

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first volume of the new Dictionary of the Bible is published, and it has been sent us for formal review. Well, we could review it as easily as most. But it would not do. There is an etiquette even in reviewing books. In Germany it allows an author to review his own, even when he has been the sole author of the book. It does not allow him here.

Here the utmost that it allows us is to notice the reviews of others. Now, so far as we have seen, the most searching review of the book has appeared in the *British Weekly*. It is evidently the editor's own. And the gift which enabled the editor of the *British Weekly*, with a few hours' handling, to search the volume through and through and express an undeniable judgment on every part of it, is almost uncanny.

The review in the *British Weekly*, and at least one other, have drawn special attention to the smaller articles. We are glad of that. First, because they are apt to be passed over by the commonplace reader who does not appreciate the importance of the little drops of water and the little grains of sand. And, secondly, because the smaller articles cost the men who wrote them time and brains out of all proportion to the reward they can ever receive. And that reminds us that in naming the scholars in a previous issue of THE

EXPOSITORY TIMES who had contributed such articles, we had no intention of giving an exhaustive list. But there is one name that ought not to have been omitted, the name of Mr. John F. Stenning, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

Of the larger articles, those in Biblical Theology seem to have attracted most attention. That is due no doubt to the eminence of the writers as well as to the importance of the subject. And it was perhaps natural that when Professor A. B. Davidson's name was found appended to great articles like those on Angels, Covenants, and Eschatology, a reviewer's eye should be arrested by them. But it seems to us that the greater articles in Archæology are as able and exhaustive as any. Professor Hommel has been sharply brought to book of late for his opposition to the Higher Criticism, but the most energetic advocate of the criticism of the Old Testament will acknowledge the mastery of his articles on Assyria and Babylonia. We are quite sure that nowhere else at present will the student of the Bible find such fulness and accuracy of knowledge on the matters in which he is most interested. And for Mr. Crum's article on Egypt, we may be permitted to quote the words of the reviewer in the *Daily Free Press*. 'Egypt has been entrusted to a writer not known to us, but, judging from this bit of work,

he will soon be widely known. His article is one of the most valuable in the volume, and forms a splendid introduction and guide to those who may desire to pursue that fascinating study.'

That leads us to say that, as noticed by the *British Weekly*, there are some new writers. No one will object to that. The reviewer in the *British Weekly* does not object to it. He is good enough to say, 'It is one of Dr. Hastings' chief merits as an editor that he gives us surprises, that he has put some of his most important articles into the hands of men who have written little, and that in almost every case the wisdom of his choice has been justified.' We mention this to draw attention to the article on the Apocrypha. Professor Frank Porter of Yale was absolutely unknown to us till we read three short articles of his in *The Biblical World* which touched on books of the Apocrypha. But they seemed so separate from ordinary apocryphal writing that we resolved to entrust him with this most important article. We do not claim to have always landed right; but we leave its readers to judge if we did not land right then. We have the testimony, in fact, of two of the most cautious scholars we know, that no better work on the Apocrypha has ever been done.

It is with thankfulness we have seen this first volume published and well received by the press. We are quite sure that the second, which is well in hand already, will not be behind it in interest.

That St. Paul's address at Athens was a failure is one of the articles in the creed of Christendom. It is even held that St. Paul himself admitted its failure. For, as he moved on to Corinth, did he not determine that among *them* he would know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified? Yet, in the *American Journal of Theology* for the quarter ending March 1898, Professor English of the Newton Theological Institution sets forth St. Paul's address at Athens as a model address for the Christian preacher, and especially for the Christian missionary of to-day.

The business of the Christian preacher of to-day is to persuade men. St. Paul regarded that as his business also. He spoke to the men of Athens to persuade them. He did persuade some—a man and a woman, and others with them. On the face of it, therefore, his speech was not the failure which the creed of Christendom makes it. 'Should a Christian preacher of our time, through a single sermon that an audience would not permit him to finish, persuade to faith in Christ a judge of a high court and several others, would not his success,' asks Professor English, 'be counted extraordinary?' Said Canon Wordsworth long ago, 'St. Paul's speech at Athens—both in what he does say and in what he does not say—is the model and pattern to all Christian missionaries for their addresses to the heathen world.' And Professor English has been informed 'by one of our ablest, most skilful, most successful missionaries,' that he instructs his native preachers to make a large use of this speech in their first approaches to their heathen hearers, and that it is found to be excellently adapted to awaken attention and to gain entrance for the gospel.

