

SEPTEMBER 1890

The  
Theological Monthly

---

WELLHAUSEN ON THE PENTATEUCH.

PART II.

IN the last paper the general features of the new criticism were discussed. The importance of the question for the Christian Church at large, and for the teachers of religion in particular, was pointed out. At both Universities the future clergy of England are being authoritatively taught that the Hexateuch (it perhaps should be explained that this phrase means the Pentateuch and Joshua) is a composite volume, put together at a considerably later date than the events recorded in its pages, and that the laws it contains were not Mosaic in their origin, but the gradual growth of centuries. In a very few years this teaching will have penetrated to our remotest villages. There will be a considerable change in our methods of Old Testament exposition. Unfledged curates are not always remarkable for judgment, and we may therefore expect that instead of instruction on vigils and vestments, the Catholic doctrines of the Eucharist and Sacramental Confession, our astonished rustics, or the hapless denizens of the crowded portions of our larger cities, will be treated to discourses on the Jehovist and Elohist, on the contradictions between the Deuteronomist and the author of the Priestly Code, on the growth and development of Israelitish customs, from their germ in the "original form" of the Ten Commandments—the only portion of the Hexateuch of which Moses may be believed to be the author—through the vicissitudes of

unwritten law, to their final form subsequent to the exile.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps, under certain influences now prevalent at Oxford, some parishes may suddenly find themselves inundated with a torrent of doctrine of both these descriptions at once. It will depend entirely on circumstances whether our unfortunate congregations are to be nourished on the milk of Oxford and Cambridge Professors, or the strong meat of Wellhausen and Kuenen, and other similar writers, now widely read in England; whether they are to be taught to regard the Old Testament as a compilation of uncertain date, and more or less doubtful authority, or whether they are to look upon it as an audacious forgery in the interests of a class, absurd in its statements, loose in its moral principles, utterly ludicrous in its literary form.<sup>2</sup> The question, therefore, is already before the Christian world in a practical shape. Every teacher of religion must be prepared to state his opinion upon it. We must know where the new criticism is to stop, and why. We must know definitely on what grounds it is recommended to us, and what is the value of the consent which is urged upon us as a reason for accepting it. We must decide for ourselves whether the narrative which comes before us as the history of the people of Israel be "idealized" or not. Nor will it do to explain this phrase as meaning no more than the honest delivery of traditions handed down from an earlier age. To "idealize," consciously or "unconsciously," is to create; to record tradition is to relate. We must understand precisely which of the two theories, the German or the English, we mean to adopt, for our treatment of the Scriptures will depend entirely on our decision. Nor can it be contended that these questions should be settled by experts alone.<sup>3</sup> They must be decided by arguments which are calculated to satisfy the reason of every intelligent man. Every honest attempt to understand the principles on which our acceptance of these new views of the Old Testament is asked is a con-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kuenen, cited in last paper, p. 369, note.

<sup>2</sup> See passages from Wellhausen cited in the former paper, p. 369, note.

<sup>3</sup> As we have seen, the results of Hebrew criticism are of a most contradictory character. See former paper, pp. 364, 365.

tribution toward the settlement of the question. The writer of the present paper need therefore make no apology for endeavouring to discuss the points raised to the best of his ability, with the object of eliciting such information as may guide him and others in coming to a conclusion.

It is not with English critics that these papers are specially concerned, it is with the writings of Wellhausen and Kuenen. For it is on the ground of their general consent, and on the general consent of other German critics who, while differing from their conclusions, accept their principles of analysis, that our assent to the theory of the later origin of the Pentateuch is asked. When we understand what those methods are, and what their results, we shall be in a better position to judge how far we are bound to accept all or any of them. As to the results, Wellhausen and Kuenen believe Deuteronomy to be a forgery of the reign of Josiah. What is known as the Priestly Code, including the whole of Leviticus except chapters xvii.-xxvi., they suppose to have originated after the exile, while the Hexateuch in its present shape is said to have been the work of a "redactor" of a somewhat later date. It is quite true, as Professor Driver tells us, that to disprove the doctrines of these two writers is not to establish the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, or the accuracy of every statement in the Books of Chronicles. But we are asked to abandon our belief in the Pentateuch as a contemporary record on the strength of the statements of these writers, and of others working on similar lines. If their methods appear on examination to be faulty, and the results reached improbable, we shall be justified in at least suspecting their authority.

We must bear in mind that even before we come to consider the arguments by which these writers support their hypotheses we are confronted by certain grave difficulties of an *a priori* character. The first of these is the utter arbitrariness of the method itself. Statements are made absolutely without the slightest shadow of an attempt at proof. Instances of this have been given already, and more will be given presently. Now, this question of method is an important one. When

conclusions are pressed upon us on the ground of a general agreement on the part of the critics, it is essential for us to know how such an agreement is reached. The disintegration theory of the Pentateuch is presented to us as the result of scientific criticism. But it can hardly be called scientific progress to adopt theories simply because they have been adopted by other people. We do not accept the theory of gravitation on the mere authority of Newton, Lagrange, Laplace, and other distinguished mathematicians. The writers of mathematical and scientific books give us the working by which the theories are reached, and every one may scrutinize the processes who will. But when we are told, without any effort at proof, that "we know for certain" that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes, that Isaiah did not write the latter part of the book that goes by his name, and that David did not compose the greater part of the Psalms that are ascribed to him,<sup>1</sup> our slow Anglo-Saxon brain gets a little confused. Criticism may render these conclusions probable; but how without a great deal more information than we possess can we possibly know for certain that they are correct? Kuenen and Wellhausen literally bristle with such assertions as these. We have already given some specimens from the former; a few are now added from the latter. "I refuse to believe" is a phrase frequently in use, but the reasons for the refusal are seldom given. "Nöldeke's assertion is quite off the mark." "Isaiah used the word Torah not of priestly but prophetic instruction." "The piece is Jehovistic," with sublime self-confidence, in spite of Nöldeke's assertion to the contrary. Such passages occur in almost every page. Reasonable men do not, we repeat, complain of these assertions if they can be proved. What is complained of is that they are made without any attempt at proof, and that unlimited dogmatism and conjecture is dignified by the name of scientific investigation. When our critics will point us to any other science which has advanced by such methods as these, we may be inclined to pay

<sup>1</sup> See Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, i. 15. He apparently means those formally ascribed to him in the Psalter as we now have it. "Every schoolboy knows" that he did not write *all* the Psalms.

some heed to them. As it is, we are entitled to ask, Is such so-called criticism as this deserving of any serious attention whatever? Does it not rather look as if ingenious and learned men had been playing with the Pentateuch as with a puzzle or a mechanical toy, amusing themselves by taking it to pieces and putting it together again? The element of finality, too, is altogether wanting in these speculations. I have long ago ventured to question the value of a kind of criticism which shifts continually like the figures in a kaleidoscope.<sup>1</sup> The objection has been answered by saying that though more careful investigation tends to modify certain of the conclusions, yet that some permanent results have been obtained. But even then we are entitled to ask, *How* have those results been obtained? By careful, rigid investigation and demonstration, or by processes as purely arbitrary and external as the turning of a kaleidoscope, or the fitting together the pieces of a puzzle? It is true that when a puzzle is rightly put together the success of the process is apparent. But it cannot be said that any such success has been at present attained in the analysis and reconstruction of the Pentateuch. When that task has been successfully achieved, and its results are accepted by all competent scholars, the critics will be in a position to demand more attention than they can at present claim.

Another characteristic of the new criticism which does not inspire confidence is its extreme ingenuity in eluding all rational argument. As I have said elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> "It is very difficult to reply conclusively to a critic who has a theory ready made to meet every emergency. Thus, if the author of the Book of Joshua displays an accurate and minute acquaintance with his subject, he is quoting an early and authentic document. If he states anything which is not at first sight easily reconcilable with what he has stated elsewhere, he has taken it out of another less early and less authentic one. If he quotes the Book of Deuteronomy, which, according to all acknowledged laws of literary criticism, proves that book to have been in

<sup>1</sup> *Doctrinal System of St. John*, Preface, p. vii. Mr. Bissell has lately used a similar phrase. *The Pentateuch*, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Commentary on Joshua*, Introduction, p. vi.

existence when he wrote, he was himself the author of it. If a 'Book of the Wars of Jahveh' is quoted, as in Num. xxi. 14, 15, it is an older document. If a 'Book of the Law of Jahveh,' he wrote it himself. 'This is not to inquire, it is to make inquiry impossible." But it is an extremely convenient process for its authors. No answer to it is possible. Every testimony to the antiquity of a book is declared to have been inserted into the older narrative at the time the book was written. This is not proved; it is simply asserted. The only possible answer is a counter-assertion. Assertions, however, in favour of the traditional belief unfortunately are worth nothing. It is only when they are alleged against it that they are supposed to be entitled to any weight. What is the value of a general consent of writers who call this process criticism, and its results scientific?

Again, the notion of ancient documents transferred bodily to the redactor's pages suggests some object and purpose in thus transferring them. But what was the use of putting a simple allegory like that of the Fall, so obviously the product of a very early stage in the national development, into a book intended to influence a people who had reached a high degree of civilization, and had declined from it—the very period of national life least accessible to the beauty of simplicity and childlike credulity?<sup>1</sup> Why is the tribe of Judah, the pivot on which all the later history revolves, omitted altogether from the narrative of the early struggles of the race, if, as we are continually told is the case, Judges was revised throughout in the interest of the Jewish priesthood? Why do we find the apostate tribe of Ephraim exalted above that of faithful Judah in the blessings of Jacob and Moses, as recorded in a book written partly for the express purpose of supporting the policy of Josiah, and partly after the captivity and the utter disappearance of the tribe of Joseph from the earth? Documents of northern Israel are,

---

<sup>1</sup> Observe how fully Ezra recognizes the fact that the age of miracles was over in his day (Ezra viii. 22). This single verse is sufficient to prove the antiquity of the miraculous portions of the Old Testament.

we are told, embedded in the narrative.<sup>1</sup> But we are not told how they came there, when every consideration of interest and symmetry would induce the redactor to keep them out. But this same redactor, who, when it suits the theory, is so utterly incapable of understanding how to draw up a narrative which may promote the end he has in view, is the next moment gifted with the finest invention and the keenest literary tact. His skill in perverting the facts of history to suit his purposes is almost miraculous.<sup>2</sup> And his fine perception of the value of facts which were almost forgotten in his day is little less so. Thus he transfers to his pages the ancient document quoted in Gen. x. This passage, until lately supposed to be teeming with inaccuracies, has now been proved to be correct in every particular. A Turanian population was the first to inhabit Assyria and Babylonia, and was afterwards conquered by a Semitic invasion. The two peoples continued to dwell side by side for many centuries. Bilingual inscriptions have lately been found in great numbers, including a book of instruction for a Chaldean princess in the Accadian language.<sup>3</sup> Even the sites of the three cities Erech, Accad, and Calneh, which, with Babel, made a kind of Mesopotamian quadrilateral, have been identified. It is for the advocates of the new criticism to explain how a post-exilic redactor thought of embodying so antiquated, and apparently in his days so useless a document in his history, or how to such a singular capacity for blundering as he must have possessed, if he can be so easily detected in our own day, should be added occasional lucid intervals of the rarest historical intuition.

The favourite theory of both schools of the new criticism is that Jewish institutions in the shape in which they reach us are the work of the sacerdotal class in the decline and fall of the kingdom, and after the return of the people to their native land in a condition very far removed from their ancient glory. It is the belief of writers such as De Wette

<sup>1</sup> See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 139. The citations from Wellhausen in this paper are from the German, not the English edition.

<sup>2</sup> Some instances of this will be given in a future paper.

<sup>3</sup> See Sayce, *Babylonian Literature*, pp. 13, 64, 71.

and Ewald, and Knobel and Dillmann,<sup>1</sup> as representing the older school, who believe Deuteronomy to be the latest form of Mosaic institutions, as well as of Wellhausen and Kuenen, who believe it to be earlier than the Priestly Code. All these writers regard Deuteronomy as a book written in or about the days of Josiah by what Wellhausen calls "the reforming party," for the purpose of carrying their point in abolishing idolatry and polytheism. Kuenen tells us<sup>2</sup> that Deuteronomy is "the programme of the Mosaic party of Josiah's day."

<sup>1</sup> Ewald's theories, though now obsolete, deserve more attention than those of Kuenen and Wellhausen. Though he is no doubt unduly dogmatic, his assertions are by no means as rash as theirs. He treats Jewish literature with respect. We have, according to him, something like a real account of Jewish life and polity. As we have seen in the former paper, he regards the first source of the present Pentateuch—save some few archaic fragments—as not later than the age of Solomon. The prophets of later reigns supply further information, and Deuteronomy, the latest work of them all, is not later than the age of Manasseh. He regards this book as the "authoritative basis" on which the whole of the Reformation under Josiah was founded. But he does not go so far as to say that it was palmed off by the priests on the country as the veritable book of the Law of Moses. Knobel regards the first thirty chapters of Deuteronomy as written by the last law-giver, with the exception of certain short passages which he specifies. The greater portion of chap. xxxi. is also his, and two verses of chap. xxxiv. Also certain portions of Joshua are attributed to him. *Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua*, p. 579. We may very fairly ask, before we can rely on Knobel's authority, how far his assignment of these passages is to be attributed to critical analysis, and how far to the necessities of his theory. If the latter, his judgment is of little value on the point. Yet it will be found that all the passages in Joshua assigned to the Deuteronomist, with one or two trifling exceptions, are quotations from, or allusions to, Deuteronomy. In other words, he is not led to his conclusion by critical considerations. He has made his theory first, and then has manipulated his author to square with it. He does not regard Deuteronomy as the book found in the temple, but regards it as the work of a man of position and influence in the reign of Josiah. He regards the language as the chief proof of the date of the book. *Ib.* p. 591. This is sufficient to justify us in asking for something more than the mere fact of the agreement of German critics. Until we are in a position to settle authoritatively what parts of the Bible are archaic and what otherwise, Hebrew linguistic criticism can hardly be very trustworthy. The history of the English language could hardly be regarded as in a very advanced stage if we did not know to what age Chaucer and Pope should be respectively assigned. Dillmann (*Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, 2nd edit., 1886, p. 611) regards the date of Deuteronomy as about the 7th or 8th century B.C., *i.e.*, between the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah. But he adds that some words to be found in it are hardly, one is certainly, not before the 7th century B.C. As usual, no proof is given.

<sup>2</sup> *Religion of Israel*, ii. 15.

