

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ONE of the great books of the season—one of the greatest books of any season—will be the translation of Wendt's *Contents of the Teaching of Jesus*. Two important reviews of the German original have already appeared in English magazines—one by Dr. Iverach in the *Expositor* (September 1891), the other by Dr. Dickson in the *Critical Review* (October 1891), and Principal Harper gives an excellent summary of the latter in the *Old and New Testament Student* for December. He says: "It is unfortunate that this highly valuable work is accessible as yet only to readers of German, but it will no doubt soon be translated. Professor Dickson has not over-estimated its importance. It is another great contribution to the study of biblical theology, the department of theological study so recently entered upon, and which promises to throw so much light upon the rise and character of Christian truth." Professor Dickson's estimate to which Dr. Harper refers is as follows: "The work is marked by care in detail, skill in the presentation and weighing of facts, candour in the consideration of opposing aspects of truth, and freshness in style of treatment. It is independent in tone, makes few direct references to other scholars, and is written with clearness and fluency. It is remarkably suggestive. Indeed, Dr. Wendt's volume deserves to be ranked among the most important contributions to biblical theology. It is adapted to the use of intelligent laymen, and there is an evident desire on the part of the author to

make himself clearly and fully understood." Professor Iverach's testimony to the worth of the book is that "it is the most important contribution yet made to biblical theology."

Professor Wendt will himself revise the whole of the English translation of his *Contents of the Teaching of Jesus*. His knowledge of English is described as "almost perfect." It is a sign that English theological scholarship is now at last receiving more adequate recognition on the Continent. The older generation of German theologians were mostly as ignorant of the English tongue as they were indifferent to English thought. There were exceptions. Kuenen was an exception, a notable one. Delitzsch was another exception. Yet it is significant that Delitzsch's successor at Leipzig—Dr. Franz Buhl—is recognised to have a more accurate and extensive knowledge of English than Delitzsch had. Döllinger was also an exception, and the most notable of all. Nevertheless, even Döllinger was not beyond the possibility of a fall. In the course of his most delightful "Conversations with Carlyle" in the *Contemporary Review* for January, Sir C. Gavan Duffy says:—"Speaking of the difficulties foreigners find in mastering colloquial English, Carlyle mentioned a blunder of Mazzini's, who called Scotch paupers, 'Scotch poors.' I told him a kindred story which a friend of mine, who visited Dr. Döllinger, brought home with him: 'There is

a prodigious multitude of infidels in Germany, I fear,' said my friend. 'Yes,' replied the professor, 'infidels are numerous, but there are a good many *fidels* also.'

The following "paradox," as the editor of the *Free Church of Scotland Monthly* calls it,—ought it not rather in these days to be called a heresy?—was spoken by President Patton in his Commencement Sermon to the graduating class at Princeton:—"It is not true that Christianity is a life and not a doctrine. It is a life because it is a doctrine. A religion that sees only the human side of Christ always calls him Jesus; the religion that looks only upon ethical states and preaches only the moralities of life, a religion which holds that love is the greatest thing in the world, and is satisfied with the sweetness and tenderness of Christian feeling, is a religion of which the best that you can say is that it is trying to keep the fruits of Christianity living, while it lays the axe at the root of the tree which bears them. Now I say,—I dare to say,—would to God that men would heed me!—that if I must choose between life and dogma, I will say that Christianity is not a life, but a dogma."

But let us at least separate doctrine and dogma. They may both be true, they may both be necessary in a true Christianity, but they are distinct. They are distinct historically, and they are distinct essentially also. It is one of the clearest gains of these days that we now can and do make this distinction. Enumerating the "*positive religious elements* in an era of negatives" (see the *Christian World Pulpit*, November 18, 1891), Dr. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, pastor of the American Church in Berlin, gives this a place. "While theology is carefully distinguished from religion, dogma is also distinguished from doctrine. Scripture," he goes on, "contains doctrines, but no dogmas. The distinction is of great importance, and must be made if confusion is to be avoided. Dogmas, like dogmatic systems, are the product of historic development, usually under the influence of the

prevailing philosophies, and receive the stamp of authority from a Church or sect."

