring. He approached the whirling wheel, and was torn in pieces. He laid His hand upon the cockatrice's den, and its fangs pierced Him. It is the law which governs the conflict with evil. It can be crushed only by suffering from it. . . . The Son of Man who puts His naked foot on the serpent's head, crushes it: but the fang goes into His heel."

Robertson further connects the death of Christ with the immutable "moral Laws of this universe." He attributes it to "the eternal impossibility of violating that law of the universe whereby penalty is annexed to transgression, and must fall, either laden with curse, or rich in blessing."

This is, on the whole, reasonable so far as it goes. The writer does good service by asserting that the death of Christ was no arbitrary act of God, but was itself in harmony with the principles of His moral government of the world. He rightly, though perhaps needlessly, protests, "Let no man say that God was angry with His Son." But it seems to me that in this sermon Robertson has not grappled with the real difficulties of the case; nor has he grasped the central conception of St. Paul touching the death of Christ. He does little or nothing to explain the absolute necessity which compelled Christ to go up to Jerusalem and put Himself in the hands of enemies who, as He knew, would kill Him. Nor does He show how the death of the Innocent harmonizes, as St. Paul teaches, the justification of sinners with the justice of God.

The sermon is valuable chiefly as a not uncalled-for protest against certain coarse misrepresentations of the doctrine of the Atonement. But it does little to elucidate the doctrine.

In a thoughtful and devout work on *The Nature of the Atonement* by M'Leod Campbell, we are taught that Christ

made expiation for our sins by His recognition and confession of them, this recognition by Man of man's guilt being a necessary condition of remission of sins, and being also, in consequence of Christ's voluntary union with us, intensely painful to Him. In chapter vi. page 119 we read: "Without the assumption of an imputation of our guilt, and in perfect harmony with the unbroken consciousness of personal separation from our sins, the Son of God, bearing us and our sins on His heart before the Father, must needs respond to the Father's judgment on our sins, with that confession of their evil and of the righteousness of the wrath of God against them, and holy sorrow because of them, which were due, due in the truth of things, due on our behalf though we could not render it, due from Him as in our nature and our true brother;—what He must needs feel in Himself because of the holiness and love which were in Him—what He must needs utter to the Father in expiation of our sins when He would make intercession for us." Similarly on p. 117: "This confession, as to its own nature, must have been *a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man.*"

It is impossible to reproduce, by one or two short quotations, the teaching of a book. But, as I understand him, this is Campbell's explanation of the relation of the death of Christ to the forgiveness of sins. Sin must be fully acknowledged before it can be forgiven. And, inasmuch as it cannot be fully recognised by guilty man, the Son of God became Man in order that in Him humanity might know the depth of its own fall; and suffered all the moral anguish involved in this recognition.

We have here an important aspect of the Incarnation of the Son of God, viz. the moral pain involved in the contact of a pure human spirit with evil. And doubtless this pain was an essential part of the burden laid by the Father upon the Son for the salvation of men. But the suggestion

before us does nothing to explain the necessity, so conspicuous in the Synoptist Gospels, which gave Christ no choice but to put himself into the hands of His enemies, to go up to Jerusalem and to die. Nor does it explain the prominence, as a means of salvation, given throughout the New Testament to the *death* of Christ upon the *cross*.

Another somewhat similar view demands a moment's attention. Dr. Horace Bushnell, in a volume on *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, ch. i. page 7, says: "Christ, in what is called His vicarious sacrifice, simply engages, at the expense of great suffering and even of death itself, to bring us out of our sins themselves and so out of their penalties; being Himself profoundly identified with us in our fallen state, and burdened in feeling with our evils. . . . Love is a principle essentially vicarious in its own nature, identifying the subject with others, so as to suffer their adversities and pains, and taking on itself the burden of their evils. It does not come in officiously and abruptly, and propose to be substituted in some formal and literal way that overturns all the moral relations of law and desert, but it clings to the evil and lost man as in feeling, afflicted for him, burdened by his ill deserts, incapacities, and pains, encountering gladly any loss or suffering for his sake."

All this is true and good. But, as before, it fails to explain the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ. Indisputably, the death of Christ is frequently appealed to as an amazing manifestation of the infinite love of God to fallen man. But love never prompts a needless sacrifice. Our question comes back to us, as yet unanswered, Whence came the necessity which required, for man's salvation, that Christ should voluntarily surrender Himself to die? The above suggestions unveil interesting and important elements in the work of Christ, but they are only side lights. They do not touch the real difficulties of the case.

Very different from the above is another type of popular

teaching of which I shall select Dr. Chas. Hodge of Princeton as a modern representative. In his *Systematic Theology* vol. ii. page 482 he writes: "The first point is that Christ's work was of the nature of a satisfaction, because it met and answered all the demands of God's law and justice against the sinner. The law no longer condemns the sinner who believes in Christ. Those, however, whom the infinitely holy and strict law of God does not condemn are entitled to the divine fellowship and favour. To them there can be no condemnation. The work of Christ was not, therefore, a mere substitute for the execution of the law, which God in His sovereign mercy saw fit to accept in lieu of what the sinner was bound to render. It had an inherent worth which rendered it a perfect satisfaction, so that justice has no further demands. It is here as in the case of state criminals. If such an offender suffers the penalty which the law prescribes as the punishment of his offence he is no longer liable to condemnation. No further punishment can justly be demanded for that offence. This is what is called the perfection of Christ's satisfaction. It perfectly, from its own intrinsic worth, satisfies the demands of justice. This is the point meant to be illustrated when the work of Christ is compared in Scripture and in the writings of theologians to the payment of a debt. The creditor has no further claims when the debt due to him is fully paid.

This perfection of the satisfaction of Christ, as already remarked, is not due to His having suffered either in kind or degree what the sinner would have been required to endure; but principally to the infinite dignity of His person."

In this quotation, and elsewhere, Dr. Hodge correctly traces the necessity of the death of Christ as a means of man's salvation to the justice of God. He thus holds fast the distinctive feature of St. Paul's teaching on the subject. But I think that he somewhat misrepresents it.

For the Bible never says that Christ has paid the debt of those for whom he died in such manner that the Law has no further claims upon them. And the suggestion that they for whom Christ died are in the position of an offender who has suffered the penalty which the law prescribes and is therefore no longer liable to condemnation is, in my view, repugnant to all principles of justice. It seems to me that Dr. Hodge does nothing to meet our real difficulty, viz. to explain how the death of Him who knew no sin made consistent with the justice of God the pardon of sinners.

Dr. Hodge complicates the question by speaking (*Systematic Theology* vol. ii. page 359) of a "covenant between the Father and the Son in reference to the salvation of men." Of such Covenant we never read in the Bible. Both Old and New Covenants are between God and man. So Jeremiah xxxi. 33, quoted in Hebrews viii. 10: "This is the Covenant which I will make with the house of Israel." It is true that Christ speaks in John vi. 39 of those whom the Father had given to him. But we have no hint of negotiation between the Persons of the Godhead touching the salvation of men. And such negotiation is inconsistent with the unity of the Godhead.

A still more serious error, found here and there in popular religious literature, is that which represents the Father as implacable, and the Son as pleading for those whom the Father was minded to slay. In the New Testament, the coming of Christ is even traced to the infinite love of God who gave up His Son to die in order to save fallen man.

The results of this paper are chiefly negative. It seemed to me well, before attempting to grapple with the real difficulties of the case, difficulties which I can only partly remove, to consider certain unsatisfactory solutions which have been offered, in hope that the failure of others may suggest a better path.

In my next paper I shall endeavour to answer the two

questions before us, viz. (1) Why could not God pardon sin by mere prerogative, as a father forgives a penitent child? and, if this be impossible, (2) How does the death of an Innocent Victim harmonize with the justice of God the pardon of the guilty? I shall then conclude this series by a paper discussing the question, For whom did Christ die?

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

*HEROD THE TETRARCH: A STUDY OF
CONSCIENCE.*

ONE of the fairest ways of testing the authenticity of the Gospels, just as they lie before us, is to take some one narrative recorded by more than one Evangelist, embracing a number of incidents, some of them small, and extending over a considerable period; and, having put all the details together, to see whether they make a consistent story, and, especially if we happen to know something of the case from other sources, whether the two agree together. That there should be even one case in which all these conditions meet, is hardly what we should expect. But it so happens that the narrative we have fixed on—that of Herod the Tetrarch—is recorded or referred to by all the four Evangelists; that it embraces a number of incidents; that it extends over a period of at least two years, and that Josephus expressly refers to it as a known historical fact. Let us, then, take the facts, just as we read them in the Gospels, and see if they do not speak for themselves, assuring us of the authenticity of the story and of the Gospels which tell it even in its details, many of which are of the most startling and unexpected nature.

Herod Antipas was left by his father, Herod the Great, the two provinces of Galilee and Peræa, with the title of Tetrarch. He married the daughter of Aretas, the king of

Arabia Petraea, but afterwards fell in love with Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Herod Philip, and with her he contracted an incestuary marriage—a marriage which Josephus tells us eventually cost him his crown.¹

That Herod had a sense of religion is evident from several things. He had John the Baptist at his court, and for a considerable time. How he came to be there, we are not told, but we may conjecture. Herod appears to have been well brought up; for we happen to know that his foster-brother, Manaen, not only became a Christian, but was among the prophets and teachers that were in the Church of Antioch at the time when Saul and Barnabas were sent forth on first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 1). And what is more, Herod's own steward had a Christian wife, and one of a small band of female disciples, who in gratitude for cures wrought upon by our Lord, accompanied Him on one of His preaching and healing tours with the Twelve, and had the privilege of supplying their temporal wants. These things coming to the knowledge of Herod, and hints given perhaps by his steward, may have led to a desire to see the Baptist. Be this as it may, here we find the stern prophet. Nor does he spare the king. He "reproved Herod for all the evil things that he had done" (Luke iii. 19). But so far from resenting it, he "did many things"²—that is, redressed certain wrongs in his administration, and heard John gladly (Mark vi. 20). But John went beyond this. He dared to tell Herod "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (Mark vi. 18). That Herod could stand even that, says much for his *open-*

¹ For, unable to endure the presence of such a woman at her court, his lawful wife, returned to her father, who never rested till he was able to raise an army enough to go to war with Herod, which at length he did, and not only defeated but utterly ruined him.

² It is to be regretted that the R.V. did not adhere to the received text, as in the A.V., but read "was perplexed." The context seems clearly in favour of the received text.

ness to conviction. In fact, he stood in awe of that man of God. Herod (says the Evangelist) feared John, "knowing that he was a righteous man and a holy."

But that infamous woman, his paramour, could not stand it. Nothing would satisfy her but that the man who would dare to lift the veil from her sin should be put to death. She "set herself against him, and desired to kill him." But Herod "kept him safe" (ver. 20). This, however, was far from easy. She would never let him alone. "How long will you stand that? How long is that hateful man to be seen at this court? If not put to death, put him in prison." To this as a compromise he seems to have yielded, but with reluctance, probably, and only for peace' sake. "Herod laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison, for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife" (Matt. xix. 3).

From this time we lose sight of the imprisoned Baptist; but when he does re-appear in the Gospels, we gather (from the intervening events recorded) that he must have lain in prison at least a full year.¹

One touching incident recorded of the Baptist while he lay in prison speaks well for Herod at that time. The Baptist, it seems, had disciples of his own, who for some unknown reason, stood aloof from our Lord's more attached followers. These disciples appear to have had free access to their imprisoned master, from which we cannot but conclude that Herod, when he had to consent to order the Baptist to be imprisoned, took care that he should have liberty to see his friends.

At length the crisis came. "When a convenient day came, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, with the high captains and the chief men of Galilee,

¹ The prison itself was (as will appear by-and-by) doubtless the castle of Machærus, which was built at the south eastern boundary of Herod's dominions, overlooking the Dead Sea, and it would be the keep of the castle.

and when the daughter of Herodias herself¹ came in and danced, she pleased Herod and those that sat at meat with him." Beyond doubt, this was a plot of that vile woman, her mother. She knew what would excite the passions of men heated with wine; and the girl would be old enough to be taught by her mother how to dance lasciviously. And she appears to have learnt her lesson well. For it is hard to see how Herod could have promised the girl so preposterous a reward, and even clinch it with an oath, save that he was in his cups. "And the king said unto her, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee. And he swore unto her, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom; and she went out, and said unto her mother (who, though not present, was close at hand, watching the success of this disgusting plot), What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. And she came in haste unto the king, and asked saying, I will that thou forthwith give me in a charger the head of John the Baptist." No doubt the "haste" with which she rushed in was her mother's eagerness to have the order issued at once, and the very words of her reply had been dictated by her mother. What was the half of his kingdom to her? The head of the man who had dared to tell the king that she had no right to be there, was more to her than the whole of the kingdom.

Poor Herod! He had long ago ceased to think of the imprisoned Baptist; but that infamous woman had not. He had yielded to her far enough when he consented to his imprisonment, but nothing would satisfy her but the head of her enemy. For this she had bided her time, and long as it had been in coming, it had come at last. "And the king was exceeding sorry." No doubt of it. But what was he

¹ That is her own daughter by her lawful husband—not Herod's daughter (by this incestuous marriage), according to the marginal reading of the R.V. For it is incredible that they should have lived long enough together to have a daughter of that description.

to do? Fain would he have withdrawn his promise; "but for the sake of his oath and of them that sat at meat with him, he would not reject her." As for his oath, he had some scruple in breaking the second commandment; but he could live in the perpetual breach of the seventh. And as for them that sat at meat with him, he was ashamed to be thought to have any scruples on the subject. "And straightway the king sent forth a soldier of his guard, and commanded to bring his head; and he went and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head in a charger and gave it to the damsel, and she gave it to her mother." (The rapidity with which the order was executed shows plainly that the prison was close at hand, and could be no other than the keep of the castle, in which the supper was made—the castle, as we have said, was the castle of Machærus—with which tradition agrees.)

From that night Herod was no longer himself. His conscience smote him for doing what he had determined never to do. He had not done it wittingly; he had got himself entrapped into it; but the deed was done and could not be undone, and he was wretched. He was haunted by the ghost of the murdered Baptist. So that when the fame of Jesus was spread abroad, and news of the mighty works which He was doing reached Herod's ears, he said, "This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him"; or (as in the R.V.) "therefore do these powers work in him" (Matt. xiv. 1, 2).¹

But Herod, though sorry for what he had done, would not long trouble himself about it—living the sinful life he was living, this was not to be expected. It was "the sorrow of the world which worketh death" (2 Cor. vii. 10). When we

¹ Luke says, "he desired to see him"; but that must have been after he had ceased to believe he was the Baptist; for to see the man whom he had murdered would be the last thing he would wish.

next meet with him, this is seen clearly. It was probably a year and a half after this, when our Lord was travelling through His dominions, on His way to Jerusalem for the last time. "In that hour (says Luke xiii. 31, etc.), there came certain Pharisees, saying, 'Get thee out hence, for Herod would fain kill thee.'" Word had perhaps been brought to Herod whereabouts Jesus was—not far from the spot where he had beheaded the Baptist—and guilty fears of what He might do to him. To prevent this, he might take steps to have him also put to death.

Has Herod, then, come down so low as this? The man who deeply regretted having put the servant to death, is he now prepared to put the Master Himself to death? It is even so. His conscience was now thoroughly blunted. With dignified irony and inimitable calmness, the Lord said to them, "Go, and say to that fox"—that crafty, cruel enemy of God's innocent servants—"Behold, I cast out demons, and perform cures to-day, and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected. Howbeit, I must go on my way to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem! Herod is laying his plans, is he, to have me put to death! He may save himself that trouble. I have my plans too. I have work to do—works of mercy to perform—to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following; and then what Herod wants to do will be done elsewhere. Jerusalem is the slaughter-house of God's messengers, and it could never be that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem!"

From this time we hear no more of Herod till just before Pilate was about to deliver up our Lord to be crucified. But he would fain have some excuse for not putting an innocent man to death, and just at that moment one seemed to have turned up. Herod happened to be in Jerusalem with his court at this time, settling some dispute

with Pilate; and learning that Jesus belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, and therefore ought to be tried by him, he sent him to him (Luke xxiii.).

Had the last spark of religious awe not left the breast of Herod ere this time, the appearance of our Lord before him as a prisoner might have touched him. But what read we? "Now when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceedingly glad; for he was of a long time desirous to see him; for he had heard concerning him." For what purpose, then, did he want to see him? "He hoped to see some miracles done by him." As if our Lord would display His power for the entertainment of Herod and his courtiers! No wonder that failing in this, and proceeding to question in many words" (with no good intent, we may be sure), He answers him nothing. But "the chief priests and the scribes stood vehemently accusing Him." Herod let them speak on unmoved, apparently amusing himself with the case, though he was there as a judge. "Herod with his soldiers set Him at nought, and mocked Him; and, arraying Him in gorgeous apparel, sent Him back to Pilate"—the mock royalty in which he arrayed Him sufficiently showing the contempt with which he regarded the prisoner and His claim to be a king.

Ah, Herod! There was a time when, though living in sensuality, thou stoodest in awe of that man of God who reproved thee for the evil things thou wast doing, and hearest gladly that stern reprove, and didst set right many of the wrongs of thy administration. Even when he dared to denounce the life thou wast living with thy brother's wife, thou wouldst not lay a hand upon him, and only for peace' sake didst shut him up in prison. And though at length consenting unwittingly to his death, it cost thee many a pang. But in time this wore off; all was forgotten; and that conscience of thine became so blunted, that when word came to thee that the Baptist's Master was in thy dominions, thou tookest steps to have even Him put to

death, so reckless now hadst thou become. But it remained for Him, to whom every knee shall yet bow, to be brought before thee as His judge, to be tried as a prisoner, charged with crimes worthy of death, to show the depth of debasement to which thou hadst now sunk, and how that conscience of thine was not blunted, but "seared (branded) as with a hot iron."

Yet what is Herod but an outstanding specimen of what it is to *trifle with conscience*? When first defiled, the ground lost may be recovered by speedy repentance and watchfulness for the future. Failing this, the downward tendency begins and goes rapidly on; and, unchecked, it hastens to recklessness, till one is ready to say, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing."

But the object of this paper was not to teach this lesson, though it does it very strikingly. It was to show, by a test of authenticity the most unexceptionable, that the Gospels, just as they lie before us even in minute details, bear the stamp of their own authenticity.

DAVID BROWN.

*DUHM'S ISAAH AND THE NEW COMMENTARY
TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.*

Hand - Kommentar zum Alten Testament in Verbindung mit anderen Fachgelehrten herausgegeben von B. W. Nowack, o. Prof. der Theol. in Strassburg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1892.—*Das Buch Jesaia*, übersetzt u. erklärt von D. Bernh. Duhm, o. Prof. der Theol. in Basel.

This is the beginning of another of those series of handbooks on the Bible, which are intended to bring, not only special students, but the public who are interested in their subject, abreast of the latest movements of exegetical science. The prospectus contains the usual reasons for the appearance of such a work—the progress of Comparative Religion, the recent discoveries in the East, the revolution within the interpretation of the Old Testament itself,

and the great increase of research into special points of the text and the exegesis of separate books. It expresses the need for a work, which, while doing justice to the innumerable details of its subject, will not deal with them with such prolixity as to confuse the scope and main results of the whole. It proposes to supply this need in a readable and attractive form, one of the characteristics of which shall be the use of such different types in the printing of the translation of the text of the Old Testament, that the reader can observe at a glance the different sources of the latter and their respective dates.

The authors already engaged for the work are, Baethgen for the Psalms, Giesebrecht for Jeremiah, Budde for Job, the editor himself for the Minor Prophets, and Kittel for Kings.

As regards the technical part of their undertaking, the editor and publishers are to be congratulated on the proof this first volume gives of almost complete success. It is as clear and pleasant to read as any commentary can be—458 broad pages of fine paper, with good-sized Roman type. The only fault is that in the Introduction, in citations from the Bible the figures for chapters and the figures for verses are set too close, and differ too little for their difference to catch the eye at a glance. One needs to look twice or thrice at a citation to be sure of it. But this can be easily repaired. A more serious mistake is the absence of a table explaining the various types employed. As it is these are often confusing.

I do not think that this first volume gives evidence of so exact a fulfilment of the rest of the programme. It is indeed a work of great ability and freshness, full of relevant facts well arranged and expressed, and distinguished by an ingenuity and boldness of theory which render it a most original work. But precisely such qualities make doubtful its right to a place in a series, whose first design is to bring readers abreast of the main positions of Old Testament science. For Dr. Duhm carries us far beyond these, and by a series of daring excursions into a period as late as the first century contradicts not only the conclusions of most recent critics concerning the dates of the post-Exilic portions of the Book of Isaiah, but the generally received opinions as to the close of the whole Prophetic Canon. As I have not space to discuss the bulk of the Commentary, I will mention in a sentence or two Duhm's opinions on other points, and confine my criticism to his proposal to assign so many chapters to the second century and the completion of the book to the end of the first.

Like most critics, Dr. Duhm admits a large number of authentic prophecies of Isaiah, though he finds in them frequent insertions of a later date. In chapters i.-xi. all is genuine except the titles, some clauses and passages in i.-ix., among these iv. 2-5; v. 15, 16, 30; vii. 1, 8*b*, 15, 18*a*, 21-25; viii. 19, and the famous verse 23; long passages in x., including the description of the invaders' march. His reasons for rejecting these are mostly subjective—they are not “jesaianisch,”—or are based upon supposed changes in the metre; and Hebrew metre, alas! is also at present the prey of the subjectivity of critics. In xiii.-xxiii. the only “oracles” allowed to be genuine are xiv. 24-27; xvii. 1-6, 9-14; xviii. 1-6; xx., xxii. except 9*b*-11*a* and 19-24. With exceptions, chapters xxviii.-xxxii. are allowed. In xxxvi.-xxxix. not even the challenge to Assyria is authentic. In xl.-lxvi. three writers are distinguished: the so-called Deutero-Isaiah, of the date of the Exile, whom by one of his many suggestive but inconclusive reasons Duhm assigns to Lebanon or Northern Phœnicia (see on xlix. 12); a younger post-Exilic author of the passages on the Servant of Jehovah; and a Trito-Isaiah, whom Duhm considers to be the author of the bulk of lvi.-lxvi. The conclusions as to xl.-lxvi. are much less revolutionary than those on i.-xxxix. With regard to such of the arguments on the latter as are not presently to be criticised, I can only report that many of them are precarious, and so opposed to the consensus of most critics, that they are decidedly out of place in a series which is designed, not to give scope to the theories of individuals, but to represent the main results of O. T. criticism as a whole.

I turn now to the original feature of Duhm's book, which is certain to attract a great deal of attention—the argument that the Book of Isaiah suffered large additions and alterations up to the close of the second century before Christ, and did not receive its present form before 90 or 80 B.C.

In order to prove this novel and startling theory, Duhm has to do three things. He has *first* to overthrow the general opinion of critics that the Canon of the Prophets was fixed by 200 B.C. He has, *second*, to show that the form of this particular Book of Isaiah was not settled in the third and second centuries. And he has, *third*, to prove that the style and the matter of the disputed chapters suit the special dates to which he assigns them in these centuries. I propose to inquire whether he has succeeded in any or all of these.

I. The Canon of the Prophets is generally assumed by O. T.

critics to have been fixed by 200 B.C. because of the following facts. From then onwards there is the recognition in Israel that prophecy has ceased; in 180 the son of Sirach gives clear evidence that he had the prophetic books before him in the same order as we have;¹ fifty years later his grandson speaks of his grandfather having "the law, the prophets, and the other books" before him; and it is impossible to account for the exclusion of Daniel from the Canon of the prophets on any other ground than that the Canon was closed long before Daniel was written in 165 B.C. Now to these facts Duhm has nothing definite to oppose. He says, indeed, that it is an arbitrary assertion, that Daniel's exclusion from the prophetic Canon was due to the close of the Canon before Daniel was written; but one of the two reasons which he himself suggests for the exclusion is Daniel's apocalyptic character, the very feature, as we shall presently see, on which he argues for the admission, at this same date, into the Canon of certain chapters of Isaiah! He throws some doubt, too, on the authenticity of the passage in Ecclesiasticus, but does not persist in it, as indeed he could not after Nöldeke's defence of the passage. His own account, too, of the formation of the Prophetic Canon is very vague and problematical. He supposes that the *prophete priores* were originally attached to the Torah; that they were separated from the latter at the time of its translation into Greek, that is, towards the middle of the third century; that they were then attached to the prophets proper; that because they had a "fast frame" this led to the prophets proper also receiving a "fast frame." But all this is only "wahrscheinlich" and "nicht beweisbar"; as to when the process concluded "darüber wissen wir gar nichts." It does not, therefore, surprise us that Duhm next throws up his opposition to the fixing of the Canon about 200—he now asks,—Granting that this Canon was fixed in 200, what is there to hinder us from allowing that subsequent additions were made to it? Only the very great improbability—so great as to be final to common sense—that when a body of sacred writings was fixed there could be room in it for additions so large and alterations so fundamental as Duhm's theory implies. And again, the question meets us, If the Prophetic Canon was so loose a bond as to admit of the addition of more than a fifth of Isaiah, and the collection and re-arrangement of the whole book, why was a book of the size of Daniel left out of it?

¹ Ecclesiasticus xlvi. and xlix.

II. The next part of Duhm's case is a number of alleged signs, that the form and text of *Isaiah* itself was still undetermined in the third and second centuries. The first of these is that the chronicler in 2 *Chronicles* xxxvi. 22 (= *Ezra* i. 1-3) quotes the prediction of Deutero-*Isaiah*, that Cyrus would build the temple again, as a word of *Jeremiah*. The chronicler does no such thing. All that he says is that the word of the Lord by *Jeremiah*—which may be any of *Jeremiah's* predictions of the close of the captivity—was fulfilled by the raising up of Cyrus. Again, Duhm says that the chronicler knew the section, *Isaiah* xxxvi.-xxxix.,¹ but refers to it as a part, not of a "Book of *Isaiah*," but of a "Book of Kings." Yet all that the chronicler says is that there is a vision of *Isaiah* in the Book of Kings—a statement which is true, but does not contradict the existence at that time as now of the same vision in the Book of *Isaiah*. Duhm, however, not only confidently affirms the absence of these chapters from the Book of *Isaiah* in the time of the Chronicler, but goes on to argue that in consequence chapters i.-xxxv. were not in their present form! Was ever so large a conclusion obtained so gratuitously? Again, granting (though, as we have seen, with some demur) that the passage in *Ecclesiasticus*² about *Isaiah* is genuine, he seeks to limit its evidence to this, that only chapters xxxvi.-lxvi. were known to the son of *Sirach* as *Isaiah's*. But he forgets that he has just told us that the hand which put xxxvi.-xxxix. into the Book of *Isaiah* was also that which collected i.-xxxv., and that therefore, on his own theory, if the son of *Sirach* regarded the former chapters as genuine, he regarded also the latter as such. But again, in the name of common sense, how could the son of *Sirach* have regarded xl.-lxvi. as the work of *Isaiah* unless they had been already so long attached to the prophet's genuine oracles that they were also appealed to as his.

We must, therefore, hold Dr. Duhm to have failed in producing any external evidence for his opinion that the substance and form of the Book of *Isaiah* were materially different in the second century from what they are to-day.

III. But has he any internal evidence to offer? Do the chapters of *Isaiah* bear any evidence, in style or historical reference, of the late dates to which he assigns them. Let us take the chapters he places in the second century. They are xxxiii., which he assigns

¹ 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 32.

² *xlvi.* 23 ff.

to 162 B.C.; xix. 16-24, to 150 B.C.; xxix. 15-24. xxx. 18-25, to "the time of the Maccabees"; xxiv.-xxvii., to 128 B.C.; xxxiv., xxxv., to before John Hyrkanus; and xv. 1-9a, xvi. 7-11, to the reign of John Hyrkanus. The chief evidence which Duhm proposes for these dates is the apocalyptic character of the chapters; they are of the same stuff and temper as the Sibylline books, Daniel, Enoch, etc. Their style differs altogether from Isaiah's; it is stilted and artificial. Their language recalls that of the latest Psalms. Their historical reflection is that of the days of the Maccabees, with the destruction of Jerusalem and wars with the Syrians and Parthians, and more peaceful relations with Egypt. It is impossible, in the limits of a single review, to examine Duhm's arguments in detail. I content myself with stating their deficiencies, and the main objections to the line they take. Duhm deserves praise for the ingenuity and force with which he plies them; but neither do they make out a complete case for his thesis, nor are they always natural, nor even consistent. Take the last point *first*. In one page Duhm gives the apocalyptic character of the Book of Daniel as a reason for its exclusion from the Canon of the Prophets; on the next he gives the apocalyptic character of a part of this Canon, viz. some of the chapters of Isaiah, as a reason for the opinion that they are insertions dating from this age. Surely every reason of style and matter that prevailed against Daniel's admission to the Canon, must have been valid against the admission of xxiv.-xxvii. to the Book of Isaiah. *Secondly*, there is an altogether arbitrary distinction drawn between some "apocalyptic" passages in the Book of Isaiah, which Duhm leaves to him, and others which, against the opinion of the best critics, he takes from him. This is especially the case with chapters xxix.-xxxii. And the efforts to find traces of "apocalypse" pass all bounds when they are directed upon the phrase וְזִוְיָהוּ in the opening title of the Book. When Duhm insists that this title refers to the whole Book, that it was therefore the work of the final collector, and that it betrays his view of prophecy as purely apocalyptic, he makes two statements which can be contradicted. The final editor, who had chapters xiii., xiv., xxiii., xxiv., xxxiv., xxxv. before him, could not have entitled the Book a vision "on Jerusalem and Judah" alone. And וְזִוְיָהוּ was not a monopoly of the second century. *Thirdly*, in point of style and language, while Duhm has some things to exhibit, say in xxiv.-xxvii., which harmonise with his theory, he overlooks how much evidence there is

on the other side. For instance, he has distinctly exaggerated the difference between the style of chapter xxxiii. and that of Isaiah's admitted prophecies. There are many phrases in xxxiii. characteristically Isaiah's (see Cheyne and Ewald *in loco*). It is, indeed, utterly in contradiction to the catholic programme of this series, that the reader should not be put in possession of the strong evidence for the authenticity of xxxiii., and of the fact that so large a majority of the best critics support it. *Fourthly*, there are few historical allusions in the disputed chapters; but Duhm's theory lays upon him the necessity of altering these. Thus in xix. 15-24 the combination Egypt, Asshur, Israel, which evidently reflects Isaiah's own day, is altered to Egypt, Syria, Israel, in order to suit the second century. It is an old emendation of Hitzig's, but has nothing to support it, and has been rejected by almost every scholar. Only Duhm's theory forces him to make it. *Fifthly*, other passages are strained, in order to suit the historical circumstances of the second century, or have meanings thrust upon them. Thus in xxxiii. the enemy "can only be the army of the Seleucids." In xix. 20 *they, i.e. the Egyptians, shall cry unto Jehovah because of oppressors, and He shall send them a deliverer and advocate, and he shall save them*; in this general statement Duhm confidently sees an account of the Jewish mercenaries employed by Ptolemy Philometor and his consort Cleopatra. In ver. 25 the text ברכו is taken as a substitute for ברכה (LXX.), and dated from Roman times when objection might have been taken to the idea that the earth was comprised of Egypt, Syria, and Israel! Truly, we may say, Duhm has proved to us, at least for himself, the statement of his preface: "Das Commentarsehreiben hat eben viel vom pig puzzle."

Duhm has made a very bold, original, and well-equipped adventure. But he has not made out his case, for he has neither disproved the opinion that the Canon of the Prophets was closed in 200, nor proved that the Book of Isaiah was different in the second century from what it is now, nor adduced any final or even probable evidence that any of its chapters have features which require so late a date. On the contrary, the necessity which he labours under to fetch from so far, and to strain his reasoning, create a prejudice against it. It is a great essay he has given us, but the place for it was scarcely a series of handbooks in O. T. science.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

BREVIA.

The Gospel of St. John. By Marcus Dods, D.D. Vol. II. [*The Expositor's Bible.*] London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.

The second volume of the Commentary on St. John by Dr. Dods is a natural continuation of the first. It has the same easy, graceful style, the same moderate and reasonable spirit, the same psychological insight and quickness to catch points of application to present-day conditions. It awakens, however, in my mind the doubt which I could not help expressing when the first volume came before me. For whom exactly is it intended? One would have thought that such a series was most needed by the preacher; but Dr. Dods seems to have written rather for the congregation. It seems to me that he has left the expositor, at least the pulpit expositor, nothing to say. Granted the basis of the exposition, and to a mind which is conscious of its own poverty in this respect he seems to wring from his text the last drop of practical application. But can we always quite grant the basis of the exposition? Of that I am not so sure. I am not sure that the difficulties have been always fully grappled with. Dr. Dods has such a wonderful way of making rough places smooth, that one might almost be tempted to think that St. John was as facile a writer as himself. That, however, is hardly the case. Take, for instance, that well-known passage, St. John xvi. 8-11:—

“When He is come, He will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on Me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged.”

Here the real points are not the conviction of sin in general, or of righteousness in general, but exactly in what lay the particular sin of rejecting Christ and how the guilt of that sin is brought home by the Paraclete; whose or what righteousness He reveals, and how that revealing is connected with the Ascension; and lastly, how there is any declared judgment of the Evil One. I do not say that Dr. Dods contributes nothing helpful on these points; he seems to me to hit the mark once and again; but his exposition would have been still more helpful if it had been more concise and more resolutely disengaged from confusing generalities.

It is a matter of taste; but I confess that for my own part I would rather have seen the two volumes compressed into one, and that a volume of fewer pages. I think too, as I said before, that we should have been more enabled to take our stand by the side of the Evangelist and see the history unroll itself as he saw it.

Just one point of detail. I observe that Dr. Dods rejects the revised rendering of St. John xiii. 2, "during supper," for "supper being served," or "supper-time having arrived." But has he not overlooked the change of reading, *δείπνου γινομένου* for *γερομένου*?