Wellhausen tells us that every one disposed to recognize scientific methods must allow that it was composed at the time it was found.<sup>1</sup> The force of the objections to this theory, as well as that of the post-exilic origin of a large part of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, is admitted by their English followers. They will not face the vast improbability that important portions of the history of Israel and her institutions could have been invented at a far later date, and yet that Israel could be induced to believe them.<sup>2</sup> We are entitled to ask whether any other instance is to be found of a nation so credulous as to receive with eagerness a book as authentic containing an entirely fictitious account of its history and institutions, full of the most sweeping condemnations of their past behaviour and present condition, and making the strongest demands upon them for an entire change of conduct and religious conviction. We have read of religious reforms in other countries. The examples of Zoroaster, Manes, Mahomet, Wiclif, Martin Luther are before us. Did it occur to any of these remarkable men to attempt to palm off a forgery upon those whom they addressed, or does it seem probable that they would have succeeded better if they had done so? Mohammed wrote the Koran, it is true. But he did not pretend that it was a volume eight hundred years old. Wiclif and Luther pinned their faith to a book. But it was a book of demonstrated antiquity. We may be able to

<sup>1</sup> *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. "In allen Kreisen wo überhaupt auf Anerkennung wissenschaftlicher Resultate wird anerkannt dass es in der Zeit verfasst ist, in der es entdeckt werde." p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> In order to support this theory, we are required to believe that the allusions to the "book of the law" in Joshua are the insertion of the Deuteronomist himself. It is difficult to believe that an authentic history of Joshua *ex hypothesi* in the hands of the men of that day could have been so falsified under the eyes of a determined and powerful opposition. Civilized society is much the same in all ages, and such attempts, if made, would be sure to recoil on their authors. Only in an age of ignorance, produced by the suppression of all free inquiry, would such a policy be likely to succeed. So obvious is this, that we may expect to find a school arise which will make the whole Hexateuch, in its present shape, post-exilic. But even then all the difficulties will not have vanished. The discrepancies between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code would be on that hypothesis at least as inexplicable as they are upon the hypothesis of the Mosaic origin of the whole.

estimate the probability of German conjecture by the really scientific course of applying German critical principles to other cases, and ascertaining how they will work. Imagine the Parliamentary party before the great rebellion producing Magna Charta as a document of the time of King John, when as a matter of fact it had been secretly concocted by Pym, Hampden, and their associates. Or imagine the Petition of Right forged in 1689 and ascribed to the reign of Charles I. in order to facilitate the accession of William and Mary. Has a policy of this kind ever been attempted? And if attempted, is it not certain that its failure would have covered its authors with confusion? If so, we may be sure that the priestly party in Israel would have gained nothing by so palpable a fraud. The Jews were not an ignorant people; on the contrary, they were highly civilized, and at one period had seemed likely to become the predominant monarchy of the world. Still less were they the victims of priestly domination. The whole of the Old Testament, whether we regard it as authentic or fabricated, proceeds on the assumption that the Israelites as a nation had steadily rejected monotheism and all worship founded upon it, and had embraced the polytheistic and immoral worship of Palestine. Can we suppose for a moment that the Pashurs, the Hananiahs, and the other intelligent and influential leaders of the anti-priestly, or rather anti-rigoristic, party would have been unable to detect and expose an imposture of this kind? Are nations so utterly forgetful of, or careless about, the traditions of the past as to swallow greedily without protest such extraordinary fabrications as German commentators would have us believe were received by the whole Jewish nation as authentic history? Let any trained historical scholar investigate the pages of the prophet Jeremiah, and tell us whether they give the slightest colour to the supposition that the prophet's opponents were men likely to be hoodwinked by a document which represented to them institutions unknown to their grandfathers, as the original laws given to Israel by Moses after the Exodus. But we have, fortunately for ourselves, a very close historical parallel in the history of our own country.

One of the favourite arguments of the German school is the absolute neglect by the Israelitish people of the precepts of the law, and the utter impossibility that institutions could have been in existence which exerted no visible influence upon the life of the people. The epoch of the Reformation is almost an exact case in point. The hierarchical system dominant in England in mediæval times was widely removed from Christianity in its primitive form. The Scriptures, that is to say the original principles of Christianity, were a sealed book to the mass of the people, and even to the great majority of the priests, and all attempts to translate them, except the translation had the sanction of authority, and was manipulated to suit the views of the party in power, were sternly repressed. But a change occurs. The "reforming party" attains to power. The "Sacred Bible," as Milton says, is "sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it."<sup>1</sup> The book is eagerly read, and quoted with enthusiasm by Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and the other reforming leaders. What can be more evident than that the Bible was forged by these men in order to promote the reformation they had at heart? The citations of it in their pages are pure inventions of the anti-priestly party of the Reformation era. But, so utterly ignorant were the Gardiners and Bonners of the day, that, in spite of their fanatical hatred of the reforming leaders, and their persecution of them even to death, they were utterly unable to detect and expose the forgery. Of course such a supposition in our history is simply absurd. Arguing from analogy, we may pronounce it equally absurd in the case of a kingdom like Judæa in the days of Josiah. Had we had access to contemporary literature, its absurdity could no doubt be demonstrated easily enough. As it is, we must be content to say that until a similar event in the world's history can be shown to us to have happened, we must continue to be sceptical as to the possibility of its occurring. Till then we must attach as much weight to ideal reconstructions of national history and literature as they have been proved to deserve, from the days

<sup>1</sup> *Of Reformation in England*, Book I.

of Niebuhr downwards. When, therefore, we are told here in England that no such thing is imagined for a moment, and that all that is meant is that considerations of style, and the like, prove the Hexateuch to be a composite document of later date than it purports to be, we must remind our English disciples of the German school that the general consent to which they point embraces paradoxes such as these we have described, and that the agreement of writers capable of such *tours de force* will not weigh much with men who are guided by the ordinary laws of historical probability.

There is yet another objection to the theory established by general consent in Germany. Great institutions are usually the product of great minds and great deeds. The laws ascribed to Moses have won extraordinary authority and reverence for two thousand five hundred years, under circumstances absolutely unique in history. Their intrinsic excellence is demonstrated by a vast variety of considerations. We will however, but adduce two modern ones. The enlightened wisdom displayed in them may be estimated by the fact that Mr. Charles Booth, in his exhaustive work on the condition of the poor in London, remarks on the peculiar aptitude of Jewish institutions to protect the physical development of the race under the most unfavourable circumstances, while the correspondent of the *Times*, writing of the destruction of the Roman Ghetto, corroborates this statement by observing on the superior physical vigour of the Jewish population to that of the Italians around them, in spite of the filthy condition in which they lived. Add to this the extraordinary attachment of the Jews to their law throughout two thousand five hundred years, in spite of their humiliation, of their dispersion, of persecutions unusually severe and protracted, extending over the whole period. How can we explain so long a retention of national existence, an attachment so unparalleled to institutions, under circumstances so unfavourable? Will a forgery by Huldah the prophetess and her associates, or even the theory that Deuteronomy is the composition of a man of influence and authority, when the Jewish nation was crumbling to pieces under the influence of attacks from without and moral decay and degradation

within, satisfy the conditions of the problem? Or do we imagine that so elaborate and striking a system of sacrificial worship, the underlying character of which is so clearly brought out by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and which was so singularly calculated to foreshadow the Christian scheme, was the product of a time when a handful of trembling fugitives returned to their land under the protection of a foreign lord? Were men like Ezra or Nehemiah, who, however excellent, seem by their own admission to have been singularly destitute of the constructive faculty, the kind of persons to inaugurate a religion which has had so remarkable an effect on the after history of the world? Or do we suppose that Haggai and Zechariah, whose mission it was to encourage Zerubbabel in his attempt to reproduce the shadow of the ancient glories of the land, were the real authors of those Mosaic enactments which have won such deathless fame? Again, we must say that it must need a very general agreement indeed before the English people will accept such paradoxes as these.

Once more. The world has had many noble conceptions of God placed before it. But is there one, even under the Christian dispensation, which surpasses in moral sublimity the Deuteronomic presentation of Him? Are there anywhere to be found warnings more solemn, pathos more touching, eloquence more striking, appeals to the conscience and moral sense more forcible, than are to be found in that book when it treats of God? "Ascribe ye greatness to our God. He is the Rock, His work is perfect: for all His ways are justice:<sup>1</sup> a God of faithfulness and without iniquity, just and right is He." "If I whet My glittering sword, and Mine hand take hold of judgment; I will render vengeance on Mine adversaries."<sup>2</sup> "See, I have set before thee life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments, His statutes, and His judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and that the Lord thy God may bless thee in the land whither thou goest in to possess it."<sup>3</sup> "Behold, I have

<sup>1</sup> This is the real meaning of the word translated *judgment* in our versions.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xxxii. 4, 41.

<sup>3</sup> Deut. xxx. 15.

taught you statutes and judgments. . . . Keep therefore and do them ; for this is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of all the peoples, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there that hath a god so nigh unto them as the Lord our God, whensoever we call upon Him ?”<sup>1</sup> Are these the sort of exhortations which a forger in the disastrous seventh century before Christ would be likely to invent in order to recommend his principles to the people ? Are they not at once words of warning and of truth, such as would naturally be addressed by a great moral teacher to a nation at the outset of its career ? Does any one doubt that if the principles laid down in Deuteronomy *had* been obeyed, the Israelitish nation would have advanced steadily to the empire of the world ? Was it anything but the neglect of these admirable precepts which had actually led to their fall from the position in which Solomon had left them, and could anything but their keen sense of the fact that they *had* neglected such precepts have produced that intense attachment to the law of Moses which has endured for so many ages ? The appeal to conscience in reproof of precepts despised and opportunities neglected may have some power. The *ex post facto* manufacture of such precepts and opportunities in order to produce a factitious repentance would, one would think, be more likely to irritate than to convince.

Nor is this all. We have abundant evidence that a lofty standard of morality—something more than the “original form” of the Ten Commandments—was before the Israelites from the very first. Has history ever produced prophets like Moses and Samuel, captains like Joshua, kings (in spite of his one great sin) like David ?<sup>2</sup> The first led the people of Israel for forty years through difficult and dangerous wanderings ; his hands are stained by no crime ; his exquisite temper and

<sup>1</sup> Deut. iv. 5-7.

<sup>2</sup> History is usually very lenient to such faults in royal personages. We may instance Lord Macaulay’s treatment of them in William III. It is a very different standard by which David is judged. Moreover, if the Mosaic law then existed, the life of Bathsheba was forfeit to it. It was to save the life of the partner of his guilt that David stooped to meanness so abject as the murder of Uriah.

patience never fail him, except when judged by a standard far too high for ordinary mortals. He seeks for no reward for himself. The permanent high-priesthood is vested in the descendants of his brother Aaron. His own children descend to the level of other Israelites. The great moralist and deliverer is content to have fulfilled his mission and have brought the people under his charge to the borders of the promised land.<sup>1</sup> Joshua was equally indifferent to founding a family, a privilege universally conceded to great conquerors, whether before or after Christ. He is the last to claim his inheritance; and he seeks no other reward than the successful discharge of his mission. Samuel attempts and effects a remarkable political and religious reformation in Israel. He restores the national unity, which had for a long time ceased to exist, and revives the worship of Jehovah, which had been forgotten. He appeals to the people, after a long life spent in the simple discharge of duty, and obtains their ready and ungrudging assent to the assertion that his hands were clean from all wrong. David, whatever the errors of his private life may have been, was a model king. His sensitive conscience was shown by his resolute determination to spare the life of a tyrant who had sought his own with relentless vindictiveness; and by his fixed resolution to abstain from rebellion at an epoch when rebellion was almost a law of society. As a faithful friend, a zealous worshipper of God, a father of his people, a terror to foreign foes, a respecter of the voice of conscience, there are not many characters in history superior to his. Can we imagine such characters formed by the "original form" of the Ten Commandments? Did it not require an organized system of worship, statutes, and judgments, in a shape that could reach the heart as well as the mind, to call into existence men of this exalted type? And if they existed, if Moses were indeed the creator of the national life, as he has always been

---

<sup>1</sup> It is at once a proof of the genuineness of the Book of Judges, and of the disinterestedness of Moses, that we find his grandson, stung probably by the memories of his great ancestor as distinguished from his own subordinate position, becoming idol priest to the Danites. See Judges xviii. 30, in R.V. The Rabbis altered the text to Manassch by a Nun suspended above the line.

believed to be, until the school of De Wette and Ewald and their successors arose, is it probable that they have disappeared and left scarcely a trace behind?

A variety of other *a priori* considerations which may justify us in distrusting the conclusions of the disintegrating school might be urged; but thus much must suffice for the present. We have seen, it may be hoped, that there are larger and broader historical questions involved than the mere alleging of discrepancies, the dissection and reconstruction of documents. It has been forgotten that in one sense, at least, the Jews were a great people. It is an historical fact that no other nation has so largely and permanently affected the moral life of the world. The origin of institutions which have profoundly influenced the human mind is one of supreme interest to mankind. It cannot be settled by a microscopic examination of documents. It involves the wider question of the influence of great men and great ideas on the whole character, religious and moral, of a people. Nor is it easy to believe that a system so far-reaching in its influence could have originated in the intrigues of a caste, or the useless regrets and longings of a handful of returned captives. We have seen, too, perhaps, what is the value of the argument from general consent. There is a pretty general consent among German theologians that the greater part of the Pentateuch is posterior to the palmy times of Israelite history, the reigns of David and Solomon. There appears to be strong reason to believe that in accepting this view we shall be doing violence to every recognized canon of historical investigation.

Even the agreement that is pleaded for four main streams of tradition, which is all, we are told, that is contended for,<sup>1</sup> comes before us with diminished weight if it be to a large extent the result of foregone conclusions.<sup>2</sup> The idea that there is a writer who prefers the use of Elohim and another writer who prefers the use of Jehovah to designate God, and that the narratives of these two writers have been combined

---

<sup>1</sup> See Professor Ryle's article in the *Expositor* for May.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 152.

in our present Pentateuch, is not, of course, altogether destitute of probability.<sup>1</sup> But the third main stream of tradition of which we hear is largely due to the fact that this theory of the Jehovist and the Elohist cannot be got to work for many verses in succession. Hence the necessity of supposing a revision and fusion of the two histories by a later hand. Similarly, the fourth main stream of tradition may be traced to the contradiction supposed to have been discovered between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code. Following purely internal methods of criticism, we might draw from these premises a conclusion which will have at least one advantage over some other instances of such methods, namely, that it will be found in exact accordance with the facts,—the conclusion that two schools, under these circumstances, would naturally arise, the one declaring that Deuteronomy was the earlier, the other that it was the later of the two books. Whether the alleged contradictions between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch will ultimately compel us to accept the current theory of their diverse authorship is a problem we will not at present discuss. All that we have to say is that before this takes place, English criticism will have to dissociate itself more emphatically than it has yet done from the literature of unproved assertions and bold assumptions.<sup>2</sup> Until we know early Hebrew from late, until a history of the Hebrew language which cannot be gainsaid has been compiled, until we are no longer asked to embrace, or even to coquette with the conjectural reconstruction of history, we shall do well to abide by the traditional opinion.

J. J. LIAS.

<sup>1</sup> No document containing the word Jehovah or Jahveh can be anterior to the time of Moses (see Exod. vi. 3). Consequently the writer of Gen. x. must have had ancient documents before him and have rewritten them himself (see v. 9). To speak of Nimrod as "a mighty hunter before Jehovah," is an obvious anachronism, besides being language which could only be used by Israelites. Gen. xi. is also obviously very ancient tradition rewritten by or after Moses.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Braconsfield once told an anecdote of Prince Bismarck, bearing on his views for the regeneration of Germany. "First of all," said the Prince, "I should get rid of the Professors." He was no doubt referring first to the infallibility, and next to the visionary and unpractical tendencies of that particular class of his countrymen. English critics on the Pentateuch may be none the worse for taking a distinguished German's advice.

## THE RENDERING INTO ENGLISH OF THE GREEK AORIST AND PERFECT.

### PART II.

VI. Now it has been above pointed out (§ III.) that the Greek and English uses differ both of the Present, and of the Imperfect, and of the Future; and partly this has been shown of the Aorist also. But in the Aorist such variety can be exhibited yet more fully, as well as in the Greek Perfect (and therefore in the Pluperfect), and in English in the Simple Past and in the Perfect.

(a) One use of the Aorist not mentioned above is in clauses, mostly dependent, where it states some fact or event that is prior, and is intended to be understood as prior, to some other past fact or event. It then corresponds to, and should be translated by, the English Pluperfect. (The language of some grammars in which the Aorist is said to be in such cases "put for the Pluperfect," meaning the *Greek* Pluperfect, is strangely inexact.) To give just one example from the classics, in Her. 8. 21 we find, Ἐκομίζοντο δὲ ὡς ἕκαστοι ἐτάχθησαν, Κορίνθιοι πρῶτοι ὑστάτοι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, "But they [the Greek fleet] retired in the order in which the several divisions *had been stationed*, the Corinthians leading, the Athenians bringing up the rear." And in the N.T., Matt. i. 24, ὡς προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος, "as the angel *had bidden* him; xi. 1, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν, "when He *had made an end*;" xxvii. 31, ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, "when they *had mocked* Him;" xxvi. 19, ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "as Jesus *had appointed* them;" Mark i. 32, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος, "when the sun *had set* [and the Sabbath was over];" and it is, as so frequently, the Greek rather than the English idiom that both A.V. and R.V. give us in Matt. ii. 9, "the star which they *saw* (εἶδον) in the east went before them." Luther translates "der Stern den sie im Morgenlande *gesehen hatten*;" Diodati, "la stella che

*aveano veduta in Oriente ;*" de Valera, "la estrella que *habian visto en el oriente ;*" Segond, "l'étoile qu'ils *avaient vue en Orient ;* so also Lasserre and Stapfer; and going back to earlier dates, the Vulgate (both Clementine and Amiatine), and later Beza, render "*stella quam viderant in Oriente.*"

Such clauses I have said are mostly dependent, as in all the examples just given. In John xiv. 3 however *ἔδησεν* and *ἀπέθετο* seem to be principal verbs, and possibly *ἀπέστειλεν* in John xviii. 24 should be so understood. But these may be simply Hebraisms.

