

And what are the reasons for the hope? The author has argued that the basis of all things is mind, and not matter; and not only mind, but reason; and that therefore it is incredible that, the Power which is responsible for the hope being reasonable, the hope itself can be doomed to extinction.

Messrs. Watts have published a thorough-going Materialistic Scheme of Ethics under the title of *The New Scientific System of Morality*.

It is written by Mr. G. Gore, F.R.S. (2s. 6d. net).

A series of volumes, by different writers, on the Teaching of Jesus is under issue by the American Tract Society. The new volume is *The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Christian Life* (75 c.). It is written by Dr. G. B. F. Hallock. Its topics are all discussed by scholars in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, but here they find brief, simple treatment that gives the book a good right to its existence.

## Professor W. E. Addis on Hebrew Religion.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. JAMES ORR, D.D., GLASGOW.

PROFESSOR ADDIS, of Oxford, has contributed to the 'Crown Theological Library,' a volume on *Hebrew Religion to the Establishment of Judaism under Ezra*, which has the great merit of exhibiting in short compass, and in clear, untechnical language, the prevailing view in the modern critical school as to the origins and course of development of Israel's religion, till this reached its completed shape after the Exile. The view presented in its pages, which claims to be set forth within 'the limits set by sober and moderate scholarship,' is one with which readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are not unfamiliar, and I crave indulgence, as occupying a different standpoint, for subjecting it in this paper to a brief examination. Since I conceived the idea of writing this article, I observe that Professor Addis has honoured my volume on *The Problem of the Old Testament* with a review in the columns of the *Review of Theology and Philosophy* (September), in which a number of the points in his book receive further accentuation. A brief thrashing-out of our very divergent conceptions is therefore all the more desirable. I hope that in anything I may say I shall not be found lacking in respect for one whose distinction and scholarship in this department of study I willingly acknowledge.

I shall be excused for not attempting anything

<sup>1</sup> *Hebrew Religion to the Establishment of Judaism under Ezra*. By W. E. Addis, M.A. London: Williams & Norgate, 1906.

like a formal review of Professor Addis' book. My object rather is to use the book as an occasion for testing some of the main issues in the contrast between the modern critical view and what I must persist in calling the Bible's own view of the course of Israel's history and religion, and for furnishing reasons why I think the former is not tenable, and is bound to break down, while the latter maintains its right to our acceptance. If, naturally, I do not dwell much on the things in the book with which I agree, but give prominence to those on which I differ, this also will be understood from the purpose of the article.

The view of Israel's religion expounded in the volume takes for granted, as was to be expected, the ordinary critical results on the literature. These, in the main points, are regarded as established beyond all doubt. 'Much,' says Mr. Addis, 'is certain. On many questions of capital moment—such, e.g., as the dates at which the documents composing the Pentateuch were written down, the date and authorship of most of the prophetic books—there is practical unanimity among men whose knowledge entitles them to judge. This agreement has been slowly attained; it has been severely tested by discussion, nor is there the slightest ground for thinking that it will ever be seriously disturbed' (p. 11). The weak point here is that, in many cases, and these the most essential,—as, e.g., the post-Ezekiel origin of the Priestly Code,—it is not the theory of religion which depends on

'results reached by the criticism of the documents,' but, largely, the criticism which depends on the theory of religion. Mr. Addis but speaks in the usual fashion on these 'assured' critical results; yet I humbly submit that nothing could be more misleading than just this allegation of 'unanimity' and finality in regard to the results of either the literary or the historical criticism.