W. SANDAY.

The Hebrew Accents, by Arthur Davis. London, D. Nutt, 1892.

Probably only those who have already solved all the other problems of the universe and find still a little time upon their hands think of studying the Hebrew Accents. To such persons a book of reasonable compass on the subject would be acceptable. No one who desires full knowledge can dispense with the two Treatises of Wickes (Clarendon Press), but these works are both long and expensive. Mr. Davis here offers a brief compend on the Prose Accents, which will be found of service as containing the main principles and facts of the accentuation. The book certainly might have been clearer. The author has a tendency to multiply rules (in a way that drives the reader to mutiny or despair), where the statement of a single general principle would have been sufficient. Examples of this are the rules on Sheva at the beginning, and those on Metheg at the end of the book; and other examples occur throughout. For instance, three rules are given for the case of Munach taking the place of Metheg on the word of Zakeph, where the single rule that Metheg remains if on the first letter of the word would have been enough. It might have been well to mention that the apparent Pashta on the word of Zakeph is called *Methīgah*, because the name suggests the explanation of the peculiarity. Neither will the reader easily pick up the conditions under which *Zakeph Gadol* is to be used. This subject, indeed, is rather obscure in itself, and the best editions do not remove the perplexity. Comp. Genesis i. 19 with xx. 4, in Baer.

The rules for interpunction given by Mr. Davis (p. 31 *seq.*) will be found instructive. It may be held as now ascertained that the accentual principle is a dichotomy, and not, as Ewald maintained, a trichotomy. The verse is divided into two by Athmach, and then each of these two halves into two by Zakeph, and so on. From this principle it seems to follow that Segolta does not mark the *third* of a verse, as Mr. Davis still maintains, but is really a divider of the first half of the verse. This accent is subject to peculiar rhythmical laws, but seems to be in some way a modified Zakeph.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY
LAND.

VII. ESDRAELON.

IN our survey of Samaria we have already found ourselves drawn out upon the great plain of Esdraelon. The plain has come up to meet us among the Samaritan hills. Carmel and Gilboa encompass it; half a dozen Samaritan strongholds face each other across its southern bays. Nature has manifestly set Esdraelon in the arms of Samaria. Accordingly in O. T. times they shared for the most part the same history; in tribal days, though Esdraelon was assigned to Zebulun and Issachar, Manasseh, the keeper of the hills to the south, claimed towns upon it; in the days of the kingdom, the chariots of the Samaritan kings, the footsteps of the Samaritan prophets, traversed Esdraelon from Carmel to Jordan. But after the Exile the Samaritan Schism,—confounder of so many natural arrangements,—divorced the plain from the hills which embrace it, and Esdraelon was counted not to the province of Samaria, but to that of Galilee, the southern frontier of which was coincident with its own southern edge.¹ More interesting, however, than the connection of either north or south with Esdraelon is the separation which this great plain effects between them, the break it causes in the central range of Palestine, the clear passage it affords from the coast to the Jordan. This has given Esdraelon a history of its own.

Esdraelon is usually regarded as one plain under one name from sea to Jordan. In reality, however, it is not

¹ Josephus, II. *B. J.* iii. 4.

one but several plains, more or less divided by the remains of ridges, which once upon a time sustained across it the continuity of "the backbone of Palestine." Thus nine miles from the sea, at Tell el Kasis, the traditional site of the slaughter of Baal's priests by Elijah, a promontory of the Galilean hills shoots south to within a hundred yards of Carmel, leaving only that space for the Kishon to break through. Eight or nine miles further east at Leggun, probably the ancient Megiddo, low ridges run out from both north and south, as if they once met, and again leave Kishon but a narrow pass. And once more, between Jezreel and a spot west of Shunem, about twenty-four miles from the coast, there is a sudden fall of level eastwards, which visibly separates Esdraelon proper from the narrower valley that slopes towards Jordan and is perhaps evidence of a former connection between Gilboa and Moreh. It should be added, that to north and south of the plain the geological formation is the same.

Now if we overlook the rising ground at Leggun, which is not very prominent, we get, upon this great break across Palestine, three divisions—to the west the maritime plain of Acre, bounded by the low hills at Tell el Kasis; in the centre a large inland plain; and upon the east running down from it to Jordan the long valley between Gilboa and Moreh. Of these the Central Plain lies as much athwart, as in a line with, the other two, spreading to north and south with a breadth equal to its length. In shape the Central Plain is a triangle. The southern side or base is twenty miles from Tell el Kasis by the foot of Carmel and the lower Samaritan hills, south-east to Genin. The other two sides are equal, fifteen miles each: the northern being the base of the Nazareth hills from Tell el Kasis to the angle between them and Tabor, the eastern a line from Tabor to Genin. This last side is not so bounded by hills as the other two, but has three breaks across it eastward—one between Tabor

and Moreh, a mere bay of the plain, with a narrow wady down to the Jordan: one between Moreh and Gilboa, the long valley, already mentioned, to the Jordan at Bethshan: and one between Gilboa and the hills about Genin, also a bay of the plain, but without any issue to Jordan. The general level of the Central Plain is 200 feet above the sea-line, but from that the valley Jordanwards sinks gently in twelve miles to 400 feet below the sea, at Bethshan, where it drops over a high bank into the Jordan valley.

This disposition of the land, with all that it has meant in history, is best seen from Jezreel.

As you stand upon that last headland of Gilboa, 200 feet above the plain, your eye sweeps from the foot of Tabor to Genin, from Tell el Kasis to Bethshan. The great triangle is spread before you. Along the north of it the steep, brown wall of the Galilean hills, about 1,000 feet high, runs almost due west, till it breaks out and down to the feet of Carmel, in forest slopes just high enough to hide the plain of Acre and the sea. But over and past these Carmel's steady ridge, deepening in blue the while, carries the eye out to its dark promontory above the Mediterranean. From this end of Carmel the lower Samarian hills, green with bush and dotted by white villages, run south-east to the main Samarian range, and on their edge, due south from you, seven miles across the bay, Genin stands out with its minarets and palms, and the glen breaking up behind it to Dothan. The corresponding bay on the north between Moreh and Tabor, and Tabor itself are hidden. But all the rest of the plain is before you—a great expanse of loam, red and black, which in a more peaceful land would be one sea of waving wheat with island villages; but here is what its modern name implies,¹ a free, wild prairie, upon which but one or two hamlets have ventured forth from the cover of the hills, and a timid and tardy cultivation is only now seeking to

¹ Merg ibn Amir.

overtake the waste of coarse grass and the thistly herbs that camels love. There is no water visible. The Kishon itself flows in a muddy trench, unseen five yards away. Here and there a clump of trees shows where a deep well is worked to keep a little orchard green through summer; dark patches of reeds betray the bed of many a winter swamp; and the roads have no limit to their breadth, and sprawl, as if at most seasons one caravan could not follow for mud on the path of another. But these details all sink in a great sense of space, and of a level made almost absolute by the rise of hills on every side of it. It is a vast inland basin, and from it there breaks just at your feet, between Jezreel and Moreh, the valley Jordanwards,—breaks as visibly as river from lake, with a slope and almost the look of a current upon it. Away down this, between Gilboa and Moreh, Bethshan shines like a white island in the mouth of an estuary, and across the unseen depth of Jordan beyond rises the steep flat range of Gilead—a counterpart at this end of the view to the long ridge of Carmel at the other.¹

From Jezreel you can appreciate everything in the literature and in the history of Esdraelon.

I. To begin with, you can enjoy that happiest sketch of a landscape and its history that was ever drawn in half a dozen lines—which occurs in the Blessing of the Tribes.² *Issachar*, to which the most of Esdraelon fell,

*Issachar is a large-limbed ass,
Stretching himself between the sheepfolds:
For he saw a resting-place that it was good,
And the land that it was pleasant.*

Such exactly is Esdraelon—a land relaxed and sprawling up among the hills to north, south and east, as you will see a

¹ This “antiphon” of Gilead and Carmel in the view from Jezreel further illustrates the remark on pp. 62, 63 of this vol. of THE EXPOSITOR.

² Gen. xlix.

loosened ass roll and stretch his limbs any day in the sunshine in a Syrian village yard. To the highlander looking down upon it, Esdraelon is room to stretch and lie happy. Yet the room must be paid for—the figure of the ass goes further.

*So he bowed his shoulder to bear
And became a servant under task-work.*

The inheritors of this plain never enjoyed the highland independence of Manasseh or Naphtali. Open to east and west, pleasantest stage on the highway from the Nile to the Euphrates, Esdraelon was at distant intervals the war-path or battlefield of great empires, but more regularly the prey and pasture of the Arabs who with each spring came upon it over Jordan. Even when there has been no invasion to fear, Esdraelon has still suffered: when she has not been the camp of the foreigner she has served as the farm of her neighbours. Ten years ago the peasants got rid of the Arabs of the desert, only to be bought up by Greek capitalists from Beyrout; and they say that the blackmail of the latter is worse than the blackmail of the former.

II. Another thing you see most clearly from Jezreel is the reason of the names given to the Great Plain and its offshoots. These names are two: Valley, and Plain or Opening; the former is connected with the name of Jezreel, the latter with that of Megiddo.

1. THE VALLEY OF JEZREEL. The word for Valley, 'Emeq, literally *deepening*, is a highlander's word for a valley as he looks *down* into it,¹ and is never applied to any extensive plain away from hills, but always to wide valleys running up into a mountainous country like the Vale of Elah, the Vale of Hebron, and the Vale of Ajalon.²

¹ Stanley, wrongly, from the sense of extension. Sinai and Palestine, Vocabulary, art. "Emek."

² 1 Sam. xvii. 2, 19; Gen. xxxvii. 14; Josh. x. 12. These are the only names whose sites are past doubt. There was also the vale of Siddim (Gen. xiv. 3, 8);

We should, therefore, expect the word, when associated with Jezreel, to apply not to the great Central Plain, but to the broad deep valley which descends from it to Jordan, between Moreh and Gilboa. And in fact it is so applied in the story of Gideon's campaign. There it is said that the Midianites when they passed over Jordan *pitched in the Valley of Jezreel*,¹ to the north of the well of Harod from the hill of Moreh into the valley;² and again that *the camp of Midian was in the valley beneath* Gideon, who presumably occupied like Saul the heights of Gilboa above the wells. The same identification suits the other passages where the *Valley of Jezreel* is mentioned,³ and we conclude that in the O. T. it means only the valley down which Jezreel looks to Jordan, and not the plain across which Jezreel looks to Carmel.⁴ But in later times it is this latter which is called after Jezreel—not indeed now the *Valley of Jezreel*, but *the Great Plain of Esdrelom*, or *Esdr̄elon*,⁵ and this name has survived to the present day, not in the local dialect, but in various Greek and Latin forms, as *Stradela*,⁶ or *Istradela*,⁷ *Esdraelon*.

2. The Plain of Megiddo. While 'Emeq means *deepening*, the word used here, Biq'ah, means *opening*. From its origin—a verb *to split*—one would naturally take it to

of Rephaim (Josh. xv. 8), probably the valley to the south-east of Jerusalem; of Achor (Josh. vii. 24), probably one of the passes from the Jordan into Benjamin, etc., etc. The LXX. render עֲמֵק by φάραγξ, κοιλὴ, αἰλῶν and even πεδῖον. Like בקעה, עֲמֵק is applied to parts of the Jordan valley (Josh. xiii. 27). But unlike בקעה it is never extended to any plain so wide as the Euphrates, or like Esdraelon. And it is used generically like בקעה for level valley land—either ager, land that can be ploughed (Job xxxix. 10, Ps. lxxv. 14 Heb.) or campus, ground for military manœuvres (Job xxxix. 21, Josh. xvii. 16).

¹ Judges vi. 33.

² Id. vii. 1, cf. 12.

³ Josh. xvii. 16; Hosea i. 5.

⁴ So correctly the P.E.F. Map. Ed. 1890.

⁵ Book of Judith I. 8, τὸ μέγα πεδῖον Ἐσδρηλῶμ, cf. iii. 9, iv. 6, Ἐσδρηλῶν, but again with μ in vii. 3.

⁶ The *Jerusalem Itinerary*.

⁷ *Bordeaux Pilgrim*, 333 A.D.

be a valley more narrow than 'Emeq, a cleft or gorge. But it is applied to broad vales like the Jordan under Hermon or at Jericho,¹ and even to the very wide valley of the Euphrates,² though never to table-lands or maritime plains like Sharon. The Arabic equivalent is to-day the name of the vale between the Lebanons, as well as of some other level tracts in Syria surrounded by hills.³ A surrounding of hills seems necessary to the name Biq'ah, as if it were to be translated land *laid open*, or *lying open* in the midst of hills. And this is just what the great Central Plain of Esdraelon is, girt by hills on all sides, laid open or gaping, as it were, in the midst of the main range of Palestine.

The name of Megiddo has not survived, like that of Jezreel, to the present day, and there is controversy as to what site it represents. On the base of the central plain just opposite Jezreel is a place called Leggun—the Roman Legio, Legion. As Jezreel commands the mouth of the valley towards the Jordan, so Legio guards the mouth of the chief pass towards Sharon. It was therefore as important a site as Jezreel, and as likely to give its name to the plain. In Roman times it did so. Jerome, for whom the name Megiddo is no longer extant, calls the Great Plain Campus Legionis.⁴ Moreover, the only town definitely named in the immediate neighbourhood of Megiddo—*Taanach upon the waters of Megiddo*⁵—is undoubtedly the present Tannuk, four miles from Leggun; and there even seems a trace of the name in the words the Arabs apply to

¹ Hermon, Josh. xi. 17, xii. 7; Jericho, Deut. xxxiv. 3.

² Ezek. iii. 22, xxxvii. 1; Gen. xi. 2.

³ For example, the Bek'a, البقعة, or Bukei'a, البقيعة, a plain on the Belka, to the east of Salt, which we crossed in 1891 from the Jabbok. It is a high secluded vale, about 4 miles by 3, with mountains all round it. Also the Bukei'a, east of Shechem, and the Bukei'a, in Judah, above the north end of the Dead Sea.

⁴ Eusebius, whom he translates, has τῷ μεγάλῳ πεδίῳ τῆς Λεγεῶνος, etc. Onomasticon, artt. Ἀρβηλά, Βαιθακάθ, Γαβαθών, etc.

⁵ Judges v. 19.

Kishon, the Muqutta'. Omitting this last item, there is enough of evidence to support Robinson's identification of Leggun with Megiddo, even against a plausible rival which Major Conder has favoured in Muggedda', a site with considerable ruins at the foot of Gilboa, above the Jordan, opposite Beisan.¹ I have put in a note what seem to me sufficient answers to Major Conder's argument against Leggun, and need here only emphasize once more what is so evident as you stand at Jezreel—the equal right with Jezreel which Leggun, commanding the other great gate to the plain, has to bestow its name upon the latter, as well as the fitness of calling that great triangle, opened among the hills, the Biq'ah, or Open Ground of Megiddo.²

¹ Muggedda', both town and wady, are mentioned by Burekhardt, *Travels in Syria, etc.*, July 2, 1813.

² Major Conder's argument against Leggun, and in favour of Muggedda', as the site of Megiddo, is threefold. He says (1) that Megiddo is as often mentioned—save once—with Bethshan as with Taanach; (2) that Muqutta' is not a possible transformation of Megiddo; and (3) that the site on the Jordan valley suits the narrative of the flight of Ahaziah (2 Kings ix.) better than the site by Leggun does. On each of these points I think he fails to make out his case. Thus:—(1) The phrase, *Taanach by the waters of Megiddo*, seems to me to put the Muggedda' site out of the question; Josh. xii. 21 sets Taanach and Megiddo next to Carmel and the coast (Dor); no possible definition of locality can be taken from the order of towns in Josh. xvii. 11, where the text is manifestly corrupt, we form that in Judges i. 27, which, beginning with Bethsh'an, leaps over Gilboa to Taanach, then over Carmel to Dor, in the west, then back to Ibleam (possibly the present Bir Bela'meh, near Genin; see Black's *Joshua*, "Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools," xvii. 11) and Megiddo. In 1 Kings iv. 12 there is another confusion: Taanach, Megiddo, Bethshan, Abelmeholah, then back to Jokneam on Carmel. In 1 Chron. vii. 29 the order is Bethshan, Taanach, Megiddo, Dor, the correct order from east to west, if Leggun be Megiddo. (2) Major Conder objects to the identification of Muqutta' with Megiddo, that the palatal *t* in the Arab name is never the equivalent of the Hebrew *d*. Yet in some cases they have been interchanged.¹ The deep *q* and the hard *g* are of course equivalents. There remains the 'ain at the end of Muqutta' which is not in Megiddo, but this 'ain is in Muggedda' as well, as to which Conder says that it is an equivalent of the Hebrew *n* in the form Megiddon. But it is not necessary to hold an equivalence between the modern and ancient words. Muqutta' means *ford*, and it is not impossible that Arabs should, in the case of a river, substitute it for a name so very closely resembling it in sound, of which they did not know the meaning. (3) With all deference to

¹ Cf. Wright's *Comparative Grammar*, p. 53.

III. Now when we have made out Leggun or Megiddo as a place of equal importance with Jezreel—each of them giving its name to the plain, as well as holding a chief gateway into it—we are ready to mark the next fact about Esdraelon which the view from Jezreel towards Megiddo renders clear. This is, that the passage which Esdraelon afforded across Palestine was not that, which seems at first the more natural, viz., from the plain of Acre by the glen through which Kishon breaks at Tell el Kasis, but that which comes over from the plain of Sharon by the pass at Megiddo. Look from Jezreel, and at once you see this to be possible. The plain of Acre is not more visible to you than the plain of Sharon; the Galilean hills intervene and rise almost as high and broad between Esdraelon and Acre as the Samaritan hills do between Esdraelon and Cæsarea. Look at the way Carmel lies. You easily perceive that an army coming north by Sharon, whether it was making for the south of the lake of Galilee at Bethshan or for the north of the lake by the plateau above Tiberias, would not seek to compass the prolonged ridge of Carmel by the sea, and so enter Esdraelon from the plain of Acre, for that would be a very roundabout road; but it would cut across the Samaritan hills to the south of Carmel by the easy pass which issues at Megiddo. And so in fact armies from the south always came: the Philistines, when they shirked attacking

Major Conder, I think that Megiddo at Leggun suits the story of the flight of Ahaziah far better than Magedda' does. Let it be remembered that Jehu was driving up the valley of Jezreel from Bethshan, and that Ahaziah's flight from him was not so likely to be towards Bethshan as in an opposite direction. We do not know where the ascent of Gur was; Ibleam may be beside Genin. Overtaken and wounded here, on a path southward, which Jehu afterwards pursued to Samaria, it was natural for Ahaziah's company to seek the only other route for chariots from the plain southwards—that by the pass leading over from Leggun to Sharon. These objections against Robinson's argument being repelled, I think the case for Leggun as Megiddo rests satisfactorily on these points: (1) that it is close to Taanach; (2) that the waters of Megiddo are practically Kishon (Judges v. 19); (3) that Leggun is as likely to give its name to the plain as Jezreel is, and did so give it in the time of Jerome.

Israel on the steep flanks of Benjamin and Ephraim, and camped by the most open gateway of the hill country opposite Esdraelon;¹ Pharaoh Necho, when Josiah met him at Megiddo, and was beaten *when he met him*, and was slain, and *the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the plain of Megiddo* became a proverb in Israel;² the Romans, who set a great garrison in Megiddo and called it Legion; Napoleon, in 1799, who, although he was making for Acre, did not take the sea-path round Carmel, but also crossed into Esdraelon by Leggun. If any other proof were needed that in ancient times Esdraelon's connection with the coast was south, and not north, of Carmel, it might be that singular list of towns so frequently given in the O. T.—Bethshan, Taanach, Megiddo, Dor. These formed a strategical line of fortresses on the one great avenue across country,³ but that line did not run north, but south of Carmel. Megiddo and Taanach, backed by Bethshan, were not in line with Acre or Haifa, but with Dor, the present Tanturah, a few miles to the north of Cæsarea. Nothing could be clearer than this. The break across Palestine which Esdraelon affords is a break into Sharon and not into the plain of Acre. And indeed the roads from Acre to the interior of the country, whether they made for Jordan above or below the lake, travelled then, as they do now, through the long parallel valleys of Lower Galilee. If any caravans entered Esdraelon from Acre, it was in order to seek a gateway to Samaria at Genin or to cross to Sharon by the pass of Megiddo. Few armies going north or south kept to the beach below Carmel; if those of the Ptolemies and Antiochi did so, it was because the Jews held the hills up to Carmel;

¹ Ἐσδρηλῶν πλησίον τῆς Δωταίας ἐστὶν ἀπέναντι τοῦ πρίουος τοῦ μεγάλου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, Judith iii. 9. Also αἱ ἀναβάσεις τῆς ὄρεινῆς ὅτι δι' αὐτῶν ἦν ἡ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, iv. 6.

² 2 Chron. xxxv. 22; Zech. xii. 11. Hadadrimmon (LXX. *πόων*, a pomegranate plantation) is perhaps Rummaneh, close beside Leggun.

³ Josh. xvii. 11; Judges i. 27; 1 Kings iv. 12; 1 Chron. vii. 29.

if Richard, in the third Crusade, did so,¹ it was because those hills were all in possession of the Saracen.

IV. We have seen the natural avenues to Esdraelon from the rest of the land. Let us now review the points at which they enter the Great Plain; for it is from these, of course, that its various campaigns were directed. The entrances are five in number, and all visible from Jezreel. Three are at the corners of the triangle: the pass of the Kishon at Tell el Kasis, the glen between Tabor and the Nazareth hills, and the valley southward behind Genin. The first of these is the way of advance from the plain of Acre²; Harosheth of the Gentiles, from which Sisera advanced, lies just behind it. The second is the road down from the plateau above Tiberias, and northern Galilee generally; it is commanded by Tabor, on which there was always a fortress. The third is the first of that series of passages which connect the meadows that lead up from Esdraelon to Samaria—the Anabaseis of the Hill-Country, as they are called in the Book of Judith.³ The other two gateways to the Great Plain were, of course, Megiddo and Jezreel. Megiddo guarded the natural approach of Philistines, Egyptians, and other enemies from the south; Jezreel, that of Arabs, Midianites, Syrians of Damascus, and other enemies from the east.

With our eyes on these five points, and remembering that they are not merely glens into neighbouring provinces, but passes to the Sea and to the Desert, gateways in the great road between the empires of Euphrates and Nile, the continents of Asia and Africa, we are ready for the arrival

¹ Geoffrey Vinsauf, *Chronicle*. Cestius also took the sea road (Joseph, II. B. J. xviii. The railway from the coast to Damascus will keep to the north of Carmel. It starts from Haifa, comes up the Kishon, and so over Esdraelon by Bethshan to Jordan.

² Though from Acre itself a more usual road lay further north across the slopes of the Galilean hills.

³ iv. 6: ἀναβάσεις τῆς ὄρεινῆς, ὅτι δι' αὐτῶν ἦν ἡ εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν.

of those armies of all nations, whose almost ceaseless contests have rendered this plain the classic battle-ground of Scripture. Was there ever arena so simple, so regulated for the spectacle of war? Esdraelon is a great theatre, with its clearly defined stage, with its proper avenues and doors. We will still watch it from Jezreel.

V. Very significantly the first of the historical battles of Esdraelon was one in which Israel overcame not only a foreign tyrant, but the use which that tyrant made of the plain for the purpose of preventing Israel's unity. In the days of the Judges, Esdraelon divided the tribes into two: Ephraim and Manasseh on one side, with little Benjamin and the still ineffective Judah behind; upon the other Zebulun and Naphtali, with some fragments of Issachar; and the chariots of Canaan scoured the plain between. The Canaanite camp was at Harosheth, on the west of the Kishon pass, where it paralysed the two maritime tribes, Asher and Dan. Although she was a prophetess of Ephraim who summoned Israel, the spring of the revolt was found among the northern tribes; to them the leader, Barak, belonged, and this decided the place of muster, not on Gilboa, where Gideon and Saul, southern leaders, gathered their forces, but in the strong corner at Tabor, where the main road enters the plain from Northern Galilee. It is not necessary to suppose, as some have done, that Barak arranged his men high up Tabor; though Tabor, an immemorial fortress, was there to fall back upon in case of defeat. The headquarters of the muster were probably in the glen, at Tabor's foot, in the village Deburieh—perhaps a reminiscence of Deborah herself—which also in Roman times was occupied by the natives of Galilee in their revolt against the foreigner who held the Plain.¹ Here in the northern angle of Esdraelon, Barak watched till the leng-

¹ Josephus, II. *B. J.* xxi. 3, speaks of a garrison at Dabaritta, as it was called in his day, to "keep guard on the Great Plain."

thening line of his enemy's chariots drew out from the western angle at Tell el Kasis and reached opposite him, with Taanach and Megiddo behind them. They may even have turned north towards the Hebrew position. Then Barak gave them battle in a fierce highland charge: *into the valley his thousands rushed at his feet*. It has been supposed that with the charge a storm broke from the north, for *there was fighting from heaven*, according to the poem, and Kishon was in full flood:—

*River Kishon swept them away,
River of spates, river Kishon!*

This means that the plain must already have been in a state in which it was impossible for chariots to manœuvre. As another great feature of the battle the poem remembers the plunging of horses:—

*Then did the horse-hoofs stamp,
By reason of the plungings, the plungings of their strong ones.*

The highland footmen had it all their own way. Their charge came with such impetuosity upon a labouring and divided foe, that the latter—and this, too, shows how far Canaan had advanced across the plain—were scattered both east and west. The main flight turned back towards Harosheth, and the slaughter and the drowning must have been terrible in the narrow pass. But Sisera himself, who doubtless was in the van of his army as he led it east, fled eastward still, past Moreh, across the high land beyond, towards Kadesh—which is, as Major Conder has shown, not the ancient Kadesh on Lake Merom, but probably a town still known by that name on Bitzanaaim, above the Lake of Galilee. It is the same direction as the French military maps show the flight of the Turks to have taken in 1799, when Kleber's small squares, reinforced by Napoleon, broke up vastly superior numbers, on the same field of Sisera's discomfiture.

Barak's was a strange victory, in which highlanders had for once been helped, not hindered, by the level ground. But the victory won that day by the Plain over the Canaanites was not so great as the victory won by Israel over the Plain. Esdraelon is broad and open enough to have been a frontier between two nations; but the unselfish tribes had overcome this difference between them. What in a century or two might have yawned to an impassable gulf, they had bridged once for all by their loyalty to the Ideal of a united people and a united fatherland. And the power of that Ideal was faith in a common God. Well might Deborah open her song with the Hallelujah:—

*For that the leaders took the lead in Israel,
For that the people offered themselves willingly,
Bless ye the LORD!*

2. The next invaders, whom Israel had to meet upon Esdraelon, were Arabs from over Jordan, *children of the East*. This time therefore they drew to battle not upon Kishon and the western watershed, but at the head of the long vale running down to Bethshan; and as Manasseh was now the heart of the defence, the muster of Israel took place not at Tabor, but at Gilboa. *Gideon and all the people that were with him pitched above the well of Harod, and the camp of Midian was to the north of him from Moreh into the Vale*. That is to say, the Midianites took up practically the same position about Shunem as the Philistines occupied before their defeat of Saul.¹ Due south across the head of the Vale is the rugged end of Gilboa—Jezreel standing off it—and on this Gideon, like Saul, drew up his men. The only wells are three, all lying in the Vale: one by Jezreel itself, one out upon the plain,

¹ It is doubtful how far the name Moreh extended eastward, but if the Bethshittah of Jer. vii. 22 be the present Shuttah, then Moreh must be to the west of that, and is probably, as put above, the hill above Shunem, now known as Gebel Duhy.

and one close under the steep banks of Gilboa. The first and second of these lie open to the position of the Midianites, and tradition has rightly fixed on the third and largest, now called the 'Ain Galûd, as the well of Harod. It bursts, some fifteen feet broad and two deep, from the very foot of Gilboa, and mainly out of it, but fed also by the other two springs, flows a stream considerable enough to work six or seven mills. The deep bed and soft banks of this stream constitute a formidable ditch in front of the position on Gilboa, and render it possible for the defenders of the latter to hold the spring at their feet in face of an enemy on the plain : and the spring is indispensable to them, for neither to the left, right, or rear is there any other living water. Thus the conditions of the narrative in Judges vii. are all present, though it must be left to experts to say whether ten thousand men could be deployed in the course of an evening from the hill behind to the spring and the stream that flows from it. Anybody, however, can appreciate the suitability of the test which Gideon imposed on his men. The stream, which makes it possible for the occupiers of the hill to hold also the well against an enemy on the plain, forbids them to be careless in their use of the water ; for they drink in face of that enemy, and the reeds and shrubs which mark its course afford ample cover for hostile ambushes. Those Israelites, therefore, who *bowed themselves down on their knees*, drinking headlong, did not appreciate their position or the foe ; whereas those who merely crouched, lapping up the water with one hand, while they held their arms in the other and kept their face to the enemy, were aware of their danger, and had hearts ready against all surprise. The test in fact was a test of attitude, which, after all, both in physical and moral warfare has proved of greater value than strength or skill—attitude towards the foe and appreciation of his presence. In this case it was particularly suitable. What Gideon had in

view was a night march and the sudden surprise of a great host—tactics that might be spoiled by a few careless men. Soldiers, who behaved at the water as did the three hundred, showed just the common sense and vigilance to render such tactics successful. First, however, Gideon himself explored the ground—two miles in breadth between his men and the Arab tents; and heard, holding his breath the while, the talk of the two sentries, which revealed to him what stuff for panic Midian was. The rest is easily told. It was the middle watch—that dead of the night against which our Lord also warned His disciples.¹ The wary men, behind a leader who had made himself familiar with the ground, touched without alarm the Arab lines. They carried lights, as Syrian peasants do on windy nights,² in earthen pitchers, and they had horns hung upon them. They blew the horns, brake the pitchers, flashed their lights—that to the startled Arabs must have seemed the torchbearers and pointsmen of an immense host—and shouted, *The sword! for Jehovah and Gideon!* But they did not need to use the sword. Cumbered by their tents and cattle, the Midianites, as in several other instances of Arab warfare, fell into a panic, drew their swords on each other, and finally *the host fled down the Vale to Beth-shittah, to Ssereda near Bethshan,³ unto the lip of Abelmholah, the deep bank over which the Vale of Jezreel falls into the valley of the Jordan, above the now unknown Tabbath.*⁴

¹ Luke xii. 38.

² Thomson, *The Land and the Book*.

³ 2 Chron. iv. 17, where it is described as on the plain of Jordan. It is the same as Ssartan (1 Kings vii. 46; cf. Josh. iii. 16, 1 Kings iv. 12).

⁴ Major Conder, tempted by the name, has suggested the 'Ain el Gem'ain, or Well of the Two Troops, at the foot of Gilboa, near Bethshan, as the well of Harod. But in a pass which has been the scene of countless bivouacs and forays, it is futile to suppose that this name may refer to Gideon's two troops; while if, as all are agreed, Shutta represents Beth-shittah, we must suppose the Arab position and Gideon's camp to the south of it to lie west of Shutta, up the vale.

The name 'Ain Galúd is interesting. Does it come from the form given by

3. The next campaign on Esdraelon—that of the Philistines against Saul—is more difficult to understand. It is uncertain whether the narrative (1 Sam. xxviii.—xxx.) runs in our Bibles in the proper order; and we do not know where Aphek lay.

As the narrative now runs, the Philistines gather to war against Israel (xxviii. 1), and camp at Shunem, whereupon Saul gathers Israel, and camps on Gilboa (*id.* 4); the Philistines then assemble at Aphek, and Israel pitches by a fountain in Jezreel (xxix. 1); the battle is joined, and Israel flee, and are slain in mount Gilboa (xxx. 1). This order implies that Aphek was close to Shunem, on the line of the Philistine advance on Gilboa; and accordingly it has been sought for both at Fuleh on the plain, where the Crusaders had a castle and Kleber's squares in 1799 beat back the Turks; and at Fuku'a, on Gilboa itself, on the road from Genin to Bethshan across the hill, as if the Philistines moved from Shunem to the south of Saul's position, and attacked him from the rear, and upon his own level. But neither of these sites can be proved to be Aphek.¹ Ought not Aphek, however, to come in the order of the Philistines' advance after Shunem? Probably we should rearrange the chapters of the narrative so as to put xxix.—xxx. between the second and third verses of xxviii. Then the order of events would run: the Philistine muster (xxviii.

Boha-ed-din (*Vita Saladinis*, p. 53), 'Ain el Jälüt, or Well of Goliath, with whose defeat by David the *Jerusalem Itinerary* connects Jezreel (see Stradela in the *Jer. Itin.*); or are Jälüt and the identification with Goliath errors due to a mishearing of Jalüd? If the latter, then Galüd has a striking resemblance to the Gilcad mentioned in v. 3 of the narrative, for the disappearance of the letter 'Ain is marked in several cases of ancient names.

¹ It is extremely unlikely that the Philistines should move from Shunem to the present Fuleh, for the latter is farther off than Shunem from Gilboa. It is Major Conder who suggests Fuku'a. We passed over the road from Genin to Beth-shan. From the plain up to Fuku'a the road is easy for chariots, and about Fuku'a there is open ground. But the ground between that and the part of Gilboa above the 'Ain Galüd is broken by glens. Besides, there is no affinity between the names Aphek and Fuku'a.

