RARE BOOKS
I-7

VOLUME XXVI January, 1928 NUMBER 1

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 1963
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Princeton Theological Review

CONTENTS

Jeremiah—The Man and His Message 1
ALEXANDER STEWART

Monarchy in Israel: The Ideal and the Actual 41
JAMES OSCAR BOYD

The Second Coming in the Discourse of the Last Things 65
EDGAR M. WILSON

Martin Bucer's Conception of a Christian State 80
WILHELM PAUCK

Arminianism in Holland 89
JUERGEN LUDWIG NEVE

An "American" Translation of the Old Testament 109
OSWALD T. ALLIS

Notes and Notices 142
Turretin's "Theology" By CHARLES E. EDWARDS

Reviews of Recent Literature 150

Survey of Periodical Literature 171

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1928

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR

THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

OSWALD T. ALLIS

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article
Notice of discontinuance must be sent to the Publishers; otherwise subscriptions will be continued
Subscription rate, Two Dollars a year, single copies Sixty Cents
Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at Princeton, N. J.

BOOKS REVIEWED

ANDERSON, N. L., *God's World and Word* 166

BAIKIE, J., *Egyptian Papyri and Papyrus Hunting* 169

BARRETT, E. B., *The Jesuit Enigma* 157

GUIGNEBERT, C., *Christianity Past and Present* 152

LEWIS, E., *A Manual of Christian Beliefs* 158

MAC INNIS, J. M., *Peter the Fisherman Philosopher* 162

NELSON, B. C., *"After Its Kind": The First and Last Word on Evolution* 150

RICE, M. S., *The Advantage of a Handicap* 169

STELZLE, C., Ed., *If I Had Only One Sermon to Preach* 163

THOMAS, W. H. G., *Ministerial Life and Work* 168

THOMSON, S. H., Ed., *Mag. Johannis Hus Tractatus Responsivus* .. 156

VANCE, J. A., *America's Future Religion* 160

Copyright 1928, by PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY, 1928

JEREMIAH—THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE

Jeremiah was a native of Anathoth, a village of Benjamin some three miles north-east of Jerusalem. His father Hilkiah was a priest, belonging in all probability to the family of Abiathar, who, on being deposed from the high-priesthood by Solomon, had been condemned to retirement within his "own fields" in Anathoth.[1] Jeremiah, accordingly, would have inherited the traditions of an illustrious ancestry, and his early life would have been moulded by the distinctive religious influences of the community to which he belonged. God however had "provided some better thing" for him than to spend his days in serving at the altars of a proscribed and degenerate priesthood. The young son of Hilkiah had been appointed to the tremendous destiny of being a prophet of the Lord in one of the most testing hours in the history of His chosen people.

It was in the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah, that is, in the year 627 B.C., that Jeremiah received his call to the prophetic office. His ministry extended through the disastrous years which culminated in the tragedy of the Exile, and after that was continued in Egypt, we know not how long. Altogether it lasted for at least well over forty years. While lacking to some extent in the overwhelming splendour which marks the inaugural vision of Isaiah or of Ezekiel, the circumstances of his call have an impressiveness which strikes an even deeper note. Several of these circumstances are so charged with meaning that a true conception of their significance is essential to a right understanding of the prophet's subsequent history.

[1] 1 Kings, ii. 26.

First of all, the word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah disclosed to him the fact that he was a predestined man. Before he had ever seen the light of this world God had mysteriously prepared him, and appointed him to his life work. As this fact became clear to his consciousness, many experiences of his earlier years would no doubt be invested with a new meaning for him. The outward circumstances which had shaped his course; the influences which had contributed to the formation of his character and to the development of his mental powers; the inner conflicts of his soul; the secret impulses of his heart; the very frustrations and repressions under which his spirit may sometimes have chafed —all would become luminous as indications of the controlling hand of God. But this was not all. His preparation stretched away into the mysterious past, it may be till it bore the seal of eternity, and included gifts of natural endowment and spiritual consecration which preceded the discipline of his conscious experience.

Now the significance of this unveiling of the Divine purpose was not so much its manifestation of the gracious favour of God to Jeremiah. It included of course that element of distinguishing personal honour. But to an even greater extent it pointed to the vastness of the undertaking to which the young priest of Anathoth was being called to put his hand. A preparation so extraordinary assumed a correspondingly extraordinary task. And indeed Jeremiah was not left to infer the difficulty of his mission from the mystery of his foreordination. From the very outset he was confronted with the stupendous demands of his calling. His work was to be unusually extensive in its range, and for the most part intensely painful in its character. He was set "over the nations and over the kingdoms," and his commission was "to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." The two closing terms indicate a generative purpose as the final goal of the prophet's activities; but by far the greater part of his work was to be of a destructive nature. Both these ends were of course to be achieved by

Jeremiah in a ministerial capacity, as the instrument of the resistless energies of the word of the Lord.

A second outstanding fact in connection with Jeremiah's call is his own shrinking from the task with which he was faced. "Ah, Lord God!" he cried, "Behold I cannot speak, for I am a child." He was of course no mere child in the literal sense, for he must have been more than twenty years of age; but he felt himself a child in knowledge and experience, and he was specially apprehensive of unfitness for the prophetic office on the ground of a conscious lack of the gift of utterance. There were also, however, temperamental causes to which Jeremiah's hesitation must partly be ascribed. That indeed is the main significance of this part of the story. If the terms of the Divine communication revealed the character of the work, the response which the communication elicited laid bare the heart of the workman. Jeremiah was constitutionally timid in disposition and sensitive in spirit, a gentle, tender-hearted man, with keen emotional susceptibilities, and with little inclination for controversy or strife. And it is a striking illustration of the mysterious working of the sovereign will of God that He should have chosen as "a prophet unto the nations" a man so apparently unfitted by temperament and aptitude for that tremendous task. In any case this early disclosure of the prophet's natural qualities is a suggestive foreshadowing, and furnishes at least a partial explanation, of the inward conflict and the anguish of soul which come to light at various stages of his after history.

A third feature of vital significance in Jeremiah's call is the special equipment which he received for his life work. This equipment was symbolised by the touch of the Divine hand on his mouth, an action which was accompanied by the explanatory assurance, "Behold I have put my words in thy mouth." The communication of the word of the Lord conveyed to the future prophet the gift of insight and of foresight. It lay of course behind the authority which breathed through his message and the conviction which rang in his voice. It also explains the keenness of his spiritual discern-

ment and the soundness of his political judgment, as well as the predictive element in his prophecies, the loftiness of his religious teaching, and the destructive energy which sometimes accompanied his word. It was an endowment, in short, which meant nothing less than the gift of inspiration.

Jeremiah's equipment included also a message from the Lord which was particularly adapted to his need. It consisted first of all of a word of command in answer to his protestation of unfitness.[2] The twice-repeated, "thou shalt," of this solemn charge—"thou shalt go," and "thou shalt speak"—swept aside the young prophet's objections, and made it plain to him that he must subject himself unreservedly to the authority of his Divine Master with respect alike to the sphere of his labour and to the character of his message. But the word of command was followed by a word of gracious encouragement: "Be not afraid of their faces; for I am with thee, to deliver thee." Hostile faces there certainly would be in plenty—brows lowered in resentment, eyes flashing in hatred, and lips curled in scorn or clamorous in denunciation; but here was a promise of the Lord's own presence throughout all the days, and in that fact there lay for Jeremiah a guarantee of strength and protection amid all the difficulties and dangers of his future ministry.

The prophet certainly needed a full share of courage, for few men have ever been confronted with a more formidable task. The northern kingdom had already passed to its doom, and Judah was steadily advancing to a similar catastrophe. It is true that the national decline appeared to have been arrested by the reforming zeal of Josiah. For some time before Jeremiah began his ministry the young king had been applying himself to the work of purging the land from idolatry, and five years after the prophet's call this cleansing work received a mighty impetus through the re-discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple. But notwithstanding the solemn covenant by which, on that memorable occasion,

---

[2] i. 7.

the people had pledged themselves to loyalty to their God, it is evident that their repentance was lacking in depth and their new obedience in sincerity. Their reformation was little more, indeed, than a scratching on the surface of the national life. The fallow ground had not been broken up with anything like thoroughness.[3] Certain at least it is that the account which Jeremiah gives of the state of the nation during the earlier years of his ministry forms one of the darkest pictures ever drawn of the religious and moral corruption of a community.

To begin with, there was the disease of idolatry. Josiah's efforts had secured the removal of the local sanctuaries, and had centralised the worship of the Lord in Jerusalem. But the love of idolatry remained in the heart of the people, and the practice of it, in one form or another, had never really been given up; it held sway over them indeed like an insatiable lust.[4] They set up the altars of Baal in every street,[5] burned incense to all the host of heaven on the roofs of their houses,[6] joined together—men, women, and children—in rendering homage to the queen of heaven in the cities of Judah and the thoroughfares of Jerusalem,[7] and introduced their idolatrous abominations into the very Temple of the Lord.[8] And the crowning iniquity of all was the sacrifice of their innocent sons and daughters to Baal in the valley of the son of Hinnom.[9] Judah in short had changed her God, and in so doing had displayed a greater inconstancy than the surrounding heathen nations, who remained faithful to their own false deities.[10]

Then there was the plague of moral corruption, propagated by idolatry, and flourishing to a great extent under its sanction. Adultery ate like a canker into the entire life of the community,[11] and covetousness held an equally extensive

---

[3] iv. 3.
[4] iii. 2.
[5] xi. 13.
[6] xix. 13.
[7] vii. 18.
[8] vii. 30.
[9] ii. 34; vii. 31; xix. 4, 5.
[10] ii. 10, 11.
[11] v. 7, 8; vii. 9; ix. 2; xxiii. 14.

sway,[12] followed by dishonesty, oppression, violence, and even murder.[13] Lying took the place of truth on men's lips,[14] and so complete was the lack of ordinary integrity in the land that a man could not trust his own brother.[15] Jeremiah challenged his hearers to discover, after the most diligent search through all the streets and broad places of Jerusalem, a single man who executed judgment and sought the truth.[16] Set as an assayer over the people, he had tested their quality, and found them to be reprobate silver.[17]

For this appalling condition of things the religious guides of the nation were in no small degree responsible. Prophets, priests, and people, indeed, were banded together in an unholy conspiracy against the Lord.[18] The influence of the prophets was specially pernicious. These unfaithful shepherds were themselves infected with the prevailing moral foulness,[19] and they fed their flock with lying assurances in the name of the Lord.[20] Scorning the idea of approaching calamity,[21] and appealing to the Law and the Temple as guarantees of the Divine protection,[22] they created in the minds of men a fatal sense of security. So the people shared the lighthearted optimism of their teachers, and with tragic blindness placed their confidence in their external privileges and observances. Were they not the Lord's covenant people, and were they not attending with diligence to the ritual prescribed in His law?[23] And if these spiritual defences were not enough, had they not the strength of Assyria or of Egypt to fall back on in times of special need?[24] They accordingly listened to the warnings of Jeremiah with faces that were harder than a rock,[25] refusing to admit their guilt or to accept correction,[26] and devoting themselves to their evil practices with a proud and shameless abandonment.[27] This was

---

[12] vi. 13.
[13] v. 27, 28; vii. 9.
[14] vii. 28.
[15] ix. 4.
[16] v. 1.
[17] vi. 27-30.
[18] v. 31.
[19] xxiii. 14.
[20] xiv. 14.
[21] xiv. 13.
[22] vii. 4.
[23] viii. 8.
[24] ii. 18.
[25] v. 3.
[26] ii. 23, 35; vii. 28.
[27] v. 23; vi. 15.

the state of Judah when Jeremiah began his ministry.[28]

As he was entering on his appointed task Jeremiah received two visions, each of which, with its accompanying interpretation, was a disclosure of the Divine purpose with reference to the nation, and consequently exercised a determining influence on the general character of his message. First of all he saw a rod of an almond tree,[29] and was told that this was a sign that the Lord would hasten His word to perform it. The appropriateness of the sign is not at once apparent, but it comes to light when we learn on the one hand that the name of the almond-tree—or "wake-tree," as the word has been rendered—points to the fact that it is the first of the trees to wake from the sleep of winter, and on the other that the word translated "hasten," in the Lord's message, bears the meaning of being "wakeful." The strengthening effect of this communication on the prophet's mind can well be understood. In its general sense it was an assurance that the Lord stood committed to the fulfilment of the Word which He put in His servant's mouth, in its element of judgment as well as in its aspect of grace. Sometimes He might seem to be asleep, so far as giving effect either to His threatenings or to His promises was concerned, but not one jot or tittle of His message would fall to the ground.

The second vision, that of the seething cauldron,[30] with its face toward, or rather from, the north, was explained to the prophet as a sign of the trouble which was brewing in the north for Judah, and would ere long break forth. As instruments of Divine judgment on the apostate nation, the kingdoms of the north were to over-run the land and encamp before the very gates of Jerusalem. Following this vision

[28] The Rev. George Douglas, in *The Book of Jeremiah*, contends, with a good deal of force, that the Book begins with the reign of Jehoiakim, and that it contains nothing that belongs to the time of Josiah except the narrative of the prophet's call and the expressly dated passage in chap. iii (vss. 6-25). But while this view meets certain difficulties, the argument just fails to carry conviction.

[29] i. 11, 12.

[30] i. 13.

there is a final message from the Lord to the young prophet, containing a renewed exhortation to courage, and a fresh assurance of help in his work—help so mighty as to transform the timid waverer into a man of rock-like strength, who would stand before his enemies as a "defenced city and an iron pillar and brazen walls."

In the earlier years of his ministry Jeremiah's message, for the most part, took the form of denunciation and warning. With unsparing vigour he exposed the wickedness of the people, summoned them to repentance, and threatened them with the judgments of the Lord if they refused to return. Especially did he dwell on the peril from the north represented by the vision of the seething cauldron. With a remarkable wealth of imagery he described the terrible mission of those nameless avengers. Like the hot sirocco from the wilderness,[31] or a raging lion breaking forth from his thicket;[32] with chariots like the whirlwind and with horses swifter than eagles,[33] they were to sweep over the land, spreading terror before them and leaving ruin in their train.[34]

---

[31] iv. 11.

[32] iv. 7.

[33] iv. 13.

[34] Most modern scholars maintain that it was the Scythians that Jeremiah had in view in those early premonitions of danger, and that, since his fears from that quarter were proved by the event to be groundless, he was compelled at a later stage to change his mind. Sir George Adam Smith, for example, bluntly affirms (*Jeremiah*, pp. 111, 117, 259) that the prophet was mistaken in his first identification of the invaders, and suggests that he made alterations in the text of his original prophecies when it became clear to him that the Chaldeans were the real enemy. But, to say nothing about the question of the prophet's inspiration, this is surely doing less than justice to his honesty. It is indeed the case that the northern enemy of the earlier oracles are to a large extent a vague and mysterious terror, and that it is only in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim that they are given a local habitation and a name; but although Jeremiah's knowledge may have grown in clearness with the development of events, there is not a particle of evidence that it was ever open to correction on any question of fact. Nor is there any evidence that the Scythians ever actually invaded the land of Judah.

It is probable that for some time after his call Jeremiah continued to reside in Anathoth, but ere long he was compelled to leave the home of his birth and take up his abode in Jerusalem. The reason was that the men of Anathoth entered into a conspiracy to put him to death.[35] The cause of their hostility we are not told; but it may be that the priestly community from which Jeremiah was sprung resented his assumption of the prophetic office as a betrayal of his own order. The treachery of his neighbours, and especially of his own kinsfolk, came as a painful shock to the unsuspecting prophet, and gave rise to inward perplexities which he poured forth before the Lord in a kind of wondering expostulation.[36] The answer he received was in effect an intimation that this experience was only the beginning of his troubles, and that it was designed to be a preparation for still more exacting trials in the days to come.[37]

Of Jeremiah's work during the later years of Josiah's reign we have little record. There is no warrant for believing that he was out of sympathy with the reforming activities of the young king and that "his insight into the nature of religion makes it inconceivable that he could ever have had any sympathy with an attempt to convert the nation by a forcible change in its forms of worship."[38] We find on the contrary that in a later day he paid a high tribute to the character and work of Josiah,[39] and that instead of being opposed, as is sometimes alleged, to the teaching of the newly discovered Book of the Law, he puts his cordial Amen to the demands of "this covenant," and declares that he was called by the Lord to proclaim its message throughout the land.[40] He realised indeed, as we have seen, that Josiah's reformation did not go deep enough, but, so far as it went, it was a work of God, and so could not but receive his support.

Through the death of Josiah at Megiddo, in a gallant attempt to withstand an Egyptian army advancing against

---

[35] xi. 18-23.
[36] xii. 1-4.
[37] xii. 5.
[38] Dr. John Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*, p. 105.
[39] xx. 15, 16.
[40] xi. 1-6.

Assyria under Pharaoh Necho, Judah was stricken with a calamity from which it never recovered. Josiah was succeeded by his younger son Jehoahaz, whom "the people of the land" placed on the throne in preference to his older brother Eliakim. But Jehoahaz was allowed to reign for only three months, being deposed by Necho, and carried off in chains to Egypt, where he died. As his successor on the throne, Necho—now virtually over-lord of Judah—appointed Eliakim, whose name he changed to Jehoiakim. This took place in the year 608 B.C.

The accession of Jehoiakim was a bad day for the nation, as well as for its one faithful prophet. Jehoiakim was "the ideal of a bad ruler"[41]—proud, vindictive, selfish, and covetous. He laid the land under heavy taxation to meet the demands of his Egyptian conqueror,[42] and with callous indifference to the consequent sufferings of his people, devoted most of his attention to the task of enlarging and adorning his palace, ceiling its chambers with cedar and painting them with vermilion. With incredible meanness, too, he carried out those costly schemes with labour for which he never paid. Jeremiah did not hesitate to denounce such shameless wrongdoing. In a memorable indictment of the royal iniquities,[43] he places Jehoiakim in the pillory, and scourges him with the lash of a righteous scorn, predicting that he would die without being lamented, and would be buried with the burial of an ass.[44] Under Jehoiakim's rule the reforming policy of

---

[41] Prof. A. B. Davidson, in *Hastings' D. B.*, vol. ii. p. 571.

[42] 2 Kings xxiii. 35.

[43] xxii. 13-19.

[44] Sir George Adam Smith's assertion (*Jeremiah*, p. 259) that this prediction was not fulfilled is as gratuitous as it is unwarranted. The assertion is based on 2 Kings xxiv. 6, where it is stated that Jehoiakim "slept with his fathers." But surely there is no contradiction between the prophecy and the recorded fact; for the one refers to the king's burial and the other to his death. In proof of this it will be enough to recall that the phrase "to sleep with one's fathers," with its various equivalents, is used in cases like those of Abraham, Jacob, Aaron, Moses, and David, where the place of burial was far removed from the ancestral graves. Cf. Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, 3rd Ed. p. 201.

Josiah was abandoned, and the nation relapsed into open idolatry. Jeremiah accordingly comes into greater prominence, and from this time forward we have a fuller account of his personal history.

An incident which took place at the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign is of special significance.[45] Standing in the courts of the Lord's House, probably on one of the national feast days, Jeremiah declared in the name of the Lord that unless the people hearkened to the Divine appeal and turned from their evil ways, the Temple in which they trusted would share the fate of Shiloh, and Jerusalem itself would become a desolation. The scene which followed stands out from the sacred page with arresting distinctness. Jeremiah's hearers were horrified at words which appeared to them to be nothing less than blasphemy, and the priests and the prophets, aided at first by the people, laid hold of him and threatened him with death. The prophet alone remained calm in the midst of the general commotion, standing like "an iron pillar" before the whole array of menacing faces. Attracted by the tumult the princes appeared on the scene, and to them Jeremiah's accusers appealed to support their demand. With quiet dignity the prophet replied that the message he had delivered was the word of the Lord, and that accordingly if his opponents put him to death they would be guilty of shedding innocent blood. This defence made a profound impression, not only winning the princes, but turning round the people to the prophet's side. Some of the elders also were able to quote a precedent for leniency from the history of Micah in the days of King Hezekiah. Finally, through the intervention of Ahikam, Jeremiah was delivered from the hand of his enemies.

The fourth year[46] of Jehoiakim's reign was a year that

---

[45] xxvi. 1 ff.

[46] To the earlier years of this reign probably belong the mysterious incident of the linen girdle (xiii. 1-7), and Jeremiah's discourses in connection with the drought (xiv) and with Sabbath observance (xvii. 19-27).

marked an epoch in the history of the adjoining nations, as well as in the fortunes of Judah and in the experience of Jeremiah. Several years before, the Medes and the Chaldeans had joined their forces in a successful attack on Nineveh, and following the overthrow of the Assyrian dominion Mesopotamia and the provinces south of the Euphrates passed into the hands of the Chaldeans. This region however had already been conquered by Egypt, and a conflict between the two rival claimants could not be long delayed. A battle was fought at Carchemish in the year 604 B.C., resulting in the defeat of Pharaoh Necho by Nebuchadnezzar. In the same year Nebuchadnezzar invaded Judah, and it was then that Daniel and his companions were carried away to Babylon.[47] Jehoiakim himself was also put in chains, with a similar end in view, but in his case, for some unexplained reason, Nebuchadnezzar did not carry his purpose into effect. Jehoiakim however became his vassal, and for three years paid him tribute. As a result of the battle of Carchemish, accordingly, the sovereignty of Egypt over Judah gave place to that of Babylon.

An interesting confirmation of a Chaldean invasion at this time is furnished by the fact that the Rechabites, who, according to the laws imposed upon them by Jonathan their ancestor, had for two centuries been living a nomadic life, were constrained by fear of Nebuchadnezzar to leave their desert home and take refuge in Jerusalem.[48] Their loyalty to the commandment of Jonathan in the matter of abstaining from wine was put to the proof by Jeremiah, and the contrast which it presented to the conduct of Judah in refusing to obey the laws of their God was emphasised by him in an address to the people. It was about this time that Jeremiah paid a visit to the potter's house, and saw in the methods of the potter a kind of parable of God's sovereign dealings with

---

[47] 2 Kings xxiv. 1; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 7; Daniel i. 1 ff. The date given in Daniel is calculated according to the Babylonian method of reckoning, and is the fourth year of Jehoiakim according to the Jewish method.

[48] xxxv. 11.

nations and individuals.[49] Not long afterwards he was commanded to take a potter's earthen bottle and proceed to the valley of the son of Hinnom, accompanied by a number of the elders of the people and of the priests.[50] There he prophesied that evil from the Lord would come upon that place because of the idolatrous abominations with which it was associated, and, having broken the bottle as a sign of the destruction of people and city by the hand of the Lord, he returned to the Temple and there repeated his message of doom. This incident had an unhappy sequel for the prophet.[51] His words were reported to Pashur, who appears to have been chief of the Temple police, and this official considered it his duty to beat Jeremiah and place him in the stocks, where he remained the whole night. On being released in the morning he addressed Pashur in terms of stern remonstrance and warning, prophesying that he would become a terror to himself and to all his friends, and that he and they would die in captivity in Babylon. The humiliation involved in this experience filled the prophet's soul with mingled indignation and pain, and caused him deep searchings of heart. The passage in which he pours out his complaint unto the Lord[52]—one of those passages of intimate self-disclosure which are characteristic of the Book of Jeremiah, and give it a unique place among the prophetic writings—shows how intense were the writhings of his spirit under persecution, and how earnestly he sometimes longed to be released from his task.

The reference to Babylon in the sentence pronounced on Pashur is significant as marking a change which from this time forward appears in Jeremiah's allusions to the enemy from the North. The political upheavals among the nations cast light for him on the Divine purpose, and the instruments of judgment are now definitely named as the Chaldeans. Not only so, but in one striking oracle[53] which bears the date of the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar is

---

[49] xviii. 1-10.
[50] xix. 1 ff.
[51] xx. 1-6.
[52] xx. 7-10.
[53] xxv. 1 ff.

described as a servant of the Lord, the captivity in Babylon is clearly predicted, and its duration is fixed at seventy years. At the close of the seventy years the Chaldeans in turn were to be punished for their iniquity, and all the nations indeed were to drink the wine cup of the wrath of God. This is one of the most remarkable of Jeremiah's prophecies.

The fourth year of Jehoiakim is also memorable as the year in which Jeremiah's previous prophecies were first committed to writing and formed into a roll, the immediate aim being that they should be read to the people in their completeness as a final call from God to repentance.[54] As his amanuensis in this undertaking Jeremiah employed Baruch the son of Neriah, who became his intimate friend, and whose sympathy and companionship would seem to have been almost his only earthly solace during the trials of his remaining years. On the completion of his task Baruch read the roll in the hearing of the people on a fast-day in Jerusalem towards the close of the following year, Jeremiah himself being for some reason prevented from entering the Temple. One of his audience, Micaiah, was so impressed with the message that he proceeded to the royal palace, and gave the princes an account of what he had heard. The princes immediately sent for Baruch, and requested him to read the roll a second time. And so great was the cumulative effect of the prophetic warnings and appeals that the princes turned in fear one toward another, and decided that the roll must be brought before the notice of the king. Knowing full well the character of Jehoiakim, however, they wisely advised Jeremiah and Baruch to go into hiding before the roll was read in the royal presence. On being informed of the nature of Jeremiah's words, the king sent a messenger to fetch the roll. But as Jehudi proceeded to read the manuscript, Jehoiakim was unable to restrain his wrath. When the reading of every three or four pages was completed, he cut them with his pen-knife, and cast them into the fire, until the whole roll

[54] xxxvi. 1 ff.

was burned. The witnesses of this impious act looked on with apparent indifference, although two or three of the princes made a futile appeal to the king to desist from his purpose. Having made an end of the roll, Jehoiakim was ready to deal after a similar fashion with Jeremiah and Baruch, and gave orders to have them arrested. Their hiding-place however could not be discovered. Nor had the king, for all his fury, succeeded in destroying the word of the Lord. Jeremiah was commanded to secure another roll, and in it Baruch wrote down all the prophecies which Jehoiakim had committed to the flames, with "many like words" added to the original collection. This enlarged roll forms, no doubt, the nucleus of our present book.

Jehoiakim acknowledged the supremacy of Babylon for three years, and then threw off the yoke. Nebuchadnezzar did not immediately come against him in person, but he sent bands of his own forces, together with Moabite, Syrian, and Ammonite auxiliaries, to lay waste the land. Before more effective measures for the re-conquest of Judah could be initiated, however, Jehoiakim died.

He was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin, a youth of eighteen years of age, who, during his brief reign of three months and ten days, appears to have maintained his father's policy both in religious and in political affairs. In any case the Chaldean army soon appeared before the gates of Jerusalem, and after a three months' siege the city was captured. Jehoiachin and the queen-mother, together with the princes and the flower of the Jewish people, were carried into Babylon; none were left "save the poorest sort of the people of the land."[55]

On the throne of the stricken kingdom Nebuchadnezzar set Zedekiah, who was a half-brother to Jehoiakim. Zedekiah was personally disposed to be friendly to Jeremiah; but he was a weak man, without courage or independence of judgment, and he was as clay in the hands of the upstart princes who surrounded his throne. These dignitaries were ill quali-

[55] 2 Kings xxiv. 14.

fied for the task of government, but they were filled with the usual arrogance of men of their class, and looked upon themselves as the true nobility of the nation, in contrast with those who had been carried into captivity. Jeremiah was not long in discerning their real character, and in the parable of the baskets of figs[56] he exposed their worthlessness and announced their doom, while at the same time he affirmed the superior quality of the exiles and predicted their ultimate return to their own land. This parable of the figs is significant as marking a definite stage in the enlightenment of the prophet's mind with regard to the future of the Kingdom of God. From this time forward his hopes are centred in the captives in Babylon.

Jeremiah incurred the displeasure of the prophets who were in Babylon because, in a letter to the exiles, he directly opposed their prediction of an early return from captivity;[57] and for the same reason, as well as because of his repeated counsels of submission to Nebuchadnezzar, he came into conflict with the prophets who remained in Judah. A dramatic encounter took place one day between Jeremiah and Hananiah in the Temple, Jeremiah appearing with a yoke on his neck as a sign of the necessity for subjection to the king of Babylon, and Hananiah, who was a leading representative of the false prophets, declaring with equal emphasis that the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar would be broken within two years, and, in token of the truth of his prediction, removing the yoke from Jeremiah's neck and breaking it. A sequel to the interview was a message from Jeremiah to the optimistic prophet, announcing that he would die that year for teaching "rebellion against the Lord." Within two months this sentence of doom was fulfilled.[58]

Zedekiah's advisers as a whole were in favour of throwing off the Chaldean yoke, and were looking to Egypt for help to achieve this end. Their counsels at length prevailed, and Zedekiah broke his covenant with the king of Babylon.[59] Nebu-

[56] Chap. xxiv. [57] xxix. [58] xxviii. [59] Ezek. xvii. 15-18.

chadnezzar swiftly marched against Jerusalem, and the final siege of the city began. After some time the Chaldeans withdrew before the advance of an Egyptian army, and during this interval in the siege Zedekiah sent a deputation to the prophet, requesting his prayers on behalf of the land, and at the same time seeking enlightenment on the future development of events. Jeremiah's reply was an emphatic assurance that the relief afforded by the Egyptian intervention was only temporary, and that the Chaldeans would certainly return and capture the city.[60]

It was during this lull in the storm also that Jeremiah was first cast into prison.[61] He was proceeding to Anathoth, on some business relating to his property there, when he was arrested by Irijah, the captain of the guard, on the charge of being a deserter, and after being beaten was placed in confinement in a dungeon attached to the house of Jonathan the scribe. He never regained his liberty until the city was captured.

During his imprisonment in Jonathan's house the king sent for him secretly, and enquired once more if there was "any word from the Lord" regarding the future of the nation. And once more Jeremiah gave the uncompromising reply that Zedekiah would be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon. At the same time he appealed to the king not to send him back to the dungeon in the house of Jonathan. Zedekiah granted this request and the prophet was accordingly removed to the court of the prison where he was allowed a certain measure of freedom and could be visited by his friends.

His confinement indeed was not all gloom and hopeless dejection; it was sweetened and to a great extent transfigured by the strong consolations of God. Like John in Patmos or Paul in Rome, Jeremiah was favoured in his prison in Jerusalem with the brightest visions of his prophetic career—

---

[60] xxxvii. 3-10.

[61] xxxvii. 11-15.

visions of a restored and regenerated nation, a reestablished sanctuary, a purified priesthood, and a happy and prosperous people serving the Lord under a new and better Covenant.[62] These revelations of the future Jeremiah was commanded to write in a book.[63]

It was during this period of comparative liberty that an incident took place which has a special significance in its bearing on the quality of the prophet's faith. The Egyptian army had meantime been compelled to retire and the Chaldeans had resumed the siege of Jerusalem. One day Jeremiah was visited in his prison by his cousin Hanameel from Anathoth.[64] A piece of ground in the prophet's native place had fallen vacant and Hanameel had come to give Jeremiah an opportunity of buying it for himself as the next of kin. The prophet promptly closed with the offer and bought the land at the price of seventeen shekels. The transaction was carried out with a strict regard to legal formalities. A deed of purchase was drawn up and was duly signed, witnessed, and sealed. Then Jeremiah handed the deed to Baruch, and charged him to deposit it in a safe place, where it might be preserved for many days. What was the meaning of this strange transaction? It was at once a test and an evidence of the prophet's faith in his own predictions. He was asked to buy a piece of land which for all practical purposes was worthless, because it was in the hands of the enemy. Was he so convinced that houses and lands would yet be bought and sold in Judah in a new era of prosperity as to be prepared, in simple reliance on God's promise, to make this apparently hopeless investment? In other words, was his assurance of the future hope strong enough to carry the day against all the opposing evidence of the present fact? And Jeremiah's faith survived this searching test. His purchase of the land provided those who witnessed the transaction with a practical evidence of the prophet's confidence in the ultimate restoration of Judah, while the rediscovered deed would furnish future generations with a

---

[62] xxx-xxxiii. [63] xxx. 2. [64] xxxii. 6 ff.

striking testimony to the faithfulness of God to His own promises. It is significant that no sooner was the transaction completed than Jeremiah betook himself to prayer, for his faith, even in the hour of its victory, needed fresh confirmations and reinforcements from God.

As the siege proceeded, the hostility of Jeremiah's enemies became more intense. Charging him with counselling desertion to the Chaldeans, and thus with weakening the hands of the men of war within the city, they petitioned the king to have him put to death.[65] With characteristic weakness Zedekiah yielded to the clamour of his princes, and delivered Jeremiah into their hands. Then followed the most terrible ordeal of the prophet's career. For some reason or other the princes shrank from killing him out of hand; but they chose for him a more dreadful end. Lowering him with cords into a miry dungeon, they left him there to die of starvation and exposure. From an unexpected quarter, however, the Lord sent deliverance to His servant in his extremity. An Ethiopian eunuch, named Ebed-melech, who was attached to the royal palace, heard of Jeremiah's plight, and immediately made his way to the king and interceded on the prophet's behalf. Zedekiah at once gave instructions for his release, and Ebed-melech, accompanied by a number of assistants, proceeded without delay to carry out his merciful task. Lowering into the dungeon a quantity of "old cast clouts and old rotten rags" for the prophet to place under his arm-pits beneath the cords—Jeremiah was "sunk in the mire," and the work of extrication would have involved an immense strain—they raised him from his "horrible pit," and removed him to his former place of confinement in the court of the prison. For this courageous action, which was prompted not merely by natural compassion but by religious faith, the Ethiopian received "a prophet's reward." Jeremiah afterwards conveyed to him an assurance from the Lord that in the day of Jerusalem's desolation his life would be given him for a prey.[66]

---

[65] xxxviii. 4. [66] xxxix. 15-18.

After Jeremiah's rescue from the dungeon Zedekiah sent for him again with the ostensible aim of obtaining guidance on the course he should follow.[67] This final interview between the two men presents an interesting psychological study. On the one hand, we see the king, struggling in the toils of a now desperate situation, wavering between conflicting views of duty, and perhaps secretly hoping that now at length, as a result of his recent experiences, Jeremiah might find it possible to deliver a more accommodating message to his royal benefactor. And before him stands the prophet, newly saved from a terrible death, and weak and shaken, no doubt, by the privations and horrors of that experience. For him the interview meant a fresh trial of courage and fidelity. But the brave heart never faltered. Whatever the condition of his body, he stood "as an iron pillar" in the steadfastness of his soul. Stipulating only that he should not be put to death for telling the truth, he assured Zedekiah once more that surrender to the king of Babylon would mean deliverance for himself and the city, while continued resistance would involve irretrievable disaster. Zedekiah expressed his fear that if he surrendered to the Chaldeans he would be delivered to the mocking of those Jews who had already gone over to the enemy, and Jeremiah met this objection with a warning that if he refused to yield he would incur, as a prisoner, the more bitter mocking of his own women. Zedekiah's only answer to this scathing message was a request that the nature of his interview with the prophet might not be divulged to his princes, and to this request Jeremiah acceded.

After a siege of eighteen months Jerusalem was taken. Zedekiah and some of his men tried to escape by night, but they were overtaken in the plains of Jericho and brought to Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah. Zedekiah's sons were put to death in his own presence, and then he himself was blinded and afterwards carried in fetters to Babylon.[68] Jeremiah was brought out of prison by the Chaldean officers, and handed over to the

---

[67] xxxviii. 14. [68] xxxix. 1-7.

care of Gedaliah, who was appointed governor of Judah.[69] Afterwards he was brought to Ramah by Nebuzaradan—who had been charged by the king of Babylon to treat the prophet with every respect—and was given the choice of going to Babylon, where freedom and honour awaited him, or of remaining behind in Judah. With rare courage and self-denial Jeremiah elected to cast in his lot with the remnant who were left in the land.[70]

The rest of the sad story need not detain us long. Under the wise rule of Gedaliah there was some hope that Judah might regain a measure of prosperity. But Gedaliah was murdered by Ishmael,[71] and Ishmael in turn was put to flight by Johanan.[72] Fearing the vengeance of Nebuchadnezzar, Johanan and his companions, in spite of the warnings of Jeremiah, resolved to flee to Egypt, and the prophet and Baruch were compelled to accompany them.[73] On arriving at Tahpanhes Jeremiah—making characteristic use of symbolical action to reinforce his message—buried great stones in front of the royal palace, and predicted that over these the throne of Nebuchadnezzar would yet be set up when he came to conquer the land.[74]

Even in Egypt we find the prophet carrying out his commission to root out and to pull down. The Jews who dwelt in the Nile valley were practising idolatry, and Jeremiah sternly denounced this wickedness. And when they refused to listen to his remonstrances, boldly challenging the truth of his assertions, and justifying themselves in their worship of other gods, Jeremiah declared that the stroke of Divine judgment would fall on them as surely and as terribly as it had fallen on Judah, and that as a sign of the fulfilment of this prophecy Pharaoh-Hophra himself would be delivered into the hand of his enemies.[75]

This is the last that we hear of Jeremiah. How long he

---

[69] xxxix. 11-14.
[70] xl. 1-6.
[71] xli. 2.
[72] xli. 11-15.
[73] xlii.
[74] xliii. 8-13.
[75] Chap. xliv.

lived in Egypt afterwards, and in what circumstances he came to his end, we do not know.

Jeremiah has sometimes been called the greatest of the prophets, and beyond question there are elements in his character and in his message which go far to justify this lofty claim. It is certainly true, as has been already indicated, that the task committed to his hands was one of the most difficult ever assigned to mortal man. For, apart altogether from the fact that Jeremiah was constitutionally disinclined to be a prophet of judgment, his mission brought him into conflict with a tremendous combination of forces. There are men who drink delight from battling with their peers, and on whom the dust of controversy has the effect of a tonic. But Jeremiah was not of that pugnacious tribe. He instinctively recoiled from strife. But we have already seen that he was engaged in strife throughout his whole career. The priests and prophets were of course his bitterest enemies, for by the purity of his life as well as by the faithfulness of his message he rebuked their corruptions and condemned their shallow optimism. The princes were at first his protectors, but in the later years of his ministry they became his most violent persecutors. The kings for the most part resented his plainness of speech, and even Zedekiah never once acted on his advice although he frequently asked for it. The people too, with characteristic fickleness, at one time befriended him, but latterly joined with the princes in clamouring for his life. His enemies plotted against him secretly, and cursed him openly. He had to endure at their hands repeated public humiliations, the restraints of a long imprisonment, and the horror of being left to die in a miry pit. And sometimes the anguish of his spirit under these experiences could not be restrained. "Woe is me, my mother," we hear him crying, "that thou hast borne me a man of strife, and a man of contention to the whole earth . . . everyone of them doth curse me."[76] Was there ever a man, indeed, whose fidelity to his commission ex-

[76] xv. 10.

posed him to more cruel misrepresentation? He was a true patriot, but he was hated and reproached as a traitor. He toiled and prayed above everything else for the religious well-being of his country, but he was condemned as a betrayer of its most sacred heritage.

In Jeremiah's heart too there flamed a passion of love for his own people; but he had not only to endure the hatred with which they repaid his devotion, but had also to be a helpless spectator of their wickedness and a stern herald of their destruction. He pleaded with them to return unto the Lord, but he knew that his task was hopeless. This was indeed one of the most distressing features of his ministry. So far as direct and visible results were concerned, his work appeared to be a complete failure. Other prophets had at least occasional successes to cheer their hearts in the midst of their difficulties; but Jeremiah seemed to be fighting a losing battle to the very end. His warnings were unheeded; his counsels were set aside. Even after the fall of Jerusalem we see him dragged into Egypt by a fleeing rabble, who had at first consulted him as to what they should do, and then angrily refused to follow his guidance. And in the last scene of all, before the curtain falls in Tahpanhes, we see a company of Jewish women boldly giving him the lie and pouring contempt on his message. Who can estimate the pain which such experiences as these occasioned to a spirit so sensitive as Jeremiah's? But his love burned on in a quenchless flame. Like Paul in a later day he had "great heaviness and continual sorrow" in his heart for his kinsmen according to the flesh. "Oh," he exclaims, "that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people."[77] These are words which, like the still profounder exclamations of Moses and Paul in the same connection, were "sparks from the fire of Christ's substitutionary love."

It was Jeremiah's lot also to live a lonely life throughout

[77] ix. 1.

all his days. To some extent of course this was the inevitable result of the unpopularity of his mission. But solitariness was also imposed upon him by the direct command of God. He was forbidden, for example, to marry,[78] and so was denied the domestic encouragements and sympathies which have often helped men to endure the sorest public trials. He was even charged to remain apart from the social life of the community. Alike from the house of mourning and from the house of feasting he must hold aloof.[79] For Jeremiah was appointed to be a sign to the nation, and his mode of life was intended to reinforce his message. But these restrictions must have been a real trial to him. Jeremiah was no ascetic, who would have practised such austerities from personal choice. He was a man of warm human sympathies, and from various references in his prophecies we may gather that he would have rejoiced in having friendly intercourse with his fellowmen. But from all those alleviations and solaces which sorrow finds in human fellowship Jeremiah was shut out. With the single exception of Baruch, he had not even one friend during his whole life-time into whose ear he could pour forth the tale of his griefs and his wrongs.