Let me take one or two illustrations. It would be easy to mention names, recent and contemporary, some of them of no mean weight, that do not accept the current literary datings, or the theories connected with them; but let these pass. 'Competent scholars' (a phrase of Mr. Addis) is too often simply a synonym for the scholars who accept these 'results.' I refrain from emphasizing also the stampede of the archæologists, many of whom, as Sayce, Hommel, Halévy, were originally adherents of the Wellhausen School. They too are put out of court. But I rest my dissent on two facts, as to the importance of which there is no doubt whatever in my own mind. The first is that in Old Testament scholarship itself, under the influence of the new so-called 'historical-critical' movement, there is taking place a profound change of opinion, which threatens very soon to make the Wellhausen School, alike in its historical construction and in many of its critical results, as obsolete as the school of Baur already is in New Testament criticism. And second, there is going on in critical circles a process of disintegration of older critical views—a development of the older theories into new forms which practically means a transformation of them into something altogether different: a putting of them into the melting-pot with results fatal to their continuance. Of the first of these facts, I give but one instance. Hugo Winckler is a scholar of sufficiently radical tendency, whose ability and influence on contemporary thought Mr. Addis, I think, will not affect to despise. But even since Mr. Addis wrote, Winckler has published a remarkable address,<sup>1</sup> delivered at a Conference at Eisenach, which has for its aim—what? To assail the very foundations of the Wellhausen 'historical-religious' theory, and demonstrate that the view of the religion of Israel expounded by this school (*i.e.* Mr. Addis' own view in this book) is undermined by newer know-

ledge. Winckler is not a champion to my liking: his 'pan-Babylonianism' is as much an error in the opposite direction; but on this subject it is difficult not to give him one's assent, and in any case he explodes effectually the conceit of securely 'settled results.' I have no space to quote at length, but his assault is thoroughgoing enough. At the one end he affirms 'the historical impossibility of the theory (*Auffassung*) of Stade and Wellhausen' of the wilderness period; at the other he denies what is the rock-position of this school—the posteriority of the law to the prophets, and the post-exilic origin of Judaism. Here are one or two of his sentences. 'From a nomadic to an agricultural religion, from this to the religion of the prophets, from this to that of the "law," that is the course of the "development" or evolution [here is Mr. Addis' theory *in nuce*]. For us, who appreciate the culture of the Orient at its true value, there are no "original" beginnings; there is, therefore, no "development" in this sense.' 'On the other hand, the new view is compelled to break with certain presuppositions of the older [Wellhausen] theory, in so far as certain alleged decisive marks, which appear to offer the starting-point for a new development, and which I also formerly accepted, now fall to the ground in this regard. To this category belongs, above all, the idea that the beginnings of the development of Judaism, its organization into a sect, which, torn away from its native soil, thereby becomes for the first time "international," fall in the Exile, and are the consequences of that.' Is the founding of 'Judaism' in the Exile, through the acceptance of the newly devised 'Priestly Code,' in view of a protest like this, which comes from the newest 'school' of all, still to be ranked among the firmly 'assured results'?

I respectfully urge that it is time there was an abating of this habitual speech about 'assured results' which nobody is at liberty to challenge. An instructive example comes at the present moment from New Testament criticism in the notable work which Professor Harnack has just published in defence of the Lucan authorship of the third Gospel and the Acts. Here again was a matter which criticism thought it had finally settled—in the negative. Professor Schürer is amazed that Harnack should venture to controvert a position on which 'all representatives of a critical treatment' had come to be 'at one.' It is

<sup>1</sup> His *Religionsgeschichte und geschichtlicher Orient*, apropos of Marti's *Die Religion des A. T.*, a work on the same lines as that of Addis.

refreshing to hear Harnack on the point. 'Despite the contradiction of Credner, B. Weiss, Klostermann, Zahn, etc., the untenableness of the tradition [of Luke's authorship] is held to be so thoroughly established, that hardly any one to-day any longer thinks it worth his while to prove it, or to pay any attention to the arguments of opponents. In fact, there appears to be no longer a willingness to recognize that there *are* such arguments. Jülicher thinks we must see in the ascription of the Book of Acts to Luke only an "adventurous wish." So speedily does criticism forget, and in so partisan a spirit does it stiffen itself up in its hypotheses!' Harnack, however, convincingly maintains that here again 'tradition' vindicates itself; and on the 'pretended impossibility' that Luke could have been a companion and fellow-worker of Paul, he pertinently asks: "Can not"—why not? From what quarter have we such sure knowledge of apostolic and post-apostolic times that we dare oppose our "knowing" to a surely attested fact?' These words have as direct a bearing on much of the Old Testament criticism, and of its venturesome reconstruction of the history of times of which we know little or nothing but what we glean from the Bible itself.