It is because the distinction between doctrine and dogma is now recognised that our doctrinal outlook is more hopeful than it has been for many a day. Let it be granted that our doctrine is in the Bible, let it be granted that it is all there: what profit is it that we should go to the Bible for it, if we go only to confirm our dogmatic prepossessions? How long have the Protestant and the Romanist met here, the one as obedient a believer in the infallibility of dogma as the other! the only difference being that the Protestant refuses to give the Church the credit for the formation and binding force of his dogma. But it is less so now. "It is reported on good authority," says Principal Harper in the *Old and New Testament Student* for December, "that a professor, who, ten years ago, occupied the Chair of Dogmatic Theology in one of the leading seminaries in this country (America), openly declared that a student must first decide what his general dogmatic position was to be, and then interpret the Scripture according. Probably that avowal would not be made in many schools to-day, *perhaps in none.*"

"Does the Bible teach the reality of witchcraft?" With that question Mr. J. M. Buckley introduces one section of his article on witchcraft in the January issue of the *Century*. His answer is that it does not. "An examination of the references to witchcraft shows that only the existence and criminality of the *attempt* to practise it are to be concluded from the words of the Scriptures." He holds that such words as "the man or the woman who hath a familiar spirit, or is a wizard, shall be put to death" (Lev. xx. 27); and "thou shalt not suffer a witch [Revised Version, *a sorceress*] to live," demand no more than the existence of the *pretence* of having a familiar spirit, and an *attempt* to practise witchcraft. That pretence was common. It was notoriously and overwhelmingly common among the nations with whom the Israelites had to come in contact, and it was neces-

sary that the Mosaic legislation should contain enactments, and those of the most stringent kind, against such pretences. They were an essential part of idolatry. And it may well have been that it was just on that side, its occult practices, its possible association with devils and demons, that much of the fascination of idolatry lay. Hence it is striking to observe that, while in one breath St. Paul says: "We know that no idol is anything in the world;" in another he adds: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils* and not to God."

"The case of the Witch of Endor," says Mr. Buckley, "is the only instance in the Bible where a description of the processes and results is given." And the question is simply whether or not the Bible says that any person appeared to the witch. Some authorities say, Yes, and some say, No. "The Septuagint and the Apocrypha represent that it was Samuel, and Justin Martyr held the same. Tertullian believed it was a *pythoness*, and exclaimed: 'Far be it from us to believe that the soul of any saint, much less a prophet, can be drawn forth by any demon.' Theodoret, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, and some Jewish Rabbis, held that the 'appearance of Samuel' was produced by God's power; and Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, and other moderns, support it. Luther held that it was 'the Devil's ghost'; Calvin that 'it was not the real Samuel, but a spectre.' Grotius thought that it was a deceptive spirit."

Amidst this conflict, Mr. Buckley will also give his own opinion. He describes Saul as a man of strong passions, feeble judgment, and little self-control, who was now at the ebb of his fortunes, and, determined to know the worst, sought out a professed witch or necromancer. She began in her usual way: "Whom shall I bring up unto thee?" "Bring me up Samuel." Immediately afterwards the woman cried out, and said to Saul: "Why hast thou deceived me, for thou art Saul?" Mr. Buckley believes that she knew from the first that he was Saul. Who would not know the king,

who was "head and shoulders above all the people"? But it belonged to her art to conceal this, so that she might pretend the knowledge was given by her familiar spirit. And Saul thought it was so. He saw nothing. He saw nothing all the time he was there. But he believed she saw some one; and he said: "What form is he of?" It was easy to say, "An old man covered with a mantle." And Saul, who never saw anything, but depended upon her description, "perceived that it was Samuel." In all this, and even in the reply of Samuel, "which consisted of things which Samuel had said while living, and of things that could be conjectured from the situation," Mr. Buckley believes that there is nothing which implies reality in the supposed vision itself, nor any committal to the reality of witchcraft on the part of the sacred narrative. "The narrator, as certain ancient Church decrees, according to Reginald Scot, declare, 'set forth Saule's mind and Samuel's estate and certeine things which were said and scene, omitting whether they were true or false.'"

