

Muratorian fragment in this order—Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Romans, Philemon, Titus, Timothy. Gradually they settled down into their present order. But modern scholars place them—Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy. Would Mr. Halcombe propose to go back to the old order? If he did, would any one support him?

The ancients did their best. Their proximity to

the events gave them certain advantages. Direct testimony, like that of Irenæus, must not lightly be set aside. But we claim the right to review the whole question, and decide it according to the evidence. In this paper I have endeavoured impartially to review the external witness, and I have not found it favourable to Mr. Halcombe's view. In a future paper I may deal with the internal evidence. My prayer is that the reverential study of the Gospels may be promoted by these investigations.

The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

OUR LORD'S REFERENCES TO HISTORY AND PROPHECY.

WE now pass to the consideration of our Lord's teaching in regard of the historical and the prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament, and to the inferences which may be drawn from His teaching as to the trustworthiness of the writers.

Before, however, we enter into the details of this teaching, it will be necessary to make a few preliminary comments.

1. We have now before us two classes of references; the one to certain facts and events to which our Lord makes brief allusions in His addresses to His disciples and to the Jews; the other, to prophecies relating to Himself and to His Messianic work. From the former of these no very conclusive inferences can be drawn. The historical references, or, to speak more correctly, the historical allusions are not in any respect of a critical nature. The twelve or thirteen separate incidents to which our Lord refers seem all specified with the simple view of defining, illustrating, or emphasising the subject-matter of the addresses in which they are found. They are not thus necessarily substantiated or authenticated by the fact that reference is made to them, but, as will be seen hereafter in detail, the manner in which the greater part are alluded to is such as to make it improbable that our Lord regarded them as otherwise than as veritable events of veritable and trustworthy history.

It is, however, otherwise with our Lord's references to prophecy. From almost all of these it will be seen that inferences may be drawn as to our Lord's recognition of the inspiration of the writers and the reality of their predictions. It may be often doubtful whether the words of the prophecy admit of a primary reference, or whether we are justified in admitting a typical view of the words or incidents, and in believing that our Lord did the same. This, however, will not be doubtful,—that our Lord *did* regard the writers to whom He refers as inspired by God, and as speaking predictively. In fact, the words of the first evangelist, "spoken by the Lord through the prophet," represent the view which was entertained by the apostles, and also by our Lord Himself. This there seems no reason to doubt. It is, however, just what is doubted by some of the more advanced writers of the Analytical school. The authorship of the prophetic books has been for the most part left unchallenged. The dates also at which the different books were written have been in a few instances—as in the case of the Book of Daniel, and in the second portion of the Books of Isaiah and Zechariah—the subjects of vigorous controversy, but in the great majority of cases have not been seriously called in question. What has been called in question is the predictive element, whether in reference to national events, or to the Messianic dispensation. Writers like Professor Kuenen do not hesitate to regard the

alleged predictions as simply fallible anticipations of the manner in which those who uttered them considered the Deity must, as a consequence of His character, according to their view of it, act towards nations and individuals. The traditional views of Messianic prophecy are freely recognised as forming a beautiful whole, but are gently set aside as having no historical reality to rely on. If appeal is made to the writers of the New Testament, and to their plainly expressed views of prophecy, we are distinctly told that their exegesis cannot stand before the tribunal of science; and if even a higher appeal is made, it is respectfully but firmly pronounced to be unavailing.

It is, however, right to say that such views have not as yet met with any reception at the hands of those who are supporting the Analytical view among ourselves. Still there are signs that increasing difficulty is being felt in regard of definite predictions, and that the anti-supernatural bias which is certainly to be recognised in the writings of the foreign exponents of the Analytical view is beginning, perhaps unconsciously, to be shown in this country by writers on Old Testament prophecy.

2. Another general remark that may be made on both the classes of references, the historical and the prophetic, which we are about to consider, is that, with regard to the space of time which they cover, both are distinctly comprehensive. The twelve or thirteen allusions to historical events in the Old Testament begin with Genesis and end with the Second Book of Chronicles, and include allusions to events mentioned in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Samuel, and Kings. They may thus be considered as samples of our Lord's usual mode of referring to the Scriptures of the Old Testament in His discourses, whether to His disciples or to the Jews. They also seem to suggest that if more of our Lord's discourses had been recorded by the evangelists, we should have found in them similar allusions to the leading events in the history of the chosen people.