Next, I have referred to the disintegration—what I would call, borrowing a German word, the *Selbstzersetzung*—of the older theories in the critical schools themselves. The assertion of the 'practical unanimity,' e.g., as to 'the dates at which the documents composing the Pentateuch were written down,' can only be taken with qualifications which 'practically' nullify its value. The original simple hypothesis, based on analysis, of a J E D P, with some redactional additions or curtailments, has finally disappeared, and given place to imaginary processional series of Js, Es, Ds, Ps, Rs (J<sup>1</sup> J<sup>2</sup> J<sup>3</sup>, etc.), which in turn have become merged in 'schools,' that continue to maintain themselves, and to add, manipulate, and change, for no one knows how long. Well might Dillmann call such complicated developments, in which unity and homogeneity vanish, only 'a hypothesis of perplexity.' But is it credible? Has Mr. Addis ever seriously set before his mind what is implied, say, in a J and an E 'school,' each retaining its peculiarities, continuing to subsist, and, like the waters of the Rhone and Saône, peacefully flowing on side by side, unchanged, after the fall of the Northern Kingdom,

presumably, therefore, in Judah, possibly even through the Exile? The P document is in even worse case (P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> P<sup>3</sup> P<sup>4</sup>, etc.); and it is only by a fiction that one can speak of it as ever subsisting as an independent document at all. Graf was no fool, yet Graf held to the end that the Priestly Document had never a separate existence. He had the amplest logical justification for his position in the character of the document then, and the newer developments have destroyed what earlier plausibility attached to the other supposition. Even on Wellhausen's theory that the Priestly Law, in its final codification, first appeared in the law-book which Ezra brought with him from Babylon, there is no necessity for supposing that it ever subsisted separately. If, further, as Wellhausen contends, its meagre thread of history throughout presupposes the J E narratives, and is based on these, the ground falls for the allegation that it designedly suppresses all mention of priests, altars, sacrifices, etc., before the time of Moses.

For myself, I must again frankly say that this whole theory of the first introduction of the Levitical Law by Ezra, in flagrant contradiction, as respects its main provisions, of previous usage and tradition, and its unquestioning acceptance by the people, is to my mind a huge incredibility, and, in many of its parts, as in the origin of the Levitical order from the degraded priests in Ezekiel's sketch of his temple, a piece of pure mythology. I have given my reasons elsewhere, and need not repeat them here. Compared with this fundamental difference of view, divergence of opinion from Mr. Addis on particular points is of secondary importance, save as it may help to illustrate the arbitrariness and assumption which I take to be the fundamental fault of his procedure. For which of Mr. Addis' literary or historical judgments can, after all, 'unanimity' be claimed? The 'Law of Holiness,' e.g. comprising no small part of the Levitical Code, he takes to be dependent on Ezekiel (pp. 241-242). But many living scholars, including Dr. Driver and Bishop Ryle, hold it to be clearly *older* than Ezekiel, and not a few, as Baudissin, Kittel, Oettli, etc., believe it even 'to antecede Deuteronomy. The roll of Deuteronomy, as found in the reign of Josiah, Mr. Addis affirms categorically, 'at first contained only the kernel of our present book, viz. the legislative part from chap. 12 to chap. 26, and even there certain portions have been added to the