This loneliness however was not without its compensations, for it threw him back upon God. If Jeremiah was denied the comfort of earthly friendships, he was favoured in a remarkable degree with the fellowship of the Lord. There is perhaps nothing in the records of the religious life anywhere, in the Bible or out of it, that is quite like the account which Jeremiah gives us of his intercourse with his God. He spoke to God "as a man speaketh unto his friend," not indeed with irreverent familiarity, but with the courage which is inspired by profound emotion. And he weaves the story of these colloquies with Heaven into his prophetic messages with a frankness of self-revelation that lays bare to us the inner workings of his spirit. The struggles of his soul, the tumult of his emotions, the chaffing, and sometimes the fainting, of

---

[78] xvi. 2. [79] xvi. 5-9.

his heart under the burden of his destiny, the tides of anguish that surged through his breast—all these are mirrored for us in brief but vivid sketches of his secret history. We hear him, for example, now giving utterance to his perplexities regarding the Divine government of the world,[80] now expostulating with the Lord for having "beguiled" him into entering the prophetic office.[81] At one time we find him longing to escape from the field of battle altogether, and to retire into "a lodging-place of way-faring men" in the wilderness,[82] and again he tells us how on other occasions he actually refrained from delivering his message, until the word of the Lord became as a burning fire in his bones, and he was compelled to seek relief in speech.[83] And finally, in a mood which bordered on despair, we find this tormented man cursing the day on which he was born.[84]

But if Jeremiah had to tread a lonely and sorrowful path, he never wavered in his fidelity. There is nothing indeed that stands out more clearly from his history than the courage of his soul. It was courage, too, of the highest quality. There are men who know no fear, because they are lacking in fineness of sensibility; they are without imagination, and do not know the meaning of "nerves." The real hero is the man who is conscious of fear, but overcomes the impulse to run away, and triumphs over himself before he grapples with his enemy. Of this more excellent kind was the courage of Jeremiah. If he sometimes felt inclined to quit his post, he refused to yield to such unworthy promptings. If he was naturally timid in disposition, he never failed to play the man in the hour of danger. Again and again he faced his enemies with fearless eyes, and delivered his message with unfaltering voice. What magnificent courage, for example, shines through his final interview with Zedekiah, when the intrepidity of his spirit made light of the feebleness of his bodily strength. And what rare devotion to duty he revealed after the capture of Jeru-

[80] xii. 1, 2. [82] ix. 2. [84] xx. 14-18.
[81] xx. 7. [83] xx. 9.

salem, when, instead of choosing the easier path, he decided to remain behind with the broken remnant whom Nebuchadnezzar did not think it worth while to carry into captivity—the man who a little while before had been cast into prison as a deserter to the enemy!

It is indeed a mistake to think of Jeremiah as a soft and effeminate personality who was often dissolved in tears. That is the traditional conception of his character, but it receives but scanty support from the recorded facts. The truth is that in the prophet's constitution there was a combination of diffidence and resolution, of gentleness and severity; or shall we rather put it that his natural qualities were reinforced through the inward strengthening of God? In any case, his face was often set in righteous anger; he was master of a biting irony; and he could thunder forth the judgments of the Lord with terrific vehemence. Again and again we find him invoking the judgment of Heaven on his enemies,[85] not, we may believe, in a spirit of personal vindictiveness, but because they were the enemies of the Lord as well as of His servant. This at least was the crowning quality of his prophetic ministry; he could not but declare the message which God had given him to deliver.

Jeremiah's message was preeminently a message of judgment, and we have seen how loyally he carried out his stern commission, even at the cost of much pain to himself. But we must not lose sight of other elements in his teaching about God. Few indeed of the prophets excel Jeremiah in their account of the riches of God's grace and the tenderness and patience of God's love. It is a deeply significant fact that it is this aspect of the Divine character that is emphasized in the words which form the introduction to his recorded prophecies.[86] From the position which it occupies, that moving passage is no doubt meant to be regarded as setting forth the conception of God which should be fundamental in all our

[85] x. 25; xi. 20; xii. 3; xvii. 18; xviii. 21-23; xx. 12.
[86] ii. 1-9.

thinking about Him, and which should be kept steadily in view even when the sterner attributes of His nature appear to receive greater prominence. Jeremiah's "sound" is to be stormy in the ears of his countrymen, but the prelude to those thunderous notes of doom is singularly soft and sweet. It is God Himself Who speaks in that introductory passage, and His words reveal the yearning of His heart after His apostate people. As He recalls the tender grace of the day when Israel was a young and radiant bride, her heart aflame with love to the Lord and responding to His call in a fearless loyalty, we realise how unquenchable must have been the love which could thus remember her at her best, and describe that best with so generous an appreciation. And how persistent was His pleading with His people throughout the years, and how amazing His assurances of grace and mercy. Again and again He represents Himself as "rising up early," through the ministry of the prophets, in His eagerness to present His appeals to the heart of the nation, and again and again, notwithstanding the failure of those efforts, He still addresses to them the call to return. Only let them acknowledge their iniquity, and He will receive them back in pardoning and restoring mercy.[87] The God whose word Jeremiah proclaims is assuredly a God of boundless grace and compassion. To a people so laden with iniquity, so defiled in life, and so rebellious in heart, He cries, "Return, O backsliding children . . . for I am married unto you." "Return . . . for I am merciful and will not keep anger for ever."[88]

It is suggestive also that Jeremiah's vision of the almond tree[89]—his first vision before entering on his official work—agrees with those first recorded words of his, in the emphasis which it lays on the graciousness of God's character. The nature of the symbol used determines for us the special aspect of the Divine "wakefulness" which was presented to the prophet's mind. It was the unslumbering vigilance of the love of God "keeping watch above His own" with a view to

[87] iii. 13. [88] iii. 12, 14. [89] i. 11, 12.

their final deliverance. The almond tree awaking from its long winter sleep in the beginning of the year was the harbinger of spring, and it spoke to Jeremiah of the brighter days which lay beyond the dark and stormy winter of the nation's present state. In the experience of Judah also, the sleep of spiritual death would be followed by a glorious resurrection. And to secure that end, her Divine Keeper, who "shall neither slumber nor sleep," was watching over her life even amid the storms of judgment through which she must first pass. So the vision of the almond tree comes before the vision of the seething cauldron; the promise of grace precedes the threatening of judgment.

But the God of Jeremiah was certainly a God of Judgment. He was holy and righteous, as well as long-suffering and kind. His wrath was as real as His love; and of that fact Jeremiah himself was a standing witness, for his own life reflected both the goodness and severity of the Divine character. If his broken-hearted lamentations over the impending doom of the people were sparks from the fire of the sacrificial love of the Redeemer, the imprecations which were wrung from his heart by their ungodliness may be said—and this too is surely the solving word with regard to the imprecatory Psalms—to have been sparks from the fire of the holy wrath of God; for the servant was "full of the fury" of his Master.[90] Both the insincerities and the impurities of the nation were an abomination unto the Lord. He had long warned them of the punishment which would follow their iniquities; and at last He was "weary with repenting,"[91] and the stroke of judgment fell. It was a terrible stroke when it came, and it was inflicted by the hand of God. The destroyers who swept over the land of Judah were prepared by Him.[92] Nebuchadnezzar was His servant, in the sense of being the instrument of His righteous vengeance. The sword, the famine, and the pestilence were the scourge of His chastisements.[93] And when He rose to do His strange work of judgment, His hand did

[90] vi. 11. [91] xv. 6. [92] xxii. 7. [93] xxiv. 10.

not spare, as the agonies of "the Babylonian woe" abundantly testified. Let us remember that in so punishing His disloyal children there was no unrighteousness with God. The disease of the people had proved incurable[94] by medicinal treatment, and it became necessary to resort to surgery. It was a terrible operation, but it was the only way to save the life of the nation.

With equal clearness Jeremiah bore witness to the sovereignty of God. The dominion of Jehovah extended over all the nations, for He was indeed the God of all flesh. The gods of the heathen were but "vanity"[95]—a worthless and empty delusion; and Jehovah was the one living and true God. Nowhere is Jeremiah's irony more effective than in his description of the idols to which the Gentiles bowed down in worship. "They are like a scarecrow in a cucumber-garden, and speak not; they must needs be borne, because they cannot go . . . they cannot do evil, neither also is it in them to do good."[96] In contrast with the helplessness of these dumb images is the majesty of the God of Israel. "Jehovah is the true God, He is the living God, and an everlasting King."[97] And this living and true God has power to make His sovereignty effective. Such is the ease with which He is able to accomplish His purposes, that the sand which he has placed for a bound to the sea is sufficient to hold in check the turbulence of its waters.[98]

Jeremiah's doctrine of the sovereignty of God is indeed particularly full of instruction. As a result of his visit to the potter's house he has much to say on this august theme.[99] Three distinct aspects of the truth come to light in his teaching. First of all, there is the reality of the sovereignty of God in human life. We *are* as clay in the hand of the potter. He controls our destiny and fashions our life according to His own will. In the work of salvation it is He Who takes the initiative, "preventing" us in the quickening and liberating

---

[94] xxx. 12.
[95] x. 15.
[96] x. 5.
[97] x. 10.
[98] v. 22.
[99] xviii. 1-11.

operations of His grace. Of that fact Jeremiah's own experience was an outstanding illustration.

But the sovereignty which Jeremiah was taught to claim for his God was not the working out in human life of the arbitrary decrees of an almighty despot. Not, in every sense, as the potter deals with the lifeless clay does the Lord deal with men. He deals with them as moral beings who are endowed by Himself with certain rights of personality, men who possess the tremendous gift of freedom, and consequently lie under a heavy burden of responsibility. So in the message which accompanied the incident in the potter's house, we find that the Lord associates His sovereignty with freedom—not merely freedom of choice on the part of men, but freedom of change on His own part. As the potter can change into another vessel the article he is making, so the Lord claims and exercises the right to modify His attitude to His people in accordance with the changes which may take place in their relation to Him. When they repent of their wickedness He withdraws His threats; when they turn to evil, He recalls His promises.[100]

But, finally, in Jeremiah's teaching the actings of Divine sovereignty are represented as inclining to the side of grace. Surely this is an unmistakable lesson of the incident which the prophet witnessed in the potter's house. As the workman was fashioning a certain vessel on the wheel, it was marred in his hand. It was a vessel of common clay, with little claim to intrinsic value. But instead of throwing it on the scrap-heap as a worthless thing, the potter took the broken pieces into his hand again, and with patient skill, now using the delicate pressure of his fingers, now applying a gentle touch of the revolving wheel, he re-fashioned it into another vessel as seemed good to him. And with the same unwearying patience God deals with His people. Many a time the human vessel of clay is sadly marred. There are falls that impair its strength, and flaws that disfigure its beauty, but the Divine Potter will

[100] xviii. 7-10.

not cast off the work which He has once begun. He restores the soul that has been marred through disloyalty, and enables it to make a fresh beginning in the spiritual life. In the whole of Jeremiah's teaching there is scarcely anything that is more encouraging than this.

Jeremiah was a prophet of judgment to the nation because of the sins of the people. There is nothing that he is more careful to make clear than that the calamities which he is threatening are the direct outcome of the guilt of the community. It is indeed part of his mission to "justify the ways of God to men." They had forsaken God, the Fountain of living waters, and had endeavoured to find a substitute for Him in the broken cisterns of idolatrous worship and political diplomacy.[101] This apostasy was the root cause of all their corruptions and miseries. They had lost the true knowledge of God, and had become sottish children, wise to do evil, but understanding not how to do good.[102] We have already considered the prophet's account of the corruption of the national life. He does not, however, merely frame a general indictment against the nation. It is distinctive of his message that he deals with the fact of individual guilt, and takes account mainly of specific moral offences. It is also a feature of his teaching that he traces the evil which appears in men's lives to its source in their corrupt hearts. "The heart," he declares, "is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"[103] The wickedness of the heart was abundantly reflected in the iniquities of the people. Its deceitfulness was revealed in the fact that they were resting in a religion which was divorced from morality, imagining that they were pleasing God by the observance of ritual while their life was foul with sin.

Jeremiah indeed attaches first importance to the ethical element in human conduct. No adherence to religious ceremonial is acceptable to God which is not accompanied by moral uprightness. The man who trusts in the arm of

[101] ii. 13. [102] iv. 22. [103] xvii. 9.

flesh is lying under the curse of spiritual barrenness and insensibility, while true blessedness is to be found in trusting in the Lord.[104] To know God, indeed—the Lord who exercises "loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth"—is the supreme attainment in which men should glory, the final secret of wisdom, and strength, and spiritual riches.[105]

Jeremiah's emphasis on moral and spiritual values has sometimes, indeed, been invested with an unwarranted significance. It is the fashion in some quarters today, for example, to describe him as the discoverer of ethical monotheism. This however is a claim which rests on a poor conception of the earlier stages of the religion of Israel. The truth is that the unity of God, as well as the moral perfections of His character, had been made known to Israel long ago by revelation, and while it was given to Jeremiah through the illumination of God's Spirit to unfold those truths with special fullness and clearness, yet he taught nothing that was absolutely new regarding the two great departments of religious knowledge—"what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man."

Jeremiah's insistence on ethical standards is also, however, misrepresented in another direction. It is understood to involve a disparagement of the whole ceremonial system which occupied so central a place in the religion of Israel. Not only so, but the prophet is actually represented as teaching that the Levitical sacrifices had no religious value because they had no Divine authority. The famous passage on which this view is based is as follows: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you."[106] These are

---

[104] xvii. 5-8. [105] ix. 23, 24. [106] vii. 22, 23.

words on which a certain school of Higher Criticism builds one of its chief arguments for the post-Exilic date of the "Priestly Code." It is plain, however, that Jeremiah's words cannot be understood in an absolute sense; because, for one thing, as a matter of historical fact, sacrifices were commanded to Israel by the Lord;[107] and, for another, Jeremiah himself speaks of sacrifice as an institution which, in a restored and purified commonwealth, is to enjoy the favour of God.[108] We cannot suppose that he is contradicting either history or himself. It is only an exegetical judgment which is perverted by a critical theory that will fail to recognise that the prophet is speaking in a relative sense. He is in fact "using the rhetorical negation frequently employed for emphatic antithesis;"[109] and the unreasonableness of pressing for a literal understanding of his words will at once appear if we apply the same principle of interpretation to other passages where this figure of speech is used.[110] Even at the time when sacrifices were originally commanded, it was made clear to Israel that moral loyalty was the thing to which God attached most value,[111] and to which, as Driver observes,[112] the promises are generally annexed—the sacrificial system being, in point of fact, the means, and conformity to the will of God, the end. Jeremiah is simply re-affirming this principle with arresting emphasis. He is not depreciating the value of sacrifice in its own place; he is combating the view and denouncing the practice, of his countrymen who were exalting ceremonial into an end in itself, and making it in-

---

[107] Exod. xx. 24; xxiii. 14-19; Deut. xii. 6.

[108] xvii. 2-6; xxvii. 17-22; xxxi. 14; xxxiii. 10, 11, 18.

[109] J. D. Davis, *Dict. Bib.* s.v. *Jeremiah.*

[110] e.g. (a) John vi. 27, where, on this view, Christ's teaching lends support to the economic theory of those who like better to live on the dole than to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. (b) 1 Cor. i. 17, where, according to the same principle, Paul denies that he had any authority from Christ to administer the rite of Baptism.

[111] Deut. x. 12.

[112] *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah,* p. 44, note b.

deed the whole of religion, thereby perverting, with disastrous results for themselves, a Divine institution.

Jeremiah draws a dark picture of human sin as manifested in the life of his countrymen. The sin of Judah was written with the point of a diamond,[113] so ineffaceably did its dark characters appear to be graven on the tablet of their heart. Their case indeed was beyond the skill of man. No efforts at self-cleansing, however assiduous, could wash away their pollution.[114] As well might the Ethiopian hope to change his skin or the leopard his spots, as that they who were "accustomed to do evil," whose hearts had been hardened through the deceitfulness of sin and whose lives had been enslaved through the tyranny of habit, should of themselves attain to purity and goodness.[115] Jeremiah, beyond question, despairs of fallen human nature. He proclaims its moral and spiritual bankruptcy. So far as the healing resources of men are concerned, there is "no remedy."

But Jeremiah does not leave us in this dungeon of despair. He is above all a messenger of hope to men. For he is the prophet of the New Covenant,[116] and the doctrine of the new covenant represents the high-water mark of Old Testament teaching on the way of life, and is indeed a remarkable foreshadowing of the grace of the gospel. It is a striking, though perhaps not a surprising fact, that of all the prophets it is Jeremiah—the man whose mission was so largely associated with judgment—who was led into the clearest conception of the grace of God in the salvation of men. But it is just because his consciousness of human need was so profound that his vision of the Divine provision to meet that need was so lofty. His knowledge of the abounding guilt and spiritual impotence of men forced him—speaking from the human point of view—to look for a way of deliverance in which grace would much more abound. So his doctrine of the new covenant is the correlative of his doctrine of human sin.

The new covenant is first of all contrasted with the old

---

[113] xvii. 1. [114] ii. 22. [115] xiii. 23. [116] xxxi. 31-34.

covenant made with Israel at Sinai. That old covenant had proved ineffective. It was "weak through the flesh," for its authority was external, and it could not secure obedience to its own demands. Its precepts discharged their imperatives in vain against the corruption and rebellion of the unregenerate heart. Of this insufficiency the life of Judah in Jeremiah's own day furnished a tragic illustration.

But Jeremiah had a vision of a new covenant whose provisions were completely adequate to human need, alike in its guilt and in its corruption. It is a covenant which is established on better promises. The key-note of the old covenant was "thou shalt"; the key-note of the new covenant is "I will." In other words the new covenant proclaims as its central fact the gracious activity of God in the sphere of redemption. To begin with, it deals with men's guilty past; for in the forefront of its message is the promise of a complete and final forgiveness. But forgiveness is not of itself complete salvation. The evil record of the past may be blotted out; but there remains the question of the future adjustment of a man's life to the will of God. It is here that the distinctive element in the new covenant comes to light. It speaks of a spiritual illumination, and of a consequent knowledge of God, which mean nothing less than life from the dead. The new covenant involves the gift of a new heart, and on that heart God writes His law. It is in short the miracle of regeneration that Jeremiah proclaims as the Divine remedy for the spiritual impotence of men. As the outcome of a new life men are enabled to render a new obedience. They not only stand in a new relation to God because they are forgiven; they manifest a new disposition toward Him because they have been quickened. And this new disposition is loving and submissive and loyal. The fact that the law of God is written on the heart involves that the impulse to obedience comes from within. The demands of the covenant are no longer met in the spirit of forced submission to an external authority; they receive the glad and spontaneous obedience of loving hearts.

Nor does it detract from the grace of this new relationship that it should still be described as a covenant. For the covenant that is intended is of the nature of a marriage bond, and the central fact which it enshrines is set forth in the words, "I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

One other outstanding fact in Jeremiah's teaching remains to be noticed. The predictive element is so clearly present in his message that it can be denied only by men who approach the question under the influence of a theory of inspiration which allows to the vision of a prophet no element of the *pre*vision of a seer. His prophecies regarding the future course of Providence in relation to the history of Judah—his intimation, for example, of the conquest of the land by Nebuchadnezzar, of the subsequent Exile, and of the Return from Babylon after a captivity of seventy years, are so definite and so well authenticated as to present rationalistic criticism with one of its most baffling problems. But it would be strange indeed if the prophet who had so clear an understanding of the new covenant should be altogether silent regarding the Redeemer, through Whom its blessings were to be mediated. And Jeremiah speaks of the Messiah with no uncertain voice.[117] In the new age of prosperity for the Church of God which he foresaw, and whose blessings he described under such glowing figures, Israel will own the sway of a new King. He is the "Branch" of the House of David under whose just and gracious rule they will dwell safely, and from whom they will receive the blessing of righteousness. It is through this righteousness that the grace of the new covenant reigns.[118]

The Book of Jeremiah has suffered severely at the hands of modern critics. There is scarcely any part of the Bible, indeed, that has been subjected to more drastic treatment. The fact that the Septuagint version of the Book differs to a considerable extent from the Hebrew text, together with the

---

[117] xxiii. 5-8; xxx. 4-11; xxxiii. 14-26.

[118] Cf. T. K. Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, in the PULPIT COMMENTARY, p. xiii.

lack of chronological order which sometimes marks the arrangement of the prophecies, has apparently been regarded by many scholars as a warrant for a specially "free" application of the methods of modern textual criticism. In any case there is scarcely a passage in the Book the authenticity of which has been allowed to pass without some form of challenge; nor is it without significance that it is on some of the richest and loftiest portions of Jeremiah's message that this process of dissection has been put into most active operation. Whole chapters are deleted as later additions,[119] while a large number of other passages are represented as containing only a Jeremianic nucleus which has been expanded in various ways by subsequent writers.[120] In many cases the process of rejection has been carried out under the influence of a certain view of prophetic inspiration; in other cases it is a theory of the literary medium used by the prophet that is made the criterion of genuineness, everything that does not

[119] For example, chaps. l and li. "It is an almost universally accepted result of criticism," says Professor Peake (*Jeremiah* in THE CENTURY BIBLE, Vol. II, p. 254) "that l. 1-li. 58 cannot be the work of Jeremiah." This denial of Jeremianic authorship, however, is not based on grounds of language or style, for it is admitted by the same scholar, in common with many other critics, that "characteristic expressions of the Book of Jeremiah are present in large proportions." It is based mainly on the fact that those chapters contain a prediction of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Babylon many years before that event took place, and as the critic's view of inspiration does not admit the likelihood, or perhaps even the possibility, of such a prophetic achievement, he proceeds to look for reasons to buttress his own preconceived opinions, and relegates those chapters accordingly to a period when the events they describe have become facts of history. It is worthy of note that these two chapters begin and end with an affirmation that they are from the hand of Jeremiah. On the critical assumption they are a forgery, and a forgery which for long centuries escaped detection on the part of those to whom "were committed the oracles of God."

[120] For example, chaps. xxx and xxxi. The critics admit, says Sir George Adam Smith (*Jeremiah*, p. 374), "post-Exilic elements and consequently a late age for the whole collection, but reserve for Jeremiah various passages." An examination of the passages so "reserved" by different writers reveals a striking lack of agreement among the critics themselves, and, for that reason, shows how little value is to be attached to the judgments of a purely subjective criticism.

fit into this particular mould being cut off with procrustean thoroughness. Sometimes the deletion of a verse or passage is based on linguistic grounds, the use of a single word or phrase being regarded as sufficient evidence of post-Exilic origin. At other times the objection to a passage is founded on moral considerations: the imprecatory character of some of Jeremiah's utterances, for example, is represented as decisive against their authenticity, the critic's argument apparently being that the prophet ought not to have said such things, and it is charitable therefore to believe that he never did say them. Or again, if a passage for any reason presents some difficulty of interpretation, it is found convenient to throw it out as forming no part of the original text.[121]

On this method of dealing with the sacred text two observations may be made in closing. The first is that the claim of literary criticism that it is able to discover evidences of different authorship in two or three consecutive verses, or even within the compass of a single verse, is a claim that no vigour or frequency of assertion can substantiate. Those who advance the claim deny infallibility to the Scriptures, but they come very near to arrogating infallibility of discernment to themselves. But let them try this gift of discernment on contemporary literature, where it is possible to test their conclusions, and see what measure of success will attend their efforts. There are various books in English literature, for example, which are the product of dual authorship; but it is a simple fact that criticism has been unable to say with definiteness where the work of one writer ends and that of the other begins. On this subject the weighty words of the late Sir William Robertson Nicoll, who devoted a great deal of attention to the question, and whose judgment is of value, not only because of the range of his knowledge, but because of his generally favourable attitude to modern criticism, are worthy of serious consideration. "It is past dispute," he says,

[121] e.g. Sir G. A. Smith's treatment of xxxi. 22. "This couplet," he says, "has been the despair of commentators. Its exilic terms *created* and *female* relieve us of it" (*Jeremiah*, p. 305). So out it goes!

in the Introduction to *The Church's One Foundation,* "that English Criticism is unable, as a rule, to assign authorship to an anonymous contemporary book. It is unable, as a rule, to distinguish between the work of two collaborators. It is unable, in short, to perform any of these achievements which are believed possible when the Scriptures are handled. . . . There may be probabilities; but as a rule, the likely interpretation is not the true explanation. In other words the answer to much sceptical criticism is to be found in showing by a catena of instances, that criticism is attempting a task of which it is fundamentally incapable."

The other thing that needs to be said is that this method of handling the Scriptures cannot by any stretch of charity be reconciled with a true reverence. We are familiar of course with the position that the Bible must submit to the same critical tests as are applied to other kinds of literature. And in a certain sense this is no doubt a reasonable demand—although it should not be forgotten that the claims of the Bible to be something radically *different* from ordinary literature have been made good at the bar of history and of the religious consciousness of mankind throughout the ages. But leaving out of account meantime the question of Inspiration, in the Biblical sense of that term; setting aside also, in particular, the significance of the fact that the Lord, in calling Jeremiah, put His words in the young prophet's mouth; renouncing in short for the moment every claim to differential treatment on the ground of supernatural considerations, both as to the origin and the preservation of the Scriptures, it remains unquestionably true that the kind of criticism to which reference has been made denies to the Bible the ordinary decencies of respect that are due to any kind of reputable literature.[122] Sir George Adam Smith de-

[122] The following are examples of the spirit in which criticism sometimes approaches Jeremiah: "The oracle against Moab (xlviii), besides being unpardonably diffuse, is essentially an imitation of the old oracle preserved in Isaiah xv, xvi" (Prof. J. E. McFadyen, *Old Testament Introduction,* p. 152); "The introduction 1-3a is an unintelligible piece of writing, and is evidently the result of repeated and careless editing" (Dr. John Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion,* p. 98).

plores the activities of later writers who added to Jeremiah's original words, especially in the closing part of the Book. "How pathetic," he exclaims, "that even after his death he is not spared from spoiling, but that the last clear streams of his prophesying must run out, as we have seen, in the sands of those expanders."[123] The present writer does not know anything about expanders. But he does know about a class of spoilers who are not expanders, but mutilators. They do not as a rule add to the prophet's words, but they take away from them. They cut and tear the text of the sacred oracles with a ruthlessness which can only be compared to the methods of Jehoiakim when he used his pen-knife so freely on Jeremiah's original roll. This, one ventures to say, is the real tragedy, for which the eminent scholar just quoted might well have reserved his exclamation of distress—Jeremiah is being "sawn asunder" in these modern days by the hand of a daringly irreverent criticism.

But his words live on in the power of an imperishable life, and his message has lost nothing of its timeliness with the passing of the generations. It is a message which the world would do well to ponder in this Twentieth Century. Jeremiah's teaching about sin, for example, is sorely needed in an age when the sense of guilt has well-nigh ceased to trouble the consciences of men. In days too when the note of judgment has to a large extent disappeared from the message of the pulpit, and God is represented as an indulgent Father, who is too good-natured to "mark iniquity" on the part of nations or individuals, we need to listen anew to the voice which proclaimed with such unwavering fidelity the holiness and righteousness of the Divine character. And perhaps our greatest need of all is that Jeremiah's doctrine of the New Covenant should be really understood and accepted by men, in a time when "another gospel" which speaks of salvation on the basis of character and of service is taking the place of the old evangel of the free grace of God.

Edinburgh, Scotland. ALEXANDER STEWART.

[123] *Jeremiah*, p. 316.

MONARCHY IN ISRAEL: THE IDEAL AND THE ACTUAL*

To the fathers of the people of Israel, Abraham and Jacob, was given a divine promise of perpetual blessing which included, among other details, this detail: "kings shall come out of thee."[1] To whatever date these ancient records of a still more ancient promise may be assigned by criticism, they show that men of Israel saw in monarchy itself nothing incongruous with Israel's national prerogative.

The narrative of how in accordance with that promise Israel first came to have a king, is contained in the First Book of Samuel, chapters eight to twelve. As this narrative lies before us the momentous step is described in its several stages.

First, the way is prepared for the step by allusion to Samuel's increasing age and his sons' moral unfitness for leadership.[2] Next, a colloquy is reported between Samuel and the elders of the nation at the prophet's home in Ramah: they ask him for the institution of monarchy to remedy the present want of leadership, especially in view of the custom prevailing in surrounding nations. At God's bidding Samuel deprecates their petition, associates it with their own lack of loyalty to Jehovah, points out at length the drawbacks of monarchy in actual operation, yet gives assent in principle.[3] The next turn of the story reports the remarkable way in which Samuel's eyes were first providentially directed toward Saul, the son of Kish, the private preparation and anointing for sovereignty which Saul received at the prophet's hands, and Saul's personal reaction to this astounding prospect.[4] Then follows the assembly of the people at Mizpah, summoned by Samuel, at which Saul is publicly designated,

---

* The substance of this article was delivered in Miller Chapel, October 11 and 14, 1921, as the second and fifth lectures on "The House of David," constituting the Stone Lectures for the year 1921-2.

[1] Gen. xvii. 6; xxxv. 11. Comp. xvii. 16; xxxvi. 31.

[2] 1 Sam. viii. 1-3.

[3] *Ibid.*, 4-22.

[4] *Ibid.*, ix. 1-x. 16.

anointed, and saluted as king: whereupon he resumes his private life, amid a wide divergence of popular judgment as to his fitness for the royal office.[5] How Saul uses a crisis with Ammon to unite Israel under his leadership, is the part of the narrative which occupies the next—the eleventh—chapter, and it is altogether fitting that at its close popular approbation of the new king because of his initial success should take, as it does, the double aspect of wrath against those who had maligned him and a renewed oath of allegiance to a king who had now proved his worth.[6] The last part of the story presents Samuel's public *apologia pro vita sua,* and his personal appeal to the nation to remain loyal to Jehovah under this new monarchical constitution, lest it prove to be in fact, as in appearance, rejection of Jehovah's sovereignty.[7]

This section as a whole, just as it has come down to us, is thus not obviously composite. Its subject-matter, at least, does not afford *prima facie* evidence of divergent documents. It does not cry aloud for analysis in order to a rational understanding of it. It is true, there are mingled here favorable and unfavorable judgments of monarchy as an institution in Israel. But who can deny that this double point of view is actually inherent in the historical situation? The tediously uniform solvent of the dominant critical school is literary analysis. Here, as in every other case where there is a hint of divergent views, or even where a difference can be made to appear through the process of analysis itself, documents with diverse "tendencies"—because supposedly issuing from different circles or periods—are discovered, and their present unity is ascribed to the harmonizing efforts of a subsequent redactor. And here, as in other cases, one is constrained to ask, If the harmony admittedly achieved by this redactor is a real unity, which could satisfy not only himself but his readers from that day to this, why may not that harmony have lain from the first in the facts themselves and a true report of them?

In this particular case that query is notably pertinent, be-

[5] *Ibid.,* 17-27. [6] *Ibid.,* chap. xi. [7] *Ibid.,* chap. xii.

cause it is impossible to think of monarchy in Israel without a double significance. Israel's relations to God and to the world are both ideal and actual. Ideally, Israel is God's peculiar people, the agent of His purposes of grace for the world. Actually, Israel is a sinful, rebellious nation, quite ready to enjoy all the benefits of its peculiar relation to God, but equally ready to disown God's rights to its undivided allegiance and service. Isaiah's parable of Jehovah and His vineyard affords an incomparable picture of the two Israels:[8] the choice vine, with its noble grapes expected, and with the wildlings which the owner found—"he looked for justice (*mishpat*), but, behold, oppression (*mispach*); for righteousness (*tsedhaqah*), but, behold, a cry (*tse'aqah*)."

All the institutions of Israel are framed with a view to this double-sidedness: the ideal, and the actual. And by no means least, its form of government is susceptible of both an ideal and a practical constitution.

Ideally, Israel was a theocracy. The principle is nowhere better stated than in Isaiah xxxiii. 22, "Jehovah is our judge, Jehovah is our lawgiver, Jehovah is our king; he will save us." If this ideal point of view could be thus maintained and expressed centuries after there had been human kings ruling in Israel, who dare profess surprise at its presence in an historical document which purports to give the attitude of Samuel, one of the greatest of Israel's prophet-statesmen, before the human monarchy had been set up?

On the other hand, all the burden of the story in the Books of Judges and First Samuel is Israel's desperate situation in its kingless days. And the institution of monarchy is necessarily a measure that belongs to the empirical side of statesmanship. Because Israel faced "a condition, not a theory" in the troublous days of Philistine and Ammonite oppression, therefore, and not because of any alteration in fundamental religious or political principles, was a king over the Hebrew tribes demanded and created. Surely the man Samuel, who according to all tradition did this practical thing, may be held

[8] Is. v. 1-7.

to have himself shared the practical viewpoint of the monarchy.

Apart from all literary questions, therefore, one cannot approach the section of Samuel which tells the story of Saul's elevation, without expecting to find in this transitional time a dual attitude toward the monarchy in Israel. And when these five chapters of Samuel are scanned with this thought in view, they will be found by any unprejudiced reader to contain just that blending of hope and fear, of regret and enthusiasm, which real men of flesh and blood might be expected to show under such circumstances.

A typical representative of the water-tight-compartment criticism is Budde, who says of this matter: "God contradicts himself. For he here declares the transition to monarchy to be revolt and sin, while there he himself introduces it."[9] This shallow dictum should be contrasted with the thoughtful summary which Wilke gives of the same matter. Wilke writes:

> The prophets' political activity can appear contradictory and often incomprehensible, if one confines himself merely to the consideration of external events. But their attitude appears unitary, conscious of its goal, and psychologically intelligible, if one looks for the historical circumstances and the inner impulses of their conduct. . . . Samuel recognized the necessity for this reform in the constitution and carried it out with a sure hand. True, Samuel seems to have resolved upon this important step only after long hesitation and repeated debate with Jehovah. And as a matter of fact this alteration of the constitution meant a radical break with the past, in which Jehovah had formed His nation without monarchy and without monarchy had led it on to victory and fame. The far-sighted seer had even thought out well in advance the important social and political consequences of this innovation: a royal establishment makes burdensome taxes necessary; the crown-domain, which the ruler must needs possess in order to be independent of influential families and parties, demands all sorts of services, numerous undertakings and government officials; and the possession of war-horses and chariots—the dreaded cavalry of antiquity—leads to the rise of a privileged and professional warrior caste. Besides, the sad experience they had undergone with the tyranny of Abimelech in Shechem in the time of the Judges was certainly not forgotten. Nevertheless, in the end the unendurable yoke of foreign domination silenced all scruples. The ark—that ancient means for

[9] Budde, *Die Schätzung des Königthums im Alten Testament: eine Kaisersgeburtstagsrede*. Marburg, 1903. P. 14.

unifying the tribes—was in the enemy's land. The hand of the Philistines rested heavily on the country—so heavily that not even were smiths permitted in Israel. And the way other neighboring peoples could at that time treat the people of Jehovah appears clearly from the disgraceful proposal which a ruler of Ammon dared to make to the Israelitish city of Jabesh in Gilead: he would make a covenant with the citizens, if they would all have their right eyes put out. But complete loss of national independence would necessarily bring about the death of the religion of Jehovah also, under the conditions of those times. The gathering together of all the nation's forces, therefore, about a new means of unification, was under such circumstances nothing less than a life-and-death matter for Israel. And it was thus that the glance of Samuel, who in his youth had already become acquainted with the Israelites' troubles on the occasions of their concourse as pilgrims at the shrine of Shiloh, and had since borne them on his praying heart, was directed toward an institution to which foreigners owed a great share of their success—to monarchy. A king, called from among the people by Jehovah, could summon to the colors the discouraged, divided tribes, to fight for the freedom of their country and their religious heritage, and could permanently master the centrifugal forces. Saul's elevation as king over Israel was thus a political act of the first magnitude, which the "Old Master" of prophecy carried out advisedly.[10]

Embedded in the Deuteronomic Law is a view of the monarchy as an institution in Israel, which rather gains than loses in significance if it is held—as critics commonly hold it—to date from the later monarchical period.[11] The main features of the king here sanctioned by the Law are the following: (1) though elected by the people, he is to be selected by Jehovah; (2) he must be an Israelite; (3) he is forbidden three specific things—the commonest objects of royal cupidity always and everywhere—a great stable,[12] a great harem, and a great treasury; and (4) he is required to write, read, and observe the commandments of Jehovah as contained in the Law.

Not alone from these main features, however, but also from the nuances with which the royal portrait is shaded, we receive the same double impression of the monarchy here as

[10] Wilke, *Die politische Wirksamkeit der Propheten Israels.* Leipzig, 1913. Pp. 91, 10-12.

[11] Deut. xvii. 14-20.

[12] Or, rather, in view of such passages as Is. xxxi. 1, a great force of cavalry or chariots, constituting a royal bodyguard and the nucleus of a standing army. Comp. 1 Sam. viii. 11f; 1 Kings xi. 26, 28f.

we receive in the First Book of Samuel. On the one hand the rule of this human king is a human substitute for the ideal rule of Jehovah in Israel. Note these turns of expression: "When thou shalt say, *I* will set a king over *me*" (not, be it observed, "When Jehovah shall set a king over thee");[13] "that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren"—he is prone to pride;[14] "that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left"—he is prone to disobedience;[15] "that his heart turn not away"—he is prone to apostasy.[16] Yet on the other hand, this king is chosen of God: "Thou shalt surely set him king over thee, whom Jehovah thy God shall choose."[17] He thus enjoys that divine prerogative which reigning houses have sought as the basis for their thrones from Egyptian Pharaohs to Prussian Hohenzollerns. And he is to have indefinite continuance of his own and his children's regal sway, as long as he binds up his own cause with Jehovah's in Israel by conforming to those statutes of Jehovah which are as definitely "with him"[18] (that is, in his hands, his keeping) as they are in the hands of the priests of the sanctuary.

It is "the Lord's Anointed" (*Messiah*), with a conditional immortality for his house, and a standing in Israel correlative with priest and prophet as measured by "divine right," who meets us in these verses of Deuteronomy. If Deuteronomy is of Mosaic origin, as it purports to be, then of course its pronouncement upon monarchy was normative for such a person as Samuel and for all the true prophets of Jehovah who came after him. But if Deuteronomy is a product of the seventh century B.C., even then it shows that to the best minds of that century in Judah the monarchy in retrospect meant *the same* mingling of practical value and necessity with principial surrender or accommodation, as it meant to the author of the Books of Samuel, and, if he reports truly, to Samuel himself.

What then of that body of opinion about the monarchy

---

[13] Deut. xvii. 14.
[14] *Ibid.*, ver. 20.
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Ibid.*, ver. 17.
[17] *Ibid.*, ver. 15.
[18] *Ibid.*, ver. 19.

which can be positively dated subsequently to Samuel? Schematizers like Budde have worked out a theory of the approval and disapproval of monarchy in Israel, with Hosea as the turning-point. Such sharp opposition to it as we find before Hosea's time—for example, from Elijah—is not interpreted by Budde as opposition to monarchy as such: "they merely substituted one house for another."[19] But Hosea, whose profound mysticism conceived the relation between Jehovah and Israel under the figure of a marriage, could not, we are told, tolerate the notion of any other lord's coming between Israel and her divine Husband. Moreover, according to Budde, a profound pessimism gripped Hosea, as he looked forth upon the Israel of his day, doomed to disaster by the Assyrian menace from without and by utter corruption and dissolution within. "Beneath the pressure of such prospects," he says, "there disappears from the best souls all national spirit, all reliance on powers resident in the people, and there is formed a religious idealism which can build only on God and seeks help only from Him."[20] It is thus, we are informed, that Hosea is led to reject the monarchy as not merely of human invention but atheistic in conception and principle: "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not."[21] "Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath."[22] According to some, Hosea's indictment, "O Israel, thou hast sinned from the days of Gibeah,"[23] means that the starting-point of Israel's apostasy was when Saul of Gibeah was elevated to the kingship.

But, like other schemes elaborated by modern critics of the Old Testament, this scheme is built upon the following arbitrary method: first, a selection from among all the facts, followed, second, by the rejection of whatever contradicts the deductions drawn from those selected facts. In reality,

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.
[20] *Op. cit.*, p. 17.
[21] Hos. viii. 4.
[22] Hos. xiii. 10f.
[23] Hos. x. 9, comp. ix. 9.