The Aorist too is often used where our idiom demands the Present, as in the similes of Homer and Theocritus, and as in the *ναῦς ἔβαλεν ἔστη δ' αὖθις* of Euripides; but this force of the tense—the Gnostic, and the Epistolary, Aorist—has been recently discussed in this Monthly (Dec. 1889), and nothing further need now be added.

The Aorist Participle in a Future Perfect sense, though overlooked in the grammars, is worth notice. Examples (a few will suffice) are—*νικήσαντι*, Hom. Il. 3. 138; *νοστήσαντα*, Il. 13. 38; *συναυτήσαντα*, Eur. Ion 534; *κυρήσας*, Eur. Phœn. 490; and in N.T., *ποιήσας*, Rom. x. 5; *κοιμηθέντας*, 1 Thess. iv. 14; *πιστεύσασιν*, 2 Thess. i. 10.

Again, the Aorist cannot be translated by the Simple Past, when, being the Aorist of an intransitive verb that signifies state or condition, it marks the entrance on that state or condition; such being often<sup>1</sup> the force of the tense in verbs of that class. One example is, "for now is your salvation nearer than when ye *first believed*" (Rom. xiii. 11), where the "first" ought not to be printed, as in R.V., as though it were not in the Greek: it *is* in the Greek, fully implied by the tense. Compare *ὅπως σχῶ*, Acts xxv. 26, "that I may find" or "get;" *ἐπτώχευσεν*, 2 Cor. viii. 9; *ζήσωμεν*, 1 Thess. v. 10 and 1 John iv. 9; *πλουτήσης*, Rev. iii. 18; *ἐβασίλευσεν*, Rev.

<sup>1</sup> Not always; for while Hellen and his sons are said by Thucydides (I. 3) to have "grown powerful (*ισχυσάντων*) in Phthiotis," in Luke vi. 48 we find the same verb in the same tense signifying the possession of strength in past time looked at as a whole, not merely in the incipient stage—"the wind *could* not shake the house." And so elsewhere, but always, I think, with a negative or *μῶλις*.

xix. 6.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes the passive Aorist has a similar force, as *ἐμερίσθη*, Matt. xii. 26; *φωτισθέντες*, Heb. x. 32. So in the classics, *ἤρυθρίασας*, "you are blushing," *ἐδάκρυσας*, "you are weeping," lit., "you have begun to blush" or "to weep;" and see Kühner's note on *βουλευσας*, "senator factus," Xen. Mem. I. i. 18.

And there is also at least one passage where an Aorist is apparently used by a Hebraism (see above, p. 36) for the Future, namely *καὶ ἐτελέσθη*, "then shall be consummated," Rev. x. 7; for the Apocalypse is brim-full of Hebraisms. Compare Num. xx. 19, "then I will pay," Hebr. *וְנָתַתִּי*, lit., "and I paid"; Is. xlix. 21, "then shalt thou say," Hebr. *וְאָמַרְתִּי*, lit., "and thou saidst;" Jer. li. 48, "then . . . shall sing," Hebr. *וְשָׁרְרוּ*, lit., "and they sang."

(*b*) Compare now our Simple Past. It is never employed as certain Aorists are, as shown in the three preceding paragraphs. *Ἐβασίλευσε* or *ἐτυράννησε* may mean "he reigned," but also, and more commonly, "he came to the throne" (see 1 Cor. iv. 8); but "he reigned" never bears this latter sense.

It can be used however, at least in colloquial English, for the Pluperfect; as, "He gave her the apple he knocked down from the tree." This usage survives from Anglo-Saxon times, as, "And þá ðá he fæste feowertige daga," "And when he *fasted*" (that is, "*had fasted*") "forty days."

It often signifies that which used to take place at some past time, as, "His sons *went* and *feasted* in their houses, every one his day, and *sent* and *called* for their three sisters to eat and to drink with them" (Job i. 4). But this would be the Imperfect in Greek, not the Aorist. In this verse in the LXX. there is only one finite verb, and that is not an Aorist, but an Imperfect.

Again it may signify that which happened or was done during a period more or less prolonged simultaneously with

<sup>1</sup> When Bishop Lightfoot wrote, what is undoubtedly true, that "the Aorist of *πιστεύειν* is used very commonly, not of the continuous state of belief, but of the definite act of accepting the faith" (*On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 86), one may confidently affirm that he did not mean that this verb stands alone in being so modified in sense in the Aorist.

some other event or action or course of action, as, "I *wrote* while they *painted*," where the same idea may be expressed by saying, "I *was writing*, while they *were painting*." This sense also, like the last mentioned, would require, not the Aorist in Greek, but the Imperfect; and not only in Greek, but in Anglo-Saxon also, French, Spanish, and Italian.

In short the one and only use in which our Simple Past is equivalent to the Aorist is its use in narrative as a Past Definite (§ V. *ad finem*); but of course this includes the brief and fragmentary narrative that constitutes an important element in ordinary conversation. Still there remain innumerable cases in which the Aorist is not our Past, nor our Past the Aorist.

VII. Let us now turn to the Greek Perfect, which is commonly assumed to be equivalent to the English Perfect. That it may, not only in many cases but in most, be translated by our Perfect is quite true; but the two are not therefore equivalent.

Their equivalence is at once disproved by the fact (see §§ IV. and XI.) that our Perfect is so often the fitting and only true representative of the Aorist. But there is more to be said.

(a) In Smith and Hall's English Grammar it is affirmed: "The statement, 'I have lived in London seven years,' implies that the speaker is still living in London, and the period of time referred to reaches up to the moment of speaking." And it is because this is the common view that in so many modern grammars this tense is called the Present Complete. But the assertion is not true. The words do not at all of necessity imply "that the speaker is still living in London, &c." He may be now living, and may have lived for years, in New York or Madagascar or Tonquin, and may yet be able to state, referring to *an earlier period of his life*, "I have lived in London seven years." Undoubtedly the expression *may* be used in the sense those writers attribute to it, being then equivalent to the *Present* in German, French, Italian, &c.; but it may also be used without implying any connexion

with present time, nothing but mere priority, being then equivalent to the *Preterite Indefinite* in German, French, Italian, &c. In other words this form "I have lived" is sometimes a Present Complete, while also it is sometimes, though rather less frequently, a Past Indefinite.

(b) But what of the Greek Perfect? This is a Present Complete, I think always: I doubt whether it is ever a Past Indefinite. In its prevailing use it differs from the Aorist in this: the Aorist predicates—definitely (by aid of the context, as above pointed out) as to time in narrative, indefinitely in its other uses—a past *event* or *act*, looked at as a completed whole; the Perfect predicates the *present state* resulting from that event or act. So the Pluperfect predicates a *past state* resulting from a prior act; and the Future Perfect, a *future state* that will result from a prior act. The state is commonly that of the object in active transitive verbs, that of the subject in intransitive and passive verbs.

The following are examples. Transitives: ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα, and there it remains written; δέδωκα, and the gift remains theirs; your faith σέσωκέν σε, and you are now in perfect health; νενικήκατε τὸν Πονηρόν, and he is now a beaten foe. Intransitives: μεμαρτύρηκε, and he is a standing witness to the truth; προγεγονότα ἁμαρτήματα, sins whose place is in the category of things past; τέθνηκεν, "he is dead," describing the present condition, while ἀπέθανεν marks the act, "he has died" (Rom. vi. 7); κεκρίκει (Acts xx. 16), the intention being then fully formed in St. Paul's mind. Passives: μεμυγμένον οἶνον, the wine mixed with gall was already prepared—St. Matthew would have written μίξαντες ἔδωκαν, had he intended to suggest to his readers the *act* of mixing; ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται, his love to God has reached maturity and is perfect; the assembly, ἦν συγκεχυμένη, was in a state of confusion. The Future Perfect does not, I believe, occur in the N.T., but its force is easily discernible when we compare κληθήσεται (Matt. ii. 23), "shall receive the name," with κεκλήσεται (Æsch. Pr. V. 865), "shall bear the name." Of course, when the Future Perfect dropped out of use (as it has quite disappeared from Modern Greek), the

Simple Future had to do duty in its place.<sup>1</sup> Matthiæ, § 498, remarks of this Future Perfect (or Third Future, or Paulo Post Future) that it expresses "not so much the simple future passive, a future transient action, as a future permanent condition, which will have arisen from a transient action." It is to be regretted that he apparently failed to observe how closely analogous to this is the force of the Perfect and of the Pluperfect.

But it is fitting to invite attention to two specially instructive examples of the Perfect. Every kind of inferior nature, St. James reminds us (iii. 7) *δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται* by mankind. The *δαμάζεται* of course does not signify that men actually do tame every kind of animal, but that such a conquest is effected now and then—*can* be effected. The Perfect *δεδάμασται* marks the result of the taming. The passage means therefore that every animal "can be tamed and kept tame" by man. The other is in Rom. xvi. 25, 26, where we have the Perfect, or rather Pluperfect, Participle *σεσιγημένου* in immediate conjunction with the Aorist Participle *φανερωθέντος*. The latter predicates an *act*, the former a *state*. If the throwing of the veil of silence had been spoken of, and the being first hidden by it, we should have had the Aorist *σιγηθέντος*: the Perfect indicates the remaining under the veil. "Which was kept secret" is the excellent rendering of A.V.; and *φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν* should be translated "but has now been laid open to view."

(c) The Greek Perfect, however, of a transitive verb does not always indicate the resulting and permanent state of the object: occasionally it is that of the subject. Thus *ἑωρακότες* the miracles of Christ (John iv. 45), "having been eye-witnesses of them, and being therefore still under the abiding impression produced by them:" all this is implied in the *ἑωρακότες*.

As to permanence of result, compare the passive *ἑσταυρωμένος*.

<sup>1</sup> So in Hebrew, where there is no Fut. Perf., the Simple Future is at times used as one: see Is. liii. 10, "When thou shalt make" (וְעָשִׂיתָ) signifying "When thou shalt have made": LXX., *ἐὰν δῶτε*, Vulg., "si posuerit."

The primary meaning is "in the condition resulting from the act of crucifying," in other words, "on the cross." And this is apparently the sense intended in Gal. iii. 1: "before whose very eyes Jesus Christ was [in my preaching] painted as on the cross." But in 1 Cor. i. 23 the thought is different: "We proclaim Christ as One who may to endless ages be described as having endured the agony of the Cross."

"Crucified! we Thee adore."

Similar to this is the ἀπέσταλκεν of 1 John iv. 9. Jesus abides for ever the Ἀπόστολος whom we confess.

(d) But there are passages where it is not easy to see any permanent result as having followed the action, there being some Old Testament narrative either quoted or alluded to, and the Perfect being so used as to bear a certain resemblance to the Historical Present. See Heb. vii. 4—10. Melchizedek meets Abraham returning from the κοπή of the kings; and now *we see* he "has received a tithe" (δεδεκάτωκεν) from the Patriarch and "has blessed" (εὐλόγηκεν) him, and Levi too "has paid tithe" (δεδεκάτωται). So in Heb. viii. 5 the book of Exodus is quoted: we refer and see that Moses "has been divinely instructed" (κεχρημάτισται) concerning the building of the Tabernacle. In like manner, Heb. xi. 17, we read in Genesis how Abraham in intention "has offered Isaac." In translating into English the Historical Present may be used, as in R.V. of Heb. viii. 5; but the Simple Past is sometimes preferable, as adopted by the Revisers in Heb. xi. 17. The English Perfect, as in R.V. of Heb. vii. 6, 9, even if we take it as a Past Indefinite, seems strangely out of place; as also in Acts vii. 35, where ἀπέσταλκεν, which is to be similarly accounted for, must be simply "sent," not "hath sent."<sup>1</sup>

(e) Yet other places there are where the English Perfect

---

<sup>1</sup> One wonders how the Revisers would render the following: "Anselme Popinot était petit, pied-bot, infirmité que le hasard a donné à lord Byron, à Walter Scott, à monsieur de Talleyrand, pour ne pas décourager ceux qui en sont affligés." For Byron, Scott, Talleyrand were all dead when Balzac wrote that sentence.

cannot be employed as the equivalent of the Greek Perfect.<sup>1</sup> It is utterly amazing that in Rom. xvi. 7 οὐ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ is rendered in R.V. "who also have been in Christ before me." The English idiom here is simply outraged. What officer in our Navy or Army would not stare at the βύρβαρος who should say of a senior officer "He *has been* in the Service before me?" "He *was* in the Navy (or Army) before me" is the only correct English form according to the *norma loquendi* on which usage has set its seal. And this is perfectly intelligible. The English mind fastens on the idea of time defined (though loosely) by "before me," and therefore uses the Simple Past, which, as above pointed out, is our Past Definite. The *Greek* Perfect is correctly employed, because it is intended to convey, and does convey, the idea that they are still in Christ, while the English "have been" suggests precisely the contrary. "I have been in Spain" implies that I am *not* there now; "I have *long* been in Spain" implies that I *am* there now; but this would not need the Perfect but the Present in Greek. With Rom. xvi. 7 we may compare John ix. 29, Μωυσεὶ λελάληκεν ὁ Θεός, "God *spoke* [what we still have on record] to Moses;" and vi. 25, πότε ὧδε γέγονας; when *camest* thou hither [where thou now art]?" Also I Cor. xi. 15, ἡ κόμη αὐτῆ περιβολαίου δέδοται αὐτῇ, "*was given* to her as [what it still is] a covering;" xiii. 11, ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ, "when I *became*, [what I am], a man;"<sup>2</sup> xv. 4, καὶ ὅτι

<sup>1</sup> I do not propose to discuss every Perfect in the Greek Test., but one small exceptional class may be just alluded to. The Perfects ἐσχηκα, εἴληφα, and εἶρηκα are sometimes used apparently in a purely aoristic sense. I venture to think however that the Perfect admits of explanation as such in every case except where εἴληφα and εἶρηκα occur in the Apoc., εἴληφα five times (ii. 27, iii. 3, v. 7, viii. 5, xi. 17) and εἶρηκα twice (vii. 14, xix. 3). The aoristic force (which indeed is not necessarily assigned in all these passages) is, I suspect, to be attributed to simple error, the Perfects being mistaken for Aorists through their resemblance to ἔθηκα, ἤνεγκα, &c.

<sup>2</sup> I am inclined to think that similar to this is the true explanation also of the γέγονεν in Matt. i. 22, xxi. 4, xxvi. 56, "all this *came to pass* [and remains what it is—an accomplished fact]." Bishops Lightfoot and Wordsworth prefer to account for the Perfect on the ground that "St. Matthew writes as one who lived near the fact, and speaks of it as just done." But any way the tense implies that

ἐγήγερται, "and that He *rose*," [as He still is a risen Saviour]. "Has risen," of the act, would be the nearest English representative not of ἐγήγερται, but of ἠγέρθη.

With this use of the Perfect compare the τεθνᾶσιω of Luc. Dial. Mort. 11. 2: "What was the end then? I should much like to know?" "They both *died* [and they are now here among us] on the same day." And τέθασται in Xen. Hell. II. 4. 19, coming in the very midst of the description of a battle, must in English be rendered "was buried," the word further implying "Where he still lies."

In short while such a sentence as "One of the A.S. Kings *has* established Trial by Jury" or "King John *has* signed Magna Charta" is quite contrary to usage in English, notwithstanding the continued existence of Trial by Jury as one of our institutions and of Magna Charta as part of the law of the land, in Greek on the contrary the verb might correctly be in the Perfect; and this again constitutes a marked distinction between the Greek Perfect and the English Perfect.

(f) A further and double proof remains that the Greek and English Perfects are not equivalent. For what more familiar modes of expression have we than these—"I *have* never *written* to him," "I *have* often *written* to him"? Yet here we should normally have the Aorist in Greek, not the Perfect.

