A GUIDE TO BIBLICAL STUDY

A GUIDE TO BIBLICAL STUDY

BY

A. S. PEAKE M.A.

FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE OXFORD

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
A. M. FAIRBAIRN D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF MANSFIELD
COLLEGE OXFORD

SECOND EDITION

LONDON
HODDER AND STOUGHTON
27 PATERNOSTER ROW
1897

Butler & Tanner,
The Selwood Printing Works,
Frome, and London.

DEDICATED

TO

MY FATHER

WITH GRATEFUL AFFECTION

INTRODUCTION

I CONTRIBUTE with pleasure an Introductory Note to this volume. Its limitations are obvious. It is too brief for its subject, though without brevity it could not have fulfilled its purpose. It discusses nothing fully, for to have attempted an independent discussion on any single critical or exegetical problem would have been to write a work on a Biblical subject, and not an introduction to Biblical Study. Then it omits all reference to some radical and many interesting questions, and is full of provisional judgments, for it deals with a multitude of questions on which only pro-

visional judgments are possible,—and it is crowded with details, which are yet not the carefully reasoned and tested details, all worked into an organic whole, such as must have found a place in a dissertation on the Bible written by a scholar for scholars. The book has, therefore, the incompleteness and even inconclusiveness of a work which may be described as an exposition of many minds expressed in many books, rather than of the author's own mind and conclusions. But it is no paradox to say that when its end is contemplated its very defects become virtues. If it had been exhaustive, erudite, critical, constructive, and final, it would not have been what it purposes to be—an introduction to Biblical study; nor would it have been able to accomplish the work it desires to do—place men who, while not specialists, are yet interested students of the Bible or are about to begin the special study of it, in relation to modern methods of sacred criticism, its principles, and its determinations.

And it attempts to do this in order that the student may personally and intelligently work out his own conclusions. The book thus does not address itself to scholars, to men acquainted with the history and achievements of Biblical criticism; but to the many—happily, a growing multitude,—who either have begun, or wish to begin, the careful and critical study of the Bible as it has become in the hands of the scholar and theologian.

It is evident that a book of this kind has a very distinct function of its own. The work done in connection with the sacred Scriptures during the lifetime of the present generation has been remarkable alike as regards the method pursued and the results achieved. It is not too much to say that for the first time since the collection of our sacred books was formed, a serious, and on the whole progressively successful, attempt has been made to analyse the process of its formation, to pursue a search into what may be termed the evidences

within the Bible as to how the books of the Bible came to be, how they stand related to their contemporary history, and what special message each several part brought to its own age, and has preserved for all time. The analysis of the documents has been carried far, has often appeared gratuitous and even violent, and has proceeded on grounds and according to evidences that to those who did not follow patiently in the path of the explorer must have seemed now arbitrary and now profane. The break up of old ideas is never an agreeable process, and nowhere has the work of the pioneer been so hard, so ungrateful, so liable to misapprehension and misjudgment as in the field of sacred criticism. The mistakes of the critics have been innumerable; but it is by the mistakes of the discoverer that the truth is ultimately served. There is no process that has so little that is reasonable and conclusive in it as the process that would discredit exploration by magnifying the discordances of

the explorers. Were this method had recourse to in other things as it has been pursued by many of the more officious apologists for traditional beliefs, we should never have had satisfactory results in any single science, abstract or concrete, natural or historical, or in any single line of investigation whether geographical or antiquarian. There is, therefore, real promise of good in the attempt to initiate the serious reader or the ingenuous beginner into the best way of understanding what scholars who have been as reverent in their search after truth as the great majority of those who have been most forward in the field of Biblical scholarship and research, have come to think in their respective provinces concerning that most marvellous of all sacred literatures which ancient love and reverence gathered into the volume we so felicitously name the Bible. The book that attempts to do this seems to have undertaken a much-needed piece of work.

The book, of course, is expository, not positive

or constructive; it has no dogmatic character, does not seek to frame any theory of inspiration or revelation, of the mode in which these doctrines have been affected by modern criticism or the methods of modern scholarship; but only to exhibit in a general way what the outcome has been of the extraordinary critical activity in the field of Biblical knowledge. Its purpose is in a measure popular, but its end is to lead from more general impressions to the detailed knowledge that conducts to reasoned and intelligible conclusions. The time has come when certain matters ought to be made entirely apparent. First, what is the present state of our knowledge touching the origin, authorship, authenticity and contents of the sacred Books. The present state of knowledge does not mean the stage of final conclusions, but rather of tentative enquiry. On some points—indeed, on many—fixed conclusions have been reached—conclusions that enquiry may illustrate and confirm, but can hardly change. On other points

no final conclusion has been reached, nor is likely to be. As regards many others the process of determination still goes on, and we may hope that what is still dark may yet be illumined, and what is still uncertain made finally sure. It is a matter of immense consequence that the student should see what has been proved, what cannot be proved, and what he may yet hope either to see proved or to find the proof of himself. In this work the specialist does well when he invites the assistance of the student and the student does no less well when he seeks the assistance of the scholar; and when they both co-operate to the common end of ascertaining the truth concerning the most sacred things in history and in literature.

Secondly. The method by which results have been obtained can now be made intelligible. The more analysis discloses the process of formation the more can the value of the formative process be determined, the worth of its results appraised, and the need for a reforma-

tive process be made evident. Much of the misunderstanding which has existed in this field has been due to ignorance of the method pursued, and so inability to appreciate both the validity of the process and the value of its results.

Thirdly. Knowledge of the literary method will also help to shew the organic connection between literature and history, and greatly help the student to see into the process by which truth has come, religion been developed, and Divine Providence fulfilled its purpose in and through the life of man.

Fourthly. The value of Biblical study conducted according to the methods of scholarship for those who teach the younger mind in school or church is becoming every day more manifest. The conclusions of sacred scholarship have long ceased to be the exclusive possession of scholars; they have become part and parcel of the common consciousness of the age, distilled in every possible form through the press, in conversation,

and in those subtle modes of common thought and speech that are distinctive of our time.

It is necessary, therefore, that the earthly vessel which holds the heavenly treasure should be adapted to the treasure it holds rather than the treasure to the vessel. In other words, it will not do for the teacher in the school or the church to proceed on assumptions which have ceased to be granted, to follow methods that are no longer recognised, and to maintain positions that have in provinces of thought other than religious been discredited or abandoned. The new teacher must speak to the new mind in the terms it has come to understand and in the methods it has learned to follow.

To all such I would commend this book, but would ask them to use it with intelligence, with independence of judgment, with the desire, by following the lines it indicates, to find out how to study the Bible, how to get at its meaning, and how to communicate the meaning once it has been got at. The writer has had in view

the serious learner who is looking out for a fuller equipment than he yet possesses, and to such a learner, though only to such, this book will prove both stimulating and helpful.

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

PREFACE

THIS book is intended for those who wish to make a systematic study of the Bible, and its purpose is to indicate the methods that should be employed, and the problems to which attention should be directed. As it is not designed for scholars, it is untechnical in character; and although it contemplates a long course of study, it will, I hope, meet the needs of beginners.

In so brief a work, many things had to be omitted, and nothing could be fully discussed. I have tried to give prominence to the most important matters, though I have probably not always made the best selection of points to be mentioned, or observed due proportion in the treatment of them.

In my account of the literature, I have been guided by considerations of practical utility. Books have not been included for their historical importance, but for their relevance to the present state of Biblical science. I have also omitted all books not accessible to the English reader.

It gives me great pleasure to thank my friend and former colleague Mr. G. B. Gray, of Mansfield College, for the excellent chapter he has so kindly contributed on Language and Biblical Study, and for the appendix he has added to it. I have also had the advantage of discussing with him most of the questions referred to in the chapters dealing with the Old Testament.

I have lastly to acknowledge my deep debt to Dr. Fairbairn, and thank him for the kindly interest he has displayed in the book. He made several valuable suggestions, a few of which I was able to accept. I very much regret that it was impracticable to carry out his suggestion that a bibliographical appendix should be substituted for the chapter on books. I wish

to thank him especially for the Introduction, by which he has greatly enriched the work. It is only one of the many tokens of kindness that I have received from him.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

Contents

PAGE

CHAPTER X

Chapter I

INTRODUCTORY

NOTHING is more characteristic of the intellectual temper of our age than its emphasis on the need, in all our studies, of a return to the sources. Only as we trace the river from the spring where it first rises to our view, and follow it through all its course, marking the land through which it runs and the streams by which it is fed, can we be truly said to know it. The study of religion can claim no exemption from this law. If we find its origin elude us because it has been wrought by the Father of spirits into the texture of the race, yet in study of the many forms through which it has sought expression we shall come to understand what in its inmost essence it is.

And what is true of religion in general, is true of Christianity. It exists and has existed in numberless forms, for in no two men is it precisely the same; and even if we reduce these to comparatively few fundamental types, yet each is complex in a remarkable degree. Foreign elements of unsuspected ancestry have blended with those that are native, and if we are to understand the product, it can only be by knowledge of the factors that have gone to its making. How wide such knowledge should be will be realized only by those who know how inextricably all parts of human life are knit together. But if we restrict ourselves to that which is purely religious, we must include the study of Comparative Religion, of the Bible, and of the History of Doctrine. Even for this purpose the study of the Bible is most important. But it is not the most vital thing to know the theologies of our own day in this manner. It is our duty, by comparing them with their sources, to regenerate them so far as we can do so, and make them more truly Christian. And from this point of view Biblical

study is of supreme moment. For the New Testament is not merely the chief source of our religion. It presents Christianity in its purest form, and therefore supplies us with a standard by which all the historical forms of Christianity ought to be judged. The regeneration of religion can be best attained by a return to the sources, in proof of which it is needless to say more than that the greatest religious revivals have sprung from a deeper study of the New Testament. And this means that students of theology should devote themselves earnestly to Biblical study, as the department of their science in which the most fruitful results are to be won. Even those who read the Bible simply for devotional uses would find that much would be gained by studying it in a historical spirit. The Word comes home to ourselves most when we realize how aptly it came to those who first heard it. And this we can do only if we steadily reconstruct their life and its conditions by an effort of historical imagination. As our theology is healthiest when its contact with Scripture is closest, so we find refreshment of

spirit in that river whose streams make glad the city of God.

It should be said very emphatically, that nothing can compensate for a lack of familiarity with the actual contents of the Bible itself. This is a truism, but it is frequently overlooked by those who diligently read the literature that has grown up around the Bible, but neglect to give patient attention to the text of the Bible itself. In the first instance, indeed, it is best to work at the text without assistance from those who have worked at it before. In this way a better grasp of the book is got, and there is a deeper sense of its difficulties. A commentator may make a thing so clear that we are scarcely conscious that there is any difficulty at all. We are in danger in such cases of slipping into too easy acquiescence, and perhaps missing the true interpretation. Of course the converse is true, and the book must be carefully studied again in the light of the best criticism and interpretation, when unsuspected difficulties will be revealed. Much of the student's own work may need correction or amplification, and he will

find many points that he has overlooked. But much will remain, a possession all the more truly his because it is the fruit of his own labour; and he may even advance the knowledge of the subject through this independent work.

In carrying out this independent study of a book the first thing to do is to read it through and get a general impression. A fairly full analysis of its contents should then be made, in which the general sense of each section should be given. Difficult questions of interpretation will often emerge and prevent any more precise treatment. The detailed exegesis may follow. Much will often be quite clear; but all difficulties should be carefully marked, and, if possible, a provisional interpretation be given and written down; for what seems quite clear in the head may prove to be very hazy when it is put down on paper. The interpretation should be tested by its suitability to the context, and by the general probability that the idea is likely to have been expressed by the writer of the book. The student should then set himself to reconstruct the historical situation presupposed in the

book, to discover the purpose of the author in writing it, his theological views, and so forth. One caution is specially needed. It is just the points that seem obvious that demand the most careful investigation. Most of our old theological ideas were new some time, and we should be scrupulous in our refusal to read them into a book that knows nothing of them. The familiar terms are even more of a snare. When we meet with such words as holiness, righteousness, atonement, law, and so forth, we naturally think we know all about them, and neglect to examine them. Now the danger is perhaps less in the New than in the Old Testament; yet it is a large assumption that the meaning the words have now in our current theological language is precisely the same as the sense they bore before they passed through centuries of controversy and use. They may have passed through it all unchanged, with nothing lost and nothing gained, but it is, at any rate, unscientific to assume that they have. In the Old Testament in particular must the student be on his guard. The gospel has taken old terms for us and lifted

them to higher uses, and filled them with a new content. And thus they mean much more to us than they meant to the Old Testament writers. To understand what they meant to them we must examine them where they stand, divest ourselves of all the associations they have for us, and by carefully noting what is said about them where they occur, and comparing the use in one place with that in another, come to some tentative conclusion about them. In this work the concordance is necessary, only it must be either a Hebrew or Greek concordance, or a concordance which discriminates between the different Hebrew or Greek words which are represented indiscriminately by the same English word, and exhibits the various English words used to translate the same Hebrew or Greek word. The ordinary concordance is worse than useless for this purpose, from its failure to attend to this precaution. It is well also to collect and classify all the theological statements in the book, and construct, as far as possible, a sketch of the author's theological views. This should be compared with that of those expressed by

the writers who have preceded him, and points of agreement or difference noted, and especially any advance that is made. A feeling for the progressive character of revelation will thus be created and developed. When the plan indicated has been followed out, with reference to any book, before proceeding to another the book should be studied over again with the help of the best authorities on it. As to these one thing may be mentioned here. The references they give to parallel passages should be consulted. The reference Bibles have brought parallels into disrepute; but there are several writers who could be named whose references are almost invariably worth turning up for the light they throw upon a passage.

It is perhaps necessary to add that the only study with which we have to do is critical and scientific. The Bible is to be studied just like any other book. We can come to it with no prepossessions, but simply with an open mind. We cannot let ourselves be intimidated by an appeal to tradition or authority, confident that we stand in a far more favourable position for

knowing the truth than those who have handed on to us the guesses of an uncritical past. We can bow only to the argument of facts. It is this study which has restored the Bible to us and made it once more intelligible. And the greatest service that scholarship can render to the Church is to interpret for it the fundamental documents in which its faith has received its classical expression. These documents are primarily those contained in the New Testament. But the Old Testament also demands attention, since it contains the history of the revelation which led to Christ, and sets us at the right point of view for understanding Him, and the religion He came to found.

Chapter II

DIVISION OF THE SUBJECT AND ORDER OF STUDY

IN studying the contents of the Bible the work might conveniently be arranged under the headings of Introduction, Exegesis, History, and Theology. This is not an exhaustive, but merely a convenient division, and it is not always possible to keep them apart, especially in the account given of the literature of the subject. Introduction deals with the literary history of the several books, and their collection into a Canon. Exegesis is concerned with the interpretation of the books. History is in this case confined to political and social history, the history of the religion falling under the head of Biblical Theology. This branch

of the subject embraces, beside the history of the religion, the theology of the individual writers and the history of the particular doctrines. Archæology is so important that it might seem to demand a place of its own, but it is more convenient to treat it under the History and Theology. This is so, because much of the most important material in each of these subjects is derived from Archæology, especially in the case of Biblical Theology. Thus all the religious institutions of Israel are matters of Archæology; yet it is imperative that they should be discussed in connection with Theology, since in them the religious consciousness of the Israelites found expression. These various divisions of the subject cannot be kept altogether apart, since the conclusions reached in one will often determine the conclusions as to particular problems in another. Introduction is sometimes of importance in settling questions of Exegesis. For example, in the disputed question whether the higher view of the future life is taught in the Psalms, the exegesis of the passages is, to some extent,

dependent on the dates to which the Psalms in question are assigned. Similarly the general view as to the development of the Hebrew religion, derived from Old Testament Theology, is important, not simply for this and similar questions of Exegesis, but also for difficult questions of Introduction—such as the dates of the Psalms. The moral of this is that the different departments of Biblical Science should be studied simultaneously, and also that the results of each should be regarded as provisional till they have been tested by the results reached in the others.

In accordance with the scientific method it is important to begin with those books that are contemporary with the events to which they refer; or, to be more precise, that are generally admitted to be contemporary. We find far more vivid pictures of the state of religion and society in contemporary writers than in the historical books, where the latter deal with past periods. In the histories the movement of actual life is gone, near and distant are not so sharply separated. But the con-

temporary writers paint society for us as it lived before their eyes, their figures are sketched from the life, and as we read them we breathe their atmosphere and think their thoughts after them. We grapple with their problems and feel their pressure upon us, we rejoice in their victory as they wrest from them their solution. We learn how men thought of God, and of their duty to Him and to one another, of the relations that He sustained to them, of the way in which He had come to stand to them as He did, and of the path by which He had led His people. And thus, with our feet planted on the rock of scientific certainty, we can look before and behind, and feel that we have gained a point of vantage from which we may trace the march of events in the past and future.

The practical inference from this is that the study of the Old Testament should begin with the prophets. They deal with their own times, and are besides among our earliest authorities for the ancient history of the Hebrews. It is needless to say that they should be studied in chronological order, so far as that may be de-

termined. Amos will come first, then Hosea, and in both cases the study given should be as exhaustive as possible, and especial attention paid to the question of the course of religious development that such writings imply. Isaiah comes next. Here, only those prophecies fall for consideration which are written from the standpoint of Isaiah's own time. This will exclude chaps. xiii., xiv. 1–23; xxi. 1–10; xxiv.–xxvii., xxxiv., xxxv., xl.–lxvi. Considerable doubt is felt by several critics as to some other passages. This raises a difficulty as to method which cannot be satisfactorily met. Should the prophecies about which this uncertainty is felt be passed by for the present, or provisionally treated as Isaiah's? For the former course it may be urged that to take into account as evidence for the religion of the eighth century B.C. documents which are really post-exilic is to vitiate from the outset our reconstruction of the religious history of Israel. On the other hand it may be said, that if they really are his, our conception of his theological ideas will be greatly impoverished by such neglect. If it is

borne in mind that the acceptance of them as Isaiah's is only provisional, perhaps it will be safest to use them as his, and leave the detailed examination for a later stage. The question could only be settled after a very thorough treatment of much of the rest of Hebrew literature. Similarly with Micah, while the two last chapters may perhaps be left out of account, it is not certain whether chaps. iv. and v. are his. The same difficulty occurs in other prophets. It is hard to say how far the study of the prophets should be pursued at this stage. Good reasons might be given for stopping with the prophets of the eighth century, and passing to the historical books. But there are also arguments for including all down to the time of Ezekiel. In either case the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings should come next. Here, of course, the earlier and later elements must be distinguished, and special attention given to those contemporary documents, or documents almost contemporary, incorporated in the Books, such as the Song of Deborah, which is of immense historical importance, or the Court

History of David (2 Sam. ix.–xx.; 1 Kings i., ii.). The student will then be in a position to proceed to the study of the Hexateuch. So far as the literary criticism goes the study might have been taken first, without the preliminary work at the prophets and the historical books. But the chief aim of the study of the Old Testament is not to analyse the Hexateuch into its component parts, but to understand the course which was taken in the education of Israel to prepare for the coming of Christ; and for the right comprehension of this the course indicated is best. It is also unsatisfactory to stop short with the literary criticism, for the analysis at once raises the question of the dates of the respective documents. And as wide a knowledge of the religious development of the Israelites as can be gained from thorough study of the prophets and the histories will prove most important in settling this question. The prophets that remain may then be taken. Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah might come next, though the autobiographical portions of the two latter ought perhaps to have

been taken with the earlier historical books. The dates of many of the books that still remain are very uncertain, and matters of considerable controversy. The Book of Lamentations has a fairly definite historical situation. So, too, Daniel, which is not a prophetic, but an apocalyptic book, is fixed down to a date within very narrow limits. But the dates of Proverbs, Job, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and Esther are very uncertain. The Psalms should be left till last. The problem they present is probably the most difficult and obscure of all which we find in the literature of the Old Testament, and will tax all the resources of knowledge that can be brought to it. Since much of the Old Testament literature belongs to the post-exilic period, such knowledge of this period as may be conveniently gained should be added to that of the earlier history, that the dates of various pieces of literature may be more precisely determined. The more important of the Apocryphal Books should be read, as, quite apart from their intrinsic merit, they are of great importance for the study of

the Old Testament, and perhaps even more for the New. The publication of the Revised Version, and of Mr. Ball's edition in the Variorum Bible, together with the "Speaker's Commentary" on the Apocrypha, has placed the student in a very favourable position for this work.

In the New Testament the point of departure is the Pauline Epistles. Strictly, perhaps, not more than the four great Epistles, whose genuineness was admitted by Baur, should be assumed as authentic. But there seems no valid reason why the other three epistles, now generally recognised by critics as genuine, should not be included—1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon. A genuine Pauline nucleus is often recognised in 2 Thessalonians and Colossians, with fragments in 2 Timothy. That this position will be finally accepted is not probable, but at first it is best to start from what is generally admitted, and find in it the sure basis for investigation of the things left in dispute. James and Hebrews might be taken next, then 1 Peter. The attention might next be turned

to the Synoptic Gospels, and the Synoptic Problem will first fall for examination. It will be a fruitful source of profit to compare the impression of the personality and teaching of Jesus already derived from the study of the Epistles with that we gain from the study of the first three Gospels. At a later stage the comparison should extend to the material derived from the Fourth Gospel. After the Synoptic Gospels the Acts of the Apostles and the remaining Epistles may be taken. Jude and 2 Peter should be studied side by side. It may be convenient to take the Apocalypse here rather than at an earlier stage, since it is well to keep it in connection with the Gospel and Epistles of John, which should, in any case, come last of all.

Chapter III

LANGUAGE AND BIBLICAL STUDY

BY G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A.

THE original languages of the Bible are three—Hebrew, Aramaic (Jer. x. 11; Dan. ii. 4–vii. 28; Ezra iv. 8–vi. 18), and Greek. For thorough Biblical study, a knowledge of these languages is of primary importance. Possessed of this, the student may become master of his subject; without it he must remain to a large extent dependent on others.

The great importance of this linguistic study may be understood by considering how large a part it played in the Reformation. By publishing the New Testament in Greek, and thus re-introducing the study of the original text which had been neglected for centuries, Erasmus became one of the main factors in that move-

ment. As the publication of the Bible in the vulgar tongue made the Scriptures once again the possession of the whole Church, quickening the spirits of those who had been deprived of them, so the publication of the original text enabled religious thinkers and teachers to obtain a more adequate understanding of the Book on which their instruction had to be based.

Of the three languages, Greek is the most important, and its value is little likely to be ignored. On the other hand the value of Hebrew is almost certain to be at first sight underestimated, and by the Hebrew student himself is only gradually appreciated. In the interests of both it is well to realize, what has only of late years been gaining due recognition, the inter-relation between the Biblical languages; for this indicates at once the method of studying Biblical (as distinct from classical) Greek, and an important element in the value of Hebrew. The New Testament was, indeed, written in Greek, but by men familiar with, and accustomed to use, if not

Hebrew, yet the closely related Aramaic language. Not only this, but the Greek which these men knew and wrote, was not that of Plato and Xenophon and the other strictly classical writers, but that of the LXX translators of the Old Testament. Now this translation frequently retained Hebrew idioms, and compelled many a Greek word to carry meanings and suggestions which had hitherto belonged only to the Hebrew of which the Greek word chosen by the translator was perhaps the nearest possible and yet often a remote equivalent. Hence some of the constructions of the New Testament are unintelligible in the light of classical Greek, and only explicable by Hebrew usage. And the history of numerous words, especially the more important theological terms, must be traced in the Hebrew, and by it many of the most significant New Testament figures must be explained. All this has been fully illustrated by the late Professor Hatch in his "Essays in Biblical Greek," which will long remain one of the most illuminating and suggestive discussions of the Biblical languages and

their inter-relation. Thus the language of the New Testament must be approached through Hebrew and Aramaic as well as through classical Greek; and the study of it will be illuminated by Greek translations from the Hebrew, especially the LXX and the writings of Jews (in particular Philo) originally composed in Greek.

The place of Hebrew and Aramaic in New Testament study generally is thus clear. The peculiar importance of these languages in dealing with the important problem of the original Semitic basis of the Gospels, and in interpreting the sayings of Jesus, which were originally spoken in Aramaic, must be obvious. But it is, of course, for an adequate study of the Old Testament that Hebrew is mainly requisite. Like Greek, Hebrew also was revived among Christian scholars at the Reformation. The revival was in the first place due to John Reuchlin, and had an important effect on the interpretation of the Old Testament. But the greatest revolution in this department falls much later, and is scarcely yet complete. It

was due to the comparative study of the Semitic languages, which has profoundly modified the traditional interpretations borrowed by the earlier Christian scholars from the Jews. The result is in part seen in the differences between the A.V. and R.V.; but in part only, for the R.V. is naturally the result of compromise, and frequently retains the traditional interpretations of words, sometimes solely, sometimes as alternatives (in text or margin) to the correct interpretations. The student may thus realize both the need for his own study of the original and the ideal equipment for that purpose. Beyond acquaintance with Hebrew and Aramaic, some familiarity with the principles of comparative Semitic grammar is most desirable.

Another great cause of difference between quite modern and earlier methods of interpretation is due to the exacter study and more critical use of the versions. In this respect the R.V. altogether inadequately represents the advance of scholarship. Only, therefore, by an accurate linguistic knowledge can the student hope to deal satisfactorily with the in-

numerable passages where the alternative lies between an extremely artificial and often an impossible exegesis, or a reconstruction of the existing Hebrew text. He must remember that a modern printed copy of the Hebrew Bible represents three easily distinguishable texts of different ages. As it stands, provided with vowel and other points, it represents a text not earlier than the fourth century A.D. Consequently when a scholar departs in his interpretation from the traditional Jewish in favour of another vocalization, he is merely abandoning a tradition which cannot be traced further back than several centuries after the composition of the book. The Hebrew text as it existed down to about the fourth century A.D. will therefore be found (approximately) not in the ordinary pointed Hebrew Bibles, but in the more rarely published unpointed editions. At a yet earlier period the text was still briefer and more ambiguous, for it was written without the so-called vowel letters (the consonants waw (ו), he (ה), jod (י), used to represent the related vowel sounds). The relative antiquity, and consequently the

relative authority, of these three texts ought to be constantly borne in mind, and also that the R.V. follows with almost unquestioning obedience the latest and least authoritative of the three. If the earliest and most authoritative appear at first sight exceedingly ambiguous, this is only the greater reason for the study of the original. Only so can the relative probabilities of various possible renderings be rightly estimated. And, again, only so will the student regain confidence as he finds the frequency of ambiguity and the range of possibility less than at first sight seems inevitable from the nature of the case.

Enough has perhaps been said in this necessarily very inadequate sketch to show that in studying the Bible in the original much more is requisite than a mere consultation of the dictionary and off-hand acceptance of the first meaning it offers. That is useless. For what is true of all is particularly true of the Biblical languages—that corresponding words in different languages are never exact and actual equivalents. To take a single instance, Amos

says of Jehovah that he utters his voice out of Jerusalem. The Hebrew here suggests, what the English does not, the roll of thunder. The difference between reading the Bible in the original and in English is that English gives the bald and direct statement of the writer, whereas through the writer's own words, with their innumerable secondary suggestions and associations, we reach in large part the world of thought and feeling out of which his statement sprang. But the object of the Biblical student is just this—to think and feel when he interprets a passage as the writer thought and felt when he wrote it. And this he will only attain by study of the usage of the words and (especially in the Semitic languages) of the roots to which they belong in other passages.