Apart from St. Paul's own confession—which, however, may be no more a confession of the failure of the speech at Athens than of the failure of the speech at Antioch in Pisidia; which, in fact, is no confession at all, but the resolution to do at Corinth what he had done at Antioch and Athens and everywhere else—apart from the words, 'I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified,' the great argument for the failure of St. Paul's speech at Athens is the supposition, that it does not contain the gospel.

Now Professor English acknowledges that it moves almost entirely within the realm of what we call Natural Theology. The whole speech, indeed, if we leave out of account the last two verses, is divided between theology and anthropology. That is to say, it speaks of the nature of God and of His relations to mankind, and it speaks of both

as they can be learned from the material universe and from human nature. And so far, no doubt, St. Paul might as well have been a theist or a unitarian. But what does he say about God? The speech is short. Yet within its compass Professor English finds that St. Paul speaks of God's unity, personality, spirituality, self-sufficiency, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, benevolence, righteousness, providence, immanence, and transcendence. Could he have spoken of all that without touching the gospel? Did he not need the gospel to tell him all that about God? Did not some at least of that involve the preaching of the gospel?

Moreover, we have left out of account the last two verses. 'And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead.' Every element of the gospel is there. There is the fulness of time—'but now.' There is the need of repentance unto the forgiveness of sins—'He commandeth all men everywhere to repent.' And there is the deeper condemnation of those who reject the gospel, because the Man who is the Gospel will afterwards be the Judge.

And if the apostle did not begin with the gospel he had excellent reason for it. As he stood before his hearers on Mars Hill, a great moral and intellectual chasm lay between them. They were idolaters, he was a believer in Jesus Christ. His business was to bridge that chasm. He really knew nothing among them save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. But he had to begin at their end of the bridge. His consummate tact in beginning there marks him, says Professor English, as a man of rare homiletic instinct.

He bridged the chasm with four swift arches. First, idolatry is *superfluous* (verses 24 and 25).

God is sovereign in heaven and in earth; He cannot be confined within a temple or arrested by an altar. He giveth life and breath to all things; He needs no gift or offering to sustain His life. Secondly, idolatry is *false* (verses 26 to 28). God hath made of one blood all nations of men; therefore you to have your god and I to have my God is to contradict this elementary truth of anthropology. He has made all men in His own image; to serve an idol is to fashion oneself after an imperfect and sectarian likeness. Thirdly, idolatry is *absurd* (verse 29). For we are the offspring of God. If *we* have heart and brain, surely the God whose offspring we are has no less. To liken Him to gold or silver or stone is to lower Him to a world below His own creation. And fourthly, idolatry is *wicked* (verses 30 and 31). He who made us all made us for worship. But we have sinned and come short. We have worshipped the creature more than the creator. He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained. Thus the chasm is bridged.

And it is not by mere reasoning that the bridge is made. From point to point, says Professor English, the apostle makes appeal to the religious sensibility, the intellectual interest, and the moral sense of his hearers. He touches their religious sensibility first, by recognizing their zeal for God. Next he wakens their intellectual interest. He has borne them witness that they have a zeal for God, but now he tells them that it is not according to knowledge. 'Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.' And then he reaches their conscience. Hitherto God hath winked; but now He hath appointed a day.