Hosea reveals precisely the same double attitude towards the monarchy as do his predecessors and his successors. Not only does Hosea permit us to see that for the people themselves the loss of their king would be regarded as a punishment for their unfaithfulness, but he classes the monarchy with other valuable possessions cherished by Israel, which God will withdraw from His people temporarily but restore to them in brighter days beyond. If Hosea held the view attributed to him by Budde, he would rather see in this anticipated setting aside of the kingship a gleam of hope.

It is hardly necessary to examine further in detail a scheme which thus breaks down at its chosen turning-point. Like Samuel himself, all the writers, both early and late, have a latent sense of Jehovah's fundamental sovereignty, which becomes patent whenever the contrast between the empirical monarchy in Israel and Jehovah's ideal sway comes to expression. And yet they all have at the same time a practical and patriotic view of the human institution of monarchy, which leads them to uphold and co-operate with their king, just as long as that king's own conduct and policy do not compel every far-sighted and religiously-minded patriot to oppose him. Or, looked at from the side of restraint rather than of constraint, respect for the king as visible head of a divinely sanctioned political organization restrains the articulate among them from open rebellion, even under great provocation; while on the other hand, their consciousness of God's majesty as the fountain of the king's derived majesty restrains them from that exaggerated reverence which in other ancient nations often passed the bounds of adulation and became adoration.[24]

What now of the relation of the monarch in Israel to his people, as exhibited in the practical exercise of his royal functions? To what type of monarchy did the Hebrew monarchy belong?

---

[24] See in particular the monograph of C. Jeremias, *Die Vergöttlichung der babylonisch-assyrischen Könige,* in DER ALTE ORIENT for 1919, Leipzig, Jahrgang 19, Heft 3-4.

The attempt has been made to represent Israel's king as the head of a highly democratic, constitutional state, and herein to contrast him with the general type of ancient oriental kings, who were admittedly absolute monarchs.

The late Professor Kent, in an article bearing the rather pretentious title, "The Birth of Democracy,"[25] has perhaps gone further than anyone else in developing this view. He says: "In theory and in practice the head of an ancient Semitic tribe was not the master but the servant of the people, and each man shared the responsibilities as well as the rights that went with this thoroughly democratic type of organization." Of the Hebrew tribes, as particular exemplifications of this political system, he writes: "Opposition and struggle with the autocratic systems of government already established in Palestine only intensified the devotion of the Hebrews to their inherited ideals." Relying upon a more or less plausible derivation of the Hebrew word for king, *melek*, from a root meaning to advise, to counsel, Kent asserts: "By virtue of their title, as well as in fact, Gideon, Saul, David, and their successors were simply the chief counsellors of the united tribes. Their functions and authority were practically identical with those of the tribal sheikh, only these served a larger and more stable social group. Their method of election was more direct and democratic than that followed today in electing the President of the United States. Their tenure of office resembled more closely that of the present head of the British democracy, although it was not so firmly established."

As illustrations of these and similar assertions, the writer instances Saul's fear of David's prowess and popularity, the ratification of Solomon's nomination by the people, Rehoboam's rejection by the bulk of the nation, the overruling of Saul's sentence of death upon Jonathan by the popular will, the temporary success of Absalom's revolt because of popular support gained through his assumed democratic bearing, and even Naboth's trial before his own townsfolk, in which King

[25] In the YALE REVIEW for October, 1919, pp. 131-142.

Ahab was compelled to force a miscarriage of justice in order to satisfy a royal whim.

Professor Kent sees in the prophets of Israel the great protagonists of democracy, as they became the champions of a nation devoted to the maintenance of their democratic institutions and constantly menaced with the loss of them. The foes of autocracy—Moses, Deborah, Samuel, Nathan, Ahijah, Elijah—these were the great national heroes. "There is not a decade," he writes, "from 1200 to 600 B.C., when the contest between the ideals of Hebrew democracy and those of oriental despotism was not being hotly waged. . . . To maintain them the Hebrews sacrificed internal peace and in the end their national life."

There is truth in all this. Every friend of democracy and of the Bible will gladly recognize, with Professor Kent, the intimate historical association of the two as respectively effect and cause. Yet it would be a mistake to look so exclusively on one side of the Hebrew monarchy as to be unable to see the other side also.

At the time the monarchy was introduced into Israel the people themselves and Samuel their leader were quite conscious that they were introducing a novelty into Israel's political constitution. The experiment of Abimelech, son of Gideon, who was as willing to be called "king" as his father had been unwilling, was local, brief, and highly unsatisfactory.[26] His relation to Shechem was of the same class with the local kingships prevailing in the Canaanitish city-states. Saul, not Abimelech, was the first King of Israel. It is therefore hazardous at the outset to equate, as Kent does, a Hebrew king and an Arab sheikh. Leaders, in peace and in war, Israel always had. The king was a specific kind of leader. That general atmosphere of democracy in Israel, which Kent and others have so admirably pointed out, affected the nature of its kingship no less than that of its other institutions. But this is far from justifying the representation of the men who ruled at Jerusalem and Samaria as a succession of Presi-

[26] Judg. ix.

dents and Premiers. Kent's admission that Solomon and Ahab were tyrants appears to carry with it the assumption that the other two-score kings were not tyrants. But it would be a bold historian who ventured to assert that Ahab's rule was any more of a tyranny than that of Omri or Jehu, or Solomon's rule more so than that of Manasseh or Jehoiakim. Furthermore, to represent the political events that are associated with the names of Jeroboam and Jehu as merely a democratic reaction against autocracy is to ignore most of the historical background of both events.

Professor McCurdy has presented this matter in a better, because a more diffused, light, where he writes:[27] "In practice as in theory the king was always absolute. . . . No higher conceptions of a good king have ever been given to the world than those which are presented in the proverbial Wisdom of the Hebrews. But no constitutional obligations were laid upon any one of the rulers, nor any restriction put upon his arbitrary authority. Whether they could be most fairly symbolized by the olive, the fig, the vine, or the bramble of Jotham's famous parable, their good or their bad conduct alike was the expression of their own sweet will." Thus while we have mentioned Manasseh and Jehoiakim as illustrations of absolute sovereignty in seventh-century Jerusalem, there is little reason to suppose that their evil reigns were a whit more arbitrary than the good reign of Josiah, which lay between them, and which witnessed the imposition of the famous covenant upon the people *from above*—by royal will.[28]

Selfish despotism was the persistent tendency of monarchy in Israel. Even in the reign of a David it is illustrated by the matter of Uriah the Hittite.[29] Yet it is already admirably depicted in advance by Samuel, in his sketch of "the manner of the king" in First Samuel, chapter eight.

What then was there in Israel, it may be asked, to mitigate the despotism of such an autocratic institution?

---

[27] McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments,* New York, 1896. Vol. II, p. 163.

[28] 2 Kings xxiii. 1-3, 21, *etc.*

[29] 2 Sam. xi.

Primarily, there was the "duty of deference to Jehovah as His vicegerents and servants; . . . the sphere of religion formed an exception to the rule that the king did not brook control or even seek for counsel. . . . Jehovah is above the king, and the prophet who communicates the oracles is by the nature of the case superior in his own proper sphere."[30] Those "heroes of the nation"—the prophets whom Kent represents as spokesmen for democracy—what were they but the spokesmen for Jehovah? Is it in the name of an outraged people that we find them apostrophizing Saul, David, Solomon, Ahab? By no means. They come to these monarchs in the name of a forgotten or defied Deity, to whom they owe their throne, and over whose people they rule simply as vicegerents. The first fifteen verses of the twelfth chapter of Second Samuel—Nathan's interview with David after his sin with Bathsheba—brief as it is, is as instructive as any passage in the "latter prophets" for the understanding of the following relationships: the mutual relations of God and the king, of God and the prophet, of king and prophet, of God and the people, and of king and people.

But besides this major curb on autocracy—the religious curb—there were minor curbs also. There were the local magistrates and rulers, with whom the people came into a direct contact such as they rarely had with the king. The story of Naboth, while it shows the exceptional power of a tyrant to override the humbler powers of the "elders and nobles" of a community, proves also that, under ordinary circumstances, the life of the common citizen was more immediately affected by the good will and good character (or the reverse) of these his neighbors, than by the king and court.[31] And finally there was also the curb of custom and convention —a power which in the East far more than in the West, in antiquity far more than today, prescribes limits to personal power and individual whim. "It is not so done in Israel"—and similar formulae that meet us frequently on the pages of

[30] McCurdy, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[31] 1 Kings xxi. 1-16.

the Old Testament[32]—must have served often and again to hold back even a wilful prince from some folly or tyranny.

Yet after all subtraction has been made for these mitigations, and after we have freely granted that "the Hebrew monarchy was the only one of the Semitic communities which realized anything like the true idea of a nation," and that "the Hebrews . . . were the most independent and democratic of all the Semites," it still remains true that in Israel as elsewhere "unchecked power tends to make men despots and unlimited opportunity to make them unscrupulous."[33] And whenever we feel tempted to wonder at the frequency with which the sacred historian records as his verdict on the moral quality of a particular king, "He did evil in the sight of Jehovah," we need also to weigh these true words of Professor McCurdy: "Perhaps the wonderful thing, after all, is not that the evil kings of Israel and Judah should have been so numerous, but that there should have been any kings at all of a high and noble type."[34]

What is "the Messianic idea"? Perhaps no answer to this question has been more carefully framed than this one by the late Professor von Orelli of Basel: "The Davidic king stands in the most immediate relation to Jehovah, who is properly King of this people in virtue of His covenant. Chosen and constituted by the Lord, he represents to the nation—indeed, to the world—the almighty, sovereign Ruler of heaven and earth. But at the same time there comes to culmination in his person the calling of that holy nation which was to be at once God's servant and God's son. Thus the Davidic king represents his people in priestly fashion towards the Lord. The national form of the covenant-idea assumes here the personal form, yet without surrender of the thought of God's

[32] 2 Sam. xiii. 12. Comp. Gen. xxix. 26; and see Köberle, *Sünde und Gnade,* München, 1905, p. 38.

[33] McCurdy, *op. cit.,* p. 164.

[34] *Ibid.*

national commonwealth, for the person thus intimately bound up with God is the national king, the mediator between God and His people."[35]

After what we have already discovered in the fundamental character of this Messianic idea, 2 Sam. vii.,[36] and what we have further seen reflected from it in the literary documents of Israel's spokesmen,[37] we need spend no time now in verifying the correctness of the above statement: it is merely an orderly induction from the facts of Scripture. But the further question remains to be answered: was this merely an idea, with a literary expression, indeed, yet with nothing in the sphere of reality to correspond to it? Or do we find in the record of historical facts and figures that the idea incorporated itself in human life? Was *this* "word" "made flesh"? When, how, and in whom did the covenant-promise of God fulfil itself?

In asking this question we are by no means passing beyond the limits of Biblical warrant. For, in the first place, the God of the Bible is the God of life, whose decree eventuates in act and fact: the God of revelation, to be sure, yet the God of redemption also, whose revelation is only intended to prepare for, accompany, and interpret His redemptive process. And, in the second place, later revelation looks back, not merely to earlier revelation, as for example we have seen an Isaiah looking back to a Nathan; but it looks back also on the course of history in connection with that earlier revelation, and finds in the former the fulfilment of the latter. So, for example, Zechariah begins his prophetic ministry (Zech. i. 6).

That term "fulfilment" is not, indeed, the commonest expression for this idea in the Old Testament, as it has become in the New. Rather, the Old Testament writers prefer to speak of a "setting up" or "raising up," a "coming in" or

[35] C. von Orelli, *ATliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreichs,* Vienna, 1882. P. 188. Eng. trans. by Banks, Edinburgh, 1885. P. 168.

[36] See art. "The Davidic Covenant" in this REVIEW for July, 1927.

[37] See art. "Echoes of the Covenant" in this REVIEW for October, 1927.

"bringing in," or a "doing" of the earlier word. Yet the figure of "filling up," "completing," through the actualization of what, as spoken or written word, was previously incomplete or empty, is not unknown even to the Old Testament. And we may the more appropriately use the term "fulfilment" in connection with "the sure mercies of David," because we find the two expressions combined in the Bible itself. Solomon, in his dedicatory prayer says: "Yea, thou spakest with thy mouth, and hast fulfilled it with thy hand, as it is this day."[38] Here "fulfilled" is the word meaning literally "filled up," "completed," like the corresponding Greek word of the New Testament; while the contrast of "mouth" and "hand" shows that the author of Kings conceived Solomon as having in mind precisely those two phases of the divine self-expression which we have just contrasted—speech and action—the latter as the "fulfilment" of the former.

To return then to our question: When, how, and in whom did God's covenant with David concerning his house fulfil itself?

The promise was to a collective unit. The "seed" or "house" of a man meant the body of his posterity, which of course would vary in numbers with the passage of time and the alteration of circumstance. The analogy with the seed of Abraham is instructive. This consisted for a time of Ishmael only—when he was cast out, of Isaac only. As the family broadened out rapidly with each passing generation after Jacob's, so Abraham's seed grew in the total of individuals included in it, yet remained still a unit, collectively heir to the covenant-promise to Abraham its father. So with David's seed. In the next generation Solomon and his brothers were the heir of the promise through Nathan. Solomon himself was the specific individual, singled out in ver. 13 of Nathan's oracle, who should build the Temple; and, accordingly, he sees in his completion of the Temple the "fulfilment" of that part of

[38] 1 Kings viii. 15.

the oracle.[39] Yet Solomon did not mean to claim that the whole content of the promise was "fulfilled" in him, at least in that one act of his career. The further fact that he was sitting on the throne of Israel, instead of suffering the fate of Jonathan, the worthy son of rejected Saul, was in his mind a fulfilment of the promise.[40] Yet was not the promise *filled full* thereby: "for ever"—thus, with the utmost insistence, ran the terms of the promise—"for ever shall thy seed sit on the throne of Israel."

Did any of these kings expect to live for ever? Did the most ardent of their admiring, loyal subjects, the most extravagant of their court-poets, mean literally that Solomon, or Jehoshaphat, or Hezekiah, or Josiah, would live for ever, when they applied this customary phrase to them in address or in affirmation? We cannot think so. Those kings must have been apprehended, and have apprehended themselves, as links in a chain of succession, such as we see historically realized in the dynastic list of Jerusalem's sovereigns through four centuries. In each of them David lived on, or rather, the heir of David lived, to whom the promise was made. Yet all together constituted that "seed" of David, which was the subject of all save the individualized, limited portion of Nathan's oracle.

In that oracle, besides the individualization of Solomon as the Temple-builder (2 Sam. vii. 13), there is the hypothetical individualization implied in the tempered warning of ver. 14. "*If* he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men." We term this a "tempered" warning, because the "rod of men" and its parallel phrase can only mean such a rod as *men* use for chastisement—not an overwhelming, annihilating "rod of God," which no man could endure. Thus the whole sentence

---

[39] "In general one should remember, as Hengstenberg and Keil remark, that the erection of the Temple likewise waited till Christ for its fulfilment and thus belonged to the task assigned to David's seed lasting beyond the O.T. history, John ii. 19." Orelli, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

[40] 1 Kings viii. 20.

is in harmony with what precedes and what follows it. Preceding it is the gracious promise, "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." And following it is the further promise, "My loving-kindness shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee." So this "rod of men" is after all a *father's* rod for a *son,* whom he will chasten to amend, not smite to destroy.

What then of the fulfilment of this hypothetical individualization? Did David's seed, collectively considered, yet of course in its concrete individual manifestations, "commit iniquity," and did God "fulfil" His promise under these circumstances? Here again we possess Scriptural interpretation of the fulfilment as well as of the intent of the covenant. When the ten tribes were rent away from the Davidic house in the person of Rehoboam, we are told that the one tribe, Judah, was left to David (!) because of that covenant-promise. For the iniquity of Solomon and of his son who followed in his evil ways God chastised the seed of David by the forfeiture of most of the power, dignity, and opportunity conferred in the prophecy of Nathan. Yet God chastised with "the rod of men," in that He did not make an end of the sinners, but left "a lamp" for David in Jerusalem.[41] Thus we are expressly instructed to regard the diminished scope of the Davidic heritage throughout the centuries of divided monarchy, as a fulfilment of *both* the warning and the promise contained in 2 Sam. vii. 14.

This prepares us to view from the right angle that situation which began with the year 587 B.C. With the Exile the beginning of a new era must be recognized, not only for the House of Israel, but also for the House of David. The prophets who were appointed to announce that Exile as a work wrought by Jehovah, had also to interpret its meaning and relation to Jehovah's covenant with His people. In Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., for instance, the culminating stroke in the series of chastisements wherewith Jehovah will punish the apostasy of Israel is their banishment from the land of

[41] 1 Kings xi. 36; 2 Kings viii. 19.

promise, their captivity to alien peoples, and their forfeiture of those privileges to which the covenant with Jehovah had previously entitled them. Now if these two chapters date, as they purport to date, from the Mosaic age, and forecast the future of a nation with its whole record still to write for good or ill, then they merely anticipate the words of the prophets—an Amos in the North, a Jeremiah in the South—who had to specify and apply the principial program of the Law. But even if those chapters date, as current critical views commonly hold, from the latter part of the 7th century B.C., being parts of the "Holiness Code" and of the "Deuteronomistic Supplements" to the Book of Deuteronomy respectively, still they reflect the contemporaneous views of prophecy and sum them up in a formal, schematic expression. In any case, there is no doubt that Israel's dark experience of exile was thoroughly interpreted to it, before, during, and after the experience itself. And never is it represented as a termination, or even violation, of the covenant between God and Israel. It is punitive, corrective, temporary: a suspension, not a dissolution.

Similarly, that Exile was to the House of David the culmination of a series of divine measures, punitive, corrective, temporary, designed to prepare the collective unit which experienced them for a better, broader fulfilment thereafter of the terms of the ancient covenant. In this case too we have a document that purports to lay down in advance the formal principles of this chastisement. In what we have called the "hypothetical individualization" of 2 Sam. vii. 14, we have the special treatment described which would be accorded David's seed *if* it proved faithless as a son to its father's commands, disloyal to its own covenant-duties. All the trend of our former inquiry about the age and influence of this document leads to the conviction, that it really preceded the defection which it anticipates as possible in view of Saul's defection. Yet here too, even if it were a product of the 7th century, the meaning would not be altered. Its author would then be interpreting, for the House of David in his own day

and thereafter, the connection between God's dealings with individual representatives of this house and their own degree of fidelity to God's requirements of His vicegerent, His "servant," His "son."

The fact that for only a brief period the dominion of the House of David remained a dominion over all Israel and so realized historically the ideal sovereignty contemplated in the covenant, and that it was thereafter limited to dominion over Judah alone—this fact is expressly pointed out as a fulfilment of the threatened chastisement. When the dynasty finally fell, and David's "lamp in Jerusalem" was extinguished, it must have seemed to many at the time as if God had annulled His covenant. Men said one to another, we know: "The breath of our nostrils, the Anointed of Jehovah, was taken in their pits; of whom we said, Under his shadow we shall live among the nations."[42] Yet voices were raised to interpret even this supreme tragedy as merely the culmination of that chastisement which had been threatened in the Davidic covenant. It was indeed different in degree from what had gone before, but not in kind. That long phase of obscurity,[43] which stretches from Jehoiachin onward through centuries, was no more an annulment of the Davidic covenant than the Exile was an annulment of the covenant with Abraham and Jacob. Just as a backsliding people had to leave its land till that land had "enjoyed its sabbaths," (as the prophets picturesquely expressed it), although that land had been promised to the seed of Abraham for ever, so it must for many days continue without king and without prince, until that "afterward"—those "latter days"—when Jehovah should restore to them the supreme blessing of His own rule in the seed of David.

It is this phase of obscurity which historically separates the ultimate individualized "Son of David" from the partial fulfilment of Nathan's oracle in the dynastic line of Judah. It is analogous to the ecclesiastical Judaism of the post-

[42] Lam. iv. 20.

[43] See art. "The Davidic Dynasty" in this REVIEW for April, 1927.

exilic period, which historically separates the universal community of Christians from the ancient nation of Israel. It should never be lost sight of, that these two things belong together and move in agreement: sovereign, and subjects; or, the kingdom viewed as a personal status and function of the king, and the kingdom viewed as a sphere of human relations and operations. They are two sides of the same thing.

By means of this providential historical development there gradually came to be projected upon, and so detached from, the collective seed of David, more and more clearly to prophetic vision and in popular expectation, the Figure of an Individual, in whom the covenant with David should find its complete realization, its ideal fulfilment. The firm historical basis for this Figure of the future lay in the past: he was to be the Heir, and a heritage is always from and of the past. As a son of David, what he should inherit through the covenant would be just this: "the sure mercies of David." As such he is often directly called "David." Much of the prophetic description of his status and functions roots in the experiences of the historical David. Yet more and more this anticipation outgrows the past. Just as imagination uses the images of memory, yet revises, combines, heightens and brightens them with the magic touch of poet and artist, so the elements furnished to the psalmists and rhapsodists of Israel by the historical records of David's person, prestige, power, and achievements, proved inadequate to clothe their image of the Coming One.[44] The prophets transcended even an idealized David, and this "Branch" of David's line grew into a new and distinct Personality. "The Lord's Anointed" *par excellence*—the Messiah, the Christ—became the Center about whose Person the characteristically forward-looking glance of the Old Testament Church envisaged the glories of "the latter days."

---

[44] One can feel the strain of the poetic imagination in Psalm cx., for example, as the Subject transcends the elements out of which the imagery must be constructed. Hence much of the exegetical difficulty, as also in the case of 2 Sam. xxiii.

Such now we discover to have been the *ideal* and the *actual*, as monarchy ran its course in Israel from its earliest intimations in Mosaic and even Patriarchal times down to a prophecy which outlived the line of Hebrew kings and still faced forward with hope. One puzzle remains to be solved: what relation did the ideal king envisaged in "the Messianic idea" bear to that ideal kingship cherished, as we have seen, by Samuel and all the prophets as the prerogative of Jehovah Himself?

To solve this problem we should be led out into the broad field of Israel's eschatology, its nature, age, and source. It must suffice here to refer to a study of this subject which was published in this REVIEW for October, 1913, under the title, "The Source of Israel's Eschatology." From the third section of that article, which deals with the Eschatology of a Saviour, we quote (in substance) the following paragraphs. (We presuppose the main result of our inquiry there, viz., Jehovah's vindication of His kingship in His "Day" by a *coming* to His people to judge and to save.)

What are we to make of a figure such as the Messianic idea of the prophets and psalmists exhibits to us, alongside of that figure of the expected Jehovah, whose vindicated sovereignty is the central fact in all Israel's expectations? What room is there for a Messianic King alongside of that divine King? The marvel only grows when we consider the divine attributes, titles, functions, associated with the Messiah. For example, take such passages as those discussed as "echoes" of 2 Sam. vii.—Isaiah's throne-names ("Mighty God, Everlasting Father"), Micah's assertion ("His goings forth are from of old, even from everlasting"), or Zechariah's prediction, that "His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth": essential deity, pre-existence, universal authority. We cannot take refuge in the view that this is only Jehovah Himself thought of as a human Person, for Jehovah's *relation* to this Person is clearly indicated: Jehovah is the One who will "raise him up," or "set him on his throne," or "bring him forth," or

supply the "strength and majesty" in which he shall rule or the "spirit" by which he shall judge.

Israel's divine King, and yet not Jehovah! *This,* in a nation of monotheists, and most unmistakably from the lips of Israel's most uncompromising monotheists! What does it mean? And why do the two expectations persist side by side from age to age: "He comes," that is, Jehovah comes; and "He comes," that is, Messiah comes?

The only explanation of this riddle lies in a *wholly unpsychological origin* for this figure of the Messiah. In this we can agree with the school of Gressmann over against the criticism dominant until lately. That in which we cannot agree with it is in its positive statement, that this figure was derived from mythical material which found its way into Israel in early days apart from any organic connection with Israel's religion. We may safely assert, in the words of Sellin (who uses spaced type to emphasize them), that "the ancient Orient does not know the eschatological king." At most we may perhaps discern in the "court style" of the scribes at Babylonian, Assyrian, Persian, or Egyptian courts a certain analogy with what may have been the "court style" at the court of David and Solomon, of Jeroboam and Hezekiah, and may therefore have contributed elements of form to the language in which this eschatological king is celebrated. This is hypothesis, but it is not in itself improbable. Yet this deals only with form, not with substance. The substance of this Messianic doctrine, we hold with Sellin, runs its roots back into "a tradition older than the revelation at Sinai, which was then, it is true, united most intimately with the fundamentally eschatological thought[45] that sprang up therefrom and in the main became subordinate thereto, yet which also maintained persistently a certain independence."

From this point, however, we must part company, in a measure, even with Sellin. We do not feel, with him, that "in the moment that we begin to pursue this pre-Mosaic tradition, we are treading on the soil of hypothesis." We believe

[45] *i.e.,* that Jehovah shall be King "in that day."

that the patriarchal period, as depicted for us in the Book of Genesis, is firm historical ground. In passing from the principles of Wellhausen to those of Gressmann, Old Testament criticism, it seems to us, is just discovering that the elephant which bears up the world must have a tortoise to stand upon—that Amos requires a Moses as a necessary *prius* for his preachment. How long must we still wait, before criticism shall awake to the stupendous discovery that the tortoise too needs something on which to stand? Just as back of Amos stands Moses, so also back of Moses stand the Patriarchs, with whose God Jehovah at Sinai takes pains to identify Himself. For to this family of Semites, immigrants into Canaan from the Mesopotamian lands, God had given a promise, world-wide in its outlook, gracious in its terms, unconditional in its pledge, that in their seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. And, back of Abraham again, we believe that the same tradition of a divine saving purpose dwelt in the line of Shem, in whose tents Jehovah was to dwell, and that it finds its source at the very gate of "paradise lost," where "the seed of the woman" is promised to "bruise the serpent's head." Starting with the weal once possessed, forfeited, yet renewed in prospect at each of those crises when Jehovah made fresh covenant with men of His choice, we see in this chain of tradition how the essence of the eschatological hope (or "comfort," as Lamech, the father of Noah, first calls it) attaches itself to a human "seed," until at length it comes to be designated as of "the seed of David according to the flesh," and from the woman of "Bethlehem-Ephrathah," travailing in birth-pangs of Him "whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

In Jesus Christ, Son of God, and Son of Mary "of the house and lineage of David," monarchy in Israel found at length the actualization of the ideal. In Him the dualism of a divine and human sovereignty over the people of God was resolved into a higher unity. In Him the provisions of the Deuteronomic Law, the brighter hopes of Samuel, the

King-maker,[46] the promises through Nathan to the House of David, and all the glories predicted of "the Branch" by prophet and psalmist, paradoxical as they seemed when given, found their justification, their interpretation, and, in the strictest sense of that word, their "fulfilment."

Princeton. JAMES OSCAR BOYD.

---

[46] 1 Sam. xiii. 14.

THE SECOND COMING IN THE DISCOURSE OF THE LAST THINGS

MATT. xxiv. 1-xxv. 46; MK. xiii. 1-37; LK. xxi. 5-36

At least three views have been taken as to the authoritative character of these discourses in the Gospels concerning the last things. One view is that the report of our Lord's words is substantially correct but that he was mistaken and that his prophecies have been falsified by the course of events. This of course means a human, fallible Jesus, and the study of his prophecies becomes a matter of merely historical interest with no bearing on our present life or future hopes. A second view is that Christ has not been correctly reported; that we have only a "misinterpretation, a confused version of the mind of Jesus, which he would have refused to accept as the truth."[1] This may save the divinity of Christ but leaves us hopelessly in the dark as to what he prophesied. The third view is that the Lord was not mistaken and that he has been correctly reported. This makes a careful study of his words worth while. Surely no one should adopt the first or second position until he has tried the third and found it untenable. To be tenable does not mean that it is to be fully understandable. If it is a prophecy concerning the future, we must expect it to contain some things beyond our complete understanding.

A study of the three accounts in Matthew, Mark and Luke should leave no doubt that we have here three reports of one conversation. In all three accounts the occasion is the same. The first question of the disciples is exactly the same and the second question nearly so. Bearing in mind the historical situation, it would seem probable that not only these two or three questions were asked but others as well. Nor need we assume that our Lord was guided closely in his reply by the questions asked. Rather may he have taken these questions as a text from which to expound the things which he

---

[1] "The Originality of Jesus." George A. Gordon, *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1920.

was desirous of showing them. So far as the record goes, none of the disciples had suggested that the future might bring them persecutions, yet that is one of the first things on which the Lord lays stress.

The suggestion has been made that the report in Luke's Gospel represents a conversation as they were leaving the temple, and that in Matthew and Mark a repetition of the same subject as discussed a little later on the Mount of Olives. The indefinite statement of time in Luke makes this possible, and the fact that our Lord probably repeated himself much more than we usually imagine, lends it a little support, but the probabilities are overwhelmingly against it. Even if true it would only relieve a few difficulties of harmonization and would leave those of interpretation the same or greater. The reply of our Lord falls easily into similar sections in all three Gospels. The order of the sections agrees in all three. A large number of expressions in the different gospels are identical or nearly so. Such being the case it is evident that the three narratives must be interpreted together. No interpretation which confines itself to one gospel will be satisfactory. We must use all light from all three sources. It is evident too that no one of the evangelists has supplied the entire discourse. In many instances they supplement one another. Lastly the differences here, just as elsewhere in the gospels, show that there has been no attempt to give in each case a verbatim report of what was said by our Lord, though oftentimes this has been done.

When we are satisfied that we have here three reports of one discourse, a discourse which obviously contains a number of different subjects, we are justified in taking a further step in interpretation. Instead of first considering each report in detail and then attempting to combine them, we may first divide all three reports into similar sections and decide upon the general subject of each section. When we can feel reasonably sure that the sections into which we have divided the discourse are according to the sense of the passage and

not imaginary, that they correspond with one another in the different gospels and that their general subjects are correctly given, we shall have a settled framework which will greatly assist in the interpretation of individual expressions. Below is an attempt at such an outline.

I.

The occasion of the conversation and Christ's prediction of the destruction of the temple. The questions of the disciples.

MATT. xxiv. 1-3, MK. xiii. 1-4, LK. xxi. 5-7	ORDER IN MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Disciples come to show Christ the temple	1		
2. Praise of temple by a disciple		1	
3. Praise of temple by some			1
4. Christ predicts one stone shall not be left on another	2	2	2
5. Question of disciples on Mount of Olives	3		
6. Question of 4 disciples on Mount of Olives		3	
7. Question of some ("they")			3
8. Question When shall these things be	4	4	4
9. Question What shall be the sign of thy coming	5		
10. Question What shall be the sign when these things are (all) about to be accomplished		5	5

II.

Warnings against being led astray by false prophets or by great calamities.

MATT. xxiv. 4-8, MK. xiii. 5-8, LK. xxi. 8-11	MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Be not deceived	1	1	1
2. Many deceivers shall come saying I am Christ	2	2	2
3. Many deceivers shall come saying also The time is at hand			2a
4. Be not troubled when you hear of wars and rumors of wars; the end is not yet	3	3	
5. Be not troubled when you hear of wars and tumults; the end is not immediately			3
6. Nations shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom	4	4	4
7. There shall be famines	5	6	6
8. There shall be pestilences			7
9. There shall be earthquakes	6	5	5
10. There shall be terrors			8
11. There shall be great signs from heaven			9
12. These are the beginning of travail	7	7	

III.

Persecution foretold and help promised.

MATT. xxiv. 9-14, MK. xiii. 9-13, LK. xxi. 12-19	MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Persecution of Christians	1	1	1
2. Betrayal by friends	2	5	4
3. False prophets	3		
4. Love of the many waxing cold	4		
5. Testimony in persecution		2	2
6. Help of Holy Spirit in answering persecutors		4	
7. My help in answering persecutors			3
8. Not a hair shall perish. In patience win souls.			5
9. He that endureth to the end shall be saved	5	5a	
10. Gospel to be preached among all nations	6	3	

IV.

The destruction of Jerusalem and its subsequent subjection to the Gentiles. The dispersion of the Jews.

MATT. xxiv. 15-28, MK. xiii. 14-23, LK. xxi. 20-24	MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Appearance of abomination of desolation	1	1	
2. Jerusalem compassed with armies			1
3. Immediate flight necessary	2	2	2
4. Greatness of the tribulation	3	3	3
5. Shortening of the days	4	4	
6. False Christs and prophets will prophesy that Christ has come	5	5	
7. Warning that His coming not secret but open	6		
8. Carcase and eagles	7		
9. Dispersion of Jews			4
10. Jerusalem trodden down till times of Gentiles are fulfilled			5

V.

The coming of the Son of Man.

MATT. xxiv. 29-31, MK. xiii. 24-27, LK. xxi. 25-27	MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Signs in heaven	1	1	1
2. Sign of the Son of Man	1a		
3. Mourning on earth	1b		
4. Coming of Son of Man in clouds	2	2	2
5. Gathering of elect by angels	3	3	

VI.

Watching for events of "this generation."

MATT. xxiv. 32-35, MK. xiii. 28-31, LK. xxi. 28-33	MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Parable of fig tree	1	1	
2. Parable of fig and all trees (with preface)			1
3. Fulfilment in this generation	2	2	2
4. My words shall not pass away	3	3	3

VII.

Watching for the coming of the Son of Man.

MATT. xxiv. 36-51, xxv. 1-46, MK. xiii. 32-37, LK. xxi. 34-36

	MATT.	MK.	LK.
1. Father only has knowledge of time	1	1	
2. Coming will be unexpected like the flood	2		
3. Coming will be unexpected			2
4. One shall be taken and another left	3		
5. Watch as one should watch for a thief	4		
6. Watch as servants for an absent master		4	
7. Watch and pray			4
8. Reward of the faithful servant	5		
9. Punishment of the unfaithful servant	6		
10. Parable of ten virgins	7		
11. Parable of ten talents	8		
12. Sheep and goats	9		

(Some numbers are omitted in the column giving the order of events for the sake of designating similar items by the same number. No material is omitted.)

Paragraphs according to the American Revised Version.

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
xxiv. 1- 2	xiii. 1- 2	xxi. 5- 9
3-14	3- 8	10-19
15-28	9-13	20-24
29-31	14-23	25-28
32-44	24-27	29-33
45-51	28-32	34-36
xxv. 1-13	33-37	
14-30		
31-46		

In the Greek original there are no divisions. Those which we find in any of our English versions simply represent the judgment of different translators. Comparing our sections with those found in the American Revised Version we find that the following sections correspond exactly: Matt. IV and

V, Mk. III, IV and V, Lk. IV, V, VI, VII, except that we have placed in section VI one verse (Lk. xxi. 28) which would be in section V if we followed the ARV. The first fourteen verses of Matthew's gospel, the first thirteen in Mark and the first nineteen in Luke we have divided into three sections, putting all preliminary matters into the first section and beginning the second section with the reply of Christ. The ARV gives the reply (plus the introductory verse) as one section in Matthew. We have broken it into two sections after the eighth verse where there is undoubtedly a slight change of subject which the ARV recognizes by making a paragraph after the corresponding verse in Mark (Mk. xiii. 8). The same is true of Luke.

In the seventh section we have ventured to take one verse (Matt. xxiv. 36, Mk. xiii. 32) which is often considered as belonging to the sixth section, and added it to the seventh. King James' version does the same. Whatever be the rhetorical connection, the change of subject comes just before this verse rather than just after it.

It would seem that the attempt which is so often made to find here prophecies which have a double fulfilment (e.g. Alford's Greek Testament) looks rather in the wrong direction. Without attempting to estimate the amount of truth in this method, we may say that it is one which can be easily overdone. In the present instance the disciples evidently had confused ideas of the relation to each other of the destruction of Jerusalem and the events connected with the end of the age. The answer of Christ is discriminating rather than inclusive. It warns them against false Christs and prophets, against mistaken inferences from real calamities, against mistaking the beginning of travail for the end, against expecting the end before the gospel has been preached among all nations and against mistaking the destruction of Jerusalem for the coming of the Son of Man. From first to last there is a note of contrast. This it is which seems to justify the headings which have been given to the sixth and seventh sections, and which brings in references to the second coming in other

sections beside those specially devoted to it (Matt. xxiv. 14, 23-27).

Taking up now briefly the teaching of the different sections concerning the second coming:

Section I need not detain us. It reveals confusion in the minds of the disciples. The Lord's teaching begins with the second section.

Section II gives a warning against being led astray by false prophets or by great calamities. Many people are proof against false prophets who are easily upset by great calamities. Wars, famines, earthquakes, pestilences, all are signs of the beginning of the birth pangs of the new age. But the end of the present age is not yet. It is not even imminent for time is required for the development of the predicted calamities. The time of the calamities is left indefinite and hence may not be restricted to happenings before the fall of Jerusalem.

Section III is concerned with the coming persecutions of the disciples. Incidentally it yields just one thing in regard to the second coming—a thought put forth for the encouragement of those who were suffering and for contrasting the end of the period of travail with its beginning. It tells us that this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come (Matt. xxiv. 14). This means an indefinite, perhaps a long period of time before the coming of the end. Two questions immediately arise concerning the meaning of this verse. One question is this, Do these words "for a testimony" indicate anything as to the method of preaching the gospel? Do they justify preaching with the idea of bearing testimony rather than that of saving men? In seeking an answer two things must be kept in mind. First, the testimony is to be borne to the *nations*. Nothing is said about individuals. The establishment of the Christian church in each nation would seem to be the most satisfactory method of testifying to the nation. Second, the methods actually pursued by the apostles in their missionary journeys, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, are the best indication as to what preaching to the na-

tions for a testimony means. Here it is evident that they used every effort to convert men, and delivered testimony against them only when it was evident that they were hardened against the truth.

The second question is as to when this testimony may be regarded as complete. The question hardly needs more than its statement to show that there is nothing on which to base any certain reply. The expressions which Paul uses in his letter to the Colossians (i. 6 and i. 23) where he speaks of the gospel as bearing fruit in "all the world" and as preached in "all creation under heaven" are of too general a nature to have any bearing on the question, or to be quoted as showing that the world-wide preaching of the gospel was fulfilled in Paul's time. The expressions are natural to an epistle which lays stress on the adaptation of the gospel to all nations—Jewish and Gentile alike. It may be safe to say that this condition of world-wide testimony was not fulfilled before the era of modern missions began, when there were whole nations where the gospel was unknown. But to attempt today to say when the Lord will regard the witness to all the nations as sufficient, is obviously going beyond the limits of our knowledge.

Section IV is concerned with the destruction of Jerusalem. In this connection we have renewed warnings against false Christs and prophets who prophesy that Christ has come, and the assurance that when the real coming takes place, it will be seen by all. Is not this the point of the enigmatical saying, "Wheresoever the carcase is there will the eagles be gathered together." The coming will be immediately seen by all—just as the carcase is seen by the eagles. The attempt to assign particular meanings to the "eagles" (vultures) or the "carcase" leads to absurdities and misses the point to be illustrated.

Luke's gospel in this section speaks also of the dispersion of the Jews subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem and adds: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

The word translated "Gentiles" is literally "Nations." The plural of times is used apparently because of the plural of "nations"—each nation having its own time or appointed season (Alford). The word for "times" is not χρόνοι but καιροί—not periods of time but opportune times, right times for action, critical moments. Crises as opposed to intervals, would perhaps give the idea. We might render it "until the opportunities of the nations be fulfilled." It will thus be seen that the common interpretation of "times" as meaning "periods of time" or "a period of time" is at fault. Periods of time may be involved but they are not the direct subject of the prophecy. The meaning apparently is that Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the nations until the suitable times for their doing so are completed. If Palestine becomes the home of the Jews under the present British Mandate, the complete fulfilment of this prophecy would seem to be a matter of the near future. But so far as we can see this prophecy stands detached with no apparent connection between the completion of the times of the nations for holding Jerusalem and other events of the last times—except in one particular. The condition of Jerusalem is a part of that tribulation spoken of in the next section immediately after which Christ is to come. But it has no apparent connection with the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles.

Section V is concerned directly with the second coming of Christ. In the gospel of Matthew alone stands one word "immediately" which has caused much difficulty to interpreters. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened" (Matt. xxiv. 29). Attention to the fact already noted in regard to this tribulation would however seem to relieve the difficulty. This is that the tribulation appears to include the sufferings and dispersion of the Jews and the treading down of Jerusalem by the nations, neither of which are yet completed (Alford). The force of this will be appreciated if Matt. xxiv. 29 is read after Lk. xxi. 24.

In regard to the signs preceding the coming of the Son of Man, while all three evangelists mention the signs in the

heavens, Matthew and Mark give them more in detail, while Luke has only brief mention of it. In regard to the distress on the earth Mark says nothing, his whole account being very brief, Matthew mentions it and Luke gives a more detailed account.