primary text' (p. 188). But Dr. Driver and other eminent scholars in the present, like Kuenen and Dillmann in the past, contest this assertion, while Steuernagel abandons this older view, and propounds an entirely new and revolutionary theory. It is granted that the book 'certainly claimed to be Mosaic'; 'the writer speaks in the person of Moses, believing, and rightly, that he wrote in Moses' spirit, and built on his foundation' (p. 188). The book claims, I think, to be much more than this; but, in any case, how does such claim comport with Mr. Addis' own meagre conception of Moses as law-giver? 'We can but note an idea or an institution here and there which may be traced to Moses. No fragment of his writing has survived.' Even the Decalogue is not his (p. 72). This in face of the fact that every code of law in the Old Testament is directly attributed to him. The J and E documents, again, 'which form the oldest parts of the Pentateuch,' are believed to have been reduced to writing somewhere between 850 and 750 B.C. It has already been noted that the new theory of 'schools' plays havoc with these dates. The dating of the J and E documents has, in the author's view, a direct bearing on their credibility (pp. 57, 65, etc.). But if we inquire into the reasons for dating them even so low as 850-750, we get no satisfying answer. A chief reason, one is led to believe by examples given, is the arbitrary interpretation put on certain narratives as mirrorings of events in the days of the divided kingdom. These instances are excellent illustrations of what the school which Mr. Addis represents understands by proofs. *E.g.* the story of Jacob at Bethel is 'a temple myth intended to explain the ancient custom of paying tithes at that time-honoured sanctuary' (p. 88). The story of the Golden Calf (Ex 32) 'is written with the obvious design of discrediting the northern ritual, and it is unlikely on the face of it' (p. 96). The immoral practice of 'holy women' and 'holy men' obtained, we are told, not only in North Israel, but in Judah—a proof-text being Gn 38, the story of Judah and Tamar. At the Conquest 'Levi and Simeon made a raid upon Shechem in the centre of Palestine, and fared badly.' The proof is the story of Dinah in Gn 34 (p. 90). Gunkel has written strongly against this mode of treating the older stories, and now Winckler adds his protest in the address above referred to (pp. 35-36). What Winckler,

with his Babylonian knowledge, writes on the 'feasts,' in criticism of the Wellhausen contention, might also profitably be considered by our author.

Coming to the theory of the course of Hebrew religion itself, expounded in this volume, one's fundamental difficulty in dealing with it is to find any ground of agreement as to the method or principles on which such an inquiry should be conducted. This naturally is set down by Mr. Addis in his review of my book to the fact that I am absolutely unable to put myself in the position of my adversaries. Probably he is right: I *am* unable to enter into the mental processes by which many, if not most, of the conclusions detailed in this volume are reached. The method, in brief, particularly as regards the earlier stages of the religion, is, as I take it, the simple one of summarily ignoring, or dispensing with, all the history we have, and substituting for this an imaginary construction, built up largely on conjectures, and on forced and *a priori* interpretations of isolated *data*. I quoted Budde in my volume as an example of this so-called 'historical' method, as when, after showing how the Yahweh of Moses became the Yahweh of a later period by the absorption of the Canaanitish gods into Himself, he naïvely adds: 'To be sure, neither the law, nor the historical narratives, nor the prophets, say a word of all this, yet it can be proved,' etc. (*Rel. of Israel*, p. 41). Or again: 'It is, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that Yahweh demanded at Sinai the exclusive veneration of His own God-head. True, this is the unvarying testimony of Old Testament tradition. It is to this day the generally accepted view, and is held even by advanced specialists. But it can hardly be maintained,' etc. (p. 59). It would not be easy to express more accurately the method followed in this volume by Mr. Addis, though the results sometimes differ. *E.g.* Mr. Addis thinks that Moses *did* demand the exclusive worship of Jehovah.

The core of patriarchal history in Genesis is unquestionably to be sought in the covenants made by God with the fathers of Israel, and in the promises given to them, and fulfilled at the Exodus. Here is the vestibule to the whole history of revelation. Without this element the drama of Genesis is worse than the play of *Hamlet* with *Hamlet* left out. Of all this, however, we have nothing in Mr. Addis' picture of the pre-Mosaic