Chapter IV

BOOKS

FOR the sake of convenience, I desert the natural order and speak first of the literature of Exegesis before I pass to that of Introduction. The reason is, that in many cases the best introduction to a book is to be found in one of the commentaries on it. Accordingly I shall now refer to the subject of commentaries. The choice of these is largely determined by common-sense principles. And if my advice seems to smack too strongly of platitude, my defence must be that these considerations of common-sense are frequently, so far as my observation goes, allowed too little weight. It is clearly important to secure the best as far as possible. The time has gone by for commentaries on

the whole Bible by a single hand. Such works have served a useful purpose in the past; but for a young student to buy Adam Clarke's Commentary at this time of day is for him to spend his money very foolishly. For one thing, Adam Clarke lived before the dawn of the critical movement, though he was not unvisited by gleams of critical insight. For another, it is plain that no one man can write a tolerable commentary on the whole Bible. The great commentaries of to-day are, in most cases, the result of many years' labour on a few books at most; though to this there are exceptions. It does not fall within the province of this book to speak of a commentary like that of Matthew Henry, for I am dealing only with those works which are useful to the student, not with those which are meant primarily for the preacher. Unless a commentary is modern, it should not, as a rule, be bought. Some of the patristic commentaries are still useful, especially, perhaps, those of Chrysostom and Augustine, but even these it is not worth while to buy. The same applies

to Calvin, whose exegetical works have a permanent value. But Bengel's "Gnomon" should be bought, and constantly used, in the original Latin, if that can be read, but if not, in an English translation. In his own special excellences Bengel is unrivalled, and likely to remain so. We have in him a writer whose work extended over the whole of the New Testament, and which yet must remain in the first rank. A convenient and cheap edition is the "Critical English New Testament." A more elaborate edition is published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. Neither of these is Bengel quite pure and simple, but will probably be found satisfactory. As to commentaries in a series, it may be said that they have their advantages and disadvantages. They meet the two conditions that a commentary should be modern, and that it should not be the work of one man. But there is a point that must not be overlooked. It does not follow because one or two volumes of a series are good that the whole series should be bought. Probably no series could be named in which

the volumes were not of very unequal merit. This is natural, as an editor has to call in inferior as well as highly competent writers. In making a selection, it is often safe to be guided by the name of the writer. It is pretty certain that it would be right to buy any commentaries by Davidson or Cheyne, Westcott or Godet. Their names are a guarantee of high-class work. On the other hand, there are writers whose names should act as warnings to those who may think of buying their books. With new writers it is well not to be in too great a hurry, since their work is sure to be appraised by competent critics, and for their verdict it is best to wait. One more caution may be given. There is a common misconception that the latest commentary on a book is likely to be the best. It is true that the author has had the advantage of reading the best work already done in that field. But about the best commentaries there is an incommunicable quality imparted by the personality of the writer, which is to be found only in his work, and which it would be vain for

another writer to attempt to transfer to his. And a commentary which is a mere compilation can never compete with one which is the outcome of years of patient investigation and labour at the text itself.

Commentaries on the whole Bible call for notice first. The Old Testament portion of the "Speaker's Commentary" should be avoided. Some of the writers display a remarkable ignorance of some of the elementary facts and rules of the Hebrew language, which casts a curious light on their claim that they are competent to deal with subjects requiring deep knowledge. In critical matters they were not on the level of their subject even at the time their work was published. The case is different with the New Testament portion. Some of the very best English commentaries on New Testament books are contained in it, especially Westcott on the Gospel of John, and Evans on 1 Corinthians. The chief thing against the Pulpit Commentary is its size and its excessive load of homiletics, which almost smothers the puny exegesis. The publishers would confer

a great boon on students if they would reprint the Introduction and Notes separately. It is exasperating to one who does not want to be bothered with Homilies and Homiletics to feel that he must buy these ponderous volumes if he wishes to possess Cheyne's "Jeremiah," or Reynolds' "Gospel of John." The "Expositor's Bible" has volumes that have already become famous. Some of these should certainly be bought. As it is not strictly a commentary, it may be bought in some cases to supplement a commentary, where it would not be worth while to buy it otherwise. There is a tendency in some quarters to disparage the Cambridge Bible for Schools. But this is not just. Several of the volumes contain the best work done as yet by English scholars on the respective books. It is true that in some cases they do not rise above mediocrity. For Joshua and Judges the smaller Cambridge Bible is to be preferred.

Unfortunately, the rule that the best commentary should be bought on each individual book is modified by the actual condition of

things. On many books of the Old Testament there is no respectable commentary. This reproach is likely soon to be rolled away. Messrs. T. & T. Clark are bringing out a series of high-class commentaries of which Driver's "Deuteronomy," Moore's "Judges," Gould's "Mark," and Sanday and Headlam's "Romans" have already appeared. That this will altogether escape the inequalities that dog a series is not to be expected, but we shall have some valuable additions to our exegetical masterpieces, and several commentaries that will take the first place on the books with which they deal. But it is a lamentable fact that on not a few Old Testament books there are no English commentaries that are really worth buying. It may be useful to indicate in detail the best we have. I exclude volumes of the "Pulpit Commentary" and the "Speaker," except that it might be worth while to get the third volume of the New Testament portion of the "Speaker," chiefly for the commentaries on Romans and Corinthians.

On Genesis we have Delitzsch, which could

be supplemented by Dods in Bible Class Handbooks. On Deuteronomy there is Driver. On the other books of the Pentateuch there is nothing to mention at present, except Kalisch; but while his volume on Leviticus contains a great deal of valuable matter, it is, perhaps, a book for the discriminating specialist rather than the general student. On Joshua and Judges there are the little works of Sutherland Black. On Judges there is the brilliant commentary of Dr. Moore in the "International Critical Commentary." For Samuel we have the useful but uncritical commentary of Professor Kirkpatrick. The Hebrew student will do better to buy Driver's "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel." For Kings Professor Lumby, in the Cambridge Bible, will be found useful. In the same series we have an admirable Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah by Professor Ryle. Perhaps the gem of this series is Dr. A. B. Davidson's "Job." A finer specimen of exegesis we are scarcely likely to receive, and the only regret that need be expressed is that

the limitations of the series did not permit of the work being on a larger scale. If the student buys only one commentary, this should be chosen. But Ewald and Delitzsch should be added if he wishes to pursue his studies on that most important book. On the Psalms, the last edition of Delitzsch, that published by Hodder and Stoughton, is perhaps the best. But Professor Cheyne's Commentary should certainly not be neglected. A useful, but much too conservative commentary, is that by Professor Kirkpatrick in the Cambridge Bible. On Proverbs there is Delitzsch. For Ecclesiastes we have Plumptre in the Cambridge Bible, which, whether we agree with its conclusions or not, is one of the most fascinating volumes of exegesis which we possess. To Plumptre we should add Delitzsch. The works of Tyler and C. H. H. Wright are also worth reading. Delitzsch's volume on Ecclesiastes contains a commentary on the Song of Songs, which is one of the least satisfactory of his works. For the prophets generally, Ewald's great Commentary, in five

volumes, might be procured, though a beginner can hardly be advised to use it very much. On the Minor Prophets Orelli should be bought, for although it is not all that could be desired, there are several of the Minor Prophets on whom we have no special commentary. Turning to individual books, there are two Commentaries on Isaiah that should be procured. One is Delitzsch, which is the best and fullest on the whole. Care must be taken to get the Fourth Edition published by T. & T. Clark. But that of Professor Cheyne is a masterpiece of exegesis, and ranks with the greatest works on Isaiah. It has advanced considerably the interpretation of the book. It however presupposes an ordinary commentary, and so cannot be used entirely by itself. It is true, that since its publication the author's critical views have greatly changed, and it is much to be wished that the Commentary should be rewritten from his present critical standpoint. At the same time it is not at all clear that the newer views put forward in his Introduction to Isaiah will be

ultimately accepted, so that the present commentary is not likely to be superseded for some time yet. On Jeremiah there is Streane in the Cambridge Bible, or Orelli. On Ezekiel, Davidson, in the Cambridge Bible, is by far the best. For Daniel, the commentary by Professor Bevan is perhaps best, though its chief value is to the Semitic student, and it is rather brief. For Hosea and Micah it will be best to get Cheyne, in the Cambridge Bible. I am glad to be able to add the valuable Commentary on Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah by Dr. Davidson, which has just appeared in the Cambridge Bible. In the same series Archdeacon Perowne has written on Obadiah, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Dr. C. H. H. Wright has also a large volume on Zechariah, while Dr. Dods has written on the Post-Exilian Prophets in the Bible Class Handbooks. It will be seen that in many cases there is no commentary to be mentioned, and that in others we still need something worthier of the subject and of English scholarship.

The case is different with the New Testament. Bengel's "Gnomon" has been already mentioned. Meyer's "Commentary on the New Testament," in twenty volumes, is the best commentary on the New Testament as a whole. Meyer did not himself write the whole of his commentary. Lünemann wrote on Thessalonians and Hebrews, Huther on the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, and Düsterdieck on the Apocalypse. The last is not translated. The whole of the work should be procured if possible, and not simply Meyer's portion of it. It is valuable for three qualities in particular. These are the ample information given as to the various interpretations of individual passages, with the reasons that have led to their acceptance or rejection, the rigid accuracy of the scholarship, and the general soundness of the exegesis. The faults are perhaps these, that the application of grammatical rules is sometimes too rigid—"grammatical terrorism," Philippi called it, and that there is scarcely sufficient sympathy with the mystical element in the New Testament writers. But Meyer is

more indispensable than any other commentary, and it is a mistake to suppose that the possession even of our best English commentaries makes it superfluous. In fact, the very excellence of such commentaries as those of Lightfoot has had a most unfortunate effect in causing many students to rest content with them, to the great detriment of their exegetical work. Alford may be dispensed with without serious loss, though it is possible now to secure his work at so reasonable a price that it may be worth while to get it. The "Expositor's Greek Testament," just announced by Hodder and Stoughton, will take the place it formerly filled. On individual books the following commentaries may be mentioned. On Matthew and Mark we have Morison; and on Mark, Gould in the "Critical Commentary." For Luke there is Godet. For John, Westcott and Godet, both if possible, but Westcott by preference if only one is chosen. For the Acts of the Apostles, perhaps the little work of T. E. Page would be best; but for a commentary of the first rank we have still to wait,

and hope that here, as elsewhere, the "International Critical Commentary" will supply the defect. Romans is so important that more commentaries than usual should be studied. There are, besides Gifford in the "Speaker," Godet, which is valuable for the thought of the Epistle, as well as the exegesis; Sanday and Headlam, which, if in imperfect sympathy with that which is deepest in Paulinism—that elemental force which demands for its adequate interpretation a Luther or a Bunyan—is yet of great value, and especially for its use of current Jewish theology in the elucidation of Paul's doctrines; Liddon's "Explanatory Analysis," which reproduces Meyer's exegesis in the main, but adds much that is good besides; Beet, which also rests almost entirely on Meyer for its exegesis, but gives special attention to the theology; and Vaughan, which is specially good for its discussion of words. Of these, at least Godet, and Sanday and Headlam should be procured. On 1 Corinthians, besides Evans in the "Speaker," there are Godet, Edwards, and Ellicott. On 2 Corinthians, there is Waite in the

"Speaker." We have Ellicott on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Thessalonians, and the Pastoral Epistles. Lightfoot has complete Commentaries on Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. A posthumous volume has also been published with notes on parts of Romans and Corinthians, derived from his Cambridge lectures, and a small portion of his projected Commentary on Ephesians, covering the first fourteen verses. There is a not very satisfactory Commentary on Ephesians by Macpherson. On Thessalonians there is Findlay in the Cambridge Bible. On Hebrews the great commentary is that of Westcott. But the student will not neglect the small but very valuable work of Dr. Davidson. There is also an excellent little volume by Dr. Moulton in Ellicott's "Commentary for Schools." On the Epistle of James we have the elaborate commentary of Mayor; but the little work by Plumptre in the Cambridge Bible will, of course, be used with it. His Commentary on Peter and Jude in the same series should also be procured. For the Epistles of John, Westcott's

Commentary is much the best. On Revelation, perhaps, Simcox should be used, though Bleek should be read, and the works on this book by Dr. Milligan. The volumes of the "Expositor's Bible" that might be best worth getting I could hardly name with confidence. But the following may be mentioned: Genesis, Chronicles, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, the Gospel of John, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, Revelation. There are others that might have been mentioned; but the series lies less strictly in our province than commentaries proper.

But Exegesis is only one side of Biblical study. I pass on to the literature of Introduction. For the Old Testament two books may be named as indispensable. One is Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" (fifth edition, with earlier editions the valuable appendix should be procured), the other is Robertson Smith's "Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Care should be taken to get the second edition of the latter. With Driver's "Introduction" should be taken

the last three chapters of Cheyne's "Founders of Old Testament Criticism." These form a valuable supplement to the Introduction, while the book generally gives a most interesting and useful account of the great Old Testament critics. Some of the most valuable work on the Old Testament is to be found in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." Among the articles that may be specially mentioned are the following. By Robertson Smith: Angel, Ark of the Covenant, Bible, Canticles, Chronicles, David, Decalogue, Haggai, Hebrew Language and Literature, Epistle to the Hebrews, Hosea, Jerusalem, Joel, Judges, Kings, Lamentations, Leviticus, Malachi, Messiah, Micah, Moloch, Nahum, Nineveh, Obadiah, Passover, Philistines, Priest, Prophet, Psalms, Ruth, Sabbath, Sacrifice, Samaria, Temple, Tithes, Tobit, Vow, Zephaniah. By Cheyne: Amos, Canaan, Cherubim, Cosmogony, Daniel, Deluge, Esther, Hittites, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jonah. By A. B. Davidson: Apocrypha, Job, Proverbs. By Wellhausen: Israel, Moab, Moses, Nimrod, Pentateuch, Septuagint, Zechariah. By Suther-

land Black: Esdras, Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah, Galatians. By Hatch: Pastoral Epistles, Paul, Peter, Sacrifice. By Schürer: Philo, Epistle to the Romans, Thessalonians. Many of the articles in the new edition of Chambers' "Encyclopædia," written by the best authorities, are well worthy of attention. Such are the articles on Bible by Davidson and Psalms by Cheyne. For Dictionaries of the Bible we have at present Smith, the two last volumes of which are largely antiquated, while the first volume has been recently rewritten. Even this is very unequal in treatment and inconsistent in standpoint, yet with all its imperfections, and they are neither few nor slight, several of its articles are the best things of their kind accessible. Fortunately two new dictionaries are in course of preparation, which will be on a level with the present state of knowledge. One of these is to be edited by Rev. James Hastings, and published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, the other will be edited by Professor Cheyne and Mr Sutherland Black, and published by Messrs. A. & C. Black. It would be better to buy one

of these rather than Smith. The various Helps published by the Oxford and Cambridge Presses, by Eyre & Spottiswoode, and other publishers, often contain much useful matter, but they are very unequal and far too uncritical to be of much service in matters of Introduction. The "Cambridge Companion" is perhaps the best. The little Introductions by Wright and Robertson contain useful features, and some of the sections in "Book by Book" are very valuable.

I pass now to works on special departments of Introduction. The great work on the Hexateuch is Kuenen's "Hexateuch." This is necessary to all who wish to make a special study of the subject; but it will be too detailed and elaborate for the majority, who will find Driver sufficient. There is also Briggs' "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," a work which, while strongly enforcing the literary analysis of the Hexateuch and the critical view of the dates of the documents, is opposed to the historical views of Kuenen and Wellhausen. The "Prolegomena to the History of

Israel" of the latter scholar is, of course, of primary importance for this subject, and also contains valuable material for the criticism of the historical books. Bacon's "Genesis of Genesis," and his "Triple Tradition of the Exodus," present the documents as analysed by literary criticism, and the same may be said of Addis's "Documents of the Hexateuch," though at present this is incomplete. A more elementary but useful book is Wade's "Book of Genesis." Kittel's "History of the Hebrews" goes very fully into the critical problems presented both by the Hexateuch and the historical books. For Samuel we have Cheyne's "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism," which is of value also for the criticism of the Psalter, and for a series of fine Psalm studies, which might have been mentioned under the head of Exposition. For Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes we have Cheyne's admirable work "Job and Solomon," containing a wealth of material for the criticism, exegesis and theology of these books. They are also dealt with by W. T. Davison in his little work, "The Wisdom

Literature of the Old Testament," which includes also the Song of Songs. The same author has a companion volume, "The Praises of Israel," dealing with the Psalms. These books are strongest in their treatment of the ideas, weakest in their criticism. For the Psalms the great work is Cheyne's Bampton Lectures on the "Origin of the Psalter." While crowded with information and criticism, it contains much that is hotly disputed, and it would be well for the student to leave it till last. The last three lectures deal with the theology of the Psalter. On the Prophets Kuenen has an elaborate work, unfortunately out of print, entitled "The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel." It is packed with information, but written from a Rationalistic point of view. Of special value is Robertson Smith's "The Prophets of Israel." It is a book that no student should neglect. The second edition has been edited by Prof. Cheyne, who has added an introduction which gives a very useful conspectus of recent critical views on the four Prophets dealt with in the work. It

is most unfortunate that the author was unable to fulfil his intention to rewrite the work and add another volume on the later Prophets. The first of three small volumes on the Prophets by Prof. Findlay has recently appeared. Three volumes may also be mentioned from the "Men of the Bible" series: Driver's "Isaiah," Cheyne's "Jeremiah," and Farrar's "Minor Prophets."

In the department of New Testament Introduction, the best work at present is that of Weiss, in spite of some eccentricities. Salmon is remarkably clear and interesting in style; he has wide knowledge of the subject; he often displays sound common sense. But he writes too much as an advocate, and he seems unable to put himself at his opponent's point of view. His accounts of foreign critics remind one too strongly of George Meredith's Egoist, who in his travels through Europe was engaged in "holding a review of his Maker's grotesques." His criticism is thus of a rather rough-and-ready type, and just the kind to be popular with the plain man. When we turn from him

to a critic like Prof. Sanday, we find that happy balance of qualities which makes him so ideal a critic. There is perfect fairness and impartiality, a determination to let the matter be settled by the evidence, a readiness to enter into his opponent's views and estimate them at their full worth, a delicacy of perception combined with a sobriety of judgment that makes him, in some respects, almost a court of final appeal in criticism. His works on the "Authorship and Authenticity of the Fourth Gospel" and the "Gospels in the Second Century" are unhappily out of print, and likely to remain so, but his recent papers in the *Expositor* on the "Synoptic Problem" and the "Johannean Question" should be read by all students, while his Bampton Lectures supply us with a bird's-eye view of the whole field. The brief Introductions of Dr. Dods and Mr. M'Clymont will be found very useful. Prof. Ramsay's "Church in the Roman Empire," and his "St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen," are also of great importance. Dr. Gloag has produced a series of works on Introduction

which cover the whole of the New Testament. Godet is engaged on an Introduction of which at present only the first volume, dealing with the Pauline Epistles, has been published. If he is spared to complete it, it will be a most valuable addition. For the special study of the Gospels there is Westcott's "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," and Rev. Arthur Wright's "Composition of the Four Gospels." A sounder view of the Synoptic Problem is to be found in Sanday's article in the "Dictionary of the Bible," the section that deals with this subject in "Book by Book," and his articles in the *Expositor* already mentioned. The article "Gospel" in the "Britannica" should also be consulted, as well as Prof. Estlin Carpenter's work on the "Synoptic Gospels." Weiss has some valuable chapters on this in his "Life of Christ." A more negative standpoint is occupied by Orello Cone in his "Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity." For the detailed study of the Synoptic Problem, Rushbrooke's "Synopticon" will be found most valuable. By the ingen-

ious use of colours and type, this work shows at a glance what words in the parallel narratives are common to all, or to two only, and to which two, or peculiar to one. Tischendorf's "Synopsis Evangelica" is also very useful, and in some respects more convenient to use than Rushbrooke, though without any of its mechanical devices. Abbott and Rushbrooke have printed an English work containing the common matter of the "Synoptic Gospels." There is also Wright's "Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek," which is perhaps the most generally useful. Of the literature on the Fourth Gospel, there may be mentioned, as the case is exceptional, the Introductions in the commentaries of Godet, Westcott, and Reynolds. The external evidence is dealt with in a famous essay by Ezra Abbot. This is reprinted in a convenient form along with an article by Peabody and another by Lightfoot. The latter is also reprinted in the author's "Biblical Essays," a posthumous work which contains, besides, an elaborate discussion of the external evidence,

with lectures on problems connected with the Pauline Epistles. An important article was published in the *Contemporary Review* by Schürer (September, 1891), and replied to by Sanday (October, 1891). The other works of the latter scholar have been already mentioned. There is a work by Luthardt, "St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel." A useful Introduction to the Pauline Epistles is furnished by Prof. Findlay. Hort's "Introduction to the Romans and the Ephesians" is important. For the Revelation, Milligan's "Discussions on the Apocalypse" is useful, if not convincing, and Bleek should also be read. But an English work relevant to the present state of criticism is much needed. Briggs discusses the critical questions at some length in his "Messiah of the Apostles." For the textual criticism of the New Testament it would be best to begin with Warfield's little book, along with which Hammond's might also be used. Hort's "Introduction" is of the highest value, but very difficult. Scrivener's is also very valuable, but, except

for those who wish to go somewhat fully into the subject, it will be unnecessary. For the Canon there are the works of Reuss, Charteris, Westcott, and S. Davidson. Lightfoot's "Essays on Supernatural Religion" cover part of the same ground as Westcott's "Canon." The discussions in Weiss's "Introduction" and Harnack's "History of Doctrine" should be read. There is still room for an English work which shall be on a level with the present condition of the subject, and discuss the reasons which led to the formation of the Canon, and the criteria by which the canonicity was determined.

Passing on to the History, there are, unfortunately, not many books to recommend. The great work is Ewald's "History of Israel." It is a monumental work, and covers the New Testament period as well as the Old. Its defects are obvious—arbitrariness, dogmatism, the tendency to build on conjecture, too implicit a faith in his own powers of divination, too little willingness to learn from others. He has also far too little sense of development. Yet

with all its defects there is an array of qualities both solid and brilliant which makes it a work of the first importance. At the same time it must be said that criticism has moved very considerably since Ewald, and that the reconstruction of the history has been largely affected by this. Stanley's "History of the Jewish Church" rests chiefly on Ewald. Wellhausen gave a brilliant sketch of the history in the article "Israel" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." This was published in an enlarged form in the English edition of the "Prolegomena," and again with modifications as a separate work under the title "History of Israel and Judah." Recently this has been considerably expanded, and made to take the place of the long-expected History, but it is not translated. Kittel's "History of the Hebrews" will be found most useful, although it scarcely represents the most probable view on some points, or that which the author would now hold. The standpoint is more conservative than that of Wellhausen. Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament" is the most

important work on that subject. McCurdy's "History, Prophecy and the Monuments" is also an excellent work, though the uncertainty as to his critical position somewhat detracts from its value. Many of the most important documents have been printed in "Records of the Past." For geography the best general book is G. A. Smith's "The Historical Geography of the Holy Land." Miller's "The Least of All Lands" is excellent for its careful elucidation of the meaning of some Biblical narratives by an examination of the actual site.

Passing on to the New Testament History, we have for the Gospel History the various Lives of Christ. Keim's is the ablest from the Rationalistic point of view, and is marked by a fine spirit of reverence and devotion to Christ. Weiss's is perhaps the ablest from the orthodox side, though it has the limitations that beset his work. Edersheim is specially valuable for Jewish archæology. Fairbairn's "Studies in the Life of Christ" will be found full of insight and stimulus. Much useful information is to be found in Farrar's "Life of Christ," as well as in

his companion works on "Paul" and the "Early Days of Christianity." Andrews' "Life of our Lord" is useful for the chronology. For the apostolic age Weizsäcker's work, "The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church," will be found most valuable. It is true that the views it expresses as to the historical character of the Acts of the Apostles seem to need correction in a more positive sense, but it is a most brilliant and masterly work, and is especially remarkable for the genius with which it constructs the history from the Epistles. Slater's "Faith and Life of the Early Church" is very fresh and interesting. The Lives of Paul by Conybeare, and Howson, and Lewin, contain much useful matter. The two works by Prof. Ramsay previously mentioned are also valuable for the history of this period. Among the indispensable books must be named Schürer's "Jewish People in the Time of Christ." The index is published separately, and must not be neglected. Morison's "The Jews under Roman Rule" is an excellent compendium based largely on Schürer. For one side of the New Testa-

ment history Hort's "Judaistic Christianity" will be found suggestive. Fairweather's "From the Exile to the Advent" will be found a convenient history of that important period.

It only remains, so far as the literature of our subject is concerned, to speak of books in the department of Biblical Theology. Here, again, it must be confessed with shame that English scholarship is sadly lacking. With the exception of Prof. Bennett's little work, we have no English book which aims at covering the whole field of Old Testament theology. When Dr. Davidson's is published, a great reproach will be rolled away from our native theology. Two German works have been translated, those of Oehler and Schultz. Oehler made great contributions to this study, and his book is still useful. It is now, however, largely out of date, and vitiated by the defective criticism that underlies it. Schultz's "Old Testament Theology" is the work of a thoroughly equipped scholar, resting on a sound but not extreme criticism, and is the best book on its subject. Works of a more special character might be

divided into three classes, though with this caution—that they overlap to some extent. First, we have those books which deal with the history of the religion of Israel. The general histories of Israel will here have to be taken into account. Apart from these we have first Kuenen's great work, "The Religion of Israel." A second edition of this would have been a great boon, but the death of the author has made this impossible. Our regret is lessened by the masterly summary he has given in his Hibbert Lectures. Another volume of Hibbert Lectures, by Mr. Montefiore, is much fuller, and takes account of very recent investigation. It is also interesting for the discussion in the later chapters on the Life under the Law, in which he challenges the common views of Christian scholars upon it, a point on which Mr. Schechter's "Studies in Judaism" may also be consulted. The brilliant and well-balanced sketch in Bruce's "Apologetics," Book II., should not be overlooked. Robertson's "Early Religion of Israel" occupies a different standpoint, and suffers from its defective method in

postponing the literary to the historical criticism; yet it contains important arguments which must be allowed their weight in determining the estimate of the pre-prophetic religion. In the second place, we have the literature which deals with special doctrines or religious institutions. This is a department where books are few. On Messianic prophecy we have the works of Riehm, Briggs, and Delitzsch, with the article in the "Britannica," and two articles by Dr. A. B. Davidson in the *Expositor*, first series, vol. viii. On Sacrifice we have, besides the older literature, in which Spencer's chapter in his "De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus" is the most important, some modern works. Of these Kurtz's "Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament" and Cave's "Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice" may be mentioned as containing useful material. More important is the chapter in Wellhausen's "Prolegomena." But by far the most valuable and original contribution ever made to the subject is that made by our greatest Old Testament scholar, whose loss is the severest blow

that could possibly have been struck at Old Testament research. I refer to Robertson Smith's "Religion of the Semites." Nothing is to be more regretted than the loss to science caused by his inability to prepare the remaining volumes for the press. We shall never know how much we have missed by this. Along with the "Religion of the Semites" should be taken his article "Sacrifice" in the "Britannica"; and as furnishing the basis for some of his conclusions, his article on "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament," in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. ix., together with his "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia." In these works, especially the "Religion of the Semites," very valuable light is thrown on such subjects as the early conception of holiness among the Semites. Readers who are interested in the comparative study of institutions, which has already given us important results, should at any rate read Frazer's "Golden Bough," his little work on Totemism, and his article on Taboo in the "Britannica." Mr.