Whether the description of the signs in the heavens is to be taken literally or figuratively it is impossible to say. The impression given by the narrative is that it is to be taken literally. But similar descriptions in the prophets leave us somewhat in doubt. If the signs in the heavens are to be taken literally, modern astronomy furnishes abundant suggestions as to what they might be. Collisions of heavenly bodies is one possibility. Any such event would of course be governed by the physical laws which control all matter and would probably, though not necessarily, be the result of arrangements and forces now in operation. But this would not in the least make it impossible for a proper grouping of such events to be signs of the end. (They might be causes as well as signs of a complete end of everything so far as man is concerned.) Nor would it in any way diminish the importance of the prophecy in which, apart from all astronomical calculations, they were predicted.

In Matthew alone it is recorded "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man." Two explanations have been given of this. One is that it is some special sign, whose character is at present unknown, which will appear before the coming of Christ. The other is that the sign is the coming of Christ itself. We incline to this explanation in view of the suddenness elsewhere ascribed to the coming. The disciples had asked "What shall be the sign of thy coming?" The Lord replies "The sign will be the coming itself." But the matter must remain uncertain. In regard to the earth Matthew only has "and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn." If the "sign of the Son of Man" is the coming itself, this mourning would seem to be at the time of the coming. If the sign is something different, the mourning would be immediately before the coming. Luke goes much more into detail.

Following the signs comes the solemn announcement in all the gospels that they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven. The minor variations in the wording between "cloud" and "clouds" and between "power and great glory" and "great power and glory" are scarcely significant. No reason exists for making this other than a literal return to earth. Matthew and Mark add to this that he shall send forth his angels and gather together his elect from the four winds. Matthew adds "with a great sound of a trumpet." He also speaks of their being gathered "from one end of heaven to the other." The expression in Mark is "from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven." The English translation obscures the fact that "uttermost part" in Mark is the same word as "end" in Matthew. It seems best to take both expressions as meaning that the elect will be gathered from whatever place they may be. The best comment is Paul's assurance that "the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive shall together with them be caught up."

Section VI we have named as "Watching for the events of this generation" and made it begin with Luke xxi. 28. This verse reads as follows: "But when these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh." This verse is often taken as the conclusion of the preceding paragraph. In that case the words "these things" would mean the things in connection with Christ's second coming and the "redemption" would be the full salvation to be received by his followers at that time. This makes good sense and may be the correct interpretation. But there seem good reasons for connecting this verse with what follows rather than with what goes before:

(1) The Greek particle, δέ, which introduces the verse is the same as that which introduces the new section (VI) Matt. xxiv. 32, Mk. xiii. 28). This does not settle the attachment of the verse to the following section but it makes it probable and grammatically possible.

(2) The time of Lk. xxi. 28 is the same as that of xxi. 31 and the expression "these things" occurs in both verses.

(3) Verse 28 seems like an anti-climax to section V whereas it fitly introduces section VI. If it belongs to section VI, the words "and he spake unto them a parable" would be in the nature of a parenthesis or explanation connecting verse 28 with the parable which illustrates it and whose teaching he again emphasises in verse 31.

The most important consideration in connection with the naming and interpretation of sections VI and VII is the contrast between the "these things" of the one and the "that day" of the other. "That day" of Matt. xxiv. 36 is shown by verse 37 to be the day of Christ's coming. "These things" are the coming events of this generation. This brings us to the interpretation of the words "This generation." There is no occasion for taking them in any but their ordinary sense as meaning the generation which was living when our Lord spoke. Just as sections IV and V dealing respectively with the fall of Jerusalem and the coming of Christ are contrasted with each other, so sections VI and VII dealing with the proper attitude to be maintained toward these two great events are contrasted with each other. The interpretation which makes "this generation" to mean the "Jewish people" (Alford and others) or "the same generation" (i.e. "The same generation which sees the beginning of these signs shall live to see the end"—McConkey) are strained interpretations designed to harmonize with the understanding of "these things" as those of the second coming. The word translated "generation" is used forty-one times in the New Testament. In 29 of these passages the ordinary meaning of the word, the whole body of persons born about the same time, is required by the context. (Matt. i. 17, 4 times; xi. 16, xii. 39, 41, 42, 45, xvi. 4, xxiii. 36; Lk. i. 48, 50, vii. 31, xi. 29, 30, 31, 32, 50, 51, xvi. 8, xvii. 25; Acts xiii. 36, xiv. 16, xv. 21; Eph. iii. 5, 21; Col. i. 26; Heb. iii. 10. In 8 of the 9 remaining cases (excluding the 3 under discussion) viz., Matt. xvii. 17, Mk. viii. 12, 2 times, viii. 38, ix. 19; Lk. ix.

41; Acts ii. 40; Phil. ii. 15, the ordinary meaning of the word satisfies all requirements and is the best rendering. In these 8 cases the rendering "Jewish people" would make good sense. But because another meaning would make good sense is no reason for departing in translation from the ordinary meaning of the word. To translate "disciples" would also make good sense in several cases but there would be no justification for its use. In the 3 cases before us the ordinary meaning would probably have been accepted without question if it had not been for the difficulties of interpretation.

In Lk. xxi. 28 it is said "your redemption draweth nigh" and in verse 31 "the kingdom of God is nigh." The corresponding expression in Matt. and Mk. is "he (or it) is nigh." "He" or "it" has no word corresponding to it in the Greek. It is supplied from the verb. Now all four of these expressions are not what we should expect to find in connection with the second coming but are more easily applied to the destruction of Jerusalem. The disciples had been warned to flee to the mountains to be saved from the terrible destruction whose days had been shortened "for the elect's sake." This may account for the expression "your redemption." "The kingdom of God is near" is parallel to if not explanatory of the expression "your redemption." It is the common phrase with which our Lord introduced his preaching and hence is not a special phrase describing the second coming.

Section VII. The hour of Christ's coming is known to the Father only. Its arrival will be unexpected as the flood in the time of Noah. It will be a snare to those who are overcharged with surfeiting and cares. It will be a time of separation of one from another—apparently a reference to the same thing which Paul describes when he says, We which are alive . . . shall together with them (the raised-up dead) be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. Watchfulness is the Christian's duty. Watch as men watch for a thief, as servants watch for an absent master. Watch and pray "that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass," referring ap-

parently to the distresses recorded by Luke (xxi. 25, 26), "and to stand before the Son of Man."

All the evangelists speak of the signs which shall precede the second advent but Luke is the most explicit. "Signs in sun and moon and stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows; men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the things which are coming on the world: for the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." How shall this promise of previous signs be reconciled with the thought that the coming will be sudden and unexpected? Perhaps because the signs may precede the advent by only a short interval. This was the case in the destruction of Jerusalem. The sign (Jerusalem compassed with armies) came just before its destruction. Also it seems to be especially to non-Christians that his coming will be unexpected.

So far we have contributions from all three evangelists. Matthew adds three parables and a description of the last judgment to emphasize different aspects of that event. The faithful servant shall be richly rewarded when his lord returns. The unfaithful servant shall be rejected and punished. The virgins who are ready when the bridegroom comes enter into the wedding feast. Those who are not ready are finally rejected. The servants who make good use of their lord's money which has been entrusted to them during his absence will be rewarded with discrimination, and share the joy of their lord. The one who made no use of his talent will be cast out and punished. The issues of the judgment turn on the treatment of Christ's brethren which He regards as treatment of himself.

Let us sum up briefly the points already considered. The chief point of this discussion is the method of interpretation of the discourse. This is that the reports in the three gospels are of one discourse, that the whole discourse may be divided into sections, that the general subjects of these sections may be determined and when determined should be used in deciding the meaning of details. The result of applying this pro-

cess is to diminish the number of difficulties of interpretation. The material which concerns the second coming is found in two sections, one concerning the coming itself and the other concerning our attitude toward it, together with allusions in sections devoted to other subjects.

As to the teaching: The coming will be delayed. In the mean time many deceivers will claim to be Christ and will proclaim that the time is at hand. Be not deceived. The gospel must first be preached among all nations. The coming will be unexpected to many. The Father only knows the time. Therefore we should watch as servants for an absent master or as a man watches for a thief. But our watching should be that of faithful service lest we be ashamed at His coming. The coming will be preceded by signs. It will be seen by all. The Son of Man shall come on the clouds of heaven and shall send forth His angels and gather together His elect.

We should also note that nothing is said about a millennium. If we may trust the Talmud, which was produced later, to give us a correct account of the beliefs of the Jews in the time of Christ, the doctrine of a millennium was held by them at the time when Christ delivered this discourse. The argument from silence must always be handled cautiously, but our Lord's silence here is certainly remarkable. If He was looking forward to a millennial reign on earth, why is it that in discussing the "Last Things" He passes over the millennium in absolute silence, without any reference to the Jewish doctrine, and lays emphasis instead on the final judgment scene?

Los Angeles, California. EDGAR M. WILSON.

MARTIN BUCER'S CONCEPTION OF A CHRISTIAN STATE

Martin Bucer[1] (1491-1551) is commonly known as a Strassburg reformer[2] who intervened between Luther and Zwingli in the controversies about the Lord's Supper. And many speak of him as the counselor of Philip of Hesse,[3] whom he came to know during the negotiations preceding the attempted reconciliation of Luther and Zwingli. From then on Bucer was practically the politician among the reformers. Not only did he organize the Church of Hesse,[4] and not only was he called to numerous cities in southern Germany in order to install Protestantism but he was also one of the few men of the Protestant party who was called upon to be present at the Diets in order to attempt a reunion of the Protestants with the Catholic Church. But few know Bucer as the Cambridge professor of theology, and fewer still his almost entirely forgotten activities in behalf of reforming England.[5]

After he was forced to leave Strassburg at the beginning of the counter-reformation in 1549, he went to England, accepting a repeated invitation of Archbishop Cranmer. In England, he was soon in the forefront of the Protestant reformers, not only advising Cranmer out of the fullness of his many practical experiences in Germany, discussing the most difficult problems of the Eucharist and of the vestments,[6] and criticizing the first edition of the Common Prayer

---

[1] Gustav Anrich, *Martin Butzer,* Strassburg, 1914.

[2] W. Baum, *Capito und Butzer,* 1860.

[3] Max-Lenz, *Briefwechsel Philipps des Grossmütigen mit Butzer,* Leipzig, 1880 ff.

[4] F. W. Hassenkamp, *Hessische Kirchengeschichte,* Marburg, 1851-55.

[5] E. Harvey, *Bucer in England,* Marburg, 1906.

[6] G. G. Perry, *The Reformation of the English Church,* London, 1910, pp. 88 f. Martin Bucer, *Scripta anglicana,* pp. 705 ff. (cf. John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials,* London, 1816, Vol. VI, pp. 448 ff. and 434 ff.); E. Harvey, *Bucer in England,* p. 62; John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,* London, 1725, Vol. II, pp. 554 ff.; *Zurich Letters* (ed. by the Parker Society) Cambridge, 1842-45, Vol. I, p. 161.

Book of 1549,[7] but also constantly giving his attention to the practical needs of the country.[8] These endeavors were crowned by the work which he dedicated in 1550 to young King Edward VI, which may be called his masterpiece.[9]

This book which bears the title *De Regno Christi,* has never been adequately studied. By some theologians of the last century it is rightly called an outline of "Christian Politics."[10] It is this work of Bucer to which I wish to call attention: it may cast some light upon some problems of today.

1. Its title leads us to consider the problem which is given by the concept of the Kingdom of Christ. The theological as well as the practical ethical change of the Christian mind throughout the centuries may be studied in the development of this idea. There exist some essays on the development of the conception of the Kingdom of Christ from the times of the early church until the Reformation, but I know only one small book on the history of this idea in modern times since the Reformation,[11] and yet it is one of the most important tasks of the modern historian to reveal the attitudes of modern Christians as they are expressed in their conception of the Kingdom of God. Everyone who reads the lately published reports of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work of 1925,[12] will be struck by the fact that the main differences in the opinions of German and British theologians

---

[7] *Scripta anglicana,* pp. 456-503. (Cf. E. Harvey, p. 63.)

[8] G. Klingenburg, *Das Verhaeltnis Calvins zu Butzer in der wirtschaftsethischen Anschauung beider Reformatoren,* Bonn, 1912.

[9] To be found in *Scripta anglicana fere omnia,* Basel, 1577, pp. 1-170.

[10] W. Baum, p. 564. Cf. August Lang, *Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers und die Grundzuege seiner Theologie,* Leipzig, 1900, pp. 43 f. and pp. 366 ff.

[11] Emanuel Hirsch, *Die Reich-Gottes-Begriffe des modernen Denkens,* Göttingen, 1923. Cf. also Gotthold Schrenck, *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus, vornehmlich bei Coccejus,* Gütersloh, 1923. (Schrenck devotes also a chapter to Bucer, pp. 160 f.)

[12] The English report was edited by Dean G. K. A. Bell: *The Stockholm Conference* 1925, London, 1926.

and churchmen are based upon their conception of the Kingdom of God. It is very easy to declare that these differences are due to the history of the different church bodies, one coming mainly from Luther, the other being influenced strongly by Calvin. A full proof of such a statement, however, cannot be so easily given. Bucer's book is an example of the truth of this statement.

2. The main line of thought, which Bucer expresses in his last work, shows the King of England how he could christianize the whole life of his country, how its inner politics should be directed by the ethics of Jesus Christ.[13] One may say that Bucer is the first herald of the social gospel. The history of the so-called social gospel needs to be written as well as that of the Kingdom of God. Probably the tasks are identical. A book like Bucer's proves that the plan to christianize the whole social order was not undertaken only at the beginning of the industrial era. It may, therefore, be interesting to characterize Bucer's book.

The Kingdom of God as conceived by Bucer is identical with the Church, but only with the Church as far as it consists of true Christians, i.e. those who are elected by Christ and endowed with the Holy Spirit.[14] In other words, only those people are citizens of Christ's Kingdom, who are chosen by Him and made capable by Him, of obeying His commandments.

But this rather narrow concept is considerably enlarged, for the election proves itself in virtue. *Regnum Dei non in sermone consistit, sed in virtute.*[15] It is at this point, that Bucer differs widely from Luther and even from Calvin. Neither of these could have made his own Bucer's most characteristic words, in his commentary on the Gospels, 1536: *Vera theologia non theoretica, sed practica est. Finis siqui-*

---

[13] *Scripta anglicana*, p. 3 and p. 174.
[14] *ibid.*, pp. 13, 16, 33.
[15] *ibid.*, p. 30 (cf. p. 20).

dem eius agere est; hoc est vitam vivere deiformem.[16] According to Bucer's opinion, the Kingdom of God really exists only, if its citizens form a community based upon a realization of Jesus' new commandment of love. And the consequence is that according to Bucer the Kingdom of God will be established whenever the life of man in all its parts and functions is ruled by Christian love.[17] Bucer is eager to see his ideal realized in full life. He was a realist; he had studied life, and therefore he related his religious concept closely to the existing world, taking full account of the natural social order. In other words, he conceived the Kingdom of God as a community of love within the natural community of state, family and vocational life. For his concept of election contains not only an election to redemption, but also an election which has put every man into the place in which he finds himself, and has endowed him with the natural gifts of body and mind.[18] From this point of view the Kingdom of God is no longer the Church only, but the Christian state.

In the first part of his book Bucer develops his idea in its theoretical aspects, and it is not very easy to discover the trend of his original thought among his many traditional theological concepts. But in the second part of his book, he reveals himself as a man of profound practical insight, presenting clearly outlined programs for a Christianization of the social order. It is amazing for the student of the England of the Reformation period to see how well informed he was about the situation in England as well as in most European countries. The English Reformation brought about eager endeavors to reorganize the national life.

Bucer's book was not the only one to sketch a reorganization of England's social life. I have studied many anonymous pamphlets which are concerned with different practical as-

---

[16] *Enarrationes in quatuor Evangelia,* Strassburg, 1536, p. 753.
[17] *Scripta angl.,* p. 8.
[18] *ibid.,* pp. 32 f., 136.

pects.[19] But none of them showed such completeness and consistency as Bucer's work.

The first point of his program is of course the Church-reformation, and here a few words need to be said about the relationship of State and Church as conceived by Bucer. His idea of the State is thoroughly original. He maintains that the king or the magistrate has received, with the power of the sword, full responsibility for the lives of his subjects. He shall not only protect their external welfare, but also be responsible for the inner life of the citizens.[20] The State is conceived as a community seeking the common welfare, and since this exists to its full extent only when a godly life is secured, the State is responsible for the true religion. The true religion can, according to Bucer, be only Christianity as it has been rediscovered by the reformers and as it is based upon the Bible.

All legislation by the State, even its inner principles, must therefore be taken from the Bible and its ethical commandments. No law, says Bucer, deserves the name of law unless it is derived from Christ's orders.[21] The first step toward a Christianization of the State is, therefore, the restoration of the true Christian religion, and the first task of the State for such an end is the foundation of a strong Biblical Church.[22] Thus, the State guarantees the Church, which later becomes the conscience of its life; for though it seems that the State is superior to the Church, yea, that the State, according to

---

[19] William Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce,* Vol. I, 5th ed. (Cambridge 1905); "Drei volkswirtschaftliche Denkschriften aus der Zeit Heinrichs VIII.," ed. by R. Pauli, in *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,* 1878; John Latimer, *Works* (Parker Soc.) Cambridge, 1844-45; E. M. Leonard, *The Early History of English Poor-Relief,* Cambridge, 1900; Thomas Morus, *Utopia* (ed. by V. Michels and Th. Ziegler) Berlin, 1875; John Stafford, *Discourses,* ed. by E. Leser, Leipzig, 1895.—Much material can be found in J. Strype's various books.

[20] *Scripta angl.,* pp. 85 f.

[21] *ibid.,* p. 149.

[22] *ibid.,* pp. 58 ff.

Bucer, has taken over all the tasks commonly attributed to the Church—the Church, is, in fact, superior to the State. For once established, it gives the directions to the political leaders, and the churchmen are the constant advisors of king or magistrate.

Church and State propagate in close cooperation the Kingdom of God. After the purification and the following constant supervision of the Church as an institution of worship, they have to pay attention to two main factors in human life. Both have to install Christian marriage as the institute of social life,[23] and they have to organize a poor relief against the results of idleness.[24] In close contact with each other, Church and State have their main concern in a healthy family life and in sound economic conditions.

But there remains still the wide field of cultural and political activities which are involved in the task of the State. And here Bucer develops for the first time a social gospel concerned with all the problems of the social order. His general principle is that in all parts of public life *personalities* are the leading influence, persons who are not only experts in their field but also thorough Christians.

We owe our present education to the Reformation and especially to Luther's early educational propaganda but nowhere is there such a consistency in the educational program as that revealed in Bucer. Children and adults shall constantly be supervised in the development of their Christian character as well as in their professional activities. In a number of proposed laws Bucer is concerned with the manifold problems of education and of professional life.[25] He recognizes fully the importance of all natural orders and in all his endeavors one must admire his intention to make the natural orders useful for his great idea of the Kingdom of God as

---

[23] *Scripta anglicana*, pp. 86 ff. and 133 ff. Cf., however, Hastings Eells, *The Attitude of Martin Bucer toward the Bigamy of Philipp of Hesse*, New Haven, 1924.

[24] *ibid.*, pp. 50 ff. and 80 ff.

[25] *ibid.*, pp. 134 ff.

a community of love, *i.e.* he gives full credit to the manifold parts of life as they are, from working to playing, but he wants to see them penetrated with a Christian spirit.

This educational enthusiasm is at the basis of the laws which he proposes for a Christianization of the social life. There is a lengthy discussion of England's agricultural problems and of the possible reorganization of craftsmanship.[26] In another proposition, he favors the development of industries.[27] He gives an ethic of merchants and business men, limiting their activities to such commerce as is useful for the needs of the State and excludes any selfish gain.[28] Every profession is conceived as contributing in service and cooperation to the common welfare. In that sense, all professions shall be an expression of Christian love. He is thoroughly original in his sketch of a Christian morality for the stage.[29] In his partly amusing pictures of dramas which he drew in order to illustrate their possible contributions to a Christian life, he inaugurated the modern pageant or religious drama, in which he was followed by Calvin's successor in Geneva, Beza. The last group of his laws is concerned with the legislature[30] and the execution of its statutes. Everywhere the final principle is taken from the Bible. The underlying ideas are the abolition of selfishness and the restoration of love; and the execution of these laws shall take place in accordance with the severity of the Mosaic law.

It will be agreed that some parts of this program are thoroughly modern. It may be interesting to regard its practical influence in his own time. It was unfortunate that Bucer died in the spring of 1551 after a two years' residence in England. Just two years after him young King Edward passed away, to be succeeded by his Catholic sister, Mary, so that Bucer was soon forgotten. I have found no reference

---

[26] *Scripta angl.*, pp. 136 ff.
[27] *ibid.*, p. 138.
[28] *ibid.*, pp. 139 ff.
[29] *ibid.*, pp. 141 ff.
[30] *ibid.*, pp. 148 ff.

to his work in the books of his Cambridge friends, Grindal, Bradford, and Parker, but that it was used is proved by the diary of Edward VI[31] and by correspondence between the Puritan Sampson and Secretary Burleigh in 1573, in which Sampson demands that Burleigh follow the advices of the Strassburg reformer.[32] Later Milton used Bucer's book for his own purposes in his fight for a divorce. He translated the chapter on Marriage and Divorce.[33] Whether we may conclude from this fact that Bucer influenced the Cromwell Independents, is an open question.

But in regard to the practical application of Bucer's social program, we observe that during Elizabeth's reign English public life was indeed reorganized according to many of Bucer's principles. There are many laws concerned with poor relief and the reorganization of professional and vocational life. Bucer's aim seems to have been partly achieved. But in Protestant England, no eagerness was shown for a realization of the Kingdom of God. All these reforming endeavors can be understood in the light of the Tudor policy of forming a strong English nation endowed with power based on economical wealth. It was not the religious enthusiasm of Bucer, that led to the reformation of public life, but the strong national policy of the country, and this indeed is a point which shows the fundamental lack of Bucer's book and explains why his conception of the Kingdom of Christ could not be realized. He forgot that the community of love which he desired, had to be established within a national state ruled by selfish patriotism.

Bucer's *De Regno Christi* as a picture of an ideal state offers a striking contrast to Thomas Moore's *Utopia* as an ideal Platonic community of the sixteenth century. Moore's concept of the State is also that of a community based upon,

---

[31] Gilbert Burnet, *History of English Reformation,* London, 1841. Records, pp. lxxxv f.

[32] Strype, *Annals,* pp. 265 f.; Parker, pp. 177 f. and 448.

[33] John Milton, *The Judgment of M. Butzer concerning divorce. . . .* London, 1644.

and working for, mutual welfare and the greatest happiness of all its adherents.[34] If Bucer wants to replace selfishness by Christian love, Moore wants to extinguish it by abolishing property as the root of the social evil. Bucer's ideal state is that of a Christian communism; Moore's, that of a Platonic and anti-capitalistic communism. The Protestant reformer forgot the external politics of his ideal state, but the English philosopher and politician developed in his fantastic picture a clear imperialistic policy for his island state, anticipating policies later pursued by imperialistic England.[35] Bucer could draw his picture of a Christian state without relating his state definitely to others. He did not see England in her relation to other countries; but Moore developed for the state of the Utopians clear principles of colonization and expansion.[36] Bucer failed to regard the State as endowed with the instrument of power, Moore did not hesitate to declare that in certain cases even a communistic state had to act in defense and expression of its power.

Chicago, Ill. WILHELM PAUCK.

---

[34] *Utopia* (ed. Michels-Ziegler), pp. 111 ff.

[35] Hermann Oncken, "Die Utopia des Thomas Morus and das Machtproblem in der Staatslehre" (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1922).

[36] *Utopia* (ed. Michels-Ziegler) pp. 31, 22 ff.; 56, 15 ff.; 93, 33 ff.; 95, 11 ff.; 8, 22 ff.

ARMINIANISM IN HOLLAND

The Arminian movement[1] began with a controversy on predestination, but this was only the starting point of the conflict. In the following we shall speak first of this starting point and secondly of the further development of Arminianism.

I. Arminianism as it Started.

1. *The Immediate Cause of the Conflict* was on one side the emphasizing of Calvin's double predestination in the form of supralapsarianism as contrasted with infralapsarianism, and on the other side the opposition to this teaching. In the thought of the Reformed theologians after the death of Calvin, these two terms refer to the logical order of the Divine decrees. Charles Hodge[2] wrote on the meaning of supralapsarianism as follows: "According to this view, God, in order to manifest His grace and justice, selected from creatable men (*i.e.*, from men to be created) a certain number to be vessels of mercy, and certain others to be vessels of wrath. In the order of thought, election and reprobation precede the pur-

---

[1] Literature: The writings of Arminius: Latin, J. Arminii, *Opera Theologica*, Lugd. Bat. 1629; in new ed. at Frankfort, 1631 and 1635. Translated from the Latin into English by J. Nichols, London 1825-28 (2 vols.); Buffalo 1853 (3 vols.). J. Nichols, *The Life of Arminius*, London 1843. Also the articles on Arminius and Arminianism in Meusel, *Kirchl. Hand-lexikon*, in *Protestantische Realencyklopaedie*, 3d ed. by Hauck (*PRE*) and the corresponding article in the *New Schaff-Herzog*, also in the *Encycl. Britannica*, and in L. Stephen's *Dictionary of World Biography*. Compare also the historically orientating article by E. G. A. Boeckel given as an introduction to the Canons of Dort in his *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch reformierten Kirchen* (1847) pp. 508-13. As to an easily obtainable well balanced review, we refer to Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* I, pp. 509-15. Compare Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (1874) II, 316 ff, 327 ff. We have a detailed investigation of the whole situation by O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte* (to be quoted by *DG*) *des Protestantismus* Vol. III (1926), pp. 314-339; also by R. Seeberg, *Lehrb. d. DG*, 3d ed. (1920), pp. 676-700. (cf. Loofs, *DG* and Fisher). A valuable critical review is given by G. F. Oehler, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, 2d ed., 191-196. Among the English Church Histories we mention the one by W. Walker. J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology* I (1872).

[2] *Systematic Theology* II, 316.

pose to create and to permit the fall. Creation is in order to redemption." Then Hodge speaks of infralapsarianism: "God, with the design to reveal his own glory, that is, the perfections of His own nature, determined to create the world; secondly, to permit the fall of man; thirdly, to elect from the mass of fallen men a multitude whom no man can number as 'vessels of mercy'," etc.

Calvin himself has not expressed himself clearly or consistently on this matter. "As it was not in his day a special matter of discussion, certain passages may be quoted from his writings which favor the supralapsarian and other passages which favor the infralapsarian view."[3]

In the writings of Beza also there are expressions not irreconcilable with an infralapsarianism.[4] But, as is pointed out by O. Ritschl[5] to whom we are indebted for these references, the burden of his teaching throughout was the supralapsarian conception of predestination.[6]

D. V. Koornheert, a scholarly layman, of whom we shall hear more a little later, wrote against this teaching. He gathered a following, and the demand was for a revision of the Belgic Confession. Jacob Arminius, known for dialectical skill and for loyalty to Calvinism, was asked to reply to him. But on closer study of this problem he turned against Beza and all the strict predestinarians. As professor at the University of Leyden (1603) he soon was in conflict with his colleague, Francis Gomarus, a rigid Calvinist.[7]

It is in the emphasis upon this conception by strict adherents to Calvinistic principles and in the determination of a more or less rationalistically inclined anti-Calvinist group of

---

[3] Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

[4] Cf. *Tractationes Theologicae*, ed. II. Genevae, 1582, III, 406 b; see also his argumentation at the Montbeliard Colloquy in the *Acta Colloquii Montis Belligartensis*, Tubingae, 1587, p. 523 seqq.

[5] *DG*, III, 295 f.

[6] See his *Tractationes*, I pp. 81 (10), 173 (2), 179 (5), 196 (5), 683, 684, 687; III, 403 a.

[7] Fisher, p. 338; Seeberg, *DG* (English II, p. 412, German 3d ed. IV, 676); Ritschl *DG* III, 319 f; J. Tulloch, I, 11ff.

men who wanted to get rid of every vestige of the Biblical doctrine of predestination that we must see the historical cause of the conflict here to be described.

2. *The Conflict* soon resulted in a schism affecting the whole of the Reformed Church in Holland. Arminius died 1609. The scholarly and able Simon Episcopius became his successor in the university and the spokesman for his followers. It was he especially who systematized and developed the "Arminian" views. The "Arminians," in 1610, expressed their position in five articles (Articuli Arminiani sive Remonstrantiae) which gave to them the name "*Remonstrants.*"[8] The adherents of the official church issued a *Counter-Remonstrance.* All endeavors to reach an agreement were of no avail. So the question came before the famous Synod of Dort, convened on November 13, 1618, and lasting till May 9, 1619, during which time there were held 154 formal sessions and a large number of conferences.[9] The whole Dutch delegation, consisting of 84 clerical and 18 secular commissioners, was orthodox. There were 28 foreign delegates of Reformed churches: from England, Scotland, the Palatinate, Hesse, Nassau, East Friesland, and Bremen. King James had instructed the English delegates to "mitigate the heat of both sides." Some of the German delegates were urging in the same way. But such voices were ignored. The representatives of Arminianism, thirteen in all, were treated as persons under indictment and were excluded from participation in the proceedings. The result was the condemnation of the five articles of the Remonstrance and the drafting of five decidedly Cal-

---

[8] These articles are published by Schaff in *Creeds,* III, 545 ff. in Dutch, Latin and English (from which we shall quote below). The Preface, the five negative articles and the conclusion are here omitted. E. G. A. Boeckel, in his above mentioned *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche* (Leipzig, 1847) gives a German translation of the whole (pp. 544-53).

[9] On the composition and history of this synod which was representative of the whole of Reformed Protestantism, see Schaff, *Creeds,* I, 512-15.

vinistic "Canons." The Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism were formally adopted.[10]

3. *The Doctrine of Predestination in the Discussion of the Synod.*

a. The *general situation* is characterized by Schaff with the following remark: "The Arminian controversy is the most important which took place within the Reformed Church. It corresponds to the Pelagian and the Jansenist controversies in the Catholic Church. It involves the problem of the ages, which again and again has baffled the ken of theologians and philosophers, and will do so to the end of time: the relation of divine sovereignty and human responsibility."

b. The "five articles" of the Remonstrants together with the "explanatory theses" which they were required to lay before the Synod[11] may guide us in stating what was their teaching on predestination:

Point 1: God had simply decreed to save all who would believe in Christ and persevere in this faith to their end; and to condemn all who continue to refuse Him. In this act there is no reference to individuals. Thus predestination is reduced to the mere foreknowledge of God.

Point 2: Christ died for all men and for every man, obtaining "for them all . . . redemption and the forgiveness of sins"; only that "no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins except the believer." They protest against distinguishing between the general fact of Christ dying for all and His actually dying for the elect only (thesis 2, 4).

Points 3 and 4[12]: "Man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can of and by himself neither think, will,

---

[10] Schaff in his *Creeds of Christendom,* III, gives these "Canones Synodi Dordrechtanae" in Latin (pp. 550-80), then the English abridgment, as adopted by the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America (581-97). The Latin text is found also in Niemeyer's *Collectio* and the German in the collections of Boeckel.

[11] Given by Müller, *Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche,* pp. LIX, ff.

[12] After English translation by Schaff, *Creeds,* III, p. 546 f.

nor do anything that is truly good (such as saving faith eminently is); but it is needful that he be born again—and renewed in understanding, inclination, or will, and all his powers." Art. 4, speaking of the absolute need of divine grace, adds: "But as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many, that they have resisted the Holy Ghost." In the background of these two articles, supplemented by the theses, are the thoughts expressed and unexpressed: The sinner, while not free in the doing of the good, is still expected to prepare himself and to take the decisive steps. The divine call is always seriously meant, the distinction between an external and an internal call being rejected. There is no calling of the reprobates just for the purpose of hardening them, for removing their excuse and for punishing them the much more severely. There is no secretly predestinating divine will. The given grace is sufficient for the salvation of all. (These are statements contained in the theses.)

Point 5: Perseverance, resistance in temptation are through the assistance of the Holy Spirit and by the help of Christ; they are not, however, the result of an absolute decree. Believers, therefore, can fall into grievous sins and persevere in these. They can only hope that they may persevere and be confident that divine grace will always be at hand and be sufficient (see besides the art. 5 the theses upon this subject). The basis for all these thoughts is, after all, the belief in a certain freedom of the will in spiritual things and the denial of a real predestination.[13]

c. The *Canons of Dort*[14] are the reply of the Synod to the "five points" of the Remonstrants. Points 3 and 4 are taken together. Under each of these heads, "articles," or statements of positive doctrine, are first given. These are then followed

---

[13] Cf. Seeberg, *DG,* IV, 678-82; see also Schaff, *Creeds,* I, 516-19.

[14] In reviewing the "Canons of Dort" we have before us the Latin text and the English abridged text, both given by Schaff in vol. III, also the German text by Boeckel (see above), and the careful review by Seeberg, vol. IV.

by "rejectory articles" directed against the opponents. The articles show that the leaders at Dort were not deceived as to tendencies and principles of the Remonstrants, that were not expressed in the articles which they had submitted.[15] The question of supralapsarianism versus infralapsarianism was evaded at the Synod. But the infralapsarians were decidedly in the majority, especially also through the delegates from England and from Germany. There are in the Canons no really supralapsarian statements. In their entirety they represent the orthodox Reformed system as pivoting around the doctrine of predestination.[16]

In the following we shall try to give the essentials of these "Five Points of Calvinism."

Point One: Of Divine Predestination. All men have sinned in Adam, are under God's curse and deserve eternal death. Christ was sent for the salvation of all believers. The wrath of God is upon those who believe not this Gospel, because the cause of this unbelief is "in man himself."[17]

But on the other hand, the messengers of God go only "to whom He will and at what time He pleaseth" (Art. 3).[18] Faith "is the free gift of God," and "that some receive the gift of faith from God and others do not receive it, proceeds from God's eternal decree . . . according to which decree He graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however obstinate, and inclines them to believe while, in His just judgment, He leaves the non-elect to their own wickedness and obduracy" (Art. 6).

There is emphasis upon the fact that the predestination for salvation pertains to "a certain number of persons," to an "elect number" that cannot be "diminished" (Arts. 7, 10, 11, 15).

---

[15] See II below, also the footnote in Seeberg, *DG*, p. 690.

[16] Cf. Seeberg, *DG*, IV, 685.

[17] Schaff, Creeds, III, Art. 5, see pp. 581 ff.

[18] There is a similar statement in the Augsburg Confession (Art. V): Ubi et quando visum est Deo.

As to the non-elect or reprobate there is the statement that "others are passed by in the eternal decree" (Art. 15).

What is God's motive in this double "eternal decree"? The election for salvation is "out of mere grace," "to the sovereign good pleasure of His own will," "for the praise of the riches of His glorious grace" (Art. 7). The *reprobate* has fallen into his state "out of His sovereign, most just, irreprehensible and unchangeable good pleasure," "for the declaration of His justice" (Art. 15).

To meet the troubling thoughts of imperfect Christians the following article (Art. 16) is added: "Those who do not yet experience a lively faith in Christ . . . and do nevertheless persist in the use of the means which God has appointed for working these graces in us, ought not to be alarmed at the mention of reprobation, nor to rank themselves among the reprobate, but diligently to persevere . . . and with ardent desires devoutly and humbly to wait for a season of richer grace. Much less are they to be terrified . . . who cannot yet reach that measure of holiness and faith to which they aspire. . . ."

To these articles on Point One the synod attached a *"rejection of errors"* in nine paragraphs.[19] Among these was this, that the whole of predestination is simply the general truth that God will save all who believe and persevere (Art. 1); also that this predestination is conditioned upon the right use of the "light of nature" (which would be Pelagian), and upon the foreseen attitude of man in repentance, faith and perseverance (Arts. 4, 5); also this that the elect may be lost which would be in conflict with the immutability of God (Arts. 6, 7); that God cannot have decreed to condemn anybody (8); finally that the evangelization of some peoples is to be explained by merits that these had before others (9).

Point Two: *The Death of Christ and the Redemption of Men thereby.* The justice of God demands also the eternal

---

[19] Latin by Schaff, *Creeds*, III, 556 ff., German by Boeckel, 520 ff., cf. Seeberg IV, 690 ff.

punishment of the sinner unless satisfaction be made. He cannot do this in his own person (Arts. 1, 2). Thus God gave His Son who became a curse for us and rendered the satisfaction. His sacrifice and satisfaction was of infinite worth and value and, therefore, sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world. It was sufficient for the reason that Christ was not only "really man and perfectly holy," but also the only begotten Son of God. This gospel is to be preached to all. Those, thus called, that do not believe, perish because of their own desert (Art. 6); those that believe and are saved "are indebted for this benefit solely to the Grace of God given them in Christ from everlasting. . . . For this was the sovereign counsel and most gracious will and purpose of God the Father that the quickening and saving efficacy of the most precious death of His Son should extend to all the elect, for bestowing upon them alone the gift of justifying faith, thereby to bring them infallibly to salvation: that is, it was the will of God, that Christ by the blood of the cross . . . should effectually redeem out of every people . . . all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation" (8).

The *rejectory paragraphs* are directed against the teaching that Christ had suffered without regard to special persons (Art. 1); that Christ, by His satisfaction, had merely opened the way for the Father to offer salvation under new conditions to be met by man in the use of his free will (Art. 3); that a federation of grace had been established in which God had declared Himself satisfied with faith and with an obedience, which while it is imperfect, is yet worthy of eternal life (Art. 4); that all men must be regarded as having been adopted into that federation of grace so that nobody is under condemnation because of original sin (Art. 5); that in reality the death of Christ was not necessary for those who loved God and were His elect (Art. 7).

Points Three and Four: Of Man's Corruption, his Conversion, and the Manner of this Process. Man, through a

false use of his freedom, and under temptation by the devil, sank into the state of the fall: "entailing on himself blindness of mind, horrible darkness, vanity and perverseness of judgment." He "became wicked, rebellious, and obdurate in heart and will, and impure in his affections" (Art. 1). His children and "all the posterity of Adam, Christ only excepted have derived corruption by their original parent, not by imitation, as the Pelagians of old asserted, but by the propagation of a vicious nature in consequence of a just judgment of God" (Art. 2). Man, therefore, is under God's "wrath, incapable of any saving good, prone to evil, dead in sin, and in bondage thereto; and, without the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit men are neither able nor willing to return to God, to reform the depravity of their nature, nor to dispose themselves to reformation" (Art. 3). However, there is "in man, since the fall, the glimmerings of a natural light whereby he retains some knowledge of God, of natural things, and of the difference between good and evil, and discovers some regard for virtue, good order in society, and for maintaining an orderly external deportment. But so far is this light of nature from being sufficient to bring him to a saving knowledge of God, and to true conversion, that he is incapable of using it aright even in things natural and civil (Art. 4). Not even "the law of the decalogue" can bring salvation. "For though it discovers the greatness of sin, and more and more convinces man thereof, yet as it neither points out a remedy, nor imparts strength to extricate him from misery, and thus being weak through the flesh, leaves the transgressor under the curse, man cannot by this law obtain saving grace" (Art. 5).

"What, therefore, neither the light of nature nor the law could do, that God performs by the operation of His Holy Spirit through the Word or ministry of reconciliation" (Art. 6). This call is not feigned, but serious (Art. 8).

If there are those that do not accept the call nor persevere then "the fault lies in themselves" as also in those who

"though they receive it, suffer it not to make a lasting impression on their heart. Therefore, their joy, arising only from a temporary faith, soon vanishes and they fall away . . ." (Art. 9). The accepting of the call by others is not to be ascribed to the proper exercise of a free will, but to God's eternal election; it is this election that makes the call efficient (Arts. 10, 11).

Thus the regeneration does not come about through teaching, moral persuasion (which would lead into Pelagian conceptions), but through a supernatural work of God. After this divine work has taken place and man is renewed, then the will itself becomes active (Art. 12). Thus faith is to be considered "the gift of God" (Art. 14). But in all this, the *"grace of regeneration does not treat men as senseless stocks and blocks, nor take away their will and its properties, neither does violence* thereto; but spiritually quickens, heals, corrects . . . that where carnal rebellion and resistance formerly prevailed a ready and sincere spiritual obedience begins to reign" (Art. 16). The last article emphasizes the need of the means of grace: "the sacred precepts of the gospel, in the exercise of the Word, the sacraments *and discipline"* (Art. 17). The Lutherans never included "discipline" among the means of grace.