How important a little word the definite article is, has been shown by Dr. Donald Fraser in the November issue of the *Review of the Churches*. In one of his "Presbyterian Notes" he says: "In his excellent paper last month, the Bishop of Ripon repeats a current tale to the effect that in Scotland 'prayers used to be offered that the people might be baptized into the spirit of disruption.' Has not some injustice been done," he asks, "not by the Bishop, but by the authority he quotes, through the omission of the important little word 'the' before disruption? The ecclesiastical separation in the year 1843 was represented by the Free Church Party as a Disruption of the National Church; though the opposite party spoke of it as a secession." So the spirit of the Disruption was not a spirit of disruption. He who would know what spirit it was when at its very best, let him turn to that book of the genial "John Strathesk," called *Bits from Blinkbonny*, and he will find it right pleasantly there.

One of the most frequent changes introduced by the Revisers of the kind which the casual reader calls "finical," but which is very precious to the careful student, has to do with the definite article. There is no severer test of the faithfulness of a version than that "important little word." And it must be confessed that the Authorised Version sustains the test but indifferently. The late Bishop of Durham held that its translators knew nothing at all about it: and he gave good reasons for his judgment. In a delightful chapter of that book which, though written before the revision began, is still its best Apologia (*On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*), he shows how often the A.V. misses the meaning by simply mistranslating (or not translating at all) the definite article, and that sometimes when serious doctrinal or historical questions are involved. Thus, in Rom. v. 15-19, there is a sustained contrast between "the one" and "the many," but in the A.V. the definite article is systematically omitted: "If, through the offence of one, many be dead;" and so throughout the passage, closing with, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Pleading for the correct rendering, Bentley long ago said, "By the accurate version (the one, the many) some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the Fathers saw and testified, that (οἱ πολλοί) *the many*, in an antithesis to *the one*, are equivalent to (πάντες) *all* in ver. 12, and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one*." "In other words," adds Dr. Lightfoot, "the benefits of Christ's obedience extend to all men potentially. It is only human self-will which places limits to its operation."

In such an instance it is probable that the mere sound of the words in English decided the translators to omit the article. And there are those who have been readily pardoned when they took exception to the English of the Revised Version in this very passage: "For as through the one man's

disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous." But, in other cases, either ignorance, pure and simple, or perhaps a determination not to pronounce upon a point in dispute (one of the *principles* of King James' translators) seems to have influenced them in either omitting or mistranslating the article. Why do they once, and only once, say plainly, "*the* prophet" (John xi. 40), when the same Greek is found also in John i. 21, 25, vi. 14? Nothing seems gained either by the exaggerated rendering "*that* prophet," or by the weakened rendering "*a* prophet;" and the reference to "*the* Prophet" whom Moses foretold, and "who occupied a large space in the Messianic horizon of the Jews" is thereby obliterated. Or why do they say: "These are they which came out of great tribulation" in Rev. vii. 14, when the original has "out of *the* great tribulation," and the reference, it cannot be doubted, is to "the tribulation" foretold by our Lord in Matt. xxii. 29? For, as Archbishop Trench points out, "it is the character of the Apocalypse, the crowning book of the Canon, that it abounds with allusions to preceding Scriptures; and numerous as are those that appear on the surface, those which lie a little below the surface are more numerous still."