1); their gathering to Aphek and the encampment of Israel by the fountain which is in Jezreel (xxix. 1); the Philistines' advance towards Jezreel (*id.* 11), their camp on Shunem and Israel's on Gilboa (xxviii. 4); the battle on Gilboa (xxx. 1).¹ On this order, the uncertainties are the position of Aphek and that of the fountain which is in Jezreel. Some have placed Aphek in Sharon, at the mouth of an easy pass into Samaria, identifying it with the Aphek of the previous Philistine invasion, when the ark was taken.² But for many reasons this is unlikely,³ and here it is hard to believe that Saul's advance to the plain of Esdraelon, which is given as simultaneous with the Palestine gathering at Aphek, should have taken place while the Philistines were still in Shunem, for that would have been to leave all Benjamin and Ephraim undefended to their pleasure. Saul must have *followed* the Philistines to Esdraelon; and it is almost impossible to think of him leaving Genin, the great entrance to the hill country of Israel,⁴ and advancing to Gilboa till he saw the Philistines move across the plain to Shunem. In this case, while Aphek remains unknown, we might take *the fountain which is in Jezreel* to be the great fountain at Genin, 'Ain Gannim, Jezreel being intended for the whole district. That would give us a consistent story of the earlier stages of the campaign.⁵

However that may be, the rest is clear. The Philistines

¹ So Reuss, Budde, etc.

² 1 Sam. iv. 1.

³ The identification of the two Apheks, and the placing of their site in Sharon is due to Wellhausen and Robertson Smith. They also identify with it the Aphek from which the Syrians attacked Samaria (1 Kings xx. 26, etc.). But in this case, the Syrians crossing the Jordan by their great Damascus highway south of the Lake of Galilee, would march over Esdraelon, passing the most open and obvious entrance into Samaria, cross into Sharon, and there commence their attack from a far more difficult point. This is most improbable.

⁴ Cf. p. 330, note 1.

⁵ The only other alternative, of supposing two differing narratives, one of which assigns the Philistine muster to Aphek the other to Shunem, is not so probable.

had entered Esdraelon—doubtless by Megiddo. Had their aim been the invasion of the hill country, they would have turned south-east to Genin, and Saul would have met them there. That, instead, we find them striking north-east to Shunem, at the head of the Vale of Jezreel, proves that at least their first intention had to do with the Valley of the Jordan. Either they had come to subjugate all the low country, and so confine Israel, as the Canaanites did, to the hills, or else they merely sought to secure their caravan route to Damascus and the East, from Israel's descents upon it by the roads from Bezek to Bethshan and across Gilboa. In either case Saul must not be permitted to remain where he was, for from Gilboa he could descend with equal ease upon Esdraelon and the valley of the Jordan. They attacked him, therefore, on his superior position. Both the narrative of the battle and the great Elogy in which the defeat was mourned imply that the fighting was upon the heights of Gilboa, and yet upon ground over which cavalry and chariots might operate.¹ The Philistines could not carry Saul's position directly from Shunem, for that way the plain dips, and the deep bed of the stream intervenes and the rocks of Gilboa are steep and high. But they went round Jezreel, and attacked the promontory of the hill by the easier slopes and wadies to the south, which lead up to open ground about the village of Nuris, and directly above the 'Ain Galûd. Somewhere on these slopes they must have encountered that desperate resistance which cost Israel the life of three of the king's sons; and somewhere higher up the gigantic king himself, wounded and pressed hard by the chariots and horsemen, yet imperious to the last, commanded his own death.²

¹ 2 Sam. i. 7, 19, 21, 25.

² The above view of the battle was formed on the ground, and I am glad to find that in the main it is the same as that of so competent an observer as Principal Miller, who surveyed the ground in detail, and gives both a gradual description of the course of the fight and careful plans, that include not only

4. The rest of the historical scenes of Esdraelon, there is space only to enumerate. But perhaps the mere succession of them will impress us, more than detailed accounts could do, with the constant pageant of commerce, war and judgment, which throughout the centuries has traversed this wonderful arena. From Jezreel you see the slaughter-place of the priests of Baal; you see Jehu's ride from Bethshan to the vineyard of Naboth at your feet; you see Megiddo where Pharaoh Necho burst through upon Josiah, *and slew him as they met*; you see the enormous camp of Holofernes spreading from the hills above Genin, out to Kuamon in the plain; ¹ you see the marches and counter-marches of Syrians, Egyptians and Jews in the Hasmonean days—the elephants and engines of Antiochus, the litters of Cleopatra and her ladies. Then the Romans come and plant their camps and stamp their mighty names for ever on the soil, Legio and Kastra; ² Pompey, Mark Antony, Vespasian, Titus and Trajan pass at the head of their legions, and the men of Galilee sally forth upon them from the same nooks in the hills of Naphtali, from which their forefathers broke with Barak upon the chariots of Canaan. After the Roman war comes the Roman peace, and for a great interval of centuries Esdraelon is no more blotted by the black tents of the Bedouin; but

the contours of the ground, but what he believes to have been successive positions of the hard-pressed Israelites. Principal Miller exposes the errors in Dean Stanley's account, in which the battle is described as on the plain, and only the flight on the hills. But I think he himself is not justified in declaring from xxix. 11 that the Philistines occupied the town of Jezreel before the battle. He conceives Saul's position on Gilboa to be due to his rash designs of adding to his kingdom the whole of northern Palestine—rash, for so Saul left Benjamin and Ephraim undefended. This, however, is not certain. *The Least of all Lands*, ch. vi. Plans on 151 and 171.

¹ Judith vii. 3. *Κύαμων* = bean-field, has been identified with Tell Keimun at the foot of Carmel: but some think to find it at Fuleh, which also means bean. The description of *Κύαμων* which is opposite Esdraelon (name of plain or of city?) suits both Keimun and Fuleh.

² Round Carmel on the Coast.

a broad civilisation grows between her and Arabia, and Jordan is bridged, and from the Greek cities of the Decapolis, chariots and bands of soldiers, officials and provincial wits on their way to Rome, pass to the ports of Cæsarea and Ptolemais. In the fourth century Christian pilgrims arrive, and cloisters are built from Bethshan to Carmel. Three centuries of this, and then through their old channel the Desert swarms sweep back, now united by a common faith, and with the vigour of a new civilisation; you see before them the rout of the Greek army up the Vale of Jezreel. The Arabs stay, for nearly five hundred years, obliterating the past, distorting the familiar and famous names. Then the ensigns of Christendom return. Crusading castles rise—on the Plain Sapham and Faba¹ under the black and white banner of the Templars, and high up on the ridge north of Bethshan—so high and far that it is called by the Arabs Star-of-the-Wind,—Belvoir under the Red Cross of the Hospitallers. Cloisters are rebuilt, and thriving villages, for justice and shelter given them, bring their tribute to the Abbey of Mount Tabor; pilgrims throng from all lands, and the holy memories are replanted—not always on their proper sites! Once more by Bethshan the Arabs break the line of the Christian defence, and Saladin spreads his camp where Israel saw those of Midian and the Philistines; through a long hot summer the castles of the Cross yield one by one, till Belvoir holds out alone, flying the Red Cross for eighteen months over a Saracen country. Finally, after two last forlorn hopes—one of Andrew of Hungary, who carried the Cross to the top of Tabor, and was beaten down again,² and one of Saint Louis of France, who marched to Jordan and back—Esdraelon is closed to the arms of the West, till in 1799 Napoleon with his monstrous ambitions of an Empire on

¹ “The Bean” on the site where its Arab synonym Fuleh now stands.

² In the Sixth Crusade.

the Euphrates, breaks into it by Megiddo, and in three months again by the same fatal path falls back upon the first great Retreat of his career.

What a Plain it is! Upon which not only the greatest empires, races and faiths, east and west, have contended with each other, but all have come to judgment—on which from the first, with all its splendour of human battle, men have felt that *there was fighting from heaven, the stars in their courses were fighting*—on which panic has descended so mysteriously upon the best equipped and most successful armies, but the humble have been exalted to victory in the hour of their weakness—on which false faiths, equally with false defenders of the true faith, have been exposed and scattered—on which since the time of Saul wilfulness and superstition, though aided by every human excellence, have come to nought, and since Josiah's time the purest piety has not atoned for rash and mistaken zeal. The Crusaders repeat the splendid folly of the kings of Israel; and, alike under the old and the new covenant, a degenerate church suffers here her judgment at the hands of the infidel.

They go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world to gather them to the battle of the great Day of God Almighty . . . and He gathered them together unto a place called in the Hebrew tongue Har Megeaddon.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

*THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.*

IX.—RATIONALE OF THE ATONEMENT.

IN my last paper I considered certain theories claiming to explain the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ and to link this teaching with other teaching of the Bible about God's administration of the world and with the principles which underlie the moral sense of man. All these theories, although each containing important elements of truth, we found to be, in different ways, inadequate to explain and unify the facts of the case. Our questions returned to us unanswered, (1) Why could not God pardon sin, apart from the death of Christ, by royal prerogative? (2) How does the death of an innocent victim harmonize with the justice of God the pardon of the guilty?

Before attempting to answer these questions, we must remember that already we have proved, by documentary evidence admitting no doubt, that Christ taught that it was needful for Him to go up to Jerusalem and put Himself in the hands of those who, as He knew, would kill Him, and taught that the need for this voluntary sacrifice of Himself lay in man's sin. We also found proof that St. Paul taught that the need for this costly means of salvation from the penalty of sin has its root in the eternal justice of God. And, inasmuch as justice is the divine attribute specially concerned with sin, this partial explanation suggested by the great Apostle at once claimed our approval.

This explanation, however, satisfactory as it is within its own limits, does not satisfy our eager inquiry. We must now proceed to ask, with profound reverence, why could not God pardon sin, by mere prerogative, apart from the death of Christ, as a father forgives a penitent child?

A reply to this question is suggested by the analogy of human government. Practically, a king cannot pardon a guilty criminal. What men call pardon is merely a disguise veiling the perplexing incompleteness of the evidence, insufficient either for condemnation or for acquittal, or a recognition of extenuating circumstances which the sentence could not take into account, or occasionally a bribe to induce accessories to betray the principal offender. This last is never given except with extreme reluctance, and is always felt to be a partial failure of justice. When guilt is certain and there are no palliations, even the most merciful government is deaf to appeals for mercy and the sentence is invariably carried out. In such cases, to pardon the guilty would invoke a cry of indignation which would shake the firmest throne.

We notice also that impartial administration of punitive justice is expressly commanded in the Bible. So Proverbs xvii. 15: "He that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the righteous, both of them alike are an abomination to the Lord."

The reason of all this is not far to seek. "When the guilty goes free, the innocent is injured." The security of the state demands the certain and speedy punishment of all who break its laws. For certainty of punishment is a strong deterrent from crime. To remove or weaken this deterrent, is to disorganize and break up society. National welfare demands the maintenance to the highest degree in national life, and as far as possible in the thought of each citizen, of the inevitable sequence of sin and punishment.

It is now evident that, in human government, to pardon the guilty is not only unjust, as running counter to a principle underlying all law, but unkind. Mercy to an individual is cruelty to the nation. The greatest kindness is a strict administration of justice. For this will deter from crime many who are morally weak and thus save them from infinite

injury; and it will save from their violence those who would be its victims.

This impartial administration of justice always secures respect for the governor. And respect for the governor always strengthens a government. On the other hand, the governor who fails to carry out the punitive regulations of the law is looked down upon with contempt even by those whom he pardons. And this contempt weakens both his government and the state. Even in parental rule it is frequently, perhaps always, expedient that a disobedient child, even though penitent, experience the ill result of disobedience. In such cases, parental love prompts and demands punishment. "He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." Everywhere in human life it is of the utmost importance to maintain the invariable sequence of sin and sorrow, of righteousness and happiness.

All this sheds light upon God's government of the world. For, just as the principles of right and wrong which underlie all government, so deeply interwoven into human consciousness, are manifestly of superhuman origin and authority, so the absolute necessity of government for human welfare proves it to be an ordinance of God. We cannot think of God except as acting upon, and by His action maintaining, those principles of justice which are universal among men. That which in man would be unjust and contemptible, we cannot conceive to be consistent with the character of God. We therefore cannot doubt that the principles which underlie good human government underlie also God's government of men.

If the above inference be correct, the justice of God would forbid pardon by mere prerogative; and the justice which forbade it is but one aspect of that love which is the essence of God and which seeks ever the highest welfare of His creatures. All analogy assures us that the love of God

demands maintenance of the invariable sequence of sin and sorrow by an impartial administration of the prescriptions of the Law, and therefore forbids the pardon of sin by mere prerogative.

This result is in close harmony with the frequent teaching of the Bible that all sin will and must receive due retribution.

Looking at the matter from another point of view, we may say that the creation of free and intelligent agents made needful for their highest good, as a deterrent from sin, the threat of punishment of sin, and that the truth of God required the due infliction of the threatened punishment. Thus both the justice and the truth of God, these being an outflow of His love, forbade the pardon of sin by mere prerogative.

These considerations answer fairly our first question.

A much more difficult question remains. If it be inconsistent with the justice of God to pardon sin by mere prerogative, how is this inconsistency removed or lessened by the death of the innocent in order to save the guilty from the due punishment of their sins? It must be admitted that such transfer of punishment would not be allowed in human government; nor would it ordinarily serve the purposes of justice. But that which would not be permitted in the human administration of justice was, as I have proved, according to the express teaching of St. Paul and the implied teaching of the rest of the New Testament, actually ordained by God as the means of saving the world. This difference between human and divine administration of justice demands now our best attention.

Our question is not answered by the conspicuous teaching of St. Paul and St. John that the death of Christ reveals the wonderful love of God to man, and that the love thus revealed changes into love towards God the hard heart of man. As examples of this teaching, I may quote Romans v. 8, "a

proof of His love towards us God giveth, that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us"; and 2 Corinthians v. 15, "the love of Christ constraineth us, having judged this, that One died for all, therefore all died." Similarly 1 John iv. 10, 19, "herein is love, not that we loved Him, but that He loved us and sent His son to be a propitiation for our sins . . . we love because He first loved us." For this important truth does not explain St. Paul's teaching in Romans iii. 26 that the death of Christ as a means of man's salvation was required by the justice of God; nor his teaching in Romans vii. 4, Colossians ii. 14 about the relation between the death of Christ and the Law. Nor does it explain the necessity which moved Christ, as recorded in Matthew xvi. 21, etc., to go up to Jerusalem and put Himself in the hands of those who, as He foresaw, would kill Him. Moreover, love never prompts a needless sacrifice, or a sacrifice needful only to reveal its own intensity or to obtain for its object something which might be had at less cost. Indeed we sometimes resent, and always regret, useless expenditure on our behalf. On the other hand, when a great benefit, which could not otherwise be ours, or deliverance from great and imminent peril or loss, is obtained for us at great cost, this sacrifice on our behalf, combined with a benefit worthy of the sacrifice, fills us with gratitude. The costliness of the means used by God to harmonize with His own justice the justification of sinners and thus make it possible proves clearly that no less costly means would attain the same result. Our question therefore comes back to us unanswered, why was so costly a revelation of God's love needful for man's salvation?

For an answer, we turn again to the great passage, Romans iii. 25, 26. St. Paul here asserts that God gave Christ to be a propitiation through faith, in His own blood, in order to afford proof of the righteousness of God; that He was moved to give this proof by His own apparent tolerance of

sin in days gone by ; and that the ultimate aim of this proof was to harmonize with His own justice the justification of believers. In other words, the immediate purpose of the death of Christ was to manifest the justice of God in view of past forbearance which seemed to obscure it and in view of the Gospel which announces God's reception into His favour of all those who believe the words of Jesus. The concluding words of verse 26 imply that the justice of God itself demanded this manifestation, that it would have been unjust of God to allow His justice to remain obscured and to pardon sin without giving, through the death of Christ, this public proof of His justice.

It is worthy of note that in human government justice demands not only impartial administration but administration manifestly and conspicuously impartial. Whatever obscures the justice of the ruler hinders, and whatever reveals it helps, the ends of justice.

The question before us now is, Does the death of Christ as a means of man's salvation give proof of the justice of God? If so, justice demanded it as a condition of man's salvation. For justice ever claims, even for the good of the governed, to be openly manifested. Moreover, the justice of God seemed to be obscured by the pardon of sin.

Now justice is the divine attribute which underlies the sequence of sin and sorrow and death. Whatever reveals the inevitability of this sequence reveals God's impartial administration of His own laws. I shall endeavour to show that the death of Christ, following His union with a race smitten with the deadly curse of sin, does reveal this inevitable sequence and thus reveals God's impartial administration in a way which elicits our profound reverence for the character of God and serves a definite moral purpose.

Let us look again at the sequence of sin and sorrow. So deeply rooted in our moral nature is our conviction of this sequence that we cannot doubt that the sequence itself is

ordained by the Author of our being. Nor can we doubt that it is universal and inevitable. We notice also that frequently, indeed usually, sin brings sorrow not only to the sinner but to others, often to innocent persons, especially to those closely related to the guilty one. So frequent is this result of sin that it must be by the ordinance of God. And this far-reaching effect of sin reveals, even more than does the suffering of the guilty, the tremendous and deadly power of sin. The pain thus inflicted on the innocent, by a wide-spread and divinely-ordained moral sequence, is in some sense a vicarious punishment of sin.

The injury wrought by sin upon those associated with the sinner is, in spite of its manifest hardship, a real gain to the race. For, a world in which none suffered except by their own fault would be a far less effective school of moral discipline. In view of this gain, we cannot doubt that even this strange connection of sin and innocent suffering was ordained by the wisdom and love of God for the good of mankind.

To the human race thus constituted, the Son of God occupies, as the writers of the New Testament agree to assert, a unique and very close relation as its Creator and Lawgiver and Judge. It was He who called man into existence, wrote upon the hearts of all men the great principles of morality, linked together moral sequences, and will pronounce and inflict the punishment of sin.

At His incarnation the Son of God entered into still closer relation to our race. He took upon Him flesh and blood and all the conditions of human bodily life. He shared with man that flesh and blood on which rests, in consequence of man's sin, the doom of death. This partnership involved, unless the incarnate Son was to be sheltered by special divine intervention from the consequences of His own act, suffering and death. It involved also close contact with man's sin—a contact which could

not but be infinitely painful to the pure human spirit of Jesus. In Him, pure human nature experienced to the full, while still unstained by its pollution, the painful and shameful consequences of sin. The inevitable result of this close nearness to man was mental and bodily agony, followed by death. And these inevitable results of the incarnation were foreseen and willingly endured by the Son of God.

This intimate union of the Creator Son with His creature man was probably part of the original purpose of creation, and was probably needful for the accomplishment of that purpose and for the highest interest of men. For we may well believe that an intelligent creature can attain his full development and happiness only by closest possible union with his Creator. Had man not sinned, this union would have involved neither death nor suffering. Through man's sin, this union of the Son of God with man, needful for man's highest development, involved all that Christ actually suffered.

The Son of God became Man. He thus became conscious, by actual experience, of bodily pain. His pure human spirit felt, as none but the pure can feel, the shame and degradation of sin. And the testimony He bore to God's claims upon man exposed Him to the fury of bad men. No hand from heaven was reached out to save Him from these various consequences of His entrance into a body doomed to die and into a race dominated by sin. On Him sin worked out its full consequences until the human body of the Sinless One hung dead upon the cross. In other words, in the incarnate Son, the sequence of sin and suffering, ordained by Himself as Creator, was maintained inviolate, and ran its full course although in doing so it struck with infinite agony the Son Himself.

If, as suggested above, the close union of the Creator Son with His creature man was needful for man's highest

good, the sufferings of Christ just described were, on account of man's sin, needful for the same. In full view of the inevitable consequences of so doing, the Son willingly entered into human flesh. And, that God permitted the full consequences of sin to run their course, even though they struck down His only-begotten and beloved Son, reveals in the strongest manner we can conceive the inevitability of this sequence. In Christ's death we see the essential deadliness of sin and its inevitable result as we could not otherwise have done.

This manifestation of the inevitable sequence of sin and sorrow serves a great moral purpose. The forbearance of God in not inflicting speedily the full punishment of sin in former days, and His proclamation of pardon for all who believe the good news announced by Christ, might seem to indicate a tolerance of sin itself by God, as though it were not essentially evil and deadly. The cross of Christ forbids the suggestion. That sin slew the Author of life when He came, for our salvation, in some sense under its domain, is the strongest motive possible for avoiding all future contact with sin.

Thus the death of Christ reveals the justice of God. By revealing the inevitable sequence of sin and death, a sequence which could not be broken even by the incarnation of the Son of God, it reveals the divine attribute underlying that sequence. In the death of Christ we see the Father not overriding, but submitting to His own law. We see the Strong One submitting to the restraints which for their good He imposed on those under His control. Such submission and self-restraint always secure for a ruler our profound respect. Pardon of sin under such circumstances cannot loosen any moral obligation. For He who proclaims pardon maintains at infinite cost to Himself the moral sequences on which rests the highest well-being of men.

As an illustration of the subject before us, appeal has often been made to a famous story about Zaleucus recorded by Valerius Maximus¹ which tells that, when the lawgiver's own son had been found guilty of adultery, a crime for which the punishment prescribed was loss of both eyes, Zaleucus, in order to save his son's sight and yet maintain the letter of the law, ordered one of his son's eyes to be put out and one of his own. It is true that, by so doing, he evaded inflicting the full intention of the law, which was total blindness. But, whatever this story be worth, whether true or false, it proves conclusively that voluntary endurance of suffering by the innocent may serve the interests of justice as effectively as full punishment inflicted on the guilty. For the mutilated face of Zaleucus would proclaim, if the story be true, his inflexible determination to administer impartially his own laws. In view of such self-sacrifice, none would dare to break the law in hope of escape from punishment. In other words, the self-inflicted punishment rendered morally harmless the partial forgiveness of the crime. Similarly, the death of the Son of God reveals, even more clearly than would the death of all the guilty ones, God's purpose to maintain the sequence of sin and suffering. Moreover, just as this story is a tribute of honour to Zaleucus, so in all ages the servants of Christ have seen in His death a manifestation of the justice of God which has secured their profound homage. And this vindication of divine justice has, in their minds, rendered morally harmless the forgiveness of sins announced in the Gospel.

Sometimes in actual life the suffering of the innocent caused by the sin of others serves a moral purpose. Occasionally, dissolute parents have been aroused to a consciousness of their vileness by the suffering they have inflicted on

¹ Book vi. 5, ext. 3.

their children. Thus innocent suffering has fulfilled a moral purpose.

An illustration of the good moral effect of refusing to pardon the guilty, when that refusal eventually cost the lives of innocent victims, occurred some years ago in Greece. A party of Englishmen were captured by brigands at Marathon. The captors offered to release them on condition of a large ransom and a full pardon. The king was most anxious to save the captives; and was willing, for this end, to pay a large price. But he could not pardon the guilty. For, to permit the robbers to enjoy in peace their ill-gotten gains, would have been an inducement to similar acts of violence by others, and would thus render all travelling in Greece dangerous. Indeed, the discontent which had culminated in the dethronement of the king's predecessor, Otho, had been greatly aggravated by his misplaced mercy in the frequent pardon of criminals, and by the insecurity resulting therefrom. The Englishmen were murdered. But the king's refusal to pardon the robbers struck a blow at brigandage in Greece from which it never recovered. It became at once manifest that the guilty could no longer count on mercy, and travelling in Greece is now said to be thoroughly safe. In this case, the capture was not foreseen, nor was the death of the innocent voluntary. But the interests of justice and of the nation were helped by the death of innocent men caused by the sin of others. And in these points it affords a parallel to the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ.

So far we have spoken of Christ's death only as resulting from His entrance into mortal human life. But, for the ends of justice, it was needful that His death should be placed in conspicuous connection with man's sin. This end was attained by His violent death on the cross. For, indisputably, He died because He was good and had

preached righteousness among men who were bad. This all-important connection between His death and our sin would not have been manifested had Christ fled from His enemies and afterwards died a natural death. It was therefore needful for the manifestation of divine justice and for our salvation that He should put Himself in the hands of His enemies. And in this sense we may interpret His own words recorded in Matthew xvi. 21, "He must needs go away to Jerusalem and suffer many things from the elders and chief priests and scribes and be put to death."

Whatever estimate be formed of the above attempt to explain that which the writers of the New Testament have left unexplained, abundant documentary evidence compels us to believe that Christ taught that He was Himself about willingly to die in order to save men from the due penalty of their sins; and that St. Paul taught that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of sinners, and to give proof of this harmony. We have also observed that the teaching of St. Paul explains fully, and is the only explanation of, the teaching of the rest of the New Testament about the death of Christ. And we have now seen that the analogy of human governments affords a strong presumption that God could not pardon sin by mere prerogative; and have seen that the death upon the cross of Him who, in order to fulfil man's original and glorious destiny, Himself became Man reveals the inevitable moral sequence imposed upon man by God for man's good. In this real sense the death of Christ, as a means of saving man, reveals the justice of God, a revelation needful in order to vindicate His justice which seemed to be obscured both by past tolerance of sinners and by the Gospel proclamation of forgiveness of sin.

This explanation, imperfect as it is, does something to harmonize the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ with other teaching contained therein, with

the intuitions of man's moral sense, and with the principles of human government.

In a concluding paper I shall consider the extent of the Atonement.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

PETER'S WIFE'S MOTHER.

MATTHEW VIII. 14. MARK I. 29. LUKE IV. 38.

“A MAN'S foes shall be they of his own household.” This general law of the devoted, of all who stand on a higher level than custom sanctions, was fulfilled in our Lord Himself. They did not believe on Him. They sought to take Him. Their estrangement gave to His enemies the opportunity for at least one sarcastic interruption.

But this estrangement was inevitable, when once His claims were put forward and acceptance was refused to them. For those demands were peremptory. He that was not for Him was against Him. It needs no reference to their possible irritation when the common home in Nazareth became untenable to explain the fact that the anointed of the Lord could not live in close domestic relations with men who rejected his authority and reckoned him to be mad. Henceforth it is clear enough that “His home was not their house.”

Many indications combine to strengthen the belief that at least for a time Jesus made “the house of Peter” the centre of His early journeys. There, in humble comfort, Andrew lived happily with his brother, to whom, the moment he found the Christ, his fraternal heart turned with the glad announcement. Although he seems to have been the elder, yet their common dwelling was naturally known

as the house of the married brother; and there also the mother of Peter's wife found a home, and took her share in the duties of the household. All this conveys an impression of domestic happiness which is confirmed by the fact, incidentally mentioned long afterwards, that Peter's wife became the companion of his perilous missionary journeys. (1 Cor. ix. 5.)

We can well believe that such a harmonious and loving abode was attractive to the Prince of Peace, and that it soothed His spirit to retire hither at intervals from the suspicions, contradictions and blasphemies of the leaders of the people.

After the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue, Jesus turned to this quiet and well-known home. But its peace was clouded. The mother of Peter's wife lay sick of a great fever (typhus, or some such virulent malady, as distinguished from fevers of a long and wasting type) "and they besought him for her." It is Luke the physician who thus specifies her ailment, and adds this strong expression of the appealing anxiety of her relatives. Mark simply mentions that "they tell Him of her" (*λέγουσιν . . . περὶ*) but it will be remembered that the same mannerism, the expression of a petition in the mildest form, reappears a little later in his Gospel: He spake unto His disciples that a little boat should wait upon Him" (*εἶπε . . . ἵνα*, iii, 9). St. Matthew is only concerned with his Lord's own sympathetic recognition of distress, and we might have supposed him to mean that Jesus saw her and restored her to health spontaneously and unsolicited. It is one of the numerous cases in which one narrative warns us not to rely overmuch upon the mere omissions of another.

Christ wrought no miracle to relieve Himself from the common burdens of humanity. These indeed pressed the heavier upon Him because He uplifted their weight from

other men; and it is in his narrative of this very day's events that St. Matthew applies this principle to His mastery over disease (viii. 17). All the more, He relieved with especial promptness the distresses of those who were near to Him, of His hosts when their wine failed, of his followers threatened by hunger, of His disciples alone upon the waters, of those whom he loved in Bethany. Thus He was, in temporal as in spiritual trouble, the Saviour of all men, yet especially of them who believe. And therefore He is prompt to respond to this appeal for one whom He must have known, and whom His disciples evidently loved, an appeal at once so fervent and so delicate, so free from dictation, that it was equally well characterised as beseeching Him and as telling Him of her.

Thus it is that St. Paul describes our fitting prayers in temporal anxiety as a making known of our requests unto God, and yet tells us that he himself, in such a case, "besought the Lord thrice." (Phil. iv. 6; 2 Cor. v. 8.)

St. Luke, with the special interest of a physician in the treatment of disease, tells us, what is peculiar to this case, that He stood over her, and that He rebuked the disease as if it were what it represented, an embodied principle of evil. The same consciousness of moral evil, as if present where its footprint is so visible, is still more evident in the fourth Gospel, when, as He approached the grave of Lazarus, we are twice told of some urgent movement in His spirit which He deliberately fostered, like one who sets himself against a foe (*ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν . . . πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος*, John xi 33, 38). Think whether Christ's rebuke of disease, His hostility to death (of which He shall be "the plague") is not the justification of His church in her long warfare against the insanitary and degrading conditions of our social life.

Nor is His bending over a patient whose disease was virulently infectious lacking in suggestion. For it must be observed that Jesus was never rash; He who steadfastly set His face to go up to Jerusalem exposed Himself to no danger without sufficient cause; and until the appointed time, the third day when He should be perfected, was content to withdraw Himself, to walk no more in Judæa, and even to hide Himself from them.

Now this adds weight to the fact that His attitude toward the infection of disease is the same as toward ceremonial pollution, the same which we shall have to observe when we study His treatment of the leper; it is that of one consciously and wholly beyond its reach. Both contagion and ceremonial defilement are physical adumbrations of that spiritual weakness, that exposure to pollution of the soul and infection from other men's evil, which Jesus came to overcome. And therefore He set them utterly at nought.

St. Matthew tells us nothing of this, and apparently ascribes the miracle to the mere touch of Jesus; while it is characteristic of St. Mark that what He dwells upon is the energetic action by which the Lord appealed to faith and evoked its response; He not merely touched her but took her by the hand, and raised her up, and the fever left her.

No three accounts could harmonize more readily and with less pressure, and yet no three could be more manifestly independent. The narratives offer as easy and fair a test as could be asked, of the attempts to make any one Gospel the progenitor of the other two. And it is especially manifest that Matthew and Luke could not have written with St. Mark's Gospel in their hand. For in no place could the special sources of information which that evangelist drew upon be more valuable than in respect to Peter's household. Yet neither of the other Gospels shows

any sign of depending on the second. Their testimony agrees with it, but it is the free accord in variety which belongs to independent narrators of an event well known to all.

We are constantly told that the evidential value of the Christian miracles is at an end. And it is clear enough that this incident does not help our controversy with that vulgar unbelief which regards the first preachers of Christianity as deliberate impostors. We will even grant that no place could be more convenient than Peter's house for the hatching of such a plot as that which Renan imagined, to explain the story of Lazarus. If any one thinks that liars proclaimed a Messiah who came into the world to bear witness to the truth, that the noblest and most spiritual of all creeds was conceived and propagated by low-minded swindlers, and that a group of homely men were glad to suffer the loss of all things, even life itself, in order to glorify a dead man by ascribing powers to him which they knew that he had not possessed, this is not the story which will assist him to a better mind. Such theories are an outrage upon criticism, in degree far more scandalous, but of the same kind as the notion that Luther's high-souled preaching was inspired by spite and lust. It is not by evidence that they are to be exploded, but by apprehension of cause and effect, by reflecting that thorns will not bear figs.

But this narrative has a deadly significance for the popular theories (more specious only because they are more vague and difficult to bring to book) which represent the greatest of all revolutions as wrought by sincere persons of weak capacity, easily swept along by popular opinion (which they spent their lives in resisting) and so taking for miracles the result of the public effervescence. Here is a work of early date and before enthusiasm reached its

height,¹ a work to which no reasonable theory of the Synoptic Gospels, however sceptical, can refuse the weight of apostolic attestation. For it could not have been inserted in all three, unless it were current in days when the lack of such attestation would have been fatal to a story professing to deal with the domestic concerns of two leaders among the apostles. Moreover, their close connection with it is the simplest, perhaps the only explanation of the existence in all three, without copying from one another, of such a detail as that she ministered unto them. But if the story is of their telling, and if they are not impostors, it is certainly true. Who can doubt the competence of Peter and Andrew to judge of the reality of a work of healing performed in their own house, upon their own relative prostrated by a serious malady, the symptoms of which were perfectly well known? As soon as the coarse theory of false witness is abandoned, the conclusion is irresistible, for the narrative cannot be removed from their cognizance, and the event is one upon which they cannot have wanted the means to form a competent and sober judgment.

The very calmness and moderation of the narrative, its humble rank as a marvel among the miracles, the absence of extreme urgency, of such dread of imminent death, or sorrow for its consummation, as in the case of the child of Jairus or in that of Lazarus, bear ample witness that it sprang from no myth-gendering desire to connect a worthy miracle with the name of Peter—a tendency quite foreign to the tone of all the Gospels.

Such a story, then, the three evangelists have related, briefly and simply, as became men to whom it was a familiar and an interesting event, yet overshadowed by many far greater works.

¹ Keim rightly proves its early date by the great impression which resulted from this relatively small work.

There is always a harmony, a consistent display of character, between many acts of the same person. Give us a sufficient number of them, and without any other evidence they will go far to attest each other, as the paintings of the same artist do. No person could attribute to Wellington a story characteristic of Napoleon, or to Melancthon any one of the great sayings or deeds of Luther. The manner of Julius Cæsar is clearly to be distinguished from that of Augustus. And if a lost epistle were discovered to-morrow, we could not hesitate between the authorship of John, or James, and that of Paul; nor would it be possible to impose half a dozen chapters of any later author upon the Church as the work of any one of them.