To these articles a number of very interesting *rejectory paragraphs* were attached. In reading them we must keep in mind the Socinian influences which we shall have occasion to point out below as having contributed to the historical background of developing Arminianism. The Synod rejects the teaching that original sin in itself was not sufficient to merit temporal and eternal punishments for the whole race (Art. 1); that spiritual gifts and virtues, such as goodness, holiness and justness in the will, cannot have been present in the first man and that for this reason he cannot have fallen from it (Art. 2); that in man's spiritual death the spiritual gifts cannot be separated from his will, because this will was never depraved, but was merely hindered through the darkness of

mind and irregularity of passions (*per tenebras mentis et affectuum inordinationem,*[20] so that after the removal of these hindrances (*impedimenta*) man again is free and can choose in his own free powers as he wills (Art. 3); that the unregenerate is not entirely dead in his sins, but can hunger and thirst after righteousness (Art. 4); that man in his depraved and natural condition is able to use the general grace which he has in the natural light . . . so correctly that in this way he can gradually attain to a larger evangelical saving grace (Art. 5).

Regarding the communication of grace the following sentences are rejected: that in a true conversion God *cannot infuse into the will* new qualities, ways (*habitus*) or gifts, and that, therefore, the faith of conversion is no divinely infused quality or gift, but an act of man . . . (Art. 6); that the grace of conversion is nothing but a persuading (*lenis suasio, Anraten*) which produces the consent of the will (Art. 7); that *man can resist grace* and that it is in his power to become regenerated or not (Art. 8); that the cause of conversion must be seen in the *cooperation* (the Lutherans spoke of "synergism") between grace and free-will, and that grace does nothing until man's will first has moved and made the decision (Art. 9).

Point Five: *Of the Perseverance of the Saints.* God has liberated the regenerated from the dominion and service of sin though not yet altogether from the body of sin and from the infirmities of the flesh. Daily sins of infirmity are a constant cause for humiliation before God, for flying for refuge to Christ, for mortifying the flesh and for pressing forward to perfection. If left to their own strength the converted could not persevere in grace. They are not always so influenced and actuated by the Spirit of God that they be not led into temptation and do not fall into grave sins—"sometimes by the righteous permission of God." "By such enormous sins, however, they very highly offend God, incur a

[20] Cf. Latin text by Schaff, *Creeds*, III, 569.

deadly guilt, grieve the Holy Spirit, interrupt the exercise of faith, very greviously wound their consciences, and sometimes lose the sense of God's favor, for a time, until on their returning into the right way by serious repentance, the light of God's fatherly countenance again shines upon them" (Arts. 1-5).

But God, . . . according to His unchangeable purpose of election, does not wholly withdraw the Holy Spirit from His own people; . . . nor suffer them to proceed so far as to lose the grace of adoption and to forfeit the state of justification, or to commit the sin unto death. But He preserves in the elect "the incorruptible seed of regeneration" from perishing and by His Word and Spirit effectually renews them to repentance so that they may again experience the favor of a reconciled God" (Arts. 6, 7).

The cause for this is to be seen in *"God's free mercy," not "in their own merits and strength." "With respect to God, it is utterly impossible . . . that they should totally fall from faith and grace . . . and* perish in their backslidings . . . *since His counsel cannot be changed, nor His promise fail, neither can the call according to His purpose be revoked,* nor the merit, intercession and preservation of Christ be rendered ineffectual, nor the sealing of the Holy Spirit be frustrated or obliterated" (Art. 8). The assurance for this preservation of the elect the true believers find "according to the measure of their faith" in the "Word of God," in the "testimony of the Holy Spirit" and in a serious and holy desire to preserve a good conscience, and to perform good works" (Arts. 9-11). "This certainty of perseverance" will not excite in believers a "spirit of pride" nor make them "carnally secure"; it is, on the contrary, "a real source of humility." "Neither does renewed confidence of persevering produce licentiousness . . . , but it renders them much more careful . . . lest by abusing His fatherly kindness, God should turn away" (Arts. 12-13).

On this fifth point the Synod added the following *rejections*

of opposed errors: that the perseverance of believers is not the effect of election, but a necessary condition for man to comply with in his own free will (Art. 1); that while God furnishes the needed strength for perseverance it is dependent upon man's will whether he wants to persevere or not (Art. 2); that believers and elect can definitely fall from grace and commit the sin against the Holy Spirit (Arts. 3-4).

Regarding the assurance of salvation the following sentences are rejected: that a special revelation alone could give such an assurance (Art. 5); that the teaching of such a guarantee of salvation would furnish a comfort for the flesh and be detrimental to the religious and ethical life (Art. 6); that the difference between those who believe only for a time (*fides temporariorum*) and those of permanent, justifying and saving faith consists merely in the element of duration (Art. 7).

II. The Genius of Arminianism in the Light of its Further Development.

1. *The Remonstrants in their "Five Articles" of* 1610 *had moved in very guarded statements.* In the minds of their subscribers there was much more than was here expressed. If this was not yet completely developed, it was in process of development on the basis of principles that were discernible. This was clear to the Synod of Dort in 1618 as may be seen from the many rejectory statements attached to its "Canons."[21] We learn it especially also from the Confession which was prepared, 1622, by Episcopius for the Remonstrants after their condemnation at Dort.[22]

---

[21] These rejectory parts are omitted by Schaff in his abridged English text, pp. 581 ff., but they are given in his Latin text, pp. 545 ff. We have them also in German by Boeckel, pp. 516 ff.

[22] This document of a considerable length appeared in Holland in Dutch (1621) and in Latin (1622): "Confessio sive declaratio sententiae pastorum, qui in foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur." It was also printed in the Latin works of Episcopius (2nd ed. in London, 1678, cf. Part II, pp. 75-94). In German this most interesting document is given by Boeckel and covers 86 pages (pp. 554-640). We miss it in Schaff, *Creeds*, III, where we should have had an English translation of it.

2. *The theological liberalism of later Arminianism had already been foreshadowed by certain pioneer influences in Holland.*[23] We can observe in the Netherlands a certain confluence of humanistic and practical-mystical tendencies. Settled doctrines and strict church forms were not in favor. The call was for tolerance, for the simple devotional teachings of the Bible and for a universal religion fit to promote morality. The Bible alone was to be authority, and binding Confessions were to be declined. Seeberg whose observations in the new and larger (German) edition of his work we are here following illustrates this whole peculiar situation by an exhibition of the teachings of two men: Jacob Acontius and D. Koornheert. Acontius represents the mild humanistic views of Erasmus. His book *Stratagemata Satanae* (1565) went through twelve editions and was much read in Holland and England. Obligatory Christian teaching was to be reduced to certain essentials. He demanded tolerance and the abrogation of execution for heresy. Koornheert was less conservative than Acontius. He delighted in criticism of the Church. Still he took the Scriptures as standard in matters of faith. But the traces of Socinian rationalization are observable. He suggested modifications of doctrine in a number of respects: Scripture, he declared, knows nothing of original sin, the imputation idea in connection with the doctrine of justification is to be rejected, the redemption of Christ consists in making man righteous, the teaching of predestination in the sense of Calvin is a fundamental error because it makes God the author of sin.[24] We will fail to understand Arminianism if we do not consider this whole historical background of the controversy.

3. *The Theological leaders of the movement after the death of Arminius* (1609) *all contributed considerably to*

---

[23] Our references are especially to Seeberg, *DG* IV, 667-75 and to O. Ritschl, *DG*, III, 314-19. See also the introductory remarks of Walker (*Hist. of Chr. Ch.*) in his chapter on *"Arminianism,"* p. 453 f.

[24] The literary sources for these statements are given by Seeberg, pp. 672 ff.

develop the real genius of it. The following names must be mentioned: Wtenbogaert (died 1644), K. Vorstius (1622), S. Episcopius (1643), H. Grotius (1645), S. Curcellaeus (1659), P. van Limborch (1712). As to the theological positions that were taken the following should be mentioned:

In *Jacob Arminius* already can be seen the traits of the movement as a whole. In his first pastorate he won distinction as a preacher and pastor of an irenic spirit. The change of conviction regarding predestination, which drove him into a study of the Scriptures, developed into differences on other matters. More than once was he accused of a defection from Reformed orthodoxy.

Wtgenbogaert, the special friend of Arminius, who functioned as leader 1610 when the articles of remonstrance were drafted, stood opposed to making the Church a school of theologians. With Arminius he emphasized the devotional import of religion. The Bible as such was to be authority, Confessions and Catechism were not to have binding force.[25]

Vorstius, having cultivated a relationship to the Socians, had fundamental antipathies against the theology of the Reformed Church, especially also against the traditional conception of the atonement, and this position, naturally, affected his attitude to other doctrines, especially predestination and justification. He protested against a dogma in conflict with reason.[26]

Grotius contributed the much discussed "governmental" theory of the atonement. Starting from the idea that God in His relation to the sinner should not be thought of as an offended individual demanding satisfaction, he taught that God was to be regarded as "a great moral ruler." The death of Christ, therefore, "was not a payment for man's sin—which is freely forgiven—but a tribute to the sanctity of the divine government, showing that while God remits the penalty, He

[25] See the article on this man in the *PRE,* XXI, pp. 510-18 and the same in the *New Schaff-Herzog.*

[26] See the special references to his writings by O. Ritschl, *DG,* III, pp. 339-43. Cf. article in *PRE* XX, 762 ff. and in *New Schaff-Herzog.*

vindicates the majesty of His divine government" (Walker). Thus Grotius aimed to meet the objection of the Socinians against the Anselmian theory. This "theatrical" explanation of the atonement, however, was not followed by the Arminians, but men like Episcopius, Curcellaeus and Limborch rather followed their teacher Arminius and developed conceptions leading in the direction of Socinianism or into lines of thought which formerly had been dwelt upon by the Franciscans against the Dominicans (*acceptilatio*).[27]

Episcopius, as special spokesman, covered in a well balanced way all the characteristic tenets of Arminianism.[28]

Curcellaeus was a relentless critic of traditional dogmas. In a positive way he contributed to the teaching of the Arminians especially their subordinationism in the conception of the Trinity.[29]

Limborch, finally, the only one of the Arminian theologians to leave us a complete system of dogmatics including ethics,[30] again called attention to the distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals. His theology was later called "rational supernaturalism." With Vorstius he insisted that nothing must be found in Scripture that is not agreeable with reason.[31] As to particulars he was a subordinationist, taught the freedom of the will, spoke of faith as an act of obedience, favored a moralistic Christianity and aimed to avoid the traditional terminology of dogmatics.[32] In him we see a flexibility of theology that is characteristic of Arminianism.

4. *The doctrinal tenets of Arminianism* are summarized and itemized in the view of a conservative writer as follows: "According to its whole genius (*Geistesrichtung*) it gradually made dogma second to ethics; it saw in Christ preemin-

---

[27] On Grotius, cf. O. Ritschl, *DG,* III, 343-56 and the Church Histories with the Encyclopedias.

[28] Cf. Ritschl, *DG,* III, 356-61.

[29] Cf. the above-mentioned literature.

[30] *Theologia Christiana*; five editions appeared in the years 1686-1730.

[31] Cf. Oehler, *Symbolik,* p. 197.

[32] Ritschl, *DG,* III, 364-69.

ently a new lawgiver, not the redeemer. In the dogma of the Trinity it inclined to the subordination of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father. Original sin was taken as an inborn weakness. The image of God in man was not seen in a righteousness and holiness given him at the creation, but was taken to consist merely in the dominion over the creatures, as with the Socinians. In the receiving of divine grace (in conversion) there was taken to be a cooperation of man by virtue of an inborn moral freedom. The substitutional atonement of Christ and His fulfilment of the law was denied to have been sufficient (in itself), but was merely a free act of love which was accepted as sufficient. For this reason there can be no justification of the sinner as an imputation of Christ's merit in the sense of a forensic justification. The sacraments have only a ceremonial significance. Baptism was the ceremony of an admission of believers into the Church. Infant baptism had little favour, because children cannot believe. The Lord's Supper offers only a moral strengthening of faith and love."[33]

5. *Standards of Faith.* In the special Confession already mentioned, which was prepared by Episcopius, and published by the Remonstrants after their excommunication and banishment, they took occasion to express themselves on standards of faith:

Authority of Confessions. Their leaders had been writing against Confessions. Now the Remonstrants published one themselves. This forced them to a long and very interesting discussion of creeds and confessions in the "introduction" to their document.[34] They say that conditions can arise in the Church that will make confessional statements a matter of necessity. They are a means of defending truth against error, of pointing out fundamentals in distinction from non-fundamentals. Still they must not become decrees of what is to be believed; not norms and rules of faith, by which truth and

---

[33] Meusel, *Kirchliches Handlexikon* on Arminianism.

[34] The text of it is given in the *Opera Episcopii*, II, pp. 71 seqq; in German translation by Boeckel, pp. 554-72.

error are to be judged. But their purpose is merely to indicate what the writers of these Confessions believed regarding religion. And by such indications they may aid the less informed and the careless as beacon lights. They must not be put on a level with the Scriptures. They are not tests of truth, not even in the sense of being entitled to render the decision where the meaning of Scripture is doubtful. Nobody is tied to the view of the Confession if he becomes convinced in his conscience that it does not agree with Scripture.[35] With all the truth in these statements, the document of the Arminians left out of consideration that in critical and decisive moments the Confession of the Church must serve as a bond of union. There are moments in the Church's life when believers will need to know who is fellow-believer and who is not. Episcopius also overlooked that the historic Confessions can claim to represent stages of religious experience in the life of the Church and on that account are bound to have at least a derived authority that cannot, as a rule, be attributed to other religious literature.[36]

The Scriptures. In reading the Confession of Episcopius one cannot fail to be impressed with his energy in stressing the authority of the Scriptures.[37] He held that this authority does not rest upon decrees of the Church, ancient or modern; the Word has its authenticity in itself, is established upon God's veracity and is in need of no official interpreter because it addresses itself to the individual Christian. But while admitting the authority of Scripture they had already spoken of it in their "Confessio Remonstrantia" (I, 10) as merely "directive." They had a milder conception of the inspiration of the Scriptures, especially regarding the historical books of the Bible.[38]

---

[35] Cf. Boeckel, especially pp. 560 f.

[36] The writer has written on this matter more in detail in his *Introduction to the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church,* 2d ed., pp. 31-39; also in *Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union* (1921), pp. 153-62.

[37] Boeckel, pp. 572-78.

[38] Cf. Oehler, *Symbolik,* p. 197; also Tulloch, *Rational Theology* I, 28.

6. *Estimates*: John Tulloch, an Englishman and a representative of an opposing theology (Congregational), writes: "Arminianism was a great deal more than a dogmatic theory. It was also, or at least it rapidly became, a method of religious inquiry. . . . The method alone has given to it enduring significance in the history of Christian thought. It revived the suppressed rational side of the original Protestant movement, and, for the first time, organized it into a definite power and assigned to it its due place both in theology and the Church."[39]

Schaff writes: "Calvinism represented the consistent, logical conservative orthodoxy; Arminianism an elastic, progressive, changing liberalism."[40] He continues: "Their literary and religious influence has gone far beyond their organization. Their eminent scholars . . . have enriched exegetical and critical learning and liberalized theological opinions, especially on religious toleration and the salvation of unbaptized infants. Arminianism, in some of its advocates had a leaning towards Socinianism, and prepared the way for Rationalism. Many Arminians adhered to the original position of a moderated semi-Pelagianism."[41]

Oehler, referring to their principle of "natural supernaturalism," which they applied to exegesis, remarks that with all their influence upon theology and with all their scholarship they contributed their part to putting the stamp of latitudinarianism (*Verflachung*) upon the Biblical branches of theology.[42] Limborch laid down the principle that exegesis must never find anything in the Scriptures that is not in agreement with reason.[43] Historic Latitudinarianism developed chiefly in England.

In giving of these estimates from the various sources we feel that the following from E. Troeltsch deserves to be mentioned as food for much thought. He remarks that the Arminians, in opposition to the confessionally governed

---

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[40] *Creeds*, I, p. 509.
[41] P. 516.
[42] *Symbolik*, p. 197.
[43] Cf. *Theologia Christiana* I, 12.

churches "widened the sphere of the natural."[44] It was here that the idea of Hugo Grotius of a natural law (*lex naturae*), of a state emancipated from the civilization of the Church, of an ethics independent of the motives derived from the Christian religion, first found a place. The conservative Protestant Church of today recognizes of course an independent philosophy, and with this an ethics such as also the Reformation had spoken of under the term *justitia civilis*.[45] But the danger for religion came when under the sway of Deism and its successors the Church itself came into the temptation of turning away from "theological ethics," and when psychological analysis alone was to show and to furnish the motives for the doing of the good. In the last analysis it was this coming of new ethics that stimulated the "Arminian" attitude to predestination and synergism in England. The impulses for this movement came from the new philosophy (Montaigne, Charron, Spinoza, Hobbes). The English empiricists took up the problem in their development of an analytical psychology. It is in the light of these philosophical undercurrents that we must study the further development of Arminianism especially in its influence upon England, which does not belong to the task of this article.

Springfield, Ohio. JUERGEN LUDWIG NEVE.

---

[44] See his article on the "English Moralists" in the *PRE*, vol. XIII, p. 441 (line 20).

[45] Cf. the Augsburg Confession, Art. 18.

AN "AMERICAN" TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*

"Why should anyone make a new English translation of the Old Testament? With the Authorized Version of King James and the British and American revisions, to say nothing of unofficial renderings, have we not enough?" This question, the editor of this translation, Dr. Powis Smith, who may be assumed to be speaking for his colleagues as well as for himself, tells us in the Preface, may quite fairly be asked. He answers it in the following words: "The only possible basis for a satisfactory answer must be either in a better knowledge of Hebrew than was possible at the time when the earlier translations were made, or in a fuller appreciation of fundamental textual problems, or in a clearer recognition of poetic structures, or in such a change in our own language as would render the language of the older translations more or less unintelligible to the average man of our day. As a matter of fact our answer is to be found in all of these areas."

Since the "American" translation lies finished before us, it would seem to be evident that the reasons just enumerated for the preparation of this new translation must have appeared to Dr. Powis Smith and his colleagues sufficiently cogent to justify the commencement and completion of so laborious and exacting an undertaking as the translation of the Old Testament. Admitting, as we do, that the reasons alleged are the ones which must be established if a new translation is to justify itself, we have two questions to consider: first, whether these reasons while valid in themselves are as cogent as the editor of this new translation believes them to be, that is, whether the increase in our knowledge and the difference in our forms of expression are actually as great as is alleged, and, secondly, whether these reasons have really been the controlling factors in the work of preparation itself,

---

* *The Old Testament—An American Translation.* By Alexander R. Gordon, Theophile J. Meek, J. M. Powis Smith, Leroy Waterman. Edited by J. M. Powis Smith. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1927. 8vo. Pp. xii, 1713. Price $7.50, postage extra.

or whether there are other reasons which Dr. Smith has not mentioned, reasons sufficiently important to be regarded as really determinative of the character of the new translation.

Philology and Textual Criticism

Especial importance seems to be attached to the first of the reasons alleged, the fact that we have today a better knowledge of Hebrew than was possible when the earlier translations were made. Thus the editor in enlarging upon these reasons tells us in the next paragraph: "The most urgent demand for a new translation comes from the field of Hebrew scholarship. The control of the Hebrew vocabulary and syntax available to the scholar of today is vastly greater than that at the command of the translators of the Authorized Version or of its revisers." This statement is a surprising one. It would be sufficiently striking had the editor contented himself with declaring that our knowledge of Hebrew is "vastly greater" than that possessed by the translators of 1611. But it is to be noted that the words "or of its revisers" are added. This amounts to saying that our control of Hebrew vocabulary and syntax has "vastly" increased in about twenty-five years, since the American Revision did not appear until 1901. We should hesitate to accept this extreme statement even as applicable to the 1611 version. But when the English and American Revisions are expressly included, it becomes, we believe, simply indefensible. In proof of this, we shall call attention to a few facts which are noteworthy.

In justification of the statement which we have just quoted the editor goes on to say: "This [the vastly greater control of Hebrew vocabulary and syntax] is due partly to the greater degree of scientific methodology now practised in the study of language in general and of Hebrew in particular, and partly to the contributions made to our knowledge of Hebrew by the decipherment of the hieroglyphic and cuneiform writings." The reference to "scientific methodology" we take to mean that "comparative" method which has done so much to clarify the study of language in recent years. We

gladly recognize this. But it should be remembered that among the scholars who prepared our 1611 version there were those whose linguistic equipment was quite extensive and whose knowledge of Semitics was very far from meager. "How large an amount of scholarship was enlisted" in the preparation of the AV[1] is illustrated according to Canon Henson by the following facts: "It includes Dr. Andrewes, afterwards bishop of Winchester, who was familiar with Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Greek, Latin and at least ten other languages, while his knowledge of patristic literature was unrivalled; Dr. Overall, regius professor of theology and afterwards bishop of Norwich; Bedwell, the greatest Arabic scholar of Europe; Sir Henry Saville, the most learned layman of his time; and, to say nothing of others well known to later generations, nine who were then or afterwards professors of Hebrew or of Greek at Oxford or Cambridge."[2] The claim which is made for this version is that it was "translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised." It was prepared in the middle of what we may call "the era of Polyglots"—Complutensian (1522), Antwerp (1572), Paris (1645), London or Walton's (1657). Anyone who will take the pains to consult Castell's *Lexicon Heptaglotton* (1669), which was prepared primarily as a companion to Walton's Polyglot, will be obliged to admit that these works, which may fairly be regarded as the product of the scholarship of the age which produced the AV, show that the interest in and knowledge of comparative Semitics was by no means inconsiderable. And it must not be forgotten that Gesenius' *Thesaurus* (finished 1858) was available for the English and American revisers from the very beginning of their work.

---

[1] The following abbreviations will be used in the course of this article: Authorized Version of 1611 (AV), American Revision (ARV), the Hebrew text of the Old Testament with Massoretic pointings (Hebrew or Heb.; also MT), the Septuagint (LXX), Targum (Targ.), Peshitto (Pesh.), Vulgate (Vulg.), Arabic (Arab.). In the quotations the following abbreviations are retained: omits (om.), Versions (Vrs.).

[2] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., Art. "Bible," Vol. III, p. 902.

We would also call attention to the closing words of the above quotation, the reference to "the hieroglyphic and cuneiform writings," that is, broadly speaking, to Egyptian and Babylonian research. It seems to be implied that such research has contributed very largely to the "vast" increase of our knowledge of Hebrew, which is given as a reason for the new translation. Consequently it is a decidedly noteworthy fact that in the nearly one hundred pages of "Textual Notes" which are added to this volume we have failed to find a single reference to Egyptian and only some half dozen to cuneiform discoveries. Of course we recognize that some, perhaps a good many of the new renderings found in this translation are due directly or indirectly to such discoveries. But if these discoveries have figured so prominently in the new translation, if the translators owe so much to this new department of knowledge which was opened up for us by Champollion and Grotefend early in the last century, it is surprising, to say the least, that the three thousand or more Textual Notes should make practically no reference to them.

The editor tells us further that "modern studies of textual problems reinforce the need for a new rendering," that "the science of textual criticism has made great progress in recent years and no translation of the Old Testament can afford to ignore its results."[3] We have just called attention to the fact that the Textual Notes appended to the new version make practically no reference to hieroglyphs or cuneiform. It is to be noted now that, on the contrary, where objective evidence is cited in support of the "corrections" advocated by the translators, it is the well known and, in most instances, long known versions to which appeal is constantly being made. A large part of the textual apparatus used by Dr. Powis Smith and his associates was accessible to the translators of the 1611 version. It is true, of course, that they had access to the Septuagint—the version most frequently ap-

[3] This is really the second of the four reasons enumerated above by Dr. Powis Smith. But since it is so closely related to the first we shall consider them together under the same general head.

pealed to in the Textual Notes—only in editions for which the great uncials were only partially and inadequately available.[4] But Codex B which has been made by Swete the basis of his critical edition of that version was fully available to the English and American revisers, who, as we have seen, are expressly included with the translators of 1611 by Dr. Powis Smith. Valuable manuscripts have been discovered and critical texts have been published. But Walton's *Polyglot* can still be used with profit by the Old Testament textual critic, and is very far from being replaced by Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (1913) to which our translators seem to owe much by way of information as to the versions and also as regards conjectural emendations.

In what has just been said the writer has no thought of disparaging the valuable contributions to Hebrew vocabulary and syntax on the one hand or to textual criticism on the other which have been made within the last fifty or one hundred years. He recognizes and appreciates them very heartily. But in order to do this it is not necessary to disparage the knowledge or attainments of all previous ages and generations. The scholar of today, especially when he adopts theories which bring him into sharp conflict with opinions and beliefs tenaciously held by past generations, is all too prone to speak with ill-disguised contempt of their attainments and to assume an attitude of superiority for which there is far less real warrant than he imagines. We do not question for one moment Dr. Powis Smith's contention that we now know more about the Hebrew language and are in a better position to study the text of the Old Testament than were the scholars of 1611 or even of 1870-1900. But we do maintain that the word "vastly" is out of place, and we believe that we shall be able to convince the reader that the reason Dr. Smith and his colleagues feel that a new transla-

[4] The Vatican Codex (Codex B) was undoubtedly used in the preparation of the Sixtine or Roman edition of the LXX (1587). But it is not now claimed that it supplies "a critical or even a wholly trustworthy representation" of this codex. Cf. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, I, p. vii; also Walton's *Polyglot*, I, p. 65.

tion of the Old Testament is so imperatively needed lies not in their greater knowledge of Hebrew and their better understanding of textual problems but in the fact that they assume a very different attitude toward the Old Testament text itself than was held by either the translators of 1611 or the English and American revisers. But before proceeding to cite the evidence which seems to us to justify this statement, it will be well for us to quote Dr. Smith's statement with regard to the method pursued by his colleagues and himself: "Our guiding principle has been that the official Massoretic text must be adhered to as long as it made satisfactory sense. We have not tried to create a new text; but rather to translate the received text wherever translation was possible. Where departure from this text was imperative we have sought a substitute for it along generally approved lines, depending primarily upon the collateral versions, having recourse to scientific conjecture only when the versions failed to afford adequate help. The reader who wishes to check the translation from the standpoint of its loyalty to the original will find the passages in which textual change has been made listed in the Appendix."

This statement as to the "guiding principle" of the translators would seem to indicate that their translation is characterized by conservatism and caution, and that it is based on strictly scientific methods; and the paragraph from which it is quoted closes with the words: "We trust that our attitude in this fundamentally important matter will commend itself to careful and cautious scholars." Since we believe that the reader will agree with Dr. Smith, as we do, that the question of the correct treatment of textual problems is "fundamentally important," let us first read the statement over again, and then proceed to test it by examples taken from the translation itself and from the Textual Notes.

We would call attention to several words in the above quotation. We are told that the Massoretic Hebrew text was to be retained wherever it made "satisfactory sense" and wherever translation was "possible," and that it was de-

parted from only when "imperative," that then the versions were followed, and that recourse was had to "scientific conjecture" only when the versions had failed to afford "adequate help." It is to be observed that all these words or phrases are of doubtful because uncertain meaning. What does "satisfactory sense" mean? Clearly it must mean, satisfactory to the author or authors of the translation. Who is to determine when deviation from the Hebrew text is "imperative"? Who else but the editor or his colleagues? The large number of "Textual Notes" at the end of the volume indicates that the authors of this translation have found much which they could not regard as "satisfactory." It would be still larger if all the deviations from the Hebrew had been listed, which they are not. But of this more will be said later.[5]

We shall now proceed to cite some examples which should enable the reader to judge for himself what "satisfactory," "imperative," "possible" and "adequate" mean in the minds of Dr. Powis Smith and his associates.[6]

[5] Sometimes these omissions may be due to accident, which Dr. Meek so often tells us is the explanation of the difference between the Hebrew text and the reading which he prefers. Others may be due to a feeling on the part of the translator that the weight of critical opinion in favor of a "correction" made it unnecessary even to mention it. Yet we find minor changes listed while important ones are omitted. It is certainly strange that Dr. Powis Smith should give no "textual notes" on Pss. i-viii. Certainly the emendation of Ps. ii. 12, "kiss the son" (*vide infra* p. 124 f.) and of viii. 2 "I will sing" (אשירה) instead of "who hast set" (אשר תנה), both of which require the dropping of two consonants of the Hebrew text, are worthy of mention in a list which is declared to contain "the passages in which textual change has been made." Again, are we to suppose that Dr. Gordon felt that Isa. viii. 6 "melt in fear" instead of "rejoice in" had such a weight of critical authority back of it as not to need mention? Or are such inconsistent omissions as these purely the result of carelessness?

[6] This translation follows the fourfold or Greek arrangement of the Old Testament books—Law, History, Poetry, Prophecy—with which the English reader is familiar through the AV and RV. These four divisions have been assigned in the main to Drs. Meek of Toronto, Waterman of Michigan, Smith of Chicago, and Gordon of McGill Universities respectively. But it may be noted that Dr. Meek has also translated Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the Song of Songs and Lamentations, that Dr. Gordon has translated Proverbs, and that Dr. Smith has translated the Minor Prophets.

Genesis iv. 1. "I have gotten a man from (את) the Lord" (AV). The rendering "from" is doubtful: "with (the help of)" would be a more natural rendering of the preposition. The LXX renders by "through" (διά with gen.), Pesh. by "to" (ל), Vulg. by *"per,"* Targ. of Onkelos by "from before," Samaritan Targum by "from," Arab. by "from." Dr. Meek renders thus: "I have won back my husband; the Lord is with me." He does not give any explanation of the exceedingly questionable rendering "won back." He merely remarks regarding the last phrase, "So by insertion of one letter accidentally dropped; Heb. 'with the Lord'." We observe first that this statement is inadequate. It may be regarded as still an open question to what extent "vowel letters" are properly a part of the consonantal text (*Kethibh*). But if the "me" of "with *me*" (אתי) means that a *yodh* was "accidentally dropped," why is this not equally true of *"my* husband" (אישי). Either the words "I have won back my husband" are not in vs. 1 *d* to which this textual note refers, in which case there should be a note on vs. 1 *c* to which they would then belong, or Dr. Meek's statement should be changed to read "two letters accidentally dropped." We observe further that Dr. Meek has nothing to say in defense of his correction but "accidentally dropped." "Accidentally" is a favorite word with Dr. Meek. We were under the impression that modern scientists did not believe in accidents!

Deut. xxii. 21*c*. "To play the harlot in the house of her father." Dr. Meek's rendering is "by playing the harlot in her father's house." His note reads thus: "So by insertion of one letter accidentally dropped; Heb. om. 'in' before 'her father's house'." Yet every student of Hebrew knows that *place where* may be expressed by the simple accusative. This construction may occur in the case of a noun followed by a genitive and may also be due to "euphonic reasons," to avoid the coming together of two *beths*.[7] In Gen. xxiv. 23 and xxxviii. 11 where the same phrase occurs Dr. Meek finds no fault with it. Why then does he do so here?

[7] Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* § 118 *g*.

1 Sam. i. 5, "a double portion." The Hebrew is supported by Targ. "a choice portion," Pesh. "a double portion" and by Vulg. "a sad (*tristis*) portion," where "sad" is perhaps connected with the idea of "anger." Since the word *'aph* may mean "nose" or "face" (?) in the singular number, as well as in the dual, *appaim* may easily mean two "noses" or two "faces," "a portion of two faces," i.e. a double portion (cf. the use of "feet" in the sense of "times" in Ex. xxiii. 14). It is possible that the word "double" (אפים) is to be connected with the Aramaic עפף or אעף (a weakening of the guttural would not be without analogy); or with the Assyr. root from which the word *iptu* "mass, multitude" is derived. The LXX has apparently read אפם ("however") instead of אפים ("and he gave Hannah [only] one portion, *however* he loved her"). Grammatically this rendering is of course quite simple. But it is open to serious objection. If Elkanah loved Hannah the mention of a double portion as an expression of his love is natural and appropriate. But why should the narrative state that she received only one portion when her husband might easily have given her more, and then proceed to add "however he loved her"? Or if the number of portions was determined simply by counting the mouths to be filled, why call especial attention to the fact that Hannah had no children to feed, since it has already been expressly stated that "she had no child," if the object was to point out his affection for Hannah? Clearly the LXX rendering is not free from difficulties; and the Hebrew is sufficiently well supported to be regarded as at least as "satisfactory" as the LXX. Yet Dr. Waterman makes the blunt remark: "'However' follows LXX; Heb. makes no sense"!

In 1 Sam. i. 12 the words "and it came to pass" (והיה), where the perfect with *waw conjunctive* is used instead of the imperfect with *waw conversive* or *consecutive*, are said to mean "and it shall be" and summarily declared to be "ungrammatical." This statement would seem to imply ignorance on the part of Dr. Waterman that there is such a thing as *waw conjunctive* with the perfect in Hebrew and that it

occurs too often to be treated as simply an indication of a corrupt text.[8] Surely Dr. Waterman did not learn either from the hieroglyphs or from the cuneiform that *waw conversive* with the imperfect is alone permissible, inasmuch as the *waw conversive* is not used in either Egyptian or Babylonian.

1 Sam. xviii. 28. Here the words "and that Michal loved him," although supported by Targ., Vulg., Pesh., and Arab., are changed to "and that all Israel loved him," following the LXX. Yet a number of good reasons suggest themselves for regarding the Hebrew as "satisfactory." The words in vs. 21 "I will give him her that she may be a snare to him" may well be regarded as supplying the explanation. Not merely had Saul failed to destroy his rival, but the marriage with Michal was not even a mere marriage of convenience. Michal, his own daughter, *loved* David and would consequently aid him even against her own father.

In 1 Kings xix. 2 Jezebel says in her threat to Elijah "so may (the) gods do to me," etc. This reading of the Hebrew is supported by Targ., Vulg., Pesh. and by Cod. A of LXX. It is changed to "so may God do," apparently solely on the authority of Cod. B of the LXX. (The Note says simply "so LXX," as if the reading of the LXX were not itself open to question). Why is this change made? Does not the Hebrew make "satisfactory sense"? The critics hesitate to admit that Elijah was a monotheist. Why should Dr. Waterman insist on making Jezebel, the devotee of Baal and Ashtoreth, speak like one? But perhaps this is only meant to imply that she was referring to *the* God of Israel whom it was her purpose to defy and whose servant she intended to destroy. Even so, granted that this might be the case, why is the statement of the Hebrew not equally "satisfactory"?

In 2 Kings vi. 15 we read that "the servant of the man of God" went forth and saw the chariots of Syria encamped about the city and that "his servant" said to him: "Alas my master, what shall we do?" We are told by Dr. Waterman

[8] Cf. R. D. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the O.T.*, p. 110 f.; Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 161.

that the Heb. "is confused and harsh"; and that the change of "the servant (משרת) of the man of God" to "so on the morrow (מחרת ?) the man of God" is made "with the help of the Versions and context." Yet the reading "servant" of the Hebrew is supported by Targ., LXX, Vulg., Pesh. and Arab. And it may be noted that the same word for "servant" occurs also in iv. 43. If the versions accepted this expression without demur, is there any imperative reason for the change? We might prefer to say "the servant of the man of God arose early . . . and he said to his master," or, "the man of God arose early . . . and his servant said unto him." But surely that does not justify us in speaking of the Hebrew as "harsh and confused" and resorting to conjectural emendation.

In 2 Kings xvi. 6 (end) we read that the "Syrians (ארומים) came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." The MT margin (*Qere*) has "Edomites" (אדומים) and is supported by the Vulg., LXX (Cod. B) and Pesh. Since the confusion of *resh* and *daleth* is well known to the textual critic, the marginal reading may be correct. But Dr. Waterman tells us that "this carries with it 'Edom' for 'Syria' throughout the vs." So he changes "Rezin king of Syria" into "the king of Edom," apparently without any textual warrant; at least he produces none. Is Dr. Waterman prepared to prove that the Syrians did not capture Elath and hold it for an indefinite period, or until they were driven out by the Edomites? His manner of statement indicates that his reading is purely conjectural.

Regarding 2 Kings xvi. 18 Dr. Waterman remarks: "The vs. is hopelessly obscure." The opening words especially have caused difficulty and have been variously rendered (ARV, "and the covered way [מיסך] for the sabbath"); and it is possible that the LXX ("and the foundation" [reading apparently מוסד] of the seat") has preserved a better text. But we notice that Dr. Waterman has ventured to translate the verse, which seems to imply that he does not consider the situation quite "hopeless." And since he apparently agrees

with Dr. Smith that our knowledge of Hebrew has "vastly increased," it is rather strange that he should take such a pessimistic view as to the likelihood of a satisfactory interpretation being arrived at. It should be recognized we think that it is at least possible that the obscurity may be due not to the passage itself, but to our ignorance of the subject matter of which it treats—an ignorance which we share with Dr. Waterman, but which we for our part are not prepared to regard as "hopeless."

Dr. Waterman tells us that in 2 Kings xxiii. 15 "Heb. has the impossible: 'he burnt the high place'." The form of statement is ambiguous. Dr. Waterman clearly cannot mean that the Hebrew is "ungrammatical" or "untranslatable" or that the meaning is "obscure." The Hebrew is very simple and clear; it means exactly what Dr. Waterman says it does. Consequently what is meant by "impossible" must be that it is absurd to speak of the burning of a high place, since a high place could not *possibly* be burned. So he follows the LXX reading ("and shattered its stones"), which involves considerable change in the text, against Targ., Vulg., Pesh. But is Dr. Waterman prepared to prove that a "high place" was as such impervious to fire, that there was nothing there that fire could burn? A stone building can be gutted by fire, even though its walls may remain standing; and if the fire is hot enough the very stones of which it is composed may be cracked and even melted. Dr. Waterman speaks with the confidence of an eyewitness and of an expert on high places. But we know that he was not the one and we doubt whether he can qualify as the other. Such wanton attacks upon the Hebrew Scriptures are clearly out of place in a translation which is expected to "commend itself to careful and cautious scholars."

In Neh. v. 2 it is alleged that the "Heb. is not straightforward." Just what this means is not clear. Does it mean that the statement contained in this verse, the language used by the poor and needy among the Jews in making their complaint, is insincere? Or does it mean that something is the

matter with the Hebrew text itself, in other words, that this complaint has not been correctly reported? Whatever be the reason, the word "many" (רבים) is supported by LXX, Vulg., and Pesh. Yet it is changed into "giving in pledge" (ערבים) to make it correspond with verse 3. This change cannot be regarded as "imperative," since the Hebrew makes satisfactory sense.

Psalm xxxvi. 1. "The transgression of the wicked saith (נאם) within his heart" is changed to "Transgression is delightful (נעם) to the wicked within his heart." This conjectural change is without the support of MSS or versions. It is interesting; but certainly cannot be regarded as "imperative."

As an interesting example of what is meant by "satisfactory sense" Ps. lxxiv. 8*a* may be cited: "They said in their hearts, Let us destroy them (*nînām*) together" (AV). This rendering, which makes good sense, takes the word *nînām* as Impf. Kal of ינה. The rendering is supported by the Pesh. and the correctness of the form is confirmed, as Delitzsch points out, by Num. xxi. 30. On the other hand Targ., LXX, Vulg., apparently found here the noun "posterity" (*nîn*). Dr. Smith recognizes such a word as occurring in Job xviii. 19, while Dr. Meek finds it in Gen. xxi. 23 and Dr. Gordon in Isa. xiv. 22. The sense is not nearly so good as "let us destroy them" which is clearly parallel with the "they burned" etc. which follows. But either rendering is certainly "possible," while the first seems to us quite "satisfactory." Dr. Powis Smith's rendering is: "They said in their heart, 'We will Hellenize them also'." His explanatory note reads as follows: "So by slight change; Heb. 'their progeny' for 'We will Hellenize them'." Two points are to be noted. The one is that Dr. Smith ignores the fact that the Heb. is ambiguous: he gives only one rendering for *nînām,* and that the less probable. The other is that the correction which he proposes is doubtful for at least three reasons: (1) It finds no support in the versions. (2) The verb "Hellenize" (we suppose he would read *n^{e}yawwn^{e}nēm,* a hypothetical Piel form

from the root יון) is coined by him; it is not found in the Heb. of the OT nor in the Heb., New Heb. or Aram. of Targums and Talmud.[9] (3) It would be at all probable only if the psalm were demonstrably of late, *i.e.*, of Maccabean date. At best it is only one of several conjectural emendations which are proposed on the unproved assumption that the Hebrew text is corrupt.

Isa. viii. 12. The reading "holy" (קדש) for "confederacy" (קשר ; ARV, "conspiracy") rests simply on conjecture. It is of course suggested by the "sanctify" of the following verse. But the Hebrew makes good sense; and there is no "imperative" reason for changing it.

An interesting illustration of Dr. Gordon's understanding of the words "satisfactory" and "imperative" is furnished by the word rendered "watchers" or "watchmen" (נצרים) in Jer. iv. 16 and xxxi. 6 (so AV and ARV). It is hard to see where any valid objection to this rendering is to be found. Yet in iv. 16 Dr. Gordon changes the text to read "leopards" (נמרים) and in xxxi. 6 to "vintagers" (בצרים). Both of these changes are interesting conjectures and show the ingenuity of the textual critic. But neither is required by the context; and Dr. Gordon apparently has not succeeded in finding any support for them in the versions. Is he prepared to maintain that they are "imperative"?