As to *never* of past time. In the N.T. (see Bruder) we find 23 such passages, in only 6 of which (all containing πω) is the Perfect used, while in all the remaining 17 the Aorist appears, with οὐδέποτε or οὐδεὶς πώποτε or οὐδεὶς οὐπω or οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς or the simple οὐκ as equivalent to *never* (Mark xiv. 21, Luke xxiii. 29). As in this last case in the N.T., so in half a dozen passages which I have succeeded in finding in the O.T., the LXX. uses οὐκ where A.V. has *never*—there is in Hebrew no one word for *never*,—and in only one of these (Dan. xii. 1) is it followed by a Perfect. Turning to the

---

the thing *abides* as done, the meaning being in this respect fuller than that of the English Perfect. Alford and Plumptre pass over the difficulty.

classical authors, I have with some difficulty found in Sophocles, Aristophanes, Plato, and Demosthenes, 34 passages in which the force of *never* is conveyed (by οὐδέπω, οὐδέπώποτε, οὐ . . . ποτε, οὔτε . . . ποτε) of past time, but the verb in 29 of the 34 is in the Aorist. In many of these in English also we should employ the Simple Past, but by no means so commonly as the Aorist is used in Greek.<sup>1</sup>

In the case of *πολλάκις*, though its employment with a past tense is by no means frequent, the Aorist is almost exclusively found as the equivalent of our Perfect. Thus in Hom. Il. i. 396, "For oft *have I heard* (ἄκουσα) thee say in my father's house ; *ib.* 3. 232, "Oft *has Menelaus entertained* (ξείνισσεν) him in our house ;" Soph. El. 62, "For oft before now *have I seen* (εἶδον) ;" Plat. Crito i, "I *have often thought* you happy (εὐδαιμόνισα) ;" *ib.* 10, "As *we have often agreed* (ὡμολογήθη) before now ;" Xen. Mem. I. i. 1, "I *have often wondered* (ἐθαύμασα) ;" Luc. Dial. De. 11. 1, "I *have often threatened* (ἠπειλήσα), if he will not desist from doing such mischief, I will break his arrows ;" and similarly, *ib.* 19. 2, "You *have hit* him with many an arrow (πολλὰ ἐτόξευσας)." Occasionally indeed *πολλάκις* takes the Perfect, as *πολλάκις τεθαύμακα*, Xen. Mem. III. 13. 3, but not in precisely the same sense : with the Aorist the meaning is "I have often been led to wonder" (or "admire"), with the Perfect, "I have often been in a state of wonder" (or "admiration"). But when we find Homer's lines (Il. 9. 490, 1)

πολλάκι μοι κατέδευσας ἐπὶ στήθεσσι χιτῶνα  
οἴνου ἀποβλύζων ἐν νηπιῇ ἀλεγείνῃ,

translated by Newman

"— oft in infantine annoyance

Didst thou the wine-draught gurgle out and wet my bosom's vesture ;"

or by Cordery,

"Yes, I remember, oft a fretful child

Thou 'dst spill the wine and soil the garb upon me ;"

<sup>1</sup> "The indefiniteness of the Aorist is very conspicuous in negative sentences. For in these it is quite clear that it covers the entire past up to the present moment." Prof. Agar Beet.

as to tense these are inaccurate renderings, representing not the Aorist, but the Imperfect of the Greek. Compare Hom. Il. 17. 408, *πολλάκι . . . ἐπέυθετο*, Soph. CEd. Tyr. 1275, *πολλάκις ἤρασσε βλέφαρα*, Xen. Mem. I. 2. 50, *πολλάκις ἐσκόπει*. Here the oft-repeated enquiry, striking discussion, took place in *definite* past time: and this is what the Simple Past in English expresses. *Πολλάκις ἔγραφον* is "I often wrote;" *πολλάκις ἔγραφα*, "I have often written;" and the much rarer *πολλάκις γέγραφα*, "I have often had my completed writing before me."

So in N.T. *πολλάκις ἔβαλε*, Mark ix. 22, "*has* often thrown;" *πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν*, Rom. i. 13, "I *have* often intended to come;" *ἐδοκιμάσαμεν πολλάκις*, 2 Cor. viii. 22, "we *have* found by frequent experience;" *πολλάκις με ἀνέψυξεν*, 2 Tim. i. 16, "*has* often cheered my spirit:" no time being defined, these are the only correct renderings. Similarly *πολλάκις συνήχθη*, John xviii. 2, "he *had* often resorted." In Mark v. 4 the full force of *πολλάκις δεδέσθαι* is not merely "that he has often been secured," but "made fast and left (as was supposed) secure." The Imperfect with *πολλάκις* in Rom. xv. 22 and Phil. iii. 18 refers to repeated action within a *definite* past period, and therefore the English Simple Past may be used: "I *was* hindered on those" (not "these") "many occasions (*ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλά* in the best MSS.);" and "I many times *told* you," namely, while present with you.

VIII. The persistent rendering of the Greek Aorist by the English Simple Past in the R.V. of the N.T. has one very undesirable effect—that *the translation is not English*.

This un-English tone is felt in the numerous Hebrew and Greek idioms that so abound in the R.V. of the N.T. I will not digress to deal with Hebraisms, but will adduce just one example of a Greek idiom, one out of many: "a man which *had his hand withered*." We do indeed say "the man who had his arm broken" or "scalded" or "cut off;" but there the *act*—that is, his endurance of the act—of breaking or scalding or cutting off is suggested; but no one can imagine that the *act* of withering, whether God's act or one performed

by some human process unknown to modern science, is referred to in the *ἐξηραμμένην* (not *ξηρανθείσαν*) of Mark iii. 1. *State*, not *act*, is indicated by the Perfect Participle. As to "had his hand withered," we should as soon say "The elephant has his hide thick," or "The girl has her hair red:" excellent as Greek, intolerable as English.

So is it with respect to the use of the tenses in R.V.; and it is possible to adduce a somewhat striking proof of the recalcitrance of our native tongue on this bed of Procrustes on which the Revisers—I still speak only of the N.T.—have forced it to lie.

I have examined numerous chapters of the Epistles—the English R.V.—and classified all the indicative verbs in them to a total of 650. I have similarly examined non-narrative writings—dedications, prefaces, dialogues, but mainly *letters*—of several of our classical English authors, classifying the verbs to a total of 2,000. It would not have done justice to the experiment not to appeal to a variety of authors on a variety of subjects. The letters &c. were those of Pope, Gay, Kirke White, Byron, Coleridge, Southey, Charles Lamb, W. S. Landor, Trench, Mrs. Browning, and especially (but eschewing narrative) Macaulay. The following table shows the percentages of results.

	Pres.	Impf.	S. Past.	Perf.	Plup.	Fut.
Pope &c.....	57'55	'2	16'95	14'25	1'95	9'1
St. Paul in R.V...	52'92	'15	26'46	10'92	'46	9'1
Do. A.V...	50'15	'15	19'69	16'77	'61	12'61

Of course such expressions as Pope's "That gentleman *is become*," Kirke White's "Your time *is nearly expired*," "My Essay *is printed*," Coleridge's "Their fame *is established*," Macaulay's "I *am fully resolved*," and in R.V. "Ye *are made nigh*," "Your faith *is gone forth*," "It *is written*"—are not reckoned as Presents, but, what they really are, Perfects. None of them would be in the Present either in Latin or Greek.

Now when we look at this table we see at a glance that the Future is used with exactly the same proportionate frequency in the R.V. of the Epistles as in our English classics, while all the other tenses, especially the Perfect and Pluperfect, are thrust into the background to enhance the honour of the Simple Past. In Pope's and Gay's letters the Perfect is used just as frequently as the Past, by Coleridge and Mrs. Browning even more frequently in the writings that I examined; while the average is about as 7 to 8: in R.V. the ratio is about 2 to 5, and this in spite of the fact that some of these Perfects (as shown on p. 169) are such by an illicit process. Would it be possible to adduce evidence more conclusive that the Revisers showed too little consideration for the genius of the English language?

Let us now compare R.V. with A.V. The figures (the percentages reduced from the same total of 650) are given in the same table. It is unfortunate that I did not keep an exact list of the passages from R.V. that I examined, so that I lighted on places where there were more Futures but fewer Presents. But in respect to the two tenses now chiefly under consideration, it is truly remarkable how accurately the relative use of the Simple Past and of the Perfect by the Translators of 1611 coincides with that of our best writers in the same class of composition. If instead of 1677 we had 1655 the proportion would be exact, for

$$1695 : 1425 :: 1969 : 1655.$$

How is it then to be accounted for that the N.T. Revisers of 1881 have so far departed from the model of our best writers? Because — untaught by the very name of the *α-όριστος* — they imagined it to be the special function of the Aorist to predicate a past event in definite past time, overlooking the wide difference (§ IV.) between narrative and non-narrative Greek; and rightly feeling, in spite of the inexact and misleading nomenclature of the English grammars, that the Simple Past is the Definite Past in our language, they came to the erroneous though honest conclusion that they were bound to translate the Aorist by the Simple Past — with a few inexplicable exceptions.

IX.—Attention has already been called (p. 41) to the wealth of tenses of our English verb. Nevertheless it is deficient in one tense, the *Simple Imperfect*. Such a tense is found in Greek, Latin, French, Italian, &c., but there is none in English. What then do we substitute for it? Frequently, as above pointed out (p. 42), we adopt some periphrasis, "I was writing," "I kept on writing," and so on; but most commonly, whether we are translating Thucydides or St. Luke, we employ the Simple Past: ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίησεν, Mark iii. 8, "What great things He *did*," A.V. and R.V. Obviously we might render the ἐποίησεν by "He was doing" or "He had been doing;" but our Simple Past is often used of (1) prolonged or (2) repeated or (3) habitual action, where the Imperfect would be used in the languages that are provided with that tense. Examples, though perhaps scarcely necessary, are (1) "He utterly *distrusted* the baron," (2) "An actress who night after night *played* the Belle Arsène, and whom the pit *hissed*," (3) "She always *thought* of his troubles;" where in French we should find "se défiait," "jouait . . . sifflait," "pensait." Now this suggests two remarks.

(a.) First, if our Simple Past bears this sense, and so frequently, as every reader of Greek knows, corresponds to the Imperfect as well as the Aorist, is there not obvious danger, while avoiding confusion of the Aorist with the Perfect, of confounding it with the Imperfect? a danger of steering away from Scylla into Charybdis? Hence in many places were the R.V. retranslated into Greek by any scholar who was keenly alive to the distinction of tenses, the English Past would be rendered by the Greek Imperfect. To give one example of many that might be adduced: Jesus upbraided certain towns "because they *repented* not" (Matt. xi. 20) must convey to the mind the sense "because they were not penitent" or "repenting." But this would be the Imperfect, while the Greek has the Aorist. The true rendering is "because they *had not repented*"—the English Pluperfect.

In any translation some seeming confusion of the tenses of the original is absolutely unavoidable, because, as above shown, none of our tenses correspond exactly—nay, they are

far from corresponding—with those of the Greek verb ; but it does seem strange that translators have been so apprehensive of confounding the Greek Aorist and Perfect (or Pluperfect) under one tense in English, while yet continually compelled to confound the Greek Aorist and Imperfect under another. There will be least clashing of the two tenses if we shift the ground of the Aorist itself, restoring it to its just rights as an indefinite tense, and accordingly often rendering it by the English Perfect or Pluperfect. This necessity the Revisers fully recognize when they write: "In the great majority of cases we have been obliged to retain the English preterite [= Simple Past], and to rely either on slight changes in the order of the words, or on prominence given to the accompanying temporal particles, for the indication of the meaning which in the Greek the imperfect tense was designed to convey." (Pref. to N. T. III. 2.) But why should one regard this necessity as *valde defendenda*?

In translating from French and other modern languages we do not painfully trouble ourselves about either Scylla or Charybdis. Our one aim is to give an exact and adequate reproduction of the writer's meaning, as accurate as our idiom admits, in pure and natural English ; and more than this cannot be done except by adding explanatory notes. In Spanish the Past Definite is often used, just like the Aorist, where we prefer the Perfect, and even at times in principal clauses. Thus Pérez Galdós writes: "Dios te *hizo* tan sosa que le dejarás escapar," "God *has made* you such a fool that you will let the man escape from you ;" "Esa vida *se acabó*," "That kind of life *has come to an end*." But who would dream of translating otherwise, although they are simple tenses in the Spanish?

(b) Moreover the Simple Past when equivalent to a Latin or Greek, French or Spanish, Imperfect, still always refers to *definite* past time in or within which the action, prolonged or repeated or habitual, took place. The reader can test this for himself. Read page after page of Plautus or Livy, Sophocles or Thucydides or the Greek Testament, of Dumas (père ou fils), Balzac, Victor Hugo, or Cervantes or Pérez Galdós, and this will be found true.

X. This fact that our Simple Past, whether it represents in translation an Aorist or an Imperfect, is always definite, is one on which I must strenuously insist. The English Perfect may be, and often is, so employed that the circumstances, or a gesture, or other words in the sentence may indicate—as the Greek Perfect always does—a connexion with present time, though this is by no means always the case. In “I have written these letters” there is a true Present Complete. In “I have written dozens of letters on gilt-edged paper” there is no indication of time whatever—none specified, none implied; only the writing was in some past time. This is a Past Indefinite. But in “I wrote dozens of letters” some time is definitely alluded to, or has been already mentioned, at or within which the letters were written. This is a Past Definite.

Occasionally a Simple Past is apparently indefinite, but only apparently. For instance, let a contractor say, “I built those houses,” what he really means is, “At the time when those houses were built, I was the builder.” The true predicate is *I*: “the builder was—I;” and time is definitely implied. Or some extension of the predicate may be in sense the predicate, as “I built those houses *of the best Suffolk stocks*;” still the time is definite. So in Rom. i. 5, δι’ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν is preferably to be rendered “by whom we *have received*, &c. ;” but “by whom we *received*” is intelligible, if we understand the Apostle as saying that “*when* we received grace and apostleship, these came through Him.” In that case the true predicate is the οὗ: “the giver was—He;” but the time is definitely implied. And there are a few more similar passages.

But there are many which will not admit of such an explanation, and in which the rendering of the Aorist by our Simple Past *imports an idea of definite time which is not in the original*; and the introduction of any thought not in the original no one would attempt to justify. In Rom. xvi. 17, “the doctrine which ye *learned* :” at any special time? Surely not.—2 John 6, “as ye *heard* from the beginning :” “as ye heard *in* the beginning” would be intelligible; but as it

stands the expression points to a period wholly past that started "from the beginning," and what such period was there, and when did it terminate?—1 John ii. 27, "even as it [the anointing] *taught* you:" but this cannot have been limited to one definite past time, for the very same verse says, "His anointing *teacheth* you," so that the teaching still goes on. (I hesitate to accept Bishop Westcott's interpretation of this verse, for it seems to me that in order to justify the importation of one extraneous idea he introduces another, that of the "germ" of truth). In Matt. xi. 25, what pretext is there for supposing that on one particular occasion God "*hid* these things from the wise and prudent, and *revealed* them to babes"?—Certain persons are alluded to in 1 Tim. i. 19, 20 as having made shipwreck concerning the faith, and Hymenæus and Alexander as having been by St. Paul delivered to Satan. A.V. states these things indefinitely as having happened: R.V. alludes to some particular time not mentioned. With what advantage?—"Demas *forsook* me," says R.V., 2 Tim. iv. 10; "brethren who *bare* witness," 3 John 6; and "thou *didst leave* thy first love," Rev. ii. 4; but no definite time is stated or implied in the Greek in any of these cases, and it is not only unnecessary but unwarrantable to foist in that idea.—"Those who . . . *fell* away," Heb. vi. 4—6: this R.V. rendering limits the awful warning to certain persons who so sinned at a certain time. "Each part of the picture," says Bishop Westcott, "is presented in its past completeness," an interpretation which I venture to think inexact and perilously misleading.—In Rom. iii. 7 even Alford renders, "If the truth of God *hath abounded* by means of my falsehood, &c.;" and what is gained by fixing "my lie" to a certain date?—And again, two verses below, even Alford renders "we *have* before *proved*, &c." R.V. gives, "we before *laid* to the charge both of Jews and Greeks, &c." Well, when? If in this same Epistle, which seems clearly the meaning, assuredly "we *have* above *laid*, &c." is imperatively demanded by the "usus" of English speech.—In Col. iii. 1, 3, even if "the allusion is to a definite time, your baptism" (Alf.), the time not being mentioned, our idiom prefers "ye *have been*

raised with Christ" and "ye *have died*," the latter as in Rom. vi. 7.—In all these cases the "have" needs not a word of apology, or to be spoken with "whispering humbleness:" there is nothing unscholarly in its use; it supplies the only correct form to exhibit adequately the true sense of the original—the *true* English Past Indefinite for the Greek Past Indefinite.