religion of Israel, but instead are presented with the usual catalogue of Semitic superstitions—worship of ancestors, stone worship, tree worship, sacred wells, and the like [Mr. Addis, nevertheless, disclaims totemism], which the tribal ancestors of the Hebrews are supposed to have shared. There is no need for denying the existence of such things in Semitic heathenism, or in Canaan; what is to be proved is that they were adopted by the patriarchs, and formed the distinctive thing in their religion. Even if it were shown that such superstitions were in some degree present, this would not disprove the presence of a higher and purer faith. The reader of Dr. A. Mitchell's valuable Rhind Lectures, *The Past and the Present*, will remember the curious evidence cited as to the survival of sacrifice and adoration of sacred wells in Scotland. 'This adoration of wells,' he says, 'continues largely to our day.' No one, at least, will contend that the superstitions named are conspicuous features on the Bible page; yet everything else is merged in them. I go further, and challenge the relevancy of most of the evidence that these things were part of the patriarchal religion at all. What real proof, *e.g.*, is afforded by all Mr. Addis' conjectures ('may be,' 'may have arisen,' 'perhaps,' 'may have been,' etc.) that worship of ancestors was practised by the primitive Hebrews? (pp. 22-23). Does the erecting of a 'sacred pillar' at the grave of Rachel (Gn 35<sup>20</sup>), as he appears to think, prove it? For 'sacred stones' we are referred, of course, to Jacob's pillar at Bethel, and are reminded that 'for meteoric stones the Greeks used the very word "Bethel" (*βαίτυλος* or *βαϊτύλιον*), which they must have borrowed from the Phœnicians' (p. 26). The idea is that the stone was regarded as an abode of a spirit or deity (house of a god), and the anointing was to conciliate the spirit in the stone. But W. R. Smith and Dr. Driver dispute the connexion with *βαϊτύλιον*, and it is perfectly certain that there never was a class of sacred stones in Israel known as 'Bethels.' The context of the passage ('he called the name of that place Bethel,' Gn 28<sup>20</sup>—this in direct connexion with the setting up and anointing, v. 19), shows that, as Dillmann holds, the stone had simply a memorial character. The proofs of 'sacred wells' are such names as Beersheba, En-Mishpat, Beer-la-hai-roi, and the reader may judge of their cogency for himself. So with trees and other superstitions. The use of

images in the service of Jehovah is thought to have become general after the Conquest, and to have been lawful till the time of Hosea. The proofs are the brazen serpent, the 'ephod,' taken to be an 'image,' and the later calf-worship at Bethel and Dan. This is one reason why the Decalogue cannot have been from Moses: 'like Hosea and Isaiah, but unlike Elijah, it prohibits images' (p. 186). Elijah's alleged *silence* as to the idolatrous worship at Bethel is here taken as *sanction* of that iniquity; yet, is there no implied condemnation in Elijah's denunciation of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin (1 K 21<sup>22</sup>)? This is demonstration to Mr. Addis: others may not find it so cogent.

The real religion of Israel, we are told, begins with Moses, and Mr. Addis, while denying to Moses all actual legislation, must be acknowledged to have some worthy sense of the personality of the Deliverer, and seemingly also of the reality of the 'revelation' received through him. Jehovah, thought perhaps to mean 'He who casts down' (lightning), was probably a god of the nomad tribes about Sinai, though, mysteriously, he is regarded apparently as having a true existence, and as, possibly, even known in some measure to the fathers. Through Moses He becomes the God of the confederation of Hebrew tribes, and a covenant with Him is ratified at Sinai. The Decalogue, as already said, is not allowed to Moses; but, instead, we have an older decalogue in Ex 34<sup>14</sup>.—'a table of ten short commandments comprising duties to Jehovah'—which, if not Mosaic, at least 'descends from an age unaffected by the ethical monotheism of the prophets' (p. 118). We learn that this older decalogue 'proscribes idolatrous practices'; yet only 'molten images, not images absolutely,' are prohibited (p. 119). On this pretended decalogue, it may be sufficient to quote Mr. Addis himself in his *Docs. of the Hexateuch* (i. p. 157): 'Many critics, *e.g.* Wellhausen,' he says, 'adopting a suggestion of Goethe, have tried to disentangle ten "words of the covenant" answering to the Ten Words or the Decalogue of the Elohist. This, however, is mere guess-work.' Jehovah, nevertheless, though greater than all other gods, is still not regarded as the only God: the religion is not monotheism, but monolatry. Neither is He thought of as omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient. Besides anthropomorphisms of the earlier books, the