But be this as it may, a general view of the allusions which are recorded would seem to create the impression that the Lord regarded both the earlier and the later events as tradition has always regarded them, viz. as real and historical, and as rightfully holding their place in the truthful annals of the nation. This further may be said, that not

one of the references favours the supposition that any of the events might be mythical, or that any might have been rewritten by some priestly editor of adulterated history; on the contrary, the obvious simplicity and directness of them all seem unfavourable to any other supposition than that of the reality of the incidents to which they refer.

But this is but impression. If it is to be substantiated, it can only be so by a consideration of individual passages.

Much the same might be said of our Lord's references to prophecy. If we include therein both direct quotations and the more distinct allusions, we have more references to the prophetic than to the historical Scriptures; and if we add to them the references, direct and indirect, to the Psalms, fully twice as many. These references, too, as in the case of the historical references, range over some extent of time. Besides the Psalms, the Books of Isaiah, Hosea, Jonah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Zechariah, and Malachi are either cited from, or referred to, sometimes with, but more commonly without, specific mention of the names of the writers. So cogent also and so pertinent are these references, that even anti-predictive and anti-supernatural writers like Kuenen, though they by no means admit that our Lord's uses of prophecy are to be regarded as necessarily free from exegetical error, do draw clear distinctions between the references to prophecy made by our Lord and the references made by His Evangelists and Apostles, and do recognise to some extent the wisdom and knowledge with which the great Master made His citations from the prophets of the Old Covenant.

We do not, however, dwell upon such recognitions as these. What we now contend for is simply this,—that, as in the case of the historical allusions, the impression conveyed was that our Lord considered the events referred to as real, so, in these references to prophecy considered generally, the impression that seems left upon the mind is that the Lord recognises in the prophets to whom He refers the gifts of inspiration and predictive knowledge, especially in their relation to Himself and His sufferings. This impression we must substantiate, and prove to be correct by considering in detail some of the citations or references which seem more distinctly to reveal the teaching of our Lord as to Old Testament prophecy. We begin, however, with our Lord's

references to history, and will now endeavour to show, from some selected examples, that it is certain that He regarded the events as real, and that thus far He may be considered to set His seal to the truth of Old Testament history.

1. The first two examples which we propose to consider relate to that portion of the Book of Genesis which we are told by a recent writer is of the nature of myth, and "in which we cannot distinguish the historical germ, though we do not at all deny that it exists."¹ The two events are the death of Abel and the Flood.

Now, in regard to the first, what historical germ is there about which we can be in any difficulty? We learn from Genesis that the blood of Abel was shed by his brother, and that his blood cried unto God from the ground. To this event two evangelists tell us that our Lord referred in a rebukeful utterance, most probably in the hearing of the scribes and Pharisees, in which He solemnly declares that all the righteous blood shed on the earth from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah will come upon those to whom these words were more particularly addressed. Now, when we turn to the narrative of the death of Zechariah, and mark his dying words, and the sort of analogy they suggest, with what is said of the blood of Abel, is it possible to doubt that our Lord was placing before those to whom He was speaking two historic circumstances and two historic persons? And are we not justified in saying this,—that the resolution of the history of the death of Abel into myth is out of harmony with the tenor of our Lord's words, and that we can only understand those words as implying that Abel was a person as really historical as Zechariah? If a serious speaker marks off a period of time by the names of two persons, one of whom is historical, is it natural to suppose that the other is mythical? It is certainly far from natural to suppose this in the case of the solemn and realistic words on which we have been commenting.

The reference to the Flood is mentioned by the same two evangelists, and in both with the addition of particulars not recorded in Genesis. The reference apparently forms part of a solemn address delivered by our Lord on the occasion of a question being put to Him by the Pharisees concerning the coming of the kingdom of God.² In

¹ *Lux Mundi*, p. 357.