In connexion with this very subject of the translation of the article, Dr. Monro Gibson gives a striking illustration (in the *Sunday Magazine* for December), of the superiority of the Revised Version over the Authorised. As the text of a fine exposition he chooses Luke ii. 12 in the revised form, which runs: "And this is the sign unto you; Ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger." The old translation was: "This shall be *a* sign unto you; Ye shall find *the* babe." He shows that "this shall be a sign" suggests the idea that it was one out of many; whereas, "This shall be the sign," singles it out from all other circumstances, summons us as it were to dwell in it, to think over it, to attach the very greatest import-

ance to it." And the change from "the babe" to "a babe" is equally suggestive. "Ye shall find the babe," simply says which babe among all the babes then in Bethlehem, is referred to. "But read with the indefinite article, and see what new meaning and power there are in the words. The angel had just announced to the shepherds 'a Saviour, Christ the Lord.' And, now, how are they to recognise this wonderful Saviour, this Christ so long expected, this Lord to whom their homage and adoration are due? What is to be the sign? 'This is the sign unto you, Ye shall find a babe!' In the one case the idea suggested is the very ordinary one, you shall find the babe you are looking for in such and such a condition; in the other case, the idea conveyed is the most extraordinary and suggestive one, you shall find the Saviour you are looking for, Christ the Lord, in the form of a babe, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger."

Yet, even in such a matter as this, where the Revised Version is at its strongest, and incomparably more accurate than the Authorised, even in respect of the translation of the definite article, it is not always beyond criticism. In the course of his delightfully clear and instructive introduction to the translation of Dr. Bickell's *The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual*, Dr. W. F. Skene has occasion to quote the translation of Acts ii. 42: "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." It is thus the verse is rendered in the Authorised Version. The Revisers give it in this way: "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship (Margin, Or, *in fellowship*), in the breaking of bread and the prayers." They make two alterations. They change "doctrine" into "teaching," and they introduce the definite article twice. And both changes are beyond question right. But there is a surprising omission. There are four substantives—teaching, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers; and in the Greek the article is found in front of each of them. When the Revisers

restored it to two of them, why not to the other? The omission in the case of "fellowship" is the more remarkable, that they give the other words their due. And it is made still more noticeable when they repeat it in the margin, and omit the article again. A mere oversight, perhaps, in the Authorised, it must be the result of deliberate choice in the "finical" Revised Version. Surely it cannot be that having translated the Greek word, *koinonia*, by "fellowship," they could not see what *meaning* the article could have in front of it, and so left it out; for once imitating the methods of the older translators, and flatly contradicting their own. Is "fellowship," then, the right translation? Dr. Skene, who says nothing about the article, his immediate purpose having nothing to do with that, shows very plainly that it is not.

This word *koinonia* (*κοινωνία*) is one of the most interesting in the New Testament. Its history, for it has a history, is closely identified with the history of the early Christian Church. And it cannot be said that the Revisers have been quite alive to the importance of it, or happy in their efforts to translate it. Clearly, it gave some trouble. They tell us that one of their "rules" was "to translate, as far as possible, the same Greek word by the same English word." Now, this word occurs just twenty times (according to Bruder) in the New Testament. It may not have been possible to find one English word which would stand for it on every occasion. But it must be a remarkable word that, keeping the "rule" in mind demanded four different words or phrases (five, if you count the margin) to render it aright. Discounting one instance of its occurrence in the received text (Ephes. iii. 9), where the Revisers adopt a different reading, we find "fellowship" thirteen times; "communion" thrice; "contribution" twice: and once, strangely enough, it is rendered by a verb (Heb. xiii. 16) "To do good and *to communicate* forget not."

