

on it. The result is a biography of the Divine Paraclete.

A HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE. BY CHARLES FOSTER KENT, PH.D. (*Smith, Elder, & Co.* Crown 8vo, pp. xvii, 217. 6s.)

This is the second volume of Mr. Kent's short history. It is clear and competent. It is archaeological as well as critical. It places before us in fewest words the setting of the history of the Hebrews which the advanced scholarship of the last half-century has been persistently working out. This volume runs from the Division of the kingdom to the Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C.

THE ORIGIN OF GENESIS. BY GEORGE STOSCH. (*Elliot Stock.* Crown 8vo, pp. viii, 211. 5s.)

The Origin of Genesis is a curious title, since Genesis itself is 'Origin,' but the origin of the book is yet more curious. 'Towards the close of the year 1891, while engaged in missionary work in Madras among the Tamil population, I heard Dr. Pentecost of New York complain that German theology had spread such mists around Holy Writ as threatened to dim the brightness of its shining for the Christians of the whole world.' Whereupon Pastor Stosch patriotically resolved to show that German theology is able also to disperse the mists, and wrote this book for English readers. Well, notwithstanding its origin, it is an excellent book. Its tone is excellent, so is its scholarship, so is its evangelical warmth. For the unfortunate title

must not set up an impression that this is a discussion of the authorship of Genesis. Pastor Stosch does not trouble himself or us with critical questions. He takes the narratives as he finds them in their order and entirety, and then he considers their everlasting meaning. He shows that just as they stand they carry the lessons which every man coming into the world must learn.

SMALLER BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

FIFTEEN HUNDRED FACTS AND SIMILES. BY J. F. B. TINLING, B.A. (*Hodder & Stoughton.* New edition, crown 8vo, pp. 471. 5s.)

RECONSIDERATIONS AND REINFORCEMENTS. BY JAMES MORRIS WHITON, D.D. (*J. Clarke & Co.* Pott 8vo, pp. 149. 1s. 6d.)

BIBLE-CLASS PRIMERS. THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. BY THE REV. PROFESSOR LAIDLAW, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* pp. viii, 93. 6d.)

THE FIRST BOOK OF KINGS. BY THE REV. W. O. BURROWS, M.A. (*Rivington, Percival, & Co.* Crown 8vo, pp. xxx, 109. 1s. 6d.)

JIM HALLMAN: A TALE OF MILITARY LIFE. BY C. G. C. M'INROY. (*Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier.* pp. 96.)

HOW CHRISTIANITY CONQUERED THE ROMAN EMPIRE. BY THE REV. A. F. TAYLER, M.A. (Manchester: *Lockwood.* Pott 8vo, pp. 88.)

AGNI, THE ARYAN GOD. BY K. S. MACDONALD, M.A., D.D. (Calcutta: *Traill & Co.* 8vo, pp. 75.)

THE CHILD IN THE MIDST. BY THE REV. GEORGE HENDERSON, M.A., B.D. (Stirling: *Drummond.* 24mo, pp. 32. 1s. per doz.)

Could Jesus Err?

BY THE REV. THOMAS WHITELAW, D.D., KILMARNOCK.

III.

THE complete failure of the preceding attempt to convict Jesus of error might reasonably have dispensed one from the necessity of intermeddling further with the Professor's strictures, had it not been that these possess in themselves an independent value as well as an important bearing on the doctrine of the Person of our Lord. Assuming that his antecedent indictment has been sustained, the Professor advances, in the second main division of his brochure, to dispel the fears of those who apprehend lest the existence of error on the part of Christ should impair or imperil His efficiency as a

Saviour. Unless this anxiety can be removed, he rightly perceives, it is hopeless to expect that Christians will assent to any proposal which associates intellectual error with Him who named Himself The Truth, who claimed to know the secrets of God, who showed that He could read the thoughts of men, and who more than once discovered an acquaintance with facts in nature and events in providence which were hidden from ordinary minds. Now to remove this anxiety, it is apparent two principal objections require to be met—that which regards the admission of intellectual

error on the part of Christ as not compatible with His claim to be divine, and that which sees in such admission a reduction of His power to save.

1. Dealing with the first of these objections, the *Christological*, Dr. Schwartzkopff admits that, if the prevailing view of Christ's Person be correct,—that He was a pre-existent Divine Being, co-equal, co-substantial, and co-eternal with the Father, who became incarnate by taking upon Himself a true body and a reasonable soul,—the charge of errancy cannot be upheld. In express terms he over and over again concedes that 'errancy is not reconcilable with the old conception of Christ's divinity,' by which he understands the Church doctrine that Christ, as to His divine nature, possessed 'a substantial equality of essence with God.' Those who favour the view that intellectual error is capable of being harmonised with a claim of supreme divinity on the part of or for Christ might note this outspoken confession of the learned Professor. It is well known that at least two attempts have been made to conserve Christ's essential divinity while conceding His human fallibility—one by Nestorius in the fifth century, and another by Menzer and Feuerborn, Giessen theologians, in the seventeenth century. Both of these are subjected to review.