² See Meyer on Luke xvii. 26.

such a discourse we may feel confident that every word and every allusion must have its fullest significance. The details which our Lord drew from the treasury of His own divine knowledge could never have been added to the merely mythical or traditional. We are told, indeed, the contrary. It is said that our Lord suggests by these very additions that He is simply treating the Flood as typical,³ and that we have here a tradition used as a vehicle for spiritual teaching. But is tradition rather than history what we should expect in such a discourse, and in reference to such a subject? Tradition, and embellished tradition, when the question was as to the coming of an event, solemn and real beyond all words—the coming of the kingdom of God? Does not the very principle of homogeneity require that there should be reality, historical reality in the illustration corresponding to the reality of that which it illustrates? Surely if an event alleged to have taken place in the past history of the world is placed before us by the Lord as typically foreshadowing the greatest and most certain event in the history of the future, it is but reasonable to suppose that the event so typically used was a real event, and was so regarded by our Master.

We may pass from these two events to another which, though not included in the so-called mythical period, has been often regarded as little better than legendary and traditional—the destruction of the cities of the plain, and the fate of Lot's wife. Here it is even less possible than in the case of the Flood to doubt that our Lord regarded the event as real, and as forming a truthful portion of truthful history. In His words describing the overthrow, He adopts the language of Genesis, and in the solemnly appended warning authenticates the account of the fate of the lingering woman who perished in the whirling storm, and whose memorial was one of those salt cones which the traveller still finds by the shores of the Dead Sea.⁴ It is simply impossible to avoid the conclusion, that our Lord *does* confirm the historical truth of the narrative, and that, convenient as it may be found to push backward these illustrations of the supernatural into the region of legend, His use and application of the narrative distinctly forbids it. It may be quite true that the Lord, as a general rule, lays but little stress on the details of the account

³ *Lux Mundi*, p. 359 (ed. 10).

⁴ See Lynch, *United States Expedition*, p. 143.

which He employs ; still, in this case, it must not be forgotten that, in regard of the manner of the destruction of the cities, He adopts the very language of the original narrative.

The three remaining instances of references made by our Lord to incidents mentioned in the Old Testament—all of them, it may be observed, miraculous—are the appearance of God to Moses in the burning bush, the descent of the manna, and the lifting up of the brazen serpent.

In the first of these three instances we have the concurrent testimony of three evangelists that our blessed Lord used the narrative to substantiate a doctrine of vital importance. The present case, then, is a case not merely of passing allusion, but of definite teaching ; just one of those cases, in fact, in which we are justified in claiming that our Lord's words are to be considered as spoken with plenary authority, and as admitting no assumption of any accommodative use of the passage. They are spoken, too, with studied precision,—“in the Book of Moses, in the place concerning the bush,”—and cannot possibly be understood in any other sense than as authenticating the narrative, and the miraculous circumstances related by Moses. We have, then, here an authoritative recognition not only of the narrative, but, by reasonable inference, of the inspiration and divine mission of Moses.

The second instance is of equal importance. The allusion to the manna is not merely incidental, but forms the typical substratum of the deep teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum of Himself as the living bread, the bread of which he that eateth will live for ever. The allusion to the manna was first made by the Jews. The events of the preceding day and the feeding of the five thousand had turned their thoughts to the great miracle that was associated with His ministry, and they ask, it may be, that the Lord should prove Himself to be their long-looked-for Messiah by some analogous miracle which tradition taught them to look for in the Messiah. The answer is contained in all that follows ; and in that answer the miracle of the first-given manna is not merely alluded to, but stated in the most definite and unreserved language. That the Lord Jesus Christ here places his seal upon a miracle which modern criticism regards as a story, that the Priestly Code has made use of for pressing upon the people the sanctity of the Sabbath, and has spoilt in the using, may be considered as beyond reasonable doubt.