Andrew Lang's "Myth, Ritual and Religion," and his "Custom and Myth," will also be found useful. M'Lennan's work is of high importance, but is perhaps too specialist to be mentioned here. On the Doctrine of a Future Life we have Salmond's "Christian Doctrine of Immortality," which also treats the New Testament Doctrine, but beyond it only articles or chapters in various books. I may mention Cheyne's "Origin of the Psalter," Lecture viii., part 2, also an article of his, entitled "Possible Zoroastrian Influence on the Religion of Israel," in the *Expository Times*, June, July, and August, 1892; Kirkpatrick's Psalms, Introduction, pp. lxxv. seq.; Davidson's Job, pp. 103–4, and appendix. In the third place, we may take the books which deal with the theology of one or more of the writers of the Old Testament. For the prophets we have Kirkpatrick's "Doctrine of the Prophets." A far more important work is Robertson Smith's "The Prophets of Israel," already mentioned. Dr. A. B. Davidson has some valuable articles in the *Expositor*—Hosea in series i., vol. ix.; a study on II Isaiah in

series ii., vols. vi., vii., viii.; on Deborah, Amos and Joel, in series iii., vols. v., vi., vii. Also two valuable chapters in his "Commentary on Ezekiel." The posthumous articles of Prof. Elmslie in the fourth series of the *Expositor* may also be mentioned. The *Expository Times* is just now giving special attention to this work. For the theology of the Psalter valuable material is given by Prof. Cheyne in his Bampton Lectures, and this may be supplemented by chapters in Dr. Davison's "Praises of Israel."

We have no English book on New Testament Theology as a whole, with the exception of Prof. Adeney's useful little work recently published. We have translations of foreign works. First, there is Weiss's "Biblical Theology of the New Testament." Perhaps the general opinion that this is best is right, but, personally, I may confess I have never been enthusiastic about it. It is not simply the unhappy bias of which Dr. Bruce complains so justly; but, if I may use such words about the work of an extremely able critic, there is a wooden and

prosaic quality in it that makes it most unsatisfactory as an interpretation of Christ and Paul. At the same time his collection of facts, his generally sound exegesis, and the exhaustiveness of his work, make the book almost indispensable, even though we feel that much of the spirit of the New Testament has been lost in the process. The work of Beyschlag seems to me to be on the whole the best, when his views on one or two points, especially the Christology, have been allowed for. There is a volume by Schmid, rather old now. A valuable work, now out of print, is Reuss' "History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age." The English translation was edited by Dr. Dale, who has frequently controverted the views of the author in his notes. We have some important works in special departments of this discipline. For the Teaching of Jesus we have the important work of Wendt, that goes by that name. Bruce's "Kingdom of God" deals with the Teaching of Christ as it is recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. His other works, such as "The Training of the Twelve," "The Miraculous Element in the

Gospels," and "The Parabolic Teaching of Christ," may also be conveniently mentioned here. The Doctrine of the Apostles has been treated by Neander in his "Planting and Training of the Christian Church." For Paulinism, we have Pfleiderer's brilliant and stimulating work, which may be checked by Stevens' "The Pauline Theology." There is a short but important sketch in Weizsäcker's "Apostolic Age." Sabatier's "Apostle Paul" should also be read, however we may dissent from some of its conclusions. For freshness and originality, Everett's "Gospel of Paul" should not be neglected, though I cannot believe many students will accept his special views. Bruce's "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity" is excellent, and especially for the way in which it has caught the Pauline spirit, and the glow with which it has interpreted it. He has also a valuable series of articles on the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the third and fourth series of the *Expositor*. Along with this may be taken the somewhat too original work of Rendall on the "Theology of the Hebrew Christians."

There is also a series of articles by Robertson Smith on Christ and the Angels, in the second series of the *Expositor*, vols. i., ii., iii. For the Theology of John there is Stevens' "The Johannine Theology," which is the best. Haupt's "First Epistle of John" may also be mentioned. It need not be said that commentaries and works on Systematic Theology often contain useful material for Biblical Theology. I may mention the discussion of the New Testament Christologies given by Dr. Fairbairn in his "Christ in Modern Theology."

Chapter V

OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

IN Old Testament Introduction we are dealing with the questions that arise as to the text, date, authorship, literary analysis of the individual books, and their collection into a Canon. The first subject in the order of scientific treatment would be Textual or Lower Criticism. And it would be well for a student to start with some knowledge of it, though an elementary knowledge will in most cases be all that is attainable. If the student reads Buhl's "Canon and Text of the Old Testament," with the introduction to Driver's "Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel," and the relevant parts in Robertson Smith's "Old Testament in the Jewish Church," he will find them helpful in giving him general principles

and destroying some of his illusions. The application of them will come in detailed exegetical study; and here the critical notes in his commentaries will be very useful. The evidence that our Hebrew text is in several places corrupt may be thus summarised. There are passages that cannot be translated without violence as they stand. Further, in some cases, we have two versions of the same piece, with variants which point to textual corruption. But most important is the presence in translations of the Old Testament of variants which not only presuppose a different Hebrew text from that which we possess, but a better one. This is especially so in the case of the Septuagint, though it is far from true that wherever there is such a difference the Septuagint is probably right. The presumption is, as a rule, in favour of the Hebrew text. In using the versions certain cautions have to be borne in mind. Variants in the versions do not always imply variants in the original Hebrew. They may be due to the carelessness of the scribe, or to a tendency to para-

phrase, or even to deliberate alteration. Then, even if we can safely argue back to various readings in the Hebrew, it remains to be seen whether that represented in the translation is superior to that contained in the text. Further, the text of the versions themselves is by no means so fixed and certain that it can be used without more ado for the correction of the Hebrew. But when the best has been done with the help of the versions, many passages remain that must be amended, if at all, by the use of conjectural emendation. This cannot be excluded on dogmatic grounds, for we know that in the case of the New Testament corruption in very bad forms attacked the text within a century from the writing of the autographs. The same may surely have happened in the Old Testament, especially as more than eight hundred years lie between our oldest canonical prophets and the earliest period to which we can trace back our present text of their writings. In the New Testament we have abundance of various readings, hence the province of conjecture is very small. But in the

case of the Old Testament we have no variants on which to work. All our manuscripts give us one text, and this can only mean that a too successful attempt was made to form a standard text. As the scribes were completely ignorant of the principles of Textual Criticism, we cannot have any confidence that the text they formed and transmitted to us is free from error. And since some centuries elapsed between the composition of several of our Old Testament books and their translation into Greek, we cannot be sure that corruption may not have entered higher up the stream, and be now established in the versions as well as the Hebrew text. In that case, conjecture alone can restore the true reading. Of course conjectural emendations should be left to thoroughly equipped scholars.

As to the Old Testament Canon, our information is far more meagre than we could wish, but some conclusions are pretty generally accepted by critics. The threefold division of the Old Testament into The Law, the Prophets, and the Writings, is believed to

point to a growth in the Canon, which at first embraced only the Law, and then later was enlarged by the addition of the Prophets, and finally completed by the addition of the Hagiographa. The first Canon was formally accepted at the assembly held by Ezra and Nehemiah B.C. 444. When the second Canon was completed is a more debatable question, but criticism seems settling down to a date between B.C. 250 and B.C. 200. The evidence of the author of Ecclesiasticus is in favour of supposing that the Canon of the Prophets was already complete in his time. If Duhm were right in some of his extreme views as to the very late dates of some sections of Isaiah, our judgment would have to be revised; but of this it need only be said that, with all recognition of Duhm's remarkable critical ability, the views referred to are unlikely to secure wide acceptance. The third Canon presents still more difficult questions. In the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, written about B.C. 132, we find the threefold division—the Law, the Prophets, and the Rest of the Books. From this

it may be inferred that besides the first and second Canons other books already stood, forming a third. But we cannot at once identify the books spoken of by the writer with the other books that we have in our Canon. It is clear that he uses a very indefinite expression, and, in fact, it occurs in different forms, so that he can hardly be referring to a collection as clearly defined and universally recognised as were the two former. The actual extent would be hard to define. It is not even certain that all the books now included in the third collection were written by this time; some, at any rate, had been only written or completed a short time earlier. Perhaps the general view may be accepted that the Canon was substantially complete by 100 B.C. But it must be understood that this does not foreclose the question on which authorities are divided—whether some books were admitted after that date. It is well known that discussions went on in the Jewish schools towards the end of the first century A.D. as to the canonicity of certain books.

Some of these had been previously recognised as canonical, the question is whether all had. Was Ecclesiastes, for example, striving for admission or to retain a position that was threatened? On this interesting question Ryle and Wildeboer take opposite sides. The remarks of the latter scholar on the reasons which led to the formation of the Canon and the criteria of canonicity will throw light on a rather obscure problem, none the less obscure because we are so familiar with the result that we too rarely feel it to be a problem at all.

Passing from general to special Introduction, I begin with the Prophets. I have already indicated in the case of Isaiah that in addition to the prophecies regarded by all critics as later than the age of Isaiah, several more have been recently referred by some critics to a later period. But this is by no means true of Isaiah alone. It applies to several of the prophets. This newer criticism is especially associated with the names of Stade, Wellhausen, Duhm, and Cheyne. The

valuable Introduction which the last-named scholar has prefixed to the new edition of Robertson Smith's "Prophets of Israel" will show the results as far as they affect Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. His Introduction to Isaiah is very full on the criticism of that book. Prof. G. A. Smith's work on the "Twelve Prophets" is not as yet finished, but the first volume deals fully with the critical questions so far as it has gone, and reveals a sympathy with the later developments for which I was hardly prepared. The work that still remains to be done before the criticism of the Prophets has reached the relative finality that has been attained in the criticism of the Hexateuch is very great, and I must simply content myself with noticing the passages which may still be said to rest in dispute without attempting to discuss them. As to many, results have been reached on which critics generally are agreed.

Amos is probably the earliest of the canonical prophets, his date is about B.C. 750. The following passages are suspected as inter-

polations: i. 9–12, ii. 4, 5, iv. 13, v. 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, vi. 2, 14, viii. 11–13, ix. 5, 6, 8–15, and the words "in Zion" in vi. 1. Some of these passages are important for the theology of the book. Among these the creation passages and the prediction of the happy future may be especially mentioned. In Hosea, the junior contemporary of Amos, several critical questions arise. The text is in a very bad state, but emendations of it must, of course, be left for detailed study. There are also several suspected passages, of which the following is a sufficiently complete list: i. 7, i. 10–ii. 1, iii. 5, iv. 15a, v. 15–vi. 4, part of vi. 11–vii. 1, viii. 14, xiv. 1–9.

The Book of Isaiah comes next, and presents several important questions relating to Introduction. First, there is the question of the presence of portions written by later authors. A list of those that are written from a standpoint other than that of Isaiah's own time has already been given. That these portions are the work of Isaiah himself is only credible if we accept the probability of

the curious view propounded by Delitzsch, but surrendered by him before his death, and, indeed, excluded by the law of parsimony—that Isaiah lived a life in the spirit among the exiles several generations before the Return. For the language used is explicit as to the circumstances in which these prophecies are spoken, and they are not the circumstances of Isaiah's own time. The theory further requires that in this state of trance he should exhibit a different style, vocabulary set of theological ideas, from what we find in his undoubted work, and, further, that in utterances arising out of the same circumstances similar differences should be manifested. For it must be remembered that it is not only in the latter portion of the book that the exilic standpoint is assumed, but in prophecies in the earlier part too; yet these prophecies betray internal differences that would be naturally held to imply divergence of authors. So many ecstatic parts to play, and in each so different!—the theory sinks under the accumulation of improbabilities. The frequent statement that the

denial of these passages to Isaiah is due to disbelief in the possibility of prediction is untrue, and misses the point. The reason for it is simply deference to the actual statements of the prophecies themselves, which do not predict the exile, but speak of the people as at the time in exile. That they were not in exile in Isaiah's time, that Babylon was not the great world-power, already to the eye of faith tottering to its fall, needs no proof. The critical view has this advantage—that it prefers to accept the definite statement of Scripture rather than the artificial theories devised by human ingenuity to bolster up an untenable tradition. It is obvious to all whose faith is unsophisticated that the inspiration is in no way lessened, but increased, by the perfect adaptation of Divine teaching and comfort to human need, which is one of the essential elements in Inspiration. In addition to the passages already mentioned, there are others doubted by critics who are not extreme, such as Dillmann. I take the following list from Prof. Cheyne's introduction to "The Prophets

of Israel": iv. 5*b*, 6, xi. 10–xii. 6, xix. 18, xxi. 11, 12, 13, 14, xxiii., xxxii., xxxiii.

But, in addition to these, there are passages thrown late by the leaders of the newer critical study of the prophets, especially by Duhm and Cheyne. I add a list of these: iv. 2–6, x. 16–27, xix., xxii. 19–25, xxviii. 23–29, xxix. 16–24, xxx. 18–33. There are also numerous editorial additions. Cheyne also throws out the two highly important Messianic passages, ix. 1–7, xi. 1–9.

These questions are specially important for the theology of Isaiah. The oracle on Moab is generally regarded as the work of an older prophet taken up and endorsed by Isaiah, who fixed the date for its fulfilment. But this is denied by Duhm, and much qualified by Cheyne. The historical chapters, xxxvi.–xxxix., are taken from the Book of Kings, with the exception of the Song of Hezekiah, which an increasing number of students are inclined to make post-exilic. Weighty, though not absolutely convincing, reasons have been adduced for regarding the story of Sen-

nacherib's invasion as composite and as consisting of two parallel stories (xxxvi. 1–xxxvii. 9*a*, 37, 38, and xxxvii. 9*b*–36). As to the latter part of the book criticism has been very active of late. Here Ewald and Bleek led the way; but Cheyne and Duhm have done most for the analysis. Both are agreed that the work of the Babylonian prophet stops at chapter lv., and Wellhausen has recently and somewhat unexpectedly said that this seems to him to be made out. But they are not wholly agreed as to either of these sections. Duhm denies the Servant passages in xl.–lv. to the author of the rest of that section, while Cheyne thinks they may be earlier compositions of the author inserted by him in his later prophecy. As to lvi.–lxvi., Duhm thinks it is the work of a single author, the Trito-Isaiah, writing in Jerusalem in the first half of the Persian period. Cheyne regards it as consisting of about ten compositions, which, except lxiii. 7–lxiv. 11, all belong to the time of Nehemiah, the religious phenomena of which they accurately reflect. He thinks that several

of these compositions may have come from the same writer. The prophecy, lxiii. 7–lxiv. 11, he places in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus. On Duhm's Isaiah the reader may refer to a brilliant and sometimes scathing criticism by Dr. A. B. Davidson, in the *Critical Review* (vol. iii., p. 12). On Hackmann's theories an article in the *Expositor*, by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, may be consulted (series iv., vol. x., p. 330). I have dwelt on Isaiah at considerable length because of the great importance of the book, and because it is the first instance of the emergence of critical questions on a large scale.

In the case of Micah, Ewald pointed out that the last two chapters seem to presuppose the reign of Manasseh, and Wellhausen, accepting this in the main, made vii. 7–20 a product of the Exile. Stade denied to Micah everything after the first three chapters. Kuenen refused to go so far, and while agreeing with Wellhausen as to chapters vi. and vii., he accepted iv. 9, 10, except the words "and thou shalt go to Babylon," v. 1–9

and 10–15, in its original form, as the work of Micah. More recently, Wellhausen has come to the conclusion that vii. 7–20 is probably post-exilic, that vi. 1–8 may be Micah's, and perhaps iv. 14, and v. 10–14. Cheyne agrees, on the whole, with his views.

As to the famous oracle iv. 1–4, found also in Isaiah, the older view that it belongs to an earlier prophet, and was borrowed by both from him, is denied by Stade, Cheyne, Wellhausen, and Cornill, though the very high authority of Kuenen may be quoted for it. Prof. G. A. Smith takes on the general subject a somewhat conservative, but independent line. For further details I refer the reader to his work in the "Expositor's Bible," and to Cheyne's introduction to "The Prophets of Israel." Zephaniah is generally dated early in Josiah's reign, and part of it at least must be earlier than the Deuteronomic Reformation. There is a growing consensus that iii. 14–20 is post-exilic; but while Kautzsch dates it between B.C. 538 and 527, Cornill brings it down to the Greek period. The latter scholar

rejects the extreme view of Schwally, that ii. and iii., with the exception of ii. 13–15, are exilic or post-exilic, and regards ii. and iii. as worked over, ii. only to an insignificant extent. Davidson seems to occupy a similar position. Kautzsch, however, still retains ii.–iii. 13 for Zephaniah, but places it after the Reformation, though still in the reign of Josiah. The date of Nahum lies between B.C. 664 and 607, on the whole about 624 seems most probable, though Kautzsch places it before 660. It has been thought, though on rather slender grounds, that i. 2–ii. 3 was originally an alphabetical poem, now much mutilated. Habakkuk may be conveniently taken before, rather than after, Jeremiah. The question of date is perplexing, and its solution depends, in part, on the interpretation that is given to the prophecy, and this again is implicated with the critical questions which are of peculiar difficulty, yet of great interest. Stade made chapter iii. a post-exilic church psalm taken from a liturgical collection and inserted here by an editor. So far, his

criticism has commanded increasing consent, and the great caution which Dr. Driver has shown in dealing with the newer criticism of the prophets makes his apparent acceptance of this result very significant. Dr. Davidson seems also to incline to this view. Stade further made ii. 8–20 a post-exilic denunciation of a Palestinian tyrant. This has not met with the same acceptance, and it is doubtful if in its original form this section can be regarded as at all post-exilic. The first part of the prophecy Stade's criticism left untouched. But it is here that the most recent work has been done. Giesebrecht pointed out that i. 4 was most naturally connected with i. 12, and he therefore argued that i. 5–11 should be placed at the beginning, as the original oracle of Habakkuk against the Chaldeans. The rest of this section, i. 2–4 and i. 12–ii. 8, he thought was also uttered against the Chaldeans, but in exile. Wellhausen accepted the analysis, but made the latter part pre-exilic. He saw, however, that this left the prophecy without any satisfactory conclusion. Mean-

while, Budde had worked out a new and brilliant theory which met this difficulty. He, too, had come to the conclusion that i. 5–11 was not in its original place. But instead of placing it at the beginning he placed it after ii. 4. His construction of the original oracle as far as ii. 5 was as follows: i. 2–4, 12–17, ii. 1–4, i. 6–11, ii. 5. His theory was that the prophecy of Habakkuk was not directed against the Chaldeans at all, but against the Assyrians, and that the Chaldeans are regarded by him as the instruments of Yahweh's vengeance upon the Assyrian oppressor. The reference to the Assyrians he regards as having been struck out by a later editor, who made the transposition by which i. 5–11 was placed in its present position. The advantages of this theory are obvious. It gets over the difficulty about the misplaced section without the objection that could be urged against Giesebrecht's view, and it secures the rest of the chapter for Habakkuk as prophecy also against the Assyrians. The transposition required is very

slight, and the omission of the mention of the Assyrians, which it postulates, is readily granted. On the other hand, Davidson points out historical difficulties, which are more serious, though in our present ignorance not conclusive. It only remains to mention the bold and original theory of Rothstein. The section i. 2–ii. 5 he regarded as in its original form a prophecy of Habakkuk about 605, directed against the sinners of Judah, subsequently turned by an exilic editor into a prophecy against the Chaldeans. This oracle he regarded as consisting of the following: i. 2–4, 12*a*, 13, ii. 1–5*a*, i. 6–10, 14, 15*a*. The oracle ii. 6–20 he regarded as originally a prophecy against Jehoiakim, subsequently worked up into an oracle against the king of Babylon and his empire. For an exposition and criticism of his theory, I am glad to be able to refer to a valuable article by Budde himself in the *Expositor* for May, 1895, where his own view is also stated and defended.

With Jeremiah criticism has also been busy. Many of the doubtful passages are suspected

on account of their absence from the LXX.; the book thus affords a very useful illustration of the transition from the Lower to the Higher Criticism. Some passages are also rejected as foreign to Jeremiah's circle of ideas, or as interrupting the sequence of thought. I can fortunately refer the reader to the Appendix to the fifth edition of Driver's "Introduction" for fuller details than could be conveniently given here. He gives a list of the passages regarded as interpolations by Cornill, and adds those as to which Giesebrecht and Kuenen agree with him. Obadiah may be conveniently mentioned here, since the relation of his prophecy to Jeremiah xlix. 7–22 raises an interesting critical question. The passage in Jeremiah is earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem, while Obadiah seems to refer to it as past. Since, however, Obadiah undoubtedly preserves the original form, we have to assume that both are borrowing from a common source. This is probably preserved to us in the first nine verses of Obadiah. In its present form the book may date from the

fifth or fourth century. The date of Ezekiel is clearly fixed. Some of his prophecies are earlier, some later, than the destruction of Jerusalem. Haggai is dated B.C. 520. Zechariah is not a unity. The first eight chapters of the book are his, and date from the years 520 and 518. Critics have commonly assumed two authors for the rest of the book, the former being the author of ix–xi. with xiii. 7–9, the latter of xii. 1–xiii. 6 with xiv. But, perhaps, as Stade and Cornill think, the whole of these six chapters is from a single hand. Cornill dates it about 280, and even if, as is often thought, the former portion dates from the eighth century, there are features which point to a revision in the Greek period. As to the latter part, if it is kept distinct from the former, its date may perhaps be as early as the time of Nehemiah. Malachi is also about that time, but somewhat earlier, before 458. Jonah seems to belong to the same period as Ezra, though Cornill thinks it must date from the end of the Persian period, and perhaps is as late as the Greek.

Joel has been made by many the earliest of the canonical prophets, but critical opinion is now decided in favour of a post-exilic date, and it is, perhaps, as late as the fourth century.

From the Prophets we pass to the Historical Books. Judges falls into three divisions: (*a*) i. 1–ii. 5; (*b*) ii. 6–xvi.; (*c*) xvii.–xxi. The first of these is parallel to the narrative of Joshua, and it is interesting to observe that there are a few similar fragmentary notices embedded in Joshua, probably derived from the same source. The historical value of these sections is very great. The criticism of the second portion reveals that the stories of the six chief heroes are set in a framework from the hand of a writer who has not written the stories themselves, and whose phraseology is strongly influenced by Deuteronomy. The religious standpoint is that of Deuteronomy, and the lesson which the writer emphasizes throughout is that there was a recurring cycle of sin, oppression, repentance, and deliverance. The Introduction is largely due to the compiler, who states the theory of

the history (ii. 11–19). There are older elements which may be readily disengaged. The chief questions raised by the stories of the heroes are these: Did the compiler collect the stories himself, or did he find them collected and ready to his hand, and then add the framework and introduction? How far are the stories themselves composite? Can we trace the familiar sources of the Hexateuch J and E in this section? Budde asserts that we can, and Moore seems inclined to agree with him while Kuenen does not allow that we can. Points of interest are the comparison of the prose version of the defeat and death of Sisera with the poetical description in the Song of Deborah, and the double narrative of the overthrow of the Midianites by Gideon. The two narratives in xvii.–xxi. present interesting features, especially the latter, where the chief questions are raised by xx.–xxi. That in its present form it is very late is clear; but a strong case can be made out for the view that the groundwork of the narrative is old.

The criticism of Samuel is greatly helped by

the presence of duplicate narratives which can be easily separated. A clear case is the double account of the institution of the monarchy, the earlier narrative consisting of ix. 1–10, 15, 27*b* (LXX.); xi. 1–11, 15; xiii. 2–14, 51; the latter of viii., x. 17–27*a*, xii.; perhaps also xi. 12–14. With this, vii. 2–17 should be united, since it is an integral part of the same account. The following out of this analysis and determination of the reasons for it will be a most useful exercise in criticism. Another interesting case is that of the double narrative of David's introduction to Saul, one being found xvi. 14–28, the other xvii. 1–xviii. 5. This is complicated by the fact that the LXX. omits part of the second narrative; viz., xvii. 13–31, and xvii. 55–xviii. 5. The worst discrepancies thus disappear; and Robertson Smith thinks the LXX. text is to be preferred, while Kuenen and Wellhausen think that the translators found the Hebrew as we have it, and made an attempt to remove the difficulties without attaining complete success. This, again, is an instructive problem in criticism. There

are other cases which cannot be dwelt on here. The critical analysis by Kautzsch has been given by Cheyne in his "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism." He also furnishes a list of doublets with critical notes. As in Jeremiah, so in Samuel and Kings, the transition from the Lower to the Higher Criticism is illustrated by a comparison of the text of the LXX. with that of the Hebrew. 2 Samuel xxi.–xxiv. forms an appendix which interrupts the Court History of David (2 Sam. ix.–xx.; 1 Kings i.–ii.). It raises critical questions, especially with reference to the two sacred poems, which are connected with the larger questions raised as to the Psalms. Kings, like Judges, is set in a framework by a compiler who has been much influenced by Deuteronomy, and who, in addition to the framework, has inserted comments on the history, or even long reflections and reviews. The parts due to him are marked by strongly defined phraseology (see an excellent list in Driver's "Introduction," pp. 190–193). These portions must be disengaged by the student. We then have a few

passages which seem to be later insertions, though there is a difference of opinion as to some of these. What is left consists, in the main, partly of official notices about the kings and their acts, or the temple, partly of prophetical narratives. It is unnecessary to linger here on the details of the analysis. The variations of the LXX. should be studied in a good text.

I pass to the Hexateuch. The literary analysis may profitably begin with the doublets, since they raise the question as to compilation from different documents in a very clear form. This part of the work the student may do for himself. Some apparent doublets may be thought to refer to different events. But others can only be explained as giving two accounts of the same thing, and where this is the case a presumption is raised as to the use of more than one source. Such a presumption, however, demands verification by an attempt at scientific literary analysis. Perhaps it would be well for the student to place himself under the guidance of a skilled critic here. Of course

he might previously have noticed characteristic expressions or ideas which appeared in some portions but not in others, and in the doublets he has collected some of these will be present. These provisional attempts at analysis are right, so long as they are recognised as simply provisional. But before long it will be well for him to take such an analysis as he will find in Driver, and work carefully through it, verifying every statement and weighing every argument. The proofs for the analysis accumulate step by step, and by the time the process is ended he will be in a position for judging the validity of the method, and testing the accuracy of the results. It is in the nature of things that the arguments for the main outlines of the analysis should be stronger than those for special details. It may be added that it is the phenomena presented by the Hexateuch itself that have led to the literary analysis. It may be readily granted that one man may be master of several styles; but it is difficult to ascribe to one writer the inconsistent codes of legislation and the remarkable divergence in points of view,

especially when we remember that the stylistic and phraseological indications of difference in authors are so constantly associated with the others that have been mentioned. The results of the literary analysis are as follows. Four main documents have been distinguished. There is, first of all, Deuteronomy. Then there is the work known as the Priestly Code (P), which has taken up a small Code known as the Law of Holiness (Lev. xvii.–xxvi.). The other two documents commonly known as J and E are not capable of such clear separation from each other as from the two documents already mentioned; but the composite character of J E has been made out to the satisfaction of almost all critics who admit the composite character of the Pentateuch at all.