XI. Since writing thus far I have for my own satisfaction tested the soundness of the view of the Aorist here maintained by a careful reading of Lucian's *Deorum Dialogi*, selecting these because they contain but little narrative. The result is interesting. In those Dialogues there are in all, if I have correctly counted, 154 Aorists Indicative. Of this total 83 are in narrative passages, such as describe the offence and the punishment of Prometheus, the death of Hyacinthus, the fate of Phaethon, &c.; 4 refer to a definite time just past ("Why do you ask me that?" "I *asked* for no particular reason"); 12 may be translated indifferently by the English Simple Past or Perfect ("Io is no longer a girl, but a heifer." "Marvellous! but how has she been," or "was she," "changed?"—"I carried off the infant to Nysa and gave it," or "have given it," "to the nymphs to bring up under the name of Dionysus"); while one (*ἐγέλασα*) may best be rendered by the Present ("You make me laugh.") The remaining 54 seem to me *all* to require, or at least to prefer, the Perfect in English. For instance, Eros entreating Zeus to release him pleads, "But if I *have done* anything wrong (*ἡμάρτον*), forgive me."—"Hera *has put* a herdsman in charge (*ἐπέστησεν*) of Io, and he sees to the heifer's grazing."—"He is unworthy . . ." "What outrage then *has he committed* (*ὑβρίσεν*)?"—"Why are you laughing, Hermes?" "Because I *have seen*, &c."—"He has on his face the scars of the punishment he *has received* (*ἔλαβεν*) in boxing."—"I am obliged to you for" (lit., "you *have obliged*, *ὤνησας*, me by") "telling me how to distinguish them."

It is not necessary to quote all the 54. Let the reader

examine these Dialogues for himself, carefully separating the narrative portion—even short fragments—from that which is not narrative, and let him deal with the various Aorists Indicative that occur, considering with what tenses they ought to be rendered according to the true, natural, and familiar English idiom. Next let him read a few chapters of Herodotus or Thucydides or Xenophon, distinguishing speeches, and then decide whether my contention is justified that while the Aorist in narrative is (by virtue of the context) definite as to time, and corresponds to our *Simple Past*, or occasionally our Pluperfect, the non-narrative Aorist is wholly indefinite in time, and that its true representative is what we ought to call our Past Indefinite, namely the *Perfect*. If so, while it is strictly accurate to render δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν εἰς Ποτιόλους by “On the second day we *reached* Puteoli,” it is not a whit less accurate to render τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφῆκες by “Thou *hast left* thy first love,” Rev. ii. 4 : “thou leftest” is inaccurate and wrong.

It is profoundly to be regretted that our N. T. Revisers so insufficiently studied our English tenses. Thousands there were of their Bible-loving countrymen who year after year from the inception of the Revision to its completion were always on the look-out for every morsel or crumb of information as to the progress of the work, and who, when it appeared, discovered with interest and delight its many real and high excellences ; but to such it has been matter of sincere lamentation to find these excellences so seriously marred and countervailed by faults and blemishes that impair the surface, and more than the surface, of the work. And in particular the reader far too often feels that he is not reading *English* ; so he lays the volume aside, or at most regards it as useful merely for occasional reference. In short the disappointing and deplorable result is this—the public rejects the book. The cause κατ' ἐξοχήν I believe to be the erroneous treatment of the English verb with which this paper has dealt.

RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, D.LIT. LOND.

## THE QUESTIONS OF THE BIBLE.

IN a book which has recently been published by Mr. Fisher Unwin, and which has been compiled by Mr. William Carnelley, the part which questions play in the sacred volume has been very distinctly brought out. That this is a strong element in the Scriptures even the most cursory readers must have felt; for a very superficial reading of the Bible leaves some of its profound and heart-searching questions lingering, like sad and melancholy music, in the reader's heart. And those who have read the Scriptures devoutly and sincerely have found that some of its deepest and most abiding impressions have been made by those words which arrest the soul in the demands that they make upon conscience; which bring the soul into the presence of great questions, ever new and ever personal, and yet defying the power of man in his attempt to find for them an adequate solution. Prepared, therefore, as every reader of the Bible must have been, to find that a very large element of its most powerful teaching was to be found in its questions; few, we venture to think, would have anticipated that it was such an important factor, and that even by this element alone it would be possible to form some conception of the distinctive character of certain books of the Scriptures. The Book of Job, for instance, has a higher average of questions than any other book in the Bible. The soul of the writer,

“In those grand moments when she probes herself,”

carries on the work of self-introspection and self-acquaintance by means of interrogatives. And when, like another Dante, she wings her flight to heaven above, and to hell beneath, the half-dark lantern with which that investigation of the dark places of the universe is accomplished is almost invariably some profound and searching question—a question which suggests absolutes beyond human grasp, infinities beyond human ken, and immortalities beyond human search. If, therefore, this volume does nothing more than attract attention—which it must assuredly do—to the large place which

questions have in the Revelation of the Divine Will, it will not have been without its value to all intelligent students of the Bible.

It would be the merest affectation to say that all the questions in this volume are of equal significance. They range from the merest triviality of a commonplace inquiry, to the very profoundest and most important questions which have ever exercised the highest human intelligences. But it is remarkable to notice how many of these questions are of first-rate importance. Whether they are the questions which the soul addresses to itself or to God, or those in which the Creator appeals to His creatures, they are questions in the correct solution of which lies man's highest destiny and blessedness. Of the 1,189 chapters of which the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are composed, 453 only are without a question of some sort. In the 929 chapters of the Old Testament, there are 2,274 questions, while in the 260 chapters of the New Testament there are 1,024 questions; thus showing an average per chapter for the Old Testament of 2.3; and for the New Testament 3.9, and for the whole Bible of 2.75. The Book in the Old Testament which has the greatest number of questions is Job, which is far ahead of all other books, having 329 as compared with Jeremiah, which has 195, and which is next in the list. The Book of the New Testament which has a similar pre-eminence is St. Matthew's Gospel, which has 177 questions, but it is immediately followed by St. John's with 167. The chapter in the Old Testament which has the greatest number of questions is Job xxxviii., which has 40, far out distancing 2 Sam. xix., which has 22, and which is the next in the list; while 1 Cor. ix. has the greatest number of questions of any chapter in the New Testament, having 20, being followed immediately, however, by St. John vii., which has 19. These are some of the facts which are clearly stated in this volume, and which make it of interest to all who are attracted to the study of the Bible. This volume is the simple presentation of those high questionings of which the Bible contains the permanent record—questionings of the human mind upon

God, character, destiny, and the great problems of which these words are the symbols. It reveals to us the eager, anxious, and restless spirit of man, ever searching, and though often baffled, pursuing with tireless foot the fair form of Truth, buoyed up with the constant hope that in the end it shall stand in the glory of her revealed loveliness, and find in that vision perfect and immortal blessedness.

It is perhaps impossible to estimate how large a part is played by questions in the education of a human mind, and in the culture of a human spirit. First of all a question is a challenge to the reason, and rarely fails to be arrestive, and to awaken the mind to the consideration of the problems which it has to suggest. Many a man who would stand unmoved when a truth is stated categorically, will find every part of his sensibility aroused and become responsive when that same truth is put to him in the form of a question. Then it is a challenge; the call of a clarion which awakens echoes in his own heart. It seems as though the truth had suddenly assumed a reality which it had never had before, and had addressed him as a person to a person. As though that which hitherto had been to him but a dim abstraction, dwelling apart, and having its home, if indeed it could be said to have a home, in a land of clouds and dreams, had abruptly become incarnate, and assumed a visible form, and spoken with a real voice which had entered into his very soul. All at once it has seemed to become authoritative; and not only to have a kingdom but to rule and to demand submission to its sovereignty. Every one can think of truths which have become powerful in life when they have been stated as a clear interrogative to the conscience, and when the conscience has stood, for a moment, at least, as before some supreme judgment bar to which it is bound to account for its own conduct and life. And of such questions the Bible provides us with many an instance. Look at that dramatic incident in the vineyard of Naboth, where the prophet of Horeb confronts the king whose heart is stained with the dark crime of murder, and who is even now deepening the stain by the sin of theft, and arrests him with the

God-given question, "Hast thou killed, and also taken possession?" and so sets before the bewildered eyes of Ahab in clear and vivid outline the dark tragedy in which he is now playing so foul a part; and by his very question giving a voice to the dead man which cries out so loudly for judgment, that the trembling king exclaims, "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?" Surely that question of Elijah's, which lashed Ahab's conscience into at least temporary activity, was arrestive. It was a challenge which could not be silenced; an appeal which must be heard; a flaming light illuminating the soul in whose dark chambers there was unholy imagery and dark and foul spectres. It was a call which in God's mercy might have convicted to convert; but instead of which it convicted to destroy. And this is but one of many illustrations which might be provided from the "Questions of the Bible" of solemn, awful interrogatives addressed to the human soul; interrogatives which are full of force, and pregnant with significance, and which by the very boldness of their contrasts, and impressiveness of their suggested truths have ever been, and ever must be, to those who come beneath their influence, arrestive of deep thought and of conflicting feelings.

But further, a well-selected, succinctly-stated, and opportunely-put question is full of profound suggestiveness. It may not only be used to elicit from the person to whom it is addressed certain knowledge which he may be supposed to possess, but may be full of suggestion of long and beautiful vistas, of unimagined and indescribable splendours, of dark and hidden caverns in which undreamed of gold is buried; and by the very suggestion that that which is known is but a fraction of what may be known, may awaken within the heart desires, activities, enthusiasms which shall fill the soul with intense energy, and prompt it to unresting search of great and undiscovered realities; a search which shall not cease until its anxiety has found, at least, a short repose in the joy of realization and achievement. One of the chief factors in all education is the insinuation into the human mind of profound and bewitching suggestions of unexplored countries

and resources, and the firing of the mind with intense and contagious enthusiasm ; and there is nothing which does most of these at the same time more powerfully than a well-selected question. It was thus that Socrates taught his noble band of pupils ; and it is thus that many a successful teacher, both of old and young, has taught those who have gathered around him the majesty of truth, and the beauty of virtue. The earnest question has transported the listening soul beyond the veil, and if in the darkness it has been full of high imaginings, these very imaginings have become inspirations to search, and this, in its turn, has become a prophecy of conquest.

And it is here that, perhaps, the value of the questions of the Bible is most seen. Almost every page of this book brings into prominence one of those profound and searching questions which at first fills the mind with silent wonder, which is succeeded by strange and fascinating suggestion, which, in turn, is followed by aspiration, enthusiasm, and activity, ending, at last, in the triumph of achievement, and in that deep joy which, in spite of Lessing's very famous dictum, comes to the man who holds truth in his possession. We have chosen two such questions, one from the Old Testament and one from the New Testament, which completely illustrate our meaning. The searching question of one of the Psalmists is, "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place?" What infinite and inexhaustible suggestiveness there is in this question. Dim, and perhaps obscure, as childhood's intimations of immortality, revelations of the undimmed glory and spotless purity of the place which is the abode of God: suggestions of an element in man's nature which is not of the earth, earthy; but spiritual, and having a kinship with God: of possibilities of fellowship, in which the child shall hold unbroken communion with the loving Father: of communion so real that it is timeless, overstepping the artificial boundaries which limit our present being, mocking the impotence of death to destroy, and prolonging itself for ever: of moral affinity, and even likeness as essential to communion, because there can be no fellowship except between

that which is kindred in nature and spirit: of growth by fellowship, in which the soul shall realize its high destiny and become so Christ-like that it can enjoy perfect communion with the great object of its love. These are some of the hints, some of the wonderful suggestions of the question, realized in part by the Psalmist as is seen by his answer; more completely apprehended by the woman of Samaria under the kindly teaching of the Lord; and perhaps more completely understood by the saints of to-day under the ever-growing teaching and discipline of the Divine Revealer who takes of the things of Christ and reveals them to men. How the devout or undevout would be arrested by this question; how full of deep suggestiveness it would be as they pondered its appeal; and how strong the desire which it awakened would be in all hearts who considered it, needs not to be affirmed. We who have entered into the result of their thinkings, to whom there has come, side by side with their question, their answer, still feel the force of their self-probing, and there is awakened within our souls, suggestions, longings, desires, which are quenchless, and which arouse us to aspiration, activity, research, pursuit, and will, we feel convinced, lead us ultimately to full attainment. Or to leave the Old Testament Scriptures and come into the clearer light of the New Testament, we find there, not that the solved problems of the past made all future questions unnecessary; (for every solved problem seems only to suggest a thousand other problems which are unsolved, and to give them tongue for utterance, and strength for appeal;) but that men are still arrested by large suggestions and vivid hopes which are contained in great and searching questions. Who ever appealed to the heart of man as Jesus Christ of Nazareth? Who ever had such power to search the soul, to reveal its emptiness, and to suggest elements of grandeur and glory with which it might be filled. Some of His questions are among the words that burn themselves into the human soul: and when once heard can never be forgotten. The words of other great teachers may recede into dimmer and ever dimmer indistinctness; but His defy oblivion. As long as memory has a place in the

palace of the human mind, and gazes with searching eye upon her ever open book, the questions of Christ will flame upon its page, for they are written with ink which is indelible. How the crowd that listened to His question, "What man is there of you whom if his son asked bread will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?" would have its heart filled with deep and silent wonder, and infinite and helpful suggestion. One man as he listened, catching glimpses which would brighten into vision, of a truth of which he had hardly dreamed, the universal Fatherhood of God. Another whose heart was tossed with distracting cares, finding suggestions of a Divine solicitude, which was wise in its choice, and loving in its supply; while a third, as he listened, would find suggestions of a basis of confidence, trust, and hope, of which he had never before heard; and that here, at least, he could build the structure of his blessedness in the confidence that the foundation would hold all that was built upon it. And we, to-day, who hear this same question addressed to us, find in it the same calming and helpful suggestions. It is a voice from afar, but it tells our souls that in God's heaven there is a Father who loves, desires, and seeks the good of all men, whom He regards as the sheep of His pasture, and the children of His own home. And these two selected instances only speak of scores of equally suggestive questions which they represent; questions which make the soul to open wide its half-closed eyes, and to lift those eyes even to the heavens; feeling that beyond the dim frontiers that bound our present life there are grace, tenderness, and peace, and that joy which is unspeakable and full of glory.

But beyond all this: the questions of the Bible have a certain revealing power: telling us something of the nature of man; and something of the character of God.

What a light these questionings which arise in man's heart, and perplex his mind, and many a time spring to his lips, throw upon the nature of the being who asks them.

How they light up the dark places of his soul, revealing at once vast capacities and undreamed-of powers ; and at the same time speak of a restless curiosity, which man in his very intensest moments is unable to satisfy. There are many things in man which are the silent witnesses to the greatness of his nature, and which ever speak to the listening ear, even as the silent stars have language, of his real worth and intrinsic glory. Aspirations which are God-like ; desires which reach out into the infinite ; longings which seem ever to be unmet ; hopes which the present world cannot contain, and which mock the brevity of time by their endurance ; ambitions which carry the spirit out into a life that is perpetual, and which only find realization beyond the grave. But there is nothing which more reveals man's splendid powers, and pleads with eloquent tongue for a recognition of his glory, than those obstinate questions which rise perennially in the human heart. How they tell of great capacities, which, at present, are unsatisfied ; of longings for knowledge which the frail walls of ignorance cannot permanently keep within their present bounds ; of faculties to search into the very deepest things, but which to-day are bound and fettered by things over which the possessor has no control ; of restlessness which shows that man was not born for ignorance, and therefore cannot rest until he stands in the clear light of knowledge, and until the dark mysteries which sadden are forever solved. Is there a God ? and if so, where is He and what ? What am I ? Whence do I come, and whither do I go ? What is life ; and is it bounded by a birth and a death ? What is the nature of the voice within which commands and says I ought ? Whence its right to approve and to condemn ? and where is the law and judgment to which it points ? What is the meaning of the mysterious world in which I live—is it a machine or an organism ; a cosmos or a chaos ? These are the questions which arise with unflinching freshness and pressing urgency in the human heart, and so give to the history of philosophy a fascination which is all its own. And if they are the revelation of man's littleness, because they show the strict limitations of his life, they are also the indi-

cation of his real power because they point to a day when those limitations being removed, his God-like capacities and faculties shall find their fullest activity in an infinite subject of contemplation. The spirit which ever searches, though at present it may be baffled, must be made to know; the soul which would wing its flight into the heavens above, though to-day it may be caged, yet some day shall soar even to the highest heights; so that man's very limitations cry out eloquently, "It doth not yet appear what he shall be"; and in the promise and potency of that exalted and transfigured future there is a powerful witness to his present greatness. And how true the questions of Scripture are to all this. Now the soul, conscious of its limitations and pain, wails out its agony, "What is my strength, that I should hope? and what is mine end, that I should prolong my life? Is my strength the strength of stones? or is my flesh of brass? Is not my help in me? and is wisdom driven quite from me?" And now it rises to sublime heights of trust; and its very question has in it an invincible confidence, and itself is a trumpet note of triumph, "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?" And again, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us." Now, the man gazing upon the unnumbered splendours of the midnight sky cries out, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?" but in moments when another feeling possesses his heart, when physical things seem small compared with great moral realities, another man cries, "Know ye not that ye are the temples of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?" Now, the soul thinking of the infinitude of God, and conscious of its own finite limitations inquires, "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? Deeper than hell, what canst thou know?" and

yet in spite of this the soul has moments when it feels the power of the Divine presence, a presence from which it can no more escape than it can free itself from the atmosphere; then its inquiry is, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there."