Such diversity is puzzling to the English reader; it almost puts the fool's cap upon the rule of

uniformity in the rendering; and, what is worse than all, it is very doubtful if in all the nineteen genuine cases, and all the variety of expressions used for them, the right word has more than twice, or thrice been found. *Koinonia*, from an adjective signifying "common," simply means making a thing common to all concerned, parting it all round, granting to every one a common participation in it. The word "communion" at once suggests itself. Three times the Revisers use this word. Once it is in reference to the communion, or participation of the Spirit—"the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all" (2 Cor. xiii. 14). Then it occurs twice in one verse (1 Cor. x. 16), "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" Most appropriate is its use here. And yet the Revisers are so timid about it that they give an alternative rendering in the margin—"Or, *participation in the blood of Christ, participation in the body of Christ.*" In the imagery of the apostle, so beautiful in its strength and fearlessness, the cup is a common sharing on the part of all concerned, a communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread is a common sharing of the body of Christ. And what is that in our prosaic Western tongue but simply and solely a participation or communion of the benefits of the death of Christ?

"Common participation" or "communion," then, is the original and natural meaning of the word. Will it stand in every case where *koinonia* is found? We believe it may. But we have said the word has a history; and that history is a reflexion of the life of the men and women who took it upon their lips. Let us now, therefore, go back for a little to Dr. Skene and his fresh and suggestive survey of the relation which Jesus and His early followers had to the synagogue worship of the Jews. Let it be remembered that in every town or village in Palestine of 120 inhabitants, with ten men of leisure, "of full age and free condition," a synagogue was erected. During the

early days of His ministry it was the custom of our Lord to attend the synagogues. It was there He found the people; and "He went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. iv. 35). But this came to an abrupt termination in the second year of His ministry. He had gone up to Jerusalem to the Feast of Tabernacles, and, encountering the Scribes and Pharisees in the Temple, He had plainly and emphatically declared that He came from God. Whereupon they took the decided step of proclaiming that "if any man did confess that he was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue." This proclamation was a sentence of excommunication upon Jesus and His followers. They could no longer meet their fellow-worshippers in the village synagogue; He could no longer find the people there and preach the gospel of the kingdom. "From that time it was unavoidable that the followers of Jesus should form a separate community."

Dr. Skene goes on to show that the Christian Church, which was thus established to replace the synagogue worship, adopted the forms of administration and of service which were associated with the synagogue. But into that attractive subject we cannot follow him now. One result, however, of this excommunication from the synagogues was the cutting off all means of livelihood from the poorer Christians, so that those who had wealth had to support their poorer brethren. This, we know, was done in the most thorough and generous way, by what we are accustomed to call the Community of Goods: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul: and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common. For neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto each, according as any one had need" (Acts iv. 32, 34, 35). Here, then, was a new thing among

men. And as each new invention or discovery needs a new name, a new word is coined for it—microphone, agnostic; or else an old word is taken and applied in a special technical sense—station, speaker. Here the latter method was employed. The word *koinonia*, which simply meant participation, sharing, communion, was adapted to name this special kind of participation, this community of goods, which became so essential and so familiar a part of the life of the early Church. And it is well known that, when a word has become quite familiar in some special technical sense as this, it by and by gets employed in the freest manner and even applied to other things in this special sense, without any hint that it is so applied, the mere fact that it has become most familiar in this sense being sufficient to prevent any misapprehension on the part of those who are thus familiar with it. The very word “communion” is a case in point. Among many Christians it is familiarly used in a technical sense to signify the Lord’s Supper, whence we readily have and never misunderstand such phrases as the Communion Address, the Communion Sunday, and even the Communion Collection.

Precisely similar is the history of *koinonia*. First of all it meant in a general sense sharing, participation, communion; and in this general sense it is several times employed in the New Testament: “That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the communion (R.V. *fellowship*) of His sufferings” (Phil. iii. 10). Next it was taken hold of and fixed down to be the special designation of that sharing of goods—aye “and our own selves also”—which became so marked a feature of earliest Christianity. In 2 Cor. viii. 4 we see the word, one might say, in the very process of transformation. The Revisers translate: “the fellowship in the ministering to the saints”; but the literal translation is: “the communion of the ministry towards the saints” (τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους). Then, in the hearing of those who are familiar with it in this sense, it may be used freely in other applica-