It must of course be clearly understood that in each of these documents earlier and later strata are present, and that they are in some cases the product of a school rather than of an individual writer. Not only so, but the very task of uniting the sources involved much editorial redaction, though, fortunately, this was not

carried so far as to obliterate all trace of their original distinction. It will be enough, however, for the ordinary student to rest content with the main results of the analysis, without attempting to follow the literary criticism any further. The next question relates to the dates of the documents thus discovered. The first step towards this is to settle by careful comparison with each other the probable order of succession. The conclusions reached by this method must be held in suspense till considerations drawn from other parts of Old Testament literature have helped to determine the date. The prophets and historical books will be of special importance. Thus the prophets from Amos downwards must be carefully examined for the information they can give as to the story of the early patriarchs and Moses. In this way we can judge whether they had before them any of the documents preserved in our Pentateuch, and if so, which. Their evidence is also important as to the laws and institutions which they recognised, and it must be asked how far their utterances are consistent with a

recognition of our Pentateuchal Codes. The same may be said as to the historical books. The history of Josiah's reformation should be carefully studied, with a view to answering the question, On what law-book was this reform based? There can be little or no doubt that the Deuteronomic Code was this law-book. Confirmation of this position may be found in the fact of its great influence on subsequent writers like Jeremiah, and of the complete freedom of earlier writers from traces of such influence, and from the knowledge of its commands as laws of binding force. A minor question relates to the time when the book was actually composed, and there is the further problem whether our present book is identical with that found in the temple or whether it is not rather an enlarged edition of it. As to the former of these points, critics are not agreed whether the Code was actually composed in the reign of Josiah or in that of Manasseh. Some have even thrown it back as far as the reign of Hezekiah. As to the latter, it is probable that the actual work found by Hilkiah

included little more than Deuteronomy v.–xxvi. with xxviii. Wellhausen regards it as beginning with chapter xii., but there seems no adequate reason for this limitation. Dillmann's theory, which cannot be stated here, is so clever and tempting that one would gladly accept it if it were not too complicated to be probable. Once Deuteronomy is fixed there can be little doubt that J E is earlier, and that the two documents of which it is composed were used by the author of the original Deuteronomy. The main question is about the Priestly Code, if the fact that some eminent critics were not convinced by the arguments of Kuenen and Wellhausen forbids us to treat the Grafian theory as finally established. Of course the arguments which have seemed to the majority of critics conclusive must be carefully examined. The line of proof is something as follows. A development in Hebrew legislation can be traced in which Deuteronomy marks an advance on the Book of the Covenant contained in J E. The Priestly Code marks a more advanced stage in the development, and its

legislation is the outcome very largely of the revolution caused by the Deuteronomic reformation. In other words, just as Deuteronomy is based on J E, so P is based on Deuteronomy, which is the starting-point for its peculiar development. But there is another thing that must be mentioned. Deuteronomy draws on J E, but it is the outcome of the work of the prophets of the eighth century. In the same way while the centralisation of the cultus explains the form which the developments took, the work of Ezekiel lies between them, and he is the father of the Priestly Code. The last nine chapters of Ezekiel should be compared with the Priestly legislation if the force of this argument is to be realised. The conclusion is supported by the fact that while P cannot be proved to have had any influence on the earlier historians or prophets, its influence on Chronicles is quite unmistakable. But it is by the comparative study of institutions, as a great critic has said, that the question of priority is to be settled.

The Poetical Books might next be examined.

The questions raised about Job are these: First as to its integrity. Critics are nearly unanimous (Cornill, Budde, Wildeboer and, less decidedly, Briggs do not admit it) in regarding the speeches of Elihu as a later addition by a writer who wished to protest against Job's audacious arraignment of the righteousness of God's government, and to insist on the goodness of God and the disciplinary purpose of suffering. Equally strong are the arguments for the view that xxvii. 7–23 cannot be ascribed to Job. The alternatives are to regard the passage as an interpolation, or to make a rearrangement of the text by which this passage is assigned to Zophar, who, as the poem stands, does not speak on the third round, and with this would go probably a further distribution of the preceding passages. The relevance of chapter xxviii. to its particular place in the poem, or indeed to the argument as a whole, is also a matter to be considered. Questions have also been raised with reference to the speeches of Yahweh which must be examined, though, with the probable exception of the

descriptions of behemoth and leviathan, these speeches seem to belong to the original work. There is no adequate reason for doubting that the Prologue belongs to the original work, for even though the solution of the problem given in it is not revealed to Job at the end, it is obviously because one of the chief lessons of the poem is that the sufferer must trust God when he cannot understand Him, and Job is shown to us as lifted by the manifestation of God into a region where he finds a religious, and does not feel the need of an intellectual, solution of his difficulties. Nor is there any real reason for regarding the Epilogue with its "Happy Ending" as a later addition. The feeling which prompts such a criticism is probably too modern. It is a question whether we should regard it as complete. For, apart from the ill-founded doubt as to its congruity with the idea which underlies the poem, there is the fact that the scene in heaven in the Prologue would naturally be completed by another in the Epilogue, in which the accuser should have admitted that there were men who served God

disinterestedly. Still, this is not conclusive. In the next place, there is the date of Job. Setting aside the views that do not call for serious discussion, the alternatives would be—the time of Jeremiah, the period of the exile, or the post-exilic period. The stage of reflection implied and the comparison with other Hebrew literature will hardly, I think, allow us to place the original poem earlier than towards the close of the exile. It may be later, but it cannot well be earlier.

The Book of Proverbs also consists of various collections which must be distinguished, arranged as far as possible in chronological order and dated. Proverbs i.–ix. is not a collection of proverbs at all, but a beautiful poem in praise of wisdom. The second section, x. 1.–xxii. 16, consists of 376 proverbs, mainly antithetic in form. To this there are two appendices, xxii. 17–xxiv. 22, which contain moral precepts on various subjects, chiefly of a practical character, and xxiv. 23–34. In xxv.–xxix. we have a second collection of proverbs. xxx. contains matter of

very various descriptions. The marginal renderings 7 and 9 in the R.V. should probably be accepted. In xxx. 1–9 we have the Agnostic statement 1*b*–4, the reply 5, 6, and a prayer to be kept from scepticism or crime 7–9. xxx 10–33 has nine groups of proverbs, a curious feature in several being that things are arranged in sets of four. xxxi. 1–9 contains advice given to Lemuel, King of Massa, by his mother; xxxi. 10–31 gives a description of the good housewife. The divisions in the Book are marked by spaces in the R.V. That the various portions do not proceed from one hand or one time, the student can readily satisfy himself. It is needless to say that the headings do not settle the question of authorship any more than the headings of the Psalms. In no case can any one of the collections come from Solomon's own hand, and it is altogether uncertain what elements in the book, if any, can be traced back to him. If there are any, they are most likely to be found in xxv.–xxix., a section which is thought by many to be the oldest. In this case the note at the beginning

which connects the section with the literary activities of the men of Hezekiah is not to be set aside. But this does not guarantee the whole section; there are elements even in it which seem to some critics to point to the post-exilic period, and this is even more the case in the other sections. The date at which any section was completed must not, of course, be taken as the date at which all of it originated, and it would not be inconsistent with a quite early date for much in the book, if each part of it was supposed to have been completed in the post-exilic period, and there is a tendency to take this view. The date of the Praise of Wisdom is in any case post-Deuteronomic, but while some critics place it in the quarter of a century following the Reformation of Josiah, others regard it as post-exilic; and if so, it is probably fairly late in that period. Chapters xxx. and xxxi. are almost certainly post-exilic.

The Psalms may conveniently be taken here, though kept till last in actual study. The questions they raise are so numerous and so wide

that any mention of them must be disproportionately brief. It will be well for the student to clear the way by an examination of the titles. The inappropriateness of some of these will remove any scruples he might have in leaving them out of the question as evidence for the authorship, though they are important for the clues they give to the history of the collections. It is with the study of these collections that the investigation should begin, for in this way we can trace the stages by which the Psalter has grown to its present form. Here Robertson Smith's chapter in the "Old Testament in the Jewish Church" will be most helpful, and provide a firm foundation for future study. This may be supplemented by the first and second lectures in Prof. Cheyne's "Origin of the Psalter." When the three great collections and the stages in their formation have been discovered, so far as this is possible, then, and not till then, should the student turn to examine the dates of the Psalms. On this some general remarks may be offered. The definite results are likely to be oftener nega-

tive than positive. It may be proved that a psalm cannot have been written at a given time or by a given man, yet it may be impossible to say when or by whom it was written. This is in the nature of things, and many parallels might be quoted. Further, where the criteria of date are so indefinite, as they frequently are, regard must be had to wider considerations. Of these the most important seem to be such as are derived from the history of the religion of Israel. Linguistic phenomena can throw very little light at present on this question, though they mark some psalms as late. An obvious point often overlooked is that it is one thing to say that psalms were written at a certain period, or by a certain man, and quite another thing to say that these psalms have been included in our Psalter. This is to be taken into account in dealing with the interesting, though not important, question, whether any of our Psalms were written by David. We know that David was a skilful musician and a highly gifted poet. It is very probable, both from tradition and on

antecedent grounds, that he wrote religious poems. So much is admitted by advanced critics. The questions that have to be settled are these: How far is the David we know from the Books of Samuel and Kings likely to have written such psalms as those preserved in the Psalter? What assurance can we feel that the compilers of the first collection had a trustworthy tradition as to psalms they accepted as David's? or that they exercised any critical judgment in the admission of such psalms as his? Such questions must be studied patiently and without prejudice; nor must it be assumed beforehand that the result will be either favourable or unfavourable to the preservation of such psalms. Similarly the question of psalms dating from the early prophetic period, or the age of Josiah, must be examined. The objections that have been raised to the preservation of any pre-exilic psalms at all (with the doubtful exception of the eighteenth psalm) demand careful scrutiny, and should not pass unchallenged. If they are found to be valid, the conclusion must, of

course, be admitted. But it has certainly not been proved to the satisfaction of several critics that such psalms do not exist. On the other hand, the general similarity in religious thought and expression, the greater fitness they possess for use in the Second Temple than in that of the First, the passionate devotion to the Law breathed by many of them, the deep spirituality, the personification of the ideal Israel as the speaker in many psalms—all point to the post-exilic period as that in which a very large number of psalms should most probably be placed. Whether there are any Maccabean psalms is disputed; but while it is, perhaps, improbable that there are any in the first three books of the Psalter, it seems unreasonable to question their presence in the last collection.

The Song of Songs is a drama in which there seem to be three main characters—the Shulamite, her lover, and King Solomon. Its object is, probably, to celebrate the triumph of love over the glittering allurements of exalted station—the maiden who is wooed by the magnificent king remaining faithful to her

lover of humble rank. On the interpretation of the poem Driver's "Introduction" should be consulted, since it gives a full abstract of the rival theories of Ewald and Delitzsch, with Oettli's improvements on the former. The date is disputed. Though several critics, and perhaps the majority, believe it to be an early North Israelite poem, perhaps dating from the tenth century B.C., it cannot be denied that there are very weighty reasons for regarding it as post-exilic. Ruth is now assigned by several critics on strong grounds to the fifth century B.C., or even later, though Prof. Driver cannot see his way, on account of the linguistic phenomena, to place it after the exile. The Lamentations raise two questions. Are they by Jeremiah? and if not, are all the five poems by the same writer? The opinion of critics is against ascribing them to Jeremiah; but there is not such an agreement on the second question, though the arguments seem to be decidedly against the unity of authorship. The date of Ecclesiastes is also a matter of controversy, opinion being divided between a date

towards the end of the Persian period (332 B.C.), or about 200 B.C., the latter being the more probable on linguistic grounds. The student should examine the theory that it has been worked over in the interests of orthodoxy, and that the Epilogue, in whole or in part, is not by the author of the rest of the book. Esther has generally been placed in the third century B.C., though some of the ablest scholars have assigned it to a date later than the Maccabean war. Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah should be taken together as probably the work of the same author. Ezra and Nehemiah, however, have preserved very valuable extracts from the memoirs of these two men, besides lists and documents. The narrative in Chronicles should be carefully compared with the parallels in Samuel and Kings, and in this way insight will be gained into the motives and ideas that underlay the author's work. The date is probably somewhat later than 300 B.C. Daniel is by almost all critics, even the most moderate, placed some time between 168 and 164. It is thought, however,

by some that in its present form it is part of a larger work, but such a view calls for careful examination.

In mentioning the views of critics on various points of Old Testament Introduction I have simply wished to indicate the questions which the student should bear in mind, and to which he should give serious attention. No critical dictum, and, I may add, still more no uncritical dictum, should be accepted on authority. The reasons for each should be examined, and only when they are found satisfactory should the view be accepted. At the same time this should be borne in mind, that reasons which a beginner might find slight may seem cogent to an advanced student, because the latter, from his general knowledge of the subject, is better prepared to estimate the strength of them. If, then, the beginner does not feel the force of an argument, he should certainly not accept the conclusion; but neither should he reject it, especially if there is a general consensus of experienced critics about it. Suspense of judgment is, in this case, the only

proper course. For conclusions in one department of Introduction almost inevitably react on those formed in another. Especially is this true of classes of literature, such as the lyrical or Wisdom portions of the Old Testament, and criticism will have to study not simply individual books, but groups of books, in the future more than it has done in the past. I might add further, with reference to the charge of subjectivity so often urged, that too much weight may easily be given to it. Criticism is largely a matter for trained instinct combined with comprehensive knowledge of the subject, and a critic may often come to perfectly right conclusions for which he can only give reasons which seem very slender and inconclusive to those whose training and information have not raised them to his point of view. No doubt there is a temptation to base too much on minute details, and so far the student should be on his guard. But the fear that is sometimes expressed by those who are not opposed to progress that criticism is getting top-heavy seems quite groundless. The recent criticism

of the Prophets seems revolutionary to some who have assented to the Grafian view of the Hexateuch. There is no valid reason for this; the former is no more revolutionary than the latter. The only question that can even be entertained is, Does it rest on valid argument? It was not the Law only that needed to undergo development as conditions changed. Psalm and prophecy, too, had to be adapted to new needs, so that the living word might soothe and inspire as it had done of old. And if criticism shows to us that the prophetic spirit moved men in times which have been too often thought barren of prophecy or psalm, who does not feel that he has gained a larger view of the unwearied activity of the Spirit of God? We must, indeed, be on our guard against depreciating the pre-exilic that we may glorify the post-exilic period. But we shall probably have to make up our minds to the view that the prophetic literature of Israel received considerable additions in the post-exilic period, and that the very process of making them canonical implied some working over of the writings of the older prophets.

Chapter VI

OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS AND HISTORY

IT will be plain that the problems raised in the detailed exegesis of the Old Testament cannot be spoken of here. This being so, I will simply say that the sole object of exegesis is to discover the actual meaning of the words of Scripture. It is an axiom that these are to be taken in their plain grammatical sense, without any reading into them of ideas that are not there, and without any wish to support favourite theories of our own. The single aim of the interpreter is to put himself at his author's point of view, and discover what he himself meant by his words. It is, of course, important to remember that there is a distinction between the obvious

sense and the real sense. To discover the latter is often very difficult, and demands a familiarity with the writer's times, the religious ideas that were familiar to him, and the current sense of the phraseology he employed. Words which bear one meaning to us may have meant something altogether different to the writer and his readers. And a warning should be given in connection with the much-praised practice of interpreting Scripture by Scripture. This has its uses, but it has its dangers. The most vicious form of it is that which treats Scripture as if it were the homogeneous work of a single author. Leviticus has too long been the happy hunting ground of theologians who have aspired to interpret the gospel, and doctrines have been drawn from it with as little hesitation as from the Epistles of Paul. It has been assumed that the gospel was really there, and that nothing was needed but to draw it out. It is true that the Old Testament does supply principles that find their highest expression in the teaching of Christ and the

Apostles, but it is an unhistorical exegesis which reads the New Testament into the Old. We cannot venture to argue unreservedly even from one author to another. Nothing is more necessary than to observe how each writer employs his terms, and this can only be determined by careful study of them in their context, wherever they occur. It is almost unnecessary to say that no quarter must be given to allegorical interpretation which leaves the Bible at the mercy of every fad and caprice of the exegete. And the student must carefully avoid the prophetic school of interpreters, which affords a melancholy example of the fantastic follies to which such crotchets as Anglo-Israelism and Millennium dating will carry their deluded victims. It is a golden rule in the study of the Prophets to start from the principle that the Prophet's main interest is with his own time, and only when this rule is observed do the Prophets become intelligible. If we are bent on seeking after a sign, we may look for prosaic fulfilments of the prophetic visions. But it is

only the incurable conceit of human nature to imagine that the Prophets had a peculiar interest in the closing years of the nineteenth century or the fortunes of the British Empire. Their concern was almost wholly with their own people, and even their happy future is closely linked with the present. But on this no more need be said.

In studying the history of Israel it will be well, for reasons already given, to begin with the early Prophets. The first thing is to gain from them as clear and full a conception as possible of the actual condition of things at the time they wrote. The eighth century Prophets supply an admirable picture of the social, religious, and political condition of Israel in their time. The next thing is to work backwards along two lines. There is, first, the examination of what they tell us as to the earlier fortunes of the people. And secondly, there is the more difficult question as to the course of previous development implied by the state of things described by the Prophets. But, fortunately, we are not

confined to these sources of information. The historical books give us much help. It is true that they often leave whole periods untouched save for the briefest summaries, and that the religious aim of the writers has caused them to pay less attention to political and social history than we could have wished. But they supply invaluable material for the reconstruction of the history. Some of the most important sources are to be found in the historical books. The Song of Deborah is a most precious relic of Hebrew antiquity, and as a contemporary document sets the political condition of the period before us in a most vivid way. David's lament for Saul and Jonathan is similarly, though in a less degree, important. The early narratives of the Hexateuch have also valuable light to shed on the condition of Old Israel. Chronicles has a special value for the student of the post-exilic period. The secular history of the nations with which Israel came in contact is also important, and the inscriptions which have come to light in this century have illu-

minated many of the dark places of history, while much is still expected from those as yet undiscovered or undeciphered. But without enlarging on the sources, I may touch briefly on the various points that demand attention.

Beginning with the Exodus, it would be necessary to examine the previous condition of the Hebrews in Egypt, in order that the work of Moses might be adequately appreciated. The character of Moses and his achievements, the laws that he imposed, the national spirit he created, through stimulating the consciousness that they were the people of Yahweh, will all have to be estimated in their influence on the national development. And with this must be taken the impression created by their deliverance from bondage and the wandering in the wilderness. From this we pass to the history of the Conquest. It is most important to avoid the blunder often made of deriving the history of this exclusively from the narrative in Joshua. The first chapter of Judges must be taken with it, or a one-sided impression

will be produced. The student will then see that so far from exterminating the Canaanites, the Hebrews settled down with them, not always gaining the upper hand. Some knowledge of the Canaanites should be obtained, so that an estimate may be formed of their influence on the Israelites. And there should be added a clear general knowledge of Palestine, the physical features of the country, and the situation of the most important places. A knowledge of the political geography is necessary to make the history intelligible, and the physical geography will throw light on it too. But the physical geography is also important for the estimate of the influence of the climate and physical conditions of the country on the Israelites. For the period of the Judges the main thing to notice is the weakness of the bond between tribe and tribe. There was little national sentiment. Deborah's Song is most instructive on this point. Only a few tribes, comparatively, help against Sisera, the others stand aloof. Judah is not even mentioned,

as if it were not counted part of Israel Judges also informs us that the detailed conquest had to be undertaken by the tribes independently. The whole period, then, is one of weakness and disunion, and the tribes fall a prey to various oppressors. The Philistines bring matters to a crisis, and Samuel creates the monarchy, the symbol of national unity. The work of Saul and David in welding the kingdom together and crushing the formidable enemies of Israel requires careful study, and Solomon's disintegrating domestic policy as preparing the way for the separation of Judah from Israel, to which it had always been somewhat loosely attached. His foreign trade and too indolent foreign policy will be judged by their effects on the social life of the Israelites and their future foreign relations. The course of the two kingdoms must then be followed. The materials are often very slight, and the character of some of the kings, such as Omri and Ahab, is apt to prevent us from realising the great political ability they displayed.

This history of the Northern kingdom is largely a record of wars with Syria and smaller powers, till at last the onward march of Assyria reconciled the two in vain against their common foe. The history of Judah is that of a poorer and a pettier State, and scarcely comes before us in much detail till the time of Isaiah. Many of the reigns are almost a blank to us. Still, it was much more free than the northern kingdom from intestine feud and frequent change of dynasty. With the Prophets we lay our finger on the pulse of the nation's life. From the time of Ahaz till the captivity, the history of Judah is largely implicated with that of the great empires of Assyria and Babylon. The foreign policy advocated by Isaiah and Jeremiah should be examined, and the reason for it discovered. The case of these two Prophets is one of real agreement masked by formal divergence, and is on that account peculiarly instructive. The effect of the Exile on the people may be determined by a comparison of the character of those who went into cap-

tivity with that of those who returned from it, making allowance for the fact that many of them simply surrendered their national faith altogether. A new and startling theory has recently been propounded by Kosters to the effect that the temple was really rebuilt, not by returned exiles, the first return taking place under Ezra, but by those who had been left, when the greater part of the people had been carried into exile, or by their children. This theory has been accepted by Wildeboer and Cheyne, but with the modification that some did return from captivity in the reign of Cyrus. The theory, no doubt, avoids difficulties that beset the common view, yet it is not clear that it is not itself encumbered with greater difficulties. The memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah are of the highest importance for the history of their times, and as showing to us the origin of Judaism. Much of the subsequent history is all but unknown to us. So far as criticism has succeeded in referring documents to this period, we are the gainers of new sources of information. But the fact

that these results are in many cases uncertain makes it impossible to use them with any great confidence.

I am afraid that I have spoken of the study of the history in a very imperfect way, but there is this excuse—the Old Testament writers are so engrossed with the religious side of the history, which falls for mention under the head of Old Testament Theology, that the materials for the general history are often very slight.

Chapter VII

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

I HAVE first to speak of the History of the Religion of Israel. It will be well here, also, to begin with the Prophets of the eighth century B.C. A careful study, though at this stage not necessarily an exhaustive one, will give a view of the popular and prophetic faith as they are there delineated. The question that then arises is this: What does this imply in the way of previous development? The lines on which such an investigation would be pursued would be these: A comparison of the prophetic with the popular theology would show what elements they had in common, and this would go a long way towards determining the conception formed of the previous history. Account would, of

course, be taken of the direct statements of the Prophets on the religious development of Israel. It should be remembered, and this caution is important, that different judgments are passed on these matters by different writers. I do not say that these are inconsistent, but it is clear that in such cases the student must allow, if not for a personal, for a chronological equation, and remember that the standard of ethics varies according as an act in an early age is judged from the point of view of that age or of the age of a later historian. Further, there must have been some preparation for the Prophets of the eighth century. On this Prof. Robertson has made some noteworthy contributions in his "Early Religion of Israel," following lines already indicated by Prof. A. B. Davidson. That he has pushed his views too far is probable, and his literary does not seem to control sufficiently his historical criticism; but such arguments as these—that the phraseology of Amos and Hosea implies a long previous development, that written prophecies imply a reading public, and

that the constant appeals of the Prophets to the better knowledge of the people testify that their views were by no means so novel as is often assumed—deserve serious attention. Along with the early Prophets might be taken the earlier documents of the Hexateuch and the historical books. When some conception has been formed of the probable course of the pre-prophetic religious history, it will be well to work over the ground again from the time of Moses to the eighth century with the help of the historical books that cover this period. The subject may also be attacked from a third side—that of Semitic religion generally. It must never be forgotten that the religion of Revelation strikes its roots into a soil with which the idea of revelation is not commonly associated. Whether such a limitation of the work of the Spirit of God is right or wrong I do not stay to enquire. I call attention to the fact, since it is not possible to understand the religion of Israel aright without reference to the earlier group of religious ideas and practices from which, in the providence of

God, it sprang. These three lines of research will secure, as far as is possible, accurate results much better than if one line alone were to be followed. Results reached by one method may be checked or confirmed by those reached by other methods. When we come to the eighth century, the documents are more abundant and more serviceable for the rest of the history.

The main points to which attention should be directed in the history of the religion may be briefly summarised. The study of Semitic society and religion will show the kind of material on which revelation had to work. Here the constitution of the tribe, and especially the laws of kinship, the influence of the desert, the alleged monotheism of the Semitic race, the religious usages, will demand special study. For while on this much of the accurate knowledge of the religion of Israel depends, it is an apologetic argument of high value if it is made probable that we cannot account for that religion apart from the direct action of God. The work of Moses must then be estimated. His great

merit is that he created the national consciousness of Israel, and placed it on the religious basis of the choice of Yahweh, so that it was His people and He was its God. It is disputed whether the ethical monotheism of the Prophets is to be found in Moses; and while we may shrink from a decided answer, it must be remembered that a great religious genius like Moses may well have been centuries ahead of his time. That the mass of the people fell far below this is beyond dispute, though it is not clear that they were, to any great extent, worshippers of foreign deities. The settlement in Canaan had several results. It shattered the national unity, with all the disaster that meant to the religion, and it brought the hardy Israelites under the enervating influence of the Palestinian climate and of the deadlier Canaanitish worship. The pressure of external oppression hammered them into cohesion, and their victories enhanced their estimate of their national Deity. Morality received a religious sanction through the judicial functions of the priests. The Pro-

phets arose shortly before the establishment of the monarchy, very different, it is true, from Hosea or Isaiah. The origin and early characteristics and functions of both priest and prophet demand careful study. The materials for writing the general religious history of the pre-prophetic periods are rather slight, but a serious attempt should be made to form some idea of it. The greatness of Elijah consists in two things—his emphatic assertion that the worship of Yahweh and the worship of the Tyrian Baal (Melkart) were mutually exclusive, and not, as king and people thought, perfectly compatible with each other, and his equally emphatic stress on morality, as shown in his denunciation of Ahab for the judicial murder of Naboth. Elijah may, or may not, have been a monotheist—that is unimportant. What was wanted just then was not speculative monotheism, but practical monolatry.

We next come to the canonical Prophets. With Amos monotheism becomes explicit, and with it we have a stern righteousness to which oppression of the poor is especially

hateful, and a doctrine of extermination of the wicked from which only a remnant, if that, shall escape. The well-known saying, that Amos is the prophet of morality, and Hosea the prophet of religion, is too epigrammatic to be quite accurate, but it hits off the main characteristic of each. Hosea is the great prophet of Yahweh's patient, inexhaustible love for Israel. In the dark tragedy of his own life, which wrecked his home, he saw mirrored only too plainly the sin of Israel. And in the love which, though thus sorely bruised, would not give the offender up, but strove for her reform, and reunion when purity had been regained, he saw faintly shadowed forth Yahweh's love for His faithless Israel, which would take no rebuff and acknowledge no defeat, but went forward steadily to its goal—the reformation of the nation, and the restoration of the old relations. To understand Isaiah, we must start with his vision, which, as chronology shows, precedes the whole of his prophecies. The truths he learnt in it—the majesty and holiness of Yahweh, the uncleanness of the

people, their destruction and the salvation of a righteous remnant, the inviolability of Zion because it was Yahweh's seat—are all to be traced back to his vision of God, and dominate the whole of his prophetic work. The reform under Hezekiah is his work, and the overthrow of Sennacherib at once vindicated him, and saved for the world the religion of Israel, as yet unable to bear the rude shock of transplantation. In the case of the northern kingdom exile had meant the destruction of the faith the exiles carried with them into captivity, and we can hardly doubt that a like fate would at that time have befallen the southern kingdom. In Micah, Isaiah had one who joined in his denunciations of tyranny and injustice, which, as one of the oppressed, he resented even more keenly. Nor had he any of Isaiah's sense of the inviolability of Zion, which he predicts shall be ploughed as a field. With Manasseh came a long and fanatical reaction, in which the prophetic cause seemed to be hopelessly lost. But with Josiah the wave of progress that had receded so far

returned with mightier force, and went beyond the point it had touched before. A drastic reform was carried out on the lines of the Deuteronomic Law. The local sanctuaries, or high places, were forcibly abolished, and thus one of the chief obstacles in the way of the purification of the religion was removed when they with their abuses were swept away. The centralisation of the cultus is the turning point in its history, for while it left the details of ritual comparatively unaltered, it yet carried with it, as its logical consequence, changes of a far-reaching kind. The untimely death of the righteous Josiah, and the triumphant career of the Babylonians, raised for Habakkuk the problem of suffering that was to engage the attention of Israel's profoundest thinkers for a long time to come. Judah had reformed, yet the promised prosperity had not come, while the ungodly Chaldeans were sweeping all into their net.[1]

But Jeremiah was not misled by the fair

[1] This would have to be modified if Budde's view of the prophecy is correct.

appearance. With keener insight he saw how shallow the reform really was. The time had come for a sharper remedy to be tried. Exile alone can cut the cancer from the nation's life, and he looks forward to the time when temple and ark shall be no longer needed, when a new covenant shall be made, written on the heart. In other words, he made the immeasurable advance from the view which regarded religion as a matter of the State and of ritual and obedience to a code, to the view of it as personal and individual—a matter of the heart and inward impulse. And thus, while he could wish that his head were waters and his eyes a fountain of tears, that he might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of his people, he could behold with composure the downfall of the State, and welcome it as the birth of spiritual religion. For in his own experience he had solved the problem, in fellowship with God he had found rest for his soul. He thus became the father of the faithful, the founder of the invisible Church. And

so when the supports on which the religion had rested had been cut away, and the cherished illusions of his people shattered against the hard realities of a temple in ashes, and the chosen race in captivity, it had already been made independent of these things and was able to survive them. From the doomed city he had turned to the New Jerusalem, and had found a refuge in the secret place of the Most High. And though his followers were for a time comparatively few, yet his work was of the highest importance for the future of religion. The Exile stripped away half-hearted adherents of the prophetic faith: it was well with them, they said, while they served the Queen of Heaven, but misfortune had followed them since they had renounced her service. But others admitted that Jeremiah, who had foreseen the overthrow of the kingdom, was right in his teaching, and set themselves to carry it out.