That is St. Paul's address at Athens, a model for the missionary of to-day. But surely there is one thing lacking. Professor English admits the defect. But it is not in St. Paul's address. It is only in his own account of it. So he proceeds to fill it up. And he fills it up by a simple but reverent 'of course.' Of course the Spirit is

needed, for of course the Spirit is the power. But there is a vital alliance between apt, well-ordered discourse and the work of the Holy Spirit. The best work of the Holy Spirit upon human nature in His sphere is conditioned largely by the preacher's best work upon human nature in his sphere. For the Spirit is no Sanctifier of ignorance. And the preacher who disdains the nicest psychological adaptation of means to ends in the effort to secure persuasion, prevents the Spirit's most effective working, and rejects His fullest aid.

The new *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund is full of interest. It opens with an elaborate and probably successful effort on the part of that enthusiastic explorer, Dr. Schick, to identify the Ramah of Samuel and the Bezek of Adoni. There is also an amusing illustration of the skipping of the little hills of Ps. 114^{4,6}, quoted from a German missionary named Schultz, who wrote in the middle of last century. Schultz tells the story of a visit paid to the Arabs in the Plain of Esdraelon, when, to the entertainment of himself and those that were with him, the Arab shepherd led his flock *through* the tent where they were; and as he piped the sheep danced, keeping time to the music 'as accurately as a French dancer would do whilst following a minuet.'

But the matter of keenest interest which the present *Statement* contains is a discussion of the date of the Siloam Inscription.

To the *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archæology for May last, Mr. E. J. Pilcher contributed an elaborate article on this famous Inscription. 'In the month of June 1880,' the article began, 'a sharp-eyed pupil of Dr. Schick detected the letters of an inscription upon the wall of a rock-hewn channel which conveys water from the Virgin's Spring to the Pool of Siloam at Jerusalem.' Professor A. H. Sayce of Oxford, in February

1881, made the first intelligible copy, and the following is his latest revised translation:—

1. (Behold) the excavation! Now this is the history of the excavation. While the excavators were lifting up
2. the pick, each towards his neighbour, and while there were yet three cubits (to excavate, there was heard) the voice of one man
3. calling to his neighbour, for there was an excess in the rock on the right hand (and on the left). And after that on the day
4. of excavating, the excavators had struck pick against pick, one against the other,
5. the waters flowed from the spring to the pool for a distance of 1200 cubits. And a
6. hundred cubits was the height of the rock over the head of the excavators.

The inscription, Mr. Pilcher further reminded us, was carefully and artistically engraved upon the *lower half* of a niche, or tablet, cut in the rock, the upper half being left blank. And it seemed to indicate that the notice it contained was to have been given in two languages, but that the other language had never been added. In 1890 an attempt was made to steal the Inscription by cutting it out of the rock; but the only result was to break it in pieces, and the fragments are now preserved in the Royal Museum at Constantinople.

The Inscription contains no historical statement. Its date, therefore, must be decided by the character of the writing. Professor Sayce at first believed the language to be Phœnician, and assigned the date to the time of Solomon. After he discovered the language to be Hebrew, he still held by the Solomonic date; but he afterwards brought it down to the reign of Hezekiah, and found that the Inscription was a contemporaneous account of the making of the conduit of 2 K 20²⁰. Dr. Neubauer, however, sought to show that this Siloam tunnel was in existence in the days of Ahaz, for he identified it with 'the waters of Shiloah that go softly' of Is 8⁶. And then Canon Isaac Taylor, on purely palæographical grounds, decided on the reign of Manasseh.

Mr. Pilcher chose a new and wholly different date. He went over the history of the Hebrew alphabet, freely illustrating as he went. And he came to the conclusion that 'palæographically the Siloam Inscription falls somewhere near the beginning of the Christian era.' Then he went closer. He examined the letters by the side of those on the 'Seal of Haggai.' This gem was discovered by Sir Charles Warren in 1868 among the foundations of Herod's temple at Jerusalem, at a depth of twenty-two feet from the present surface of the ground. Its discoverer supposed it to be at least as old as the time of the Maccabees. Mr. Pilcher fixed upon a date not older than 17 B.C., when Herod's temple was completed. And inasmuch as this Seal and the Inscription bore letters that were exactly alike, Mr. Pilcher assigned the Inscription to the reign of Herod also, and to Herod's own instructions.

