the above-named scholars have done much in the way of amendment and addition.

That BIBLICAL THEOLOGY may not come off quite empty-handed in this review, we mention—last, but not least—the work of Ed. König, published as early as 1882, in which particularly the personal testimonies of the prophets, with regard to the revelations vouchsafed to them, are very carefully examined (Friedrich Eduard König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments.* Leipzig, 1882. 2 vols. pp. 212, 410).

HERMANN L. STRACK.

University of Berlin.

BREVIA.

Bishop Temple on the Relations between Religion and Science.—The most admirable point of these lectures is their very thorough and lucid statement of the *status questionis.* The whole ground is traversed with complete appreciation of the main difficulties, and with wide knowledge of the modern answers to them. *The Bampton Lecture for* 1884, indeed, may be said to embody the results of all recent speculation upon the problem—is in fact a tide-mark indicating the levels reached by the maturest speculation up to this time. On one point, that of the probable naturalness of the miraculous, there is a distinct advance at least in firmness and boldness of statement; and certainly the distinctively moral aspects of religion have never been brought out with more clearness or enforced with greater purity and dignity of expression.

Whether this is the whole truth, however, regarding the relations of Science and Religion is a question. We are inclined to think it is not. Valid as are the distinctions drawn by Bishop Temple, the mere difficulty of grasping them, and the innumerable philosophical questions that arise all along the line, suggest the doubt as to whether the standpoint from which the subject is viewed can be the final one. Philosophical examinations of the relations of Science and Religion proceed upon the supposition that the field of knowledge is a plane divided into different departments, one for Theology, one for Philosophy, one for Science, and so on. The effort is then made to trace and fix the boundaries of the several domains—a process apparently satisfactory enough,

and yielding results up to a certain point. That point is attained, and very admirably attained, in the lectures before us. Yet, as we have hinted, the final result is somehow unsatisfying, and the impression remains that something at once more simple and more decisive might be reached from a different standpoint. We would not presume in the present state of the discussion to offer the following as more than a suggestion; but the difficulties of the old position justify every attempt to get more out of the subject from other points of view.

To the non-astronomical eye the various constellations appear projected on a uniform black dome. Two stars twinkle side by side, and the impression they give to the mind is that they are in the same plane and near neighbours. Yet any attempt from this standpoint to define their relations to one another, though satisfactory enough up to a point, would certainly be defective, seeing that in reality they are probably millions of miles apart. Not that they may not be almost touching each other in *one* plane, but yet at the same time one may be millions of miles, as it were, *above* the other, behind the other, farther out than the other. Now the relations of Science and Religion may be something like this. Taking the field of knowledge to be a plane, to contrast two different departments as if they were adjacent will yield undoubted results. Points of difference, and points of contact will certainly be apparent. But suppose we arrange the different spheres of knowledge not in a plane, but *in series*. Suppose we arrange them, not as so many squares on a chess-board, or as so many stars on a uniform dome, but as high, higher, and highest. We should have here, as it were, a new dimension to take into account; and if this dimension be the most important of all, it is clear how much all observations must lack, however skilfully the case may be stated in terms of the other dimensions, which ignore this one. The mere arranging of the fields of knowledge in evolutionary series, when that is accomplished, may yet show the true relations of Science and Religion at a glance, and save the laboured expositions which we are now compelled to resort to. We would venture therefore to propose that the whole question of the relations of Science and Religion should be approached, not in the first instance from philosophy, but from the standpoint of the Classification of the Sciences—of a new Classification of the Sciences from the standpoint of Evolution.

HENRY DRUMMOND.

The Sealing of the Heavenly Bread. John vi. 27. "Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endures unto everlasting life which the Son of man shall give to you, *for Him hath God the Father sealed*" (τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ Θεός). The use of σφραγίζω (natural in iii. 33, where it means *confirm*), is puzzling in this place. Delitzsch in the *Old Testament Student*, Sept. 1883, gives with his approval the suggestion of a Jewish correspondent in Wilna. In Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament the passage reads כִּי בוֹ חָתַם חוֹתָמוֹ אָבִיו הָאֱלֹהִים. In the language of the Mishna the baker is called נַחְתּוֹם. The correspondent suggests that he is named thus because he impresses his seal upon the bread, and that in the original text the seal referred to the meat (bread). The latter suggestion Delitzsch considers unnecessary. "The Lord compares Himself to a heavenly meat, and as such He is, as He says, sealed by the Father." Thus He may have had in His mind the custom of bakers of which their name is at least a reminder.

EDITOR.

Alphæus and Klopas. The various theories which have been invented to explain the relationship of the brethren of our Lord to their Master may be classified under two divisions. (1) Those that distinguish the sons of Alphæus from our Lord's brethren. (2) Those that presuppose their identity. Under the first head are: (i.) the Heladian theory, which supposes them to have been His uterine brothers, children of Joseph and Mary; (ii.) the Epiphanian, which supposes them to have been children of Joseph and an earlier wife. Under the second head are: (i.) the Hieronymian, which makes them His cousins german, sons of Alphæus and the Virgin's sister Mary; (ii.) Lange's theory that they were His cousins german, sons of Clopas, said by Hegesippus to have been Joseph's brother; and (iii.) the Theophylactian, according to which they were both His brothers and cousins, the sons of Joseph by a levirate marriage with the widow of his brother Clopas. The arguments for the second class of theories rest on the identification of Clopas and Alphæus; for they all turn on the identity of the names assigned in the Gospels to the sons of Alphæus and the Lord's brethren alike. But the New Testament tells us of only two sons of Alphæus, James, and Levi or Matthew; and the first step in gaining more to accord with the list of Matt.

xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3, turns on identifying Alphæus with Clopas, and thus the James of Alphæus (Matt. x. 3) with the James of Mary (John xix. 25). Again, with the supporters of the Hieronymian theory the sole evidence of the cousinship of the sons of Alphæus to our Lord turns on his identification with Clopas. Now it has been usually claimed and admitted that the two names were the same—diverse transliterations into Greek of the one Aramaic name חלפי. But Wetzel in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1883 (620–6), contends elaborately that as representation of חלפי Κλωπας fails in almost every one of its letters. The Greek κ is not used to transliterate the initial Hebrew ח. There is no accounting for the spreading of the syllable חל into the soundless κλ—nor for the subintroduction of the long vowel ω—nor for π instead of φ as in Alphæus. A note is added from Delitzsch, who affirms that Alphæus is Hebrew, while Klopas is Greek and identical with Cleopas—both being abbreviations of Cleopatros. Riehm concurs, and Prof. Warfield, in the *Independent*, says that while in his view the identity hypothesis did not need another deathblow, this argument is absolutely final. Thus our Lord's brethren were either, (1) the children of Joseph and Mary, or (2) the children of Joseph and an earlier wife.

EDITOR.