Now when we are told that the gospel miracles represent the superstitions of a generation or two of converts, a "tendency" rather than a character, our reply will not be complete without observing that what they all represent is not a tendency but a very vivid and distinct character, the same character as speaks in the discourses, the one thing which scepticism cannot possibly deny, because it is absurd to make any one but Jesus Himself answerable for all that is most characteristic in His religion, for its tendency and temper through all subsequent times. If any one else could be dreamed of in such a connection, it would be the master-mind of Paul. Yes, but what is masterful in Paul is the mind, a mind on fire with devotion and love, but working by intellectual methods still. But an ardent mind is not what the miracles display. It is the purest individualizing personal pity, a pity which counts no contact with misery repulsive, which cares about the smallest inconvenience, which is not expressed in all literature so exactly as in many phrases of Him to whom these actions are ascribed. "I am among you as he that serveth." "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister." "Your

heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of" food and clothing.

We recognise this when we meet it again, pitying the multitude when they have nothing to eat, having compassion on the leper and touching him, providing that the daughter of Jairus shall be fed, and that the widow of Nain shall freely embrace her son, and that Lazarus shall be disencumbered of his grave-clothes. We find it here in the tenderness of His manner to an aged and sick woman, as He stoops over the sufferer, touches her, and raises her up with His own hand.

In what is said of her behaviour also we recognise veracity and genuine human nature. When the apostles restored one who had been always lame, the joy of new physical power was seen in his walking and leaping, and loud praise. Such exuberance of delight was not to be expected here. But there is the pleasure of recovered faculty, as she arose and ministered unto them.¹ This action shows also the prompt fulness of her recovery from a disease which naturally leaves much prostration after it. Thus, in St. John's Gospel, the nobleman expected only an incipient amendment, but found that the disease (a fever also) had quite departed at the hour when his prayer was granted.

The same character is to be recognised in the spiritual work of Jesus, even to this day. It is still a personal compassion which cools the worse and deadlier fevers of the soul; still when invoked He bends over us, and our healing is due to no mechanical grace, but to His own direct act of love; and still it is ours, when healed, to minister to Him and to His people.

¹ Is it necessary to protest against the appeal which has been made to this ministration (*διηκόνει*) in behalf of an official ministry of women? Surely the employment of the word in this one place should be enough to show that it has no official significance whatever, and to forbid its citation on behalf of a cause which needs no such treacherous support.

Two such miracles as the public healing of the demoniac, and immediately afterwards this relief of a disease which must have been notorious, had their result in a great movement, the townsmen carrying all their sick folk to the door. But since it was the Sabbath, (which may be affirmed, with far more confidence than Trench expresses, from the assembly in the synagogue,) this bearing of burdens, however humane, was postponed by their superstition until sunset. Then He went forth, and healed all their sick.

How are we to explain St. Matthew's citation, as connected with this great act, of the words of Isaiah, Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows? First let us observe that the Hebrew word is more truly rendered "sicknesses" than griefs; and next, that the quotation opens the second section of this mighty prophecy, the section which, following after the announcement of a mysterious and august sufferer (lii. 13–liii. 3) declares that He suffers not as one of us but in our stead, bearing our sickness and our sorrows, healing us with His stripes, loaded with the iniquity of us all (liii. 4–7).

It will then appear plain that nothing is implied about the time of His endurance, as it should be identical with this hour of the relief of others, so that the Evangelist could only mean that He suffered, then and there, through the intensity of His sympathies with woe, or through the additional strain imposed upon His weariness by their intrusion. No such meaning, by whatever authority commended, can satisfy the strength of the context which Matthew had in his mind. Never was it less likely than on that evening that Jesus was supposed to be smitten of God.

But now, and according to the best arrangement, now for the first time, Jesus deals not only with individual griefs but those of the whole district; He relieves the people, the public, a population. True that St. Matthew's

arrangement of events is different (cf. iv. 24, 25), but one evidence that his sequence is not chronological is that not before, but now he pauses to consider the effect on Christ Himself, the necessary consequences, of His becoming the Healer of Humanity. If, as we have seen, sickness is the shadow cast by sin, then it could not be removed if sin were irremovable ; so that all healing is a pledge, almost a sacrament, of pardon, and the connection is far more than verbal between the two clauses of the verse, "Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases." Therefore in administering health to the ailments of the nation, He accepted for Himself the conditions upon which alone their sins could also be removed. He bound Himself to bear them, that He might bear them away.

G. A. CHADWICK.

THE IDIOM OF EXAGGERATED CONTRAST.

“I DESIRED mercy and not sacrifice.” These words from the prophecy of Hosea (vi. 6), quoted on two occasions by our Lord (St. Matt. ix. 13 and xii. 7), are explained on the principle of Hebrew parallelism by the succeeding clause, “and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.” Indeed, the Septuagint translators have obliterated all structural distinction between the two parts of the sentence, rendering, as they do, the first hemistich, “I desire mercy *rather than* sacrifice.”

We have here the most familiar instance of a Hebrew idiom by which, when two things are contrasted, one of less importance than the other—or for the time being so regarded—the inferior is spoken of as of no account whatsoever.

This divine declaration was not intended to intimate that sacrifice in itself was displeasing to the Almighty. The sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual had been appointed by God Himself, and to desist from offering them would have been an act of open rebellion against Him. It was intended to impress upon the Jewish mind, in the most emphatic way, the immense superiority of mercy; to enforce the lesson that ceremonial acts can never be substituted for moral duties; that ritual is valuable only so far as it is the expression of the true religion of the heart.

Among other instances of this mode of speech, found in the Old Testament, may be mentioned the well-known words of Psalm li. 16, 17: “Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.” Also the message of Joel (ii. 13) to sinful Israel: “Rend your heart and not your garments.” Perhaps the strongest passage of all

is Jeremiah xxii. 23. "I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice." Here words are used which seem to contradict the account given in Exodus of the institution of the Passover sacrifice, in order to bring into full relief the far greater importance of obedience.

This Hebrew idiom "of exaggerated contrast" as, for want of a better term, I may call it, would be well understood by the writers of the New Testament, and our Lord by His double quotation from Hosea, gave it His express sanction. We need not therefore be surprised if we find it occasionally influencing their language. And in fact there are several passages in the New Testament which cannot be satisfactorily explained except as instances of this idiom.

Take a passage which has sorely perplexed many conscientious Christian women—St. Peter's exhortation to wives (1 St. Peter iii. 3, 4): "Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, or of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." Did St. Peter intend to issue a sumptuary edict, proscribing certain fashions or ornaments? His words go quite too far for this. Taken literally, they plainly forbid ordinary neatness or even decency. And immediately afterwards the Apostle holds up as patterns of the true kind of adornment the holy women of old, mentioning Sara by name. But he had no reason to suppose that she refused to adopt the usual female fashions of her time, that she would have thought it unseemly to put on jewels of silver and jewels of gold and raiment such as those which her daughter-in-law Rebekah

(another holy woman of old) willingly accepted from Abraham's servant! When St. John compared the holy city which he saw in a vision to "a bride adorned for her husband," he said nothing, we may be sure, out of harmony with this exhortation of his brother Apostle. No, what St. Peter evidently meant was, to contrast the two kinds of adornment, the inner and the outward; to indicate that the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit was woman's truest ornament; and in order to emphasize the contrast he made use of the forcible Hebrew idiom which he found ready to his hand.

Let us now turn to 1 Corinthians i. 17. "Christ sent me," says St. Paul, "not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." What! would the Apostle of the Gentiles have us understand, contrary to his own assertions elsewhere, that his commission was less ample than that of the original apostles, yea, that his powers were inferior to those of the humblest minister of Christ? Impossible: nay, in this very passage he guards us against a literal interpretation of his words, for he mentions certain persons who had been baptized by him. Surely we have here another instance of the idiom "of exaggerated contrast," St. Paul not meaning in the least to deny his authority to baptize, but simply wishing to express in the most vigorous way his conviction that, his position and gifts being what they were, preaching the gospel was the duty peculiarly assigned to him, the duty to which all his energies must be devoted; that the work of baptizing, however important in itself—and the apostle had no thought of disparaging it—yet, as being a matter of ritual, and needing no special talents in the officiant, might with more fitness be left to inferior ministers. There was an additional reason, too, which made it desirable that St. Paul should be relieved, as far as possible, from this latter function, namely, lest those who were baptized by his hands might suppose that they belonged to him in a pre-

eminent degree, and thus encouragement should be given to the spirit of faction, so strongly denounced in this epistle. "I thank God," he says, "that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name."

Let us next consider St. John's comment (vii. 39) on our Lord's words at the Feast of Tabernacles: "But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." The word "given" is not in the original; but even supposing that it should be supplied, how astounding is St. John's assertion? When we know that the Spirit strove with men before the Flood (Gen. vi. 3), that He gave Samson his strength (Judg. xiv., xv.), and Bezaleel his wisdom (Exod. xxxi. 2), that He enlightened the seventy elders in the wilderness (Num. xi. 25), that He dwelt among the people in their wanderings, grieved at their rebellion, and finally brought them to the land of rest (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11, 14), that David in his penitence implored God not to take His Holy Spirit from him (Ps. li. 11), that Isaiah was able to say (lxi. 1), "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," that prophet after prophet in like manner claimed the Divine Afflatus, that, in short, testimonies to the presence and work of the Spirit among men are scattered broadcast through the pages of the Old Testament, and the New Testament bears its witness that "in old time holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (2 St. Peter i. 21)—when we know all this, how are we to understand St. John's statement that before Christ's glorification the Spirit was not given? Commentators supply the right interpretation when they explain that the Evangelist had in view the vast increase in the measure of the gift of the Spirit which should follow the Ascension, that he meant that the Spirit was never before so given,—so amply, so generally, so efficaciously. But

such an exposition does manifest violence to the Apostle's words. We may feel sure that this [is what he must mean. But we can give no intelligible explanation of his strange language, unless we regard it as shaped by this Hebrew idiom.

But not only does our Lord quote with approval "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," this idiom "of exaggerated contrast" finds place also in His own sacred utterances. How else are we to understand the words spoken on one occasion to persons who were more concerned about their temporal than their spiritual wants, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life" (St. John vi. 27)? Christ surely did not mean to condemn industry, the toiling for an honest livelihood, and to recommend idleness and sloth. St. Paul's command, "If any will not work, neither shall he eat," (2 Thess. iii. 10), would not have been disapproved by his Master. No, Christ's "Labour not" must mean, make not this your chief aim, the main object upon which you will spend your energies; seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; see to it that the interests of your immortal soul, its food and sustenance, take precedence of all care for your bodily welfare.

A parallel passage in the Sermon on the Mount requires a similar interpretation: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth . . . but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" (St. Matt. vi. 19, 20). A literal compliance with the negative half of this precept would discourage thrift, destroy commerce, and deprive the world of the manifold benefits of capital. It is plain that our Lord, in contrasting the two kinds of treasures, uses this emphatic idiom in order to point out in the most forcible way the kind which is beyond measure the more important.

"Call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven" (St. Matt. xxiii. 9).

This is a text which has been most unfairly pressed into the service of religious controversy, interpreted as a divine prohibition of the application of the paternal title to Christian pastors, for example, the addressing of bishops as "fathers in God." If thus understood, it condemns by anticipation St. Paul when he claims the name as expressive of the relation in which he stands to his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. iv. 14, 15), "As my beloved sons I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." But if our Lord's words are to be taken literally, we have no right to place any such artificial restriction on their meaning. "Call no man your father upon earth" forbids that title as much in the family as when used as an expression of religious veneration and respect. "Father" is completely banished from human lips, except as a designation of the Parent of all! It is plain then that the only explanation which fully and adequately accounts for this command is that we have here another verbal parallel to, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." It is an emphatic proclamation of our heavenly Father's paramount claim on the love and obedience of His children—an emphatic prohibition of any earthly relationship, natural or spiritual, being allowed to come into competition with His authority.

The last instance of this idiom that I shall adduce is perhaps the most remarkable of all—Christ's dictum as to the best kind of hospitality (St. Luke xiv. 12, 13), "Then said He also to him that bade Him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours. . . . But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind." This saying seems to cut at the root of social life, to condemn those gatherings of equals, friends and relations, which form so large an element in the brightness

and joy of human existence. But how can this be so, when our Lord by His frequent presence at entertainments of this nature has stamped them with His approval? What were the marriage at Cana, Levi's feast, the feast at the house of Simon the leper, but friendly gatherings precisely of the kind which His words here appear to denounce? His own solemn farewell was spoken at a supper which He shared with His dearest friends. This very command of His was given on an occasion when He had gone into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread, and when a large company of guests apparently of the same social standing as the host had been invited. The whole tenor of Christ's teaching and example is opposed to the supposition that He designed to proclaim war against the ordinary customs of society so far as they were innocent in themselves. He did not wish to withdraw his disciples from the world, only from the world's evil. As we must therefore put aside the literal and surface meaning of these words of Christ, the question arises, How are they to be explained? And I do not see how any interpretation can be satisfactory that is not grounded on the frank acknowledgment that our Lord's language here takes its form from that mode of speech with which the Hebrew scriptures familiarised Him. "Call not," here must mean, "Call not exclusively," or "in preference to others." What Christ intended was not to forbid all hospitality between friends and equals, but to point out what was, beyond comparison, a better sort of hospitality. He wished, further, to indicate the condition which hallowed and made lawful the former kind of entertainment. His words may be thus paraphrased, "First be generous to those who cannot recompense thee, give of thy substance to bring relief and blessing to thy poor and afflicted brethren, and then, and then alone, mayest thou with a good conscience spread thy board for guests of another class."

These passages present a series of perplexing problems which may not be put aside on the plea that common sense, guided by the general tenor of holy scripture, enables us to guess at the correct solution. The question must be faced, Why did the sacred writers use language which apparently conceals their true meaning and requires their readers, if they would understand them aright, to put a strained, unnatural interpretation on their words?

I have suggested in this paper what I believe to be the only satisfactory answer to this question.

JAMES G. CARLETON.

ST. PAUL'S FIRST JOURNEY IN ASIA MINOR.

AFTER these topographical and historical details, it is proposed, as the next part of our task, to go over the first missionary journey as a plain narrative of travel and adventure, and to show how the references, which St. Paul in his letter to the Galatian churches makes to his experiences when he first preached to them, work in with the narrative in Acts xiii. and xiv. to produce a consistent picture. On the theory (which the present writer is concerned to maintain) that Acts xiii., xiv. are founded on, or even embody with some slight modifications and additions, a document written under the immediate influence of Paul himself, it is absolutely necessary that the epistle should agree with and complete the narrative in Acts. Herein lies what is generally counted one of the strong points of the North-Galatian view: it is contended that the details of the visit to the Galatians mentioned in the epistle are inconsistent with the account of the journey in South Galatia given in Acts xiii., xiv. If that be the case, I fully acknowledge that the North-Galatian view must be adopted, in spite of the numerous difficulties attending it; and then it must be admitted, as closer examination would show, that the account of the second journey in Acts xvi. is inaccurate in itself and written by one who had not access to a trustworthy account of the acts.

Let us try to realise the facts of the journey and the situation of the apostles. How were they guided on this particular route? At certain points in this and in other journeys we are told what was the guiding impulse; a vision led Paul from Asia into Europe; the Spirit ordered him not to preach in Asia, and not even to enter Bithynia. In the first journey they were sent forth by the Holy Spirit "for the work whereunto I have called them"; and Paul

explains in Galatians that the work was to preach among the Gentiles (i. 16 ff.). There can be no doubt that the expression in Galatians i. 15, 16 tallies exactly with that in Acts xiii. 1, and that it would be appropriate for Paul to address to the churches which he founded on his first missionary journey an elaborate argument in favour of his special call to Gentile work.¹

It is not stated that the Holy Spirit prescribed the details of the route. How then should Paul and Barnabas proceed? To leave Syria they must go first to Seleuceia, the harbour of Antioch, where they would find ships going south to the Syrian coast and Egypt, and west either by way of Cyprus or along the coast of Asia Minor. The western route led towards the Roman world, to which all Paul's subsequent history proves that he considered the Spirit called him. The apostles embarked in a ship for Cyprus, which was very closely connected by commerce and general intercourse with the Syrian coast. After traversing the island from east to west, they must go onward. Ships going westward naturally went across to the coast of Pamphylia, and the apostles, after reaching Paphos, near the west end of Cyprus, sailed in one of these ships, and landed at Attalia in Pamphylia.

In the east a man with a day's journey before him always rises early in the morning; and similarly we may feel fairly confident that in view of this great expedition the apostles started early in the year, in April, when the season for navigation began.² It is not safe to allow much less than three months in Cyprus, where they preached in the Jewish synagogues along their route. We must allow a certain time in each of the Jewish settlements to enable the apostles to test the feeling of the town before they

¹ I do not argue that it would be less appropriate in writing to other churches. I am only concerned to show that it is appropriate on the South-Galatian theory.

² CH adopt this view.

proceeded on their way in search of a favourable opening ; and yet, if the document possesses vividness and direct accuracy, it is hardly consistent with the language to suppose that they stayed very long at any place. Nothing of permanent interest occurred till they reached Paphos ; and even there the words describing their experience do not suggest any prolonged stay. It seems then a fair and natural interpretation of the document to place their arrival in Pamphylia in the end of June or the beginning of July. Some slight stay at Perga is implied by the dissension which was caused by the proposal to go to the upper country ; then they proceeded to the interior without preaching at Perga or in Pamphylia.

We can hardly suppose that this was part of the original scheme, for John Mark was willing to come into Pamphylia with them, but not willing to go on into the country north of Taurus, and therefore he evidently considered that the latter proposal was a departure from the original scheme. Cyprus and Pamphylia were countries of similar situation to Cilicia and Syria, and in the closest possible relations with them, whereas it was a serious and novel step to go into the country north of Taurus. We need not therefore suppose that John Mark was actuated solely or mainly by cowardice ; the facts of the situation show that he could advance perfectly plausible arguments against the change of plan, which was to carry their work into a region new in character and not hitherto contemplated by the church. It seems no unwarrantable addition, but a plain inference from the facts, to picture the dissension as proceeding on lines like these ; and it relieves John Mark from a serious charge, which is not quite in keeping with his boldness in originally starting on this first of missionary journeys. What then was the motive of Paul and Barnabas in taking this new step ? Evidently the Spirit did not order them, for we are pre-

cluded from supposing that John Mark actually disobeyed the divine injunction which he had already obeyed in coming to Cyprus and Pamphylia; and moreover we are not justified in interpolating such divine action in the narrative without express warrant in its own words. Was it that circumstances independent of their own will dictated this change? To this question Paul himself gives the answer. "Ye know," he says to the Galatians, "that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel to you the first time."

Every one who has travelled in Pamphylia knows how relaxing and enervating the climate is. In these low-lying plains fever is endemic; the land is so moist as to be extraordinarily fertile and most dangerous to strangers. Confined by the vast ridges of Taurus, 5,000 to 9,000 feet high, the atmosphere is like the steam of a kettle, hot, moist, and swept by no strong winds. Coming down in July, 1890, from the north side of Taurus for a few days to the coast east of Pamphylia, I seemed to feel my physical and mental powers melting rapidly away. I might spend a page in quoting examples,¹ but the following fact bears so closely on our present purpose that it must be mentioned. In August, 1890, I met on the Cilician coast an English officer on his way home from three years' duty in Cyprus; previously he had spent some years in Eastern service. He said that the climate of the Cilician coast (which is very similar to that of Pamphylia, and has not any worse reputation for unhealthiness) reminded him of Singapore or Hongkong, while that of Cyprus was infinitely fresher and more invigorating.

We suppose then that Paul caught fever on reaching Perga. Here it may be objected by those who have no experience of such a situation that Paul was used to the

¹ The Rev. Mr. Daniell, who travelled with Spratt and Forbes, died of fever at Attalia, a few miles from Perga.

climate of Cilicia and Syria; why should he suffer in Pamphylia? In the first place, no one can count on immunity from fever, which attacks people in the most capricious way. In the second place, it was precisely after fatigue and hardship, travelling on foot through Cyprus amid great excitement and mental strain, that one was peculiarly liable to be affected by the sudden plunge into the enervating atmosphere of Pamphylia. The circumstances implied in the epistle are therefore in perfect keeping with the narrative in Acts; each of the authorities lends additional emphasis and meaning to the other.

A bad attack of malarial fever, such as we suppose to have befallen St. Paul in Pamphylia, could not be described better than in the words in which Lightfoot (an advocate of the North-Galatian theory) sums up the physical infirmity implied in the epistle iv. 13-15: "A return of his old malady, 'the thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan sent to buffet him,' some sharp and violent attack, it would appear, which humiliated him and prostrated his physical strength." I appeal to all who have experience, whether this is not a singularly apt description of that fever, which has such an annoying and tormenting habit of catching one by the heel just in the most inconvenient moments, in the midst of some great effort, and on the eve of some serious crisis, when all one's energies are specially needed.¹ Few experiences can be more humiliating than to lie prostrate, shaking, unable to move, at the moment when vigorous action is required.

The treatment for such an illness would be prescribed by universal consent as either the sea or the high lands

¹ I have not in the slightest word or detail altered my description to suit the case. The sentence in the text has been often in my mouth in describing what I have seen; and the words "catching by the heel" have become with me a stock phrase to describe the usual behaviour of this fever. Lightfoot's quotation from 2 Cor. xii. 7 has no certain connexion with the present case; but the connexion is generally admitted.

of the interior. Thus the paragraph in the *EXPOSITOR*, January, 1892, p. 31, acquires much more pertinence, now that we have succeeded in eliciting the probable character of the case. In this way Paul and Barnabas were led to visit the Jewish settlement of Antioch, and the evangelisation of the Galatian churches was due to "an infirmity of the flesh."

On the North-Galatian theory, I fail to comprehend what can be the situation. It is a remarkable fact, that the long toilsome journey, involving great physical and mental effort, and yet voluntarily undertaken, should be described as the result of a severe illness; such a result from such a cause is explicable only in certain rare circumstances. We have seen that the result naturally follows from a Pamphylian illness. On the other hand, I cannot see any possible circumstances in which a preaching tour in North Galatia could be due to an illness during the second journey. Let those who advocate that theory suggest some actual facts and details which are in accordance with the situation and the record. But this is a point to which I shall return on another occasion.

It may also be suggested in objection to our theory, that if so much importance attaches to this illness, a document composed under St. Paul's influence would make some reference to it. In answer, it might be sufficient to ask whether St. Paul's character would make us expect from him a formal reference to his illness. But suppose the reference made, what is the result? It would be hardly possible in such a brief account to speak of the illness without giving a worse tone to the action of Mark than it fairly deserved; and the silence preserved in regard to it is perhaps not unconnected with this fact.

The attack described in the letter to the Galatians need not be understood as lasting long; that is not the character of such attacks. But the journey to Antioch could not be

made rapidly. At the ordinary rate of twenty miles per day, it would need eight days; but we must allow a slower progress in this case. The latter part of July, on the conception we have formed of the journey, is the earliest date when the apostle can have reached Antioch; and the beginning of August is more probable. About that time the journey to the upper country would be most imperatively required for a fever-struck patient; whereas, after the middle of September a journey to the plateau would no longer be naturally recommended.

The motives which might lead the Jewish strangers to select Antioch have been already described (EXPOSITOR, Jan., 1892). We suppose Paul and Barnabas to have arrived there. After ten or twelve days' stay, they turned from the Jews to the Gentiles. Among them it is clear from Acts xiii. 48-9, and Galatians iv. 13-15, that Paul was welcomed gladly, was treated with extraordinary affection, with kindly solicitude as an invalid, and with admiration as a teacher. These two passages fit into each other perfectly. It may also be noticed that the hospitality with which Onesiphorus went out to meet and invite Paul to his house in the romance of St. Thekla¹ may be treated as implying some tradition with regard to the hearty welcome extended to the apostles in the whole of this region.

They resided in Antioch for some time. A certain interval is required for the recorded effect,—“the word of the Lord was spread abroad throughout all the region.” Two months is the minimum that can be allowed for such widespread effect. On the other hand, the stay in Antioch is not said to be “long,” as is that in Iconium. We may estimate a “long time” (*ἱκανὸν χρόνον*) by comparison with Paul's later journeys.² He stayed a “long time” (*ἱκανὰς ἡμέρας*, xviii. 18) at Corinth after the trial before Gallio,

¹ See above, p. 171.

² I avoid comparison with the earlier chapters.

and as we know that the whole duration of his residence there was eighteen months, this phrase must denote some period like six to ten months. We may fairly suppose a similar time to have been spent at Iconium, let us say eight months; whereas at Antioch he resided less than six months, and not less than two. Moreover if we may assume that the new magistrates at Antioch came into office, according to the general Asian fashion,¹ on September 23rd, it is probable that any machinations against the apostles would be directed to influence not the retiring, but the incoming, magistrates. After entering on office, the new magistrates would be occupied with pressing official duties in their first days; and the middle or end of October is likely to have been the earliest time at which they could attend to the complaints made by the influential classes against Paul. All this leads us to the conclusion that the three or four days' journey to Iconium falls in the latter part of October, or in November, and that the whole winter was spent in Iconium.

A point, which illustrates and is illustrated by the state of society in Asia Minor, is the influence exerted on the apostles' fortunes in Antioch by the women. The honours and influence which belonged to women in the cities of Asia Minor form one of the most remarkable features in the history of the country. In all periods the evidence runs on the same lines. On the border between fable and history we find the Amazons. The best authenticated cases of *Mutterrecht* belong to Asia Minor. Under the Roman Empire we find women magistrates, presidents at games, and loaded with honours.² The custom of the

¹ It is however quite possible that the Roman year was used in the colony, and that the magistrates entered on office, according to the Roman fashion, on January 1st.

² Examples have been collected with much diligence by M. Paris in his treatise, *Quatenus femine in Asia Minore res publicas attigerint*; the conclusions which he draws appear to me unsatisfactory, and the whole tone

country influenced even the Jews, who in at least one case appointed a woman at Smyrna to the position of archi-synagogos.¹ It would have been strange if they had not exercised some influence over St. Paul's fortunes.

The journey to Iconium was probably performed in greater ease and comfort, perhaps in a carriage. The apostles had now many friends, and Paul lays special stress on their extraordinary anxiety to give him anything in their power that could be of service to him² (Gal. iv. 15); this implies a liberal and overflowing hospitality, and quite naturally includes help in his actual journey, recommendations to residents at Neapolis and other towns on the way, and the use of horses for the journey.

The hurried flight from Iconium to Lystra, according to our reckoning, took place about June. It is difficult to find any indication of time in the following part of the narrative. It seems to be implied (xiv. 6) that the Apostles' residence in this district was not confined to a certain time in Lystra, and then a certain time in Derbe; but that they made some excursions, and remained in the district engaged in missionary work. I must confess, however, that the language here is vague and I do not comprehend it clearly.³ During the heat of summer this country district would be much cooler and pleasanter than the city of Iconium, though even there the heat is not excessive, and the suburban gardens are agreeable.

During this residence in the Isaurian hill country, certain

of the writer is as flippant and unpleasant as his Latin is feeble (*e.g.*, he employs Pons in the sense of Pontus, p. 116).

¹ See Neubauer in *Studia Biblica*, I., p. 70; Reinaeh in *Revue des Études Juives*, vii., p. 161.

² Mere attention to Paul in sickness is not enough to explain the words in Gal. iv. 15; the actual giving or offering of their own valued possessions is necessarily included.

³ In the country round about, among the Isaurian hills, it is highly improbable that the apostles could speak to the rustic population, who were, it is practically certain, ignorant of Greek till a far later date.

Jews came to Lystra from Antioch and Iconium. If we may judge from modern experience, these Jews were traders of the class of brokers or middle-men, who were speculating in the approaching harvest, and came to look after their business. Greeks and Armenians play among the primitive natives at the present day exactly the part which I attribute to the Jews in the first century, buying up the grain and other produce from the agricultural population, and exporting it to harbours on the south coast, or selling it in retail trade in the cities.¹ If this supposition is correct, August is a very likely month for their coming to Lystra, and the stoning of Paul would come some weeks later. The two days' journey to Derbe² would then fall perhaps as late as September. Three months is no exaggerated allowance for the effect produced at Derbe, "making many disciples." That brings us at least to the end of November. After that season the passes over Taurus are liable to be blocked by snow, and are at best very trying and difficult to cross. What, then, were the apostles to do? The journey across Taurus was described to them as impossible. They were at the extremest limit of Roman territory and could not go further forward to preach, except by entering the kingdom of Antiochus. Now it is not a too fanciful idea that St. Paul may already have begun to realise the great conception (which he certainly realised afterwards) of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire, and was already confirmed in his preference for centres of Roman life and influence. In this situation they resolved to return by the way they had come, and to take the opportunity of organising the administration of the newly founded communities, all of which they had been obliged to leave quite suddenly.

The apostles had been expelled, or had fled in danger of

¹ The tithes were no doubt also farmed by speculators, as at present in some districts: some of these visitors might be agents of the company of speculators.

² The distance is about nine or ten hours.

their lives, from Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra; and it is clear that the riotous action of the populace had been connived at, or even encouraged, by the magistrates. How then could they venture to re-enter the cities against the authority of the magistrates?

The question touches on a branch of ancient law, viz., the powers and rights of the magistrates in such provincial cities, which is so obscure that we cannot answer with certainty or confidence, but can only indicate some probabilities. It is worth notice that the magistrates of Antioch seem to have taken a more decided action than those of Iconium or Lystra. Antioch was a Roman colony, and an administrative centre; and it is quite natural that its magistrates should be of higher rank, and should venture on bolder action.

We may take it for granted that Roman law and custom prevailed in the Roman colonies, Antioch and Lystra; and in all probability they exercised great influence even in Iconium. We may then understand that the magistrates could not permanently banish any person from the city; but that, in the exercise of their powers for the preservation of peace and order, they could go to very great lengths in the way of summary punishment against any individuals whose action or presence was inconsistent with peace and order. They could turn them out of the city (though not permanently exile them), they could tear their clothes, inflict personal indignities on them, or beat them (unless they were Roman citizens). But the punishments which they inflicted caused no permanent disability, except in so far as the mere physical effect might be indelible; they could not pass sentence of death or of exile. The person who was turned out of the city might return after a little; but of course he would be wise not to return so long as the magistrate who ejected him remained in office.

But though the magistrates could not punish a culprit

with death, a "regrettable incident," such as a popular riot, might occasionally occur, leading to the death of an obnoxious individual, and mildly blamed by the magistrates, who privately rejoiced at it. Hence in Iconium and Lystra we may be pretty sure that the magistrates connived at the stoning intended in the one case, and effected in the other; but it was only by such irregular proceedings that the death of the missionaries could be compassed. The magistrates could take no overt action.

It would appear then that Paul and Barnabas had been brought before the magistrates of Antioch, but not of Iconium or of Lystra. But even in Antioch the orders of the magistrates inflicted on them no permanent disability, and in Lystra they had been the victims of illegal conduct so extreme that they had acquired a strong legal position. They were legally free also to return to Iconium and Antioch, but in common prudence they would hardly return until new magistrates came into office. Now, according to the account of the journey which has just been given, it appears that new magistrates had already been appointed in all three towns.¹

The rest of the winter then was spent in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch. The magistrates and the Jews are not again referred to; it is probable that the apostles' freedom from interference was gained by their refraining from such open preaching as before, while they devoted themselves to organising some kind of self-government in the congregations. Some years later, we know that Paul could direct the Galatian churches to make weekly contributions for the benefit of the poor at Jerusalem; and this implies officials and a system of administration. It was not before the middle of May in the following year that the apostles could

¹ Unless the magistrates in the colony of Lystra entered office on January 1st. But Lystra was the town in which St. Paul's legal position was strongest. A Roman citizen, violently assaulted by the populace, had a very strong case.

venture to cross the Pisidian mountains. They perhaps spent June in Perga, and in July, after an absence of two years and four months, they may have reached the Syrian Antioch once more. This may be taken as the minimum length of the first missionary journey.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

JULIUS KÖSTLIN.

To old Halle students an autobiography of Professor Julius Köstlin will be not only a welcome, but a somewhat surprising phenomenon. One had hardly thought of him as having attained the kind of notoriety which would lead an editor to think of including him, during his lifetime, in a series of biographies; and it would scarcely have been believed that even the most enterprising editor would be able to extract from the quiet and modest scholar an account of himself intended for a series bearing the somewhat pretentious title of "German Thinkers." But here the book is, a volume of over two hundred and fifty pages.² It is gratifying to learn that he has attained, no doubt chiefly through his *Life of Luther*, which is well known in this country also, to a fame so extensive that his countrymen have demanded a life of him; and none can read the book without being glad that it has been written.

To us, who are not Germans, it is perhaps all the more interesting, because Köstlin is not, among us at least, a notoriety. Your very famous man has of course his own

¹ The South-Galatian theory requires also a detailed examination of the second and third journeys, and of the Epistle. This necessary completion of the present paper must be reserved for another place, viz., for a volume on "The Church in the Roman Empire."

² *Deutsche Denker, und ihre Geistesschöpfungen.* Herausgegeben von Oscar Spitta. 9-12 Heft. *Julius Köstlin, eine Autobiographie.* Mit Portrait. Leipzig, 1892.

fascination ; but his peculiarity is that he is out of the common ; he does not give you a correct idea of the organism to which he belongs ; his contemporaries are sacrificed to him in a way that has often little correspondence with reality ; the gigantic proportions of one figure falsify the impressions made on the mental vision by the rest. Here, however, is a man who has walked the common road, borne the ordinary burdens, and enjoyed the ordinary rewards. His life has been a normal one. If anyone wishes to know what life in Germany has been like during the present century, in university and theological circles, he could not do better than look into these pages.

For this is the life of a real man. Under the rather commonplace details of his professorial changes and duties, and the various professional offices he has filled, there are touches of humanity and even pathos. One catches glimpses of a still and cultivated home life, such as Germans love. The writing rises to a kind of enthusiasm and even beauty when he has occasion to describe natural scenery, as in his accounts of schoolboy rambles in the Black Forest. He has evidently been, all along, a good citizen, cherishing a high ideal of patriotic duty, and acting on it. One strange episode almost rises into the sublime. On arriving in Göttingen, to occupy the chair of New Testament Exegesis, he had to pay a visit of etiquette to the court of Hanover. The interview transacted itself satisfactorily, till, when he rose to take leave, King George said, with regal dignity, "Remember, you have to teach them to honour the government, and only a monarchical government." The young professor was taken aback, but, recovering himself, explained there and then that, as a Christian scholar, he would gladly teach his students to honour the constituted authority under which they lived ; but that he could not teach that the New Testament gives exclusive sanction to any particular form of government. Nothing followed ; but it was an act

which in other days might have cost a teacher his head, not to say his professorship.