With Ezekiel we seem to fall away from the splendour of the prophetic ideal. He is the father of Judaism, with its transcendental con-

ception of God, Whose chief concern is for His own glory, its elaborate ritual, its exclusiveness and rigour. But perhaps the time had come when the higher religion needed for its preservation to form a hard protecting shell; and if so, Ezekiel has his place in the economy of Revelation. Nor can we forget that Ezekiel has his evangelic moments, in which he pens utterances that remind us strikingly of Paul. And his emphasis on the doctrine of individual responsibility, and his passionate denial that the sins of the fathers were visited on the children, should not be forgotten. A more attractive personality is that of the Second Isaiah, who rivals Isaiah in loftiness, and Hosea in gracious sweetness, and surpasses both in depth of spiritual insight by his delineation of Israel as the smitten Servant of Yahweh and his solution of the problem of suffering, that the righteous may suffer vicariously for the guilty. It is to this problem, too, that we owe the Book of Job. The writer is attacking the common view that we can argue back invariably from suffering to guilt. Even the

best may suffer, and affliction may be sent as a test of character. The sufferer, who is conscious of his own integrity, must leave himself and his perplexities in the hands of God, and none must venture to vindicate the ways of God to man by a dogmatism that ignores the facts of life and makes even the demands of charity yield to it. The narratives of the Return, both of Zerubbabel and, sixty years later, of Ezra, show us the exclusive spirit of Judaism already at work, and it is probable that Jonah, possible that Ruth, are protests, the former a very powerful one, against the harsh intolerance that prevailed. Jonah is indeed one of the greatest books of the Bible. Nothing is more astonishing than such universalism in a Jew, so deep an insight into the Divine pity; it is a true miracle of grace. The year 444, in which the code of our Pentateuch was accepted as binding law, marks the birth of Judaism, the firstfruits of Ezekiel's work. From this time forward the nation became a people of the Law, more and more controlled by the spirit of legalism. A sad

descent it may seem from the Prophets; yet it had its good side. Many of the loveliest lyrics in the Psalter were written in this period, and reveal an inwardness and a spirituality, an intensity of zeal for God and a passion for fellowship with Him, that can perhaps be matched only in the greatest names that the history of religion has to show. What is more surprising to us, who can hardly understand that the Law could excite any enthusiasm, is the fact that some of the Psalmists reveal the most ardent love for the Law, and speak of it as the chief joy of their lives. Yet even the Psalms have their limitations. And if we must admit that all this mass of external ritual is a poor substitute for the prophetic flame of vital religion, we will not forget that, though the Law came in beside, it was still the appointed servant to guard the heir till he came of age. It did not become an anachronism till the time of tutelage was past, and the religion of the Prophets came once more to its own. Alongside of the life under the Law there were other influences at work, especially

such as found expression in the composition of new prophecies or the editing of old ones, and the writing of Apocalyptic works. These served to keep the religion from the stagnation that legalism tends to bring with it.

Passing to special doctrines and institutions, the student would investigate the doctrines of God and His attributes, the Angels, Man, Sin, the Messiah, the Servant of Yahweh, the Future Life, and such institutions as Sacrifice, Circumcision, Prophecy, the Priesthood, Sacred Seasons and Feasts, the Ark, the Temple, and the local sanctuaries. Some of these will have already received attention in the study of the history of the religion. The examination of the doctrine of God may conveniently begin with the Divine names and their meaning, and their distribution in early and late documents. The Divine attributes should next be studied—His lovingkindness, righteousness, spirituality, eternity, omniscience, omnipresence. Here, again, attention should be fastened on the distribution of these ideas in documents of different dates; and, as far as possible, their history should be

traced. The doctrines of the Divine holiness and unity may be singled out for special mention. Holiness is one of those ideas which have to be traced back to their general Semitic usage. Originally it seems to have been equivalent to taboo in one of its senses, while uncleanness corresponds to the other. A thing is taboo in virtue either of the choice or use of it by a god or chief, in which case it would later have been spoken of as holy; or of some quality which resided in itself and made it dangerous, so that it would be taboo in its own right, in which case it would have been spoken of at a later time as unclean. Traces of this early meaning of the word "holy" are to be found in the ritual legislation of the Priestly Code. A holy thing has the property of communicating holiness to anything with which it comes in contact; thus a garment or a vessel may by contact with a holy thing become holy, and the holiness may be washed out of it. This materialistic conception of a contagious holiness shows that the word has in such cases no moral, but only a ritual, meaning. On all this, "The Religion

of the Semites" is the great authority; it may be supplemented by Frazer's article on Taboo in the "Britannica," and his discussion in the "Golden Bough." The holiness of God probably implies generally His separation from all creaturely weakness and infirmity, and so it comes to mean all that goes to constitute His divinity. By the time of Isaiah the idea has come to be moral; though in the earlier period we find traces of the older physical idea, as we see from 1 Samuel vi. 20, where, after the slaughter of some of the men of Beth-shemesh for looking into the ark, the survivors ask, "Who is able to stand before Yahweh, this holy God?" A doctrine which calls for remark is that of Yahweh as the Holy One of Israel, which seems to mean set apart for Israel. The doctrine of the unity of God must also be studied historically, and to a great extent this will already have been done in the investigation of the religion, where the progress towards monotheism has had to be continually estimated. It might be well to observe any tendency to break up the abstract unity in God

in the direction of Trinitarianism, such as the doctrine of the Angel of Yahweh, or the description of the Divine Wisdom in Proverbs viii. It is needless to say that the Old Testament does not contain the doctrine of the Trinity. In angelology I need only indicate as objects of special study the Angel of Yahweh, the gods, the sons of God, the cherubim and seraphim. The connection of these with the powers of nature should be carefully traced, such as that of the sons of God with the stars, the cherubim with the thundercloud, and the seraphim with the lightning. The evil spirits also demand study. It is not unnecessary to say that from want of a true historic method the demonology of the New Testament has been read into the Old Testament. Otherwise we should hardly have had the Satan of the Book of Job, with the definite article in Hebrew, and regarded as one of the sons of God, identified with Satan in the New Testament. The identity of the name does not imply the identity of the thing, which is precluded by the difference in status and

function alike, though there is a malicious zest in his work about the Satan of Job which makes it easy to see why the name should have become attached to the devil. The Old Testament use may be traced in Job, Zechariah, and Chronicles. Azazel seems also to be an evil spirit. An interesting question is raised as to the influence of Babylonian, and especially Persian, ideas on Jewish demonology; of the latter, Asmodeus, in the Book of Tobit, seems to be a clear example. On the doctrine of man and human nature not much need be said; the Old Testament does not treat it very elaborately. The psychological terms, such as flesh and spirit, call for investigation, and the doctrine that man was created in the image of God. With the doctrine of Man, that of Sin is closely associated. When the origin of sin is in question, it is well to keep the documents in Genesis distinct. The doctrine of Original Sin in the Old Testament must be gathered from the Old Testament alone; it is an anachronism to read into it the Pauline doctrine, which has taken up elements from other sources.

The doctrine of the Messianic Hope must be similarly treated. It must be studied from the Old Testament point of view, and from that alone. Nothing but confusion can result from interpreting the Old Testament prophecies through the New Testament fulfilment. The word Messiah does not occur in the Old Testament as a technical term. Moreover, the technical use should strictly be confined to the hope of a personal Ruler, the Anointed King who rules in righteousness and prosperity. This does not occur at any rate before Isaiah. But it has come to be used in a wider sense of the hope of the happy future, even where, as often happens, the figure of a personal Messiah is not present, and in this sense it is found somewhat earlier. The descriptions given by the various prophets should be collected and compared. The student should be quite sure that he includes none but genuinely Messianic prophecies in his collection, for popular exegesis has been here strangely undiscriminating. Nowhere is careful exegesis more requisite. It is also necessary to remember that the Prophets rarely

look beyond their own age. The Servant of Yahweh in II. Isaiah is Israel, viewed as God's prophet and the teacher of the world. It is a question on which interpreters are divided, whether in Isaiah lii. 13–liii. the Servant is an individual. It is true that individual features are strongly marked in the description of the suffering Servant, and it has been conjectured that it has been written with some historical character to form the basis for the idealized portrait. As to the New Testament fulfilment, perhaps one or two things ought to be said. It is well known that many Old Testament passages are referred to in the New Testament as fulfilled in the life of Christ, where it is quite evident that the original writer had no Messianic thought in his mind. Some of these may be no more than literary allusions, justified by the fact that the writers read the Old Testament through the life and death of Christ. But in other cases we can see a principle underlying their usage. Passages relating to the ideal Israel, and even to the historical Israel, are referred to Christ. Of the latter, we may take

such a case as "When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called my son out of Egypt." This is applied to the return of Jesus from Egypt after the death of Herod. If, in the case of Isaiah lii. 13–liii., we had to decide against the individual reference, the identification of the Servant with Christ may still be justified in so far as we say that He is Israel, in the sense that he sums up Israel in Himself, and takes up and perfectly fulfils the functions of Israel as the revealer of God to the world and the vicarious sufferer for sin. In other words, while the ideal Israel is in the prophet's mind when he speaks of the Servant of Yahweh, it was only in an individual Israelite, in Christ Himself, that the ideal Israel became actual. But however willingly we admit that this prophecy finds its fulfilment in Christ and Him alone, we cannot, if we have either a critical or an exegetical conscience, read back this fulfilment into the prophet's mind. It may also be said that the figure of the Servant of Yahweh is not Messianic, since He is regarded as a prophet, and not as a king. Both ideas coalesce in

Christ, but they are not on that account to be identified. Of the Messianic prophecies several have to be spiritually interpreted before they can be said to be fulfilled in Christ. This is only to say that Jesus did not realise the prophetic ideal because He immeasurably transcended it. The Messianic expectations of His contemporaries had been much influenced by the Apocalyptic literature.

On the Future Life I need say but little. The early view of the Hebrews was that Sheol was the dim underworld to which all men went, and where they lived a shadowy life not worthy of being called life, since all that made life worth living had passed away. Any higher doctrine falls very late. So much is generally admitted. It is a question for exegesis whether certain passages do or do not contain the higher view, though the question of date has also to be taken into account. So far as it is to be found, it seems to be a postulate of the religious instinct, which cares nothing for continuance of life, except for the continuance of fellowship with

God that it brings with it. It is indeed wonderful how completely these writers have risen above the lower motives for desiring a future existence other than that of Sheol, where there was no longer any remembrance of God or possibility of communion with Him. That the higher doctrine is not borrowed from Persian sources, as is sometimes asserted, is almost certain; but we need not deny that Persian influence may have stimulated the Israelites to develop the doctrine which was implicit in their religion.

Of the institutions mentioned the most important is that of Sacrifice. The student should first collect the notices of sacrifice in the prophets and historical books. Next he should pass to the legislation in the various Codes. Even if the late date for the Priestly Code be right, it remains our most valuable source, not simply for the ritual of the Second Temple, but for the early practice. "The conservatism of the religious instinct," and the difficulty of accounting for the origin of many of the customs in a stage of advanced

religious reflection, guarantee their extreme antiquity, and this conclusion is confirmed by the parallels we find in Semitic religions. For the origin and purpose of sacrifice we must go back to these religions, and test our results by the materials afforded by Comparative Religion. The method of survivals is of great value. If we find an institution quite out of harmony with the religious ideas of the people among whom we find it, it is probable that it is a relic of some earlier state of things in which it was in perfect harmony with the thought and practice of the time. And it often happens that we can discover the same practice existing elsewhere, and quite of a piece with the other institutions with which it is associated. Of course it does not do to argue from a single instance, but the wider the induction the more likely for error to be eliminated. Accordingly, when we find a survival, we should try to work back to the condition of things when it was homogeneous with the rest of the ritual, and in harmony with the preva-

lent theological ideas. In this way we can trace back these customs into the pre-historic period, and form some conception of the society and beliefs in which they took their rise. A principle on which Robertson Smith has rightly laid great stress is that we cannot treat the ritual as growing out of the myths we find told to account for it. It is the ritual, on the other hand, that gives rise to the myth. When the custom springs quite naturally out of the popular beliefs, no need for an explanation is felt. It is only when those who practise it have outgrown it, and the dread of change and force of custom keep it alive, that a myth has to be invented to account for it. Many myths are told in various parts of the world to explain the same custom. Further, beliefs and customs are profoundly influenced by the society in which they originate. Thus, to return to the subject of Sacrifice, it will make a considerable difference to our theory if we believe that the Semites passed through the Totem stage, and that Sacrifice took its rise then.

If, again, it was connected with the hunting, or pastoral, or agricultural state, our theory of its origin and character will be modified in each case. The problems as to its original meaning and the development through which it has passed are as follows: Was it meant to appease the anger of the gods, or to win their favour by gifts, or was its purpose to furnish a clan feast at which the deity and his worshippers might strengthen the bond of fellowship with each other? How was the victim regarded—as a substitute for the offerer, or as a choice gift to the deity, or as itself divine and dying to bless its people? Such questions need for their answer a true understanding of the Semitic beliefs as to God and man and the relations that existed between them. Further, if, as is most likely, propitiation was not present in the original idea, at what period did it enter, and to what causes was it due? What was the development of sacrifice in Israel itself? What was the significance ascribed to the imposition of hands, did it identify the

offerer with the victim, or symbolize the transference of guilt? Does the essence of the sacrifice lie in the slaughter of the victim or in the use made of the blood, or, in those cases where the victim was eaten, in the sacred meal? What importance was attached to the blood and the fat, and why? Why was the victim burned in certain cases? Was it to dispose of the holy flesh safely, or to convey the offering to God? What was the meaning of the ritual details of the Day of Atonement, and especially of the sending of the goat to Azazel? These are perhaps the chief, though not all the questions that are raised by the Hebrew sacrifices, and on their correct answer much depends,—something even for Christian doctrine.

The other institutions can only be spoken of briefly. Circumcision is a rite that has had a wide diffusion among peoples who certainly did not borrow it from Israel. On its purpose light may be sought from comparative sociology and religion. Prophecy has already been spoken of. Here, too, the comparative

method will be profitable. It is instructive to see how in the course of development the heathenish elements were worked out, and Hebrew prophecy grew to be altogether unique. When we think of the bands of prophets, whose contagious ecstasy stamps them as essentially of the same type as the prophets of neighbouring peoples, and then of such Prophets as Amos or Jeremiah, we can estimate better the heights which Israelite prophecy attained, and how mighty must have been the spiritual impulse that from so lowly an origin raised it to the pinnacle on which it stands. The history of the priesthood is more obscure than could be wished, though the main points stand out clearly enough. The process should be traced by which from the universal right to sacrifice preference was given to the Levites, then the exclusive right, and finally this was confined to the Zadokite priests at Jerusalem, while the Levites were degraded from the priestly functions on account of their worship at the high places in the days of the kingdom. This will have already been ex-

amined to some extent in order to determine the date of the Priestly Code. I emphasize the great importance for the morality of the religion of the exercise by the priests of judicial functions, of which I have already spoken. The ethical is the universal, and to bring the administration of justice into such close connection with the religion favoured the progress towards universalism. The subject of local sanctuaries has been touched on already in the discussion of the Deuteronomic Reformation. The facts should be carefully collected from the Prophets and Historical Books. The sacred feasts are of importance, especially in their relation to agriculture and to Canaanite festivities. It is not possible to speak of the theology of the individual books, and perhaps sufficient has been already said in the sketch of the history of the religion. On the other points of interest, and they are very many, I must say no more here.

Chapter VIII

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

IN studying New Testament Introduction we may begin with the Pauline Epistles. In addition to those accepted as genuine by Baur (Galatians, Corinthians, Romans i.–xiv.), critics are now almost unanimous in accepting 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon, with Romans xv. and xvi. I need not stay to speak of the hypercriticism which rejects the whole of Paul's Epistles, since the majority of critics who may be counted as radical have strenuously opposed it. Those who are curious on the subject may consult the excellent work of Mr. Knowling, "The Witness of the Epistles," where a very full account is given. Yet we need not be unjust to this hypercriticism. So

far as it calls attention to phenomena which have been overlooked it deserves our thanks, however far we may be from accepting its conclusions. Harnack has said: "It requires a deep knowledge of the problems which the first two centuries of the Christian Church present in order not to thrust aside as simply absurd these attempts, which, as yet, have failed, to deal with the subject in a connected way. They have their strength in the difficulties and riddles which are contained in the history of the formation of the Catholic tradition in the second century. But the single circumstance that we are asked to regard as a forgery such a document as the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians appears to me, of itself, to be an unanswerable argument against the new hypotheses." In addition to the seven Epistles already mentioned, some scholars have accepted portions of Epistles which, as a whole, they reject as spurious; this is the case especially with Colossians and 2 Timothy. We might place the more suspected Epistles in three classes, according to the degree of suspi-

cion with which they are regarded. Colossians and 2 Thessalonians are rejected by several; more reject Ephesians, still more the Pastoral Epistles. The great stumbling-block in 2 Thessalonians is the eschatological passage in the second chapter, which is difficult both in itself and in its relation to the teaching in the first Epistle. The difficulty seems to be a real one, but I think it may be explained away in a reasonable manner. Little theological importance attaches to the question of genuineness. It is very different with Colossians. In this case the course of criticism has been curiously interesting. The old Tübingen school rejected it entirely. But later, Holtzmann and Pfleiderer, while not regarding the Epistle as Paul's in its present state, both believed it to contain a Pauline nucleus. Holtzmann's theory is so ingenious that it deserves to be mentioned. He held that Paul wrote an Epistle to the Colossians, that on the basis of it a subsequent writer wrote our Epistle to the Ephesians, and was so charmed with his work that he decided to give the original Epistle the

benefit of it, and by interpolating extracts from it in Paul's letter, and adding polemical passages against Gnosticism, produced our Epistle to the Colossians. Although the theory is much too complicated to be probable, Holtzmann's work is most valuable, and, as his argument may be made to cut more ways than one, it is not surprising that defenders of the traditional view of the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians have used his investigations to support their position. Von Soden examined his discussion, and came to the conclusion that the reconstruction of the original Epistle broke down when it was tested in detail, and for his own part accepted it as Paul's, with the exception of a few important passages. But, quite recently, he has come to the conclusion that even this reservation is untenable, and now accepts the whole Epistle as genuine. The difficulties urged against the genuineness are mainly these: that the Christology is too developed, though here the acceptance of Philippians cuts the ground away; that the style and phraseology are unlike what we find in the

accepted Epistles, which is true, but not sufficiently strong to bear much weight; and that the heresies spoken of belong to a later age than that of Paul, though this is by no means made out. Whatever the Colossian heresy may be, it is, at any rate, not second-century Gnosticism: it is not even certain that it is Gnosticism at all. Ephesians is rejected with much more decision. There is, first of all, the style, which perhaps constitutes the weightiest objection. Even Godet confesses that it has frequently excited doubts in his own mind. Still, if Colossians be accepted, the difficulty is mitigated. It is also urged that the conception of the universal Church is later than Paul. This is pure assumption; so great a conception is more likely to be Paul's than any one else's, and similar phraseology may be quoted from the earlier letters. Nor do I find anything inconsistent with Pauline authorship in the theology, though objections have been urged on this score also. It is no doubt strange that Paul should speak of the holy apostles; and his association of the others with himself as the

recipients of the revelation that the Gentiles were to be admitted to the blessings of the Gospel has also been regarded as suspicious. Quite early in the critical period its relation to Colossians was counted against the genuineness; it was thought to be a diffuse expansion of the latter. But Holtzmann's researches into the relation of these Epistles have brought out that if the Epistles are by different authors, the borrowing has been mutual. If there are phenomena which point to indebtedness to Colossians on the part of Ephesians, there are indications that point the other way, and make Colossians indebted to Ephesians. Hence the theory of Holtzmann, already mentioned. But the more improbable that theory is the more we are driven to the other interpretation of the facts—that the two Epistles have proceeded from the same hand, and that the hand of Paul. And while the difficulties are real, if we strike the balance, the evidence seems to favour the authenticity. And we may add that the external testimony is excellent, and that so great an Epistle may be more credibly

believed to be the work of Paul than of another writer.

The Pastoral Epistles have been rejected as spurious by practically all advanced and several conservative critics. Some of the latter, such as Meyer, rejected all three; others, as Neander, only 1 Timothy. It is interesting that Delitzsch thought the phenomena suggested that they were written by a Paulinist on a Pauline basis. I have already said that some advanced critics find Pauline passages in 2 Timothy. English critics generally accept the Pauline authorship. Of the objections urged, some appear to me to be untenable, but others to be very weighty. I cannot attach much importance to the fact that they belong to a period of Paul's life otherwise unknown to us. If Paul was not released from the imprisonment recorded in Acts, they cannot be genuine; if he was, they may or may not be. It seems more probable that he was released. Nor does the character of the heresy attacked necessarily prove a late date any more than in the case of Colossians. But even if these and some minor difficulties be set aside, the

objections that remain are very serious. The style of the letters is quite unique; and even if we lay no stress on the many words found nowhere else in Paul, yet the structure of the sentences, and the other phenomena which go to make up what we call style, do not impress us as Pauline. Again, as to organisation, even if we have not passed into the stage of the three orders, yet we find much stress laid on ecclesiastical organisation, little on the spiritual gifts. And if we admit that one who combined the practical with the speculative as Paul did would have felt that the ecclesiastical organisation was worthy of great attention, yet it is not what we expect in Paul to find him so occupied with details of this kind. As to the theology, even if we ignore the specific differences that have been pointed out, it is hard to deny that the great emphasis on the importance of sound doctrine, and the use of faith in the sense of orthodoxy, are strange in Paul. And though the evangelical element is not absent, yet the tone of the letters is distinctly moralistic rather than evangelical. Further, it is strange

that Paul should have felt it necessary, after leaving Timothy and Titus, to write such elaborate instructions to them, which it might have been supposed he would have given them when he was with them. Nor is it easy to understand why, in a letter to Timothy, Paul should assure him so strongly that he was a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. And if Timothy was fit to be entrusted with a mission so responsible as that on which we find him, it seems unlikely that Paul should have felt it necessary to warn him to keep clear of heretical teaching. And, besides these difficulties, there is another. It is hard to read these Epistles, especially 1 Timothy, and Titus in a less degree, without feeling that the Pauline ring is strangely absent. This is a matter of impression, but to those who are impressed by it, it is among the most cogent arguments against the authenticity. I would not say as Beyschlag does with reference to 1 Timothy: "The man who is now able to ascribe it to the author of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians has never comprehended

the literary peculiarity and greatness of the apostle." Yet what he puts in this extreme way is a real and not imaginary difference. On the other hand, the external evidence is good, and the numerous personal details and trivial matters, such as the cloak left at Troas, are not likely to have been inserted by a writer who was personating the apostle, whereas in Paul's own writings they are quite natural. These details occur almost entirely in two sections, in 2 Timothy i. 15–18, and iv. 9–21. And these sections are thought to be genuine by some critics who reject the authenticity. Of course this is open to objections; yet, if the Epistles have to be surrendered, there is no reason for refusing to rescue any Pauline fragments. No doubt the presence of such fragments constitutes a presumption of the genuineness of the letter in which they are found, but only a presumption, which has to be balanced against the arguments on the other side. As to the weight of authority, it can hardly be denied that it is decidedly against the authenticity, if we leave aside the names of

those who first accept the genuineness and then find reasons for doing so. But, even so, the fact that critics of such eminence, impartiality, and freedom from a tendency to let their criticism be controlled by deference to tradition, as Dr. Hort and Dr. Sanday—to name the two whose verdict weighs most with me on that side—still believe the letters to be genuine, makes me very distrustful of my own impressions. In any case the suspicion which hangs over them is so great that it would be unwise to use them with any confidence as sources of knowledge of Paul and his work.

Some other points raised by the Pauline Epistles may be briefly mentioned. Some of these might come equally well under the head of history, but it will be convenient to take them here. In the Epistles of the second group, should Galatians come before or after Corinthians? and, similarly, in the third group, should Philippians come before or after Ephesians and Colossians? Then, to what Churches was the Epistle to the Galatians written? Are we to understand by the Churches of Galatia

those founded by Paul in South Galatia on his first journey, or churches in North Galatia possibly founded by him on the second? What letters passed between Paul and the Corinthian Church? and have we any of those supposed to be lost still embedded in our Second Epistle? If so the letter referred to in 1 Corinthians v. 9 would probably be preserved in 2 Corinthians vi. 14–vii. 1; and the letter supposed to have been written between our first and second Epistles might be partially preserved in 2 Corinthians x.–xii. Was the Epistle to the Ephesians written to that Church or to some other, or is it a circular letter addressed to several Churches?

The Epistle to the Hebrews, it may be said dogmatically, is not the work of Paul. This is proved by style, language, method of quotation, method of argument and theological point of view. The actual author is, of course, uncertain. Luther conjectured Apollos, and many critics have accepted this, the most serious objection being that he is nowhere mentioned as the author by ancient writers. Barnabas is men-

tioned as the author by Tertullian, and this is possible. But since in the case of all that have been mentioned, including Luke, Silas, and Clement, the arguments are not strong, it seems wisest to rest content in ignorance. It is also disputed to what readers it was sent. The Hebrew Christians of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Rome have been suggested, though it is quite possible that it was none of these. Its date is generally placed shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, and this is probably right, though some have dated it later in the century. The Epistle of James is by some critics made the earliest book of the New Testament. It is more probable, however, that it should be dated somewhere in the sixties. Its genuineness has been denied by many, but on rather slender grounds. 1 Peter has been placed by Weiss earlier than any of Paul's Epistles, an eccentricity in which few have followed him. The view is bound up with a historical theory, as to which I will quote the refreshingly frank words of Beyschlag: "I have long been convinced of the untenableness

of Weiss's conception of the Epistles, and regard the existence of a pre-Pauline Jewish Christian Church, stretching from Pontus to Bithynia and Asia, as a historical absurdity." The Epistle presents marked coincidences with Romans, Ephesians, and James, and the general view, which is much the more probable, regards 1 Peter as indebted to these. The date is controverted. Some critics still place it in the reign of Trajan; but in face of our better knowledge of the relations between the Roman government and the Church such a view seems no longer tenable. Ramsay dates it about 75–80 A.D.; but the grounds on which he does so are not allowed by Mommsen, so that if the latter scholar is right it is not necessary to throw the date so late. If it is as late as this, it is not probable that it is the work of Peter. That 2 Peter is not genuine is the opinion of most critics, though Spitta has recently made an attempt to rehabilitate it, and several English scholars still regard it as authentic. The state of things presupposed, the literary dependence on Jude, the reference

to a Pauline collection of Epistles which are treated as Scripture and have already been the objects of considerable misinterpretation, with other minor reasons, make the genuineness improbable.