Moreover, the questions of the Bible give expression to the thousand moods of which the human heart is the subject, and so reveal to us man's meanness and his grandeur, his impotence and his strength. Now, it is a question revealing a concentration of selfishness rarely surpassed, which inquires, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and now such a deep reverence for God's moral law, and respect and love for His authority, that in the presence of sin, which may be unseen except by God, it says, "How, then, can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" Here is a man who hates the very sin which ere long will defy and conquer his soul, and in fine scorn inquires, "Is Thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?" and here another who yearns for deliverance from all sin, saying, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Once there is the cry of a human spirit conscious of its relation to the Divine law and of violation of the Divine decrees, saying, "How shall a man be just with God?" and once the triumph of him who has had a like consciousness, but has found the answer the other sought, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" Now the soul asks, "If a man die, shall he live again?" and now it sings its triumphant death-song, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Then there is the question which reveals the meanness of the cynic's heart, testing everything by a vulgar utility, "What is the Almighty that we should serve Him? And what profit shall we have if we pray unto Him?" The question which ever rises to the lips of him who is prejudiced, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" The sad and bitter cry of the despondent is heard in the question,

“Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me?” and the ambitious soul has its revelation in the inquiry, “Who is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven?” The language of intense anxiety for spiritual blessedness is heard in the earnest entreaty, “Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?” and the spirit of unconscious goodness is revealed in the words of those who before their Judge fail to see their own superb excellence, “When saw we Thee an hungered and fed Thee? or thirsty and gave Thee drink? When saw we Thee a stranger and took Thee in? or naked and clothed Thee? Or when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee?” The love which is so intense that it has identified the interests of the person loving and the person loved, speaks out of its intensity in the language, “Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?” while the love which is fixed and rooted in God itself, and finds in Him all its supremest joy, is heard in the beautiful inquiry, “Whom have I in heaven but Thee?” So the questions of the Bible are to us a revelation of man in his weakness and in his strength, in his limitations as well as in his marvellous capacities; and here are discovered some of the various traits of his ever-changing mood and spirit. They are questions which to-day perplex, and sometimes fill his soul with dark despair; but as he lifts his eyes in mute appeal to heaven, he hopes for that supreme moment when he shall see “face to face,” and when that supreme word shall be fulfilled, in perhaps a different sense from that in which we have understood it, “In that day ye shall ask Me nothing.”

But the value of the teaching of the questions of the Bible is even higher than this. The questions would have incomparable value if we only regarded them in so far as they throw a flood of light upon human hearts in their aspirations and sorrows, hopes and disappointments, efforts and defeats, and in their great and unspeakable needs. But they go beyond this. While there are very earnest questions from the lips of man, there are also solemn and searching questions from the lips of God. And these are shafts of bright light in whose

brightness we may see something of that which it is our highest blessedness to know—the character of God. Who, for instance, can listen to that mother-like appeal, “Why will ye die, O house of Israel?” without feeling that behind it there is a heart full of the very intensest solicitude; and who understands the question of Christ, “What man of you having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost until he find it?” who does not see in it a revelation of a yearning in God’s heart that the farthest wanderer should be brought home? How tender is the watchfulness of God over those who love Him, is seen in the words, “Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, my way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God? Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary?” And what a revelation of longsuffering comes to us in the question, “How long will this people provoke Me? and how long will it be ere they believe Me, for all the signs which I have showed among them?” How solemnly, too, His own question sets forth His incomparable greatness, “To whom then will ye liken Me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One;” and what indications of His purity there are in the questions which tell us that it is not religion divorced from morality which is pleasing to Him, “To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? saith the Lord;” and again, “When ye come to appear before Me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread My courts?” Nearly every attribute of God has a voice in some solemn question of God’s Word; and if these questions were all that were left to us, we should still read of Wisdom which is always associated with Love; of Righteousness which is ever associated with Mercy; and of Omnipotent Power which is ever associated with Infinite Gentleness.

And when we turn to the pages of the New Testament, and confront that august and unique character, our Lord and our Saviour, there are two questions of His which seem to have a special pre-eminence. The one is uttered in the lonely

garden on the night that He was betrayed. Before Him stood the traitor fresh from his base bargaining; and that gentle heart could forget all the baseness and ingratitude, if even now it could save him, and so His last pleading is, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" The other question was addressed to a Pharisee as he journeyed toward Damascus. Excited, zealous, and passionate, he was bent on exterminating all who loved Christ, and destroying the work of the Man of Nazareth. But that Divine Man arrested him in his journey, and speaking in tones of mingled majesty and graciousness, said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" The one question was listened to and spurned; the other revolutionized a life and transformed a character.

The questions of the Bible, then, whether they be those which the soul addresses to itself or to its God; or whether they be the solemn, awful voice of God speaking in words of mingled severity and gentleness to the human soul, constitute a most important element of the teaching of the Bible. By them the soul is arrested from intellectual lethargy and made to confront great problems which it is its wisdom to understand and blessedness to solve. By them the frontiers of the life of the soul are extended, by subtle suggestions of facts beyond the present boundaries, so that the spirit looks out into the darkness, in confident hope that a ray of light will fall across its blackness, and reveal the wealth which to-day is hidden. They are as a lighted torch within the secret places of the soul, telling of wants which are unmet, of desires unsatisfied, of distresses which are unrelieved, and showing also some of its splendid wealth and glorious possibilities and powers. And above and beyond all, in those questions which fall from the lips of God Himself, with His own hand He draws aside the curtain by which He has been hidden, pierces with a ray of light the clouds and darkness that are round about Him, and reveals a Father with a heart of tenderness, a voice of pity, and a hand of love. And for all these reasons we value a book which has set this element of Bible teaching in a clear light and in a conspicuous form.

G. BEESLEY AUSTIN.

## FOOTPRINTS OF CHRIST.<sup>1</sup>

THEOLOGICAL thought has a tendency to move in circles. There is always, of course, movement outside, and within there are independent and opposing movements, which sometimes break away from the centre of gravity, and thenceforth move in circles of their own. The schoolmen, *e.g.*, moved round the philosophic circle within which the nominalists and the realists were in constant and fierce collision. With these the mystics maintained a somewhat loose relation, or else utterly broke away. Theology, then, became more doctrinal, and moved round certain well-defined Christian truths; Luther taking as his centre justification by faith, Calvin the election of grace, and Arminius the universality of redemption—all alike having diverged from the great ecclesiastical current of Romanism, which revolved, as it still revolves, on the pivot of the priesthood. Within the doctrinal circle formed by the Reformation, modern antinomianism was born; but not being of it, was speedily detached from it; and after a destructive career of three centuries has now practically disappeared. The Puritans moved in the same sphere as the Reformers, when at the end of the seventeenth century a revulsion occurred which turned theological discussion into two widely different channels. While philosophers had been speculating and doctors had been dogmatizing, a spirit of scepticism had been steadily growing up, and the tone of morality had been as steadily going down. The one asserted itself in the Deistic Movement, and the other in the shameless profligacies which succeeded the Restoration. It was time for theology to adjust itself to the changed necessities of the times, and the divines of the first half of the eighteenth century, therefore, met the theoretical and practical infidelity of the age with their

---

<sup>1</sup> By Rev. W. M. Campbell. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls.

famous apologetic treatises and their stern and practical ethical discourses. The powerlessness of these two movements, disassociated from doctrinal teaching, however, soon became manifest. Deism grew in spite of Bishop Butler, and immorality notwithstanding *The Whole Duty of Man*. But evangelicalism came to the rescue, and combined evidences, morals, and doctrine, by preaching the new birth with its new life of holiness, which silenced sceptics by its demonstration of the supernatural, and converted profligates by the power of the Spirit with which it was sent home. Methodism gave the main impetus to this movement, but eventually, through the force of circumstances, separated itself from it; and without altogether sundering friendly relations, worked independently. The theology of the past half century is confessedly somewhat chaotic; but those who will take the trouble to disentangle its elements, will see that its tendency is to settle down to a movement round a Christological centre. This may be tested by a survey of modern Christian literature. Books about our Lord are at once the most numerous and the most widely read. And it is precisely here that the true centre of Christian thought is, and it is here that the Apostles placed it. In their teaching Christ was the sole foundation, and had in all things the pre-eminence. And in proportion as theology revolves round Christ, every subject with which it deals will fall into its proper place and move in its true orbit. Christ is *the* evidence of Christianity, the spring of Christian truth, the model of Christian practice.

In regard to this latest and earliest-formed circle of theological thought, we notice the same characteristics as marked the rest. Eccentric movements, such as those of Paulus, Strauss, and Renan, have been thrown off, and within the circle there are diverse currents. While all flow round the Redeemer, some flow round His Person, others round His work, and others round His example. The latter current has always had a peculiar attraction for isolated thinkers in all the Christian centuries, but the first to follow it with anything like fulness was Thomas A'Kempis. The work of Kempis was continued by Jeremy Taylor, and then at length by Channing,

and the Unitarian school. Evangelical thinkers, however, have at last awakened to a sense of their duty and their privilege, and Christ the Model is being studied and expounded as never before. Of this tendency the work before us is a significant evidence. Its aim is "to direct, in a series of brief essays, special attention to some of the imitable characteristics of the Saviour." There are many ways of achieving this aim. One very striking method would be a systematic presentation of our Lord in His various relations. In one set of relations, *e.g.*, He would be a model for us in regard to God, parents, friends, enemies, women, and the world of men generally. In another set He might be shown to be our example as thinker, sufferer, worker, hero, martyr. In yet another we might see the imitable features of His character as fulfilling the inward and outward law of righteousness, personally and in the home, the Church, society, and the State. And lastly, it might be made to appear how we must follow Him in those phases of Christian experience which are symbolized by His birth, baptism, temptation, transfiguration, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and glorification. And we think that a work on the lines thus indicated would be of great service to contemporary Christian thought.

Mr. Campbell, however, has worked on a simpler, but nevertheless very effective plan, following for the most part the evangelical narrative step by step, singling out for more or less exhaustive treatment the imitable features of our Lord's character as they appear from time to time. This method certainly has its advantages, as this interesting book amply shows. For a careful and consecutive study of the pattern life as it was lived is likely to discover aspects of it which might be overlooked in the most comprehensive research under the guidance of a preconceived plan. Thus *e.g.*, in the incident of the stilling of the tempest we should scarcely expect to find our Lord appearing as an example. His manhood with its weakness and subjection to physical law is clearly apparent, and so is His Godhead in the act which calms the angry waves. But Mr. Campbell makes the incident the basis of a very suggestive essay on "Behaviour in a

Panic." "He arises master of Himself and them. If any effective help can be given, His is the true soul condition from which to expect it. His first words are reassuring. A rebuke—yet how welcome. How it steadies them. The self-possession of words and tone—how infectious. Panic-stricken people are liable to act in direct opposition to the necessities of the occasion. It does not take many minutes to empty a building of thousands when they depart in an orderly way. Could they control themselves and so depart, when conscious of the presence of fire, death would be robbed of most of his victims. Too often the danger is not the fire but the people." Again, under the somewhat uncouth title of "Not a Stickler," Mr. Campbell deals with the finding of the money in the fish's mouth, which, inasmuch as it was to pay a tax from which the children were free, is made to yield the lesson, that instead of stubbornly contending for our personal rights, we should be ready to waive them when occasion serves. In another chapter the words of St. Mark, "As He was wont," are shown to have a bearing on the nature and method of Christian habit. "The phrase is thrown in very much after the manner in which people use the words 'you know' in conversation. It is implied that you would or should take that for granted, even if it were not mentioned. The best fruit habitually borne." In the narrative of the Pharisees and the poor widow casting their gifts into the treasury, Christ stands out as "The Intelligent Observer." "In the imitation of Christ, as He is seen here, we shall be led to go deeper than the surface of things. We shall rise above the merely sensuous, we shall increasingly 'find tongues in trees,' &c." The impressive words, "One of you shall betray Me," teaches us "Propriety as to Quality and Time of News," and Christ's silence in the presence of Herod, "How to Treat Idle Curiosity."

Mr. Campbell has not, of course, rigidly followed the chronological plan, otherwise there would have been necessarily a considerable amount of repetition. This he has avoided by grouping the successive exhibitions of an imitable trait under the head of the earliest of them. Thus, all the

instances in which Christ honoured God's Word are considered in connection with the temptation. "The sword is the last argument of kings. The sword of the Spirit should be the first one wielded by those who are made kings unto God. When so honoured, would it not oftener prove to be the last and only one needed?" Christ's characteristics as a teacher are ascertained by a collation of various passages with Matt. vii. 29. "Not Fastidious about Accommodation" is the heading of a very interesting chapter; the last illustration of which, appropriately enough, is the crucifixion. But should not the first have been Luke ii. 7 instead of Matt. viii. 20? The essay entitled "Ignoring Social Distinctions" reveals Christ respectively at the tables of Matthew the Publican and Simon the Pharisee. "Beneath all the accidents of wealth, intellectual or social culture, political or ecclesiastical preferment, there were *souls*. However otherwise separated, they were one in having the Friend of sinners as their Friend, and they were to be one in the righteousness that was to be 'unto all them that believe.'" In Matt. xii. 46-50; Luke xi. 27, 28; John iv., Mr. Campbell sets forth our Lord's tact in utilizing the incidental as a model to us. We might quote several other instances in which the author has brought out the consistency of our Lord's example and the leading principles which all the way through guided His conduct, but these must suffice.

It will be seen from the above review that the author has taken special pains with those features of our Lord's character and conduct which are very generally overlooked. Amongst others we may mention "The Silence of Jesus," "Christ Resting," "Righteousness not Compromised by the Force of Hospitable Amenities," "Present Efficiency Unmarred by Visions of the Future," "Jesus Singing," "Great-heartedness" towards friends and foes, and "Christ as a Travelling Companion," in which what is termed the Saviour's "incog." is handled with a good deal of freshness. With Mr. Campbell's treatment of Christ's boyhood, obedience, moral courage, prayers, sympathies, zeal, &c., it is unnecessary to deal except to place a note of admiration against the first.

The book appropriately closes with some admirable general remarks on Christ's character in its imitable aspects, which will well repay attention. There are two sources of our knowledge of God—nature culminating in man; the Bible shining with increasing clearness until the MAN of His right hand, "the express image of His Person," comes—the crowning glory of all God's revelations. This revealing life allies Himself to us that we may grow up into Him in all things—the representative human character. It may be said that slavish imitation is a sign of littleness. Through it men lose their individuality, which is their honour, and their originality, which is their power. The artist who slavishly copies another is neither respectable nor respected. But this is only the case when the models are confessedly imperfect. The charge of want of originality or individuality is never preferred against the students of Greek sculpture or Italian painting. So here to imitate other men is weakness, to copy Christ is strength, and he who should imitate Him the most nearly will be the most original man upon earth. Such an imitation would revolutionize our old natures, and enable us to live a large and varied life. For like a glorious landscape viewed at different angles and at different times, is the character of Christ. No one can gaze upon it twice without some fresh revelation. Such will be the characters of those who resemble Christ. In the history of the race, the imitative tendencies of the soul have called into existence various schools. A master arises, and others, adopting his style and employing his method, form with him a school. So with Christ and His followers. They form a school of poetry (*ἔσμεν ποίημα*, Eph. ii. 10), a school of war; a school, in short, which embodies the analogies of all the schools. Who would not be a member of it, and follow Jesus until changed into His "image from glory to glory"?