Col. Conder answered in the *Quarterly Statement* for July. He set aside Mr. Pilcher's chief argument by setting aside his date for the 'Seal of Haggai.' He then went over the ground of the Hebrew alphabets after him, illustrating his way also as he went, and came to the conclusion that on palæographical evidence the Siloam Inscription comes down from about 700 B.C. He further argued that both tunnel and Inscription belong to Hezekiah, not only because in 2 K 20²⁰ Hezekiah is said to have 'made a conduit,' but also because in 2 Ch 32³⁰ this conduit is described as leading from Gihon to the *Nakhal* or Kidron ravine, 'and it has never been proved that there was a second tunnel to Gihon.'

In the current *Statement* Mr. Pilcher replies. He contends that the whole question turns upon the date at which the old Hebrew characters ceased to be used. He holds that they were still in use (especially for official inscriptions) in the time of Herod the Great. And he finds a new item of evidence in the fragments of Aquila, which Mr. Burkitt has discovered among the parchments recently brought from Cairo. There the name of

Jehovah is given in Hebrew letters, and Mr. Burkitt has observed that the letters are in the Old Hebrew form, not the New or Square Hebrew, as it is called. He therefore abides by his position. Since the Siloam Inscription was engraved in New Hebrew characters it cannot be older than the Christian era.

But the same issue contains another letter on the subject. It is by Mr. Ebenezer Davis. Mr. Davis argues for the early date, and he argues from the Seal of Haggai. In his original article in the *Proceedings*, Mr. Pilcher found that the letters on the Seal of Haggai and the letters on the Siloam Inscription were identical. He fixed the Seal of Haggai to the reign of Herod, and made the Inscription follow it. But Mr. Davis denies the Herodian date for the Seal of Haggai. For it contains one word which is as fatal to such a date as the word 'its' was fatal to the poems of Rowley. That is the word *ben*. In the days of Hezekiah the Hebrew word for 'son' was *ben*, but in the days of Herod it was *bar*. We have evidence enough of that, says Mr. Davis, in the New Testament. There we find Bar-jesus, Bartimæus, and many more names with Bar, but never a name with Ben. Mr. Pilcher's letter in this issue does not mention the Seal of Haggai.

The *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for the current quarter (January to March) contains an article by Professor G. T. Purves on 'The Witness of Apostolic Literature to Apostolic History.' The article has just come in time. For at the moment that the school of thought which makes so little of the historical Christ is rising into greatest influence, one of its most distinguished adherents has placed in our hands the weapon that should work its overthrow. It only remains that we use the weapon aright. And Professor Purves has come to show us the way.

Professor G. T. Purves is a liberal and scientific theologian. He has little love for the powerful Ritschlian school of theology, but he does not

caricature its position. He uses the weapon which Professor Harnack has placed in his hands, but he uses it with fairness and sobriety. He even affords us abundant opportunity to cross his reasoning or reject his results. For he makes no preliminary demands. He does not ask us even to believe in inspiration. He simply takes the writings of the New Testament which lie before us; he accepts Professor Harnack's dates for them; and then he gives us the opportunity of choosing between a historical Christianity, and a Christianity that is either a philosophy or a practical life.

To the Ritschlian school of theology Christianity is either a philosophy or a practical life. It had an origin of course, as all things human; but it is independent of its origin, and it needs no support from its history. To the Church of Christ in general, Christianity is a historical religion. It grew out of a great historical movement, inaugurated by a great historical Person. It came into being by means of definite historical events. On these events it lives still, and even though they are to a large extent supernatural, they are none the less actual in fact or fixed in time. Their supernatural character does not destroy their reality; it gives them their unparalleled importance. So between these two conceptions of Christianity there is a great gulf fixed. If the one is true the other is false. And there is no way of choosing between them but by an unprejudiced examination of the literature to which they both appeal.