Injustice is at times done the Hebrew text by asserting that it has a meaning which it need not have, a meaning which does not make good sense. Thus in Jer. ix. 19*d* what seems to be a perfectly legitimate rendering is "They have overthrown (cast down) our dwellings." Dr. Gordon's rendering is "to give up our dwellings." He remarks "So Vrs.; Heb. 'Our dwellings have cast us out'." But there is no "us" in the Heb.; and "dwellings" may be object just as well as subject.

In Ezek. xxxii. 27*a* Dr. Gordon prefers to read "warriors of old (מעלם) instead of with the Hebrew "warriors of the uncircumcised" (מערלים). He remarks, "So Vrs.," al-

[9] Cf. Levy, *Handwörterbuch.*

though Targ. and Pesh. support the Heb. In view of the fact that the word "uncircumcised" is used elsewhere *seven* times in this chapter, while the word "eternity" is not found once, it is hard to see that there is any imperative reason for following the LXX and treating the Hebrew text as corrupt.

Amos iii. 9, "Publish in the palaces at Ashdod, and in the palaces in the land of Egypt" (AV). The reading "Ashdod" is supported by Targ., Vulg. and Pesh. and also by the usage of Amos who elsewhere mentions the Philistines and all of their four cities (i. 6-8, vi. 2, ix. 7). Yet on the authority of LXX, "Ashdod" is changed to "Assyria," although Assyria is never mentioned elsewhere by Amos. Can Dr. Smith really consider this change "imperative"?

Nahum ii. 12, "Where is the den of the lions and the pasturage of the young lions." The word "pasturage" (מרעה) is well attested, being supported by the versions (e.g. LXX, *νομή*). Understood as meaning the place where the lion secures his food (his range) it is a striking, but by no means unnatural expression. We think Dr. Smith should regard it as "satisfactory." But instead he follows Wellhausen and Nowack in their conjectural reading "cave" (מערה). That the proposed reading makes good sense is obvious. But the change cannot possibly be called "imperative." We note further that the expression which follows and which Dr. Smith renders "whither the lion went bringing in spoil," is in need of explanation. The word "spoil" should be in italics or in a parenthesis. It is not in the text. The words "bringing in" apparently mean that Dr. Smith regards לביא as standing for להביא (cf. Jer. xxxix. 7, 2 Chron. xxxi. 10). Since the AV renders by "old lion" (ARV, "lioness"), Dr. Smith would have saved his readers some uncertainty by pointing out the ambiguity of the word לביא, that it can be rendered either way.

The passages we have cited are not in themselves of great importance, save as they have a bearing upon the vitally important question of the reliability of the OT text. We turn therefore to another passage which has been often discussed,

Psalm ii. 11 f. The AV renders "Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son lest he be angry" etc. Dr. Powis Smith renders thus

> Serve the Lord with fear,
> Kiss his feet with trembling,
> Lest he be angry and you perish in the way;

That is, in place of the words "and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son," he reads simply "kiss his feet with trembling," which means that "his feet" (רגליו) is to be reconstructed out of the words "and rejoice" (וגילו) and "son" (בר). Dr. Smith has not told us how his text is arrived at, whether "his feet" is derived from "and rejoice" by changing *waw* into *resh* and transposing *yodh* and *lamedh,* in which case the word "son" is to be simply deleted, or whether the *resh* of "foot" is borrowed from the word "son," in which case the *waw* of "and rejoice" and the *beth* of "son" are superfluous, while the *resh* must be regarded as having strayed rather far afield. We are not immediately concerned to account for Dr. Smith's text. But what we do want to call attention to is that it has no basis in either MSS or Versions. Certainly it cannot be argued that the frequent occurrence of the expression "kiss the feet of" (in token of submission) in the Assyrian royal inscriptions, constitutes any compelling reason for recognizing its occurrence here. Yet Dr. Smith not merely fails to explain this emendation; *he does not even list it in the Textual Notes.*

It is unfortunate that no consistent effort has been made to distinguish between changes which involve only the Massoretic pointings and those affecting the consonantal text. The reader is told in the Preface that "in a large measure the vowels only have been touched"; and it is pointed out that "A vowel change naturally involves a very much slighter correction than is involved in a change of consonants." Indeed, since the vowel points (we judge that the reference is primarily at least to the vowel points and not to the vowel letters) were not added till about the 6th century A.D., we might hesitate to call a change of pointing a correction at all. There

is consequently a real difference between the consonantal text or the *Kethibh* and the Massoretic text which is the *Kethibh* plus the pointing added by the Massoretes; and it would have been easy to distinguish them as "Heb." and "MT." Yet in the Textual Notes we observe a marked lack of consistency in this respect. The editor, Dr. Powis Smith, frequently distinguishes between changes which involve the vowels only and those which affect the consonants. The distinction is also noted at times by Dr. Meek. But Dr. Waterman and Dr. Gordon pay almost no attention to it. Yet the distinction is really an important one.

For example in 2 Chronicles xxxv. 21 we meet the words: "*I come* not against thee (עליך אתה) this day, but against the house wherewith I have war" (so AV). According to this rendering the statement is elliptical. The words "I come" (as is indicated by the italics) are to be supplied from the context, while the phrase "against thee" is emphatic, the preposition "against" with its suffix being followed by *'attāh,* the independent form of the pronoun.[10] But another rendering is possible: "Not against thee *am I* come, but," etc. In this case the word אתה is not to be pointed *'attāh* (thou) but *'ôthéh* (Kal. act. part. of *'āthāh* "to come"), the "am I" being supplied from the context. This rendering seems to be supported by LXX, Vulg., Pesh., and Arab., all of which have the verb "come," though it is of course possible that it is simply supplied from the context as in the AV. The fact that *'āthāh* is not the usual verb for "come" while the pronoun *'attāh* occurs frequently might be cited in favor of this explanation. But we are inclined to hold with Dr. Waterman that the reading "come" is the correct one. It is not the rendering that we object to, but the statement made in the Textual Notes regarding it. This statement is as follows: " 'I come,' so LXX; Heb. 'thou'." This is misleading. The Hebrew consonantal text admits as we have seen of either rendering. There is a good deal to be said in support of each. The ancient versions favor the one; the Massoretes adopted the other. If Dr.

[10] Cf. e.g., Deut. v. 3, Hag. i. 4; also Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Gram.* § 135 *g.*

Waterman had said: " 'I come,' so LXX; MT 'thou'; Heb. permits either," his statement would be in accordance with the facts; and the general reader would not be left in doubt as to the extent of the correction—in this case, as we have seen, it is not really a correction at all—made necessary by Dr. Waterman's rendering.[11]

Similarly Dr. Gordon commenting on Ezekiel xxx. 17*a* says "Heb. 'Aven' (trouble) for 'On'." To the reader who does not have the Hebrew text before him this would clearly imply a real difference between the Hebrew text and the reading preferred by Dr. Gordon, but it is merely a matter of pointing. No change in the consonantal text is involved.[12]

It is to be noted, furthermore, that these textual notes are misleading, because in them many instances are listed where the Hebrew is altered with the help of the versions or on the basis of conjecture. But nothing is said about the cases where the reading of the Hebrew is preferred to that of the versions, or where the Hebrew reading which is rejected has the support of the versions. Thus at 2 Kings x. 25 Dr. Waterman comments on the word "city" in the phrase "they went to the city of the house of Baal" as follows: " 'inner room,' a correction. Heb. has 'city' which is certainly wrong." Well, if it is wrong, then Targ., LXX, Vulg., Pesh., and Arab. are also wrong. Does it not create a false impression to refer to the Hebrew only when it is *alleged* to be wrong and to the versions only when they are *assumed* to be right?[13] As for the statement itself, we see no reason for admitting that the

[11] A familiar example of the ambiguity of the Hebrew text is found in Jer. xvii. 8 where MT reads "and shall not see when heat cometh" (so Targ. and AV), whereas "fear" is perhaps the preferable reading of the unpointed text, being supported by LXX, Vulg., Pesh. and Arab. We note that Dr. Gordon who adopts the latter reading makes no mention of the ambiguity. Yet in Micah vi. 9 where "shall see" and "is fearing" is also only a difference of pointing Dr. Smith tells us that he follows the versions against the *Hebrew* which means against the MT.

[12] On the other hand in Ps. ix. 7 more than "slight vowel change" is involved in the reading of "behold" (הנה) instead of "they" (המה).

[13] In Ps. ii. 8 the reading of the MT "crush" is followed by Dr. Smith *against* LXX and the NT (Rev. ii. 27, xii. 5) which by a different vocalization read "shepherd" (i.e., rule).

reading "city" is "certainly wrong." "City" may be used in a technical sense; or it may be that the translation "city" is wrong. That the Hebrew is "certainly wrong" is an unproved assertion.

How captious the critic may become in his treatment of the Scriptures is illustrated by Dr. Waterman's rendering of a phrase in 2 Kings xii. 10. In this verse we are told that the king's scribe and the high priest came and "bound up and counted" the silver which was in Joash's chest. The correctness of this order of words is confirmed by Targ., LXX, Vulg.; and we confess that it seems to us a correct one for an age when money was weighed instead of counted. It may mean that they tied up the silver shekels in bags of a mina or perhaps even a talent each and then counted the bags. Dr. Waterman apparently feels that the counting must have come first, that is that the single pieces of money must each have been counted before being placed in the bags. So he renders by "counted and tied up in bags"; and finding support for this in the Pesh. he phrases his note as follows: " 'Counted and tied up in bags,' so Pesh.; Heb. reverses the order," as if the Pesh. were obviously right and the Heb. as obviously wrong, no reference being made to the versions which support the Hebrew. Such fault-finding criticism is petty to say the least.

The statement is frequently made in the Textual Notes that the Hebrew *omits* a word, simply because some version, notably Cod. B. of the LXX, contains it, even though it is at least equally possible that the real truth of the matter is that the version has *inserted* it. Thus in 2 Kings viii. 13 we read, "Who is thy servant, the dog, that he should do this great thing?" (ARV). This is rendered by Dr. Waterman: "What is your servant—a dead dog—that he should do this great thing?" The "note" reads: " 'dead,' so LXX; Heb. om." We fail to see any warrant for this emendation. It is true that Mephibosheth calls himself a "dead dog" (2 Sam. ix. 8) and that Abishai applies the same derogatory epithet to Shimei (2 Sam. xvi. 9). But Goliath simply asks "Am I a dog, that

thou comest to me with staves?" And since the LXX does not here *add* the word "dead" (it would hardly be appropriate, since Goliath was very much alive), Dr. Waterman does not inform us that the Hebrew "omits" it. But why should we suppose that the Hebrew has reported the hypocritical words of Hazael incorrectly? Is there any reason for thinking that Hazael must have likened himself to "a *dead* dog"? Is the one figure current usage, the other incorrect? If so Goliath's words should be corrected also, the LXX to the contrary notwithstanding. In view of the importance attached in the preface to the "hieroglyphic and cuneiform writings" it is interesting to note that the El-Amarna letters confirm the correctness of the Hebrew text of this passage. In Knudtzon[14] No. 71 we read this interesting sentence, "Who is Abdi-Ashirta, the slave, the dog, that he should take the land of the king unto himself?" "Dog" is the contemptuous epithet which Rib-Addi of Gubla seems to delight in applying to Abdi-Ashirta whom he charges with disloyalty to Pharaoh. He does not call him "dead dog" but simply "dog." Surely "dog" is a sufficiently opprobrious epithet. And Rib-Addi's use of it clearly implies that it would have been natural for Hazael to use it when he wished to pretend that the rôle of warrior king was one to which his unworthiness could not dream of aspiring. If Dr. Waterman is not willing to admit this, if he is determined to make Hazael call himself a "dead dog," he should not, we think, content himself with improving the Hebrew text of this passage. He should carry his reforming zeal to the El-Amarna letters and see to it that Rib-Addi uses the correct terminology in telling the Pharaoh his opinion of Abdi-Ashirta.

1 Chron. x. 7, "And when all the men of Israel that were in the valleys saw that they fled" (AV). Here "they" is changed to "Israel," on the authority of the LXX (*i.e.*, of Cod. B.); and we are told that "Heb. om. Israel." Is it not equally natural to suppose that the LXX inserted "Israel" to make the sense clearer?

[14] *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, I, p. 366.

While the frequent changes in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament are of primary importance, there are several other matters connected with the handling of the text which should not be overlooked. The first is that in a few instances the translator has rearranged the verses. This has been done twice in Job (xiii. 28, xxvi. 1-4), once in Proverbs (ix. 7-12), three times in Isaiah (v. 25-30, xxxviii. 21-22, xli. 6-7) and three times in Jeremiah (x. 11, xxxviii. 28*b*, xxxix. 3). Apparently these changes are made simply because the translators felt that they improved the sense. No evidence from manuscripts or versions is produced in their support.

Attention should also be called to the use of headings. Brief headings are frequently introduced into the text with a view to indicating as concisely as possible the general contents of the section which follows. They are usually the work of the translator and constitute no part of the text.[15] Yet in about a dozen passages in Proverbs and Isaiah a verse of the text (either in whole or in part) has been used as a heading without any attempt being made to distinguish those headings which are inserted by the translator from the headings which are a part of the text itself. Where the entire verse is used as a heading (*e.g.*, Prov. xxv. 1, Isa. xiii. 1) the numbering of the verses suggest this; but where only part of the verse is so used (*e.g.*, Isa. xvii. 1, xix. 1, Prov. xxx. 1) there is nothing to indicate that these headings form a part of the text itself. This is misleading, to say the least, and certainly indicates lack of reverence for the text of Scripture.

It is to be noted also that brackets and parentheses are occasionally introduced. Their purpose is not explained in the Preface. But apparently the brackets are usually intended to call attention to what the translator considers to be a questionable addition to the original text. Examples of such usage are Jer. xxiii. 19-20 which, according to a footnote, is apparently regarded by Dr. Gordon as a duplicate of xxx. 23-

[15] These headings are not all purely objective. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 1-33 is entitled "The Deuteronomic Reform" and Ps. xlv. is called "A Royal Marriage Song."

24.[16] Ezek. i. 2-3 has no comment, but is probably regarded as an editorial insertion.[17] Similarly, the titles of the Psalms are enclosed in brackets, as editorial notes; and Dr. Meek, as a modern editor, uses them when he accompanies proper names with a translation: *e.g.*, "Gershom [immigrant]."

The Textual Notes constitute an instructive commentary on the "guiding principle" as stated by Dr. Powis Smith. The fact that there are several thousand of them and that so many of them propose changes which affect the consonants of the Hebrew text is significant. And it must be remembered that, as we have seen, there are others, even important ones,—how many we cannot say,—that are not listed in the notes. It may be remarked with regard to these notes that there is not a little difference between them, due to a difference in method of the four translators. As has been indicated above "accidentally" is a favorite word with Dr. Meek; again and again he justifies his changing of the text by telling us that something has been accidentally lost or inserted in the Hebrew. We gather the impression that the Hebrew text must have been rather carelessly preserved if accident has figured so largely in its transmission. That it was carelessly preserved is of course the assumption which, expressed or implied, underlies all the attempts of the critics to correct and improve it. Otherwise they would not dare to take such liberties with it. But it is nevertheless an assumption which cannot be established and which is contradicted by what we know about the extreme care exercised by the Jews in preserving their Sacred Oracles. At the same time Dr. Meek seems eager to avoid giving the impression that the changes which he adopts are drastic ones. A second favorite phrase with him is "so, by slight change." Dr. Waterman on the contrary is outspoken in his criticisms of the text; he constantly expresses his contempt for it. We are told again and again that the Hebrew is "ungrammatical," "unintelligible," "obviously wrong," "untranslatable." We meet such words

[16] Cf. *e.g.*, Job xxiv. 18-20, 24; Isa. v. 15-16, vi. 13*e*, vii. 8*c*.
[17] Cf. *e.g.*, Isa iii. 18-23.

as "inanely," "meaningless," "makes no sense," "entirely misses the point," "impossible," "confused and harsh," "hopelessly corrupt." Dr. Powis Smith only rarely indulges in denunciation of the Hebrew text,[18] and he very frequently distinguishes between changes which involve the vowel points and those in which the consonantal text is affected. Dr. Gordon hardly ever comments upon the Hebrew text, contenting himself with stating his authority for his own reading, if there is any, and usually following it with a translation of the Hebrew which he rejects.

We have given our readers, we hope, enough examples of the methods followed by Dr. Smith and his colleagues to lead them to regard with decided scepticism such derogatory comments upon the received text of the Old Testament, as those just cited. We believe that our readers will agree with us that the translators have mistaken their function. They have not confined themselves to translating the Old Testament; they

[18] Thus Dr. Powis Smith declares the Hebrew of Eccles. x. 15*a* to be "ungrammatical and untranslatable." Yet Plumptre, whose acceptance of the late date of Ecclesiastes should entitle him to a hearing in critical circles, accepted the AV rendering without demur: "the labor (*'āmāl*) of the foolish wearieth every one of them." The distributive use of singular suffixes after words in the plural must be recognized as permissible (Ges. Kautzsch, § 145 m), and König (*Lehrgebäude*, III. p. 168) takes exception to the claim that an "abstract" noun must have the gender corresponding to its form. He makes this statement with express reference to the case in point; and the reasons which he gives are noteworthy: "For first, *'āmāl* is not strictly speaking an 'abstract,' but often also [the word] trouble, etc., in the concrete, and furthermore the actual occurrence of תיגענו shows that rule [the rule that in the case of abstracts form and gender must correspond] to be a false generalization." In other words König argues that since *'āmāl* is actually construed with a verb in the feminine an abstract noun does not have to be masculine if it does not have the feminine ending. Dr. Powis Smith on the contrary declares the Hebrew to be "ungrammatical and untranslatable," because the syntax does not accord with his theories as to correct Hebrew usage. This is simply one of many examples of the substituting of *a priori* reasoning for that truly scientific method which draws its rules from a careful study of all the facts. That the construction of this passage is difficult may be admitted. But to dismiss the Hebrew text which is confirmed by the versions with the words "ungrammatical and untranslatable" and then proceed to alter the text is to cut the Gordian knot, without facing the difficulty of untying it.

have sought to correct and improve it. Their attitude differs from that of the translations which they aim to replace—the Authorized Version and its Revisions—in that it is characterized not so much by reverence for the received text of the Old Testament as by an attitude of superiority to it. The freedom with which it is treated cannot possibly be regarded as in harmony with the decidedly conservative language used by Dr. Powis Smith in stating the "guiding principle" of their work.

Metrics—Its Use and Its Abuse

The third reason which is given for the preparation of this new translation is stated to be "a clearer recognition of poetic structures." It is a fact which we gladly recognize that, in the course of the last half century much has been done toward the promoting of a clear understanding of the laws of Hebrew poetry. Ley, Sievers, Rothstein and others have studied the laws of Hebrew metre and sought to apply them to the poetical and prophetical literature of the Old Testament. This work has led in many instances to a clearer appreciation of Hebrew poetry. It should be noticed, however, that the most obvious characteristic of Hebrew poetry, the so-called *parallelismus membrorum,* is not a new discovery; it has long been recognized. On the other hand, no certainty has been reached with regard to the laws governing Hebrew metres. Hebrew metrics is very far from being an exact science. It has not been shown and, we believe, cannot be shown, that Hebrew poetry must be strictly regular in form. Yet on the assumption that this must be the case, words and phrases are cut off or transferred in the interest of uniformity. This has been very unfortunate. It has tended to discredit the new science of Hebrew metrics on the one hand and on the other it has led to radically destructive and totally unwarranted changes of the Old Testament text.

As an illustration of this we cite Isa. x. 27, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall depart from off thy shoulder and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke

shall be destroyed by reason of fatness" (ARV). The words "his burden shall depart from off thy shoulder" and the words "his yoke from off thy neck" are obviously parallel one to the other. The only question that can be raised is as to the closeness of the parallelism. As the words stand in the Hebrew, the second member has no verb. There is no real difficulty here, and similar cases could easily be cited. Yet "metrical" scholars have felt that there should be a second verb. So they have taken the word "and shall be destroyed" (a *waw conversive* with the perfect) and by changing *waw* into *yodh* have turned it into "shall be destroyed" (an imperfect form), or going still further have read "cease" for "destroyed," which involves the further change of a *beth* into a *daleth*. In this way two strictly parallel sentences are secured, each of which has four words (four accents) in the Hebrew:

> And on that day
> Shall his burden pass from your shoulder
> And his yoke be removed from your neck.

But this leaves the phrase "by reason of fatness" standing by itself and unrelated to what precedes or follows. So further change is made and by the insertion of a vowel letter and the change of a consonant these words are altered to read "he has gone up from Pene Rinnom." They then become parallel with the words "he has come to Aiath," which follow in vs. 28.[19]

---

[19] It is apparently largely for metrical reasons that Dr. Waterman has altered 1 Kings viii. 12 f.: "The Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness. I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in for ever" (AV). His rendering is:

> "The Lord established the sun in the heavens,
> But he chose to dwell in thick darkness;
> 'Build my house, a house of habitation for me,
> That I may dwell therein for ever.'
> Is it not written in the Book of the Upright?"

In the Textual Notes this radical departure from the Hebrew text is explained by the words: "So substantially LXX." The Hebrew makes good sense and is supported as against LXX by Targ., Vulg., Pesh. Since Dr. Waterman treats the rest of the words spoken at the dedication of the Temple as prose, it is hard to see why Solomon should be re-

It must be obvious to the reader, we think, that such "recognition of poetic structures" as appears in the instance just cited is highly theoretical and questionable. It assumes that the "Prophets" are largely poetry and that Hebrew poetry is characterized to a marked degree by metrical regularity. Neither of these assumptions can be proved. The parallelisms in vss. 27 ff. are very marked: the passage is clearly poetic. But when the attempt is made to make the parallelism or balance strictly regular, difficulties appear at once. We have much still to learn about Hebrew metrics. Yet the critics use the imperfectly understood laws of Hebrew poetry as if they were a sure standard by which to test the correctness of the text of the Old Testament. In this volume the metrical test has not been applied with the recklessness which is characteristic of the Moffatt version. We judge that Dr. Gordon has made Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* the basis of his work. But it is perfectly clear that the interest of the translators in "poetical structures" is due in no small measure to the help which they hope it will give them in their attempt to revise and improve the text of the Old Testament.

The tendency with "critical" scholars seems to be to treat more and more of the "prophetical" literature of the Bible as poetry. Yet there is considerable difference of opinion among them as to what is prose and what is poetry. Most Old Testament scholars would probably regard the Book of Daniel as very largely prose. Dr. Moffatt, an enthusiastic metricist, prints only about six verses as poetry. Dr. Gordon on the other hand apparently adopts in general the arrangement of Loehr in Kittel's *Biblica Hebraica*. Both of them print some twenty-five verses as poetry, but with some disagreement as to the verses themselves. Thus both treat vii. 13-14 as poetry, but vss. 17-18 are so treated only by Dr. Gordon. He arranges them thus:

---

quired to speak in carefully balanced phrases in these opening words. It is to be noted furthermore that these words which are found in the LXX at the close instead of at the beginning of the narrative (after vs. 53), are not found in the other versions.

'These great beasts, four in number, are four kings,
Who shall arise out of the earth;
But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom,
And shall retain the kingdom forever, even forever and ever'.

If this is poetry, it would be easy we think to render almost any prose passage into "metrical" English. Dr. Powis Smith tells us that "poetry should not be printed as prose." To this we would add the quite obvious comment that prose should not be printed as poetry.

The "Unintelligibility" of the AV

The fourth of the reasons given by the editor for the preparation of this new translation of the Old Testament is "such a change in our own language as would render the language of the older translations more or less unintelligible to the average man of our day." Elsewhere in the preface the statement is made: "The English of King James's day is not wholly natural or clear to the average man at the present time." It is pointed out that "in common everyday speech 'thou,' 'thee' and 'thy' are no longer used; they have been retained here when they occur in language addressed to God, since they convey a more reverent feeling than the blunt 'you'." But, we may ask, if "thou" is perfectly intelligible when used in addressing the Deity, why should it be regarded as unintelligible elsewhere in the Bible? Is "You must not commit murder" more intelligible, not to say impressive, than "Thou shalt not kill"? It is of course true that the endings "est" and "eth" and the word "ye" for "you," etc., are archaic; yet to very many people there is a quaint beauty and a distinctiveness about the Jacobean English of the AV which gives it a peculiar charm. We wonder what attitude the editor would take toward an "American Translation" of Shakespeare. We cannot help feeling that the attempt to translate the Bible into the vernacular of today usually results in a rather commonplace and ordinary translation. It may be noted furthermore that of the other archaisms mentioned by the editor as showing the need for a new translation, (*e.g.*, "prevent" in the sense of "anticipate") more than half have al-

ready been removed in the ARV, and consequently are quite irrelevant. If as Dr. Smith avers there are "many others like them," it is strange that he did not make a better selection of data in support of his contention.

While, as has been indicated, we cannot agree with the editor as regards the unintelligibility of the Authorized Version, we note with pleasure that the new translation seems to be free from some of the extravagances which have marred one of the recent "modern" versions of the Bible. We refer especially to the Moffatt translation. It is gratifying to be assured, although we had supposed it to be a generally recognized fact, that "the contents of the Old Testament is, with little exception, upon a high literary plane. The language of the translation, therefore, cannot be allowed to fall to the level of the street." We do not find in this translation as in the Moffatt examples of alliteration such as "a poisonous fly makes perfume putrid" (Eccles. x. 1), or of doggerel rhyme such as "for his love to us is vast, his loyalty will ever last" (Ps. cxvii. 2). We do not find in Psalm li. 7 "purge me with hyssop" changed into "purge me clean with marjoram." We note with pleasure that the familiar rendering "LORD" for the Tetragram has been retained.[20] On the whole the translation is a dignified one, and it does not offend against the ordinary canons of English style and usage.

At the same time there are many changes which seem to us decidedly unnecessary if not petty. "Futility of futility" is hardly an improvement upon the familiar "vanity of vanities" of Eccles. i. 2. "Funeral pyre" (2 Chron. xvi. 14, xxi. 20) is decidedly misleading. We naturally think of the word

[20] We are told that in this regard "the orthodox Jewish tradition" has been followed. This is only a partial statement of the warrant for "LORD." For the Christian the all-important fact is that this Jewish tradition has the express sanction of the usage of the New Testament. Thus in the Synoptic Gospels and in Acts where the words of Ps. cx. 1, "The LORD (יהוה) said unto my Lord (אדוני)," are quoted, the word "Lord" (κύριος) is used for the Tetragram, despite the fact that this partially obliterates a distinction clearly made in the Hebrew. Stronger evidence than this could hardly be given us that for the Christian "Lord" is the equivalent of the Tetragram.

pyre, a Greek word, as implying the Greek custom of cremating the dead. We hardly think that Dr. Waterman means to imply that this was followed in the case of the pious king Asa or of Jehoahaz. In substituting "propitiatory" for the familiar "mercy seat" (Ex. xxv. 17), Dr. Meek is returning to Wyclif who anglicized the *propitiatorium* of the Vulgate. We agree with Canon Harford that "mercy seat" which apparently goes back through Tyndale to Luther's "Gnadenstuhl" is still the best English rendering. It is certainly in harmony with the Scriptural statements regarding the Lord's "sitting" between the cherubim (Num. vii. 89). Dr. Meek's "propitiatory" is, of course, much to be preferred to Dr. Moffatt's "lid." But a Latinism that is at least as old as Wyclif and comes from the Vulgate does not impress us as characterized by modernity.

A great stumbling block to the translator is the difficulty of being consistent. The Old Testament is a large book. One of the most obvious weaknesses of the Moffatt translation is its inconsistency. In this case, where there were four translators there are inconsistencies which detract not a little from the value of the translation. Thus, the word "name" is a familiar one in the Old Testament. The expression "for my (thy, his) name's sake" is of frequent occurrence. Dr. Powis Smith retains it in Pss. cxliii. 11, cxlviii. 13, as does Dr. Meek in Joshua vii. 9 and Dr. Gordon in Isa. xlviii. 9, lxvi. 5. Yet in Pss. cvi. 8, cix. 21 he changes it to "reputation," and the familiar language of Ps. xxiii. 3 "He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake" he alters into "He guides me in safe paths, for his fame's sake." It is hard to see that anything is gained by such an inconsistent method of translation.

A more serious example of such inconsistency is furnished us by the rendering of the word "anointed" (AV). The familiar rendering is retained by Drs. Smith and Gordon. Dr. Waterman, on the contrary, has rendered it "Messiah" in Samuel, but "anointed" in Chronicles. It is decidedly startling, in view of the restricted usage of the word "Mes-

siah" to which Christians everywhere are accustomed, to read in 2 Sam. i. 16 "I have slain the Lord's Messiah." We cannot see that this is required by any change in the use of the English words. But certainly if such a change is made, this should be done uniformly and consistently.

As to this question of consistency Dr. Powis Smith tells us: "The Editor has left his fellow-workers free to express themselves as they would, and has aimed at uniformity only in the most essential matters. If it be felt that each translator has his own style, this should not be regarded as a defect, for each document in the Old Testament has a style of its own, and the extent to which such stylistic characteristics are ignored by translators is a measure of their failure. Each book ought to speak its own message in its own way, even in a translation." There is an element of truth, no doubt, in this statement. But it clearly does not apply to such inconsistencies as we have just cited. The fact of the matter is that to translate the Old Testament well and really improve on the standard versions which are generally in use is a very difficult and arduous task and one which requires very much more time and effort than the "modern" translators seem willing to give to it.

It would be possible to give a number of other examples of changes in phraseology which, to say the least, constitute in our opinion no improvement upon the familiar language of the AV. The above must suffice to call attention to them. But there is a further class of changes which are of especial importance, because they indicate a dogmatic bias on the part of the translators which is highly significant. Thus we have failed to find in this translation the familiar word "soul." We should hesitate to say that it is never found in the version, but the fact that in such passages as "He restoreth my soul" (Ps. xxiii. 3), "My soul thirsteth for thee" (Ps. lxiii. 1), "Bless the Lord, O my soul" (Psalm ciii. 1), "In whom my soul delighteth" (Isa. xlii. 1), the words "life," 'spirit," "whole being," and "I" are substituted certainly indicates an unwillingness to use this familiar word. We cannot but won-

der whether the avoidance of the word "soul" is out of deference to Dr. Powis Smith's one-time colleague at Chicago University, Professor John Dewey, in whose behaviorist vocabulary there is of course no room for this old fashioned word. The change, however it is to be explained, is important as an indication of the kind of "modernity" represented in this translation.

Similarly, it is safe to assert that Dr. Meek would not have rendered Genesis i. 11, "Then God said, 'Let the earth produce vegetation, seed-bearing plants and the various kinds of fruit-trees that bear fruit containing their seed!' " which is certainly a very awkward rendering, were he not seeking to evade the force of the plain declaration of the narrative that the law of increase in the natural world is reproduction "after its kind." His translation is clearly influenced by the fact that the law of the stability of species which is so plainly stated here and which is so obviously the law of the natural world as we know it today, is the most serious objection to the widely accepted, but also widely rejected, theory of evolution by reproductive variation.

In Gen. iii. 15 the reference to the "seed" of the woman is made indefinite and generic ("Your posterity and hers . . . they . . . you"). There is nothing in the narrative itself to require this. It brings the narrative, it is true, into harmony with the mythological interpretation which sees in this passage an explanation of man's instinctive aversion to snakes; but it also makes it flatly contradict the Messianic interpretation given by Paul in Gal. iii. 16. "The Lord is our God, the Lord alone" (Deut. vi. 4) does scant justice to this great declaration, called by the Jews the Shema, regarding the essential nature of the religion of Israel. It is clearly so phrased as to make it affirm nothing more than monolatry or henotheism.[21] "A book of law" (2 Kings xxii. 8) tones down the

[21] Like the rendering "various kinds" cited above, this is a novel rendering which is not favored by the Hebrew nor supported by the versions. That "one" can be used in the sense of "alone" is to be recognized (e.g. Josh. xxii. 20); but certainly the natural way of saying "alone" would

familiar rendering of the AV "the book of the law" in the interest of the Wellhausen theory of a composite Pentateuch. It is changes such as these which impress the reader with the fact that the compelling reason for a new translation of the Old Testament lies not in the archaic phraseology of the version of 1611 but in the doctrinal implications of this phraseology which are unacceptable to the "modern" mind. And since we believe that this archaic phraseology has been singularly successful in expressing the thought of the still more archaic origin, we are loath to see modern phrasing made the occasion and the pretext for altering the meaning of that original.

In view of the rather ambitious sub-title of this volume, which would seem to imply that it is distinctly and distinctively American, it may be noted that of the four translators only one, Dr. Waterman, is an American by birth: Dr. Smith was born in England, Dr. Meek in Canada, Dr. Gordon in Scotland. Consequently the word "American" must be used in a somewhat wider sense, we think, than that in which "the writings of Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Wilson are American." In fact we are told that the word is not intended as a "limitation" but an "enrichment" of our mother-tongue and that the volume "aims at being easily understood wherever English is spoken." We would not be regarded as provincial, nor would we insist that an American translation must be solely the work of native-born Americans. But we do think it would have been better if this volume had been called "a Chicago University translation," for that institution seems clearly to be the connecting link between the four translators. Dr. Smith has been connected with Chicago University, first as student and then as teacher since 1895, becoming Associate Professor of Semitics in 1912, and full professor in 1915. Drs. Waterman and Meek received the Ph.D. degree from Chicago University in 1912 and 1915 respectively, while Dr.

---

be to use לבדו. The word "one" is undoubtedly to be understood as emphasizing the unity of God. This is the interpretation that has been accepted by Jew and Christian alike throughout the centuries.

Gordon was visiting professor in the summer terms of 1917 and 1923. In calling this translation of the Old Testament "an American translation" the intention is obviously to indicate that it is a companion volume to the translation of the New Testament (1923) prepared by Dr. Smith's colleague, Dr. Goodspeed, to which the name has already been given. We call attention to this matter because this title makes a claim for this volume which we believe to be without adequate warrant. We are quite ready to call this volume a "Chicago University Translation." It is quite representative of that theological liberalism of which Chicago University is an active exponent. We challenge the right of this theological liberalism to call itself distinctively "American."

Princeton. OSWALD T. ALLIS.

NOTES AND NOTICES

Turretin's "Theology"

About eight years ago there came to the Library of Princeton Seminary several volumes of manuscript. On examination they were found to contain an English translation of Turretin's "Theology" (*Institutio theologicae elencticae*) by George Musgrave Giger, D.D. The manuscript was evidently prepared some seventy years ago, probably when Dr. Giger was professor of Latin in Princeton College (1854-1865). It is of especial interest because it is the only known translation of the "Theology" into English. The last edition, still in the original Latin, was published in Edinburgh in 1847. But, since Latin textbooks have gone very largely out of use in the last fifty years, there is danger that the merits of Turretin may be forgotten. To forget Plato would be a lost philosophy; to forget Blackstone would be a loss to the student of the law; to forget Turretin would be a loss to the theologian. It was a blessing to the world when the Calvin Translation Society provided for the publication of the works of Calvin in English in fifty volumes. A corresponding endowment is needed for the publication of the three volumes of Turretin's "Theology."[1]

Nearly a century after the death of Calvin, Francis Turretin became one of his successors in the teaching of theology at Geneva. His father had also taught theology there, and his grandfather, an Italian Protestant, had fled from persecution to Switzerland. Francis Turretin's volumes of theology were an inspiration to preachers in Great Britain and the United States for several generations, and a textbook in various seminaries. He has been called "the Aristotle of theology," and his work has been described as "invaluable." A professor said years ago that there is more Scripture per page in Turretin than in any other theology. His three volumes are divided in Loci or Topics, twenty in number. Each Topic has a series of Questions, as if

---

[1] Recently over a third of the Giger manuscript has been typewritten. To finish the typewriting of the manuscript and to revise and edit it for the press may involve an expense of more than $2,000. A publisher has estimated that the three volumes of the Edinburgh edition would make seven in the English translation, each containing over five hundred pages. To publish three thousand sets would cost about $31,000.

for a debating society, often designating the names of parties or sects or persons who have taken opposite sides in opinions. Usually there is a preliminary discussion, with definitions and distinctions, leading to a statement of the Question. This is followed by arguments for the proposition as stated; and in conclusion there is a discussion of objections or of sources of explanations. The margin gives brief titles or themes or texts, but there are no footnotes. Under each Question the paragraphs are numbered. The index of the Topics and Questions gives a fair idea of the contents of the entire work, or rather, its outline.

Turretin is quoted in such widely used treatises on theology, as those of Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, Shedd and Strong. Principal Cunningham commends him highly, in his *Historical Theology,* and says of this work, it is "a book which is of inestimable value"; and further, "In the perusal of this great work, occasionally some difficulty will be found, especially at first, in fully understanding its statements, from ignorance of, or imperfect acquaintance with, scholastic distinctions and phraseology; but as the reader becomes familiar with these, he will see more and more clearly how useful they are, in the hands of a man like Turretin, in bringing out the exact truth upon difficult and intricate questions, and especially in solving the objections of adversaries." In regard to one question which used to be discussed between the Calvinists and the Arminians on the point, whether Christ is the cause and the foundation of the decree of election, the Arminians maintaining that He is, and the Calvinists that He is not, Cunningham says that it is "a question of some intricacy, but of considerable importance, in its bearing upon the subject of election generally, which will be found discussed and *settled* in Turretin, on the decrees of God and predestination." In the last paragraph of his work, Turretin offers a prayer, in part as follows: "Since by the supreme kindness of God it has now happened, that having entered upon the most extended sea of Theology, I now joyfully reach the harbor under his guidance; what is more just than that, an altar being erected, I now pay my vows on the shore; 'To thee, therefore, Thou Triune God, the best and greatest, most merciful Father in Christ, I give thanks. But because to no purpose does any one plant and water unless Thou givest the increase, grant, Thou best Father, that these endeavors of mine, whatsoever

they may be, may contribute to the glory of Thy most holy name and the benefit of Thy Church'." The prayer has been partly fulfilled; and if an English edition can be published, it may be answered on a worldwide scale.

Many years ago, in Philadelphia, 1817, a book on the Atonement was published by Rev. James R. Willson, and in the latter part of it he translated portions from the fourteenth Topic of Turretin, five subjects or Questions pertaining to the Atonement, its necessity, truth, perfection, substance and extent. In 1859 the New York Board of Publication of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church published these translations in a "new edition, carefully revised by collation with the last edition of the Latin original." Occasionally, not often, the translator interpolated remarks, doubtless appropriate, but not Turretin's, and without giving notice to the reader. When a reader becomes aware of this, and that every interpolation was not removed even from the revised edition, he may sometimes feel uncertain whether it is Willson or Turretin that he is reading. In the portions of Professor Giger's translation that have been examined by the writer, no such interpolations have been observed, and it is a pleasure to see how faithful and judicious are his renderings.

It may be a difficult undertaking to convey an idea of Turretin's reasoning by abbreviating some passages from Giger's translation, yet this may awaken interest and be profitable. For instance, in the fourth Topic, on the Decrees of God and Predestination, the fifth Question has the title, "The Term of Life," and reads thus:

Whether the fixed and immovable term of each man's life with all its circumstances is so determined by the decree of God, that he cannot depart in another article of time, nor by another kind of death than that in which he actually does depart?