Passing to the Gospels, the student is first confronted with the Synoptic Problem. There are two main theories—the oral and the documentary. The oral theory accounts for the remarkable coincidences in our first three Gospels by ascribing them to the fixed form assumed by the oral instruction as to the life of Christ given in the early Church at Jerusalem, and independently remembered by the authors. This theory accounts for the variations easily by failure of memory as to the exact phraseology. But it is open to serious objections. It is improbable that the oral tradition should have become so stereotyped, as we often find passages in our Gospels indicating that it must have been. Further, even if the phraseology had become thus fixed, it is not likely that it should have been remembered so faithfully by three independent writers, with all

allowance for the retentiveness of the Oriental memory, especially as the memory has been so capricious in this case, sometimes retaining and sometimes varying the language of the oral tradition. Next there are frequent touches of so light a character that their preservation in oral tradition is most unlikely. There is also a definite order of incidents to be traced, and as this order is not chronological, but practically the order of Mark, it is very unlikely that it was formed in oral tradition, both because this is in itself improbable, and because Papias lays stress on the unsystematic character of Peter's preaching, which lies at the basis of Mark's Gospel. Then these Gospels deal almost exclusively with the ministry of Christ in Galilee, and this is strange if they represent a cycle of oral teaching formed in Jerusalem. The coincidences are also such that we must postulate a Greek source, whereas we should naturally have expected the oral tradition to have been in Aramaic. And if we carry back the parts common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke to a common oral tradition, how are we to account for the

still greater coincidences between Matthew and Luke where Mark has nothing? If these passages were all in the oral tradition, why have they been left out by Mark, whose narrative is generally allowed to come closest to that tradition? These difficulties seem so strong that most critics now account for the phenomena by a documentary hypothesis. This is open to the objection that the numerous divergences between the Gospels in the common sections is not what we should expect if they were writing with documents before them. This may be largely accounted for by the freedom with which each writer manipulated his materials. And it is free from the criticisms which can be urged with fatal force against the oral theory. There is also a positive argument that should be mentioned. In both Matthew and Mark, after the mention of "the abomination of desolation," the words occur, "let him that readeth understand." There is no probable explanation of this except that both are here copying a document, or that one is copying from the other. If both were independently reproducing

an oral tradition, the reference would have been to the hearer, not to the reader. If then we accept the documentary hypothesis, it seems inevitable that two documents should be assumed—one to account for the parts common to all three Gospels, the other to account for the parts common to Matthew and Luke. The former document may be identified with Mark on cogent grounds. Matthew and Luke have nothing in common outside the limits of Mark. Their agreement begins and ends at the points where he begins and ends. Then Mark's order is almost invariably the order of either Matthew or Luke, when it is not that of all three. But rarely if ever do Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. Further, Mark has more in common with Matthew and Luke than they have with each other. If we admit that Mark is the earliest, there is the question whether any document lies behind it. Holtzmann, who formerly thought so, has now abandoned this view, rightly, as it seems. The double tradition of Matthew and Luke is best connected with the Logia of Matthew, mentioned by Papias,

a collection of discourses with brief historical notices. This cannot be identified with our present Matthew for various reasons. It was written in Hebrew or Aramaic, while our Matthew was certainly written in Greek originally. Tradition also places it earlier than Mark, whereas our Matthew was later. Nor would an apostle be likely to have used the work of Mark, who was not an eye-witness. The fact that the double tradition consists almost entirely of discourses makes the connection with the Logia probable, and this is confirmed by the fact that our First Gospel still retains the name of Matthew, though it can hardly be his in any other sense than that it has incorporated his work. It is a long step from connecting the Logia with the double tradition to its reconstruction. The chief outstanding question relates to a possible use of the Logia by Mark. In favour of it we have the fact that in a few cases Luke and Matthew agree against Mark, where their version seems preferable. This may be accounted for on the view that all three drew from the Logia, and that Mark altered the

words. Or it may be explained on the hypothesis, recently adopted by some of our ablest critics, that Luke had a certain knowledge of Matthew. The objection to Mark's use of the Logia would be his strange omission of such passages as the Sermon on the Mount, and many other discourses, though we have to set against Luke's knowledge of our Matthew his omission of several of Matthew's passages, most congenial to his own spirit. The parts peculiar to either of the Gospels also constitute a difficult problem. As to the dates, the Logia, Mark, and Matthew may all be earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem. Luke may come about 80 A.D. On the interesting questions raised by Resch and Prof. Marshall as to the Semitic sources of our Gospels, I do not venture to speak.

The Acts of the Apostles presents interesting problems. The chief relates to the unity of authorship. Many critics regard the "we-sections," as they are called, as the genuine work of a companion of Paul, incorporated by a later writer, the author of Acts. Against

this view these arguments may be urged. It is improbable that a writer of such literary skill should have allowed these sections to stand unaltered, so as to give the impression that he wrote them himself. Then the style is identical, and the explanation that this is due to a working over of the sections by the author is rendered improbable by the fact that he has not altered the first person plural, which would be the first thing to be altered. There are also cross-references from them to other parts of the book assumed by the hypothesis to have been later. The correctness of the author in his use of political terms points to an early date, even for the parts that do not belong to these sections; and he shows knowledge of a state of things that existed in the first century, but had passed away by the second. The unity of authorship and the first century date seem then to be probable. There still remains the question: What sources has the author used? It can scarcely be said as yet that this has been adequately discussed. Theories have been sketched by Spitta and Feine, which will have

to be thoroughly tested before it would be wise to give an opinion. In a recent important work on Acts by Blass, the view has been put forward that Luke himself issued two recensions of his work, one being represented by our critical texts, the other by the Western text, which exhibits what seem very strange variations. This theory also requires much more discussion than it has yet received before it would be safe to pronounce an opinion upon it.

The Johannine writings would come for review last. It will be convenient to take the First Epistle with the Gospel, as the author of one was almost certainly the author of the other. The student will have to deal with the following problems. Do the Apocalypse and the Gospel proceed from the same or different authors? If from the same, was John the author? If from different authors, did John write the Apocalypse or the Gospel, or neither? Then taking up the Apocalypse, is it a unity, or is it of composite authorship? If of composite authorship, how much of it, if any, is of Jewish origin, and how much of Christian? what are the dates of the

various documents and of the final redaction? and by what stages has the book reached its present form? These questions as to the Apocalypse are now engaging the attention of critics, and so far definite results can scarcely be said to have emerged. As to the Gospel, various positions are taken up. Many critics regard it as in no sense the work of John, others regard it as altogether his. There are several gradations between these views. Some, as Renan, think the history is derived from John; others, as Matthew Arnold, think that the speeches are composed out of genuine sayings of Jesus. Others recognise a Johannine nucleus of tradition worked up by a later writer. The arguments against the genuineness are based on the wide differences between it and the Synoptists, on the improbability that an unlearned Galilean fisherman could have written so artistic and so deeply speculative a work, on various expressions that he uses, such as "high priest that year," "the Jew's passover," and the like. The first two difficulties are the more serious. Yet, on the

other hand, it may be said that the divergence between John and the Synoptists may tell rather in favour of Johannine authorship than against it. For, in many respects, the Fourth Gospel gives what must be regarded as an intrinsically more probable account. This applies to the duration of the ministry, the visits to Jerusalem, even, it may be fairly held, to the discourses of Christ; nor are there hints wanting in the Synoptists themselves of the course of events delineated by John. No doubt what weighs most with many critics is the reason to which Weizsäcker declares all the rest to be subordinate—that it is inconceivable that a primitive apostle "should have come to regard and represent his whole former experience as a life with the incarnate Logos of God." He adds: "The question is decided here, and finally here." But here we pass from the domain of criticism to that of dogma, and in this work such an argument does not even fall to be considered, though it has to be discussed by writers on Apologetics or Systematic Theology. So far

as the question is a critical one, it must be settled by purely critical methods. The internal evidence for the authenticity is strong, as may be seen by reference to the works I have named. The external evidence is also good, and has been much strengthened by recent discoveries. Many critics who do not accept the Johannine authorship have shown a tendency to come nearer to the traditional view than was the case with the Tübingen school. It is not necessary to linger on the Second and Third Epistles of John, the main question relates to the authorship, and to the reader or readers addressed in the former letter.

Chapter IX

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY

IT is unnecessary to speak of New Testament exegesis, since it is not possible to say anything of its problems in detail; and as to principles, I have nothing to add to what I said with reference to the Old Testament. I will therefore pass on at once to speak of New Testament history. The foundation for this special study should be laid in the wider study of the general state of society into which Christianity was born. This need not extend beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire. Some knowledge should be gained of the political conditions and of the Roman government. Then some idea should be formed of the religious condition of the empire, both in Greece and Rome, and in the more barbarous

countries. Some acquaintance should be made with current philosophy. The investigation should be more thorough when it touches the Jewish people. The political conditions will have to be examined, especially the adjustment of the Roman and native jurisdictions. Then the religious schools and the contemporary religious literature should receive some attention. It must be understood that this is not to be confined to Palestinian Judaism, but take in the Judaism of the Dispersion. The importance of all this preliminary study is very great. For one thing, it lends significance to the statement that Christ came in the fulness of time. For another, it helps us to realise how far Christianity was indebted to its environment for the form it took. Whether Paul owed anything to Greek philosophy, whether the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews is Palestinian or Alexandrian in some important features, are questions of moment, which need a knowledge of Greek and Jewish thought for their solution. Then the problems connected with the spread of the Gospel are nearer a solution if we know

the part played by the Jews of the Dispersion in preparing for Christianity by diffusing among the Gentiles a monotheistic faith, free in a great measure from the narrower features of Judaism. And generally it is true, here as elsewhere, that no history can be understood apart from the contemporary history to which it is related.

In studying the life of Christ the student may begin with the Pauline Epistles, and then pass to the Gospels. It will be wise to keep the history in the Synoptists distinct from that in John, and when both have been independently examined, they may be brought into connexion. No doubt we touch here on one of the most critical of all the questions raised in this subject. It will obviously make a great difference if we accept or reject the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Yet even this is not decisive for the question of its historical value. Some who fully accept it would be ready to admit that through lapse of time recollection had become less keen, and that the development had not been so accurately marked, earlier being blended with later

stages. And, on the other hand, some who cannot accept the authenticity would admit that much historical matter had been preserved for us in the Gospel. It is not the fact that the Johannine tradition stands absolutely alone. There are traces of an independent tradition which corroborates John's account of the history. There are significant hints in the Synoptists themselves that the ministry was by no means so exclusively Galilean as we might gather, if we were confined for our knowledge simply to them. In fact, it may be questioned whether any view is not fundamentally wrong which does not start from the principle that, looked at as histories, the Synoptic Gospels are very one-sided and incomplete. In those cases where John gives us the most decidedly different impression from that which the other Gospels give us, it is the case that his narrative is sometimes intrinsically more probable. So far, then, as the history goes, it is not altogether true that the authorship settles everything. Even if the writer were not John, he may have had access to an excellent tradition, and that

this was so is, I think, made probable by the considerations already adduced. Such a view seems more truly critical than one which regards the history as a mere allegory, or as setting forth the early history of the Church under the guise of a life of Christ. That the history is an allegory may be admitted, but it may be fairly held that it is allegory because it is history. In the life of Christ we have the revelation of the eternal under the conditions of space and time, and how could such a history be other than an allegory? And to the author of this Gospel, be he John or another, belongs the glory of making the inner significance of the history plain, while yet it remains history. As I accept the authenticity, I have no difficulty in using it as a source for the history; but for those who do not occupy the same standpoint I would still suggest that much valuable historical material may be derived from it, though obviously they would use it with more reserve. The use of the Synoptists as sources will also have to be critical, for we cannot refuse to distinguish between primary and secondary

sources, and for this the various strata in the Gospels have to be discovered by criticism. Here the conclusions reached in the study of the Synoptic Problem will have to be applied.

Coming then to the actual history, there will be chronological questions that will demand attention. Among those of special importance may be mentioned the date of the birth of Christ, the duration of His ministry, the date of the Last Supper and of His death. Then, as to the history itself, it should begin with a study of the work of John the Baptist. This leads on naturally to the Baptism of Jesus, and the consciousness of His Divine Sonship then attained. It is this which gives significance to the Temptation which immediately follows. The retirement into the wilderness is that He may think out what was involved in His position of Sonship, and might by thorough testing become sure of Himself and His mission. Accordingly the first two temptations, following the order of Matthew, are temptations to doubt His Sonship, the third is a temptation to take the lower road to a swifter but superficial success. And

thus unshaken in His conviction, and faithful to His high ideal, He is ready to begin His ministry. At this stage it is necessary to examine the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, and compare it with the expectations current at the time. In this way the course of the history will be much plainer and more easily understood. On another matter it is well to form some opinion on the question how far Jesus had a plan, and how far He from the outset of His ministry contemplated His rejection and violent death. The innumerable points of detail cannot be touched on here; to do so one would need to analyse the Gospels and reproduce the analysis. But attention should be kept throughout on the salient points of the history, the relations with the people, with the Pharisees, with the Sadducees, who interfere much later, the falling away of the more lightly impressed through offence at His teaching, or through the growing hostility that menaced Him, with the increasing devotion shown by the dwindling band of followers, who had found in His teaching words of eternal life. And

so the process culminates on one side in His death, and on the other in the creation of the Church.

The history of the apostolic age may be sought first in the Epistles of Paul, then in the Acts of the Apostles. In connexion with the Jerusalem Church these points should be noticed—its growth, its communism, its organisation, the relation of the various elements in it, the type of piety, the conflict with the authorities. Then the significance of Stephen and his views as pointing to a liberal tendency at work. This seems to me often much exaggerated, especially with reference to Paul. There is no hint in Stephen's speech that he thought of the Law as obsolete. The sanctity of the temple is quite another matter. Then there is the effect of the persecution in the diffusion of the Gospel among Samaritans and Gentiles. In this connexion it is important to remember that while Paul did the chief work in founding Gentile Churches, yet important Churches were founded by others; of this the Church of Rome is the most conspicuous

example. The hints as to the progress of the Church apart from Paul's work, which are scattered up and down in the New Testament, should be carefully traced. Indications of the social rank of converts, of their numbers, of the opposition or favour of the Government or the people, should also be brought together. Of course the chief interest attaches to Paul. There is first his persecution of the Christians, then his conversion, his retirement, his quiet foundation work before he is sent on his mission. Then the first journey should be followed, after which comes the dispute about circumcision and the Apostolic Conference. It is generally thought that here Galatians ii. and Acts xv. supplement each other. A few, and notably Prof. Ramsay, have objected to this identification, and referred the visit recorded in Galatians to the time of the famine mentioned in Acts xi. Then the second journey, in connexion with which arises the vexed question already mentioned in speaking of New Testament Introduction as to the identity of the Churches of Galatia. Is the term used in

the wider sense to include the districts visited by Paul on the first journey, or is it used in the narrower sense, in which case the Acts gives no hint of the formation of Churches in that district? There is no need to dwell here on the rest of his missionary activity till the time of his imprisonment. But it will be necessary to follow his relations with his Churches, as revealed to us in his Epistles. It goes without saying that his great controversy with the Judaisers for freedom against legalism must be steadily kept in view throughout. His treatment of other questions, such as those dealt with in 1 Corinthians, is also instructive for the light it throws on the state of the Churches. Whether Paul was released from the imprisonment recorded in Acts is a question that calls for attention here, and in connexion with it the Roman Law or judicial administration of that period is to be taken into account. Turning to other matters, the most important is undoubtedly the destruction of Jerusalem. This catastrophe brought matters to a crisis with Jewish Christianity, so that it was compelled

to go forwards or backwards, and it was further of great historical moment, since it transferred prestige from Jerusalem to other centres, such as Ephesus and Rome. The last stage of the history is connected with the settlement of John at Ephesus, which, however little we may really know about it, rests on tradition much too good to be set aside.

It will be convenient at this point to say something of the Tübingen construction of the history. Starting from the principle that thought moves through thesis and antithesis to synthesis, it developed the theory that over against Jewish Christianity, Paulinism arose as its antithesis, and that these opposites were blended in a higher unity in the Catholic Church. A sharp antagonism was supposed to exist between the two sections, and the older apostles were supposed to have been hostile to Paul. The process of reconciliation was gradual, and has left its mark on the literature, every piece of which should be dated according to the place it filled in the dialectical movement. The Ebionites and Marcion stood

as uncompromising representatives of primitive Jewish Christianity and Paulinism respectively, and were branded as heretics for their pains. The Catholic Church was formed by accepting the legalism of Jewish Christianity and the universalism of Paul, while abandoning the particularism of the former and the antinomianism of the latter. The theory necessitated the denial of the greater number of the New Testament books to the authors whose names they bear. The grounds on which this view was based may be thus summarised. The Epistles to the Galatians and the Corinthians show the hostility felt by the Judaisers, including the primitive apostles, to the person, teaching, and work of Paul. In the Apocalypse we find John fiercely attacking the doctrines and apostolic pretensions of Paul. Then in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions we have a trustworthy indication of the Jewish-Christian feeling on this subject, Simon Magus, the opponent of Peter, being simply an Ebionite pseudonym for Paul. Further in the other New Testament writings we find traces of the

controversy and a gradual drawing together of the two parties. Then we have the neglect into which Paul and Paulinism fell through the greater part of the second century, a neglect which testifies to the rejection of his most characteristic teaching. Lastly, we have in the Acts a history of the apostolic age, written with the intention of hushing up the scandal of the division between Paul and the Apostles and of proving their essential harmony, and for this purpose the author suppressed, invented, or distorted facts as best suited the conditions under which he wrote. This was supposed to be made out by a comparison of the book with the history as told in the Epistles, and by the studied parallel between Peter and Paul. We owe very much to the Tübingen school. Baur made scholars feel that the origin of the Catholic Church was a problem for the historian, and by no means a thing that explained itself. And by insisting on the fact that each piece of early Christian literature must be regarded as having a definite place relevant to the rest of the literature and the ecclesiastical move-

ment as a whole, he lifted criticism from the habit of treating individual books in an isolated way. And he did bring to light a great fact in the early history, though it had not the all-important place assigned to it. But we have moved very far from his positions. The priority of Mark, the historical existence of Simon Magus, the proof that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated Luke, the certainly earlier date proved for the Fourth Gospel,—all these and other results of criticism have modified profoundly the Tübingen construction of the history. Nor is this all. It made Paul more important than Christ, though not to the extent sometimes thought, whereas criticism tends to make plainer and plainer the supreme importance of Jesus for the development of the Church. And it was too narrow. It saw nothing in the history but this conflict ending with compromise by the surrender of extremes, whereas the early history of the Church was far more complex, with many factors of which Baur made nothing at all. Too much was made of the logical process, too little of the

living men. Nor can we now treat the neglect of Paul in the second century as due to hostility to him. It was rather the sheer inability of the Gentile Christians to understand the Hebrew Paul. They came to the interpretation of the Gospel with all the presuppositions derived from their very different training, and as a matter of course their solutions were widely different. Yet with all the divergence between the reconstruction of the history which Baur gave and that which is probably true, let us never forget how immense is the debt we owe to him for setting us our problems and the stimulus he has given to critical investigation. And indeed I am not sure if, in the rebound from his views, we have not been carried too far in the opposite direction.

Chapter X

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

IN New Testament Theology we begin, as elsewhere, with Paul. We can only put ourselves at the right point of view for understanding his theology by study of the man and his life before his conversion. On its external side we have his birth into a family of Pharisees, and his training under Gamaliel; his life in Tarsus, a famous city of Greek culture; his Roman citizenship. But what was of supreme importance for his subsequent work was his experience of life under the Law. This is sketched for us with the subtlest analysis, yet with the most vivid and masterly strokes, in Romans vii., a truly wonderful piece of psychological insight. Here at any rate we may find a preparation for Christianity in his

vain pursuit of righteousness through the Law culminating in despair. Whether he had been troubled with misgivings before his conversion is a question on which the best authorities are divided. Even though we admit, as we probably should, that the goads against which it was so hard for him to kick were not conscientious scruples, but the will of Christ, yet the expression points to conscious resistance on the part of Paul. It is surely probable that a man like Paul would reason with the Christians; and, if so, he would learn the chief points of their case. He can hardly have helped being impressed by their testimony to the resurrection, which, if true, would remove the offence of the accursed death of the cross. And he was only too conscious that with all his efforts he had himself failed to win righteousness, and he may have wondered if Jesus really was the Servant of Yahweh, whose death was to make many righteous. If so, the vision on the road to Damascus, which convinced him that Jesus was risen, was the fact required to bring him to decision. On the other hand,

it may be urged, as by Weizsäcker, that there is no hint of any hesitation on Paul's part, or sign of misgiving as to the truth of his position and the rightness of his conduct. Even more important is the question if his universalism was reached at the time of his conversion, or if it was a later growth. The evidence usually quoted to prove the latter alternative seems to me quite inconclusive. The absence of the distinctive tenets of Paulinism in the speeches in the Acts and in the Epistles to the Thessalonians is irrelevant, for we know that before Paul set foot in Europe at all he had fought the battle of liberty at Jerusalem. If then he passes by these questions in Epistles written subsequently to converts who had had the benefit of his teaching, how could we expect to find them discussed in his missionary sermons, where he had to start from what he had in common with his hearers? And, on the other hand, the mere fact that for his salvation privilege had counted for nothing, and that he had been saved by faith, which could be exercised by Gentile as well as Jew,

must have had its significance for him. Not only so, but he connects so closely the inner revelation of God's Son with his mission to the Gentiles that it seems most probable that they were associated in his experience. Nor should we depreciate the revolutionary character of his conversion. In this experience he knew himself to be one with Christ. And as one with Him he was lifted to a new point of view, to new sympathy with the universal grace of God. From the barren island of sectarian prejudice, on which he had so long been stranded, he had been plucked by a miracle of mercy and swept into the strong current of God's eternal purpose and eternal love, which bore along the whole universe to the summing up of all things in Christ. In his own experience that grace was all and that privilege was less than nothing he had realised the universal nature of his faith. The question is part of the wider one whether development can be traced in the Pauline doctrine. No doubt reflection and controversy served to bring out into explicit affirmation—perhaps, in

some cases, even into explicit consciousness—some features of his system; the whole doctrine was present, I believe, in germ from the first, and consciously held before he wrote our earliest Epistle.

It must be kept in mind that the relative importance of the various parts of Paul's theological system cannot be determined by the prominence given to them in his Epistles, since this was often due to the fact that they are much occupied with the defence of doctrines attacked. Where there was no controversy doctrines are often taken for granted, and some of the most important statements occur quite incidentally. The arrangement cannot be determined beforehand by a scheme borrowed from Dogmatics, it must be reached through a constructive interpretation which will exhibit that theology as a living whole. It is the product of experience, and in his experience the key to his theological development is to be sought. His doctrine of sin, flesh, and the Law rests on the experience of his pre-Christian state, his doctrine of salvation on his Christian

experience. It follows from this that in our construction of his doctrine we must be guided in the main by the glimpses he gives us of his spiritual development. From the happy state of childish innocence he had been rudely awakened by learning of the Law, which brought with it the knowledge of his own sinfulness. Not only of this, but with it a feeling of rebellion against it. Not wholly of rebellion, however, for there was an assent to the excellence of the Law, and a desire for conformity with it. He was, in fact, torn two ways. The flesh fought against the Law, the mind or inner man fought to fulfil it. It was the Law which had plunged him into this strife, and since its issue was the victory of the flesh, it was through the Law that he had become the slave of sin. Yet the Law was not to blame for this, it was sin that perverted the Law to its own base uses, and thus by turning the holy Law of God into its instrument revealed its own character. But how was it possible for sin thus to abuse the Law? It was on account of the flesh. The flesh was the home of sin, yet sin was dead

till the Law came. But when it was brought into contact with the flesh, the slumbering sin leapt to consciousness and revolt. Apart from the Law sin was dead, apart from the flesh it had no foothold in man. Now this brings us face to face with difficult yet important problems. What did Paul mean by the flesh in the specific sense in which he uses it here, and what was his doctrine of the flesh? Holsten held that Paul's doctrine shows marks of Greek philosophy. Flesh and body are the same thing under the categories of matter and form respectively. Flesh is the finite and perishable, in contrast to spirit, the divine, infinite, and eternal. But it is in the sphere of the will that this contrast is especially prominent. So all sin resides in the flesh, and the flesh is essentially sinful. Man is essentially nothing but flesh. Against this the following objections must be urged. First, it is a question whether Paul exhibits any trace of Greek philosophy. Beyschlag points out that, in his discussion of the resurrection, Paul treats the resurrection of the body or extinction as the two alternatives,

without considering the third possibility of the immortality of the disembodied soul, and this as showing how false it is to seek for traces of Greek influence in his theology. Further, it is improbable that the view, which Holsten shares with other writers, that flesh and body are at bottom identical will stand. Among the works of the flesh Paul includes sins that are not physical. Again, I do not think that Holsten's conception of the Pauline doctrine of the flesh would yield the Pauline doctrine of sin, but something much less ethical. Nor is it true that Paul's conception of human nature is so Manichæan; there is a higher element in it than flesh,—there is the mind. Pfleiderer, in the first edition of his "Paulinism," accepted the view that the flesh was essentially sinful, but rejected the Manichæan elements in the theory, and presented it in a more reasonable light. On the other hand, Wendt and Dickson argued that Paul throughout adheres to the Old Testament point of view, according to which the flesh is a synonym for creaturely weakness and infirmity. It is not essentially

sinful. But against this must be urged the difficulty that it is hard to account for the strength of Paul's language about the flesh if he meant nothing more than this. It must be remembered that it is not the mere passive tool of sin. It is actively hostile to God. In it dwells no good thing, with it he serves the law of sin, the flesh lusts against the spirit, and has works of its own and a mind which leads to death. It is the flesh which makes the Law weak, because it is the flesh of sin. The mind of the flesh is enmity against God, and they who are in the flesh cannot please Him. Could mere creaturely weakness have justified such an indictment, especially in an apostle who adhered to the Old Testament usage, and therefore did not forget how the very fact that mankind is flesh is there urged as an apology for human weakness? Further, I believe it is a mistake to lay stress on the Old Testament in this connexion. For one thing the doctrine is not prominent in the Old Testament, for another I think that Paulinism, meaning by this what is most character-

istically Pauline, is much less influenced by the Old Testament than could naturally have been expected. For example, Paul's doctrine of the Law as the strength of sin is as unlike what we find in the Psalms as we can well imagine. It was the product of his own experience, and this, I believe, was decisive for his doctrine of the flesh. Why he chose the term flesh to express this side of his nature, which stood in such antagonism to the law of God, is not clear. It may have started from the physical sense of flesh as practically equivalent to body, and by a natural extension from a connexion with physical sins have come to be used for the seat of sin in general. Only in the case of Paul, whose temptations seem not to have been to coarse physical indulgence, this seems improbable. Or it may start from the Old Testament use, and from the antithesis between man as flesh and God as spirit come to express the sinful element in man as opposed to the holiness of God. Yet there is this difference. As the Old Testament uses the word, man is merely flesh. Paul regards man as

consisting of flesh and mind. The precise origin of the term is of less importance than the Pauline use of it, and what I am chiefly concerned to insist on is, that the flesh is not the body nor a synonym for mere creaturely weakness, but all that in human nature which is hostile to God and righteousness. In all men the flesh is present; in other words, all are sinners. This throws us back on the further question: How are we to account for this universal sinfulness? Historically Paul goes back to the act of Adam, by which sin entered into the world. In him all sinned, so, I think with Meyer, Romans v. 12 must be taken. But how could this be possible? By the fact of the solidarity of the race. Adam is the natural head, and his acts are valid for the race. But why should he hold this position of such tremendous importance that he should involve the whole race in the consequences of his sin? Everything would be clear if we could assume that Adam's act is valid for mankind because it simply expresses a tendency universal in the race. If we could assume that "the flesh"

was present in Adam, and that under the stimulus of the commandment "sin revived" and he died, we should understand why his transgression was virtually the transgression of the race. This would be to assume that "the flesh" was inherent in human nature from the start, and against this it may be urged that Paul regards Adam's act as the entrance of sin into the world, not the emergence into activity of a principle present, though latent, from the first. Yet this may not be conclusive. The entrance could be interpreted of the first overt manifestation of sin. And it is to be noticed that Paul lays stress on what Adam had in common with humanity, not on that in which he stood distinguished from it. As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy. And the very fact of headship may be thought to imply this. This, I should add, is not the prevalent interpretation. The sin of Adam brought death on all, but it did not involve any in guilt. This is clear from the parallel instituted between the work of Adam and that of Christ. Christ undoes the work of Adam;

that is, physical death is met by the resurrection of the body. But the gaining of righteousness is made conditional on acceptance of the work of Christ by the individual. Similarly the guilt of Adam's sin can only attach to those who by actual transgression make it their own.