tions. There is a verse in the Epistle to Philemon which all along has been the despair of translators and commentators. The Revised Version gives it in this way: “Making mention of thee in my prayers . . . that the fellowship of thy faith may become effectual” (ver. 6). Does anyone understand what that means? They must have understood it who translated so. But Bishop Lightfoot might have put them nearer a rendering that would have been intelligible to ordinary readers. In his notes (“Colossians and Philemon,” p. 235) he gives two possible translations of *koinonia*: (1) “your friendly offices and sympathies, your kindly deeds of charity, which spring from your faith”; and (2) “your communion with God through faith”; and in his paraphrase (p. 334) he clearly prefers the former sense: “It is my prayer that this active sympathy and charity, thus springing from thy faith, may abound more and more.” There can be little doubt that this is the meaning. As a Christian, and a rich Christian too, Philemon was quite familiar with the *koinonia*, the participation of goods, the communion. As a Gentile Christian he was not *bound* to cast the whole of his property into the common treasury. What he gave, as he knew well from blest experience, depended upon the strength of his faith.

It is not quite so easy to *use* the word in Rom. xv. 26 and 2 Cor. ix. 13, the two places where the Revisers give “contribution”; but there is no doubt it *is* the word, employed with great freedom in this technical sense. First notice the verb formed from the same adjective as our noun in Rom. xii. 13: “*Communicating* to the necessities of the saints.” Is it not possible then for St. Paul to speak of “the liberality (literally, *singleness*) of your *communion*” (2 Cor. ix. 13); and even of “making a certain communion for the poor of the saints that are at Jerusalem” (Rom. xv. 26)? Principal Moule with his faithful scholarship says at this latter place: “*a contribution*, literally, a communion. The giver communicates, or shares his store with the receiver.” How needless, at any rate, is the translation, “to do good and to com-

municate forget not," at Heb. xiii. 16, and how completely it misses the definite meaning of the original! The literal translation is, "Forget not the well-doing and communion." It is one of the most unmistakable examples of what is called *hendiadys*, the naming of one compound thought by two separate substantives. The "well-doing" consists in the "communion," the participation of property and wealth with the poorer brethren. "Be not unmindful of the beneficent (the kindly) communion."

And this brings us at last to the passage from which our journey began: "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and the communion, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts ii. 42). Four things are specified, each of them characteristic of the life of the earliest Christians. The second is the *koinonia*, the community of goods, the participation, the communion. The inadequacy of "fellowship" as a translation is at once apparent. A general, abstract expression, it completely fails to convey the definiteness of the original word.

We have examined only a few of the passages—those which are the most difficult. In every one of them we have seen that "fellowship" is inadequate.

There is, however, one passage where it is at first extremely difficult to avoid the use of the word "fellowship," or, at least, some word with this general comprehensive meaning. It is Gal. ii. 9. The Revised Version has as usual "fellowship"—"James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship." Dr. Lightfoot gives in his Note—"gave pledges of fellowship." But he sees, with his unflinching care and keenness, that the addition "of fellowship" is unexpected. We shall not discuss the reason he gives for thinking it "not superfluous." But may it not be that the word *koinonia*, first used in the general sense of participation in anything, then taken to signify this

special participation of the Christian community, may have been thence transferred to describe the privileges of the Christian, that which was "common," and therefore specially characteristic of those who became the followers of the Lord Jesus? St. Paul had been received into the "communion" before this, and Barnabas still earlier. But a crisis had occurred. They had been reported as acting in so remarkable a way that it became a question whether they ought to be retained in the communion and be permitted to share its privileges. A meeting was held. They made their defence. It was more than sufficient. Whereupon James and Cephas and John gave pledges of "communion" by extending the right hand, "that we should go unto the Gentiles,"—as our share in the privileges and responsibilities, "and they unto the circumcision." We may depend upon it that St. Paul's expression is a much more exact and definite one than the vague generality "fellowship." It was a time when feeling was clearly fixed by conduct. There were but the two places possible for a man, within the communion or without it; a sharer in its privileges and its duties, or beyond the reach of both; with us or else unmistakably against us. And the very next verse (it is part of the same sentence), tells us that it was this communion that was most nearly in their minds. It tells us also, what we know to have been actually the case, that for St. Paul and the Gentiles, to whom he was sent, the duties of the communion were to be more than its privileges—"Only (they would) that we should remember the poor, which very thing I was also zealous to do."