As a closing remark, we should like to recommend this excellent work as the basis of a series of discourses, or as a text-book for a Bible-class.

J. W. BURN.

## LEAD US NOT INTO TEMPTATION.

μη εισενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.—MATT. vi. 13.

I SUPPOSE it may be fairly concluded from these words that God does upon occasion lead men into temptation. But it has become so customary to regard temptation as synonymous with solicitation to sin, that many shrink from admitting this as possible, and consequently seek for a way out of the difficulty by turning, so to say, the edge of the verb, and making it equivalent to no more than this, "Suffer us not to be led into temptation." And yet the verb is active, and most distinctly conveys the idea of God as Agent bringing us into some given situation. It is something that God can do, or forbear to do as part of His own dealing with His children, that is definitely in question. The verb must therefore stand. Nor is there any objection at all to this if the noun that follows be as carefully restricted to its natural signification. For *πειρασμός*, as everybody knows, simply means, in its first intention, the making trial of anything, or putting it to the test. A whole army of Government inspectors exist at the present day for purposes of *πειρασμός*. Whether it be boilers, bridges, bayonets, or what not, the House of Commons at question-time has enough to hear about these. That bayonets, for example, should curl up innocuously in action is highly undesirable. They must be subjected, therefore, to a severe test beforehand, a test under which a large percentage will indubitably fail; but better so than that they should be found useless for their proper purpose when the critical moment comes when everything depends on their being relied upon.

The unlettered reader has doubtless often found a difficulty in the text, "It came to pass after these things that God did *tempt* Abraham." The Revised Version has substituted "prove," and it is well. God had confidence in His servant Abraham, and this confidence, as the event showed,

was not misplaced. No severer test could have been applied than that which Abraham was subjected to ; but Abraham's faith proved equal to the test, and God was glorified in the result. He led His servant into temptation ; and who will venture to say that it had been better otherwise ? Another Old Testament reference may serve to make what is thus clear still clearer. "Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep His commandments or no" (Deut. viii. 2). Life on earth is a like wilderness-journey, a like probation-time for all of us. For ten, twenty, forty, or eighty years we are put upon our trial here. Our earthly sojourn has no meaning if viewed in any other light. The Lord has need of good and faithful servants who may be fit to be preferred to great and glorious trusts hereafter. But the opportunity of showing whether they are good and faithful must first be given them, and this opportunity can only be given in one way. They must be subjected to the discipline of temptation. For him that overcometh God has a crown of life in store ; but how can the soldier overcome who has never fought ? And how is he to fight if no enemy is to have the power to attack him ? I take up a devotional book at hazard, *The Hidden Life of the Soul*, and I turn to the chapter on "Temptation," and I find this all set down there as I should expect to find it : "When we speak of proving a thing, we mean putting its quality, its strength, its reality, to the test. Unproved goodness is but an uncertain matter. . . . Holiness would scarce be what it is, rare, hard to win, if it involved no struggle, no difficulties. St. Paul certainly held it to be no light matter when he compared it to the athletes' contest, saying, 'Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible.' Untried virtue can scarce deserve the name."

The real difficulty of the subject comes in when we take into account the action of "the Tempter" proper. Whence hath he this power to tempt, and within what limits is its exercise permitted, and what is to be thought of this per-

mission in view of the results to those who yield under temptation? In answer to these questions there can be adduced speculations, and no more. The existence of evil, the origin of evil, the soul of man has vexed itself in every age with travailing to push this problem to a solution, but the solution comes not yet, and where the dread shadow falls we do but grope in darkness after those who lost their way here long ago. But let the existence of evil and of the Arch-propagandist of evil be once admitted, and the perplexities that follow from this admission put for the present on one side, the question may be fairly asked, Is it better to be obliged to think that Satan can assail us as he pleases, whenever he likes, and as often as he likes, or to be able to think rather, that, like Pilate, he can have no power at all against us except it be given him from above? Surely the latter is best, if it thus comes to what is apparently but a choice of evils, since "God is faithful, who will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that we may be able to bear it." And as it is most reassuring to think this, so it seems to be what Scripture teaches. Against Job, for instance, Satan could do nothing till God gave him power, nor could he at any stage of his malicious machinations do more than God permitted. And if God gave permission, so bringing His servant into sore temptation, it was with no wish that he should fall. Even to entertain such a thought were blasphemy. No, it was because God had confidence in the man's integrity that He suffered his faithfulness to be brought to such a crucial test. Within certain limits the great enemy was allowed to do his worst, and the fact remains that thereby Job gained an approximation which he could not otherwise have gained towards God's best.

Or take the case of St. Peter. "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (*ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς*), that he may sift you as wheat." The form of the Greek word implies that the desire was granted. Confining ourselves to the case of this one Apostle, it is clear that Satan was to do what he could against St. Peter's faith. So far, then, he was led into

temptation by God's permission. He might have been left behind, or been sent away, but God had not planned it so. Must his fall be, therefore, charged on God? It is not to be so thought of for a moment. St Peter fell, not solely because God permitted Satan to tempt him. For God permitted Satan to tempt Jesus Himself, and Jesus did not fall. It is impossible, indeed, to lay too much stress upon this fact in this connection, "Then was Jesus *led up of the Spirit* into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil."

Wherefore the explanation of St. Peter's failure is to be looked for here, that three times he was found sleeping in spite of the loving warnings of his Master of the need he had in such an hour to watch and pray. And be it noted for our instruction that, however grievous in its immediate circumstances, that failure was the making of St. Peter. It cured him of his self-confidence once for all. The process and the cure alike are typical. For in regard to self does "man, proud man," continually reveal himself as "most ignorant of what he's most assur'd." And not till he is disabused of this so dangerous ignorance, however rude the shock, however pitiless the assailing blast, however disastrous for the moment the moral subsidence, the resulting ruin,—not till he has got down through the rubbish-heaps of a complacent fancy, got low enough, down to the truth, down to hard naked fact, can he hope to rear on the basis of a real self-knowledge a building which future tempests shall spend themselves against in vain. So true is it what St. Augustine wrote, "Diaboli tentationes ad utilitatem sanctorum convertit Deus." So true is it what another moralist has said, "One could not wish any man to fall into a fault; yet is it often precisely after a fault, or a crime even, that the morality which is in a man first unfolds itself, and what of strength he as a man possesses, now when all else is gone from him." (Quoted in Carlyle's *Miscellanies*—"Mirabeau.")

When I consider such cases as those of Job and the Apostle Peter, I often find myself recurring in thought to that scene in *Ivanhoe* when the knights challengers took up their position in the lists of Ashby prepared to do battle with

all comers. For any of those who had thus ranged themselves alongside of the redoubted Templar, it would have been sore shame and an indelible stain upon their knight-hood to hang back when an opponent's spear-point had once sounded its invitation on their shield. There could be no refusing consistently with honour. With Christ and His soldiers it is even so. He declined not the mortal challenge of the great enemy Himself. In the wilderness, in Gethsemane, they met in dread encounter. Such a passage of arms the onlooking hosts of angels had never witnessed ; but after moments of terrible suspense the victory was assured and the great enemy lay prone. But they who have thrown in their lot with Christ must expect—each in his turn—their challenge too. The weakened foe may yet retrieve his discomfiture in part by overthrowing in his turn these lesser champions. And it concerns Christ's honour and their own that they should not flinch from taking up the gage of battle. Not till the world's evening will the tourney close ; but then shall come the crowning, the banquet, the repose. He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, he shall eat of the hidden manna, he shall sit down with the Victor in His throne.

How, then, it may be asked, does it consist with honour to pray, "Lead us not into temptation"? An incident of the Battle of Creci suggests itself to me here. From the Black Prince's division, where the fight was raging fierce and doubtful, there came to the English king an urgent request for a reinforcement. "Edward, who from a windmill watched the chances of the battle, and the movements of the armies, inquired if his son were killed or wounded. The messenger replied, 'No.' 'Then,' said he, 'tell Warwick that he shall have no assistance. Let the boy win his spurs. He and those who have him in charge shall earn the whole glory of the day'" (Lingard). The king had led his son into temptation. He had brought him into this battle to try what metal he was of, to give him the chance fairly and honourably to win his spurs. The ordeal was a severe one for the young soldier. He felt himself failing under it. The desire to be

relieved at the critical moment was natural enough. The refusal of such a request might well seem hard. But the king looked at things as an old soldier looks at them. It was his pride in his son that made him prefer him at the outset to the post of danger, and that bade him afterwards withhold the succour that he sought. The son was new to battles, and feared the worst. But his father had greater confidence in him than he had in himself; and he was loth, by interposing prematurely on his behalf, to rob him of that glory which he had it in view that he should gain. All this is obvious enough. Why, then, is it less obvious that the dealings of the Heavenly Father with His children may oftentimes be even of this sort?

But still the difficulty remains—and only emphasized apparently by these considerations—that Jesus distinctly teaches us to pray, “Lead us not into temptation.” His wisdom, and His knowledge of man is nowhere perhaps more notable than here. He takes as the starting-point for human prayer, not the willingness of the spirit, but the weakness of the flesh. To recur once more to the case of St. Peter. When he expressed his readiness to lay down his life for his Master, to follow Him, if need were, to prison and to death, he meant it, aye, meant it to the uttermost. When he declared that, whatever others might do, he at all events would never flinch, he was tremendously in earnest. “Lead me into temptation,” was his heart’s prayer for the moment. “Only try me, give me a chance of showing my manhood, and no one shall ever have cause to say that Peter was a coward.” He was like those Christians of a later day who courted martyrdom. And yet the witness he was asked to bear, when the time came he could not. He failed utterly, miserably, and all because of that very longing to be led into temptation. There is a strange irony in this. It sends us back to the weakness of the flesh as the proper starting-point, and light at once streams in. It was in the weakness of the flesh realized through and through that Christ Himself, while Peter and the rest were sleeping, sent up to Heaven His agonizing cry, “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup

pass from Me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt." The prayer was heard, yet the cup did not pass from Him. And why? Because the Father would glorify the Son. Had Christ underrated the weakness of the nature He had taken upon Himself to wear, He had never prayed as He did then. In that case it must have broken down under Him. It had been fatal to rest any portion of the weight upon it. Every one is familiar with the parting charge to Cromwell which Shakespeare has put into the mouth of the fallen Wolsey—

"say, I taught thee.

Say, Wolsey—that once trod the ways of glory,  
And sounded all the depths and shoals of honour—  
Found thee a way out of his wreck to rise in;  
A sure and safe one, though thy master miss'd it.  
Mark but my fall, and that that ruin'd me."

There is marvellous pathos in that, "Say, I taught thee." When a man speaks out of the abundance of his heart, out of the fulness of his own life-experience, his utterances cannot fail to carry weight. And similarly the Lord's Prayer could not be to us all it is, if it were not for the "Say, I taught thee," of Christ, Christ who once trod the ways of humiliation here on earth, who sounded all the depths and shoals of human aspiration. Yes, Christ has found us a way, but not out of His wreck, to rise in; a sure and safe one, seeing that He Himself as Man has proved it. We have but to mark His footprints, and in them plant our own. All but the sense of human weakness had gone from Him when He knelt down to pray, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." But then and there, in absolute self-surrender to the Father's will, was realized the transmutation of this weakness into perfect strength. The Lord's Prayer is thus emphatically man's prayer, framed by the Incarnate Son of God as man for man, framed from a human standpoint, framed according to the felt needs of man by One who has worn our flesh, and is not ashamed to call us brethren, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, seeing that He was in all points tempted (tried) like as we are, only without sin. When we pass, then, from considering what Jesus

was to the consideration of our own evil and corrupt inclinations, when we take into account the special dangers to which, being such as we are, we are continually exposed, whether from our position in life, our employment, our difficult surroundings, we may well feel the need to pray, "Lead us not into temptation." Gethsemane has furnished the best commentary on that petition. No need to particularize that it is an *a fortiori* argument. We cannot know beforehand what is the strength God may vouchsafe at need when the dreaded crisis is actually upon us, so that sensible only of our own weakness in the anticipation, our prayer, if it is to be an honest one, the natural expression of the heart's instinctive yearning, will be the Lord's Prayer, and no other. And that Lord, both by precept and example, has taught us to give utterance to this sense of weakness, and to make supplication according to that true estimate of the danger to be confronted without which genuine courage is impossible, because in this sense of weakness lies our only real strength. A paradoxical form of words this may appear, but, paradox or no paradox, it is the matter of fact we are concerned with. Thrice did St. Paul, when buffeted by Satan, beseech earnestly for exemption. A little while and he is glorying in his infirmities. A strange new pleasure has been unlocked for him through prayer, the strange new pleasure of realizing to the full a paradox, if the world be pleased to name it so, but a certainty nevertheless, if Christian experience is to count for anything,—and no fact could well be asserted in plainer terms than this, "When I am weak, then am I strong."

It is when a man is careless, or, like St. Peter, self-confident, that he falls. It is when a man foresees temptation, fears it, and prays against it, that he stands. It may be that Satan will receive permission to tempt us notwithstanding; it may be that the temptation will continue long in spite of prayers; but assuredly, if we look for it, God's grace shall be sufficient for us: His strength, if we rely on it, shall be made perfect in our weakness.

F. G. CHOLMONDELEY.

## CURRENT LITERATURE.

**Sermons.** *The Bright and Morning Star, and other Sermons* (1) are published as a memorial of Dr. Henry Wilkes, the late Principal of the Congregational College of British North America. In a prefatory note his son-in-law, Dr. J. Monro Gibson, tells us that "those who remember that for the greater portion of his life Dr. Wilkes had not only the entire duties of pastor of a large and influential city congregation, but also as representative of the Colonial Missionary Society of the Congregational Union of England and Wales 'the care of all the Churches' for hundreds of miles around Montreal, will understand that even his best sermons give but an inadequate idea of his power." This we can well believe. The sermons here printed show no originality of thought or treatment; they are cast in a somewhat old-fashioned mould, and though sound and sensible, are not very striking. With the kindling eye, the striving voice, and the fiery energy that this "old man eloquent" delivered his sermons, however, they may have had a good deal of power; and we can hope that those who read them will find them profitable.

*The Lord's Prayer, and other Sermons for Children* (2) are the record of an attempt made by Mr. Hastings Ross to attract and instruct the younger members of his flock. He says the sermons were delivered one each Sunday preceding the usual sermon, with a short hymn between the two; and that the result has far exceeded his expectation. There are sixty-two sketches in the volume, and we are bound to commend them as being extremely well suited to their purpose. Their object, the author tells us, has been practical instruction rather than sensational effect. They have not been highly wrought nor embellished with stories that seldom benefit hearers; but we are informed that adults as well as children have manifested much interest in them, so that this part of Mr. Ross's labours has been very fruitful of good. Preaching to children requires almost a special gift, but to any one not possessing that ability these sketches will be found very helpful and suggestive.

We are by no means surprised that Mr. Newman Hall's commentary on *The Lord's Prayer* (3) has reached a second edition. It is a work

which does him great credit. With competent learning, and yet without any excess of elaboration, he has produced a volume which should be a source of enjoyment and comfort for many a quiet hour. It will do anybody good to read these chapters, and those who dislike them must be hard to please. The volume begins with a sensible essay on prayer, showing its necessity and reasonableness, and answering many objections alleged against it. There are also some good remarks on the personality of Satan, and many other topics are touched with great skill and delicacy. Mr. Hall's illustrations are most well-timed, though when he likens prayerfulness to the Main Hall at the Law Courts, and draws a parallel between the wiles of the devil and the tickling of trout, we are almost inclined to smile. Mr. Hall calls his commentary a practical meditation, and that very fairly describes its aim and purpose, and we confidently wish it success.