To make this question clearer, Turretin observes that the term of life may be common and general, such as is assigned to the human race; or special, such as is given to the duration of this or that individual. "We speak here," he says, "not of the first, but of the second, the question being, not whether it is appointed unto men by the decree of God, once to die; but the question is concerning the special term, whether a fixed and immovable moment of birth and death is fixed by God for each

one?" "Again, the term of life can be said to be movable or immovable in different senses, either with respect to the First Cause, or second causes. The question is not, whether the physical term of life, arising from proximate natural causes is immovable; for we confess that it can be contracted or protracted on account of good or bad regimen, as he who might have lived longer by the order of nature, may shorten the ordinary course of life by intemperance in eating and drinking, or may perish by the sword, famine or other violent causes. But the question is concerning the hyperphysical term, established by the First Cause, and by divine ordination." He quotes Thomas Aquinas: "Fate as in second causes is movable, but as from divine foreknowledge is immovable, not by an absolute, but by a conditional necessity." Further he says: "The fixing of the term of life is either absolute antecedently, or consequently so as to exclude all use of second causes and means. The question is not concerning the latter; whether each one's life and death is decreed absolutely without any respect to the necessary means, which are certainly subordinated to their ends, and included in the same decree, so that whatever God has decreed will certainly happen.—We hold that the term of life is so fixed as not to exclude the necessity of means." He then proceeds after a clear statement of the question, to his proofs that the term of life is fixed, including explanations of a series of Scripture passages: (1) Job xiv. 5 "Seeing his days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, thou hast appointed his bounds that he can not pass." Also, Chap. vii. 1 "Is there not a warfare, or an appointed time to man upon earth? and are not his days also like the days of an hireling?" And here he explains some of the words of the Hebrew original. (2) Ps. xxxix. 4, 5, "Lord, make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days, what it is," &c. (3) Acts xvii. 26, "God hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." Here he quotes the Greek original of "the times before appointed" and refers to Acts i. 7 which speaks of God's putting the times in his own power, and to Eccl. iii. 1, 2, about a time to be born and to die. (4) Matt. x. 28-30, according to which if the hairs of the head are numbered and not a sparrow falls without the Father's will, so life and

death are at His nod. (5) His argument, from predictions of death, is a striking summary of Scripture prophecies (of the deluge, of the death of Moses, of the child of David, and the son of Jeroboam, of Ahaziah, of Peter, of Christ, of Belshazzar, of Ahab and Jezebel) prophecies depending on God's foreordination. And (6), Scripture instances of accidental death, that of Ahab, who perished by chance, yet this was foretold. (7) Since God regulates the whole of life from beginning to end, He is the Lord of death as well as life. (8) Otherwise, God's providence does not include particulars, but is subject to conditions. Following these reasons, we read of the sources of explanations, including many other Scripture passages; and practical lessons are mentioned, prayerfulness, courage, prudence, use of means, with a warning against the fatalism of the Turks. The last paragraph in this Question has apt quotations from Pindar, Lucretius, Silius Italicus, Cicero and Seneca.

In the fourteenth Topic which discusses the Mediatorial Office of Christ, and the fifth Question, we have the following: *Ought Christ as Mediator to sustain a threefold office?* In the Old Testament there was no instance of one who was prophet and priest and king; and Christ alone could undertake the threefold function. Turretin mentions Scriptures which ascribe these offices to Christ; and particularly quotes John xiv. 6, "the way, the truth and the life"; the way, in His priesthood, the truth as the prophet, the life as a king. Further, and secondly, this is required by the threefold misery of man, his ignorance, guilt, and bondage to sin. Third, it is required by the nature of salvation, which must be announced, acquired and applied. Fourth, the acts of a mediator require this threefold office, as he intercedes for us as a priest, speaks for God as a prophet, and by a powerful redemption acts as a king. And he has a threefold anointing for all three offices; and last of these arguments, the three perfections of God principally exercised in redemption, his wisdom, mercy and power, call for Christ as a prophet, priest and king. In this Question, the last paragraph is quoted without translation in Charles Hodge's Theology. Here is Professor Giger's rendering:

> These three offices, however, are so united in Christ, that they not only exercise their distinct operations, but the same act proceeds at the same time from the three, which not a little increases the wonderfulness

of the thing. Thus the cross of Christ, which is the altar of the priest, on which He offered Himself as a victim to God, is also the school of the prophet, in which He teaches us the mystery of salvation, whence the gospel is called the word of the cross, and the trophy of the king, on which He triumphed over principalities and powers, Col. ii. 15. The gospel is the law of the prophet, Is. ii. 2, 3, the sceptre of the king, Ps. cx. 2, the sword of the priest, by which he penetrates even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, Heb. iv. 12, and an altar, upon which the sacrifice of our faith ought to be placed. Thus the Spirit, who as a Spirit of wisdom is the effect of prophecy, as a Spirit of consolation is a fruit of the priesthood, as a Spirit of strength and glory is a gift of the king.

A valuable feature of the writings of this famous theologian is the wide range of quotations on his pages, from the Classics, both philosophers and poets, from the Fathers, from the Middle Ages, and from the period of the Reformation. If we limit attention to a third or more of the entire work, we observe that over two hundred writers are quoted, a fact worth noticing, as the volumes have no index of these quotations. Augustine is quoted in over eighty places, and some of the places have a series of his utterances. We may well observe the effectiveness of some quotations that occur in his sixteenth Topic, the second Question, and 18th Paragraph. Justification is the subject of the Topic. Turretin offers some arguments against the idea that inherent righteousness can be the cause of justification, and after the seventh one, he says,

We cannot omit here the remarkable testimonies of two Cardinals, who, overcome by the power of the truth, agree with us. The first is Cardinal Contarenus, who in his treatise on justification (*Tract. de uJstif.*) thus expresses himself. "Since," he says, "we reach a twofold righteousness by faith, a righteousness inherent in us, and the love and grace by which we are made partakers of the divine nature; and a righteousness of Christ given and imputed to us, since we are planted in Christ and put on Christ: it remains to inquire on which of these ought we to rest, and to think ourselves justified before God, that is, reckoned holy and righteous. I truly think it to be said piously and religiously, that we ought to rest, I say rest upon a stable thing, which can certainly sustain us, upon the righteousness of Christ bestowed upon us, and not upon the holiness and grace inherent in us. For this our righteousness is inchoate and imperfect, which cannot keep us from offending in many things and from constantly sinning. Therefore we cannot in the sight of God on account of this our righteousness be esteemed righteous and good, as it becomes the sons of God to be good and holy. But the righteousness of Christ given to us is a true and perfect

righteousness, which is altogether pleasing in the sight of God, in which there is nothing that does not in the highest degree please him. We must therefore rest upon this alone, sure and stable, and on account of it alone we must believe that we are justified before God, that is, considered righteous and called righteous." From him Bellarmin does not differ much in his work on justification (*lib. v, de Justif. cap.* 7) who after exerting all his strength in a defence of human merit, pressed by the consciousness of the truth, at length is brought to say, "that on account of the uncertainty of personal righteousness, and the danger of vain glory it is safest to place our entire confidence in the mercy and kindness of God alone," &c. To this proposition answers the clause of his Will, "And I pray him to admit me among his saints and elect not as an estimator of merit, but as a bestower of pardon."

The significance of such statements is emphasized by the fact that Cardinal Bellarmin is regarded as the greatest of modern Roman Catholic controversialists. Dr. Cunningham says of Bellarmin, "He concludes with a remarkable statement, which has been often quoted, and which really amounts, in substance and spirit, to a virtual repudiation of the whole five books he had written upon justification."

In several places Turretin refutes a calumny against the Calvinistic gospel, as if it discouraged good works. In the Topic of Sanctification, one of the questions discussed is *"Are good works necessary to salvation?"* He answers, "We affirm it." He guards against the idea that good works are necessary to acquire salvation as of right, as a basis for justification. But he holds, in stating the question, that they are necessary as the means and way for possessing salvation. And he gives five reasons, with Scripture references for each, too numerous to be quoted here: (1) Good works are necessary, from the command of God. Believers are debtors, bound to obedience. (2) Again, the covenant of grace requires these, for the gracious promise of God is one part of the covenant, and the obligation that we should be his people, with all kinds of duties involved in it, is the other part; and a threefold necessity Turretin mentions, that we should live worthily as sons of God, as members of Christ, and temples of the Holy Spirit. (3) The Gospel which is proposed for our belief proves the necessity, for it is not merely theoretical, but practical, a transforming light, a sanctifying truth, the law of the Spirit of Life, demanding not a mere profession, but the practice of piety and love. (4) The state of grace and liberty into which the gospel transfers us, also de-

mands this; as we become servants of righteousness, servants of God, not under law but under grace. (5) All the blessings of God, present and future, are conferred upon us for no other reason than to promote the work of sanctification. So good works are the effects of eternal election, the fruit of present grace, the firstfruits of eternal glory. Finally, Turretin sums up the necessity of good works in three things, the glory of God, the edification of our neighbor, and our own salvation.

It is a remarkable providence that preserved Professor Giger's translation of Turretin, in a way unknown to us, for more than seventy years. It is a monument of industry and scholarship. A great part of the difficulty in publishing Turretin in English was overcome when this faithful translator reached the last page. It now remains for all who learn these facts to advocate an endowment sufficient to secure the editing and printing of these volumes.

Pittsburgh, Pa. CHARLES EUGENE EDWARDS.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

"After Its Kind": The First and Last Word on Evolution. By Byron C. Nelson, Th.M. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House. 1927. Pp. 144.

When the American Association for the Advancement of Science met in Nashville, Tenn., in December, 1927, the topic of the evolutionary origin of man was excluded from its program. This may have been a gesture of courtesy or a concession to local prejudice, but there are not wanting indications of a reaction against the evolution theory both in the popular mind and in academic circles. Thus, in discussing evolution, a current magazine whose writers usually sit in a seat of the scornful protests against the "pseudo-scientific and second-rate teachers," who "leap lightly from half-digested theory to near-discovery and accept each succeeding one as the final word. Their gullibility is without parallel since the early Middle Ages. They call themselves Modernists but they should be called Medievalists." It is interesting again to find a leading evolutionary philosopher, John Dewey, writing a foreword to Paul Radin's *Primitive Man as Philosopher,* (1927), in which the writer carries on a polemic against the popular evolutionary conception of the state of primitive man and the history of his religious beliefs. Dr. Radin contends that the mentality of primitive man does not differ intrinsically from our own, and that with men of a certain temperament theism of a relatively pure type is regularly to be found among primitive peoples. He points out the radical mistake of the Old Testament critics who refuse to admit that there was any monotheism in Israel until the time of the later prophets.

Mr. Nelson's discussion, prepared as a thesis for a master's degree at Princeton Theological Seminary, deals with organic evolution, including the origin of man, in its relation to the statements of the Bible. He maintains that the fixity of species rather than the fluidity of species is the fundamental law of nature. The first word on evolution "is the decree of the Creator at the time the different 'kinds' or species were created"; while the last word is the formulation of the laws of heredity by the Austrian monk, Gregor Mendel. Mendelism, he believes, is destructive of the evolution theory in all its popular forms and is favorable to a theory of special creation.

Mr. Nelson defines evolution as "a process which has taken place entirely naturally, without the miraculous intervention of any Divine Being, by which, from out of a single remote ancestor living in the waters of some distant sea, has come all the living things in the world today." He believes that there are a large number of types of living

beings, man included, which were so created as to remain true to their particular type throughout all generations. We recall that Darwin spoke of the "undiscovered and undiscoverable essence of species," and every discussion of evolution from that time to this has found difficulty in defining the exact meaning of species. In common speech we speak of the various species of dogs and of the human race, but according to Mr. Nelson "such species are not what the Bible means by the word 'kind.' The Bible does not mean to say that every distinct form of plant or animal men see about them came from the hand of the Creator in just the form in which it is beheld. It is not the several types of dogs: fox-terrier, dachshund, collie, that were created to remain the same forever, but the one natural species, *dog*. The 'kinds' of Genesis refer not to the 'systematic' species identified by men, but to those natural species of which the world is full, which have power to vary within themselves in such a way that the members of the species are not all exactly alike, but which, nevertheless, cannot go out of the bounds that the Creator set."

It is admitted that "only in comparatively few cases do men know exactly what the limits of a natural species are"; but Mr. Nelson insists that "the lover of the Bible who would come to a clear understanding of the evolutionary problem and to a firm faith in the Bible doctrine of creation must learn to distinguish between a natural species and the many varieties or sub-species in which God has ordained that natural species may appear."

After pointing out the difficulty of the consistent evolutionist in dealing with the origin of life, Mr. Nelson takes up in order the arguments in support of evolution, from classification, from comparative anatomy, from vestigial organs, from embryology, from geology, and from geographical distribution. He shows in each case what can be said under each of these heads in favor of evolution, but also what can be said—and a good deal can be said—against it. He quotes Paley to the effect that "our list of useless structures decreases as our store of knowledge increases." For example, the thyroid and pituitary glands were once thought to be useless but are now known to perform a highly important function in the organism. It might have been added that some enthusiastic evolutionists make the thyroid gland the principal agent in changing the ape or monkey into a man. In his geological discussion, Mr. Nelson follows Professor Price, adding also instances of his own, in insisting that there are large geographical areas where the fossil bearing strata are not in the order which the evolutionary scheme would demand. The fossiliferous condition of the earth, he believes, "can be accounted for on the basis of the Deluge." After discussing the competing theories to account for evolutionary progress, those of Lamarck, Darwin and De Vries, and insisting that Mendel's discovery has done great damage to evolution in all these forms, Mr. Nelson takes up the evidence for human evolution and points out the meagerness of the evidence. He insists also that the spiritual gap between man and the brute can never without a supernatural cause be bridged.

The readers of Mr. Nelson's thoughtful and scholarly discussion will

be slow to accept the confident assertion that evolution is now an established fact. They will be careful to discriminate between fact and hypothesis, and between a theory that may be true somewhere within a limited area and a dogma that must be true everywhere. They will be on their guard against the tendency of specialists, whether in the realms of physics, biology or psychology, to erect a scientific hypothesis, and one not yet proven, into a metaphysic of the universe.

Lincoln University, Pa. WM. HALLOCK JOHNSON.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Christianity, Past and Present. By CHARLES GUIGNEBERT, Professor of the History of Christianity, University of Paris. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927. 8vo, pp. xxvi, 507. $4.50.

Though neither title-page nor preface makes any allusion to the fact, the work before us is a translation—presumably by the author himself—of two volumes which he published in Paris some years ago—*Le Christianisme antique* (1921) and *Le Christianisme médiéval et moderne* (1922). A comparison with the original texts shows that practically the only changes made in this new edition are occasional additions to the bibliographical suggestions in the footnotes. So far as we are aware, this is the first of Professor Guignebert's publications that has appeared in English; but if we may judge from the impression the book is likely to make, especially upon readers who have not familiarized themselves with the latest reconstructions of apostolic and early church history, it is a pretty safe prophecy that there will be a considerable demand on the part of English readers for the translation of other treatises by this author.

There is an engaging frankness and candor in Professor Guignebert's application of the hypothesis of naturalistic evolution to the history of all religions, Christianity included. His first explicit statement of this theory occurs in his monograph of 1910 entitled *L'Évolution des Dogmes.* As the preface of the volume before us makes plain, the intervening years have only confirmed his conviction in regard to the validity of this biological analogy. It may be well to quote a few sentences from these introductory paragraphs, for they will give a fair idea not only of his method of treating the subject but also of what we may call his philosophy of religion—of religion conceived as a historic reality and best typified in the development of Christianity:

> The present volume seeks to understand and explain the life of one particular religion, studied as a concrete reality. It is above all with *facts,* their significance, consequences, and connections, that it deals. It is the main outlines of a history which it tries to delineate so as to prove, if possible, that not only in its dogmas, but also throughout the ramifications of its whole organism a religion undergoes the process of evolution.
>
> From the social milieu in which it establishes itself it borrows the primary elements which form its substance and sustain it in organizing themselves. By undergoing more or less thorough transformations of its

organs, it adapts itself to the demands of the diverse and successive spheres to which it is afterward transported. Like all living beings, it eliminates its worn-out and dead particles by degrees, and assimilates others derived from its surroundings which renew its flesh and blood until the day comes when, in the inevitable course of time, its powers of adaptation relax their activity and finally stop short. That means that it has become unable to rid itself of the inert and noxious waste matters it is accumulating, unable also to nourish its life; death gradually takes possession of and congeals it, until at last the moment arrives when it is good for nothing but to engender, from its own decaying tissues, a new religious organism, destined to a similar fate. . . . A very powerful atavistic tendency, difficult to eradicate, exists in us; the Romano-Christian culture brought it into being. And it would have us believe that Christianity could never have been such a religion as the others; that its genesis and the course of its long career until the present day followed methods that were exceptional, and that it will never perish. Comparison alone can dispel this illusion, and replace it by a vision which, I do not deny, is disheartening, but is at least true to the historical reality (p. vii f.).

This, then, is the thesis which, "if possible," this volume of "history" is "to prove." And the boldness with which the author conducts the "demonstration" of this theory of the "evolution" of "Christianity" gives the book a provocative tone which, however displeasing it may at times be, alike to the Roman Catholic and to the Protestant, keeps challenging the interest of the reader. But when one has finished the narrative, one wonders just how one ought to take the modest admission of the preface: "the present essay does not presume to offer a complete picture of the history of Christianity." Indeed, one soon finds that, essential "Christianity" having from the very beginning been once for all eliminated from the "history," there is nothing left but a complex of naturalistic forces to determine the entire "evolution."

The customary threefold division of history—ancient, medieval, and modern—is retained; but the treatment of the several parts is quite disproportionate—almost one-half of the volume is devoted to the first three centuries of the Christian era—and the "social milieu" that is so much emphasized in the early sections is almost ignored in the later ones.

Two introductory chapters deal with "Jesus' Initiative" and "Jesus' Failure." The author feels bound to accept the historicity of Jesus, but beyond this, practically everything is involved in "doubt and uncertainty." As a matter of fact, the "demonstration" of the thesis set forth in the preface begins with a vigorous excision of all supernatural elements in the New Testament narratives. The Gospels, we are told, give us only such a life of Jesus "as it would be imagined to have been toward the close of the Apostolic generation." The Synoptics "have not been actuated by objective truth," though Mark is "prudent enough to say nothing about the birth or childhood of Jesus." Jesus can and should be explained as a product of his Jewish environment. He was a prophet, indeed, but he never proclaimed his Messiahship. The account of Christ's entrance into Jerusalem is not "veracious"; and as regards his death on the cross, he simply "was taken by surprise" at this outcome. The "resur-

rection" was due to the fact that the faith of the disciples was "hypnotized" by the idea that he could not have abandoned them for ever.

After a brief presentation of the work of the original Apostles, three chapters are devoted to Paul (his environment, his training as a Christian, and his varied labors). And here, even more than in his treatment of Jesus, the author follows Bousset. There is a noticeable tendency to minimize the Jewish influences in Paul's development: "it is very unlikely," we are told, that he was brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3); rather is there "reason to believe" that it was in Antioch that he "completed his studies." But important as Paul's contributions were, the "real founders of Christianity were the men who established the Church of Antioch." It was there, under the influence of the mystery religions of the East, that the "deification" of Jesus took place. Paul's Christology is thus borrowed "from a milieu which, through his general education on Greek soil, was much more intelligible to him than to the Judeo-Christian society in Palestine." Doubtless, Bousset would consider the brief reproduction of his argument in the volume before us as quite inadequate—particularly as regards the elements which Paul himself contributed to the developing Christology; but the main features of the theory are clearly indicated, and enough is said to reveal the inherent difficulties of a reconstruction that must do so much violence to the records as they stand, and that, unfortunately for itself, can make no satisfactory division between the natural and the supernatural elements in the sources.

We may not linger over the chapters on the organization, the dogmas, and the liturgy of the early Church, nor over the story of her triumph over the Empire, a triumph secured, as our author correctly but with rather undue emphasis reminds us, by means of her many compromises with the pagan syncretism itself. The "Middle Ages"—which in this treatise begin as far back as Augustine—are sketched in more summary fashion. As is quite customary and pardonable in brief surveys of this kind, Oriental Christianity, after the separation of the Eastern and the Western Churches, is dismissed with a few sentences. On the other hand, there are many paragraphs dealing in admirably succinct and comprehensive fashion with the salient characteristics of the Medieval Church—the rise of the papacy, the expansion of the hierarchy, scholasticism, the popular piety, the anti-clerical tendencies and reformatory influences. At the same time, one regrets the slighting of some of the elements usually set forth with considerable fulness in portrayals of the Christianity of this period—especially those connected with the political and social background of the Church, and her work in art and literature. If attention may be called to minor errors, Jerome of Prague (p. 354) was not burned to death in the same year as Hus, but in 1416; nor is Hildebert of Tours (p. 221), but Peter Damiani, to be credited with the first use of the noun "transubstantiation."

Part III, on "Modern Times," begins with a brief but suggestive chapter on Humanism, followed by a rather superficial and unsympathetic discussion of the Reformation. No doubt, the Reformation, as

the author intimates, was incomplete on its religious side, but it is precisely this religious aspect of the movement which he fails to appreciate in its real historic significance. No attempt is made to do justice to the various Protestant denominations. Quite often the word "Reformed," regardless of its generally recognized special sense, is used as a synonym for "Protestant." Calvin and Calvinism are barely mentioned. Of the evangelical leaders as a group it is said that they retained "the great traditional dogmatic tenets, which they injected into the sacred writings while imagining that they found them there." In the Papal Church, which continues to be the subject of prime interest in these chapters, the Council of Trent and the Society of Jesus secured for Romanism, that is for pontifical absolutism, the sort of triumph that sooner or later must issue in the destruction of the victor. By rejecting the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and then the Enlightenment of the eighteenth, and the modernism of the twentieth, she has virtually suffocated herself to death. Such is the melancholy outlook for this venerable institution: "An unavoidable fatality weighs down the destiny of Roman Catholicism. It may happen that a new religion may one day issue from it, that a life-principle of religious *revival* may well forth from its ruins, but as far as it is strictly speaking Catholicism, that is as far as it is one of the definite historic forms of Christianity, its rôle seems to be virtually at an end in the world. Its hearth is still red, but there is no more fuel and the fire is slowly expiring, the chill of death upon it."

But the prospects for Protestantism are not much brighter. With the emphasis of italics the author insists upon the assertion—rather paradoxical in view of these lengthy pages of his history—that the *"Western peoples have, strictly speaking, never been Christians*; that from the very beginning they misunderstood and transformed the Gospel; and that while "the *Christian idea* still dominates" the Protestant Churches and "is always vital in them," they tend to become "dissolved in a mist of individualisms," incapable of being brought into a vital organic unity. Alike, then, for Catholicism and for Protestanism, though for the one a little earlier than for the other, the knell of doom must sound (p. 507).

As the author forewarned us, this is a rather "disheartening" account of Christianity's "Past and Present"; but few will quite agree with him that his findings are "at least true to the historic reality."

The work of the translator is fairly satisfactory, but not altogether so. While in the main the English text is clear and readable, there are indications of a downright slovenliness that makes it necessary to read some sentences a second or even a third time to get the meaning; as, for example, the following: "a doubt of himself [Jesus] may . . . have invaded his thinking and kept the thought of his approaching death which weighed heavily upon his spirit company." There are numerous omissions of commas which are really distressing. On pages 272, 301, and 365, there are typographical errors in Greek and Latin words.

There is no index, but this lack is largely made up by the excellent table of contents. The thoroughly partisan character of this interpre-

tation of historic Christianity is reflected in the one-sidedness of the bibliographies prefixed to most of the chapters.

Princeton. FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

Mag. Johannis Hus Tractatus Responsivus. Now First Edited with a Critical Introduction and Notes from the Unique Ms. Cod. C. 116, Metropolitan Chapter Library, Prague. By S. HARRISON THOMSON. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1927. 8vo, pp. xxxiv, 173.

This *editio princeps* of a tractate by John Hus is an admirable piece of work. It reflects credit not only upon the editor, who spent several years on this task, but also upon that group of American scholars who in recent years have been making notable contributions to our better understanding of the later centuries of the Middle Ages. Dr. Thomson here reveals himself as a promising specialist in medieval history.

The treatise itself, indeed, offers little by way of supplementing our knowledge of Hus's ideas on the power of the pope, priestly absolution, excommunication, indulgences, and the related topics—views set forth in more extended and systematic form in his best known work, the "De Ecclesia," which was composed soon after the date (September, 1412) assigned by Dr. Thomson, with a fair amount of probability, to the tract before us. In fact, one of the main considerations in support of the genuineness of the *Tractatus* is the similarity "in tone and manner of argument" in this and the Reformer's undisputed writings of the period 1412-1414.

But if this addition to the known works of Hus will not necessitate any important change in the evaluation of the sources hitherto used by his biographers and by the historians of Hussitism, it is none the less useful as a means of confirmng our knowledge of the man and the cause he so nobly championed.

The Introduction gives a detailed description of the Codex used, discusses the questions of authorship and date, outlines the contents of the treatise, and enumerates the chief sources which Hus employed in the composition of the work (the Bible, with the "Glossa Ordinaria" of Walafrid of Strabo and the "Glossa Interlinearis" of Anselm of Laon, the Canon Law, the Sentences of the Lombard, Wyclif's "De Ecclesia," "De Potestate Pape," and several minor tracts, and Matthew of Janov's "Regulae"). Of special interest is Dr. Thomson's conclusion that the last-named—as the recent appearance of the fourth book of the "Regulae" indicates—was extensively used. This fact deserves to be emphasized in view of the prevailing tendency among German scholars to exaggerate the dependence of Hus on Wyclif and to minimize his indebtedness to his Bohemian forerunners. The editor follows Sedlak in maintaining that the reason for Hus's free handling of the "posicio" ascribed to Jacobellus was that this tract had been composed jointly by these two men; and he also surmises that the "posicio" of Epinge, which is quoted in full and without alteration in the *Tractatus*, was likewise due to collaboration between the chief Reformer and this friend of his.

Princeton. FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

The Jesuit Enigma. By E. Boyd Barrett. New York: Boni & Liveright. 1927. Pp. 351. Price $4.

In the fifteen chapters of this book the Society of Jesus, which aroused the bitter attacks of Carlyle, comes in for a thorough, down-to-date evaluation. Some facts make this account especially noteworthy. It is written by one who spent twenty years in the Society and who is not in it now. It is exceedingly outspoken. Evidently Dr. Barrett has definitely and finally broken with the Order. He is out of all sympathy for either its aims or its methods. The book is also valuable for the "inside" picture which it gives of the Order, its sordid selfishness and bigotry, its utterly absurd religiosity, and its mercilessly rigid asceticism. The author has given an unsparing exposé of the whole Jesuit system.

Nowhere is the strange contradictory character of Jesuitism so well summed up as here: "Running through it all one finds the ever-present enigma; the contradiction inseparable from Jesuitism; the interchanging of opposites; wealth that is evangelical poverty; equivocation that is truth; laxity that is purity of doctrine; wrongs rendered good by the end in view; gross disobedience that is holy docility; rotting idleness that is labour in the vineyard; astute and cunning diplomacy that is dovelike simplicity; heroism that is the offspring of fear; chilling indifference that is the charity of Christ" (pp. 19, 44).

The author is fair to the Order. He found some worthy features. Yet he confesses that "the good and beautiful things" were attributable "not to Jesuitism, but to something else in the Jesuit than Jesuitism" p. vi). In Chapter XI, entitled "A Calumny against the Jesuits," the charge that the Society of Jesus taught the odious maxim: "The end justifies the means," is considered. Dr. Barrett says that Jesuit writers justly deny this accusation. It is not *taught* or found in Jesuit *writings.* But Dr. Barrett shows that while not *taught,* it is *practised;* and their defense of the doctrine of Probabilism and mental reservation (pp. 58, 241) run in harmony with the same type of mentality. Here Chapter IV, on "The Mind of the Jesuit Order," is most illuminating. Also Chapter IX, "Repressions and Explosions," and Chapter XII, "The Jesuit Way of Escape." If any one has never known of the rigidity, repressive measures, and the dexterous strategy of this Society, let him read and ponder these chapters.

The wealth (pp. 60-61), secrecy (p. 86), and great power of the Society of Jesus are all emphasized (Chap. X). Its history shows that it was far from securing approval and support even in the Roman Church, where some of its dignitaries and popes were among the most pronounced enemies of the Order. Cardinal Richelieu clashed with Jesuit diplomats. Popes Sixtus V, Paul IV, and Innocent X had their troubles with the Society; and Pope Clement XIV suppressed the Order in 1773. In the nineteenth century it regained power, today numbering about 19,000 members, of whom some 3,500 are in the United States (p. 39). The thirteenth chapter is devoted to Clement XIV, and the second part of it to George Tyrell (pp. 274-283), whose "modernism" also apostatized him from the Order. The closing chapters develop the

author's more personal relations with the Society, his final disillusionment, withdrawal, and the Order's heartless treatment of him as a religious exile.

This book is written in a style that carries the reader along with increasing interest to the very last page. Well does the author call it his "story." It reads like a story. Some mistakes, however, should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. Thus, page 137, line 3, read "majus" for "majis." Page 229, note 5, "Über" for "Uber." The author makes the foreigner's common mistake in his use of our English modal auxiliary "used to," by almost consistently omitting the preposition "to"; as, "he used sit down" for "he used to sit down" (page 203, line 26). Without giving the lines, this mistake will be found on pages 199, 203, 252, 257, 291, 307, 308, 324, 336. Strangely enough, the preposition is used on page 316, line 15.

Toward the close of the book Dr. Barrett calls attention, on three different occasions, to as many visions or peculiar psychic experiences which he relates evidently for whatever they may be worth (pages 302, 308-309, 336). In each "vision" he saw the same figure of a tall, gaunt woman shrouded in black. This may have been an acute extreme of the "Jesuit mind"; but Dr. Barrett saw in the dying away of these visions a symbol of the end of his "tragic Jesuit dream."

This picture has its pathos. It is sad to see twenty years of a life devoted to an ideal, only to end in disillusionment. Of course, in this book, we do not get the Jesuit side of Dr. Barrett. Mayhap we have here a case similar to Dr. Tyrell and Professor Loisy. (See this Review, Vol. XXIII, pp. 495-498.) To a conservative Protestant, with his love of Christian freedom, the infinitesimal rigidities of the discipline in the Society of Jesus are intolerable. To a modern rationalistic professor, reacting against all authority, they must be the worst form of tyranny. Such are doubtless better out than in. To be a Jesuit, one must have the Jesuit mind. But the story of one twenty years in and now out, is little less than thrilling.

Lancaster, Ohio. Benjamin F. Paist.

SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY

A Manual of Christian Beliefs. By Edwin Lewis, Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary, Author of "Jesus Christ and the Human Quest." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927. Pp. 152.

This little manual or outline of theology is of interest in showing how rapidly the successive professors of systematic theology in Drew Theological Seminary have advanced toward a completely modernistic interpretation of Christianity. Professor Miley's *Systematic Theology* showed clear departures from Watson's *Theological Institutes* which was the standard work of evangelical Arminianism in England. Professor Curtis' *Christian Theology in Outline* approached more nearly to the

old Dutch Remonstrants, clothing his views, however, in a modern garb. In this little outline of Professor Lewis there is no trace of evangelical Arminianism. It is a thoroughly modernistic interpretation of Christianity. There are beliefs, the author tells us, which may be surrendered without "imperilling the Christian way of life, such as, for example, the literal inerrancy of Scripture, the passing of the guilt of Adam upon all his descendants, and the penal character of the sufferings of Christ." But Dr. Lewis holds that no one will endeavor to live the Christian life who does not accept certain beliefs. His endeavor is to set forth what he regards as fundamental Christian beliefs, though he is quite mistaken in his statement (p. 5) that this "area" of belief has been always shared in common by Christian people.

That he is thus mistaken can be seen immediately from the fact that he not only rejects the above mentioned Christian beliefs, but also practically all the doctrines of the creeds of Christendom, such as the doctrine of an immanent Trinity, the Deity of Christ in any real metaphysical sense, the doctrine of the Two Natures of Christ, and of the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. Nor do we find any statement of the doctrine of Regeneration or of the entire work of the Holy Spirit in salvation.

Of course if these doctrines are without Scriptural basis they should be rejected. It is our belief, however, that they all have a secure basis in the teaching of Scripture.

But of course Professor Lewis does not accept the authority of Scripture in matters of doctrine. The "forms" in which the Scripture writers expressed their experience are the product of the thought of their time and untenable today. Moreover he finds the apostolic writers not in harmony among themselves. Thus he tells us (p. 86) that these writers do not offer the same "rationale" of Christ's power to save. Peter's sermons, he says, "are designed to show that Christ is Saviour *in spite* of the fact that he was put to death; whereas Paul makes him Saviour *because* of his death." But has Professor Lewis forgotten that Peter wrote that Christ "bore our sins in his own body on the tree"? (1 Peter ii. 24). Or does he suppose that Peter's preaching of Jesus as Messiah because of his resurrection, means that Peter meant that Christ saves *in spite* of his death? But why criticise this strange exegesis when the authority of Peter as a teacher is abandoned?

What then is the Christology of Professor Lewis? It is summed up in two "fundamentals." First, Jesus is Saviour. Second, Jesus is Lord. But when we enquire what he means my this, we find that the Lordship of Christ simply expresses the fact that Jesus is Saviour. And in the paragraph "Jesus is Saviour," we look in vain for any statement of how Christ saves. In a subsequent chapter, however, on the modern view of Jesus, which our author accepts, we find that the deity of Christ is simply an expression of his saving power, and his saving power consists chiefly in his teaching men their true relations to God and to one another. This is similar to the Ritschlian view, though the more recent Ritschlians have thought it best to abandon the term "deity" as applied to Jesus.

What, then, is our author's view of the Holy Spirit? Here also, he tells us, we have the problem of re-interpretation. And his reinterpretation is that "the Holy Spirit is, so to speak, a divine-human fusion. It is man knowing God, and God entering into the life of man" (p. 109). What a "divine-human fusion" is we do not know. But if one thing is evident in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in both Old and New Testaments, it is the clear way in which the Holy Spirit is kept distinct from the human spirit upon which He works.

We have not space to outline the author's conception of God. It is the thoroughly modern idea of "a Christ-like God" in which the incommunicable attributes of God are minimized, if not ignored. Nor can we stop to expound Professor Lewis' view of the relation of God to the world. It is that of an eternal and continuous creation coupled with the idea of theistic evolution.

Enough has been said to indicate the thoroughly "modernistic" and unscriptural character of the author's views. The book, however, is written in a simple, clear style, and without the turgid rhetoric which mars many of the books written from a similar standpoint by popular lecturers and preachers.

Princeton. C. W. HODGE.

America's Future Religion. By JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D., LL.D., President, Board of National Missions, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. New York, Chicago, London, and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1927. Pp. 160.

This book contains a series of special sermons delivered in the First Presbyterian Church of Detroit by the Pastor of the Church, who is the author of this little volume.

After stating his belief that a new day for religion is dawning (Chapter I), the author analyses the present religious conditions in America (Chapter II). He then gives his critical estimate of Roman Catholicism, Judaism and Protestantism in the three succeeding chapters, and concludes the volume with two chapters entitled respectively, "Speculations and Phrophecies," and "The Twentieth Century Christian."

The book is somewhat confusing to the reader, chiefly because the author exhibits all through it the anti-doctrinal attitude of modern liberalism, and yet at the same time proclaims at the outset the primacy of the intellect in religion. It is customary for those who take this anti-doctrinal attitude to dethrone the intellect. But if, as our author holds, the intellect must inform the feelings and guide the will, then we must have doctrine about God in religion, and doctrine about the Person and work of Christ in Christianity.

If this is so, then the question of the seat of authority in religious and Christian truth becomes the pressing question. To this question the author gives no clear or satisfactory answer. He rejects the evangelical Protestant doctrine of the authority of Scripture. He tells us that "there is a great dissatisfaction with present conventional ways of thinking. An age that flies through the air two hundred miles an hour, talks

across the spaces by wireless, and travels in safety below the tumultuous waves of the sea, cannot content itself with conceptions of God and life and destiny framed by a generation that travelled in ox-carts, and thought every word in the Bible must have been stenographically dictated to an amanuensis by God" (p. 122). In this brief and turgid sentence lie two amazing errors. One of these is the implication that the great Christian creeds and the great theological writers on Inspiration held and taught the mechanical or dictation theory. This is an error into which most opponents of the Church's doctrine of plenary inspiration have fallen. Let the author read Gaussen, or Lee, or Bannerman, or Kuyper, or Bavinck, or Warfield, and he will gain some historical knowledge that will save him in the future from such theological blunders.

But the difficulty lies deeper than the question of the Inspiration of Scripture. It is the question of Revelation—the fact that God speaks to us in the Scripture—that must be faced. Dr. Vance tells us (p. 136) that "whatever be its (*i.e.*, America's future) interpretation of his (Christ's) person and work, *it will have a supreme place for Jesus Christ.*" We doubt this prophecy. Even supposing that the Christian Church and the Creeds of Christendom had put a wrong interpretation upon the person and work of Christ, what about the interpretation of Paul and Peter and John and of our Lord Himself? The place which Jesus Christ will have in the life and thought of any nation will depend precisely upon the interpretation put upon His person and work. It is not Inspiration, it is the authority of Christ and the Apostles, of the Bible, as teachers of truth, that Dr. Vance calls in question. And what, we ask, does he put in place of the authority of Scripture? It is the mystical doctrine of the "inner light" which he erroneously identifies with the Reformers' doctrine of the Witness of the Spirit. It is true that in one place Dr. Vance states that the Spirit witnesses "through the Book." Nevertheless it is abundantly clear that his doctrine of the "inner light" differs *toto coelo* from the Reformers' doctrine of the Witness of the Spirit to the Bible. The latter taught that the Holy Spirit witnesses to our spirits, *through* the Bible, *to* its divine origin. Hence the Bible becomes the supreme and final authority in matters of doctrine because God speaks in it. Dr. Vance's doctrine of "the inner light," on the contrary, means not merely that each age must interpret the Bible for itself, but that the Bible's theological truths are not final or authoritative. That this is not a misrepresentation of his position is abundantly clear from the chapter on "Speculations and Prophecies," where, after raising the question whether the Cross will "lose its sacrificial character and become only a symbol of the love of God or of a martyr's devotion to his cause," and the question whether the Gospel will still carry a message of salvation, the author goes on to say that such questions will excite apprehension in the minds of some, or longings in the minds of others, but that "to the Christian with a really vital experience of the grace of God in Christ they will cause neither." That is to say, these questions which constitute the essence of Chris-

tianity are held by Dr. Vance to be matters of indifference. The doctrine of "the inner light" has led him into an anti-Christian mysticism. And yet at the same time he can write, in closing this chapter, a sentence which contradicts all that goes before, and to which we give our hearty assent—"The redemptive vitality of a Christianity that has the Bethlehem Manger and Calvary Cross and the Empty Tomb at its heart has never failed those who put their trust in it." No wonder the book is confusing!

A second mistake in the sentence first quoted, a sentence which expresses the trend of the book, is the idea that the advances in applied science which man has made have changed his fundamental religious needs as a sinner in relation to God. These needs never change; neither does the answer of God to these needs in His self-revelation ever change. Like Christ, the answer is the same yesterday, today and forever. Hence it may well be that an age which rides in ox-carts may know more about God and Christ than an age which flies through the air. This need not be so; it ought not to be so; but as a matter of fact, in spite of our intellectual advance in natural science, we are living in an age of intellectual decline in theology and hence in religion.

There are also a number of historical errors in this book which render it misleading to the uninstructed. We have space only to mention them. The exposition and criticism of Roman Catholicism is faulty. The doctrine of the Papacy is not its sole fault. It has a sacerdotal and unevangelical view of the plan of salvation. We are surprised, therefore, to find Dr. Vance applying the adjective "evangelical" to Romanism.

His idea of Calvinism is wholly inadequate and even mistaken. It was the doctrine of the Divine Majesty and Sovereignty that gave rise to democracy, not the modern idea of the universal Fatherhood of God. Dr. Vance omits the core of Calvinism and gives its by-products as its essence.

We have already mentioned the erroneous identification of the Church's doctrine of the inspiration of the Scripture with the mechanical or dictation theory, and his total misconception of the Reformed doctrine of the Witness of the Holy Spirit to the Bible.

There are many useful statistical data in this little book, but the errors and fundamental mistakes we have spoken of render it dangerous to the uninformed. It is a plea for a standpoint which happily is passing in some other countries, but unfortunately is still prevalent in America.

Princeton. C. W. HODGE.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Peter the Fisherman Philosopher. By JOHN MURDOCK MACINNIS, PH.D., D.LITT., Dean of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, California: The Biola Book Room. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 214. Price $1.50.

The basis for this discussion was a serious and searching study of the sermons and letters of the Apostle Peter. The teachings of the apostle

thus discovered have been reduced to a system and have been shown to constitute a sound and comprehensive philosophy of life. The various elements of this philosophy are set forth and discussed in terms of modern thought and are shown to be in accord with the soundest theories and most vital evangelical beliefs of the day.

The appeal of this philosophy consists in the fact that it expresses the experience of a great human soul; not that the experience of Peter created his doctrines, but it did give them power and life and it made him an authoritative interpreter of divine truth.

The value of his philosophy lies further in the facts that it was developed under the tuition of the supreme Personality of all time and that it was phrased in the language of the common people.

The central point in this philosophy is the conception of God as a living Father, active in the lives of all His children, and concerned with the very details of their lives. This God has a definite purpose and is building up a "spiritual house" in which His life can be unfolded and revealed. Disobedience to God is the source and cause of the sufferings and conflicts and discords of the world. Through men and to men God has been revealed and He has provided in Christ redemption from the hereditary bias and bondage of sin. Only through a company or body composed of redeemed individuals can the crying need of the world be met; only in such a company can the true life of man be realized. Pain and suffering are dark realities; their mystery can be solved partially in the light of another world, the influences and powers of which are not only future but constantly haunt the precincts and fill the spaces of this present life. Suffering is made the more tolerable in view of the love and wisdom of God, whose purposes are gracious and whose power can bring good out of evil. The endurance of fiery trials becomes possible because of the "great emancipation" which is assured in the life to come.