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol's second article on "The Old Testament and the Teaching of our Lord" will appear in the issue for March. The addresses have been published by the S.P.C.K. in a neat little book, which we heartily recommend to those who wish to have a convenient copy of them. We must add, however, that the articles, as they appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, will possess to some extent an independent value,



from the fact that Dr. Ellicott has made certain alterations and corrections for our pages.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March will contain an article of great value, by Principal Charles Chapman, M.A., LL.D., on "The Present Position of the Evolution Theory." A request having been received to know how the theory at present stood

in the light of recent modifications by leading men of science, it was sent to Principal Chapman, who has made a special and very capable study of the subject (see his excellent book recently published, *Pre-Organic Evolution*), and this article is his reply. It is beyond the scope of the ordinary "Requests and Replies," and is all the more valuable on that account.

## Two Old Testament Scholars.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, LL.D., EDINBURGH.

STUDENTS of the Old Testament will feel that the year 1891 has left them poorer than it found them. By the death, at the age of sixty-three, of Professor Abraham Kuenen, of Leiden, one of the most prominent figures in Old Testament learning has been removed. Few men have filled a larger place in this department at any time, and none so large a place in recent years. Those who differed from him most widely will be the readiest to offer their tribute of admiration for his eminent learning, and his singularly estimable character. Kuenen's mind was clear and logical, with great independence, and a remarkable power of seizing the crucial points in any question under investigation. Perhaps—though this may have been partly due to self-restraint—he seemed rather to want the ideal element; and fuller exegetical sympathy with the contents of an Old Testament passage might sometimes have led him to a different conclusion from that which he reached on purely critical considerations. His mind, however, was singularly honest and straightforward, and his investigations were all characterised by judicial fairness. Towards his opponents he always showed the greatest courtesy, particularly towards those who differed from him in fundamental principles; if he ever betrayed irritation or spoke sharply, it was not of those who were orthodox, but of those who, belonging to what might be thought his own school, seemed to him to misuse his principles, and push them to an un-historical excess. His religious position is stated by himself in the opening sentences of his work on the *Religion of Israel*, which appeared as one of a

number of monographs on the Principal Religions: "For us the Israelitish religion is one of those religions; nothing less, but also nothing more." This, however, was a mere theoretical judgment; the superiority of the religion of Israel to others, in truth and power to elevate human life, was felt by him as much as by others.

Kuenen's people were not wealthy, and his early studies suffered some interruptions; but from the time that he entered the University of Leiden he was never allowed to leave it, one appointment after another being conferred on him till, in 1855, he was raised to an ordinary Chair. His literary activity was enormous. His principal works are: his *Historical-Critical Inquiry; or, Introduction to the Old Testament*, in 3 vols. 1861-65, of which a second edition remains without the third volume. The first volume has been translated under the title, *The Hexateuch*. This Introduction is the most exhaustive and complete that exists. His greatest work is his *Religion of Israel*, which is a positive construction of the history of Israel, so far as its religious thought and worship is concerned. His other works but form the scaffolding to this, or are reproductions on a larger scale of some of its parts, such as his work on the Prophets, written at the instance of the late Dr. John Muir. His last important work was his Hibbert Lectures, read in London in 1882, on *National Religions and Universal Religions*. Besides these works, Kuenen was editor of the Leiden *Theological Review*, to which he contributed many important papers and critical reviews. Some of his occasional essays