The third series of *Unspoken Sermons* (4) consists of twelve discourses upon a variety of deep and important topics. Dr. Macdonald does not always approve of the Authorised Version of the Bible, nor is he satisfied with the Revised Version; and more than this, he objects in some instances to the opinions of Grimm and other recognised scholars. Having, however, settled the texts of his discourses to his own satisfaction, the author proceeds to dilate upon them in a manner all his own. Some of the discourses are long, some very long; but most of them contain things well said and worth thinking about. Dr. Macdonald is not at all content with the ordinary, or, as we may say, orthodox, statement of the doctrine of the Atonement, so he states his own view at considerable length in the discourse upon Justice; he is quite angry with the doctrine of Imputed Righteousness; and he has novel ideas on many points. The *motif* of the book seems to be the Fatherhood of God; which is worked out in several ways as far as the space permits; but sermons, of course, are not theological treatises. The discourses run one into another: they are in a way, *dissolving views*; and that expression, perhaps, very fairly describes them.

(1) *The Bright and Morning Star, and other Sermons.* By Rev. Henry Wilkes, D.D., LL.D. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1889. Price 4s. 6d.

(2) *The Lord's Prayer, and other Sermons for Children.* By A. Hastings Ross. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1890.

(3) *The Lord's Prayer.* By Newman Hall, LL.B. Second edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889. Price 6s.

(4) *Unspoken Sermons.* Third Series. By George Macdonald. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1889. Price 7s. 6d.

**Miscellaneous.** *Church or Chapel* (1) is an Eirenicon addressed to Non-conformists, with the laudable intention of showing them what the Church of England really is and what it teaches, and in the hope that some of them may be enabled to find their way back again. The promotion of the unity of Christendom must ever be a praiseworthy endeavour; the great and ever-increasing number of sects, all more or less antagonistic, is not only a scandal, but surely a hindrance to the progress of true religion; and therefore Mr. Hammond's work must be greatly commended, at any rate for its intention. Some people may desire reformation in many particulars regarding the doctrine and usages of the Church, and Mr. Hammond is not altogether averse from amendments; but, as he says, what is most needed is *information*, and this he addresses himself to supply in a concise and attractive form. The Eirenicon consists of two parts; in the first are stated the positive arguments in favour of the Church; in the second the objections to its rites, doctrines, services, and pretensions are considered. Mr. Hammond conducts his advocacy in a broad and liberal spirit; and we cordially hope that his book will be widely read by Churchmen and Nonconformists alike, and that the result the author so earnestly desires will be largely achieved.

Mr. H. H. Snell has printed, for public use, a little volume on the *Inspiration and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures*, (2) which contains the substance of lectures delivered in Montgomery Hall, Sheffield, "with the view of meeting the flood of infidelity as to the inspiration and Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, which has of late been overflowing Christendom." In the introduction Mr. Snell traverses the pretensions of Romish or Anglican Churches to be the appointed custodians of the Scriptures, and maintains that the decisions of their councils to give them this authority is as gratuitous and unfounded as anything can be. He therefore upholds the right of private judgment aided by the Holy Spirit. Mr. Snell's proofs for inspiration are taken mostly from the Bible itself, and he certainly shows an extensive acquaintance with its contents. We cannot say that his treatment of the alleged inaccuracies is all that could be desired, but, on the whole, we believe that the volume is calculated to do good, and we trust it may be read widely and thoughtfully.

*The Great Day of the Lord* (3) is a commentary on the Revelation of St. John; and the work is issued for this very sufficient reason, "The author believes that the commonly accepted doctrines on 'Last Things' have been long and ably enough discussed to show

that they are manifestly out of harmony with a candid exegesis, and at many points sadly at variance with sound reasoning." "With no warning to the contrary," says Mr. Brown, "we shall stand by common sense and common honesty in seeking for the meaning of this book. Taking our Lord's words into consideration, and the common expectation of the Apostles and their immediate followers, Mr. Brown is of opinion that the *Parousia* has taken place, and that we are now in the *Millennium*. He considers the Apocalypse to be an account, partly historical and partly prophetic, of the end of the Jewish dispensation and the inauguration of the Christian. Mr. Brown divides it into two parts: 1st, The *Nightfall*, or the last days of the Jewish age, comprised in the first eleven chapters; 2nd, The *Dayspring*, or advent of the Christian age. He is of the opinion that John was vouchsafed visions, and that he wrote in an enigmatical way on account of the danger that attended any other course. This is especially apparent in the number of the beast, which Mr. Brown thinks was the Emperor Nero. Babylon is Rome, its fall is the decay of the Empire, and the new Jerusalem is Christianity. Though in many places Mr. Brown's commentary is almost amusing, and though he seems in some ways to belittle his subject, we must say he works it out very well, and makes of it a reasonable looking whole. We are not prepared to accept all his conclusions, but there is a great deal in the book which is well worth thinking about. Mr. Brown has evidently a vigorous mind, and he can put his thoughts into nervous and telling language.

*The Salt Cellars* (4) is a collection of Proverbs, with homiletic notes thereon by the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. The second volume runs from M to Z. We need hardly say that some of the aphorisms are good and some are indifferent, though perhaps we can hardly call any worthless. We suppose the purpose of the book is to furnish preachers with a store of witticisms or illustrations wherewith to illumine their discourses; and this they may do if judiciously interlarded. But herein they suffer from the same defects as sermon sketches and skeletons; the trouble is to use them fitly: *ars est celare artem*. The book would be far more valuable if the sources of the quaint sayings were indicated. We can well imagine Mr. Spurgeon himself to be the author of a good many; but certainly not of all. When Mr. Spurgeon sets out to explain such a saying as "Up like a rocket, and down like a stick," or "There's poor profit in flaying flints," he must surely believe he will have a set of very simple

readers ; but his remarks on some of the proverbs are good and true, and at times original.

Most novels relate the sorrows, delights, the struggles and endeavours of lovers on their way to the haven of matrimony ; but in *Husbands and Wives* (5) Miss Worboise begins with matrimony, and tells us what storms and difficulties may beset those that have entered upon that ancient state. Three couples have their fortunes told in the volume before us. One couple have apparently all the conditions of happiness, but the possession of a secret on the wife's part mars everything ; another couple have to work hard and to economize, and live in apartments for a long time, but theirs is an unclouded summer of enjoyment ; and the third couple are lovers for a good while—thus giving a more youthful interest to the book—and then they, too, are happily married. The good people in the book are almost too much so, and the villainy of the villain might easily have been disposed of by a little common sense. But the book is very interesting, and instructive too ; and if it teaches people that it is not always successful to “marry for money,” that straitened means do not always signify misery, and that in all cases it is best to be open and straightforward, and not to expect too much of anybody, it will not have been written in vain. It has reached the tenth thousand, which is satisfactory in every way.

*Faith and Duty* (6) is the title of a series of Scripture lessons arranged for every Sunday in the year. The volume differs in character from the yearly courses of lessons previously published by the Church of England Sunday School Institute ; it is more varied in character, and is intended to teach the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, and to give also a prominent place to the practical duties of daily life. It is issued under a joint authorship, and it gains in utility by the fact. The lessons are rather long, but as they are divided into heads, it may not be needful to go through all at once. When these lessons are duly studied by the teacher, and impressed on the scholar, they will undoubtedly have a most useful effect.

*Cottage Lectures* (7) were delivered to mothers' meetings by the authoress, and are recommended to be read at such gatherings with a good deal of reason, for they are upon subjects which all mothers ought to be acquainted with. The volume contains ten lectures on health, and how to keep it. The first is introductory ; the next three are upon food and digestion ; the fifth, sixth, and seventh are on the blood ; the eighth is on alcohol, which, if used at all, is recommended

to be used in small quantities, greatly diluted ; but total abstinence appears to be the better way. The ninth lecture is on "Every Woman's Profession"—housekeeping—and it contains many memorable maxims. The last lecture is a fitting close, setting forth the Apostolic truth that as in our body the members act and react upon each other, so in the social body we are all members one of another. The little volume is good and cheap, and ought to be widely known.

In *Faith Cures, their History and Mystery* (8), Mr. Aurelius J. L. Gliddon calmly and carefully considers the subject of faith-healing. A large number of kindred facts has been grouped together and examined. Mr. Gliddon starts with the Accadians, and leaves off with the Salvation Army ; and his book is both interesting and instructive. The conclusion he seems to have arrived at is that "every case of healing by faith is a case of healing by the operation of natural forces in harmony with natural laws." "I believe," says Mr. Gliddon, "in the prayer of faith. But I do not believe in the dictatorial prayer. I dare not imitate those faith-healers who *claim* healing. . . . The wisest men will be disposed not to ask simply that God will restore health, but that He will do it only if He sees the restoration of health to be best." Mental states and emotions undoubtedly exert a powerful influence over the organs and tissues of the body ; and it is possible that the time may come when the physician will take more account of them in helping their drugs to do their work.

(1) *Church or Chapel*, an Eirenicon. By Joseph Hammond, LL.B., B.A. London : Wells, Gardner, Darton & Co.

(2) *On the Inspiration and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures*. By H. H. Snell. London : G. Morrish, 20, Paternoster Square.

(3) *The Great Day of the Lord*. By the Rev. Alexander Brown, Aberdeen. London : Hamilton, Adams & Co. Glasgow : Thomas D. Morison. 1890.

(4) *The Salt Cellars*. Vol. ii. By C. H. Spurgeon. London : Passmore & Alabaster. 1889.

(5) *Husbands and Wives*. By Emma Jane Worboise. London : J. Clarke & Co.

(6) *Faith and Duty*. By the Rev. T. Turner and T. Rutt. London : Church of England Sunday School Institute.

(7) *Cottage Lectures*. By Agnes C. Maitland. London : J. Nisbet & Co. 1889. Price 1s. 6d.

(8) *Faith Cures, their History and Mystery*. By Aurelius J. L. Gliddon. London : The Christian Commonwealth Publishing Company Limited. 1890. Price 2s. 6d.

**Pamphlets.** *Ignatian Difficulties and Historic Doubts* (1) is a letter addressed to the Dean of Peterborough, by the Rev. R. C. Jenkins, on a subject which is of great importance from several points of view. Mr. Jenkins alleges several reasons for doubting the authenticity and the antiquity of the letters of Ignatius, and therefore what small importance attaches to them. This pamphlet is an able and thoughtful production.

*The Origin of Scripture on its Divine and Human Sides* (2) is a contribution to the present Biblical discussion by Rev. John Wilson, of Montreux. It is a pleasantly worded essay, and is worth reading; the conclusion Mr. Wilson has arrived at is, that Scripture revelation implies four things. 1. The Divine mind and its ideas and purposes; 2. The ideas in the mind of the inspired writer; 3. The written records; 4. Our interpretation of these records. "It is only of the first of these that we can presuppose absolute perfection."

In two essays on the *Origin and Development of the Trinitarian Doctrine* (3), Ernest de Bunsen attempts to prove that the doctrine is, in the first place, only a form of solar myth which was understood by the "initiated" heathen in anti-Christian times; and secondly, that there is no Biblical authority or any Church authority for it. "Ascending humanity, not descending deity, was the theme of Jesus Christ's Gospel." The author says that this being so, a revision of the Creeds and the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England ought no longer to be resisted, and we may add, that if it be true as the author says, then another Bible revision is also necessary, for there is plenty of proof of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the one we now have.

*How our Freedom was Won* (4) is a survey of the Epistle to the Galatians, from which Mr. Rotherham comes to the opinion that Christians are free from creeds, church regulations, discipline, ritual, and everything else apparently. But Mr. Rotherham's opinions are peculiar.

*What did the Apostle Paul mean?* (5) is an attempt to explain St. Paul's intention, in Romans chap. ix. and other places, with regard to election, &c. If it be difficult to ascertain St. Paul's meaning, it is quite as difficult to know what Mr. Weir means. So things are not much advanced by this *brochure*.

(1) *Ignatian Difficulties*. By R. C. Jenkins, M.A. London: David Nutt, 1890.

(2) *The Origin of Scripture*. By John Wilson, M.A. Edinburgh: McNiven & Wallace, 1890.

(3) *Origin and Development of the Trinitarian Doctrine*. By Ernest de Bunsen. London: Williams & Norgate.

(4) *How our Freedom was Won*. By Joseph B. Rotherham. London: Elliot Stock, 1890. Price 2d.

(5) *What did the Apostle Paul mean?* By John F. Weir.

**Magazines.** *Biblia* (1) is a monthly journal for Bible readers, teachers, and students. It is the organ of the Bible Readers' Union, and, like many other American magazines, it is well edited and capitably printed. The June number, the last that has reached us, contains several articles of more than ordinary interest, and a great deal of matter which will be useful not only to those for whom it is especially designed, but to many others besides. There is an epitome of Wellhausen's Theory, which those who are acquainted with the question will like to have; it is hardly full enough for general information. "Hebrew Word Studies" are interesting, and there is a good article on the language of the New Testament. We welcome this additional help to Bible study, and commend it to English readers.

*The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* (2) contains several good articles, two of which are the composite productions of various learned and notable men. That on animal life shows what a variety of ideas can exist on any topic, scientific or otherwise.

*The Anglican Church Magazine* (3) for July contains an article on the Incorporation of the Chaplaincies in north and central Europe, and it appears that they are to become an integral part of the Diocese of London, arranged in rural Deaneries, under a Bishop Suffragan; with a representation on the Diocesan Conference, &c. This will probably add life and zeal to these useful agencies. The article on the Anglican Church Conference is interesting.

We have also received the *Homiletic Review*, published by Funk & Wagnalls; *The Homiletic Magazine*, published by Nisbet & Co.; *The Foreign Church Chronicle and the Expository Times*; each of which is distinguished by certain marks and merits which render it commendable. We regret our space does not admit of more detailed account.

Perthes' *Handlexikon* appears likely to be a most valuable addition and index to theological literature. It is published in monthly parts, and will form three volumes.

(1) *Biblia*. Edited by Dr. Chas. H. S. Davis. New York: S. L. Hawell.

(2) *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. Price 80 cents.

(3) *Anglican Church Monthly*. London: Harrison & Sons. Price 1 franc.

*Faith: Active and Passive, Divine and Human.* By the Rev. Arthur Beard, M.A. London: George Bell & Sons.

Written upon sound exegetical principles, with intense earnestness of conviction, and in a pleasant style.

*Christian Character-Building. Two Sermons for Children.* By Charles Anderson Scott, B.A. Aberdeen: D. Wyllie & Son. 1890.

An excellent topic admirably handled by a preacher who has the gift of combining in a remarkable degree practical teaching with pleasantness of style.

*Veni Creator: Thoughts on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit of Promise.* By the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889.

This treatise of Mr. Moule's well illustrates his special style of smoothly gliding along through intricate subjects, and only stopping long enough at any difficult topic for the purpose of devout adoration.

*Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.* Edited by Professor Marcus Dods, D.D., and Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D. "Church and State: A Historical Survey." By A. Taylor Innes. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

In eleven judiciously selected groups the main events of this vast subject are given with much vividness and sustained vigour. A controversial topic is treated in an uncontroversial spirit, though occasionally the bias of the writer (as is only natural) displays itself.

*Sin Condemned by the Mission of the Son.* By the Rev. Robert A. Mitchell, M.A. Aberdeen: D. Wyllie & Son.

In a lucid manner the preacher shows how justification and sanctification are vitally connected, having their point of unity in the righteousness of Christ, which is at once the ground of the former and the spring and root of the latter.

*The Pilgrim's Handbook to Jerusalem.* By Wilfrid C. Robinson, from the French by Brother Lievin de Hamme, O.S.F. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. Bruges: De Plancke Brothers.

Contains a vast amount of information which is given in a concise and business-like manner, with well-executed maps and carefully prepared plans. Of course there is the usual superstitious regard for sacred sites which one would expect in a work coming from a Roman Catholic source.

*Men of the Bible: Isaac and Jacob.* By George Rawlinson, M.A., F.R.G.S. London: James Nisbet & Co.

Rawlinson's work in this series is excellent.

*The Minor Prophets.* By Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. London: James Nisbet & Co.

This is somewhat different in character to the rest of the series. For an analytical study of the minor prophets we have here an invaluable aid. Perhaps the preacher more than the general reader will appreciate this volume. The Introduction about the inspiration of the Jewish prophets is too much of the Kuenen and Wellhausen type for our liking.

*Present Day Lessons from Habakkuk.* By Rev. P. Barclay, M.A. Edinburgh: Macniven & Wallace.

A booklet of ten lectures, each one worth reading, on a field of exposition upon which comparatively little exists.