As to the Law, Paul not only held that it was the strength of sin, but that it had been given in order that the trespass might abound. This startling doctrine is quite original, and could only have been suggested through his experience of his own life under the Law, and that as interpreted by the keenest religious insight. It was not indeed given that sin might be increased, but that the sin already latent might be brought out in its true colours.

As with his doctrine of the pre-Christian state, so also with his doctrine of salvation,—it is a product of experience. In that uniquely important passage, Galatians i. 15, 16, lie as in a nutshell some of his most important doctrines. Here we have salvation traced to its source in the gracious will of God, and the life-mission of

Paul predestined by it: the revelation of Jesus as God's Son, which carried with it the Divinity of Christ, and so a new doctrine of the Godhead: that revelation within Paul, in which we may well see his fundamental doctrine of salvation through union with Christ: and the universalism which caught both Jew and Gentile in its all-embracing sweep. Other doctrines are there by implication. Thus the death of Jesus was a fact of history; but when this was seen to be the death of God's own Son, a doctrine of the significance of this was already a problem for solution. Then God's attitude to the sinner, as gracious yet hating sin, was shown by the death of His Son, and this death, naturally interpreted by a Jew as sacrificial, gave the grace full scope. And in his joyful feeling that he was one with Christ Paul realised that God pronounced him justified. This justification had been by faith, which meant for Paul that adoring self-abandonment with which he had cast himself on Christ and knew that he was one spirit with Him. The Law and its works were passed away, salvation

was all of grace, and as one with Christ he had attained the righteousness of God.

I must, however, speak a little more in detail of some of these doctrines. Christ is the pre-existent Son, who was the Agent in the work of creation. Though in the form of God and on an equality with Him, He emptied Himself and became Man. He was sent by God in the likeness of sinful flesh ; that is, according to the common view, in flesh like the flesh of men, except that it was not sinful flesh. The other view that the flesh of Christ was flesh in which, as in all others, sin was latent, but in which it never passed over into actual trangression, must, like every other view, be examined. It may be held apart from the theory of redemption, to which Dr. Bruce has given the name of redemption by sample, though it has been associated with it. As to Christ's work, we have to start from His position as Second Adam, as the new spiritual Head of the race. He reverses, and much more than reverses, all the consequences of Adam's sin. Just as all share in the act of Adam, so all die in the death of Christ. In

both cases effects follow independent of the will of those affected. But other effects are realised through the concurrence of the individual will. This distinction it is important to keep in mind. I may also add that the parallel instituted by Paul between Christ and Adam is of great value in that we are able to check the interpretation of obscure details in one by the clearer presentation in the other. Now in Paul there are two sets of passages which speak of death with Christ, and these must be carefully distinguished. In one he speaks of all as dying with Christ when He dies: this corresponds to the sin of all when Adam sinned. The other speaks of the death of the believer with Christ through union with Him by faith: this corresponds to the individual act of sin by which the sinner makes Adam's act his own; if these are not kept apart, confusion will result. In the latter case there enters the element of personal choice.

If I may venture to construct his doctrine of salvation here, I should present it in this way. To Paul the external facts of Christ's passion and resurrection were outward and

visible symbols of great inward and spiritual facts. The death of Christ was not simply on behalf of our sins, it was a death to sin (Rom. vi. 10). The crucifixion of the body symbolised the condemnation of sin in the flesh, through putting of the sinful flesh to death. For Christ as Second Adam summed up in Himself the whole of humanity, and thus all died in Him, since the death of His flesh involved the destruction of the sinful flesh in men. But His death does not exhaust His redeeming work. The resurrection is as indispensable to the complete salvation of man as the death of Christ. Just as His death was a death to sin, so His resurrection inaugurates a new life unto God. We might almost say that, on this side at any rate, Paul attributes more efficacy to the resurrection of Christ than He does to His death. But how was this death to sin and resurrection to a new life made effective in the experience of the individual? It was by means of the reproduction in him of the same phenomena, accomplished in the vital and mystic union of the believer with Christ. But let it be noted that

this death of the believer with Christ to sin does not take place in Christ's death on the cross. It is connected with baptism, which pre-supposes the personal acceptance of Christ. It is also connected with the believer's personal faith. Faith is with Paul a very rich idea. It is that act of personal trust, that loving movement of the whole soul to Christ, in which the spirit of the believer blends with the spirit of His Lord. And as one with Him, the experiences of Christ become those of the believer; not by any fiction, but in the most literal way. We have here a new personality. Christ and not self is now his "ego." But if he has died with Christ, he has received the penalty for sin. Nor is this view fanciful, for it was supplemented by a theory which extended the sufferings of Christ through all time. It is true that on Calvary not Christ alone but all humanity is held to have died. But it is true also that not on Calvary alone was Christ crucified, but everywhere and always. He suffered in His body on the tree. He suffers in His members at all times. Paul's own sufferings are a filling up of that

which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ; he bears branded on his body the stigmata of Jesus. His great ambition is to know Him and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed to His death. He bears about with Him daily the dying of Jesus. The value of our suffering is due to this, that we are Christ's, and so our sufferings become His sufferings too. We were not simply one with Him on Calvary; we are one with Him now. It may be true that this very view of our death with Christ is an extension backward in a forensic way of our death with Christ in personal experience, but it can by no means be substituted for it. It is only when seen in the light of this doctrine of union with Christ that the Apostle's forensic teaching is transfigured and softened, made radiant and complete. We cannot, indeed, get rid of the forensic character of his doctrine of Justification by faith. And it may be asked, Is it right for God to declare the sinner innocent on the ground that he believes on Christ? The answer is clear. It is right, for the very act of

faith makes him one with Christ. But if a man is in Christ, he is a new creature, the subject of the old life is dead. In virtue of this complete change, God is able to declare him innocent. But no man is justified apart from union with Christ; so Paul can speak of being justified in Christ. There is, so to speak, a snapping of the thread of continuity which binds the past to the present. He is dead to that in which he was holden, whether law or sin; he has broken for ever with the guilty past. The individual who had incurred the guilt was, as it were, dead, and in his place there was the indwelling Christ. And thus we have the guarantee for morality. The believer is not only severed from his past with all its guilt, but his life is one with that of the risen Christ, and so a life unto holiness, a new life unto God. The flesh, too, is crucified, and thus the home of sin is destroyed. And with sin and the flesh the Law was also done away. Not simply the ritual, but also the moral law, for Paul knows no distinction between the two. A legal basis for ethics had been tried and proved a failure. And so the moral law

was abolished in the interests of morality, which ceased to be conformity to an external code, that it might be the instinctive expression of the Christ who lived within. The only law for the man who has died with Christ, and whose life is hid with Him in God, is the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

I have in some measure deserted the strict order of the subject, because I was anxious to start in my exposition of his doctrine of salvation with his experience of union with Christ, in which he had been crucified and raised with Him; and for the sake of keeping together elements which cannot be separated without loss I have followed it out into the consequences that flow from it—justification and the new life. But there are other elements which have only lightly been touched on, that require more extended treatment. The most important relates to the death of Christ in reference to sin. Christ died for our sins. God set Him forth as propitiatory, He became a curse for us —became sin for us. The precise meaning of these phrases is much disputed. If God had

dealt with sins apart from Christ, He must have dealt with them by way of punishment. But the death of Christ has made it possible for God to forgive the sinner and treat him with favour. It is commonly thought that Christ endured the punishment that should have been inflicted on the guilty. Paul nowhere asserts this, and I think it is not quite adequate as an interpretation of his meaning. It is not so much that the substitution of Christ for the sinner is wrong as that it is incomplete. It suggests the view that He suffered and died instead of the guilty race. Looked at as a fact of external history, this is true, but from the point of view of theology it is more correct to say that in Him the guilty race suffered and died. So far, that is, as the events in Gethsemane and Calvary exhaust the work of redemption, that suffering and death are, indeed, concentrated on one man, but have their efficacy not simply in the fact that He is an individual, though the Son of God, but that He is also the Second Adam, whose acts are valid for the race of which He is Head. But if it be asked whether these great historical events ex-

haust what we should understand by the sufferings of Christ, what has already been said as to Paul's doctrine of the extension of Christ's suffering through all time must not be forgotten. It is on Calvary that God set forth His Son as propitiatory; but this was the climax and the open manifestation of the suffering, in which He bears the pains of the humanity He has united with Himself. We have no warrant for reading into Paul's doctrine the notion of penalty. If it is asserted that Paul interpreted His death as sacrificial, and that in the Hebrew sacrifices the death was of the nature of a penalty, this latter statement must simply be denied. As to the reconciliation effected by the Cross, it is first a reconciliation of man to God, then probably in some sense a reconciliation of God to man, and lastly a reconciliation of man to man, especially of Jew to Gentile.

I must barely mention the other doctrines that call for notice. His doctrine of God is the Old Testament doctrine, modified by the new conception of Godhead that Christianity brought with it. The Jewish side of it comes

out in his treatment of such a question as that of the election of Israel, where the sovereignty of God is insisted on in a very Semitic way. The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God has not the central place it has in the teaching of Christ, though, of course, it is present. Yet it is true that the influence of Christianity had profoundly modified his conception of God. The gift of His Son is an irresistible proof of God's love, who will freely give all with Him. The doctrine of the Church is most elaborately drawn out in Ephesians, where it is described as the body of Christ which has in Him its Head, and therefore the centre of unity, so that all who are united to Christ are members of His body, and members one of another. The Church is also described as the bride of Christ. The ministry was of two kinds. There were first the Apostles and Prophets, whose ministry was exercised in virtue of a special spiritual gift; then there were local officers of less importance, such as overseers and deacons, who also had a "gift," but of a more normal type. As to his eschatology, which is the

only other point on which I must touch, he unquestionably expected the speedy Second Coming, though, perhaps, less confidently in the latter than the earlier part of his ministry. His doctrine of the Antichrist is generally interpreted of a movement in Judaism, held in check for the time by the Roman power. Serious difficulties encumber this view, and it seems more probable that the apostasy is regarded as taking place in the Church, while both the man of sin and he that restraineth belong to the sphere of heathenism. The features of the man of sin seem to have been modelled on Caligula, now some years dead, and Paul seems to have anticipated that the impious forces already manifested in him, and then restrained for a time by Claudius, would, when the latter was taken out of the way, come to a head again, and be embodied in a personal Antichrist, who should be destroyed at the Second Coming. For another view, which brings it into connexion with an earlier Antichrist legend, Bousset's work on that subject may be consulted. It is doubted by

some whether Paul taught a general resurrection. I think with Meyer that 1 Corinthians xv. 22 most naturally implies this, and it is demanded by the parallel of Christ and Adam.

The view that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul has been surrendered by all whose opinion need be taken into account, but its evil effect lives on in the too frequent assertion that the theology of the Epistle is Pauline. Surely this is quite incorrect. It may be disputed whether it is Palestinian or Alexandrian, but it can only be described as Pauline in the loosest sense. The author, it is true, has to face much the same problem as Paul—that of saving his readers from falling away to Judaism, but he treats it in an altogether different way, though he too reaches the same result as Paul—that the Law has been abolished for those who are Christians. Not only, indeed, does his argument proceed on different lines, but he starts from an altogether different point of view. To Paul the Law came in beside, it was interpolated between promise and fulfilment, stood in marked

contrast to Christianity, and lent sin all its strength. In Hebrews the Law is viewed as imperfect Christianity, the shadow of good things to come, superseded when the perfect religion has been revealed. The doctrine rests on the principle that the heavenly archetypes have their copies on earth. Judaism is the pale copy of Christianity. The tabernacle is made after the pattern shown to Moses in the mount. Judaism belongs to the present age, Christianity to the age to come. Yet this age to come, while later than the present in historical manifestation, exists in heaven within the veil, and from it powers come forth to be experienced by Christians, and they are, even while on earth, united to it by the anchor of hope which is cast within the veil. The note of Judaism is imperfection, and therefore transitoriness; that of Christianity is perfection, and therefore finality. It is not enough, however, for the author to state his position,—he must prove it. This he does in a very elaborate way. Of his many-sided proof an outline only can be given. Viewed as a re-

ligion of revelation, Judaism was inferior to Christianity. For in the Prophets God had been able only to speak in fragmentary utterances, but now He has spoken in a Son who, as the perfect expression of His nature, has given a complete and therefore final revelation of His Father. Further, the Son is superior to the angels who delivered the Law; He is Divine, the Creator of the universe, and His reign will never cease. They are creatures with personality so impermanent that they are reduced by God to the condition of unconscious forces of nature. Not only are they inferior to the Son, but they are sent as attendants to His followers. Therefore the revelation and salvation brought by the Son far surpass the Law given by angels. Nor is the Messianic age subject to the angels. All things have been made subject to man, and though this is not seen as yet, it is already visibly realised in Jesus, Who, while for a time lower than the angels, has now been crowned with glory and honour. We must not be staggered by His humiliation and suffer-

ing, for only thus could He become one with men, and so be qualified to be the Author of their salvation. As Son, Christ is also superior to Moses, who was only a servant. And as Leader He is also superior to him and to Joshua, for Moses did not even lead the Israelites into Canaan; and though Joshua did this, yet he did not thus bring them into the rest of God; but Christ has led His followers into the rest that remained for the people of God. He now passes on to prove that the priesthood of Christ is superior to the Levitical. This he shows by a threefold argument. It is superior in itself, the sanctuary in which it is exercised is superior, and the victim that is offered is superior also. The priesthood of Christ satisfies the conditions of a true priesthood because He has been called to it of God, and He is, through sympathy with men, gained by knowledge of their life and its temptations from the inside, able to represent them. His chief argument for the superiority of Christ's priesthood is that it is a priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. Like him, Christ was

a king-priest, whose office did not depend on His priestly lineage, but on His own intrinsic worth. Abraham, by paying tithes to Melchizedek and receiving his blessing, confessed his own inferiority, and implicitly that of Levi. So the priesthood of Levi was inferior to that of Melchizedek, and therefore to that of Christ. Other arguments adduced are—that the very prediction of a new priesthood declared the imperfection of the old; that such a change of priesthood, involving something so serious as the change of the Law, implied serious defect; that, unlike the Levitical, the priesthood of Christ has been proclaimed with an oath; that the Jewish high priests were subject to death, and therefore the priesthood was subject to change, while that of Christ, who abides for ever, remains unchanged. The superiority of His sanctuary is thus proved. He offers not on earth, for He is not a Levite, but in heaven, in the sanctuary pitched by God and not man, which was the model for the earthly tabernacle. Jeremiah had predicted a spiritual covenant, which meant that the old covenant

and its sanctuary would be superseded. For a covenant is to secure fellowship with God, and the sanctuary is the means of its realisation. But in this the earthly tabernacle failed. Its Holy of Holies remained inaccessible, except to the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, and only to him with blood. And we thus come to the third point, the superiority of the sacrifice. The coarse, animal sacrifices of Judaism could in the nature of things secure no more than ritual purification, but the sacrifice of Christ, which was conscious and voluntary and therefore moral, and moreover the sacrifice of the Son of God, cleansed the conscience. And His death was needed that the new covenant might be ratified with His blood, and that the heavenly inheritance might be ours. Unlike the yearly sacrifice of the Day of Atonement, or the daily but ineffectual sacrifices of the priests, the single sacrifice of Christ is so efficacious that it needs no repetition, but perfects for ever them that are sanctified. And by His death, which is the removal of the veil of flesh, He

has entered into the very presence of God, and by His blood consecrated a new and living way. Thus He has succeeded in bringing men into open communion with God. But only ideally, for while they remain on earth the veil is not removed; Jesus has entered as Forerunner, and this gives His followers the joyful confidence that they will enter too. But as yet they have not entered, otherwise there would be no need of the hope which is cast as an anchor within the veil. Now the author was not unconscious of this schism between the ideal and the real. Hence after his argument for the superiority of Christianity is complete, he adds a chapter on faith, partly, no doubt, to encourage his readers to hold fast, but also because of its importance for his argument. Faith is the flying bridge between the actual and the ideal. It lifts us from the present into the enjoyment of the future. It carries us within the veil, since it gives the power of realising that which we do not possess, but for which we hope. And thus while we have to wait with patience for the time when

the veil shall actually drop away, and we pass after our Forerunner into the immediate presence of God, this unhindered fellowship with Him is already possible to us through faith.

There are many points of interest in this Epistle. There is first the developed Christology. This is not a matter of merely speculative interest to the author, but is vital for his argument. Only the Son can be the perfect revelation of God. Only a Son can reveal to mankind the true filial attitude which men should adopt towards God. But while Son of God, He must also become man subject to all human infirmities except sin, that He might gain the sympathy which alone could qualify Him to represent man to God as his High Priest. Then, as to the work of Christ, it is interpreted as a sacrifice, and in symbolism borrowed in the main from the ritual of the Day of Atonement. Hence the sacrifice culminates not in the death of Christ, but in His entrance through the veil into the immediate presence of God, to Whom He presents Him-

self as our High Priest. Whether we should think that He takes in His blood (of course, not in a physical sense) and presents it to God is not clear. The main idea that underlies his statements is that by His sacrifice Christ has removed from the conscience the sense of guilt, and has thus taken out of the way the great barrier that kept man from fellowship with God. Why the sacrifice of Christ should have this effect he does not explain, but he obviously holds that it is to be explained on the analogy of the Jewish sacrifices. The principle that acted ineffectually in them acted with efficacy in the sacrifice of Christ, but we are not told what that principle was. Probably he held that it was a matter of Divine appointment that the remission of sin required the shedding of blood, and did not feel that any reason for this need be sought. The emphasis he lays on the suffering of Christ is important, but it is not regarded as part of His sacrifice, but as part of His training for His office of High Priest. The absence of the mystical element, so prominent in Paul's doctrine of union with Christ, and the

different use of faith in the two writers, should also be noticed. Christ is our Forerunner or Leader whom we follow, or He is our Brother Who is not ashamed to claim kinship with us, but He is never spoken of as uniting us to Himself so that we share His death and resurrection. Nor, as with Paul, has the resurrection of Christ any theological importance. The difference between the two writers is, in fact, so great that on the ground of the theology alone it is certain that the Epistle to the Hebrews is in no sense the work of Paul.

Of the theology of James little need be said. It has a historical interest, since it represents a Jewish Christianity which was more Jewish than Christian. So much is this the case that it has been possible for some to put forward the view that it is fundamentally a Jewish writing worked over by a Christian hand. This is not probable, but the very fact that such a view can be urged speaks for the strongly Jewish character of the Epistle. There is no reference to the death and resurrection of Christ, which gives it a somewhat unevangelical aspect. This is

intensified by the legalistic way in which Christianity is conceived. It is, perhaps, here that the divergence from Paul comes out in the most marked way. The dispute whether James teaches justification by works as opposed to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith has concentrated attention on an apparent rather than a real discrepancy, with the result that the marked difference of the two men in mental and spiritual atmosphere has scarcely been emphasized enough. The Epistle should be dear to an age which insists on an ethical gospel that is not rooted in theology, for it is as marked by the prominence of the one as by the poverty of the other. It has many reminiscences of the Sermon on the Mount. Among points of interest these may be mentioned: What is the actual relation of James's doctrine of justification to that of Paul? Has he Paul in his mind or a perversion of Paul's teaching, or does he write without reference to him? Can the two doctrines be reconciled; and if so, how? Shall we speak of a difference in the sense attached to justification, whether of dif-

ferent stages, for which we have no warrant, or a difference of time—Paul speaking of justification at conversion, James of justification at the judgment? If a reconciliation is to be sought, this seems the most hopeful line on which to seek it. The view that has found favour with many, that James means by faith a dead orthodoxy, is plausible at first sight, and supported by the reference to the confession of monotheism, but the sense will hardly stand throughout the passage, and, if substantiated, would not effect a reconciliation. For, as Wieseler says, "It is one thing to say that a man is justified by faith which is proved by works, and another thing to say that a man is justified by works in which faith is proved." His doctrine of regeneration is not very clear; it is traced to its source in the will of God, and the means by which it is effected is the word of truth. But the gospel message has to be taken into the heart, and there as an inward principle of life secure conduct in conformity with the Law, and final salvation. The Law which is to be the standard of life is indeed

spoken of as the Law of liberty, which seems to mean the Law which gives freedom from sin. But this must not be identified with the Pauline law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which makes us free from the law of sin and death. It is the Jewish Law which he regards as binding on his readers; and from his principle of the solidarity of the Law we gather that he regards the ceremonial as well as the moral law as binding. The doctrine of regeneration through the implanted word perhaps owes its origin to Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant to be written on the heart.

The First Epistle of Peter, I have already said, is dated by Weiss earlier than the Epistles of Paul. For my own part, I find it hard to interpret without assuming the Pauline theology as present to the writer. It is not only that there are marked literary coincidences between it and the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, but there are striking theological parallels. And what helps to determine the priority is this, that in 1 Peter the doctrines are isolated, and cannot be worked into a system

without conjecture. The most probable reconstruction gives an essentially Pauline type of doctrine. Even if we did not know that Paul's doctrine was original with him, it would still be clear that it is more probable that the complete system should be earlier and the isolated doctrines borrowed from it, than that one writer should throw out fragmentary hints without any indication of the relation between them, and then another writer work up these fragments into a well-organised system. There are also noteworthy parallels to James, though not specially theological, and some interesting affinities with the Epistle to the Hebrews. At the same time the author has an independent point of view. He insists on the sufferings of Christ more than Paul does, and one of his most important doctrines is that the theocratic privileges of the Old Covenant are transferred to the members of the New. Among points of interest in the theology of the Epistle the following may be mentioned. The pre-existence of Christ seems not to have been merely in the Divine foreknowledge, but to have been real, since His Spirit

was in the Prophets. The phrase "bore our sins in His own body to the tree" can hardly be interpreted "bore the punishment of our sins on the tree." The idea rather is that He took our sins into His body, and carried them up with Him to the cross, apparently that they might be put to death on it. Intimately connected with this is the doctrine of the flesh. It is peculiarly difficult, all the more so that Peter argues apparently sometimes from the physical to the ethical sense, these senses readily slipping into each other. The death of Christ is more closely defined by the phrases that He suffered in the flesh and was put to death in the flesh. Further, suffering in the flesh is intimately connected with cessation from sin. Combining these facts, we must interpret the death of Christ as such a putting of the flesh to death as effects the destruction of the sins that have been united with it. In the case of the individual Christian, too, suffering in the flesh means release from sin. And this, surely, not in the mere physical sense; for with all that may be said as to the disciplinary value of suffering, it is surely too

much to say that it, even if carried to the point of death, really involves release from sin. The fact is, we are on thoroughly familiar Pauline ground here, and Peter just means that those who have crucified the flesh, to use Pauline phraseology, have destroyed the seat of sin. The Rabbinical parallels mean something quite different. Are we to go a step further, and say that we have here not only Paul's doctrine that the death of Christ is the putting to death of the flesh and therefore a death to sin, and his corresponding doctrine that Christians die to sin by the crucifixion of the flesh, but the link between these two—the doctrine of union with Christ? I think we may, and that not simply on the ground that it is unlikely that, having understood so much, Peter should have missed the very heart of Paulinism, but on the actual language he employs. He says, "Ye have fellowship with the sufferings of Christ." It is also to be observed that release from sin is ascribed both to the bearing of our sins by Christ in His body to the tree, and to our own suffering in the flesh. The former statement

refers to our union with Christ on Calvary, the latter to our experience of suffering in union with Him now. And here, too, we are on Pauline ground. This brings us naturally to the other passages in which death in the flesh is referred to. They are the famous passages which speak of the preaching by Christ to the spirits in prison, and the preaching of the gospel to the dead. Setting aside the attractive but probably wrong view that the spirits in prison are to be explained as the angelic sons of God who wedded the daughters of men, and assuming that the antediluvians destroyed in the Deluge are the spirits in prison, two views are possible. The former is that the preaching of Christ was before the Deluge, and that He spoke through Noah, a view adopted in modern times by Schweizer and Hofmann, and more recently by Profs. Salmond and Bovon. The other is that taken by the vast majority of modern commentators, and the only one that seems strictly compatible with the language that he uses—that the scene of the ministry is Hades, and that Christ there, after His death,

preached to those who had perished in the Flood. The time of the preaching is probably to be fixed between the Death and the Resurrection. "Quickened in the spirit" should not, I think, be explained as referring to the Resurrection, for which it would be a very strange expression, but as just the other side of the death in the flesh. That is, the death in the flesh was itself the quickening in the spirit. The very difficult passage, "for to this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but might live according to God in the spirit," seems to me to express both in the judgment and in the life according to God the effect of Christ's preaching to the dead in Hades. This, it is true, will not appear to be a possible interpretation to many, on the ground that it involves the apparently strange view that the flesh can survive death. I can only say in reply to this that it is no more strange in itself that a man should be in the flesh after he is dead than that he should not be in the flesh while he is still alive. Yet the latter is one of the

commonplaces of Paulinism. Once the flesh is identified with the sinful principle, it will seem natural enough that it should survive death in those who remain unrepentant. I need not point out that though this is not the usual way of taking the passage, it is the natural way of interpreting the Greek. And in a writer who has assimilated so much of the Pauline anthropology, this view, that the unrepentant dead needed before they could live according to God in the spirit to be judged in the flesh, is not at all so strange as it appears at first sight. At the same time, it is only because we can assume a knowledge of Paulinism in the author, that such an interpretation of the flesh becomes even possible. If it still seems improbable, it will be necessary to fall back on the sense which does less justice to the terms of the passage—that the judgment is prior to the preaching, and must be interpreted of their destruction in the Deluge.

It is unnecessary here to speak of the theology of Jude and 2 Peter, or of that of the first three Evangelists or the Acts of the Apostles.

I will only say that some conception may be formed of the theological position of the Synoptists from their selection of incidents, and still more from their own contributions. At the same time, so much depends here on criticism, and, in our ignorance of what documentary or other sources were used, on criticism working in the dark, that not very considerable results can be reached in this way. Tendencies, however, do reveal themselves, so that in a general way we can speak of their theological point of view. Special study should be given to the speeches of Peter, Stephen, James, and Paul in the Acts, and the probability of their historical character estimated. If genuine representations of the theology of the men to whom they are attributed, they are of great value for determining the standpoint of the early Jewish Christians, and for their exhibition of the missionary preaching of Paul. As to the theology of the Apocalypse, I prefer not to speak in the present state of the critical question. It is certainly a work of great historical importance, but till we are clearer on the literary history it is of little use to speak

of its theology. If its unity were certain, the case would be quite different, for then the main lines of the interpretation would be sufficiently assured to make the general theological position of the writer evident. And it is quite possible that criticism will come back to the older view, which several critics have not deserted. Still so many eminent critics now regard the work as composite, though they are far from agreed as to its sources, that it is not safe to assume the unity. The divergence of view among those who regard it as composite is too great to make it wise to linger over the theology, even if the unity were rejected. Bousset's "The Antichrist Legend" may here again be consulted.

The teaching of Jesus is so occasional and unsystematic, that it is natural to shrink from speaking of it as we can of the theology of Paul or Peter or John. Yet something must be said, at least in outline. It will be necessary to keep distinct the representations in the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel, and when they have been independently treated they may be compared. The fundamental doctrine is the

Fatherhood of God. Yet even this is variously interpreted. Some deny that the Fatherhood is universal, and say that it is limited to the regenerate; others, such as Wendt, hold a limited Sonship along with a universal Fatherhood. God is the Father of all men, but men have to become His sons. Others hold that the Sonship is as unlimited as the Fatherhood; God is the Father of all men, and all men are the children of God. Between the two latter the difference is perhaps not so great as it seems at first sight. Those who say that men must become sons of God would admit that they are potentially sons of God; while those who insist that they are sons would still say that they must realize their sonship. As to which of these views is right, it may be asserted with confidence that the whole trend of the teaching of Jesus is that God is the Father of all men. And the parable of the Prodigal Son seems to carry with it the universal Sonship as well as the universal Fatherhood. He remains a son, though in the depths of his penitence and self-despising he feels unworthy of this position.