well-worn proofs from Jephthah's words about Chemosh, and David's being driven out to serve other gods, are pressed into service here. We are actually told that the latter passage, 1 S 26<sup>19</sup>, implies that 'to a man driven from Canaan the worship of Jehovah became an impossibility: he had perforce to "serve other gods" in the land of his exile' (p. 79). Does Mr. Addis, then, believe that when David was in Philistia or Moab he worshipped the gods of these peoples, or that when Elijah was in Zarephath (p. 114) he worshipped Baal? The transition from Jehovah's abode on Sinai to His making Canaan His habitation is associated, it appears, with 'the passage from nomad to agricultural life' (p. 79; Winckler should be compared). Even Elijah was not the stern monotheist he is commonly represented to be, and only objected to Baal being worshipped in Israel. It requires some courage to uphold this paradox; but, granting it, the marvel of the transition to the ethical monotheism of Amos and the later prophets only becomes the greater.

The picture given by Mr. Addis of the teaching of the prophets on Jehovah is the most satisfactory part of his book, and just on this account there is the less need to dwell upon it. There is a fine elevation in much of the writing here, which one appreciates the more because of the clear recognition of a note of true revelation in the prophets' message. 'Here let it be said, once for all,' the author declares, 'that we mean such prophets as were the organs of revealed truth' (p. 144; cf. pp. 142-143). The problem that still stands unsolved is, How did the prophets so suddenly leap into this grand conception of Jehovah as the one and sole omnipotent and righteous Ruler of the world? Is it enough to say that the Assyrian invasions led them to see that, 'if the Hebrews were to believe in Jehovah at all, they must recognize Him as one who ruled the destinies of the whole world' (p. 139). Are world-revolutionizing truths born in men's minds as the result of such reflections on political events? The prophets give no hint of any such genesis of their beliefs. On the contrary, as Mr. Addis himself tells us, they one and all 'built on the old foundations. The God whom they proclaimed was the same God who had redeemed Israel from Egyptian bondage, and had guided it ever since' (p. 148). Here is the unquestionable truth, but does it not

involve a revisal of much that Mr. Addis had previously written? For there really never is wanting to the religion of Israel, even from patriarchal times, if justice is done to its own testimony, that essentially monotheistic faith which is the soul of the teaching also of the prophets. The prophets do not create it, though they rise to nobler heights in the inculcation of it. Genesis, from first to last, is a monotheistic book. No God but one, even in its most anthropomorphic narratives, is known in it. He is the God of heaven and earth, who creates man, rules the world, judges it by a flood, regulates events for the accomplishment of His large and gracious purposes. Winckler here, whatever his errors in another direction, has a firmer grasp of the truth than Wellhausen. There is 'development' in revelation, but not of the kind which Mr. Addis, in his rejection of the Bible's own representations, has pictured.

It would carry me too far to enter even in the briefest way into questions of the Deuteronomic reform and of the relations of the Levitical Code to earlier laws and institutions. I do not therefore attempt it. To follow Mr. Addis would involve disagreement with him at almost every step. *E.g.* he avers: 'In Deuteronomy priest and Levite are synonymous terms' (p. 191). Even Dr. Driver does not go so far as this. He allows 'there is a difference in Deuteronomy between "priest" and "Levite,"' though, he thinks, 'it is not the difference recognized in P' (*Deut.* p. 219). The difference he takes to be, that in Deuteronomy the priests 'are those members of the tribe who are officiating for the time at the central sanctuary.' This, however, will manifestly not suit such a passage as Dt 21<sup>1-6</sup>, where 'the priests, the sons of Levi,' are resident in cities in other parts of the land. 'Unfortunately,' says Mr. Addis, 'we do not know what the word [Levites] means' (p. 102), and he proceeds to give an imaginary account of the origin of the tribe (p. 103). It need not be said that it is the antipodes of the Bible's own account, which is simply ignored. Ark and tabernacle are the subject of some remark. The view that the ark was the receptacle of the tables of the law is declared to be 'untenable' (p. 75), *because* the Ten Commandments did not then exist, and in the review of my volume I am censured for not perceiving the irreconcilability of the J E and P accounts of the place of the tabernacle—the