That literature is found in the New Testament. Until quite recently, however, we were not permitted to use it freely. So late was the date assigned to most of it by theologians of the Ritschlian school, that no confidence could be placed in its witness. But now Professor Harnack has revised his dates. St. Matthew's Gospel is earlier than A.D. 75, St. Mark's than A.D. 70, St. Luke's than A.D. 90. Even the Fourth Gospel, though still refused to St. John, is 'the Gospel

of John the Apostle through John the Presbyter,' and not later than the very beginning of the second century. The Acts lies somewhere between the years 78 and 93. The Pauline Epistles are genuine, every one, except the Pastorals, and even they have a Pauline kernel. Hebrews is not later than 95, and may be as early as 65; while the Apocalypse is restored to its traditional date at the close of Domitian's reign, and comes from the same hand as the Fourth Gospel. The Catholic Epistles are still denied to the apostles whose names they bear. But there is enough for our purpose without them.

Those dates are offered by Harnack in his recent book *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur*. It is possible that in his next book Harnack will give us earlier dates and more New Testament literature. But we need not wait for that. Those books and those dates are sufficient. If in an honest and good heart the books of the New Testament are examined with those dates to work upon, it will be possible now to determine whether the Christian religion rests upon ascertainable facts in history, or whether we must be content with a philosophical system and a code of cheerless morality.

Now when Professor Purves examines the New Testament in the light of those dates, the first thing he discovers is that its books bear traces of having sprung out of events that were then in actual progress. The New Testament is not a single book, written long after the events it chronicles, by a systematizing and philosophical historian. It is a library. Its contents are the work of many authors. They belong to different periods. They arose out of various and immediate needs. Thus the Epistles were written to particular communities or persons, situated in definite circumstances, beset by peculiar necessities. Even the historical books show that they were written for the immediate religious use of their readers. Whether historical or epistolary, their motives are various, they are mostly quite independent,

their literary style is individual and distinct. They are, in short, the product of circumstances, not of theory. They betray the events that drove them into existence. And they clearly enough reveal that those events were of the earliest in the history of Christianity. For, to mention but one significant circumstance, they are, with a single exception, the work of Hebrew minds, unfamiliar with the philosophy, untouched by the social life, of the Græco-Roman world. And even the single exception, St. Luke the confessed Gentile, is saturated with Hebrew modes of thought, and Hebrew views of life.

In the second place, this literature discloses an actual progress in the history which gave it birth. The books of the New Testament are arranged in a certain order. The order is not strictly chronological; but, beginning with the historical books and ending with the Apocalypse, it exhibits in a rough way the rise and progress of apostolic Christianity. The present order of the New Testament books is as old as the second century, and is clearly entitled to some respect. Let us be content, however, to receive from it the suggestion that the history, out of which the literature grew, had a certain progress, and let us examine the books themselves for the signs of it. Now the books themselves disclose a progress in doctrinal teaching. They also reveal certain definite historical situations, and especially definite conflicts, which respond to every test of reality.

Take these two witnesses and examine them separately. That the Pauline Epistles present a progress in doctrine is a commonplace of every school of theology. But the historical books, so far as they contain doctrinal elements, do so no less. The speeches of Peter in the early chapters of the Acts evince such an undeveloped statement of the faith, that they cannot but be located at the beginning of the process of apostolic teaching. And even the teaching of Christ in the Gospels, when judged internally, provides the rich germ, out of which the other doctrinal statements of the

New Testament may be explained as growing. Again, this literature discloses definite historical situations. To take the earliest, the reported teaching of Jesus carries us back to the Palestine of the beginning of the first century, with its sects and parties, its social customs and religious beliefs, its characteristic faults, and its well-known hopes. And then to pass to the latest, 'the Johannine writings,' says Professor Purves, 'exhibit the Church's world-consciousness, as we may call it, its sense of being universal in its mission and in opposition to the world, which precisely corresponds to the situation, as it must have existed at the close of that century.'

These things—and they are but broken lights of the evidence that lies before us in this fine article—are alone sufficient to stay our steps. Until we are driven to it, Professor Purves seems to say, we shall not embrace a form of Christianity which casts doubt on the possibility, and denies the necessity, of finding a historical foundation for it. That we shall ever be driven to it, is far less likely now than it has been for many a day.