It is true that before he can benefit by his sonship he has to return to his father's house and realize it; but it is the fact that he is son that saves him in extremities and gives him the right to return. I do not think that the assertion made by Jesus, according to the Fourth Gospel, that the hostile Jews were not sons of God, but sons of the devil, really conflicts with this, for in the context, while allowing that they were Abraham's seed, He denies that they were the children of Abraham, and calls them the children of the devil. The reference is simply to the fact that in character and act they were like the devil rather than God or Abraham. I may add, as to the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, that, while it was not absolutely new, its emphasis was original. Christ's doctrine of His own Person should be examined next. First, there is His consciousness of a unique filial relation to God, expressed in such language as My Father, or the Son. Then there is His favourite term for Himself, the Son of Man, of which much has been written. Wellhausen lays down as a

critical canon that to discover the words of Jesus in their original form we must employ retranslation into Aramaic. Nothing can be authentic if it will not lend itself to expression in Aramaic. Retranslating the term Son of Man into Aramaic, he says that it means man simply. If so, it emphasizes His feeling of oneness with humanity. The question is complicated by its use in the Book of Enoch, as to which Wellhausen says that this is an indication of Christian influence on the section of the book where it occurs. Mr. Charles, the latest editor of the book, believes that the whole work was edited before the Christian era. From this the student may pass on to the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, and with this should be taken His conception of the functions the Messiah had to fulfil. As to the question of the pre-existence of Christ, it is denied by some that Jesus Himself taught this. If the Johannine passages which speak of it do not report authentic sayings of Jesus, this view is quite defensible. What is strange is that some have accepted the sayings as authentic, and

then denied that they expressed a consciousness of pre-existence on the part of Jesus. This seems possible only by the most violent exegesis. Next might be taken His attitude to His Death, a subject on which He speaks but rarely in the Synoptists, so far as its theological significance is concerned, but much oftener according to the Johannine tradition. Then His doctrine of Man might follow, optimistic as to his possibilities, with the clearest recognition of his actual sinfulness. From this, by a natural transition, we pass to the largest section, though not the most fundamental—the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, in which the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, and its corollary, the Brotherhood of Men, found expression. It is necessary at the outset to examine the view that to Jesus the Kingdom was an eschatological conception. If so, it would involve most serious consequences. Thus Harnack, after saying that criticism has not altered "the main lineaments of the personality of Christ, and the sense and true point of His sayings," proceeds: "I admit that if historical

research had proved that He was an apocalyptic enthusiast or a visionary, whose image and utterance were advanced to the level of pure aim and lofty thought only by the refining influence of later times, it would be another matter." Assuming as the result of such an inquiry that this view will be set aside, the next question will be, What did Jesus mean by the Kingdom? To answer this, a careful collection of the passages in which He speaks of it will be necessary. The blessings it conferred, and the conditions on which they may be attained, the meaning of the righteousness of the Kingdom, the ethics of the Kingdom and the future that He anticipated for it, its relation to the Church,— all these subjects must be examined. These are merely hints, but they may serve the purpose of guiding study. We may test the results we gain from a study of the Gospels by the Epistles, and the impression which Jesus made on the early Church. As to the originality of Jesus, I may quote the caustic words of Wellhausen: "The Jewish scholars say, all that Jesus said is also to be found in the Talmud.

Yes, all and a great deal besides." He asks how it is that no one else has found the true and the eternal in this wilderness of legal erudition. And he asks, further, If a saying of Jesus is attributed in the Talmud to Hillel, can we make sure that the Talmud is right? The relation of the teaching of Jesus to other systems of theology in the New Testament, especially the Pauline, is very important. It is reasonable to think that for some of the doctrines which are found both in Paul and the primitive Apostles we should seek the source in the teaching of Jesus. That Christ died for sin is one such doctrine. It would be unsafe to assert this in every case; thus Paul shared with the early Apostles the expectation of the speedy second coming; but it is not probable that Jesus Himself taught this. There is another question raised as to the relation of Paul to Jesus. Where Paul has put forward doctrines which are not to be found in the teaching of Jesus, how far may they be regarded as legitimate developments of doctrines already present in that teaching, or, at any rate, not contrary to it?

I come lastly to the theology of John. It is rich and deep, yet so intangible that it eludes analysis. No one was ever less of a systematic theologian than John, and his teaching, therefore, does not lend itself to systematic statement as does that of Paul. Yet there are leading principles in it, which may be clearly stated, often in aphoristic form. As to the method there is one serious difficulty. Should the reports of the teaching of Jesus given in the Gospel be used as sources for the theology of John? If these discourses were invented by the author, then they could be taken without more ado as sources for the author's theology. If they were verbatim reports of what Jesus said, it might be urged that they should be left aside and used only as sources for the teaching of Jesus. On the other hand, it might be said that the author has reported those discourses of Jesus for which he had most affinity, and that he would certainly accept them as authoritative, and incorporate their theology in his own. We cannot, however, assume that he had completely assimilated the

teaching of his Master. There is an intermediate position between acceptance of the discourses as verbatim reports and rejection of them as altogether invented. This covers a variety of opinions shading from one extreme to the other. The substance and phraseology may be regarded as genuine, while the form and arrangement may be assigned to the author. Or the substance may be authentic, while the phraseology is assigned to the author. Or even the substance may be thought to be a free working up of genuine sayings of Jesus. There is also difficulty sometimes in determining where the word of Jesus ends and the comment of the Evangelist begins. This difficulty of disengaging his reflections from the teaching of Jesus shows how close is the resemblance between them. This confirms the view that the report of the words of Jesus has been modified by passing through the mind of John. It should be said, on the other hand, that there are well-marked distinctions between them. It would probably be best at first to take account only of the Epistle and those parts of the

Gospel which express the mind of the author himself. Later, the teaching of Jesus, as given in the Gospel, may be compared with that of John himself. The very plan of his Gospel is important for the understanding of his theology. The whole scheme which he has elaborated, with faith growing to higher faith, and unbelief developing to ever-deepening unbelief, shows the lines on which he conceived the great contest between light and darkness to be carried on. His Gospel is, indeed, as it has been called, the Gospel of the eternal, and starts with the pre-existent life of the Logos. Yet his theology is not of the kind that airily dispenses with history. It shows us the Logos active in creation and history, and finally becoming flesh and manifesting His glory by this revelation of God under the conditions of space and time. He was the eternal Word, who, coming from the bosom of the Father, revealed Him, since He was the perfect expression of His nature. The God thus revealed was Love, Light, and Life. The Logos was His Agent in creation and the Life of the universe. He was the Light

that lighteth every man. But He was not only the Logos but the eternal Son, the gift of Whom to the world was the supreme proof of the Father's love. When He became man He was rejected by the Jews, but received by a few kindred spirits to whom He gave the right to become sons of God. This reception and rejection mirrored the subsequent history of the faith. The world in general lies in the evil one, and is destined to pass away, while those who have received the Son of God have with Him received eternal life. Yet although the conflict is still proceeding between Christ and the devil, between the children of God and the children of the devil, between light and darkness, the end is already certain, the victory already won. But it is still necessary to be on guard, especially against the spirit of Antichrist, which denies the reality of the Incarnation. The Christian life is one of fellowship with God, whereby we walk in His light, experience His love, find our home in Him, as He finds His home in us. It begins with the confession of sin and its forgiveness, faith in

Christ and cleansing by His blood. Its moral standard is high: fellowship with God means a love and light in the Christian which corresponds to His own. As it is thus tested by its correspondence with the character of God, that can be no true life which is marked by hatred or darkness. Yet religion is not a matter solely of personal rectitude, or even of fellowship between God and the individual soul. Wherever the love of God has been truly felt it is answered by love of the brethren. With all his idealism and mysticism John has the keenest eye for practice. Nothing will convince him that a man really loves God unless he loves his brother too. Among points for special investigation the following may be mentioned. There is first the origin of the term Logos in the Prologue, whether it was borrowed by John from Alexandria, or Palestine. Those who have denied the authenticity of the Gospel have generally assumed an Alexandrian origin, those who have defended it, generally a Palestinian. Harnack has said that the Logos of John and the Logos of Philo have nothing

in common but the name. Perhaps this is intrinsically the more probable view, though even so it would not be incompatible with an Alexandrian origin, for the Christian facts so profoundly modified the doctrine in any case that a likeness between John's doctrine and a pre-Christian one is not to be looked for. Then there is the alleged dualism of John. It is asserted that John divides mankind into two classes—those who are by nature incapable of rejecting Christ, and those who are by nature unable to receive Him. The former are the children of God, the latter are the children of the devil. But against this it may be said that the writer insists on the universalism of the Divine purpose of salvation, God loves the world and has sent His Son to save it, though it lies in the evil one. The inability is not due to a necessity of nature, whereby, as Hase justly says, "a moral relation is falsely translated into a metaphysical relation." Next, there is the hostility to Judaism and the Jews, which some have alleged. No doubt the Jews are mentioned frequently in that attitude of

hostility to Jesus which they actually assumed. But there are numerous passages which recognise the position of the Jews as one of privilege or honour. The doctrine of the death of Christ calls for careful examination. It is the great manifestation of the love both of the Father and the Son. The Father sent the Son, not simply to reveal Himself, but to be the Saviour of the world. This is further defined by the statement that He sent Him to be the propitiation for our sins. He was manifested that He might take away sin, and destroy the work of the devil. He came by water and blood, and His blood cleanses from all sin. These terms, "propitiation" and "blood," have already met us in other New Testament writings, where also they have needed examination. It is obvious that the interpretation of the term "blood" must be ruled by the Hebraic associations which gathered round the word. It is only by falling back on the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, which again has to be interpreted by its ethnic antecedents, that we can rightly interpret it. The blood is the life, or

the life is in the blood, and when it is shed it does not cease to be living, but it is separated from the body in whose veins it had run, and thus set free to be applied to the altar or to the worshipper. Other points may be simply mentioned: the doctrines of the Holy Spirit, of sin as lawlessness, and of the sin unto death, of Antichrist, and of last things.

In conclusion, I may say that I hope that the foregoing chapters will be helpful in suggesting lines of study to some of those who read them. I will ask them to take them as they are meant, as suggestive and in no way exhaustive, and to remember the limitation of treatment involved in the nature of the case. I gladly recognise that the keenest insight into the deep things of God is given by the Holy Spirit, who is sent to guide us into all truth, and to bestow the purged vision which can alone penetrate to their inmost secret. But obstinate prejudice that will not learn is a sure hindrance to the Spirit's work. A humble reverence for facts is one of the most gracious signs of a teachable disposition. For those who

are without it, Biblical Study will be beset with limitations and with errors, and the sad words of the prophet will receive a new illustration: "Ephraim is joined to his idols, let him alone."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III

I PREFIX to the bibliographical note proper a few practical hints for those who may be studying Hebrew with little or no help from a teacher. At first, the easier prose parts of the Bible should be read—such as Genesis, with Mr. Spurrell's Notes, and Samuel, with Dr. Driver's Notes; the latter, read as illustrating the principles explained in the introductory chapter of Dr. Driver's work, will, at the same time, serve as an excellent introduction to the study of Old Testament textual criticism. The prophetic style is more difficult than the historical; it may be approached through the Book of Amos. In reading this, Dr. Driver's "Joel and Amos" (Camb. Bible) will be found very useful, containing as it does numerous notes on the Hebrew text. With Hebrew poetry the student will have made some acquaintance in reading Genesis and Samuel. Of the poetical books proper, Job, which is very difficult, should not be attempted till a considerable mastery of the language has been obtained. The Psalms vary much in difficulty, but some of them may be read comparatively early.

The student cannot be too strongly recommended to discipline himself thoroughly in the forms of the language by punctuating unpointed passages. Several sections of the Bible have been inexpensively published, and may

be conveniently used for this purpose. In the first instance it will be best to punctuate a passage recently read (say after two or three days); but the time between seeing the punctuated text and doing the exercise in punctuation should be gradually extended. These exercises can, of course, be corrected by the student himself by help of the pointed text; but he ought also freely to use his grammar so as to discover the principles violated by his incorrect punctuation.

Another useful exercise is to translate into Hebrew passages of the R.V. In this case, too, passages should at first be chosen from the narrative and historical portions. If possible, this should be supplemented by translations of other passages of English prose under the guidance of a teacher.

I. *Old Testament.*

DICTIONARIES.—"A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic (based on Robinson's translation of Gesenius' Lexicon)," by Drs. Brown, Driver, and Briggs. This is indispensable. At present the first five parts only have appeared: the work will be complete in about eleven. The English edition is published by the Oxford University Press. Davies' "Student's Hebrew Lexicon" is small but useful. The English edition of Gesenius' "Hebrew Lexicon," by Tregelles, and the American edition of the same work by Robinson, are larger, but they will become entirely antiquated when the new edition by Drs. Brown, Driver, and Briggs is complete. On the other hand, Gesenius' "Thesaurus" (3 vols. in Latin, 1835–1858: completed by Rödiger) will still be of use to the advanced student.

CONCORDANCES.—Of these, perhaps the most convenient is B. Davidson's, but Fürst's is also to be recom-

mended. Neither, however, contains the particles; these will be found in Noldius' "Concordantiae Particularum Ebræo-Chaldaicarum." The most recent, most complete, and most expensive Hebrew Concordance is Mandelkern's (published by Veit, of Leipzig). This includes the particles. All the foregoing take account of the Hebrew (or Aramaic) text only. The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance is a concordance to the Hebrew text, but gives the citations in English.

GRAMMARS.—"An Introductory Hebrew Grammar" (with Exercises), and "A Hebrew Syntax," by Dr. A. B. Davidson. As supplementary to the former of these, Strack's "Hebrew Grammar" may be advantageously used; and Driver's "Hebrew Tenses" is invaluable and indispensable. There is no single Grammar in English adequately covering the whole subject. The existing translations of Gesenius' Grammar are made from too early an edition to be in any way satisfactory. A translation of the latest much enlarged and thoroughly revised edition by Kautzsch is understood to be in preparation. The last part of Ewald's Hebrew Grammar has been translated and published under the title of "Syntax of the Hebrew Language." (T. & T. Clark.)

There is no satisfactory English Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. "An Aramaic Method," by Charles Rufus Brown (Chicago), takes account of other forms of Aramaic, and the texts printed in Part I. are entirely extra-Biblical; but Part II., containing the Grammar, distinguishes the Biblical from other Aramaic forms. The paradigms and brief notes (in Latin) are prefixed to Baer and Delitzsch's edition of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel; but the paradigms printed contain forms which do not actually occur in the literature. Winer's "Chaldee

Grammar," of which an early edition was translated into English, is fuller, but in many respects antiquated. It also treats of the language of the Targums. None of the recent excellent German Grammars by Kautzsch, Strack, and Marti (the two latter containing the Biblical texts) has yet been translated.

TEXTS.—The best editions of the Massoretic text are by Baer and Delitzsch (Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are not yet issued), and by Ginsburg (published by the Trinitarian Bible Society). The best edition of the unpointed text is Forster's; Bagster's unpointed Hebrew Bible is also convenient, though the type is very small. "The Sacred Books of the Old Testament," by various eminent Hebrew scholars (general editor Prof. Haupt) is in course of publication. The Hebrew text is here also printed without points; it is not, however, the traditional consonantal text, but an attempt by means of a critical use of the versions and other critical methods to represent the original text. Separate sections convenient for exercises in punctuation are Genesis (edited by Muelhau and Kautzsch, published by J. A. Barth, Leipzig), Psalms (Clarendon Press), Isaiah xl.–lxvi (edited by Kraetzschmar, published by Mohr, Freiburg); a "Selection of Passages of unpointed Hebrew," by W. H. Bennett (Cambridge University Press).

II. *New Testament.*

DICTIONARIES.—"A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being a translation enlarged and revised of Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti," by Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D. This is indispensable. Cremer's "Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek" will be a valuable addition to the foregoing, but cannot be substituted for it.

CONCORDANCE.—"Concordance to the Greek Testament," by Dr. Moulton and Mr. Geden.

GRAMMARS.—The standard work is Winer's "Grammar of New Testament Greek," of which the German edition of 1855 was translated with numerous additions by Dr. Moulton in 1870; this English edition has been several times reissued. Two volumes of the "Theological Educator" form a briefer introduction (of independent value) to the study—"The Language of the New Testament," and "The Writers of the New Testament: their Style and Characteristics," both by the Rev. W. H. Simcox. Burton's "New Testament Moods and Tenses" is important. As to Hatch's invaluable "Essays in Biblical Greek," see Chapter III.

TEXTS.—Westcott and Hort's "New Testament in the Original Greek." For many purposes the student will also find it convenient to possess "The New Testament in Greek, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers." For the critical apparatus, Tischendorf's "Novum Testamentum Graece" (8th edition) will be found most complete.

In addition to the literature directly connected with the original texts of the Bible, the following books relating to the LXX., the study of which was shown in Chapter III. to be so closely connected with that both of the Old Testament and New Testament in the original, may be mentioned: "The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint," edited by Dr. Swete. This gives the text of the Vatican MS., and where this is wanting clearly indicates in the margin the MS. from which the text is printed. The variants of the chief uncial MSS. are also given. The best Concordance is Hatch and Redpath's "Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament."

Schleusner's "Lexicon in Vetus Testamentum" is still useful, but needs to be used with great discretion. "An Introduction to the Greek Old Testament," by Dr. Swete, is announced as in preparation.

G. B. G.

ADDENDA

Page 37. Add Skinner, "Isaiah i.–xxxix." (Camb. Bible).

Page 38. Add Driver, "Joel and Amos" (Camb. Bible).

Page 40. Add Plummer, "St. Luke" (International Crit. Comm.), and Rendall, "The Acts of the Apostles."

Page 42. Add Liddon, "An Explanatory Analysis of St Paul's First Epistle to Timothy."

Page 53, *l.* 21. Add Kenyon, "Our Bible and the Ancient MSS." (gives useful information on the text of both O.T. and N.T.).

Page 55. Add Kent, "A History of the Hebrew People" (2 vols.).

Page 60. Add Woods, "The Hope of Israel" to works on Messianic Prophecy.

Page 62. Add Jevons, "An Introduction to the History of Religion."

Page 64. Add Schwartzkopff, "The Prophecies of Jesus Christ."

Page 75, *l.* 13. In Hosea iii. 5, the only words suspected are: "And David their king."

Pages 85, 86. Streane's "Double Text of Jeremiah" will be found very useful in tracing the origin of the divergencies between the Hebrew and LXX. The reconstruction of the text in Workman's "The Text of Jeremiah," is vitiated by its assumption that the

variations in the LXX. are to be explained throughout by a single cause,—the presence of these variations in the Hebrew text from which the LXX. translation was made. The truth is that very many of these variations were never present in any Hebrew text, but are due to a variety of causes.

By far the most important of the critical questions raised by the Book of Jeremiah is that relating to the authenticity of the new covenant passage (xxxi. 31 ff.). Stade and Smend have denied it, but it is defended by Kuenen, Cornill, and others. Our estimate of Jeremiah's importance for the history of religion would be considerably affected by its deletion from his writings. The references to it by Christ in the institution of the Supper, by Paul in 2 Corinthians iii., and the great use made of it in his argument by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, show what significance they attached to it as a description of the essence of Christianity. The epoch-making character of the prophecy would be destroyed if Smend were right in denying that it utters the doctrine of individualism in religion. But he is probably not right, for there are other passages in Jeremiah which look in the same direction.

Page 97, *l.* 4. Dillmann thinks that Deuteronomy i. 6–iii. 29 was originally written as a historical introduction to the main portion of the book and by the same author. When Deuteronomy was incorporated in the Hexateuch, this introduction, as it could not stand side by side with the historical parts of the earlier books, was changed into an address by Moses. Unfortunately this only accounts for part of the introduction, not for iv. 1–40, which, like chapters v.–xi. is hortatory in character, and which

he takes to have formed part of the original work, but to have come at the end along with parts of xxix. and xxx. It is on his reconstruction of this closing section that the theory breaks down (see Driver, "Deuteronomy," pp. lxxii.–lxxv.). The chief reason for the view taken in the text, that Deuteronomy i. 1–iv. 40 formed no part of the original work, is that it is unlikely that the author should have prefixed two introductions to his code.

Page 97, *l.* 12. The publication of Prof. Hommel's work on "Ancient Hebrew Tradition" in no essential respect affects the critical position. The writer admits the validity of the literary analysis, but denies that the Grafian school has correctly dated the documents. His argument rarely intersects the line of proof on which the School relies, and therefore, while it may be a "protest," can hardly be called a reply. Some of the conclusions are based on very disputable premises; and even if the latter were certain, the inferences drawn often do not follow; nor would his conclusions, if established, have the far-reaching results that he anticipates. It is well known that the late codification of ritual laws by no means precludes the great antiquity of much of the ritual, and that many of the institutions referred to in the Priestly Code are very ancient is certain. And if it could be shown that the names were of an antique formation, this could be accounted for by allowing that the document had incorporated ancient name-lists. But it is not probable, in the face of Mr. Gray's investigations in his "Studies in Hebrew Proper Names," that the antiquity of the lists can be maintained. What is often forgotten is, that in its main outlines the critical view rests on data found

in the Bible itself, and therefore no archæological discovery is likely to overthrow it, for these data would remain to be accounted for. The English reader should be warned that the translation is not only often inaccurate, but in some instances misrepresents and even suppresses statements in the original.

Page 100. The statement in the text in no way precludes the view that the poet of Job borrowed the prose sections from a prose book of Job. This is the opinion of Cheyne, and of the two latest commentators Budde and Duhm. If such a book existed, it was probably known to Ezekiel (xiv. 14). The important point is not whether the author of the poem wrote the Prologue and Epilogue himself, but whether the poem was written with reference to the prose portions of the book.

Page 142, *l.* 6. The Revised Version has substituted the probably correct translation "goat for Azazel" for "scape-goat," in the law for the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.). Scholars are divided on the origin of the name "Azazel," some thinking that he is to be regarded as the chief of the forest demons. Prof. Cheyne, dissenting from this view, thinks that the rite was devised by the author of the legislation in order to purify, while taking up, certain popular ideas. Analogous customs are widespread, not only sin but disease being laid upon animal or human victims, and borne away by them. (See Frazer, "The Golden Bough," for instances.)

Butler & Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London.

HODDER & STOUGHTON'S LIST.

Third Edition. Revised, with new Preface and Index.
8vo, cloth, with Map, 10*s.* 6*d.*

ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER AND THE ROMAN CITIZEN.

By W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., Professor of Humanity, Aberdeen ; Author of "The Church in the Roman Empire," etc.

"Professor Ramsay brings not only his great experience as a traveller and archæologist, but the resources of an ingenious mind, and a lively style. The book is, like everything Professor Ramsay does, extraordinarily alive. It shows everywhere personal learning, personal impression; it has the sharp touch of the traveller and the eye-witness."—*Times.*

Fifth Edition. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, 12*s.*

THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE BEFORE A.D. 170.

By W. M. RAMSAY, M.A., D.C.L., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen.

"This volume is the most important contribution to the study of early Church History which has been published in this country since the great work of Bishop Lightfoot on the Apostolic fathers. It is, too, unless our memory fails us, without a rival in any foreign country."—*Guardian.*

With Six Maps, specially prepared. Eighth Thousand.
8vo, cloth, 15*s.*

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND.

By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow.

"Professor Smith is well equipped at all points for this work. He is abreast of the latest findings of Scripture exegesis, and of geographical survey, and of archæological exploration; and he has himself travelled widely over Palestine. The value of the work is incalculably increased by the series of geographical maps, the first of the kind representing the whole lift and lie of the land by gradations of colour."—*Scotsman.*

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

WORKS BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL FAIRBAIRN, D.D.

Seventh Edition. 8vo, *cloth*, 12s.

CHRIST IN MODERN THEOLOGY.

"His work is, without doubt, one of the most valuable and comprehensive contributions to theology that has been made during this generation."—*The Spectator.*

Sixth Edition. 8vo, *cloth*, 7s. 6d.

THE CITY OF GOD.

"The author approaches the various subjects passed under review in his striking and beautiful book, with a poetic depth and refinement of feeling and expression, which we greatly appreciate. He frequently waxes into eloquence which is both thrilling and impressive. His language is nearly always as felicitous as it could be, and never lacks vigour."—*Literary World.*

Eleventh Thousand. Crown 8vo, *cloth*, 3s. 6d.

RELIGION IN HISTORY AND IN MODERN LIFE.

"There is much that is good and striking in these lectures."—*Church Times.*

"A timely and weighty contribution to a subject which theologians but too seldom venture to grapple with."—*The Scotsman.*

"It is one of the best pieces of work which even Principal Fairbairn has ever done."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

Ninth Edition. Demy 8vo, 9s.

STUDIES IN LIFE OF CHRIST.

"The thoughts are subtle and incisive, and the style scholarly—glowing ever and anon into a rare beauty."—*Methodist Recorder.*

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

LITTLE BOOKS ON RELIGION.

EDITED BY
THE REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.
Cloth elegant, 1s. 6d. each.

CHRIST AND THE FUTURE LIFE.
By the Rev. R. W. DALE, D.D., LL.D.

THE SEVEN WORDS FROM THE CROSS.
By the Rev. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

THE VISIONS OF A PROPHET.
Studies in Zechariah.
By the Rev. Professor MARCUS DODS, D.D.

THE FOUR TEMPERAMENTS.
By the Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D.

THE UPPER ROOM.
By the Rev. JOHN WATSON, M.A., D.D., Author of "Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush."

FOUR PSALMS.
By the Rev. Prof. G. A. SMITH, D.D.

WHY BE A CHRISTIAN?
And other Addresses to Young Men.
By the Rev. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

THE UNITY AND SYMMETRY OF THE BIBLE.
By the Rev. JOHN MONRO GIBSON, M.A., D.D.

GOSPEL QUESTIONS and ANSWERS.
By the Rev. JAMES DENNEY, D.D., Author of "Studies in Theology," etc.

THE HOLY FATHER AND THE LIVING CHRIST.
By the Rev. P. T. FORSYTH, D.D.

FROM STRENGTH TO STRENGTH.
By the Rev. J. H. JOWETT, M.A.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

THE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATOR.

EDITED BY

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

Fcap. 8vo, cloth, price 2s. 6d. each.

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.
By the Rev. C. A. ROW, M.A., D.D.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. Prof. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.

A HEBREW GRAMMAR.
By the Rev. W. H. LOWE, M.A., Hebrew Lecturer, Christ's College, Cambridge.

A MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY.
In Two Parts. By the Rev. A. C. JENNINGS, M.A.
Vol. I. From the First to the Tenth Century.
Vol. II. From the Tenth to the Nineteenth Century.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.
By the Rev. J. E. YONGE, M.A.

THE PRAYER BOOK.
By the Rev. CHARLES HOLE, B.A.

AN INTRODUCTION to the NEW TESTAMENT.
By MARCUS DODS, D.D.

THE LANGUAGE of THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. W. H. SIMCOX, M.A.

THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: Their Style and Characteristics.
By the Rev. W. H. SIMCOX, M.A.

AN INTRODUCTION to the OLD TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.

OUTLINES OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.
By the Rev. Principal HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, D.D.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. Professor W. F. ADENEY, M.A.

EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIANITY.
By the Rev. Professor IVERACH, D.D.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. Professor W. H. BENNETT, M.A.

THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY AND THE EVANGELICAL FAITH.
By the Rev. Professor ORR, D.D.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.