Nestorianism, which postulated two natures in Christ, a human and a divine, each with its corresponding personality, and both bound together by some external tie, so that they constituted two separate and distinct entities which had virtually nothing to do with one another, Dr. Schwartzkopff properly rejects, on the grounds that such a combination as it proposed involved a dual personality and did not constitute a real union, but only a juxtaposition of natures in Christ. When, however, he throws overboard the doctrine of the two natures in every form, on the plea that, stated any way theological experts may devise, it necessarily implies two 'Ich's,' two 'I's,' *i.e.* two personalities, one refuses quite as properly to concur in his procedure. It may be that the Christian Church, in ascribing two wills to Christ and denying two 'I's,' has allowed herself to become entangled in what looks like a metaphysical contradiction, the will as known to us being merely the 'I' in practical operation; but if New Testament Scripture is to guide her in formulating a theory of the Incarnation, she is fully justified in maintaining the one personality of the God Man. Nor is the contention as free from objection as it looks, that

human nature is not thinkable except as personal. So far as known to man himself, that is so. The only specimens of human nature with which experience makes one acquainted are individualised, *i.e.* are definite and consciously separate 'I's.' Yet true it is, and of a verity, that Scripture does not teach as its doctrine of Incarnation that the Divine Son united Himself with *a* man, but with *man*, not with an individual specimen of humanity, but with humanity as it belonged to the race. Whether humanity in this general aspect of it involved 'personality' cannot be inferred from what is known to exist in the case of individual men. The most that might be adventured as a speculation is that if personality did belong to it, that personality could scarcely be the exact counterpart of the individual 'ego,' but might possess a closer affinity to, and so be capable of entering into union with, the infinite personality of God, in whose image man was created. In any case, whether able or not, to formulate a theory of the Incarnation which shall obviate every particle of mystery attaching thereto, the Christian Church is not prepared to surrender the faith of centuries, that in the one Person of Jesus two natures coexisted in mysterious union without intermixture or confusion, and still less to accept in its place any theory which accords to Jesus only what might be called a qualified, or indeed a manufactured, divinity. And just because the doctrine of the errancy of Jesus implies, or seems to imply, this, it will not readily gain adherents among Christian believers.

For *Kenoticism*, which teaches that the pre-existent divine Word by a voluntary act of self-emptying or self-depotentiation laid aside His divine attributes, at least of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience, and reduced Himself within the limitations not of humanity merely, but of individualised humanity, the Wernigerode theologian of to-day manifests as little favour. Whether as propounded by Thomasius, Gess, or Dorner, the theory, in his judgment, labours under serious defects. Set up for the purpose of conserving the proper manhood of Jesus, it inevitably leads, as he correctly points out, 'to the denial either of the true humanity or of the true Godhead, or to the inorganic and unreasonable supposition of a double personality in the historical Jesus.' A God who has laid aside His omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience, if such be conceivable or possible, and reduced Himself to the dimensions of a man,

is, as Biedermann observes, a mythological and gnostical god, *i.e.* is no real god at all; while just as little, adds the same theologian, is he a true but rather a seeming man who is not omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient only through a voluntary act, *i.e.* because he has willed not so to be. Of course, Dr. Schwartzkopff contends that only one solution of the outstanding enigma of Christ's Person is possible, namely, that which ascribes to Him not godhead (Gottheit) but godlikeness (Göttlichkeit), which regards Him as a God-filled man but not as a God-man. This theory, he explains,—and with the explanation orthodox interpreters agree,—admits the possibility of error on the part of Jesus.

2. Examining the second objection, the *Soteriological*, Professor Schwartzkopff discerns with equal clearness that his thesis, supposing it made good, conflicts directly with the Church doctrine of the Atonement, which teaches that, unless Christ had been God in the strict sense of substantial equality with the Father, He could not have rendered satisfaction for the world's sin. Accordingly he bends his energies to demolish this conception of the work of Christ, endeavouring to show that 'in its innermost essence it is unbiblical and unchristian,' that it is found neither in the Israelitish cultus nor in the Prophets and Psalms nor in Christ's teaching, but originated in the unspiritual and legal theories of the Jewish rabbis or Pharisees, Christ's bitter opponents, from whom

it was taken over by Paul, who passed it on through the centuries till it reached Anselm, who galvanised it into fresh life through his *Cur deus homo?* and foisted it on the schoolmen who transmitted it to the Church of the Reformation. Space will not admit of following these strictures in detail, else were it not difficult to expose their unsatisfactory character. For present purposes it is only needful to emphasise the concession that a recognition of the substitutionary character of Christ's atoning work becomes impossible except on the pre-supposition of Christ's supreme divinity, and that this, as already pointed out, precludes the possibility on Christ's part of error. Accordingly it stands in perfect harmony with the exigencies of this theory (of Christ's errancy) that its advocates, if they would sweep all obstacles from its path, must first reduce the New Testament conception of Christ's divinity from that of substantial equality with the Father to that of complete ethical resemblance to God; and second, water down the biblical representation of Christ's work from that of expiating a world's sin through His obedience unto death to that of simply furnishing mankind with 'a perfect revelation of the Love of God,' the trustful and thankful acceptance of which—which is the meaning of faith—is the sole condition of salvation; and just because of these admitted exigencies, it is not too rash to predict that the dogma of Christ's (supposed) fallibility will not readily obtain universal or even general credence.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Prophets in Their Original Form.

Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form. Von Dr. Dav. Heinr. Müller. Vol. i. *Prolegomena und Epilegomena.* Vol. ii. Arabische und Hebräische Texte. Vienna, 1896. A. Hölder.

UNDER the above title has recently appeared a work which is likely to create not a little stir among students of biblical and universal literature. Readers of the Scriptures, more particularly of the prophetic books, are carried away by an irresistible influence which those powerful writings exercise, despite the lapse of centuries; and they are aston-

ished at the potency of language which charms the heart and fascinates the imagination, the vicissitudes of time and the change of hemisphere notwithstanding. This charm consists no less in the form than the thought, a fact not generally recognised, but upon which Professor Müller lays particular stress. With much skill he endeavours to prove that the Hebrew prophets used strophes like those employed in the choruses of the Greek drama, with strophe and antistrophe answering one another, yet displaying conceptive unity, perfect consonance, or else similarity of sound, while a certain rhythm supplies the place of the strict Greek metre. It was this law of antiphony