Köstlin is a native of Stuttgart, where he was born in 1826. His father was a physician of good standing; and the family had numerous connections with people of the comfortable professional class, and, among others, a not distant one with the philosopher Schelling. Influences of culture surrounded the boy; and there was a deep strain of South German piety in the family, which had come down through several generations and passed into him in a quiet and genial form. He lingers over this period with obvious delight, and it is a very attractive domestic interior which is made visible.

Tübingen was the only university in which he studied. There are numerous indications that he was an eminent student; yet he did not yield to what were then the predominant influences of the place. Hegelianism was represented by men like Zeller and Schwegler, who taught it as the final philosophical gospel. But Köstlin found more substance in Kant. He thought that Kant had immensely advanced real knowledge; but that his followers, with the exception perhaps of Fichte, had not carried forward the investigation of the questions which he raised. "Back to Kant" has since become a familiar cry in Germany; but Köstlin discovered the path for himself. It is curious to note what he says about the present position of Hegel's philosophy. Though not an adherent of his, he bitterly reproves his countrymen for allowing so great a thinker to fall into complete neglect. So swiftly spins the whirligig of time! Baur also was then at Tübingen, with others of those so well known among us as the Tübingen School. But Köstlin appears hardly to have been influenced by them at all. They seemed to him to be munching at the shell; and the deep mystical instincts which he had inherited from his Bavarian ancestors led him to prefer the kernel. He

subsequently found himself in cordial sympathy with such older theologians as Tholuck and Müller, his colleagues at Halle; and, in his book on Faith, he developed a doctrine of the grounds of Christian belief identical in substance with that which has since been expounded by Frank in his *Christian Certainty* and by Dorner in his *System of Christian Doctrine*. In distinction from Schleiermacher, he laid decisive weight not on feelings, but on moral surrender to God, who reveals Himself in the religious feelings; or on the will and the disposition wherewith we lay ourselves open to Divine impressions and allow ourselves to be determined by them. "I sought," he says, "to show how faith arises out of the impressions which we experience in ourselves, when revelation approaches us; and how it attains to full consciousness and certainty, by a personal grasping of that which is offered in the Gospel and attested in experience—by an inner surrender—by a living into fellowship with God through Christ. And thus is the mind opened to a truly rational comprehension of the method and connection of the objective, historical revelation and of the divine Word, in which it is recorded."

Köstlin had aimed rather at the pulpit than the chair; but providential circumstances drifted him into the academic career. He has filled chairs in Göttingen, Breslau, and (since 1870) in Halle. The book abounds in notices of the eminent men with whom these vicissitudes have brought him into contact, such as Dorner, Neander, Oehler, Nitzsch, Lotze, etc., and these are always kindly, and sometimes very interesting. Besides delivering the numerous courses of lectures which a German professor is expected to produce, he has carried on a ceaseless literary activity, the *Studien und Kritiken*, one of the editors of which he has been for many years, being a hungry receptacle into which he has been constantly pouring.

It is rather surprising that the most interesting of his

books have not been directly connected with any of the departments of theology of which, in the chair, he has had special charge. His fame rests on his Lives of Luther, three of which he has written; but he has never been a professor of Church History. He tells, in great detail, how he was led, from the first, by a variety of influences to the study of Luther, and how the several books arose. The largest, in two volumes, appeared first in 1874. The second was a more popular performance, in one volume, which had the great good fortune to catch the tide of the Luther Quatercentenary, and thus obtained a world-wide reputation. The third was a short sketch, for use in schools, which has reached a twenty-second edition.

The second is the book by which Köstlin will be remembered. It is an admirable work, in size and execution not unlike McCrie's *Life of Knox*. It has the great advantage of being rooted in the thorough investigations undertaken for the larger work which preceded it. Luther really lives in its pages, a homely and matter-of-fact, yet great and noble figure; and the fashion of his age is restored in impressive outlines. Köstlin has the satisfaction of knowing that his example has given an impulse to the study of the man and the time, which has produced in recent years a perfect library of Luther literature.

This is an honourable record of work well done. Yet it is touching to note that *the* book which he would have liked to give to the world has not been written, and never will be. A not uncommon case!

One thing which ought to interest us in this autobiography is, that Köstlin was one of the few men of the last generation of German scholars who could speak English, and knew this country. He visited it at the close of his university course, having won a travelling scholarship. The Disruption had recently taken place; and it was by the fame of that great event and by the desire to see the men

who had taken part in it that he was attracted to this country. He studied at the New College, Edinburgh; and he gives capital descriptions of some of the professors, especially Rabbi Duncan. He also made the acquaintance of Norman Macleod and subsequently of his friend, the Earnest Student, over whom, in his closing days, he was privileged to watch in Germany. "I attended," he says, "both General Assemblies—that of the Free Church regularly, having been furnished by Cunningham with a member's ticket. The proceedings were animated, and the speaking eloquent and energetic. In no ecclesiastical court which I have ever seen—and I have since had occasion to know many of them—has so much varied business been transacted in so short a time, or the speaking been allowed to stray so little into verbiage and exhortation."

The result of this visit was that, for long afterwards, Köstlin was an authority in his own country on our affairs. He wrote on Scotland in Herzog's *Encyclopædia*, and his first book was an account of the ecclesiastical and theological condition of this country. He has retained a life-long impression of the Home Mission operations which he witnessed in Edinburgh, and he has never ceased to draw attention to the influence which the diffusion of the home mission spirit might have on the church and even the theology of Germany. Though an enthusiastic admirer of the founders of the Free Church, he was struck with some defects of the Scottish character, which he specifies with great frankness; and he appears never to have rightly believed in "spiritual independence." Since then, indeed, he has himself played a considerable part as an ecclesiastical leader, and he has evidently suffered from irritation with colleagues less patient than himself of the yoke of the state; and these later experiences may have dimmed the colours in the picture of his early enthusiasm. He is now of opinion that a church which desires to be thoroughly free

must separate entirely from the state, and subsist on the free-will offerings of its own adherents. Such a church may, he contends, exercise a strong and salutary influence on the state through the activity of its members in their capacity as citizens and legislators; but he does not approve of those who, like himself, belong to a state church and eat the bread of the government making much noise about liberty.

“In looking back on my life”: these are his closing words: “I discern everywhere the leading of God. My most important tasks have all come to me without my own seeking or choosing, and, in performing them, I have always been able to rejoice in the divine blessing. As regards the great problems of existence, I have had emphatically to acknowledge that here we still but know in part and see through a glass darkly. May God lead us to that goal where we shall see face to face!”

JAMES STALKER.

PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON ON THE
PROPHET EZEKIEL.

PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON'S anxiously-expected Commentary on Ezekiel, in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, has at length, we are glad to see, appeared. Needless to say, it is in every respect worthy of the author of the *Commentary on Job* in the same series, and will be not less a boon to students. For Prof. Davidson is no *dilettante* commentator: he brings, on the contrary, rare qualifications to the task which he has undertaken. He has from his youth been a devoted student both of the language and of the literature of the Old Testament; he is critically-minded, yet sober; he has a singular power of unravelling and grasping the thought of the author whom he essays to explain; and he is properly conversant with the literature of his subject. Hence his Commentary on Ezekiel, like his former one on Job, stands ahead of all other English commentaries on the same book. The notes are models of terse, but incisive and adequate exegesis. The introductions to the various prophecies explain sufficiently their character and drift. The text of Ezekiel, while often as lucid and flowing as can be desired, is at other times so strange and obscure as to be nearly or altogether untranslatable: the ancient Versions, especially the LXX., frequently preserve readings which are manifestly superior; and much has been accomplished with their help by modern scholars, as Ewald, and particularly Hitzig and Cornill, for the restoration of the prophet's text. Even, however, when all has been done by these means, many obscure passages remain, in which the corruption appears to be too deep-seated to be removed, with any confidence, even by conjecture. Prof. Davidson's notes show that he is well acquainted with all questions of textual criticism relating

to Ezekiel—the prophet is fortunately untouched by the problems of the “higher criticism”: and though his exposition is designed primarily for English readers, the Hebrew student who peruses the notes attentively will find them a most helpful guide, and will generally be able without difficulty to discover the reading which Prof. Davidson adopts, and learn his judgment upon the alternatives involved.

It is refreshing to find a scholar who, while not rash in proposing innovations, nevertheless expresses his mind unambiguously with reference to the integrity of the Massoretic text. From the note on i. 14 in either the *Speaker's Commentary*, or the *Commentary* edited by Bishop Ellicott, the reader would not imagine that the text was open to any suspicion. Prof. Davidson does not state more than the simple truth when he writes: “The verse both in regard to terminology and construction is untranslatable. The word rendered ‘ran’ has no existence, and that translated ‘flash of lightning’ is equally unknown.” Again, on vi. 9, “Such a sense as ‘been broken with’ is altogether impossible; and the middle sense, ‘break for myself,’ is equally to be rejected.” The first of these renderings, found (substantially) in the Authorized Version, is unhappily retained in the Revised Version: the second is adopted by Dean Plumtre in Bishop Ellicott's *Commentary*. On xvi. 16, “The rendering given [*should not come*] can hardly be extracted from the words, which are probably corrupt in some way, though already read by LXX. (with a different vocalization)”; and on xvi. 47, “the strange word *kāt* is utterly unknown.” As these examples show, the reader, however little conversant with Hebrew he may be, is at once placed in possession of the facts about a passage. On xiii. 20 Prof. Davidson accepts the very neat and convincing conjectural emendation of Cornill, אַתָּן חַפְּשִׁים for the unexampled אֶת־נַפְשֵׁים (for the Hebrew idiom involved,

see Jer. xxxiv. 9, 10, 11, 14). On iii. 12 he appears ready to endorse the excellent suggestion made some fifty years ago by Luzzatto, and shortly afterwards, independently, by Hitzig (בְּרוֹם for בְּרוֹךְ: cf. x. 4, 16, 17). Although, however, he thus considers that the Massoretic text very frequently needs correction, and allows that at least sometimes, as in chap. xxxii. (p. 232), it has been burdened by glosses, he rightly refuses to assume corruption to the extent that Cornill does, or to adopt the same drastic remedies for its cure. But it is true that Ezekiel (as we now read his text) presents passages which baffle even the best scholars. In such cases Prof. Davidson is skilful in bringing home to his reader the same uncertainty of which he is sensible himself (*e.g.* on vii. 11, xxi. 10). The difficult passages in chapters xl.-xlviii., descriptive of the restored Temple, and re-distribution of the land, are explained (with frequent correction from the LXX., the assistance of which is here indispensable) as lucidly as the circumstances admit. On chap. xix. (cf. xxvi. 17, xxvii. 32), a reference to the article of Budde in the *ZATW.*, 1882, p. 1 ff., where the rhythmical form of the Hebrew elegy was first definitely established, and which is manifestly presupposed in Prof. Davidson's note, would have been useful to the student.

Readers of the EXPOSITOR will know, from the papers which he has from time to time published in it, to what good effect Prof. Davidson has studied the theology of the Old Testament, and how instructive his articles on the characteristic teaching of its different parts always are. The present volume contains many valuable remarks on the method and aims of Ezekiel, and on his characteristic doctrines, partly comprised in the "Introduction" (pp. ix.-lv.), partly cast into the form of longer notes, prefixed or attached to particular prophecies. Chapter ii. of the Introduction is on Ezekiel's History and Prophetic work, with some account of the nature of the symbolism and

visions, in which, beyond all other prophets, Ezekiel delights. Of the visions, Prof. Davidson takes a reasonable view: he holds that in all cases the descriptions rest upon a substantial foundation of reality, but allows that when in after years the prophet reflected on the facts and recorded them, he gave them literary expansion and embellishment (pp. xxix., 53). Chaps. iii. and iv. are headed, respectively, "Jehovah, God of Israel," and "Israel, the people of the Lord"; and the Divine attributes which the character of the prophet's mind leads him to bring into greatest prominence, and the manner in which he viewed the relation of Israel to its God, are examined and illustrated. In the notes on chap. xviii. (pp. 124 f., 132 f.), and xxxiii., it is explained how Ezekiel conceives the moral freedom and responsibility of the individual before God. From the note on xxxvi. 27, it appears that Prof. Davidson agrees with those scholars who assign to Joel a date subsequent to the exile. In the course of the commentary on the prophecies against foreign nations (chaps. xxv.—xxxii.), and on the restoration of the kingdom of Israel (chaps. xxxiv.—xxxix., xl.—xlviii.), very useful and suggestive notes on the import of prophecy in general, as well as on the prophecies of Ezekiel in particular, are often to be met with (*e.g.* pp. 178–180, 190, 215 f., 255 f., 273 f., 279, 287–291, 349 f.). Most students of the prophets' writings must have been impressed by the difficulty arising from the frequent non-correspondence of the prediction with the fulfilment, especially when the *details* of the prediction are taken into account; and on pp. 190, 215 Prof. Davidson takes occasion to insist on the important principle that there is nearly always some *ideal* element in predictive prophecy: the too prosaic interpreter will often find himself—or, at least, will be found by others—to be landed in an absurdity. "Prophecy is always ideal in its delineations." It is true, the prophets "*imagined* the fulfilment as they describe it.

This, however, is part of their idealism ; the moral element is always the main thing in their prophecies. What they predict is the exhibition of Jehovah's moral rule of the world ; the *form* in which they close this exhibition may not be quite that given by history" (p. 190). We must not, Prof. Davidson is careful to warn us, allegorize what is evidently meant to be literal : we must not, for instance, in chaps. xl.-xlviii., treat purely as symbolical and figurative either the natural or the supernatural element in the picture : we must rather explain what to us seems the strange combination of the two from the prophet's own point of view. "The restoration expected and described by the prophet is no more the restoration that historically took place than the restoration in Isaiah lx. is the historical one. Both are religious ideals and constructions of the final state of the people and the world. Among other things which gave rise to what appears to us an incompatible union of natural and supernatural were two fundamental conceptions of the Hebrew writers. They could not conceive of a life of man except such a life as we now lead in the body. This bodily life could be lived nowhere but upon the earth, and it could be supported only by the sustenance natural to man. . . . The other conception was that true religious perfection was realised only through Jehovah's personal presence among His people, when the tabernacle of God was with men. To us a bodily life of man upon the earth, such as we now live, and a personal presence of Jehovah in the most real sense in the midst of men, appear things incompatible. To the Hebrew mind they were not so, or perhaps in their lofty religious idealism the prophets did not reflect on the possibility of their ideals being realised in fact. The temptation, however, to allegorize the prophetic pictures of the final state, and to evaporate from them either the natural or the supernatural elements, must be resisted at all hazards" (p. 289). The descriptions in chaps. xl.-

xlvi. are meant by the prophet literally: the regulations laid down by him are intended partly for the efficient maintenance of the worship due to Jehovah, partly for the purpose of securing that the salvation and blessedness of the restored people, which is conditioned by the presence of Jehovah in His temple in their midst, be in no way impaired by the proximity to Him of aught that may render unclean or profane.

The plan of the series in which Prof. Davidson's Commentary appears, prevented him from treating questions of text and philology so fully and explicitly as he could have done, and as students of the original may, perhaps, sometimes require: in other respects, he has supplied the reader of Ezekiel's prophecies with a Commentary containing all that he can either need or desire.

S. R. DRIVER.

THE MEMORABILIA OF JESUS.

The Memorabilia of Jesus, commonly called The Gospel of St. John, by William Wynne Peyton, Minister of Free St. Luke's, Broughty Ferry, N.B. (A. & C. Black.)

Mr. Peyton has given us a volume of genuine originality and of great value. To translate the Fourth Gospel in terms of modern science might seem an impossible, and if possible, an undesirable undertaking. But Mr. Peyton has shown us that it is both possible and full of results. He writes as if dogmatic theology had never existed, and is instructed solely by natural science and the experience of the Christian life. To turn to the world a new side of Christianity is no small achievement; it may almost be said to require a Hercules to put his shoulder to the wheel of the bogged wagon of Christian theology and lift it out of the ruts into a position in which it can start on a fresh career. To Mr. Peyton is due the credit of setting Christianity in new relations to nature and of thereby eliciting from each a significance previously hidden. He has given us an interpretation of Christianity which will appeal to many who have no patience with theology. He has accomplished a task, than which there was perhaps none more urgently required, he has brought religion into line with nature, and shown us that one God is in both, and that both are working out the same principles. "The theological conception takes on another complexion when the biological conception is placed alongside of it" (p. 338).

But the charm of the book arises not more from its main teaching than from the skill and beauty with which the teaching is given. For Mr. Peyton is not only thoroughly equipped in science, he is a poet as well, and conveys his meaning not in verse but in that most flexible and least monotonous of instruments, a prose which has all the swing and terseness and flush of poetry. This blend of science and poetry gives its peculiar flavour to the book. There are descriptions of nature equal to anything in Kingsley or in Tyndall, while there are expositions of the Spiritual life as searching and appeals as tender and inevitable as the finest passages in Maurice. The volume throughout has that peculiar charm and glamour which only genius imparts.

From first to last one scarcely meets a commonplace thought or a thought expressed in a commonplace way, and on almost every page are sentences which will often be quoted as the first and final expression of important truth. Above all, the entire volume is pervaded by faith, courage, hopefulness, charity, the spirit of power and love and a sound mind.

At the same time there is much in this book that will mar its influence. Four misprints on two pages; "Assissi," "Euripedes," and so forth, are bad enough; but these are the gnats. The camels are blemishes of style and errors in taste which some readers will not forgive. If the host sits down in shooting-coat and slippers, there are guests who will not own that the dinner is excellent. Snobs they may be, but there they are. Mr. Peyton's fondness for plural abstracts will be set down as an affected echo of Carlyle. The woman of Samaria was "quivering with magnetisms." "Life performs its physiologies in the virtues of water." "The pious actions and inspirations, the higher ethics of philosophy, have been awakened by the feeding on Christ, which lay long in the sleep of latences." Even these might be allowed to pass as one feature of an original and valuable personality, but the writer's idiosyncrasy unfortunately penetrates to the very substance of his thought and prompts utterances so singular that they will find an echo in scarcely another mind. The virgin-birth of our Lord is not made more credible by the fact that sexless generation exists among bees. "Parthenism, or a virgin-birth, is no difficulty to a naturalist," is on a par with the statement that "miracles offend a mind untrained to Nature's wonders." Nature undoubtedly shows us wonders as marvellous as any miracle, but it also shows us that those wonders occur by a natural evolution, each step in which can be exhibited. His theory of miracle is right but he does not make it so easy as he fancies for the naturalist to accept miracle.

It is also a misfortune that the opening chapters of the volume are below the level of the rest. The introduction itself is an ill-judged assault upon criticism. He pronounces all questions of genuineness and authenticity obsolete. "We deposit the literature of canonicities into a clean cabinet of antique bones." "Critics and apologists have failed to ask in these pathless arguments about authorship and authenticity the question of relevancy, What is the argument of the Johannine authenticity good for?"

What do you want to get at? Literature does not create life; life creates literature." According to Mr. Peyton it matters nothing whether the gospel belongs to the year 90 A.D. or 140 A.D. "Chronology is nowhere. The worship of Jesus was established 140 A.D. The authority of the Johannine Memorabilia established nothing about the Divine Personality of Jesus; it reflects what had been established." The gospel, if written in the second century, reflects the life of that century, and exhibits its sources. The Christian life authenticates itself and proves the Divinity of its source. This is quite true. It is a line of argument that is valid, but if Mr. Peyton supposes that he thus disposes of difficulties and cuts a short and easy path to an unassailable position, he deceives himself. This line of argument will be found to raise as many questions as any other. Does the Christian life authenticate itself? Whence the excrescences, the malformations, the disease that *uniformly* attach to it? Or, admitting its excellence, have not illusions, misconceptions of fact, unmerited love often produced, as in Buddhism and Mohammedanism, a type of life of much value? Besides, the affirmation that literature does not create life can only be admitted in a qualified sense. What produced the Christian life? Not the books of the New Testament certainly, but the oral deliverance of that same information regarding Christ, or the oral presentation of that same Christ afterwards embodied in the written gospels. Between this oral teaching and the written gospels there is no essential distinction. And of both we are driven to ask, Is this a true testimony? Have these witnesses had opportunity of knowing the truth? The other argument, from the nature of the life which their testimony produces, is valid, but does not supersede the ordinary critical argument.

But after all deductions Mr. Peyton's volume is one which for originality of thought and felicity of expression, for the delight it will bring to its readers, and the stimulus it will give to faith, may be put on a level with the best work of this generation. The type of Christianity it presents affords a happy corrective to all overstrained, morbid, unnatural, pharisaism which so commonly passes for the religion of Christ in our day.

MARCUS DODS.

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE REVISED VERSION.

IN an article which appeared in the October number of *THE EXPOSITOR* attention was called to the Revised Version, and particularly to what were characterised as the multitudinous petty changes of the text of the Authorised Version which are to be found on its pages.

In the course of the article reference is made to a small volume written by one who soon afterwards became the Chairman of the Company to which the work of revision was entrusted. Notice is called to the fact that in that volume the writer alludes to the temptation into which revisers are ever apt to fall, viz., of using with increased freedom acquired facilities in the process of revision. To that temptation it is stated that the writer of the volume himself became a victim in his capacity as Chairman of the Company; and as a proof of the correctness of the statement it is mentioned that in a specimen-revision of the Authorised Version, as set forth by the writer of the volume, only 75 changes were suggested in the 111 verses of the Sermon on the Mount, whereas there are to be found in the Revised Version of the same portion of Holy Scripture about 127 changes.

Now, in regard of the general subject, it matters but little whether the Chairman did or did not fall a victim to the temptation against which he uttered his warning. It certainly however cannot be proved that he did, unless it be known that he voted for, or otherwise approved of, the additional changes. But this comparatively unimportant

matter may be disposed of in a single line,—the principles on which the specimen-revision and the Revised Version were based were by no means wholly identical.

It is not however an unimportant matter when the writer of the article takes the great responsibility of saying that the Revisers largely exceeded their instructions, and, even further, that they did not adhere to the principles they were commissioned to follow. This grave impeachment it is the object of this paper to answer, and to show that it is not justified by the facts of the case when fully and equitably considered.

For what are the facts of the case? Why, that the first and fundamental Rule laid down for the Revisers was, that they were “To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorised Version *consistently with faithfulness*” (the italics are our own).

Now, with such a rule lying before him, would not every equitable critic be ready to admit that the Rule does in fact recognise a somewhat expansive principle, viz., that faithfulness is to be the ultimate authority to which appeal is to be made; and that the text of the Authorised Version might be changed where the Company might decide that it would not be consistent with faithfulness to retain it. But this limitation to the general direction of the Rule has been commonly quite ignored by the rough and ready critics who have sat in judgment on the Revision. They find changes for which they themselves do not see the necessity, and which they deem it their duty to denounce as superfluous; and yet, if explanations were to be given, these very critics would probably in the sequel allow that the alterations were admissible if the ultimate appeal was to be made to faithfulness.

In a word, the better the scholar and the more accurate the theologian, the more perceptive will he be likely to be of the reasons for any given change that may have been

introduced, and the more qualified to judge whether the principle of faithfulness does really require it or not.

It is by no means denied that there may be a small percentage of alterations which really competent critics, when the reasons for the changes were fully before them, might pronounce to be more strictly accurate than the renderings they displaced, but yet not positively required by the principle of faithfulness. Granted that this may be so, it still may be said, and very fairly said, that the Revisers were all men who were so keenly alive to the differences between mere accuracy and true faithfulness,—for the subject was perpetually coming before them,—that their decisions may, in all cases, claim a close and careful consideration before they are pronounced to be departures from the principles to which as Revisers they were commissioned to adhere.

The whole question of the distinction between mere accuracy and real faithfulness is a very difficult one in such a book as the New Testament. From that blessed Book we deduce doctrine, we derive rules of life, we obtain revelations of the future, and are permitted to catch glimpses of that world beyond the grave on which all else save God's Holy Word is utterly and absolutely silent. When we pause to consider this, we seem compelled to ask whether, in the translation of such a Book, accuracy and faithfulness do not so closely approach to each other that distinctions between them can in many cases never strictly be drawn. Retentions of familiar expressions, or the alleged charm of a favourite rhythm, can never wisely be permitted to exercise any predominating influence in such a momentous work as the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament. The question and the only question in each particular case must be this, Does the principle of faithfulness, with all the amount of consequential change that it may be found necessarily to involve, justify the

introduction of the altered rendering? The answer to the question, it is obvious, will vary with the varying estimate, on the part of the respondent, of what really constitutes faithfulness, and will certainly also depend on his clearness of perception of the critical or grammatical elements involved in the decision. Still, for the most part, the subject-matter, coupled with a deep feeling of the duty of setting forth, with as much clearness as possible, all that it appears to convey, will be found to supply the ultimate guidance, and to indicate when faithfulness may be confined to little more than what is erroneous and when it can only be secured by strict adherence to linguistic accuracy.

In translating the Greek Testament it must ever be borne in mind that the Book is intrinsically different from all other books, and that the adequate transference of it into our mother tongue must always be a work of exceptional character and exceptional difficulty.

This most patent truth has been far too much lost sight of in the great majority of the criticisms of the Revised Version. It has been assumed far too commonly that all the Revisers had to do, and ought to have confined themselves to doing, was to correct a certain number of generally admitted errors and to leave all else utterly alone. No such limitation however was specified in the Rule that was actually laid down for them.

But we may now profitably pass from these general considerations to some particulars which will help to show very plainly that the Revisers did not "largely exceed their instructions." Their standard was to be faithfulness. They were to make as few alterations as possible consistently with that principle; and if it can be shown that they really did make more alterations than, in the judgment of competent scholars, they ought to have made, then this overplus of alteration must be set down to their having formed too high an estimate of what constituted faithfulness in each

of the particulars of which the overplus was composed. The difficulty however is to arrive at any general idea of the actual magnitude of the overplus. To count up the total number of changes, and then, on the strength of the imposing nature of the resultant figures, to jump at the inference that the overplus of unnecessary alterations must be very large, is clearly utterly fallacious. Out of the total number of changes a very large portion is simply consequential. Certain alterations being agreed upon after careful discussion, it was one of the first duties of men who were to act on the principle of faithfulness to carry out these alterations consistently through the whole work entrusted to them. This common-sense view of their duty is alone sufficient to account for a multitude of small changes, dispersed through the whole of the Revised Version, which the inexperienced reader might consider to be valid evidences of the "over-elaboration and hypercritical exactitude" that is so often attributed to the Revisers.

Again, there is a very large number of changes which might be called sub-consequential, or, as the result not of a single principle of alteration consistently carried out, but of two or more principles, which, when duly observed, would necessitate changes that any one, unacquainted with the principles and their real importance, might very easily consider as palpable examples of conscious violations, on the part of the Revisers, of "the principles they were commissioned to follow." Illustrations of this class of necessitated changes are mentioned in the preface to the Revised Version.

When these and other deductions that could easily be specified are made from the grand total of changes, the remainder will not be found so large as to suggest any safe basis for the assumption that there is probably in that remainder a large residuum of unnecessary changes. If we would find what the residuum really is, it can only be, even

approximately, found by individual and continuous investigation.

To do this on any large scale is not possible in a paper like the present; but as it has been stated that, in the Revised Version of the Sermon on the Mount, there are some fifty-two changes more than are found in a kind of Specimen-Revision drawn up by one who was afterwards Chairman of the Company, let us go briefly through these fifty-two or more changes, and see how many of them can fairly be considered as falling outside of the fundamental Rule of the Company. Changes arising from differences of reading we will leave undiscussed, as they belong to a different department of the controversy. What we are now more particularly engaged on is the question whether the Revisers did or did not introduce in their general work of revision changes, for the justification of which they cannot successfully appeal to the Rules under which the work was entrusted to them. The Specimen-Revision which we use as the sort of assumed minimum of change, was drawn up on the principle of only correcting what the majority of competent scholars would consider to be more or less erroneous. The Revised Version may be considered to have been extended to what was not faithful to the Original. So the question before us is this: Did the Revisers, to any appreciable extent, go further, and overstep the practically specified boundary? This question we will now endeavour to answer, as above specified, from the Sermon on the Mount.

We begin with Matthew v. 1: "Was set," A.V.; "had set down," R.V. It is surely not otherwise than faithful to adopt the rendering of the word which, in passages like the present, is current in the A.V., and to leave "set" for the causative sense (1 Cor. vi. 4).

Chapter v. 9: "The children," A.V.; "sons," R.V. Here it will hardly be doubted that the change is needed in

regard of the substantive. The distinction between *υἰοὶ* and *τέκνα* will often be found to be real and significant. It may be admitted to be more doubtful whether the article should be retained or omitted. It is retained in S.R.,¹ and its retention is defended in a note. The practice of the Revisers however was mainly to be guided by the presence or absence of the article in the Original. The principles on which, according to some grammarians, it might be regarded as latent they did not always consider to be fully made out.

Chapter v. 10: "Which are," A.V.; "that have been," R.V. Here few will be disposed to deny that it was consistent with faithfulness, as well as intrinsically more correct, to displace the more predicative "which," and to retain the more purely relational "that," as in all the preceding verses. The "have been" the Revisers were always careful to maintain in the case of the Greek perfect, and deemed it required by faithfulness. This point is noted in the Preface, so that such alterations may be regarded in a certain sense as consequential, and dependent on a previously recognised principle,

Chapter v. 11: "Revile," A.V.; "reproach," R.V. The change was probably made on the ground that in the parallel passage (Luke vi. 22) the word "reproach" was used, and rightly used, by the A.V.; and further, that it is plainly desirable to reserve the stronger term "revile" for the stronger word *λοιδορέω*, which in the A.V. is commonly so rendered. Faithfulness may certainly be pleaded for this change.

Chapter v. 13: "And to be trodden," A.V.; "and trodden," R.V. The change is slight, and is due to a difference of reading, but is here noticed, as the general reader might not observe the change of text.

Chapter v. 15: "Candle," A.V.; "lamp," R.V.; and

¹ It will be convenient thus to designate the Specimen-Revision to which allusion has been made.

subsequently, "candlestick," A.V.; "stand," R.V. Here in the first case few would probably consider the change otherwise than desirable and faithful. In the second, the change is consequential. The term "candlestick" is not banished from the R.V.; as it is retained (with the A.V.) in Hebrews ix. 2, and five times in the Revelation. There, however, its retention was necessitated. . . . In regard of the change from "giveth light to," A.V.; to "shineth unto," R.V., little need be said. Not only the Original but the tenor of the precept in verse 16 requires that the same translation of *λάμπειν* should be adopted in each verse.

Chapter v. 17: "Am come," A.V.; "came," R.V. This is one of those very numerous changes to which allusion is made in the Preface to the R.V., and will plainly be estimated differently by different scholars. The "am" is of course due to the principle that, with numerous verbs of movement and of cognate import (see *exx.* in Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. ii. pp. 75, 76, Transl.), it takes the place of "have"; so that we have to limit ourselves to the simple consideration, which is here the most faithful to the exact meaning of the Lord's solemn declaration, the English preterite or the English perfect. The Revisers on careful consideration decided for the former. When the passages in which the purpose of the Lord's coming are similarly alluded to are fully and fairly considered, it will be found, we think, that the Revisers were justified on principles of faithfulness in making the change. Such alterations as the present involve far more than the merely general reader might be led to suppose. In all cases, as here, the context must be taken into careful consideration. The second change in the verse is consequential.

Chapter v. 18: "Pass," A.V.; "pass away," R.V. Here possibly nothing more can be said than this,—that in other and similar passages in the A.V. (Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 33), though not always (*e.g.* Mark xiii. 30;

Luke xvi. 17) the more common form of expression is adopted. At the end of the verse, "fulfilled" (A.V.) is changed into "accomplished" (R.V.), as the former, in the great majority of the many cases in which the word occurs, is associated with a different Greek word to that which is used in this verse.

Chapter v. 19: "The same," A.V.; "he," R.V. This perhaps *might* have been left alone, as neither one nor the other is perfectly exact, and the principle of faithfulness can thus hardly be definitely invoked. The change, however, may claim James i. 23 (A.V.) for its support. The real principle would seem to be—where the antecedent clause is short, "he" is the natural rendering; where long, "this man" is the most exact as well as obvious rendering, as in James i. 25 (A.V. and R.V.).

Chapter v. 20: "No case," A.V.; "no wise," R.V. The change is plainly designed to obviate any misunderstanding arising from the more modern sense in which "case" is frequently used.

Chapter v. 22: "Whosoever," A.V.; "every one," R.V. Here it is plain that a distinction ought to be recognised and expressed between $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{o}$ and the $\acute{o}\varsigma$ which follows. This change ought to have appeared in S.R. . . . At the close of this verse "the hell of fire" (R.V.), is substituted, and, it will probably be conceded, not improperly substituted for "hell fire" (A.V.).

Chapter v. 25: "Lest at any time." A.V.; "lest haply," R.V. The principle of faithfulness may here be appealed to, as some slight misunderstanding might arise to the English reader from the words "at any time."

Chapter v. 26: "Till thou hast," A.V.; "till thou have," R.V. This change was made as it was the opinion of the majority that, in sentences such as the present, the conjunctive was more in harmony with the language of the time than the indicative. Both moods are used after "till"

and "until" in the A.V., but the conjunctive seems the more common: see Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. ii. p. 117, Transl. . . . "Uttermost," A.V.; "last," R.V. It must be admitted that this change has often been objected to, and we may own is one of a small class of cases in which exactness can be more successfully pleaded than faithfulness.