So too for the world itself. There is to be an age of glory and of gold. Toward this age as a divine goal human history is moving and all its processes will be brought to their culmination by a new manifestation of Christ.

Such in brief, is the message of this unusual book. The philosophy of life which it sets forth is summarized by the author in the following lines: "This world is God's world and He is active in it carrying out a purpose which included the making of men and women into His own image. To this end Jesus came, lived, died and rose again. In Him we have God and His ideals revealed, and through Him God seeks to reconcile men to His plan and reign. Through humanity's relation to Jesus, God is moving to the consummation of His purposes in a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Princeton. CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

If I Had Only One Sermon to Preach. Sermons by Twenty-one Ministers. Edited, with an Introduction, by DR. CHARLES STELZLE. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1927. Pages xiii, 319. Price $2.50.

It may seem somewhat of a precarious adventure for a preacher to set down just what he would say to his people if he had only one sermon to preach. Certainly, if such were ever to be the case, that sermon would become a very solemn responsibility and the preaching of it a most momentous opportunity. Some of these sermons, while good in themselves, do not impress us as if the authors had adequately sensed the specified conditions. We are far from assured that, with this dominating specification, some of the things stressed in this series are really the things to emphasize. We pastors do not always preach on the most vital themes. But if our next sermon were to be our only one, our last one, our most important one, then the whole case would be different. We should say in that sermon the thing most necessary for our hearers to know. Even where the widest range is given under the above condition, it is difficult to see just why Jewish nationality should be held out as the *summum bonum,* as Rabbi Harrison has done in his sermon; or that the perpetual sacrifice of the Mass is the one thing in Christianity to which all minds should be directed, as Cardinal O'Connell does. Nor are we sure that the otherwise excellent sermon of Dr. Fosdick on "The Curse of Cynicism," Mr. James M. Gallis's article on "What Is Religion?", or even Bishop Brent's "The Call to Unity," would be our idea of the first thing to preach. When, on the other hand, Dr. Atkins points to Christ as the way, the truth, and the life; or Dr. Jenkins portrays Christ as the same yesterday, today, and forever; when Dr. James I. Vance defends Christ's Deity; and Dr. Charles E. Jefferson says "Behold the Man!"; when Bishop Warren A. Chandler presents the physical resurrection of Christ as a necessity of our faith, then we are brought very close to the imponderables that are pivotal.

Homiletically judged, some of these are strictly not sermons at all. We confess to a little curiosity as to what some of the others, not selected for publication, dwelt upon. Speaking frankly, if we had to make a choice from these twenty-one, we should select three: Dr. James I. Vance, "Is Jesus God?"; Bishop Warren A. Chandler, "Incontestable Fact and Indispensable Truth"; and Dr. Robert Freeman, "The Gods Ye Have Chosen."

In such a theological medley, of course, there is much to question. Assuredly, when you have Unitarian Jew, Sacramentarian Romanist, Rationalistic and Conservative Protestant, each writing his one, outstanding "sermon." This inevitable variety is one of the marked features of the book. One must be prepared to be surprised, if not actually shocked. Overlooking the crass transubstantiation of Cardinal O'Connell, and Rabbi Harrison's inadequate defense of Judaism as a preferable faith to Christianity, we would not care to recommend either the conclusions or the argumentation of some of the others, although we know they invade fields that are more or less debatable. For example: John Haynes Holmes, of the Community Church, New York, discusses "What Is a Religious Life?" in what would appear a better editorial or modern magazine article than a sermon. This one is far from being a good sample of this series. It does stand out, however. The religious life is

very properly distinguished from the moral life. It is more than ethics. And yet the writer goes no farther than a fervid humanitarianism. He places St. Francis of Assisi next to Christ (a very questionable procedure), and makes Mahatma Ghandi of India "preëminently the universal man of our time" (p. 86); calls Jesus "the outstanding non-resistant of all time" (p. 89); says that "if we would be religious, in the truest sense of the word, we must know no creed or class, no race or country, but only the family of humankind" (p. 88); and dogmatically asserts that a rich man cannot be religious, if Jesus, Francis, and Ghandi are right (p. 80). Surely, in such statements there is need of a sane mind to separate the wheat and the chaff.

Two of these sermons contain pleas for Christian unity, both of them by Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. Bishop James E. Freeman, of Washington, D.C., has a fine message on "The Greatest Story Ever Told." The religious upheavals of our day have apparently wearied this bishop, who says, "A tired and disillusioned world is a-weary of all our speculations and negations." "In the midst of a condition that literally imperils our Christian civilization there is no room for the controversialist, no time for the discussion of those questions that tend to strife and division" (pp. 194-196). He adds that people have come to believe that "in Christ alone and His teachings" are to be found the cure for all our ills and distresses. But what if it happens that, as many honest Christians think, we have fallen upon a day when it is these very teachings of Christ that are most seriously imperilled? What if this is the field now invaded by the enemy, and the peril insufficiently sensed by many equally honest Christians? The persons who feel this way may be wrong, or they may be right. But what if they are right? Whether controversy is an asset to the Church or a liability, depends on what it is about. Needless haggling over trifling non-essentials, doubtless what Dr. Freeman means by "the niceties of creedal expression," may not be the best thing for the Church, but positive reactions against trends of thought and policies that strike at the essential and fundamental content of the Christian Faith, are inevitable. Perhaps, in the long run, the best way to end a controversy is to meet it, with all Christian courage, humility, and forbearance.

Bishop Charles H. Brent's sermon on "The Call to Unity" was the opening sermon at the World Conference on Faith and Order, preached in the Cathedral of Lausanne, Switzerland, August, 1927. Over these sessions Bishop Brent presided. It is not the purpose of this article to discuss this Conference. Premature conclusions as to its abiding value to the Church are scarcely the part of sagacity. Apparently "there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed." Bishop Brent admits that there may be "occasions where controversy may be necessary" (p. 311), but he held that they were there for conference, not controversy. However, in discussing their unities, it was inevitable that their specific differences should be honestly stated, too. That was the method of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), and has been the necessary method of every church council since. Knowing that Bishop Brent is an ex-missionary,

nevertheless we would not want to say so boldly as he does that "The hundred missionary societies in China today are as suicidal for Christianity as the civil divisions are to her national peace and prosperity" (p. 314). And yet, he sees that issues must be squarely faced: "our own conception of Christ, the nature of the Church, God's method of governing His Church, the substance of the Gospel message. Christology may not be slighted. The value of theology must be admitted. The history of Christianity must be studied, if we are to get anywhere" (pp. 316-317). Such frank admissions as these impress us as being a more hopeful *modus operandi* than the all too common sweeping disregard of convictions deeply-rooted in the souls of men and women.

Four other sermons in this series are also worthy of special mention: "The Triune Entirety of the Christian Revelation," by Dr. Gaius Glenn Atkins; "Twin Perils," by Dr. Daniel A. Poling; "The One-Thing Man," by Dr. Frederick F. Shannon; and "Aware of the Eternal," by Dr. William L. Stiger. One must remember that this is a somewhat cosmopolitan group of religious writers. It would be just as easy to make a very different selection. All in all, however, they are stimulating and suggestive, cover a wide range of subjects, present a varied homiletic, and touch chords generally helpful. But it is at once significant and ominous that a minister prominent in a denomination which professes to be strictly evangelical (the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.) should invite Jew, Romanist and Unitarian to contribute to a volume entitled "If I Had Only One Sermon to Preach."

Lancaster, Ohio. BENJAMIN F. PAIST.

God's World and Word: Addresses for Today. By NEAL L. ANDERSON, D.D. Chicago, New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This little book of 160 pages by the minister of the Independent Presbyterian Church of Savannah, Georgia, consists of twelve sermons which constitute "a cross-section of the preaching of a busy pastor and the reaction of such a ministry to the problems that confront earnest-minded men and women today." Its content and scope is indicated by the titles of the individual sermons—God's Wonder World; Evolution as a Science and as a Philosophy; Christ's Interpretation of God; The Foundation of Faith; Christ's Method of Dealing with the Sinner; Christ's Method of Dealing with the Moralist; The Law's Failure; The New Freedom; Christian Liberty Limited by Love; Visions and Visionaries; What God Can Do with a Man; The Peace of God and the God of Peace. In the words of its author "they are the messages of one whose convictions are immovably anchored in the truth of God's Word, but whose mind is open to the changes through which humanity is passing, and who seeks to translate the old Gospel into the terminology of a new age."

We have found much to commend in these sermons. They are short, pithy, up-to-date, and exhibit an intense interest not only in the Christian message but in the men and women to whom that message is addressed. We have nothing but praise for his effort to express the

old Gospel in the language of today. Every worth-while preacher does that. We cannot say, however, that, in our judgment, Dr. Anderson is very successful in showing that there is no contradiction between God's Word in His world and God's Word in His Book. In fact, if we mistake not, he shows too much of a tendency to effect this reconciliation at the expense of God's Word in the Bible rather than His word in the world. He is particularly concerned to make clear that there is no contradiction between Evolution and the teachings of the Bible. We have no quarrel with him when he condemns those who say, "There is nothing to Evolution"; but while we have no disposition to deny that there is truth in Evolution we are far from supposing that it expresses the whole truth. More especially we do not think that such miraculous facts as the Incarnation, Atonement, and the Resurrection, not to mention others, can be made to fit into a thorough-going evolutionary scheme of things. It is nothing to the point to call attention to the wonders and mysteries of nature because miracles, that are truly such, while they are mysteries are much more than mysteries. To subsume miracles under mysteries is in fact to explain them away. Secondary causes are adequate for the production of mysteries; they are not adequate for the production of a miracle; that requires an immediate act on the part of God. We too hold that there is no contradiction between Science and the Christian Faith but that is not to say there is no contradiction between the Christian Faith and the teaching of present-day scientists. Present-day scientists speak only half truths or at most three-quarters truths. Only when scientists speak the whole truth, and when the Christian Faith itself is fully understood, will it be clear to all that there is no contradiction between Science and the Christian Faith. Until that day arrives, however, conflict is more or less inevitable and unavoidable.

While Dr. Anderson's language is often loose and rhetorical rather than scientifically exact, and while as a consequence it is sometimes rather difficult to know just what his position is, yet it seems to us that in his desire to show that faith is independent of the theories of science and philosophy he comes near to falling, if indeed he does not actually fall, into an anti-intellectualism that would logically lead to skepticism. For while the Christian faith rests on its own foundation and is buttressed by its own independent arguments, this should never be interpreted as meaning that we can be Christians in the sphere of religion no matter what convictions we hold in the spheres of science and philosophy. No doubt our author would largely agree with the statement just made, but we fear that he does not adequately realize the need of a Christian apologetic that meets the non-Christian scientists and philosophers on their own ground. His attitude toward controversy is hardly that of Christ and His apostles, or of the heroes of the faith in all ages.

The strength of this book, in our judgment, lies in its positive proclamation of the Gospel of the Grace of God, with special reference to the liberty wherewith it has made us free. As an apologetic for that

Gospel, however, it seems to us inadequate and unconvincing, to say the least.

Princeton. S. G. CRAIG.

Ministerial Life and Work. By Rev. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 1927. Pp. 236.

Before his death it was the intention of Dr. Thomas to re-arrange his book, *The Work of the Ministry* (that book is still used), which was based on lectures given for five years at Wycliffe College, Oxford, and eliminate material that belonged strictly to the Church of England. This work has now been done by Mrs. Thomas and her daughter, and the older title changed to the one given above. It is used as a text book at Dallas Seminary and it cannot be excelled for that purpose. Dr. Thomas has a true, exalted and inspiring idea of the ministry because he has the Holy Spirit's idea as revealed in the Scriptures. This is what we would expect from him. And he has presented his material not only clearly, which is characteristic of his method, but with an appropriate and charming devoutness. It contains a wealth of material for heart-warming Bible study on the various aspects of the subject. It contributes to the spiritual life of the minister who studies it.

The book is divided into two parts: the Man and the Work. It reviews the ministry of the prophets, of the apostles, and of the pastoral epistles, and tells what a call to the ministry is, according to the Bible. There is a full and helpful chapter on Preaching, but there is too little on Prayer. There is a brief and spiritually suggestive chapter on Visitation. It is good to see a few pages on Personal Work with individuals. The outline of what to teach to a Communicant Class is very good and trustworthy. In fact this may be said of the whole book. It will help to train the heart-enflamed, Christ-honoring men we ought to have, and that are made only by a deep experience of redeeming grace. Its appeal is to the heart and conscience, and makes one want to be a better man. It is full of splendid material and worth-while quotations.

With its constant analysis into heads and sub-heads the book is a little hard to read. One longs sometimes to follow the author's exhortations straight on at greater length. But Dr. Thomas says himself that he means the book for suggestive study. And indeed the result is not so much the mind of Dr. Thomas, even out of his fine experience, but the mind of God in the Scriptures. And it is that which gives it a rather unique value. For as Dr. Thomas tells us: "The minister's attitude to the Bible determines all else. The Bible must be our Fount of Doctrine; its authority our deciding factor, its Life our ideal, and its Grace our dynamic. The mind must be saturated with its truth, the heart inspired by its love, the conscience made sensitive to its law. Then, then only, then always, will our life be fragrant and our ministry fruitful to the glory of God." And the theme of the Bible is Christ: "'For Christ,' is the talisman that opens every door. 'In Christ,' is the guarantee of grace sufficient for every task." It is to be hoped that this book will be extensively used by Christian ministers.

Burlington, N.J. FRANK LUKENS.

The Advantage of a Handicap. By Rev. M. S. Rice. New York: Abingdon Press.

These sermons are by the Pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church of Detroit with a common theme—the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation. The title is taken from the first of twelve sermons. They are sound and deeply spiritual with no attempt at the fantastic or extreme in exegesis.

Elkins Park, Pa. Richard Montgomery.

GENERAL LITERATURE

Egyptian Papyri and Papyrus Hunting. By James Baikie, F.R.A.S., Author of "A Century of Excavation in Egypt," "The Life of the Ancient East," "The Sea-Kings of Crete," etc. With thirty-two illustrations of which four in colour are by Constance N. Baikie, New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 324.

The present volume was foreshadowed, the author reminds us, in the preface to his *A Century of Excavation in Egypt,* where it was explained that discussion of the papyri was omitted owing to the magnitude of the subject, which made separate treatment essential. So impressed, indeed, is the author with the vastness of the field to which he seeks to introduce the reader, that he assures him that not even the present volume can treat the subject adequately, that "its only merit lies in the fact that it presents its reader with samples of the wealth of an almost inexhaustible treasure-house which is open to his pillaging." On the other hand, despite his enthusiastic interest in the papyri, the author is careful not to raise the expectations of the reader too high. Thus, in discussing the funerary papyri he quotes Steindorff's statement that "quite nine-tenths of the Egyptian writings preserved to us were devoted to some religious purpose, and that of the remaining tenth the bulk contains more or less information on religion" (p. 183). Then he adds the needed word of caution: "The student of Egyptian religion, who imagines from the enormous bulk of the literature that he is going to be in an exceptionally favorable position to study the faith of a race which has left such ample record of its beliefs, is doomed to early disappointment. He speedily finds that the great bulk of what he reads is merely a repetition, wearisomely monotonous in its literalism, of what he has already read fifty times before; and that the little which seems to have some novelty about it is absolutely incomprehensible to him, and, from the glosses upon it of the ancient priests, was evidently quite as incomprehensible to them. In fact, the actual amount of solid information as to Egyptian religious beliefs and practices which can be derived from the extant mass of papyri is almost in inverse proportion to the bulk of it" (p. 184). The papyri are of great value and interest but we must be careful not to expect too much from them.

The contents of the papyri is as varied as the size. The Great Harris Papyrus of the age of Ramses III is one hundred and thirty-three feet

long; it is a funerary papyrus and recites "all the good deeds of the dead king towards the gods, a statement to be put in on his behalf before the judgment-seat of Osiris" (p. 71). Another contains nearly all of the second book of the *Iliad*. On the other hand the fragments of Menander and Pindar, of which a picture is given, are so brief and illegible as to be of little value, save as an indication of what may some day be discovered. The Poem of Pentaur, the Adventures of Wenamon, the Book of the Dead, are all well known, and are discussed at some length. An interesting group of papyri is that dealing with the trials of tomb robbers. Thus the Abbott Papyrus records "the inquiry which took place in the sixteenth year of Ramses IX into the alleged violations of royal tombs, with the findings of the court of inspection." That the robbing of tombs had become an industry, as we may call it, more than three thousand years ago, will be a surprise to many, notwithstanding the elaborate discussions of the tomb of Tutankhamen which have appeared in the newspapers and popular journals in recent months.

We agree with Mr. Baikie that the miscellaneous documents and letters are of especial interest. It is interesting to find in the Oxyrhynchus papyri a dinner invitation in the following form: "Chaeremon requests your company at dinner at the table of the lord Serapis tomorrow, the fifteenth, at nine o'clock." Another, a contract of apprenticeship, tells us that a certain Thonis, a minor, is to be bound over to learn the art of weaving, the period of indenture being five years. He is to receive wages only after his period of apprenticeship is half over, but he is to be given a new tunic each year, and is to have "twenty holidays in the year on account of festivals without any deduction from his wages after the payment of wages begins." The letter of Hilarion at Alexandria to his wife Alis at Oxyrhynchus is noteworthy because of the fact that this "affectionate husband" as our author rightly, we think, describes him, does not hesitate to instruct his wife in case a child should be born to them in his absence to preserve it alive if it is a male, but to expose it if a female, a command which recalls the order issued many centuries before to the Hebrew midwives by Pharaoh king of Egypt.

No discussion of the papyri would be complete, of course, without some reference to the Logia or Sayings of Jesus Christ. Our author, while fully alive to the importance of these fragments, is impressed with their inferiority to our canonical Gospels. We quote his words regarding a fragment of a Gospel also found in Oxyrhynchus as they sum up his estimate of these much discussed documents: "Here again we have thoughts which are plainly in line with the general thought of Jesus, but which have lost all the point and freshness which once marked them when they fell from His lips, by reason of the verbosity with which the later transmitter of them deemed it necessary to adorn them. Yet this passage, with the others, has its own wonderful interest as showing the character of that mass of traditional lore about the life and words of our Saviour which was current during the early Christian centuries, and formed, no doubt, a useful supplement to the simpler narrative of the

canonical Gospels, and a far from despicable aid to the formation of a picture of Jesus."

The book is well written, finely illustrated and will serve as an admirable guide to anyone wishing to acquaint himself with this interesting phase of archaeological research.

Princeton. OSWALD T. ALLIS.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Church Monthly, New York, October: J. G. H. BARRY, An Orthodox Modernist; JOHN C. MCKIM, Is the Foreign Missionary Still Needed in Japan?; C. H. PALMER, The New English Prayer Book; MAY L. BROSE, Catholicism in Quebec. *The Same,* November: C. H. PALMER, The World Conference on Faith and Order; GRANVILLE M. WILLIAMS, Psychology and the Confessional. *The Same,* December: J. G. H. BARRY, An Eighteenth Century Prelate; LOUIS FOLEY, Christmas under the Crescent; FREDERICK D. GRAVES, The Christmas Mystery.

American Journal of Philology, Baltimore, October: F. A. WOOD, Greek Fish Names; EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY, Verbal Homeopathy and the Etymological Story; E. H. STURTEVANT, Notes on Plautus's Mostellaria; SARA J. RYAN, Comparative Fluidity of the French and the Greek Epics; ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE, Tiberius and Thrasyllus.

Anglican Theological Review, Lancaster, October: FRANCIS J. HALL, Reunion and the Roman See; G. G. KULLMAN, Karl Barth and the Barthian Movement; THEODORE B. FOSTER, Are Creeds Out of Date?; CHARLES L. STREET, Behaviorism and Utilitarianism.

Bibliotheca Sacra, St. Louis, October: JESSE JOHNSON, Early Theological Education West of the Alleghenies; JOHN E. KUIZENGA, The Larger View of Conversion; O. LUNEBERGER, Amos, the Preacher of the Gospel of Law; A. LINCOLN SHUTE, The Battle of Beth-Horon; CHARLES E. SMITH, Is there a Missing Chapter in the Life of Christ?; GERRIT H. HOSPERS, The Testimony of the Holy Spirit: its Nature and Bearings.

Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, Toronto, Sept.-Oct.: O. R. SELLERS, Moses as an Egyptian Magician; W. H. SMITH, Christ and Creed; JAMES W. FALCONER, Religion and Art; RICHARD ROBERTS, Baron Friederich von Hügel; F. W. W. DES BARRES, Greek Influence in Palestine; D. L. RITCHIE, Christian Experience and Theology. *The Same,* Nov.-Dec.: T. ALBERT MOORE, Impressions of Lusanne Conference; A. S. TUTTLE, Approaches to Reality; T. B. KILPATRICK, Value of the Sacraments; W. G. JORDAN, French Modernism; W. A. IRWIN, Old Testament Translation.

Catholic Historical Review, Washington, October: EDITH M. ALMEDINGEN, Catholic Church of the Early North; LAWRENCE M. FLICK, Gallitzen; F. E. TOURSCHER, Catholic Historical Scholarship in the United States; ST. ALBAN KITE, William Penn and the Catholic Church in America.

Church Quarterly Review, London, October: FRIEDRICH HEILER, A Lutheran Review of Anglo-Catholicism; T. A. LACEY, Original Sin and the Fall; S. ADDLESHAW, Modern Novels and Christian Morals; FRANK L. NORRIS, China and the World Call; CHARLES GARDNER, The Religion of William Blake.

Congregational Quarterly, London, October: B. L. WOOLF, The Authority of the Risen Lord; SYDNEY CAVE, Recent Study of St. Paul; J. G. MACKENZIE, Pastoral Psychology and Its Technic; The Oxford Congregational Conference on "The Christian Faith in the Light of Modern Criticism and Science."

Crozer Quarterly, Philadelphia, October: R. E. E. HARKNESS, Present-Day Methods and Aims of Church History; JOHN T. VICHERT, The Minister as Priest; H. F. HUSE, Number, Miracle, and God; I. G. MATTHEWS, A Visit to the Land of the Pharaohs; JOHN CROSBY, The Thondraketzi of Pennsylvania.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, October: H. WHEELER ROBINSON, The Holy Spirit in the Bible; H. J. FLOWERS, Adoption and Redemption of the Beloved; W. BARTLETT, St. Paul and the Twelve. The Same, November: N. P. WILLIAMS, Present-Day Faiths—Anglo-Catholicism; HENRY LOEWE, The Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy; EDWARD GRUBB, Meaning of "Salvation"; JOHN W. CLAYTON, Who was the Rich Young Ruler? *The Same,* December: HUBERT PERNOT, Greek and the Gospels; F. J. RAE, A New Idea in Religious Education; C. J. CADOUX, Judaism and Universalism in the Gospels.

Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, October: GEORGE LA PIANA, Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire.

Homiletic Review, New York, October: WM. J. MUTCH, Construing the World Spiritually—A Reactionary or a Progressive World; ANTHONY CLYNE, Croce, the Philosopher of Italy; R. E. TROSPECT, The Lessons of Seven Years; S. PAUL WEAVER, Sermons from Dante's Purgatorio; L. L. POTTHOFF, A Layman's Concept of the Ministry. *The Same,* November: WILLIAM J. MUTCH, Construing the World Spiritually—A Dead or a Living Universe; The Peril of too much Preaching; CHARLES M. ADAMS, Getting off on the Right Foot; The Future of Missions in China. *The Same,* December: WILLIAM J. MUTCH, Construing the World Spiritually—A Material or a Spiritual Realm; H. JEFFS, Drama of the Parables—The Rich Man and the Beggar.

Jewish Quarterly Review, Philadelphia, October: ISRAEL EFROS, Studies in pre-Tibbonian Philosophical Terminology; ABRAHAM DANON, Documents Relating to the History of the Karaites in European Turkey.

Journal of Religion, Chicago, October: WILLIAM C. BOWER, The Curriculum as Enriched and Controlled Experience; CHESTER C. MCCOWN, Climate and Religion in Palestine; WALTER M. HORTON, The Objective Element in the Experience of God; DONALD W. RIDDLE, Message of the Shepherd of Hermas; WILLIAM W. SWEET, Some Religious Aspects of the Kansas Struggle; FRANK EAKIN, Interpretation of Scripture.

Journal of Theological Studies, London, October: C. H. Turner, Western Readings in the second half of Mark's Gospel; C. H. Turner, Did Codex Vercellensis contain the last twelve verses of Mark?; A. C. Clark, Michigan Fragment of the Acts; E. A. Lowe, An uncial manuscript of Mutianus in the collection of A. Chester Beatty; A. D. Nock, A note on the Ep. ad Diognetum x:1.

London Quarterly Review, London, October: W. T. Davison, A notable Modern Mystic; Alfred E. Garvie, World Unity through Christ; John Telford, Our Foreign Secretaries; John A. Faulkner, Apostolic Lord's Suppers; W. J. Ferrar, Modern View of God.

Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, October: Charles M. Jacobs, Approach to the Study of Theology; C. Theodore Benze, Visions of the Spiritual World; Henry Offermann, Studies in the Gospel of Matthew, 6:7-15; C. B. Schuchard, Critical Estimate of Henry Melchior Muehlenberg.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, October: H. M. Snyder, Church and Social Psychology; Martin Schroeder, Modern Problems of Church and State; Miles H. Krumbine, The Struggle between Church and State in Mexico; R. M. Dunkelberger, The Indigenous Church on the Foreign Mission Field.

Missionary Review of the World, New York, October: Samuel M. Zwemer, Moslem Life in Rumania and Bulgaria; S. D. Gordon, The Ceaseless Inner Urge; P. Whitwell Wilson, Why Christian Missions?; C. G. S. Mylrea, Seventeen Years on the Persian Gulf; Sadhu Sundar Singh, Tests of the Spiritual Life. The Same, November: Daniel J. Fleming, At the Institute of Pacific Relations; Paul W. Harrison, A Medical Trip to Kateef, Arabia; Mrs. Joseph P. Cochran, Among the Assyrians of Persia; Arthur J. Brown, Have Christians a Vital Message?; C. M. Spining, New Opportunities in Chile. *The Same,* December: R. P. Wilder, Early Days of the Review; Allen R. Bartholomew, Mission Boards Fifty Years Ago; Arthur H. Smith, Fifty Years of Protestant Missions in China; Stephen J. Corey, The Missionary Appeal Fifty Years Ago; John A. Marquis, Half Century of Progress in Home Missions.

Monist, Chicago, October: A. K. Wadia, Philosophy and Religion; R. W. Sellars, Current Realism in Great Britain and the United States; C. O. Weber, Reality of Time and the Autonomy of History; W. A. Shimer, Evolution of Relativity; W. H. Johnston, Hegel and Freud.

Moslem World, New York, October: Samuel M. Zwemer, Islam in South Eastern Europe; Louis Massignon, Islam in the United Soviet Socialist Republics; Lee Vrooman, Recent Tendencies in Turkish Education; Ernest Pye, The Oneness of the Near East; Among the Turks in Cyprus; Ivan Gantcheff, The Bible and Islam in Bulgaria; Dr. Freytag, German Missions in the Balkans.

New Church Life, Lancaster, October: Hugo Lj. Odhner, Swedenborg under the Scrutiny of Modern Literary Criticism; Alice E. Grant, New Church Work on Mythology. *The Same,* November: R. J. Tilson, The Vanishing Shadows of the Word; Arthur Carter, The

Druids. *The Same,* December: Albert Bjorck, The Visible God of the Heavens.

Open Court, Chicago, October: Ernest G. Braham, Spinoza and Immortality; Robert P. Richardson, Transubstantiation in Ecclesiastical Philosophy; A. Kampmeier, Actual History of the Origin of Judaism and Christianity in a Nutshell; Bolling Somerville, Humane Religion. *The Same,* November: W. G. Blaikie Murdock, Aesthetic Philosophy of Japan; T. B. Stork, The Unbelief of the Unbeliever; F. Lincoln Hutchins, Through Science up to God, or Cosmology; Curtis W. Reese, The Outlook for Religion. *The Same,* December: Jonathan Wright, Religious Factors of Science; J. V. Nash, "Nature of the World and of Man"; Edward B. Hill, Idea of God; Bruce W. Brotherston, Moral Origins and the Nub of Ethics; Wm. Weber, The Burial of Jesus.

Review and Expositor, Louisville, October: Frederick C. Spurr, The Great Name; A. L. Vail, A Tentative Meditation on the Sufferings of God; Owen P. Eaches, Sufficiency of the Holy Spirit; A. D. Belden, The Atonement and Democracy; J. Ellwood Welsh, Christ and Our Social Disorders; P. V. Ivanof-Klishnikof, The Experiences of a New Convert; H. T. Flowers, Christ's Doctrine of God.

Yale Review, New Haven, October: Virgil Jordan, Stabilizing National Prosperity; Evans Lewin, Africa in the Twentieth Century; Stanley T. Williams, Letters of Washington Irving; William A. Brown, New Signs in Religion.

Biblica, Roma, Octobri: B. Alfrink, Die Gadd'sche Chronik und die Heilige Schrift; L. Keimer, Eine Bemerkung zu Amos 7:14; P. Joüon, Notes philologiques sur le texte hébreu de Genèse; A. Allgeier, Die Hexapla in den Palmenübersetzungen des heiligen Hieronoymous; A. Allgeier, Sclussbemerkungen zum Gebrauch der Hexapla bei Hieronymous.

Bilychnis, Roma, Ottobre: A. Fasulo, La riforma in Inghilterra. Origne e sviluppo del movimento wesleyano; C. Formichi, Religioni dell'India. *The Same,* Novembre: E. Troilo, Un filosofo dalmata: G. Politeo; P. D'Ambrosio, La crisi dello spirito contemporaneo; J. Evola, Il valore dell'occultismo nella cultura contemporanea; C. Formichi, Religioni dell'Iran. *The Same,* Dicembre: S. Minocchi, Gesù fanciullo; E. Namer-E. Troilo, Il problema della materia in G. Bruno e l'interpretazione di F. Tocco.

Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique, Toulouse, Novembre-Decembre: Germain Breton, Bossuet homme d'étude; Xavier Decros, La traduction syriaque du commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur l'évangile selon saint Jean.

Ciencia Tomista, Madrid, Noviembre-Diciembre: Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, Cronologia de das Lecturas y de las Relecciones del maestro Vitoria; José D. Gafo, La situacion en España; A. Fernandez, Vota solemnia religionis eorumque dispensabilitas secundum S. Thomam.

Estudis Franciscans, Barcelona Octubre: Miquel d'Esplugues, La meravellosa perennitat del "Poverello"; Matthaeus a Coronata, De

natura seu vi iuridica concordatorum; ROMUALD DE PALMA, L'optimisme cristià i les seves bases; LÉANDRE DE SESMA, La volonté dans la philosophie de Duns Scot.

Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses, Montpellier, Novembre: CH. BRUSTON, Le Chant de Debora; ROBERT PONT, Le Renouveau spiritualiste et l'inquiétude de notre temps; GEORGES BOIS, Le Cult des ancétres en Extrême-Orient et le Christianisme.

Foi et Vie, Paris, Octobre: G. LIEGME, Psychothérapie et vie spirituelle; EDOUARD ALAIRE, Valéry liturge; PAUL DOUMERGUE, Paraboles de la vie; ALBERT FINET, Un camp d'éclaireurs; RAOUL GOUT, Sainte Douceline, béguine proveçale. *The Same,* Novembre: PAUL DOUMERGUE, Le symbole de la tortue; EDOUARD ALAIRE, Valéry liturgie; PAUL DOUMERGUE, L' "interesse" et celui qui a une âme; DR. LIENGME, Psychothérapie et vie spirituelle. *The Same,* Decembre: PAUL DOUMERGUE, Trépidation; PAUL ARBOUSSE-BASTIDE, Notes sur un voyage on Allemagne; RENÉ HERDT, L'arbre de Noël; DOMINIQUE RENOUARD, Histoire vraie pour le jour de Noël des enfants heureux.

Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, Aalten, October: P. N. KRUYSWIJK, De onderscheiding tusschen zuivere en valsche mystiek; G. KEIZER, Uit den overgangstijd binnen het ressort van de Neder-Veluwsche Classis. *The Same,* November: J. H. BAVINCK, Jets over de psychologie der religie; P. N. KRUYSWIJK, De onderscheiding tusschen zuivre en valsche mystiek, ii; G. KEIZER, Uit den overgangstijd binnen het ressort van de Neder-Veluwsche Classis. *The Same,* December: J. THIJS, De Christologie bij de Jong-Modernen: J. RIDDERBOS, Hosea's bestraffing der leidslieden.

Logos, Napoli, Anno X; 3: A. ALIOTTA, L'irrazionalismo contemporanea; L. BANDINI, Bene, virtu e "senso morale" nello Shaftesbury; E. DI CARLO, Intorno ad alcuni scritti ignorati di Pasquale Gulluppi; A. MARUCCI, Il progresso e l'educazione della volontà.

Nieuwe Theologische Studiën, Wageningen, November: TH. L. HAITJEMA, Philosophie van't "alsof" en theologie van't "nochtans"; A. VANVELDHUIZEN, Encyklopedieën en woordenboeken voor predikanten. *The Same,* December: B. GEMSER, Conjecturen bij het boek der Spreuken; G. VAN DER LEEUW, Literatuuroverzicht Godsdienstgeschiedenis: A. VAN VELDHUIZEN, Paulus; TH. L. W. VAN RAVESTEYN, Om en het Oude Testament.

Onder Eigen Vaandel, Wageningen, October: TH. L. HAITJEMA, De veiligheid des geloofs; J. C. S. LOCHER, Vrije wil en praedestinatie in de zestiende eeuw; L. J. VAN LEEUWEN, Denken en voorstellen; P. J. KROMSIGHT, Het kerkbegrip van Calvijn.

Recherches de Science Religieuse, Paris, Octobre: JULES LEBRETON, Le Père Léonce de Grandmaison; JACQUES DE BLIC, Le Péchè originel selon saint Augustin, ii. *The Same,* Decembre: GUSTAVE BARDY, L'Église Romaine sous le Pontificat de saint Anicet; JACQUES DE BLIC, Le Péchè originel selon saint Augustin (suite).

Revue d'Ascetique et de Mystique, Toulouse, Octobre: J. DE GUIBERT, L'Appel a la contemplation infuse; GAETAN DU S. NOM DE MARIE,

Saint Paul de la Croix Maitre de la Vie spirituelle; P. DEBONGNIE, Une Oeuvre Oubliée de Mauburnus: le *Rosarum Hortulus.*

Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiatique, Louvain, Octobre: P. BATIFFOL, La Liturgie du sacre des évêques dans son évolution historique; L. GOUGAUD, Étude sur l'*Ordo Monasticus* de Culross.

Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, Strasbourg, Sept.-Oct: P. ALPHANDÉRY, Le gnosticisme dans les sectes médiévales latines; EDV. LEHMANN, Un mot qui manque (A propos du "Petit catéchisme" de Luther); R. WILL, La liturgie luthérienne. *The Same,* Nov.-Dec.: PAUL HUMBERT, La génie d'Israël; GEORG BERTRAM, Le chemin sur les eaux considéré comme motif de salut dans la piété chrétienne primitive; JEAN BARUZI, Un moment de la lutte contre le protestantisme et l'illuminisme en Espagne au XVI siècle.

Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne, Aout-Dec.: EMILE LOMBARD, L'ordinaire et l'extraordinaire; CLAUDE SECRÉTAN, L'atomisme devant l'opinion scientifique; LOUIS AUBERT, Les Psaumes dan le culte d'Israël; MAURICE GEX, Esprits objectifs et esprits subjectifs.

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques, Paris, Octobre: R. BERNARD, Mater divinae gratiae; L. DENIS, La question des Universaux d'apres Jean de Salisbury; M.-D. CHENU, Notes de lexicographie philosophique médiévale.

Scholastik, Freiburg, 2:4: ALFRED FEDER, Der Semipelagianismus im Schriftstellerkatalog des Gennadius von Marseille; AUGUST MERK, Bibel und Bulle Sixtus' V; KASPAR NINK, Die Wesenheiten der Dinge und ihre Erkenntnis.

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 51:4: Innsbruck: F. SCHLAGENHAUFEN, Der geistige Charakter der jüdischen "Reichs"-Erwartung; H. GRISAR, Die römische Märtyrin Agnes; J. BIEDERLACK, Das Verhältnis von Kirche u. Staat bei Franz vom Vitoria; A. GATTERER, Aus der Welt des neueren Okkultismus.

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, Gotha, 46:3: E. CASPAR, Kleine Beiträge zur älteren Papstgeschichte; W. VÖLKER, Studien zur päpstlichen Vikariatspolitik im 5 Jahrhundert; B. ALTANER, Zur Beurteiling der Persönlichkeit und der Entwicklung der Ordensidee des hl. Dominikus; K. MÜLLER, Noch ein Wort zu Luthers letzter Krankheit und Tod; W. NIESEL, Calvin wider Osiander Rechtfertigungslehre; TH. WOTSCHKE, Eine verschollene Geschichte des Pietismus.

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Tubingen, 8:5: KURT STAVENHAGEN, Offenbarung und die Erlebnistheologie; JOACHIM WACH, Idee und Realität in der Religionsgeschichte; WILHELM THIMME, Gottesgedanke und schlechtinniges Abhängigkeitsgefühl in Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre; RUDOLF PAULUS, Zur Philosophie und Religion des deutschen Idealismus. *The Same,* 8:6: PAUL TILLICH, Die Idee der Offenbarung; CAJUS FABRICUS, Christliche Ethik: Leitsätze von Julius Kaftan; MARTIN ALBERTZ, Geschichtsmystik oder Schicksalserfüllung?; KURT PLACHTE, Die Idee der Gemeinschaft.

THE WORK OF THE PASTOR

By Charles R. Erdman, D.D., LL.D. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 1924, 8vo, pp. vii. 257.

"This volume is intended to serve as a handbook to pastors and as a textbook for students of theology. It should be found helpful, however, to many others who are concerned with the organization and activities of the Christian Church. . . . Large portions of the last five chapters have been furnished by other writers, who are recognized as specially trained and qualified for their tasks."

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE GOSPELS

By J. Ritchie Smith, D.D., Professor of Homiletics in Princeton Theological Seminary. Author of "The Teaching of the Gospel of John"; "The Wall and the Gates." New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

"Throughout the entire volume one finds unmistakable evidences of broad and accurate scholarship, a courageous facing of difficulties and objections and a determination to think things through, a catholicity of spirit even where the widest differences of convictions enter, and a deep and vital devotion to Jesus Christ. It is with an inexpressible satisfaction one rises from the reading of such a work."—*The Presbyterian.*

WHAT IS FAITH?

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, Pp. 263. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

"If we had the resources we should provide a copy to every minister and lay preacher in the British Isles."—*The British Weekly.*

"Professor Machen has written a strong and courageous book . . ."—*Christian World* (London).

CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERALISM

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.

"This is a book that should be read by every thinking man, whether he calls himself a conservative or a liberal. While evidently the product of a thorough scholar, it is written throughout in simple, non-technical words." S. G. Craig in *The Presbyterian.*

The Selected Writings

of

BENJAMIN BRECKINRIDGE WARFIELD

Late Professor of Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary

IN TEN VOLUMES

At the time of his death in 1921, the late Dr. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield was the leading Calvinistic theologian in the English speaking world. An Editorial Committee proposes to publish through the Oxford University Press, in a series of volumes, Dr. Warfield's contribution to theological thought by reprinting the important articles which he contributed to the various Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopedias and to the theological reviews, especially The Princeton Theological Review.

The first volume, entitled *Revelation and Inspiration,* contains two articles on the Idea of Revelation, and a number of exegetical and critical articles on the Biblical idea of Inspiration and the grounds of belief in the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

The second volume will contain Dr. Warfield's major articles on several Biblical doctrines, such as The Trinity, Predestination, Faith, The Person of Christ, etc.

The third volume will comprise the historico-critical articles on the Person and Work of Christ.

Volumes four, five and six will contain articles on Historical Theology. They will include the articles on Augustine, Calvin, and The Westminster Confession. These articles are authoritative on their respective subjects.

The seventh and eighth volumes will contain the articles on Perfectionism.

There will be a ninth volume of miscellaneous articles and a tenth volume containing the most important of Dr. Warfield's book reviews.

Volume I, now ready, may be ordered through your bookseller, or direct from the publisher. It is bound in cloth, 8vo (9½x6¼), pp. xiii+456, price, $3.00.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

AMERICAN BRANCH NEW YORK