The Notes this month might have ended here. But a series of 'Readings in the Epistle to the Galatians' is being contributed at present to the *Record* by Principal Moule of Cambridge; and it chanced that on finishing the Note that has just been given, our eye caught the *Record* for 28th January, and one of Dr. Moule's readings. Its subject is Gal 1¹⁶⁻¹⁶. Its words, in what Dr. Moule calls his 'baldly literal' translation, are these: 'But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by means of His grace, to unveil His Son in me, that I might (lit., may) gospel Him among the nations, forthwith I did not compare notes with flesh and blood.'

'I read this passage,' says Dr. Moule, 'for a very practical and simple purpose. It gives us the crucial moment in the most wonderful of all Christian biographies from its inner aspect.'

Where St. Luke records the light from heaven, and the audible voice of the glorified Jesus (all endorsed by St. Paul himself in 1 Co 15⁸, where he ranks himself among the witnesses of the *objective and historical* Resurrection [the italics are Dr. Moule's]), St. Paul here thinks only of a light and a voice in the sphere of his soul: "He revealed His Son in

me." My comment,' ends Dr. Moule—and no comment from us is needed—'my comment, offered in great humility, and above all with self-application, is obvious. To our Christian message-bearing, so that it shall be indeed a *εὐαγγελισμός*, one thing is supremely necessary; the revelation *in us* by the Father of the Son.'

The Mind of a Child.

BY THE REV. J. KELMAN, M.A., EDINBURGH.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL teaching is a branch of education with opportunities, advantages, and difficulties of its own. It is not our present business to discuss these, but rather to insist that it *is* a branch of education, and therefore a thing to be taken seriously and, as far as possible, scientifically. It is a work sometimes taken up by Christian people who have no real interest in the mind of a child, and who have never made a study of how it may be interested. It is done by such people to help the minister; to spend Sunday satisfactorily; to satisfy the Christian conscience that is in them. And accordingly the class becomes either a dull routine or simply a juvenile evangelistic meeting. In the former case no good can be expected; in the latter case much good may be done and often is done, but not that particular *educative* good which is the peculiar work of the Sunday school, and which is more needed to-day than it ever was before. To *interest* children with a view to *educating* them is the ideal we shall now consider.

Our subject restricts us, in the first place, to the question of interest. The need for this, apart from any other thing, or rather in order to all other things that can be done for children, is paramount. We are apt to forget or undervalue the importance of being interesting. When grown-up people set children to read, and expect them to appreciate, their own favourite books; and, still more, when they use the Bible in punishment, giving a bad boy 'a chapter to learn,' they are enlisting all the force of the young mind against religion. And it is to be feared that some of our prayers and lessons, if we only knew, simply mean nothing whatever to those who hear them, as is proved too plainly by the discipline needed to

keep the class quiet, or the mechanical and stupid answers that sometimes grieve the teacher.

Of course a certain part of our teaching is and must be uninteresting to the children, especially the learning of the Catechism, and perhaps some of the Psalms or verses. A teacher may, indeed, so explain these as to hold the attention of his pupils. But I rather think it is the explanation that is interesting in such cases more than the thing explained. Theological definitions, and expressions of adult experience, are not and cannot be brought within the child's world. They belong to a world he has not entered yet.

So it would seem that it is not the best plan to try to make this part of the work interesting. We set our children to learn these,—and long may we continue to do so!—not for their childhood but for their after years. All we need to concern ourselves about in this part is, that the words be learned accurately. The meaning will come into them when it is needed. Meanwhile, we should pass on from this pure memory-work generally and concentrate the interest in the 'lesson.'

The most significant fact in connection with modern developments of the science of education, is its close connection with psychology. It is now many years since Richter wrote *Levana*, but that wonderful book is only now being fully appreciated. Later works, among which may be noted particularly Perez's *First Three Years of Childhood*, may be said to regard education as an applied psychology.¹ Psychology is the science of the human mind, and the principle which is more and more fully being established is, that the knowledge of a

¹ When this paper was written, Professor Sully's well-known work on the subject had not been published.