former locating the tent 'without' the camp, the latter 'in the midst' of the camp. Admitting, as I do, the difference in sources and usage, I need hardly again discuss this subject, and would simply here point out that only in one of the three J E passages is the tent expressly said to have been pitched 'without the camp, afar off from the camp' (Ex 33<sup>7ff.</sup>); while in the other two (Nu II. 12) mention is indeed made of 'going out' from the camp to the tent, and from the tent to the camp (II<sup>24</sup>), but in circumstances unfavourable to the idea that the tabernacle was at a distance from the whole camp (the quails fell thick without the camp, II<sup>31</sup>; Miriam, smitten with leprosy, was expelled beyond the camp, I 2<sup>14, 15</sup>).<sup>1</sup> I have shown, besides, that in other J E passages the normal place of the tabernacle is assumed to be 'within' the camp.

I have only one other remark. It arises from the fact that Mr. Addis has felt moved in the end of his preface, and again at the close of his review of my book, to give unqualified expression to his

<sup>1</sup> It is to be remembered that in P also the camp is at the same time one and manifold (cf. Nu 2. 10<sup>3ff.</sup> 'camps'). The camp of the Levites, with the tabernacle, was in the centre, at some distance from the others (3<sup>17ff.</sup>). Alike in J E and P (cf. Nu 12<sup>14, 15</sup> 15<sup>36</sup>), the region 'without' the camp is one withdrawn from God's presence. Cf. Strack, *in loc.*

belief in the full Deity of our Lord—'Light of light, very God of very God'—'perfect God and perfect man'—therefore in the great truth of the Incarnation. No one can rejoice more heartily in this spontaneous confession than I do; though possibly some of those with whom Mr. Addis is critically associated may think he is as much in the murky theologically in making it as he takes me to be critically. With this confession must be combined his very distinct acknowledgments of supernatural revelation and action in the course of the history of Israel. May I, nevertheless, venture to express my conviction that this kind of language belongs properly to a different scheme of thought from that unfolded in his book. If there is room in the universe for such an Incarnation as Mr. Addis believes in,—if there is room, on the way to it, for special revelations, for providential deliverances like that at the Red Sea (p. 60), for answers to believing prayer like Elijah's (p. 132),—there is certainly room for a much higher view of the origins and early stages of Israel's religion than he has here given us. Consistency, too, would seem to demand that the end should more nearly correspond with the beginning. The one scheme is naturalistic; the other is positively Christian: there must in the long run be a more decisive choice between them.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Harnack on Luke the Author.<sup>1</sup>

If detachment is an essential qualification for a reviewer, this monograph ought probably to have been passed on to other hands. During last spring, in preparing the section on Acts and the Third Gospel for my New Testament Introduction, I found myself driven, by an examination of the language and the tradition, to conclude that Luke must be held to have written both books. Dr. Harnack's essay now comes to state that thesis with all his wonted vigour, and I therefore feel myself rather disqualified, by my agreement with his main position, for passing independent judgment on his

<sup>1</sup> *Lukas der Arzt, der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apogeschichte.* Von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1906. M.3.50; geb. M.4.50.

work. The plan of it is to investigate the we sections of Acts (pp. 19-85), much in the way in which Sir John Hawkins has done in *Horae Synopticae*. This is held, rightly I think, to show that, owing to the identity of their interests and the homogeneity of their style, they come from the same hand as Acts and the Third Gospel; whereupon (pp. 86 f., 122 f.) Dr. Harnack proceeds, like Hobart, to prove that the 'medical' element corroborates the tradition that this author must have been a physician of Antioch—Luke. The critical objections to this hypothesis (p. 184 f.) are then discussed and refuted. In the appendix, among other things, a detailed linguistic analysis of Lk 1<sup>39-56, 68-79</sup> 2<sup>15-20, 41-52</sup> is adduced (p. 138 f.) in order to show that Luke wrote these sections deliberately in an archaic Hebraistic style. The pages on Luke and John