Chapter v. 28: "Whosoever," A.V.; "every one," R.V. The case is not quite so strong as in verse 22, but the change may be fully justified as necessary in itself, as well as practically consequential.

Chapter v. 29: "Offend thee," A.V.; "cause thee to stumble," R.V. The correction is certainly needed owing to the meaning now regularly connected with the word "offend." The correction was very carefully discussed, and has been, I believe, carried through all the many passages in which the word *σκανδαλίζω* occurs, with the exception of five or six passages (*e.g.* Matt. xiii. 5, 7, xv. 42, xxvi. 31, 33; Mark vi. 3, xiv. 27, 29), all passages with a personal reference, which did not admit of the current correction, but where the meaning could not easily be mistaken. In these cases the change appears in the margin. . . . In this verse and in verse 30, "that" is omitted in each of the concluding members, as bringing out more sharply and clearly the meaning of the Original.

Chapter v. 31: "Hath been said," A.V.; "was said," R.V. In accordance with A.V. in verses 21, 27. The same correction is introduced in verse 33, and is obviously required if any consistency is to be maintained.

Chapter v. 34: "Heaven," A.V.; "the Heaven," R.V. The article is inserted in accordance with the Greek, and in harmony with its insertion before "earth" by A.V. in verse 35. In the words that follow, the slight change of order, "the throne of God" ("God's throne," A.V.), is necessitated by the altered rendering in verse 35, "the footstool of His

feet" ("His footstool," A.V.), a fuller rendering required by faithfulness to the original, and maintained in the seven other passages in which the expression occurs in the New Testament.

Chapter v. 35: "Neither by," A.V.; "nor by," R.V. The change here can hardly appeal directly to the principle of faithfulness, yet few, we suppose, will deny that it tends to clearness to place "nor" twice after the first "neither," and then to follow (ver. 36) with another "neither" when the subject takes a slightly new turn. It is not easy in a continuance of negative members to lay down any very strict rules. The reader who is interested in the subject will find a large collection of examples in Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. iii. p. 345 sqq., Transl.

Chapter v. 37: "Cometh of evil," A.V.; "is of the evil one," R.V. Change due to the deliberate decision made subsequently as to the translation of τοῦ ποιηροῦ in the Lords prayer; see comment on chapter vi. 13. The other change ("and," R.V.) in this verse is not alluded to as S.R. practically makes a change (by omission). Under any circumstances the translation "for" (A.V.) is not faithful.

Chapter v. 38: "Hath been said," A.V.; "was said," R.V.: see comment on verse 31.

Chapter v. 39: "That ye resist not evil," A.V.; "Resist not him that is evil," R.V. Practically consequential on the decision in reference to verse 37.

Chapter v. 40: "Will sue thee at the law," A.V.; "would go to law with thee," R.V. The alteration was made to simplify, and to maintain a little more definitely, the force of τῷ θέλοντι.

Chapter v. 41: "A mile," A.V.; "one mile," R.V. In accordance with the Original, and as better bringing out the contrast, "one" and "twain."

Chapter v. 43: "Hath been said," A.V.; "was said," R.V.; see comment on verse 31.

Chapter v. 45: "The children," A.V.; "sons," R.V.; see comment on verse 9. In the two clauses that follow A.V. repeats the "on" in each case in the second member; R.V. omits it; and on a principle generally observed in the Revision: it being found that in several passages precision in this particular was of real importance.

Chapter v. 46: "Which love," A.V.; "that love," R.V.; see comment on verse 10.

Chapter v. 48: "Be ye therefore," A.V.; "ye therefore shall be," R.V. The imperatival force of the future may perhaps be rightly recognised in categorical sentences when in a negative form. It is very doubtful whether in sentences like the present the imperatival translation can correctly be maintained. The Revisers were certainly justified in making the change.

Chapter vi. 1. In this verse beside the change also found in S.R. there are two small changes, "else" (R.V.) instead of "otherwise" (A.V.), and "with" (R.V.) instead of "of" (A.V.). In regard of the second there can be no doubt; but in regard of the first, it may be admitted that in good English "otherwise" is used where "else" might have seemed more natural (see Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. iii. p. 357, Transl.), and thus that the change is not positively required by faithfulness. Comparison with other passages however (*e.g.* Matt. ix. 17, Luke v. 37, and xiv. 32 in which passages A.V. adopts "else") seemed to show that the sense was brought out more sharply and clearly by "else," and the change was made accordingly.

Chapter vi. 2: "Thine alms," A.V.; "alms," R.V. The pronoun may, from the nature of the sentence, be latent, but it is not expressed in the Original. There are two further changes, "sound not" (R.V.), instead of "do not sound" (A.V.), a change which certainly expresses best the distinctly expressed prohibition of the Greek, and "they have received" (R.V.), instead of "they have"—a

change designed to convey, as far as a few simple words can effect it, that it is a receiving *to the full* even in the case of those spoken of. They do their alms to have glory of men, and they get fully what they seek,—but nothing more, no recompense such as is spoken of in verse 4. Whether the change of tense is desirable, and whether “they fully get their reward” would not have been a somewhat preferable alteration may be left to the judgment of our readers. Faithfulness, at any rate, requires some recognition of the ἀπέχειν.

Chapter vi. 3: “Right,” A.V.; “right hand,” R.V. If the substantive is supplied in the one case, it certainly ought to be supplied in the other. It is supplied in S.R.; but, by mistake, is not marked as a correction.

Chapter vi. 4: “Reward,” A.V.; “recompense,” R.V. Plainly necessary, to mark the distinction between what came from men and from God.

Chapter vi. 5: “Pray standing,” A.V.; “stand and pray,” R.V. The correction prevents “standing” being merely connected with what follows, and brings out the studiedly ceremonious character of the act. Standing was the attitude the Jew customarily assumed in prayer. . . . The change at the close of the verse is the same as in verse 2.

Chapter vi. 6: “Closet,” A.V.; “inner chamber,” R.V. More clear, and differing only slightly from the rendering of A.V. in Matthew xxiv. 26. Of the two remaining changes in the verse, the first, “having shut” (“when thou hast shut,” A.V.), is more true to the structure in the Original and more graphic; the second is in accordance with verse 4.

Chapter vi. 7. “But when ye pray,” A.V.; “and in praying,” R.V. The sequence of thought clearly requires “and” rather than “but”; and the participial rendering rightly fixes the attention more on the act than the time of performing it. The only other change, “Gentiles”

("heathen," A.V.) is more true to the prevalent rendering of the substantive, and is practically in harmony with A.V. in Galatians ii. 14.

Chapter vi. 8: "Be not ye," A.V.; "Be not," R.V. The introduction of "ye" in A.V. suggests an emphasis of which there is no trace in the Original.

Chapter vi. 13: "Lead," A.V.; "bring," R.V. The change is of some importance. It is, in the first place, nearer to the Original; and, in the next place, it helps somewhat to suggest the true thought, viz., that God may be said to bring men into temptation when, in His general and providential government of the world, He brings them into, so to speak, temptation-bearing circumstances, from which, however, a way of escape is ever mercifully provided: see Meyer *in loc.*, and comp. 1 Corinthians x. 13. . . . In reference to the change "the evil one" (R.V.) instead of "evil" (A.V.), more cannot here be said than this,—that the change was made with the greatest deliberation, and with the fullest recognition of the fundamental rule.

Chapter vi. 16: "Appear," A.V.; "be seen," R.V. The purpose of those spoken of and their hypocrisy are thus brought out more clearly. The concluding change has already been alluded to (ver. 2).

Chapter vi. 18. Same change as in verse 16. The concluding change ("recompense," R.V., for "reward," A.V.) has been noticed, verse 4.

Chapter vi. 19: "Corrupt," A.V.; "consume," R.V.). It was not a corrupting, but a putting out of sight, and so, practically, a making away with altogether. Perhaps in verse 16 "hide" or "conceal" would have been more true than "disfigure."

Chapter vi. 22: "Light," A.V.; "lamp," R.V. as in chapter v. 55.

Chapter vi. 23: "That darkness," A.V.; "the darkness," R.V. As in the Original.

Chapter vi. 25: "Take no thought," A.V.; "be not anxious," R.V. Change is also here made in S.R., so that, properly speaking, this correction need not here be noticed. S.R. however and R.V. differ, the former taking the word "careful," the latter the word "anxious." On the whole, considering the tenor of the context, we may rightly give the preference to R.V.

Chapter vi. 26: "The fowls of the air," A.V.; "the birds of the heaven," R.V. The rendering "birds" is found five times in A.V. The rendering "heaven" is, I believe, uniformly maintained. Here principle can hardly be appealed to. Few however can reasonably object to the change. . . . Of the two remaining changes in the verse, the "and" (R.V.) instead of "yet" (A.V.) is absolutely required, and ought to have appeared in S.R. The change in the last member, "more value" (R.V.) instead of "better" (A.V.), obviates any possible misconception as to that in which the *διαφέρειν* consists.

Chapter vi. 27, 28. Changes in accordance with change in verse 25.

Chapter vi. 29: "And yet," A.V.; "yet," R.V. The "and" is superfluous.

Chapter vi. 30: "So clothe," A.V.; "doth so clothe," R.V. This slight addition has a principle behind it. The revisers felt that it was most consistent with faithfulness to translate, where possible, *εἰ* with the indicative by "if," followed, not by the subjunctive, but by the indicative. The "doth" was thus inserted to make the mood plain. The use of "if" with the indicative or conjunctive is well discussed in Maetzner, *English Grammar*, vol. ii. p. 119, Transl.

Chapter vi. 31: "Take no thought," A.V. See comment on verse 25. The position of "therefore" in A.V. at the beginning gives to the word too much emphasis, and is therefore rightly changed in R.V.; comp. A.V. in verse 34.

Chapter vi. 34: "Take no thought" (twice), A.V. See comment on verse 25. The change from "shall" (A.V.) to "will" (R.V.) is made in accordance with the grammatical person (see Maetzner, *Engl. Gramm.*, vol. ii. p. 80, Transl.) and the purely future tenor of the clause.

Chapter vii. 4, 5. It is obvious that in these two verses the verb ἐκβάλλειν ought to have the same translation. "Cast out" seems the most natural rendering, and is thus in R.V. maintained in both verses. In verse 4 the lighter "lo" (R.V.) is,—especially when the subject of the verse is considered,—to be preferred to "behold" (A.V.) In verse 5 the *πρῶτον* is unemphatic. The rendering then ought to be "cast out first" (R.V.) rather than "first cast out" (A.V.)

Chapter vii. 6: "Cast ye," A.V.; "cast," R.V. The "ye" is clearly superfluous. The two remaining changes, "lest haply" (R.V.) and "turn" (R.V.) are required, "lest" (A.V.) being insufficient, and "turn again" (A.V.) more than sufficient, though possibly defensible as idiomatic.

Chapter vii. 9, 10. The changes in these verses are slightly complicated with changes of reading in the original. The verses are also dealt with in S.R., and thus do not come within the scope of these comments, which only relate to the additions to S.R.

Chapter vii. 12: "Therefore all things," A.V.; "all things therefore," R.V. See comment on chapter vi. 31. It may be admitted that the twice-repeated "unto" (R.V.) instead of "to" (A.V.) cannot be claimed as dependent on faithfulness. It was made to improve the rhythm. The remaining change, "even so do ye also" (R.V.), instead of "do ye even so" (A.V.), is suggested partly by euphony, partly by the desirableness of bringing the verb nearer to its dependent dative, and of maintaining the emphasis in the *καὶ ὑμεῖς*.

Chapter vii. 13: "Many there be which go in thereat," A.V.; "many be they that enter in thereby," R.V. In these few words there are as many as four changes, and yet few would, on consideration, deny that the result is a closer and more faithful rendering. The first change brings out more sharply the persons concerned; the second preserves, as in the first clause, the lighter relative; the third helps the same translation of this same word in the same verse; the fourth is consequential, and due to the necessary change in the *διά*. Is such care of rendering in such a momentous verse out of harmony with the true spirit of Rule I.?

Chapter vii. 14: "Because," A.V.; "for," R.V., as in verse 13; the particle is the same. The other changes are either as in S.R. or consequential.

Chapter vii. 16: "Ye shall know them by their fruits," A.V.; "by their fruits ye shall know them," R.V. Necessary to maintain the emphasis of the original. See verse 20.

Chapter vii. 20: "Wherefore," A.V.; "Therefore," R.V.; a slight but necessary correction.

Chapter vii. 24: "Therefore whosoever," A.V.; "Every one therefore which," R.V. See comments on chapter v. 22, and on chapter vi. 31: compare also verse 26 (A.V.) in this chapter. [It would have been better if the lighter relative had been adopted, as in verse 26.] . . . The change "words" (R.V.) for "sayings" (A.V.) is clearly desirable both here and in verses 26 and 28 as more inclusive; consider such a passage as Mark viii. 38.

Chapter vii. 27: "Beat upon," A.V.; "smote upon," R.V. The word in the original is a different word to that in verse 25, and of stronger meaning. The concluding change "thereof" (R.V.) instead of "of it" (A.V.) cannot appeal to faithfulness; but few probably who will read the verse aloud will disapprove of it.

Chapter vii. 28: "Doctrine," A.V.; "teaching," R.V.

The change is due to the fact that the word "doctrine" was more commonly adopted by the Revisers as the rendering of *διδασκαλία*. The change also harmonises better with the word "taught" that follows.

We have now concluded our examination of, we believe, all the alterations, other than those due to various readings, in which the Revised Version differs from that Specimen Version which the writer of the article in the October number refers to, and appears to regard as a kind of *terminus a quo* from which excess of alteration might fairly be estimated. We have to express our regret to the general reader that the discussion has taken up so much space, but it is only thus that the charge brought against the Revisers of having "largely exceeded their instructions," and of having "not adhered to the principles they were commissioned to follow," can fully be met. It is thus only that the equitable reader can settle for himself whether the changes, of which he has a continuous list from a connected portion of Holy Scripture of some length, do, or do not, deserve to be characterised as "unnecessary and un instructive alterations," or whether any changes in any part of a work, of which the reader has now had a specimen, presumably deserve to be spoken of as "irritating trivialities."

Such language in such subjects as the present is to be deprecated; but it must be dealt with and calmly put to the test.

It has now been put to the test, and the reader is now invited to consider whether the principle of faithfulness cannot be recognised as permeating the great majority of the changes, and whether those, in which it may be less patent, are not still due to its general influence rather than to the merely accelerative tendencies of increased literary facilities.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

*THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.*

X. THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

WE have now learnt, by examination of the documents contained in the New Testament, that its various writers agree to teach, and to represent Christ as teaching, that, even as compared with His spotless life and His words of wisdom and mercy, His death upon the cross is in a unique sense the channel through which comes from God to man the salvation announced by Christ; and as teaching that for this end He deliberately died, that this costly means was absolutely needful for our salvation, and that the need for it was in man's sin. We also found that St. Paul went beyond the other writers of the New Testament in asserting that the need for this costly means of salvation from sin has its root in the eternal justice of God.

We now ask, Who are embraced in the purpose of salvation which Christ died to accomplish? Did He in any real sense die for all men, or did He die only for a part of the race?

Wherever the writers of the New Testament describe, in general terms and without any other specific reference, the purpose of the Death of Christ, they represent that purpose as including the whole race, and in some passages (*e.g.* Colossians i. 20) as having a still wider scope. This element of the teaching of the New Testament about the Death of Christ demands now further attention.

In Romans v. 12-14 St. Paul asserts and then proves that through one man's sin "death passed through to all men." He then goes on to say that in this respect Adam is "a type of the Coming One," *i.e.* manifestly of Christ; and that through His obedience "the many will be constituted righteous." In verse 18 the Apostle says that this

influence tending to "justification of life" is designed *for all men*": εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. The preposition εἰς denotes here, as almost always when not used in a local or temporal sense, a mental direction towards an object, *i.e.* an aim or purpose. In other words, St. Paul asserts that the influences which come to men through Christ were designed "for all men."

The parallel between Adam and Christ is much closer than at first sight appears. It is true that, whereas through Adam's sin all men everywhere actually die, St. Paul uses language, *e.g.* 2 Corinthians xi. 15, Philippians iii. 19, which proves that he had no hope that all men will ultimately be saved. But this does not destroy or weaken the comparison. For in each case the abiding effect of the influence depends on each one's own action. Through Adam all men inevitably go down into the grave: through Christ come influences which lay hold of every man and which will raise from the grave into endless life all who yield to them. In each case the influence is real and universal; and in each case the abiding result depends upon the man himself.

This remarkable parallel reveals the immense importance, in St. Paul's thought, of the death of Christ. For it implies that through His death is removed an effect as far-reaching as the race, and almost as old. And it implies that the purpose of the death of Christ embraces the whole race.

In Philippians ii. 10, 11 we read that God raised Christ in order that at His name every knee may bow and every tongue make confession. We cannot conceive this worship and praise to be other than genuine. Consequently, in this passage St. Paul represents the purpose of salvation for which God raised Christ from the grave to the throne as embracing all men. Similarly, in Colossians i. 20 we read that God was pleased "to reconcile all things to Himself

through Christ, having made peace through the blood of His cross, whether the things on the earth or the things in the heavens." And in Ephesians i. 9 we read that God's purpose "in reference to the administration of the fulness of the seasons" is to gather up under one Head all things in Christ. The neuter here includes, according to Greek usage, persons and things, these being looked at merely as objects of thought without reference to personality. These passages describe manifestly a purpose of salvation; and they assert clearly that this purpose embraces all men.

Still more conspicuous is the universal purpose of the death of Christ in the latest group of the epistles of St. Paul. In 1 Timothy ii. 1-5 he exhorts that prayer be made for "all men," including kings and those in authority, and gives as a reason that God "desires all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth." This he supports by appealing to the "One God and One Mediator of God and men who gave Himself a ransom for all." Similarly, in chapter iv. 10 Christ is described as "Saviour of all men, especially of believers." He is a Saviour specially of believers, because in them is actually accomplished His purpose of salvation: and, that He is called Saviour of all men, implies that His purpose of salvation embraces all men. In the same sense, in Titus ii. 11 the grace of God is said to be "saving towards all men": *σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*. These last words, which embrace conspicuously *all men*, are found also in Romans v. 12, 18, 1 Timothy ii. 1, 4, iv. 10. They are much more definite than their English equivalent.

This plain teaching is confirmed by the words of Christ recorded in the Fourth Gospel. In John iii. 16 we read that the love which prompted God's gift of His only begotten Son was love to "the world"; and that its aim was "that every one who believeth in Him may not perish but may have eternal life." Our Lord goes on to say in verse

17 that "God sent the Son into the world . . . in order that the world may be saved through Him." In chapter vi. 51 Christ declares that He will give His flesh "for the life of the world"; and in chapter xii. 47 that He came in order that He "might save the world." John the Baptist pointed to Christ, as recorded in John i. 29, as "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world." In 1 John ii. 2 we read that "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for all the world": and in chapter iv. 14 Christ is called the "Saviour of the world."

These passages, like those quoted above from the pen of St. Paul, assert clearly that God's purpose of salvation through the death of Christ embraced all men, and imply that they who perish do so, not because they were excluded by God from His purpose of salvation, but simply and only because they refused the offered salvation.

These plain statements receive important confirmation from a casual appeal of St Paul in Romans ii. 4, where he blames a supposed objector for not knowing that God is leading him to repentance. Yet, in spite of this Divine guidance, the man in question is said in the next verse to have an "impenitent heart." The Apostle evidently means, according to Greek use of the present and imperfect tenses, that God is exerting upon him a real influence tending to repentance; but that, in consequence of his resistance to it, this influence is without result. This appeal implies that upon all men God is exerting this influence. For, if there were an exception, it might be the man to whom St. Paul speaks. Moreover, if, as St. Paul taught, God gave Christ to die in order to harmonize with His own justice the justification of sinners, these Divine influences tending to salvation would have been, apart from the death of Christ, inconsistent with the justice of God, and therefore impossible. And if so, these universal influences and the salva

tion resulting from them in all who believe the Gospel were a part of the purpose for which God gave His Son to die. In other words, the purpose of the death of Christ embraced the entire human race.

Against this plain teaching, there is in the Bible nothing to set.

In Ephesians v. 25 St. Paul writes that "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself upon its behalf"; and in Acts xx. 28, in an address to the elders of the Church at Ephesus, he speaks of "the Church, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Similarly, in John x. 11, 15 Christ declares that He was about to lay down His life for the sheep; and in chapter xv. 13 He compares His love for His disciples to that of a man who lays down his life for his friends. In xi. 52, the Evangelist, commenting on some words of Caiaphas, says that Christ was about to die in order that the scattered sheep of God may be gathered together. But this limited view of the purpose of the death of Christ by no means contradicts the universal purpose asserted in the passages quoted above. For the wider purpose includes the narrower. Indeed the limited and the unlimited aspects of the purpose of salvation are stated together in 1 John ii. 2, iv. 9, 14, 1 Timothy iv. 10. In His eternal purpose of salvation, Christ foresaw its accomplishment in the actual salvation of so many as He foresaw would accept salvation. These were, therefore, in a special sense the objects of His purpose. But, inasmuch as God resolved to bring to bear on all men influences which, if yielded to, will lead each one to salvation, both Christ and St. Paul speak of the purpose of salvation as universal.

That this wider purpose is not excluded by the narrower purpose embodied in the passages quoted above, is proved by two passages in which we have a still narrower view of the purpose of the incarnation and death of Christ. To the Christians at Corinth St. Paul writes in 2 Corinthians

viii. 9, "our Lord Jesus Christ for your sake became poor, though He was rich, in order that ye, by His poverty, may become rich." Thinking of his readers only, the Apostle leaves out of sight for a moment all others for whom Christ became poor. Similarly, thinking of himself only, he writes in Galatians ii. 20, "who loved me and gave up Himself on my behalf."

It is worthy of note that in all the limited passages quoted above the death of Christ is not the main topic in hand, but is quoted casually to illustrate some other matter.

While speaking of the foreseen results of the death of Christ, we must carefully avoid the error of supposing that man's foreseen faith prompted the gift of Christ. Of this we have no hint in the Bible. Indeed, it is excluded by the teaching of St. Paul in Romans iv. 4, Ephesians ii. 8, 9, Titus iii. 5 that salvation is by grace, not by works. For, if man's foreseen faith moved God to save, faith would itself be a meritorious act. The teaching of the entire New Testament is that God's purpose to save was prompted simply by His pity for ruined man; but that, in His purpose to save, God resolved to save, not all men indiscriminately, but only those who should accept salvation. Consequently, salvation is entirely a work and gift of God, but the destruction of the lost is caused only by their own refusal of salvation. If so, Christ died in a special sense for the Church which He had chosen to be His spotless bride; and in a very real sense for all mankind.

Accepting as I do, and as we must do unless we are prepared to charge with serious error both the Apostle Paul and all the early followers of Christ whose writings have come down to us, the harmonious teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ as true, I shall now sum up the results of our inquiry in a definite and consistent doctrinal statement.

We must conceive that in the eternal past God resolved to create intelligent beings capable of accepting or rejecting His will as the guide of their lives, that He resolved to place them under law, and to make their well-being or ruin contingent on their obedience or disobedience. Thus both man and the law which proclaims the inevitable sequence of sin and death have their source in the nature of God.

God foresaw man's sin, and foresaw the barrier which sin must necessarily erect between man and God. This barrier could be broken down only by some such demonstration of the inevitable sequence of sin and death as that which we find in the death of Christ for man's sin. Yet in full view of this necessity God resolved to save. And, in order to harmonize with His own justice the deliverance of the guilty from the due punishment of their sins, He resolved to give His Son to become Man and to die upon the cross.

God resolved to save, not all men indiscriminately, but all those who should accept the offered salvation. Thus man's freedom, which was an all-important element in the original purpose of creation, is respected in God's purpose of salvation.

Since none can turn to God and rise towards God except as led and raised by Him, He resolved to bring to bear on all men influences leading them towards Himself and towards the way of life, influences real though not irresistible, and to save all those, and those only, who yield themselves to these influences. Since, apart from the death of Christ, to rescue sinners from the penalty of their sins would be unjust and therefore impossible, these influences leading to salvation must be a result of the death of Christ. And, if so, the whole of salvation from the first good desire to final victory over death is a result of the same. On the other hand, the destruction of the lost is a result, not of

any limitation in God's purpose to save, but simply and only of their own resistance to divine influences.

This account of the purpose of the death of Christ is in harmony with all that is said by the various writers of the New Testament about the death of Christ. It is the designed and absolutely necessary means of man's salvation, the ransom of his life and the propitiation for his sins. He died in our stead: and through His death we are dead to sin, to the law, and to the world. Thus through the death of the Author of Life man shares the immortal life of Him who was raised from the dead.

Around the cross of Christ have bowed in silent adoration for more than eighteen centuries multitudes of men and women of every age and race and rank and degree of culture. On that cross they have seen a supreme manifestation of that infinite love which is the inmost essence of God. In that sight they have found the strongest stimulus to virtue and to beneficence of every kind. And, moved by the love which shines forth from that cross, not a few have dared to die for Him who first died for them.

No system of Theology, and no account of Christianity, can be in the least degree satisfactory unless it does something to explain the mighty moral influence of that mysterious death which to so many has been the light of life.

For the imperfection of this attempt to reproduce and elucidate the teaching of the New Testament, I must crave forgiveness on the ground of the supreme difficulty of the subject.

JOSEPH AGAR BEEF.

NOTE.—Among many other valuable works on the topic discussed in these papers, I may call attention to DR. DALE'S admirable Lectures on THE ATONEMENT, and to a most useful volume by DR. CAVE on THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE. But these works are too well known to need commendation from me.

CHRIST'S USE OF THE TERM "THE SON OF
MAN."

IT can hardly be said that we have reached anything like a consensus on this point. Nor can this be regarded as surprising where the materials are such as to require considerable speculative combination; as when it is asked, "What determined Christ's own choice of this term, as the one most distinctive¹ of His public ministry—the one to which He calls primary attention, as giving the key to the character of His Messiahship?" The object then of this paper is not so much to suggest a complete solution of the problem, as to indicate some data for its solution, which have too often been overlooked. But first I would make clear my attitude to the data derived from Apocalyptic literature, especially the Book of Enoch. It appears not only *a priori* probable, but also in large measure actually proved by the Gospel narratives, that such literature must in the main be taken as representative of certain as yet undefined circles, rather than of the people at large.

Esoteric in its origin, and with tendencies sometimes akin to Essenism, it does not seem in its more technical features to have become really part of the popular consciousness. And among its technicalities we must reckon the use of the "Son of Man" in Enoch. In the mouth of the multitude the puzzled query,² "Who is this Son of Man?" would mean what it does to most readers to-day, the emphasis falling on "Son of Man," not on "this." On this view, then, "the Son of Man" was not a *popular* term. Had it been so, Jesus could not have constantly used it to the

¹ The expression is found nearly eighty times in the mouth of Jesus in the Gospels, and not once in the mouth of any other, except in the way of perplexed interrogation (John xii. 34).

² John xii. 34. Of course it would be otherwise with the Sanhedrin (Mark xiv. 61 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 63 ff.).

multitudes, as well as to the disciples, as a suggestive expression, giving them the hint needed to educate faith, but nothing more.

And this gives a point of transition to the class of evidence to be here cited. Jesus was Himself a Jewish villager, nurtured "under the law," like the people at large, and like them possessed by Old Testament ideas, to an extent perhaps hardly realized by most of us to-day. Was He not likely, therefore, to make appeal to His humble brethren, "the poor" to whom the Gospel was so largely adjusted, in terms deeply rooted in the Old Testament? Would He not choose as His distinctive self-revelation a title, grounded not so much in an isolated passage (only brought into prominence by a largely esoteric apocalypse), as in ideas that formed organic parts of the whole prior revelation? Not that I would, with Schleiermacher, deny that the *term* was in any way suggested, even to Christ's mind, by Daniel vii. 13.¹ But to adopt a term is one thing, to derive one's use of it from a single striking passage in which it occurs is another. And here we may say with Schmid,² that "it is *not consistent with the character of Jesus* merely to borrow an oft-recurring expression, without at the same time intentionally giving to it an original and characteristic signification." This latter I believe to have existed in His consciousness prior to the adoption of the term. Yet while original as a clearly conceived idea, it was so native to the Old Testament in the form of scattered germs, as to invite

¹ As regards the suggested influence of the Book of Enoch Dr. Bruce says: "In truth, it is very questionable if the words of Jesus have any connection whatever with that apocryphal book, and are not rather to be directly affiliated to the [symbolic] oracle concerning the Son of Man in the book of Daniel, whereof the relative parts of the book named after the ancient patriarch are a coarse sensuous expansion." Perhaps this point can be put too sharply. But that this Apocalyptic terminology is at least used allusively, —so as merely to adumbrate the continuation of spiritual relations already in operation in the historic ministry—rather than adopted *con amore* by the speaker, seems to follow from the general attitude and method of Christ.

² *Bibl. Theol. of the N.T.*, p. 111.

the gradual recognition of His hearers. We have now to ask, "What and where were these Old Testament germs?"

It can hardly have failed to strike most of us that the absence of *explicit* reference on Christ's part to the Servant of Jehovah in Isaiah liii. is sufficiently remarkable. But what if there be a constant *implicit* reference in Christ's teaching as to the Son of Man, such as, in the presence of the existing Jewish prejudice against any but a mighty or self-assertive Messiah, was the only wise course?¹ If this chapter be the real source of the Baptist's designation² of Jesus as "the Lamb of God," surely Jesus might Himself bring it somehow to the front in connection with His own person. Does He not, then, do so in this use of the title "the Son of Man," taken in connection with the sum of the predicates in which the distinctive features of its holder are set forth?³ Let us first of all examine the links of connection presented by these features; and then ask, Are there also any verbal anticipations in the O.T. of such a use of the conception "Son of Man?"

¹ It will be seen at once by those familiar with Rev. J. E. Carpenter's view, discussed by Dr. Sanday, in *THE EXPOSITOR* (4th series, vol. iii. 18 ff.), that the present theory absorbs its positive aspect. It is able moreover to adopt a large part of Dr. Sanday's own language, when he says (p. 29 f.): "At the same time it was not a common title, because the ordinary usage of the phrase 'Son of Man' in the Old Testament pointed to that side of human weakness and frailty which the zealots of the day least cared to dwell upon. . . . But the very reason which led them to avoid the title induced our Lord to take it. It expressed His Messiahship definitely enough for His purpose; but it expressed it in that veiled and suggestive way which characterized the whole of His teaching on His own person. At the same time it conveyed to those who had ears to hear the whole secret of the incarnation. That which the Jews shrank from and ignored, He rather placed in the forefront of His mission." And so on, though he stops short of seeking for the actual (Old Testament) sources of Christ's own conception of the term.

² John i. 29, 36, cf. Isaiah liii. So Prof. G. A. Smith, who works out the traces of this and the related sections of Isaiah at considerable length (*Isaiah*, vol. ii., chap. xvii. "The Servant of the Lord in the N.T.').

³ As Keim remarks, "The *mass* of the expressions must here decide as to the ultimate meaning of the phrase." And these predicates as a whole forbid our "looking for something indefinite, or for a *mere prophetic* title" (iii. 85 f.).

I.

The affinity between the Son of Man of the Gospels and the Servant of Jehovah in Isaiah, xl.-lxvi. To begin with, the programme of His ministry is found by Christ Himself in this part of Scripture, viz. chap. lxi. 1 ff., where the mission of the Servant is depicted as a form of divine philanthropy. Now a deep unity pervades the kindred passages, in virtue of which chap. lii. 13-liii. at least could hardly fail to be a potent factor determining Christ's conception of His mission.¹ When, therefore, Jesus emerged from the Messianic crisis (represented by the events of the Baptism and Temptation), with the words of the Prophet or Servant of Isaiah lxi. 1 ff. on His lips, could He fail to realize their affinity with the passages, whose acme is reached in Isaiah lii. 13 to liii. If then His sense of the general fulfilment of the Old Testament foreshadowings was primarily conditioned by this cycle of prophetic "dissolving views," it would be strange if the title under which He adumbrated His own conception of Himself as Founder of the Kingdom of God lacked any direct relation to the realization of this prophetic ideal.

But may we not further infer something from His general method, specially as shown in the parabolic form of teaching, which veils indeed, yet so as by suggestion to stimulate even the dull hearer to a personal act of recognition? If so, the title "the Son of Man" might even be expected to indicate something, not indeed *formally* but *substantially*, present in the very heart of the Old Testament, on which the mass of His hearers had been reared (cf. John v. 39).

¹ Riehna (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 299) says that the Targum of Jonathan, with its basis in the pre-Christian era, recognizes as Messianic the prophecies regarding the Servant of Jehovah, though the aspect of his suffering is sedulously obscured. But that this latter aspect was *felt*, is proved by the Talmudic expedient of the suffering Son of Joseph, side by side with the triumphant Son of David (see Weber, *System der altsynagogalen Palästina. Theologie*, 1880, § 80).

For to recognize a formal correspondence in title implies no spiritual discernment; while only those who have a certain moral or spiritual affinity can discern correspondence of undertone, as it were. And it is precisely such a selective value that we look for in a term habitually used by Jesus. Mark well this feature. "The Son of Man," unlike "Messiah," occurs on the lips of Jesus from first to last. It must surely, then, point to those elements in the *preparatio* which were least likely to countenance any suggestions of force. How otherwise can the fact be explained that, while Jesus studiously avoids the term Messiah even in private converse with disciples prior to Peter's confession, He as studiously refers to Himself in the third person as "the Son of Man." The inference seems inevitable, that whatever may have been the technical usage in certain circles represented by literature like the *Book of Enoch*,¹ the title "the Son of Man" was not employed by Jesus in any such conventional sense.² Rather it hinted at an essential aspect of the longed-for Redeemer, as He might be expected by the common people, and as He was actually waited for by a certain pious circle referred to in the Gospels, of which the Baptist was the splendid flower.³ But "of all prophecy it was the Book of Isaiah, and chiefly the latter part of it, on which they lived."⁴

Such then being the general presumption, let us now examine more in detail the traits common to the impressive figure looming through the early morning mists of Isaiah xl. ff., and that yet more impressive figure of the

¹ Shortly to appear in a satisfactory English form, edited by Rev. R. H. Charles, through the Clarendon Press.

² The occurrence of the term in Matt. xvi. 13—on any theory as to its presence—demands nothing less than this. Otherwise for the Evangelist and his readers at least the query would be mere tautology.

³ Cf. Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i. pp. 79, 82, 87, 93 (English translation).

⁴ Prof. G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii. p. 282; where he specially emphasizes this influence in the case of the Baptist.

latter day, when the full sunlight of history pours down on the majestic yet lowly "man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs," "the Son of Man," who "came not to be ministered to but to minister and give His life a ransom in place of many." As the Servant in Isaiah liii. is unprivileged in lot, unsupported by human countenance (*vv.* 1-3); so is it with the Son of Man, who had not even house or home (Matt. viii. 20). Is the former misunderstood or despised? So is the latter; and that so readily as to involve but little direct sin in any who but mistake His real nature (Matt. xii. 32). Does he, undiscouraged, persist in his mission of love (cf. also l. 4 ff.), pitying the sheep without a shepherd (*vv.* 4-6), ministering even unto the laying down of his life for those who set him at nought (*v.* 7 ff.)? Not otherwise is it with the Son of Man, who, coming to seek the scattered sheep (Mark vi. 34, cf. Luke xix. 10), ministers to men even unto that death itself (Mark x. 45; cf. Matt. xxvi. 54), which is the basis of His people's ransom (*ib.*; cf. Isa. liii. 10 ff.) and of the great reversal, whereby glory, and no longer weakness, becomes His lot.¹ Finally the specific reference to Himself of the words, "And he was reckoned with transgressors" (Luke xxii. 37), though unaccompanied by the title "Son of Man," goes to support the general position.²

So much said, we may now advance to the key of the situation, the Archimedean point of positive proof, whereby the whole force of the circumstantial evidence can be brought to bear upon the problem. This appears to be found in a passage in Mark (ix. 12 f.), too often neglected in this connection. "And He said unto them, Elias indeed first cometh and restoreth all things: and how is it *written* as regards the Son of Man that He should suffer

¹ Isa. liii. 11 ff., cf. lii. 13 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 64; so Mark viii. 38; cf. Luke xxiv. 25 ff.; 1 Pet. i. 11; Phil. ii. 8, 9.

² See also Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 302 f.

many things and be set at nought?” Now assuming, as we well may, that the reference is here mainly to Isaiah’s suffering servant of Jehovah, we have to notice the definiteness with which Jesus blends this Old Testament type with the title “the Son of Man.” As Wendt maintains,¹ this term is everywhere used by Christ with strict appropriateness, and not, as we are too apt to imagine, as a mere synonym, where another title would be equally in place. Accordingly one is led to see in this passage a practical identification of the conception “the Son of Man,” as it lived in His mind, with the Old Testament type of the Servant,² found specifically in the latter chapters of Isaiah, if in a general sense throughout the prophets (cf. Luke xviii. 31). It is surely more than mere accident that Peter’s early speeches in the Acts habitually set forth Jesus as the Servant (*παῖς*, according to LXX. usage) of God, divinely endowed for His mission and divinely vindicated from out a violent death.³ We may note too the way in which the Apostle expresses the meaning of Christ’s death in close relation with the principle of His whole life, viz. that of perfect meekness. Such a representation must surely go back to the Isaianic type of the Master’s own language, in which at the same time the term “the Son of Man” played so prominent a part.⁴

¹ *Op. cit.* ii. 148.

² May not the essentially *filial* consciousness of Jesus have necessitated the avoidance of the original title “Servant” of Jehovah? He speaks of Himself as servant of *men*; but in relation to God, ever as Son.

³ Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30; see R.V. marg. on iii. 13, where—besides Isa. xlii. 1, lii. 13, liii. 11—Matt. xii. 18 is cited.

⁴ See 1 Pet. ii. 21 f., Isa. liii., Markx. 45. For the Epistle to the Hebrews as additional evidence of an element in the apostolic tradition pointing back in the same direction, see p. 435. Granting there be no strict dependence of the Pauline “Second” or “Heavenly” Man, upon the use of “the Son of Man” here advocated, yet the analogy witnesses to the soteriological richness of the latter idea. Here Romans v. 12 ff., as emphasizing the human nature of the Redeemer, throws welcome light on the possible meaning of Mark x. 45, though the associations of the two passages are otherwise different. Within due limits Philippians ii. 8 also may be cited as illustrative.

II.

It will now be in place to ask whether there are any *verbal* points of contact with this title to be found in the Old Testament. Does it supply any language tending to make "the Son of Man" a fitting form under which the features of Jehovah's Servant might afresh be crystalized? Here of course we start with the phrase in Daniel vii., the fountain-head of later apocalyptic developments. When we examine the passage on its own merits—as we have right to suppose that Jesus did, in keeping with His strikingly original attitude to Scripture from youth upwards (Luke ii. 47)—we perceive the arbitrariness of the conventional apocalyptic view, which failed to do any justice to the context. Here the "one like unto a son of man" must symbolize a type of kingdom, since the whole point lies in the contrast with the animal symbols, denoting brutal and worldly force. The kingdom of God's saints (*v.* 17) is essentially humane—human in the sense in which the genius and glory of manhood, the human ideal, cannot but contrast with the idea of the brute creation. Could a point so obviously appealing to spiritual insight have escaped the notice or failed to impress the mind of One, who showed such an eye for all that served to bring out God's ideal of man, as is betokened in His use of Deuteronomy in the Temptation, and in the subtle reference of John x. 34 f. (Ps. lxxxii. 6)? But this representative or typical use of "Son of Man"—here so strikingly analogous to that of "the Servant" in Isaiah—is by no means confined to Daniel vii. Not to mention Ezekiel, it occurs in the Psalter in a train of thought not only impressive in itself, but also couched in the striking terms of apostrophe.¹ "What is

¹ Ps. viii. 4 (cxliv. 3), cf. lxxx. 17. Cf. Keim, iii. 81. "This contrast of lowliness and majesty had already acquired in these passages a character of *mysteriousness*, the appearance of a special, individual, and unique privileged position." That this quality (at least quasi-Messianic) had not failed to attract

man, that Thou art mindful of him? And the Son of Man, that thou visitest him. For Thou hast made him little lower than God (*Elohim*), and crownest him with glory and honour. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands." I cannot think that the idea contained in this passage, which so rivetted the attention of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as to dominate his whole argument,¹ held a lesser place in the Scriptural equipment of Him who delighted to be recognized as "*the Son of Man*" *par excellence*.²

Finally as showing how thoroughly in keeping with the idea of the Servant of Jehovah is this notion of essential humanity, with its blending suggestions of creaturely dependence and exalted divine destiny, one may point to Isaiah lii. *fin.*, where the frail and suffering aspect of the Servant, as man among "the sons of men" (v. 14), is balanced at once by his august exaltation (vv. 13, 15).³

notice, is proved by the use of the passage in Hebrews ii. 6 ff. in a way practically identical with that here urged. Cf. the use of "Son of God" (Ps. ii. 7) as a title of Messiah (Heb. i. 5).

¹ See Heb. ii. 6 to end of chap., e.g. v. 17, so iv. 16, v. 6-10 (where *ὁ υἱὸς* of v. 6 corresponds to the salutation at the Baptism, Mark i. 11, and *ἀρχιερεὺς* to the official meaning of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, e.g. Mark ii. 10, 45).

² For Ps. viii., as Messianically interpreted, see 1 Cor. xv. 27, Eph. i. 22, as well as Heb. ii. It is to be noticed also that in Ps. viii. we have the phrase "Son of Man," not merely "one like a Son of Man."

³ It is perhaps worth noting that even *Enoch*, in the description of its Son of Man, seems to have been influenced by this passage (cf. "startle" in xlvi. 4 with Isa. lii. 15). Whilst then quite unable to entertain the notion that in all genuine utterances of Jesus Himself "the Son of Man" remains, as it appears originally in Daniel, the symbol of the kingdom of God's saints, I cannot but feel that this view so far tends to confirm the line here pursued. For if we recall Delitzsch's comparison of the three related uses of the "Servant of Jehovah" (viz. Israel as a whole, as a faithful residue, and in the person of its ideal representative) to the narrowing area of a pyramid as it rises from base to apex, we may recognize what of truth there may be in such a theory, by keeping in mind the *representative*, as opposed to individual, character attaching to "the Son of Man" as the author of the new humanity of "the Kingdom" (cf. even Matt. xvi. 28). In this connexion it is interesting to note how the servant stands as "a covenant for the people" (Isa. xlii. 6, cf. xlix. 8), an idea which makes intelligible the relation of "the Son of Man" to "the

Whatever may be the degree of probability already attained, it cannot fail to be enhanced by attention to a somewhat analogous case, the idea of God in the Old Testament as taken up and transformed by Christ. Here it must be sufficient to simply remark of a subject that has been fairly worked out already,¹ that just as Jesus gathered up all the Old Testament contributions towards a truly spiritual idea of God, and vitalized them afresh in coherent form through His idea of the Heavenly Father—the *theological* pole of “the kingdom”; so to constitute the *anthropological* pole, as it were, of the same “kingdom,” there went all the important Old Testament data as to man. Among these the passages just dealt with are cardinal; and their root may be recognized in Genesis i. 27. But instead of summing up His general teaching on this head in abstract form, Jesus concentrated attention upon it and the true nature of the “kingdom” as involved therein, by pointing to the realization of both in His own person. In Him, the Messiah, the true ideal of man as God’s perfect Servant because Son, the Kingdom was indeed present, and could be proclaimed as no longer merely future but as nigh at the very doors. And the term which contained suggestively, for those in true sympathy with the spirit of the Old Testament, these and kindred truths was the title “the Son of Man,” the unique yet typical Head of the New Mankind.² He it was who realized in principle its ideal destiny as redeemed, being indeed “the firstborn among many brethren” (Rom. viii. 29). Doubtless in anything like its full and

kingdom,” and also His blood as “the blood of the Covenant” (Matt. xxv. 28, etc.).

¹ *E.g.* by Wendt, *l.c.* p. 184 ff.

² John xii. 23 ff. illustrates the identity of principle regulating the life of “the Son of Man” and of His disciples. Such a son of man has affinity with “the Servant of Jehovah,” who denotes now (the true) Israel, now its Ideal Representative; but hardly any with a transcendental or “heavenly” Messiah, like that in *Enoch*.

inner meaning it remained for many a day more of an enigma than aught else even to the inner circle of disciples. But is not this in perfect accord with Christ's general method of evoking faith?¹ He taught in parables that tested preparedness by suggestions provocative of reflexion, rather than by explicit statement that rendered personal effort superfluous. The unexplained element in the term so understood is thus no fatal objection, but rather a fresh confirmation. But the contrary is the case with that theory which views "the Son of Man" as used primarily in a conventional sense, with all the emphasis upon a scenic and marvellous future. If however such associations are only suffered to emerge here and there, where the future, indeterminate to human thought, is necessarily in question—as in the reply to the High Priest's interrogation (Mark xiv. 62)—while as a rule the reference is to features of His own historic person, all incongruity is avoided.²

To recapitulate the discussion, so far, in the form of a bare thesis. One may say that *the title the Son of Man, as habitually used by Jesus, had primary reference to Himself as the unique personalized type of the Kingdom of God, the main features of whose character were given most vividly and completely in the picture of Jehovah's Servant in Isaiah lii. 13-liv. ; other associations of a more Apocalyptic type being confined to vague and picturesque hints as to the future developments, when weakness should give place to manifested glory.*

¹ See for instance a paper on this subject in THE EXPOSITOR for June last.

² Possibly the transition from Christ's specific use to one not unlike the "Apocalyptic," is seen in John v. 27, where His very humanity constitutes His fitness to fill the place of judge, so emphasized by the latter. Here Rev. i. 13, 18, xiv. 14 f. agree with the Gospel. Finally it is quite probable, in view of the gentle tone of Stephen's dying words, that "the Son of Man" seen of him was the patient ideal man of Hebrews ii. 8-10, rather than the judicial potentate of Apocalypics.

III.

Dr. Bruce has distinguished three classes of passages affecting the Son of Man; those suggestive of (1) unprivileged and suffering condition; (2) essential human sympathies; (3) glory in the final issue.¹ If these three strands of thought are exegetically assured, then the present discussion seems to lay bare the Old Testament basis of their vital unity to the mind of Christ, by pointing to the concrete ideal set forth in Isaiah.

One point in particular is thus cleared up, namely the paradoxical aspect of "the Son of Man," in whom lowly humanity and superhuman dignity strangely blend. Thus Baldensberger has sharply criticized Wendt and others for not finding the ascription of judicial *authority* (ἐξουσία)² to Christ as Son of Man (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου), radically inconsistent with any theory which starts with the notion of "genuine humanity."³ But the critic forgets that the term "authority" is by the same Evangelist used also for the empowering of believers with divine Sonship. While as to the judicial function, its principle seems identical with that stated three verses lower down: "I cannot do aught of mine own initiative (ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ): as I *hear*, I judge: and my judgment is righteous, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." Surely this is not the spirit of an Apocalyptic "heavenly Messiah." We must bring Christ's own sense of the judicial function to the study of each of His words. So doing we may learn from passages like John viii. 26 ff., and x. 47 ff., that the same truth whereby He searched and judged men on earth, shall be the judge of men in the final judgment; and that the "authority" needed, to be the organ of that truth then, is

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 172 ff.

² John v. 27.

³ *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 185. cf. 172 n. (Strassburg, 2nd. ed., 1892).

none other in principle than that already possessed by the lowly Son of Man on earth.¹ But waiving these points—and a tendency to water down Christ's idea of *man* to the current Jewish idea which set humanity in hard antithesis to the transcendent Deity²—it surely remains true that a similarly unique dignity belongs to the Servant in Isaiah, which is prior to any Apocalyptic tendencies. To be sure the fully realized dignity is reached only through humiliation, and, as it were, by a development. But this is just what an historical view of the Gospels also recognizes for the Son of Man, who, according to a principle common to Him and His, must be made fruitful through dying like a grain of wheat (John xii. 23 ff.), and so be glorified (cf. Luke xxiv. 26). Thus He through the discipline of suffering and temptation, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, is completely qualified (*τελειῶσαι*) as First-born to bring many sons unto glory, having as *the* Son of Man been consummated as High Priest of mankind (Heb. ii. 10 ff., 17, 18; v. 7-10).

Two or three more passages call for notice as tending to decide between rival theories. When Jesus said to the paralytic, "Son, thy sins are forgiven," the Scribes saw in His words blasphemy. In order to convince them of the reality of His authority in the spiritual sphere, Jesus proceeded to demonstrate it in the more palpable sphere of the physical. What then is the tacit reasoning here? Not that He is thereby proved to be the "heavenly Son of Man" of Apocalyptic type. To convince Scribes of this, "signs" of a very different order were required (cf. the

¹ See also John xii. 31, "Now is (the) judgment of this world," etc. Baldensberger seems to feel no scruple in taking *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* as equivalent to *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in this passage. But is it not just the point of the position criticized, that *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* must be taken as a *generic* term, *i. e.* human? Reference should here be made to Dr. Westcott's note on the passage, which should carry conviction on a point which is really crucial as between the "Apocalyptic" and "Old Testament" theories as to Christ's usage.

² Cf. *infra*, the remarks on Matthew ix. 3-8.

“sign from heaven,” Matt. xvi. 1). No, the thought is rather that even though a true man among men upon earth, the Son of Man as such was not disqualified, but rather qualified thereby, to pronounce the Father’s forgiveness to the trustful soul. Two ideas of God and man lie behind the criticism and the response. That this is the true view follows from two further considerations. To wit (1) that the first Evangelist seems to have so understood the incident; “they glorified God who had given such authority to men.” And (2) that Jesus later on delegated similar authority to His disciples (John xxi. 21-23).

“The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; so that the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath” (Mark ii. 27 f.). Here the very nerve of the logic is that the Son of Man, though unique as the Head of humanity, is yet man and so normative as judge of man’s highest interests. The intrusion of reference to a “heavenly” Son of Man would produce a mere paralogism. So with the contrast between speech against the Son of Man and that against the Holy Spirit (Matt. xii. 32). Alter the emphasis, as some would do, and the whole becomes tame, if not inept.¹

But what of the class of Johannine sayings which seem to connect the Son of Man specially with heaven as His native sphere, to which He was about to return by being “lifted up.”² Well, at least they cannot be used to override a clear verdict derived from the Synoptists. And further, we have our Lord’s own authority for taking them in a spiritual rather than realistic sense (comp. John vi. 62 with v. 63); for the Father’s inner teaching is requisite ere men can enter into their true bearing (*ib.* 65). As with

¹ It is enough to simply refer to the Son of Man’s broad humanity in social relations even with the outcasts (*e.g.* Luke xviii. 1-10)—in contrast with the Baptist’s imperfect “humanity.”

² ἰψωθῆναι, viii. 28, xii. 32; ἀναβαίνειν, vi. 62.

the "eating" of His *flesh* and "drinking" of His *blood*, so here too the Great Teacher is obviously availing Himself of figurative license. We must beware of trying to elucidate "the obscure by the more obscure." So much in general. On the other hand, a special passage like John i. 51 is otherwise capable of an excellent meaning. "Ye shall see," says Jesus in explanation of the peculiar glory of the dispensation introduced by Him, "not so much a restoration of the old prophetic vision, which ever and anon pierced into heaven, but rather heaven laid open and constant intercourse established between it and the Son of Man on earth."¹ Or, in other words, the dualism between earth and heaven, man and God, which had hitherto more or less pervaded men's thoughts, was to be done away, absorbed in the one spiritual sphere wherein the New Man, God's Son, habitually lived and had His being. This is precisely the notion of the Synoptic passages above treated, and is the root idea of the theology common to both types of Gospel.²

One more passage, and one only, calls for explicit notice, as presenting in essential harmony the two aspects calling for reconciliation, the historic and the "apocalyptic" moments in the idea "the Son of Man." In the Judgment Scene (Matt. xxv. 31 ff.), the King, as in the Book of Enoch for instance, divides men into two categories, the righteous and the wicked. But on how different a basis! Here it is men's treatment of their fellows, the very brethren of the Judge (*vv.* 40, 45). This points back irresistibly to His historic experience of unity with the race, in all its need of fraternal sympathy and mute appeal for the things that concern its conditioned and dependent lot. Conversely too,

¹ So in substance Dr. Westcott *in loc.*

² In John ix. 35, **NBD**. Theb. *Eth.* (*codl.*) Chrys. (?) read *ἀνθρώπων* for *θεοῦ*; and Dr. Westcott argues for it strongly, agreeably with the view set forth in his Additional Note on John i. 51.

it sets forth the continuity, so marked also in Isaiah liii., between the One, who "had not where to lay His head," and who craved for the companionship of His disciples in the final prayerful "watch" (Mark xiv. 34, 37, 41); and the same in glory whether of regal sway, already in process when once the state of humiliation is past (cf. "henceforth," Matt. xxvi. 64; so Luke xxii. 69), or of ultimate judicial function for mankind. And to Christ's mind, relative to either condition the title "the Son of Man" retained its *fitness*.

A final confirmation lies near at hand. All must recognise how little explicit teaching as to the significance of His death is contained in Christ's own allusions thereto. But if we regard them as indeed allusions, meant to refer the disciples' thoughts back to a great *locus classicus* on the subject, like that in Isaiah liii., then all becomes comparatively plain. For His death, too, He could point back, by the aid of His pregnant title, to prophecy, when with the meek Servant before His mind, He spoke of the Son of Man as giving "His life a ransom in the stead of many."¹ In this light also we may perhaps find it easier to conceive how the Baptist could refer to Jesus as he did, as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Certain it is that the Church at large would have kept more close to Christ's own thought as to Redemption, had her imagination dwelt longer and more lovingly upon the great Isaianic picture with its tender pathos.

Many important aspects of the Person of Christ have here been necessarily left on one side. The present is but a "short study on a great subject." Yet incidentally it may serve to confirm confidence in the Gospels,² as well as

¹ See Prof. G. A. Smith's *Isaiah*, ii. 344 f. There is a "mystic efficacy" in the death of Isaiah liii.; why should there not be the same in Mark x. 45?

² By indicating a fresh watermark of Christ's own original stamp, and that just where His reporters might well have failed to preserve His mind.

elucidate a topic of practical moment to Christian people of all sorts, who desire to know aright the Christ of History, that they may the better have fellowship with the Christ of Faith.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE FIRST LEPER HEALED.

(MATT. VIII. 2; MARK I. 40; LUKE V. 12.)

AMONG the ancient Jews, a leper was of all human creatures most forlorn. The horrible nature of his disease, in which the blood was poisoned until the very bones rotted and the body slowly fell to pieces, was enough to make him feel that he was doomed, and in some sense already dead. Therefore, Moses prayed for Miriam, "Let her not be as one dead"; and when the king of Israel was invited to restore Naaman, he felt how poor a thing is a monarch in the iron presence of fate, and cried, "Am I God, to kill and to make alive?" (Num. xii. 12; 2 Kings v. 7.) So far beyond all hope of recovery was this disease, that the marvellous pharmacopœia of the Rabbis had neither a drug nor an incantation to oppose to it (Eldersheim, *Life*, i. 492).

Josephus described the lepers as being "in effect dead persons"; and he dismisses the regulations for their purification with an expression which, however pious, has in it the ring of orthodoxy much rather than of faith: "if in answer to prayer any of them recovered." Clearly the leper was beyond hope.¹ Yet Keim asserts that "this

¹ Students of Tennyson will remember how, in the middle ages, a kind of funeral service, with a casting of earth upon the leprous body as upon a living corpse, was performed over those who suffered from the disease, which some, even yet, confound with the leprosy of Scripture. It differs from it, as in other respects, so especially in the important matter of contagion.

disease is reported, both in the Old and New Testament "to have been "often (!) arrested by a copious discharge of the matter which produced it." He should have written "which it secreted," but this would have exposed the futility of his contention. At the same time he admits, what certainly suggests its desperate virulence, that Isaiah has "no prediction concerning leprosy, as concerning the deaf and dumb, which could have been condensed into a material fact" by myth or legend (iii. 209, 210).

As if this hideous malady were not terrible enough already, the sufferer was looked askance upon, as being in some special sense "smitten of God"—a phrase which, occurring in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, was taken to announce that the Messiah Himself should be a leper.

Nor is it hard to understand how the leper came thus to be regarded as one under a ban. For the Old Testament had made his disease a special type of sin, which is indeed the origin of all our ailments, yet the horror of which seems most to reveal itself in this.

Therefore the leper might not even touch his fellow-men. As if already mourning for himself, he should go with rent clothes, shaggy hair, and covered lip, and should loudly proclaim to all men, not so much his misery, as the shame of his uncleanness. He was excluded from the camp, and by inference from all walled cities (Lev. xiii. 45, 46).

Not only was his disease hereditary, as we read in the curse pronounced upon Gehazi, but the absence of contagion (except through the very closest possible intimacy), which immunity allowed Naaman to retain his position in the court, and Gehazi to relate the acts of Elisha before the king himself, was counterbalanced by inflicting, with more than usual severity, the artificial contagion of ceremonial impurity. Thus the disease was made to express not only the infection which we inherit from the fall, but

also the corrupting influence of each sinner upon the rest.

The rigour of these laws, so unlike the manner of other nations, was used by Josephus to disprove the slander that his people and their chief had been driven out by the Egyptians as intolerably leprous, in which case he argued, not unreasonably, that Moses would have treated the ailment as gently as other legislators did (*Antiq.* III. xi. 3, 4).

From all this austerity, and its connection with the divine law, it was natural to regard the victim as himself under that special malison which his terrible doom symbolized; and thus it happened that his penalties and disabilities, prescribed by Scripture, were cruelly exaggerated in its received interpretations and expositions. To salute him was forbidden; a hundred cubits was the distance to windward which he must keep; and it was a religious thing to keep him off, even by throwing stones at him.¹

And yet the law itself contained a provision which might well have suggested kindlier thoughts to a heart that was prepared to receive them. For just when the disease was at its worst, when vengeance—if it were vengeance—was having its perfect work, the law ceased to exclude its unhappy victim from the consolations of human society. His uncleanness lasted while the disease was spreading upon the skin: it was at an end when the whole body was affected, when further severity would have been cruel indeed, and every good heart would have rebelled against so unnatural an edict. “If the leprosy shall have covered all his flesh, *the priest* shall pronounce him clean that

¹ Keim has no warrant whatever for his assertion that the restrictions of the law were administered with laxity (iii. 207). All the evidence looks the other way, including the only passage to which he refers (2 Kings vii. 3), since the four lepers were not in the city, but at the gate. How does he suppose that they obtained egress from a besieged city after sunset?

hath the plague ; it is all turned white, he is clean " (Lev. xiii. 3).

And among the minute coincidences which strengthen so greatly our faith in the Gospel narratives, this is one, that whereas the ten lepers stand aloof and cry from a distance, the " man full of leprosy " may come quite close to Jesus.

It is further to be remarked that no prophet of the Old Testament ever himself heals a leper. Moses prays to God for Miriam, and her recovery is the direct act of heaven. Elisha merely announces to Naaman the terms upon which God will heal him, namely purification in running water, according to the law of Israel (which fact explains the jealous reference to the rivers of Damascus) but he himself does nothing, and even gives additional offence by failing to associate himself with the cure, striking his hand over the place.

The notion of competition with Old Testament marvels prompting the growth of this among other legends is therefore particularly baseless ; and we have seen that no prediction could have inspired the expectation of such a work. Yet this is what Strauss insinuated by speaking of " the cure of the leper by the prophet Elisha, from whose history so many features have entered into that of Christ " (*New Life*, ii. 173).

As if any contrast could be sharper than exists between Elisha's treatment of the proud warrior commended by a king, and the kindness of Jesus to His nameless suppliant, some obscure Galilean, with no introduction except his wretchedness.

This miracle is indeed a stumbling-block to every sceptical theory.

Strauss himself has done excellent service against the sentimental school, who represent the miracles as wrought by the charm of an exquisite personality, a word, a sigh

which were not ineffectual, in simply reminding us of the nature of the disease. What this theory asks us to believe is that by a sort of mesmerism, by such an infection of energy as that with which Napoleon boasted that he could induce armies to die for him, "a skin which in consequence of thorough corruption of the blood had been eaten into by the most obstinate and malignant of eruptions, was rendered instantly pure and sound by a word and a touch" (*Life*, bk. ii., sec. 90). But this would be a miracle. Call it psychological instead of physical: you do not make it natural, nor much reduce its value as a challenge to the conscience to weigh the teaching of the unique man. In fact, however, there is little danger that our modern materialism will invest ideas and emotions with power instantaneously to secrete new tissue and expel deep-seated poison from the system. When men of our day are brought thus far, their struggle against the faith will be well-nigh closed.

But how came it that men ever turned to such resources of despair?

It is because the narrative bears on its face the most undeniable proofs of truthfulness. The author of *Supernatural Religion* may declare that for the existence of miracles "there is no evidence worthy of the name"; but writers equally sceptical, yet a little more cautious, or more capable of weighing evidence, make very startling admissions. Schenkel declares that "a mythical origin of the narrative is, for several reasons, not to be admitted. In the first place the narrative is given by the primitive Mark. . . . Then, again, it contains particulars which cannot have been invented." Hereupon we ask, with heightened curiosity, what is Schenkel's own theory? And we are only told that the expression in the third Gospel, "full of leprosy," is an exaggeration, and that "it is not improbable that the leper, when he went to Jesus, was already in an advanced state of cure, but received from

Jesus an accession of vital power greatly accelerating his restoration " (p. 376).

This attempt at an explanation is put forward as an improvement upon that of Hase, who felt himself compelled to accept the story, and to be content with pleading that cutaneous diseases are very movable, and no positive law of nature was violated by the power of Jesus over leprosy. Schenkel saw plainly enough that if, according to our narratives, Jesus cured this leper, the common sense of mankind would recognise a work utterly beyond the natural powers of a Galilean carpenter, and would not stop to ask whether He violated any positive law of nature, a matter about which the first believers were profoundly indifferent and ignorant. Yet Schenkel felt the inherent power of the narrative to be so coercing, that he could attempt no more than to file down the wonder until its reduced proportions would not utterly defy his own system. Observe, however, what he has to throw overboard. In denying that the man was " full of leprosy," he quite ignores the special interest of medical details for St. Luke, whose diagnosis is habitually both accurate and full. What is more, he fails to explain the close access which the sufferer gained to Jesus, at a moment, too, when Jesus is, *ex hypothesi*, specially jealous about compliance with the law.

The ten lepers remained afar off, as they were bound to do; and the first two evangelists, by narrating the difference in the behaviour of this suppliant, entirely confirm the report of Luke, that the disease had reached that dreadful stage at which the disability was removed. But Schenkel, while struggling so violently, commits suicide. For while contending that Jesus only " accelerated his restoration," he admits among those particulars which cannot have been invented, the injunction to exhibit himself to the priests, and offer the gifts which would only be accepted when a complete and final recovery had been

achieved, "a command," says Keim rightly, "which supplies the final and fundamental element in the healing process, and which proves the cure, or after-cure to be complete."

These explanations which explain nothing, these incredible attempts to render the miracle credible while denying the miraculous, these unnatural coincidences by means of which Jesus builds up a reputation as a Healer, in a world of sickness, while only charming and invigorating those who were already convalescent, these could not impose on such a man as Keim. He therefore confesses himself "at once in the midst of great difficulties." For it is equally "impossible to overlook altogether the striking marks of genuineness in the report" of which, however, Keim only enumerates two, the sending of the sick (healed?) man to the priests, and the unusually impassioned prohibition to make the event known. "We may thus arrive at the conclusion that the thrice-given report is not to be put aside as absolutely unhistorical. But if a positive miracle cannot here be admitted, still less can a modified degree of the miraculous"—and for this he gives some of the evidence adduced above.

How then does he explain the mystery? He revives the old rationalistic method which reduced the miracles to natural events, curiously misunderstood, so that the five thousand were fed by a generous impulse, leading those who had provisions to share with their hungry neighbours; and the walking on the waters was but a standing on some reef or promontory, and calling thence to frightened sailors, who thereupon discovered that they were safe enough.

This method has long been abandoned to the ridicule even of unbelievers, but it is a rag of its tatters which Keim now wraps about his nakedness. His theory has been somewhat misunderstood, which is the greater pity, because when accurately stated it refutes itself.

He bases his argument on the fact that the verb *καθαρίζειν* means not only to cleanse but also to make the formal pronouncement of cleanness, "that declaration of cleanness which, in the very same words, was reserved to the priests by the legislation of Moses." It is so used in the thirteenth of Leviticus; and our Revisers have acted on this analogy in their bold but doubtless correct rendering of Mark vii. 19. This much therefore we concede. He proceeds to state that the skilled inspection, upon which this pronouncement was based, had now been usurped by the Scribes, "placing themselves as men learned in the law in successful competition with the priests, and themselves uttering the decisive sentence, while, in order to avoid a direct disobedience to Moses, they left to the priests the empty and formal executive: 'the man is clean, and the priest shall pronounce him clean.'" In this sentence lurks the fallacy. The object of Keim is to transfer the official act from the priest to the scribe. Without this, his rendering will not help him in the least; and it is for the sake of this that he makes the inspection by the scribes to issue in "uttering the decisive sentence." But it is plain that as long as the "formal executive" was left to the priests, as long as the letter of the law was respected, it is to their act only that the verb *καθαρίζειν* could apply. For, as Keim rightly started by contending, this is reserved to them by the language of Leviticus, *καθαριεὶ αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεὺς* (xiii. 6, 13). The fact seems to be that any skilled person could certify cleanness to the priests, and they took action when they were satisfied, which was perfectly reasonable. But the one important point is that the formal cleansing belonged still, and even by Keim's own showing, to the priests alone.

Bearing this in mind, we return to his explanation of the miracle. The man had perfectly recovered, and neither asked healing nor needed it. All he wanted (and surely such ingratitude at such a time should excite other feelings

than compassion) was to escape the trouble and cost of a journey to Jerusalem. "Since Jesus stood before the public as a scribe, the convalescent might in fact, with Jesus' sentence in his hand, dispense with going to Jerusalem, and Jesus, on His part, could Himself, without being either physician or priest, certify according to the practice of others a visible recovery, but still reserving the formal sentence" [= καθαρικῆ, be it always observed] "to the legally authorized priest."

This, it appears, is what actually happened; and it explains the urgency of the command that he should show himself to the priests, for a testimony unto them that Jesus would not usurp their functions. Yet He was actually joining Himself with the scribes in an act which "undermined the Levitical ordinance." He refused to dispense with the formal judgment, but pronounced the antecedent verdict, and even touched the convalescent, and such a course of action excited the great admiration which we read about, "on account of His heroic love to His fellow men, and His determined conduct." Heroic love, truly, and marvellous determination, to do what any Scribe on the shore of the lake would have done as readily, and to add the hazard of touching perfectly healthy flesh! But the materializing, mythical spirit, we learn, promptly converted this declaration of cleansing into an actual cleansing.

So then we are to understand that for a favour which any Scribe could give, the man came kneeling and even prostrating himself in the dust, and declaring, Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst certify my cleanness. And Jesus, moved with compassion for a perfectly healthy man, ventured so far as to touch a body to which contagion and infection no longer attached, and won great applause by saying, "I will, be thou pronounced clean." And the narrative adds, with marvellous explicitness surely, "immediately he was pronounced clean." In the meanwhile, what happened was the reverse.

What Jesus must have said was, I refuse to pronounce thee clean: I willingly perform the preliminary steps, but only in Jerusalem can the official pronouncement be promulgated.

The man, thus baffled and rebuked, rapturously believed himself to have received all he wanted, and the whole district believed that what he wanted and got was a stupendous miracle. To such extremities the simple, self-evidencing story has reduced its keenest foes.

Surely, in the presence of these wonderful attempts to deny the miracle and yet to recognise the truth of the story, which they feel and confess, we are justified in saying that there exists no better evidence for the faith than the attacks upon it.

We contrast with such incredible myths, in which everyone behaves as no person ever yet acted in the real world, the simple and straightforward story in which human nature, a heart, sufficient motives, and intelligible action are as striking as miraculous power. On a sudden, stalking into the group, unseen and unannounced, "lo, a man full of leprosy!" He kneels, he throws himself prostrate before the mighty Healer, whose fame is just beginning to fill the land. Leprosy Jesus was not yet known to have removed, nor was there any promise that even the Messiah should do this; but the institutions of Leviticus held out some hope, on which the lonely heart of misery had doubtless brooded longingly, and to him the work seemed no harder than others which had been already done. Would Jesus do this? The victim felt himself miserable enough to melt any heart, and the new Teacher was reputed to be kind. At least, this supreme wretchedness would cry aloud to the only man who could help, and would learn whether, brought face to face with such dire need, He could refuse to hear its prayer.

The time was not far off when to doubt the love of Jesus

would be less possible than even to doubt His power, and the Apostle would declare himself "persuaded that He is able to keep my deposit" without needing to make any profession of faith in His goodwill. This advance was wrought by experience, beginning with cases such as this, when the unhappy leper, more conscious of hideous foulness than even of pain, or perhaps aware that his loathsomeness must either shock the fastidiousness or evoke the compassion of the Healer, cried out so hastily, Lord [I am one to shrink away from, but] if Thou wilt Thou art able to cleanse me.

It was a striking moment, when men saw together the Loftiest and the most abject, the Image of God and the very type and embodiment of the curse. But since the Word had come forth expressly to show lost souls the fathomless compassion of heaven, He heard with profoundest pity that half-despairing cry. Therefore He would not heal him fastidiously, nor at a distance, and His followers beheld Jesus do for a peasant what Elisha refused to do for a noble and a conqueror. For the Life laid His sacred hand unshrinkingly upon that living death, and said, "I will, be cleansed," and the touch of His purity was more strong to convey cleanness than that purulent mass of corruption to defile. Immediately the leper was cleansed.

Some of us know the delicious sensation of reviving energy after illness, or even after a passing attack of faintness. But who can tell the rapture of that long tortured frame, that mind which had bidden farewell to hope, when the blood again suddenly flowed pure in the long sluggish veins, when at a stroke the fevered tissues became once more fresh and cool, and the yearning human creature felt himself no longer repulsive and dreadful to his fellow men, nor banned, nor doomed.

In the rush of that great ecstasy, it is little wonder if the common ritual proprieties were in danger to be set at

nought. We need no artificial explanation of the earnestness wherewith Jesus enforced his duties upon him, or of the commandment to keep silence, not to make himself the centre of wondering crowds, but to go his way promptly and do his duty.

We need no comment either upon the purblind stupidity of rationalism, which mistakes for a "heroic" announcement that there was no cause of repulsion, no demand on heroism, that exquisitely gracious act, which all the narratives alike commemorate, the stretching forth of His unshrinking hand, which no more drew back from the touch of leprosy than from the anguish of the cross.

Is it true, then, that leprosy represented the contagion and the doom of sin? It follows that when diseased souls, far more hateful in His eyes although they be, cry out to Him in their anguish, they may learn by His action now what to expect. On our fallen humanity He lays His holy hand, which shrinks not from the contact; to our prayer He answers, "I will, be clean"; a new and immortal life is poured into the sick hearts of all who seek Him out; and then He bids us walk, in the strength which He has given, the homely, unsensational road of obedience—obedience for the most part not to any new and exciting call, but along the common, dusty ways of duty.

G. A. CHADWICK.

TRUE OR FALSE CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM.

(JOHN VIII. 37-42.)

WE proceed to the second half of our Lord's polemic against those Jews who after a fashion had believed on Him. They had claimed first to be Abraham's sons, and, second, to be God's freemen. Jesus had already demonstrated (as we saw in our last paper¹) that they were in point of fact spiritual slaves to sin; and it followed from this that they could be no true sons of Abraham, as Isaac was. But although this second conclusion was virtually involved in what He had already said about the free-born son and the slave-born, yet it cost Him a good deal of pains and time to argue it out, because the Jews obstinately stood upon their pure descent from the Father of the faithful. They claimed to be, in virtue of their Abrahamic lineage, heirs of all the promises of Abraham's covenant. This claim of theirs rested upon a misconception. That great patriarch sustained a twofold position in the history of revelation. He was at once the progenitor of the national Israel sprung from his blood, and also the spiritual prototype and ancestor of every faithful (or believing) soul. Of the various promises given to him in Jehovah's covenant, some were national, and descended to the tribes which sprang from his race. Such was the promise of perpetual existence as a separate people, or the promise that of their blood should Messiah be born, or the promise of permanent possession of the Promised Land on condition of fidelity to God. Of promises like these the value was earthly and temporary. But underneath these there lay others vastly more to be coveted, the value of which was spiritual and everlasting: such as the promise of the Divine favour, or of

¹ See *THE EXPOSITOR* for April, 1891.

forgiveness of sins through sacrifice. Promises of this latter class had for their condition the personal faith of each individual; and consequently they were for those who inherited the spiritual character of Abraham—his faith and godliness. To the nation as such were held out secular advantages which any Jew might call his birth-right. To godly souls in the nation who walked also in the steps of the patriarch's piety were held out heavenly blessings, such as only they had a right to claim.

The temptation lay very near, and it was a constant one, to confound these two sorts of covenant blessings. In this confusion is to be sought the central and rooted blunder of worldly-minded Hebrews all through their history. The blunder was frequently rebuked by their great prophets down to John the Baptist, their latest one. But it perpetually re-appeared. Proud of his unbroken ancestry, and aware that, on the strength of that, he did possess certain advantages guaranteed by Heaven, an ungodly Jew might very easily lay to his soul the "flattering unction" that his descent from Abraham brought him within all the benefits of God's ancient covenant. On his mere genealogy he founded a plea which seemed to forbid the idea of his ever being cut off from mercy, to fall away into the perdition of the uncircumcised and uncovenanted heathen.

It is clear that the only way to meet this confusion was to distinguish between the things confounded. This is what our Lord does even by a distinction in terms. The phrase, "seed of Abraham," had been employed by these Jews to cover both ideas—natural descent and spiritual affinity. Our Lord cuts the two sheer asunder. The natural descent He allows them, the spiritual affinity He denies to them. And for more clear distinction, so that no one might build false hopes upon the ambiguity of a phrase any longer, He assigns to each idea its own term. "Seed of Abraham" He knows them to be—that implies

blood descent; "Abraham's children" He denies that they are—that carries the idea of moral affinity. It is a distinction in the use of language which His scholar St. Paul, when conducting the same argument many years after, found serviceable.

Our Lord's position then is, that, although descended from the stock of Abraham, these men were not spiritually his sons, and therefore not entitled to claim the spiritual benefits of his covenant. The proof of this position is to be found in their moral and religious unlikeness to Abraham. Children inherit their parents' image, their parents' nature. Just as physical derivation perpetuates the physical features of a race, so that blood descendants are to be recognised by their outward resemblance to their progenitors; so, in the sense in which alone any one can be called the spiritual child of another, there is implied a community of spiritual character, showing itself of course in a correspondence of moral and religious behaviour. "If ye were Abraham's children," says our Lord, "ye would do the works of Abraham."

Now the spiritual character of Abraham is not far to seek. The history of that saint is strongly marked by two outstanding unmistakable features. Every Jew was familiar with them, for they grew to be like household words. The first is his faith in God; the second, his friendship with God. Beyond all other men whose spiritual biography has been preserved, it may be said that this man possessed an open ear for every word which reached him from the invisible. Whether it came by a vision or a dream or a visible messenger, no revelation from the unseen staggered his faith, to none did he show himself disobedient. Once he knew it to be a veritable word from God, he made room for it in his heart, rested on it the whole trust of his soul, and at every sacrifice prepared himself to carry it out. It was so with his original exodus out

of his Chaldæan home ; it was so when, a second time, he migrated from Haran ; it was so when bidden to cast out his firstborn son ; it was so when directed to sacrifice the heir of promise. No one can miss this faith in God's word, attested by practical obedience ; for it is the grand feature which rendered Abraham the original pattern and parent of all men of faith, all trusters of the Divine word in face of difficulties.

Out of this childlike yet heroic loyalty to the word of God sprang the second feature I named. It grew up alongside. Because he believed God, God admitted him to be His friend. Knowing God better than any other man of his time, he was attached to the Most High by a singular closeness and strength of affection, so that he was permitted to walk with the Eternal as friend with friend in a fellowship of spirit such as scarce any other has enjoyed. Because the man believed that God would not withhold any blessing which He had promised, therefore would the man withhold from God nothing He might ask. The two, covenanted and sworn friends, as man never had been before with God since Adam ceased to walk in paradise, had thorough confidence each in the other. Are not these the marks of character which confessedly make glorious in the eyes of mankind that sainted father whose form rises in colossal spiritual proportions against the gray dawn of revelation ?

When we turn from Abraham to these so-called "children" of his, what a notable contrast do they offer to both these marks of his character ! Analyse their attitude to the great religious fact of their age, the presence among them of Jesus the Son of God, and what do you find ? First, a reluctance to admit the truth which is pressed upon them in God's name—reluctance fast mounting to flat resistance ; next, a dislike for the person of this Messenger and Son of God who walks the land beside them—dislike

that threatens soon to mount to murder! Call these men children of Abraham? Of Abraham, the candid-hearted, the truth-loving, quick of spiritual ear to catch, alone in his generation, each accent from heaven and prompt to follow it round the world; yet here are men in whose prejudiced minds the new truth spoken by the Son of God can find no place—not lodgment, not entrance even! Of Abraham, the companion and friend of God, whose noble soul dwelt in a sweet and trustful fellowship with the Invisible, and communed apart with Heaven as the joy of his existence; yet here are persons who will not even recognise the Son of God when He is come down to keep them company, but would kill Him if they could!

The demonstration of their unlikeness in spirit to Father Abraham lay so easily to His hand, in their actual attitude to Himself, that Jesus found no long discussion necessary to complete it. It all lies compressed as in a nutshell in these few words which He first spoke to them (ver. 37): “I know that ye are Abraham’s seed; yet ye seek to kill Me, because My word hath no place in you!” It all lay there, I say. But because they had no ear to hear that, and could only respond to it by a stupid and parrot-like repetition of their original boast (“our father is Abraham”), therefore our Lord found it needful (like some patient teacher who condescends to a dull scholar) to go over His words again, supplying each omitted step in the argument, and restating it all at full length, as when one breaks down bread for infants. This is the reason why we read it over again in the following form (vers. 39–41)—a form which surely nobody can misunderstand: “If you were ‘children of Abraham’ (as you say), you would do the works of Abraham. But now what you are doing is this, you are seeking to kill Me, a man who has been telling you the truth which I heard from God. This is not what

Abraham did. You are indeed doing the works of your spiritual father"—but he is not Abraham.

Not even these men misunderstood that plain speaking. They began at least to perceive that He was referring to a spiritual, not a mere physical, kinship with the covenant Head. They felt now that He meant to deny to them any real covenant relationship with God, such as Abraham enjoyed. But to say that they were not legitimately the heirs of Abraham's religious privileges was the same as to say that they had no safe or gracious standing before Jehovah as children of His covenant. To the people of Jehovah's covenant a loftier title belonged than even children of Abraham. Jehovah Himself had been pleased to take, in the sacred books, the title of a Father unto Israel. Not often indeed, yet here and there, in texts scattered thinly through the Old Testament, do we find Jehovah speaking of Israel as His son whom He brought out of Egypt. Of course such language could only be read in a spiritual sense, of religious privilege and standing in His favour. In this sense, God might with no presumption be claimed as a Father by the faithful members of His covenant people. There was indeed one sin which every Hebrew recognised to be a breach of the blessed tie which bound Israel to its God. Idolatry is everywhere in Scripture stigmatized as infidelity to God; and Israelites born in an age when the people had forsaken Jehovah for false gods, might be said to be tainted with spiritual illegitimacy—no longer sons unto Jehovah. Could it be in this sense that Jesus denied their Divine sonship? No; for these times of national apostasy were over. Babylon had effectually cured the nation of its weakness for idols. Ever since the brave martyrs of the age of Antiochus died for their devotion to the true God, the Jews had some right to say, with pride: "We are not the offspring of an unfaithful spouse; as children of Israel, we were not born in religious

illegitimacy; we have all of us one spiritual Father, and that is God."

The claim thus made, though in form a new one, is substantially a repetition of the old. Only they understood better than at first that our Lord was thinking of religious relationship, and not of physical descent. To the claim as now put He applies the same remorseless test as before. Spiritual children must bear the likeness of their father. If they were sons of God in any real and inward sense, they would recognise Jesus for the Son of God, and love Him for His Father's sake. Like draws to like; brother to brother. If you love Him who begat, you will love Him also that is begotten of Him, as St. John says. It would indeed have been a happy experience for God's only begotten Son, when He proceeded and came forth from the bosom of the Father, had He found among the nominal family that called Jehovah Father any large company of genuine children of God prepared to recognise in Him the Divine likeness, to receive, revere, and love Him for His Father's sake, on whose errand He was come. Alas! "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." They said, "This is the Heir; come, let us kill Him." A second time Joseph's brethren disowned the family tie, and slew their brother.

I should therefore have expected our Lord to say to them, "If God were your Father, ye would love Me, for I am the Son of God," or words to that effect. He does not. He avoids in this place what is so current on His lips, the calling God His Father, or Himself God's Son. For this reason, possibly, that such a claim might at that moment, when He was exasperating them by denying their position in the Divine family, have proved so irritating as to precipitate an explosion, and abruptly close the conversation before the time. What He does say, at all events, is: "If God were (as you say) your Father, you would love Me: *for*

I came forth and am come from God." The dignity of a Divine messenger at least He may claim; of a prophet, that is to say—if you choose to call Him no more than a prophet: of one who is not come of His own motion, but has been sent by God with a message from Him. That at least He may claim, for in that is no blasphemy; and this pretension to a prophetic commission (like his predecessor, John the Baptist's) was the well-known matter in dispute, upon which until this point the Sanhedrin had scarcely announced any public decision. Yet even while expressing Himself with caution, I notice how naturally our Lord selects words which may (and, to the instructed ear, do) go far beyond the claims of an ordinary prophet. To "proceed forth and come from God," is an expression which has always appeared to the faith of the Church to cover some deeper mystery than a simple Divine commission to speak for Jehovah. Does it not betray the hidden consciousness in this speaker of a personal, as well as official, origin from the Most High; of His having drawn His pre-existent being by Divine generation from the everlasting One, whom *they* call their Father, but of whom *He* was alone the equal and well-beloved Son? From the bosom of that eternal Father no man could be said, in the strict or literal sense of the word, to have *come forth*, save He who is of God, and is God—the Divine Word, who was in the beginning with God.

In any case it remains indisputable that one whose connexion with God was so close as His must have met with a very different reception, had the chiefs of Israel been Israelites indeed. Had those whose public office it was to sit in judgment on claims like His been themselves men of a tender, reverent, and holy heart, men in whom dwelt the Spirit of God, who loved His word, and were quick to recognise His will, how different would have been Messiah's reception! In name, these false plotters against His life

were sons of God. In character they bore the likeness of one who is a liar and murderer from the beginning. It was impossible that Jesus could recognise nominal pretensions which were supported by no personal worth. And just as impossible will it be for Him, when, from being arraigned to give account of Himself, He shall sit to arraign mankind before His bar, to take men then at their own reckoning, or allow their outward standing in His Church to count, in the absence of a new heart and a holy life. Christians are (as these Jews were) inside the pale of the covenant and the household of God. They are baptized into His name, and called in His grace the children of God. Of what avail is it to vaunt these empty titles, if behind our nominal position there be no inward character corresponding?

J. OSWALD DYKES.

THE QUESTION OF SYCHAR.

(JOHN IV.)

THE identification of Sychar would be a small matter, if it were not that its difficulty, as well as that of the whole topography of the Fourth of John, has been made the ground, by some for doubting, by others for denying, that the author of the Gospel was personally acquainted with the geography of Palestine. A well-known writer has said bluntly that there was no such place as Sychar, and that the Gospel commits a blunder.¹ And recently Mr. Cross (in the *Critical Review* for July) has stated a number of difficulties in the way of accepting Fourth John as the account of an eye-witness. The time has come for a revision of the whole argument. I hope, by pointing out some material things that have hitherto been overlooked, to meet Mr. Cross's difficulties, and if not to place the identification of Sychar beyond all doubt, at least to adduce sufficient evidence in its support to prove the charge of mistake unfounded and even absurd.

The objections made to the topography of Fourth John are three:—I. Sychar is not known to us as *a city of Samaria*. II. Even if Sychar be proved to be either Shechem or the present El 'Askar, no woman seeking water would have come from it to Jacob's Well. III. Expositions, based on the accuracy of the narrative, involve an error concerning the direction of the main road through Samaria to Galilee.

I. *Supernatural Religion* holds it evident that there was no such place as Sychar: and that "a very significant mistake" has been committed by the author of John's Gospel—significant, that is, of his ignorance of Palestine.

¹ *Supernatural Religion*, ii. 427.

Now, to begin with, let us remember that the writer of the Fourth Gospel is admitted to have been a man well acquainted with the Old Testament, and that in the Old Testament the position of the locality in question, *the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph* is more than once carefully fixed. In Genesis xxxiii. 19 it is described as *in face of* or *to the east of the city of Shechem*; ¹ and in Joshua xxiv. 32 as *in Shechem*. It is inconceivable that, with these passages before him, any student of the Old Testament would have, in mere error, substituted Sychar for Sychem—*Συχάρ* for *Συχέμ*. But the point goes further. Had the writer of the Gospel possessed only that knowledge of the locality which the Old Testament gave him, it is most probable that like Stephen ² he would have used the name *Συχέμ*. That he introduces another name, is surely a sign that he employed another source of information. All now agree that Sychar is not a copyist's error. ³ If, then, the author himself wrote it, he did so in spite of two well-known passages in the Old Testament—with which his familiarity is evident—and, therefore, it may safely be presumed, because of his acquaintance with Sychar as a name in the topography of Samaria.

In that topography Sychar can have stood—either as a second name for Shechem, or as the name of another place in the neighbourhood of Shechem.

For the first of these alternatives a good deal has been said, but all in the way of hypothesis. It is within the bounds of possibility, that, by their favourite habit of playing upon names, the Jews may have called Shechem *Sheqer*, *false*, or *Shichor*, *drunken*. ⁴ But we have absolutely no

¹ That is if we adopt the rendering which takes *Shalem* adverbially, *in peace*.

² Acts viii. 16.

³ This was Jerome's way out of the difficulty.

⁴ *שֶׁקֶר*, *falsehood*, was applied to idols (Hab. ii. 18). In Isaiah xxviii., reference is made to drunkenness, *שִׁכָּר*, as the notorious sinners of Samaria.

proof of their ever having done so, and it is to be noted that the passage in Isaiah xxviii., which is quoted in support of the second, and etymologically the only possible, derivation for Sychar, does not describe Shechem at all, but the city of Samaria, or Sebaste, six miles away. Trench's idea, that John, in his habit of symbolising, was himself the author of the nickname, is too far-fetched.¹

We turn, therefore, to the second possibility, that Sychar was the name of a place other than Shechem, but like Shechem in the neighbourhood of *the parcel of ground which Jacob bought*. For this the first evidence we get is in the beginning of the fourth century, when two visitors to the land, Eusebius and the Bordeaux Pilgrim (the latter about A.D. 333), both mention a Sychar, distinct from Shechem,—lying, says the former, before Neapolis, the present Nablûs,² and the latter adds that it was a Roman mile from Shechem. Jerome, it is true, asserts that Shechem and Sychar are the same; but he says so without evidence except such as all now agree to be unfounded,³ and his negative assertion cannot stand against the other two, who say that they saw this Sychar distinct from Shechem—the less so, that in translating Eusebius Jerome adopts his Sychar without question. The next traces of a separate Sychar are found in mediæval writers. The Abbot Daniel (1106–1107) speaks of “the hamlet of Jacob called Sichar. Jacob's well is there. Near this place, at half a verst away, is the town of Samaria . . . at present called Neapolis.” Fetellus (1130) says: “A mile from Sichem is the town of Sychar, in it is the fountain of Jacob, which however is a well.” John of Wurzburg (1160–1170) says: “Sichem is to-day called Neapolis. Sichar is east of Sichem, near to

¹ *Studies in the Gospels*, 86.

² From which Eusebius also distinguishes Shechem, describing the latter as in the suburbs of Neapolis and holding Joseph's tomb. (Euseb., *Onomasticon*.)

³ Viz., the confusion by some copyist of Sychar with Sychem.

the field which Jacob gave to his son, wherein is the well of Jacob, at which place a church is now being built.”¹ Again in the Samaritan Chronicle, the latest possible date of which is the fourteenth century, there occurs the name of a town “apparently near Shechem, which is spelt Ischar,” with initial Aleph, which is merely a vulgar pronunciation of Sychar.² Quaresmius, who wrote about 1630,³ reports that Brocardus (1283) saw “a certain large city deserted and in ruins, believed to have been that ancient Sichem, to the left” or north “of Jacob’s well”: “the natives told me the place is now called Istar by them.” Then the traveller Berggren found the name ‘Askar or ‘Asgar, with initial ‘Ain, given both to a spring ‘Ain el ‘Askar, which he identifies with Jacob’s Well, and—which is much more important for our question—to the whole plain below, the Sahil el ‘Askar.⁴ And, finally, the name still attaches to a few ruins and hovels at the foot of Mount Ebal, about one mile and three-quarters E.N.E. from Nablûs and little over half a mile N. from Jacob’s Well.⁵ The question is, can ‘Askar be derived from Sychar through Ischar? Robinson says no: “the fact that ‘Askar begins with the letter ‘Ain excludes all idea of affinity with the name Sychar.”⁶ But Robinson is wrong. Though the tendency is the other way, there are cases known in which ‘Ain has displaced Aleph. Conder says that the Samaritans themselves in

¹ I quote Daniel (who very curiously confounds Neapolis with Sebaste), Fetellus, John of Wurzburg, from the translations of the Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society.

² Conder, *Tent Work*, 41.

³ “*Etucidatio Terræ Sanctæ*,” Lib. vii., Peregr. i. Cap. ix. That it is the report of Brocardus which Quaresmius gives and not his own is clear from the next paragraph, where he says: “Fator me non vidisse nisi Neapolem, nec vetus Sychar,” etc.

⁴ *Reise*, ii. 267, quoted by Robinson.

⁵ First described by Canon Williams and since with greatest detail by Major Conder, *Tent Work*, 40-42.

⁶ *Later Researches*, 133.

translating their chronicle into Arabic call Ischar 'Askar.¹ And it has hitherto been overlooked that among the place-names of Palestine we have a strictly analogous case. Ascalon in Hebrew begins with an Aleph, but in Arabic this has changed to an initial 'Ain. The case, therefore, for 'Askar, so far from being barred by the rules of the language, comes through this last test in all its strength. And its strength, in short, is this. That in the fourth century two authorities independently describe a Sychar distinct from Shechem; that in the twelfth century at least three travellers, and in the thirteenth at least one, do the same, the latter also quoting a corrupt but still possible variation of the name; that in the fourteenth the Samaritan chronicle mentions another form of the name; and that modern travellers find a third possible variation of it not only applied to a village suiting the site described by the authorities in the fourth century, but important enough to cover all the plain about the village. All this is perhaps not conclusive, but at least very strong, proof for the identification of 'Askar with Sychar. Certainly there is enough of it to expose the dictum of *Supernatural Religion* that it is "evident" there was no such place as Sychar, and that the writer of the Gospel made "a mistake." The "evidence," so far as it goes, is all the other way.

Of course it may be said that the name Sychar was fastened on the district by the Christian pilgrims and sacred-site-jobbers of the fourth century—who were forced to find a place for it since it occurred in the Gospel. But to this the answer is obvious. For many centuries after the fourth it was taken for granted that Jerome was right and that Shechem and Sychar were the same place.² That

¹ *Tent Work*, 41.

² By, among others, Arnulf, 700; Saewulf, apparently, 1102; Theoderich, 1172; Sir J. Maundeville, 1322; Tüchem of Nurnberg, 1480. A curious opinion

all this time, in spite of ecclesiastical tradition, the name Sychar should have continued to exist in the neighbourhood, and solely among the natives, is a strong proof of its originality—of its having been from the first a native and not an artificial name.

II. This still leaves us with the second difficulty. Granted that Sychar is either Shechem, the present Nablûs, or 'Askar, is it likely that any woman from them, seeking water, should have come past streams in their immediate neighbourhood to the more distant, the deep and scanty well of Jacob. There is a copious fountain in 'Askar: and a stream, capable of turning a mill, flows down the valley only "a few rods"¹ from Jacob's well. This the woman, if coming from 'Askar, must have crossed—if coming from Shechem, must have passed near it and many other sources of water. Jacob's well itself was over one hundred feet deep,² and is often dry.

Now in answer to this, it may be justly said, that the real difficulty is not why the woman should have come to the well, but why the well should be there at all. That any one should have dug so deep a well, in the immediate neighbourhood of so many streams, is most perplexing, unless indeed in those far away summers the surface streams ran dry, and the well was dug so deep that it might catch their fainting waters below the surface.³ Be that as it

is offered by the Graf zu Solms (1483) that "on the right hand of this well" of Jacob, that is, to the south of it, "ist ein alter grosser Fleek aber öde, dass ich meyne die alte Statt Sichem seyn gewesen, dann gross alt Gebäw da ist. Und liget von dem abgenanten Brunnen Jacob zwen steinwürff weit, gar an einer lustigen Stett, allein dass es Wasser mangelt." But from Neapolis the well was two bowshots off, so that "some say Napolis is Thebes."

¹ Robinson.

² "Thirty-five yards," Maundrell; "one hundred and five feet," Holmes.

³ Robinson indeed suggests that an earthquake may have changed the whole disposition of the waters in the vale of Shechem since the time of the narra-

may, the well is there,—a fact, testifying past all doubt the possibility of the fact of the woman's use of it. Specially dug for man's use by man, how impressively among the natural streams around does it explain the intensity of the woman's words: *Our father Jacob gave us the well*. Of course it was *given*, not found. The signs of labour and expense stand out upon it all the more pathetically for the freedom of the waters that come rattling down the vale; and must, one feels, have had their share in increasing the fondness of that tradition which, possibly, was the attraction that drew Jacob's fanatic children to its scantier supplies.¹

It is impossible to say whether the well is now dry, for many feet of it are choked with stones. Robinson says there is a spring in it,² Conder that it fills by infiltration. If either of these be correct, then we can understand the double titles given to it in the narrative, both of which our version renders by *well*. It is *Jacob's fountain*, *πήγη* (v. 5); *but the pit*, *τὸ φρέαρ*, *is deep* (v. 11); and *Jacob gave us the pit* (v. 12). It is by little touches like these, and by the agreement of the rest of the topography,—Mount Gerizim, and the road from Judæa to Galilee—(as well as by the unbroken traditions of three religions), that we feel sure that this is the Jacob's Well intended by the writer, and that he had seen the place.

Thus, then, the present topography, so far from contradicting, justifies the narrative. The author knew the place about which he was writing.

III. By Jacob's well the great north road through
 tive. Possible, for on that high pass very little could tilt the watershed to the west, but in an argument like this we do not dare to count on it.

¹ Porter mentions a favourite well outside Damascus which drew the inhabitants a mile away from their own abundant waters.

² *Lat. Res.*, 108.

Samaria forks, and the well lies in the fork. One branch turns eastward up the vale past Shechem and so on round the west of Ebal to Sebaste, and Gennin. The other holds north across the mouth of the vale and past 'Askar. Now Mr. Cross (in the *Critical Review* for July) takes exception to Lightfoot's and Stanley's speaking of this second road as the main road to Galilee. He says the latter has always gone by Shechem and Sebaste, and that the road which holds across the mouth of the vale turns north-east into the Jordan valley at Bethshan, and leads not to Upper Galilee, where our Lord was going, but to Tiberias and the Lake. He is correct when he says the Shechem road is the ordinary road, but wrong in saying there is not a road across the mouth of the vale and so on to Gennin. As he admits, Robinson was told of such a road; and I have to report that being anxious last year to avoid the road by Sebaste, which I had already traversed, I was informed by my muleteers that I could reach Gennin by following the Bethshan road and, when it struck east, keeping due north. Moreover, this is a much more natural direction for the trunk road to the north to take, than round by Shechem and Sebaste. For if any one will take the Survey Map, he will see this direction to be on the line of that series of plains which come right down from Esdraelon to opposite the vale of Shechem:¹ while the road round by Sebaste has to climb a great barrier of hills. Besides, such a road would be preferred by our Lord, avoiding as it did both Shechem and Sebaste, two large towns, one Greek, the other Samaritan, close to which, if He turned up the valley, He must needs have passed.

So that Lightfoot and Stanley are probably correct; but the point is a small one, and does not affect the narrative

¹ As described in THE EXPOSITOR for July.

in John. Upon the data given there, our Lord and His disciples after their rest at Jacob's well may have intended to take any one of the three roads—and that, whether the city to which the disciples went to buy bread was Shechem or was 'Askar.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Vernon Bartlet, M.A.	
Christ's Use of the Term "The Son of Man"	427
Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.	
The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament:	
VI. Other Teaching of St. Paul	27
VII. The Epistle to the Hebrews	132
VIII. Certain Modern Theories	297
IX. Rationale of the Atonement	343
X. The Extent of the Atonement	419
Rev. Principal David Brown, D.D.	
Herod the Tetrarch; A Study of Conscience	305
Rev. J. G. Carleton, B.D.	
The Idiom of Exaggerated Contrast	365
Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.	
The First Miraculous Draught of Fish	18
Some Cases of Possession	272
Peter's Wife's Mother	355
The First Leper Healed	443
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
On Some Points in Professor Robertson Smith's Lecture on the Old Testament.	155
Rev. John A. Cross, M.A.	
The Fourth Gospel	127
Rev. R. W. Dale, D.D., LL.D.	
Jonah	1

	PAGE
Rev. J. M. Danson, D.D.	
The Doctrine of the Logos; Its Genesis and Corruptions	65
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.	
Brevia: Professor Ryle on the Canon	79
The Hebrew Accents	320
Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, M.A.	
The Many Mansions and the Restitution of All Things	209
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Survey of Recent Literature on the New Testament	229
The Memorabilia of Jesus	398
Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.	
Professor W. Robertson Smith on the Old Testament	199
Professor A. B. Davidson on the Prophet Ezekiel	392
Rev. Principal J. Oswald Dykes, D.D.	
True or False Children of Abraham	455
Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D.	
The Principle of the Revised Version	401
The late Rev. Professor W. G. Elmslie, D.D.	
Samuel	98
Right Rev. William Walsham How, D.D.	
The Revised Version	241
Mrs. John Macdonell.	
Dora Greenwell; A Memorial Sketch:	
I.	144
II.	214
Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M.A.	
The Aramaic Gospel; Its Contents	81
Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D.	
A Group of Parables:	
I.	114
II.	186
Rev. Principal R. Rainy, D.D.	
Cardinal Newman, II.	34

	PAGE
Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A.	
Saint Paul's First Journey in Asia Minor :	
II.	161
III.	281
IV.	373
Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D.	
Dr. Dods on the Gospel of St. John	319
Rev. Professor George Adam Smith, M.A.	
The Historical Geography of the Holy Land :	
V. Samaria	48
VI. The Strong Places of Samaria	175
VII. Esdraelon	321
VIII. The Question of Sychar	464
Dahm's Isaiah, and the New Commentary to the Old Testament	312
Rev. James Stalker, D.D.	
Julius Köstlin	385
Rev. John Taylor, D.Lit., M.A.	
Canon Cheyne on King David and the Psalter	255

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xlix.	324	Matthew iv. 18	18
Joshua x. 12	325	v., vi., vii.	401
xvii. 11	185	vi. 1	88
1 and 2 Samuel	99	vi. 16	92
1 Samuel xvii.	260	viii. 2	443
xvii. 2, 19	325	viii. 14	355
1 Kings xiv. 17	176	ix. 13	365
2 Kings xxv.	3	ix. 32-34	272
Psalms xviii.	266	xiv. 15	129
li.	261	xvi. 18	91
Isaiah vii. 9	175	xvi. 21	354
xxviii. 1	178	xix. 3	307
xxxiii. 9	63	xix. 17	88
Ezekiel	392	Mark i. 16	18
xxiii.	48	i. 29	355
Jeremiah iii.	48	i. 23-27	272
Hosea vi. 6	365	i. 40	443

	PAGE		PAGE
Mark ii. 27	440	Acts iii. 19-21	211
vi. 20	306	xiii.	373
x. 29	91	xiii.	163
Luke i. 2	67	xiv.	294
iv. 38	355	Romans iii. 25, 26	347
v. 2-11	18	1 Corinthians vii. 1	253
v. 12	443	x. 16	29
xiii. 10-17	272	2 Corinthians v. 15	30
xvi.	114	Galatians iv. 7	253
xvii.	114	iv. 15	381
xvii.	187	vi. 12	27
xvii. 31	195	Ephesians ii. 13	31
John iv.	464	Hebrews i. 31	143
viii. 37-42	455	iv. 12, 13	68
xi. 51, 52	299	1 Peter iii. 19	252
xii. 13	130	1 John i. 8, 20	66
xiii. 1	129	ii. 14	67
xiv. 2	209	Revelation xix. 13	67
xvi. 8-11	319		