In the third case the allusion is brief, but the circumstances under which it was made, and the deep teaching of the passage where it occurs, render it impossible to take any other view than that which recognises in the words a reference to a real and historical event. According to the best interpretation of the passage, the verse which contains the reference sets forth a second reason and motive for belief in the Lord Jesus, prefacing it by an allusion to an event in the past that had a doubly typical character. The raising up of the brazen serpent foreshadowed the Crucifixion ; the healing power which flowed forth to him who gazed on the serpent betokened the saving power of faith in the crucified One. That the whole is only a legendary story, we are confident, will be pronounced by every fair mind utterly incompatible with the fact recorded by the evangelists,—that it was referred to by our Lord typically to set forth the doctrine of His own ever-blessed Atonement. A legendary story embellished by priestly ingenuity could never have formed the typical background for the Atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Of the remaining references, the most important are those in which our Lord alludes to Elijah's being sent to the widow of Zarephath, and to a miraculous event in the history of Elisha. The allusions were made in the synagogue at Nazareth, and in the address of our Lord which followed His public reading of Isaiah. The importance of the allusions is due to the fact, that the record of the ministries of Elijah and Elisha contains many accounts of miraculous events, in some of which even believers have felt passing difficulties, and all of which have been set aside, almost as a matter of course, by supporters of the Analytical view as utterly unhistorical. The narrative of the life of the first prophet is suffused with the miraculous ; and in the case of the second prophet, not only during his life, but even after his death the miraculous clings to him. It is thus of no little moment that our Lord, in His public teaching, referred to events in the life of each of the two prophets in a manner which seems to indicate that He accepted and confirmed by His authority, at the very least in the instances alluded to, the truth of the scriptural narrative. Such an attestation of a narrative, in parts of which real difficulties have been felt, must cause, in all sober minds, an immediate arrest of judgment. It may not always in itself

at once convince, but it never fails to prepare the way for considerations which often bring about a conviction more real and more lasting than is brought about by more direct and more elaborate argument. The simple feeling that He thus believed will often be found to remove almost at once many a speculative difficulty.

Lastly, it is worthy of especial notice that just those miraculous events which seem more particularly to put our faith to trial—such, for example, as those connected with the histories of Elijah and Elisha, or with the early history of Genesis—are the events to which, it would seem, our Lord has been pleased more particularly to allude.

2. We may now pass onwards to our Lord's references to prophecy; but before we consider passages which clearly belong to this portion of the subject, it may be well first to notice a well-known and anxiously-discussed passage, in which the question turns not so much on the prophecy as on the credibility of the events connected with it. I am alluding, of course, to the passages relating to the Book of Jonah and to the prophet's mission to Nineveh. Careful interpretation will here do something for us.

When we refer to the Gospels, we find that our blessed Lord twice alluded to Jonah, once after the healing of a demoniac, and once, very briefly, a little later; and in both cases in answer to a demand from the Jewish party for a sign. It is only with the words spoken on the first occasion that we are particularly concerned. These are given fully, and, as it would seem, in their original form by St. Matthew. The report of the words in St. Luke's Gospel is more condensed. In both of these passages, however, it is clear that the prophet, and not His preaching, is the sign and the type. His preaching and its results are mentioned, but quite independently, being designed simply to put in contrast the acceptance of the message of Jonah on the part of the Ninevites, and the rejection of the message of One greater than Jonah by the Jews.

How the prophet is a sign is very distinctly mentioned by St. Matthew: "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." With the details and the decision of the question whether "the heart of the earth" refers to the sepulchre or to Hades, we need not here concern ourselves. The

"three days and three nights" of the Lord's being in the heart of the earth requires in either case the same explanation. And the common explanation seems to be the right one,—that "the three days and three nights" in reference to our Lord are used, not with any studied precision, but simply in echo of the words in the Book of Jonah, and as popularly designating the whole day and parts of two other days, which was the exact period in the case of our Lord, and, for aught we know, may have been so too in the case of Jonah. Thus considered, the time is typical; the belly of the fish is typical; the deliverance of Jonah is typical. And of what? Of the resurrection, and of what preceded it. On this we may fairly ask this further question, If the history of Jonah is not only a fiction, but, as a responsible writer has said, a story bearing marks of it as patently as any of the tales in the *Thousand and One Nights*,¹—if the circumstances are not only improbable, but grotesquely so, is it conceivable that such a story would be used by our Lord as a type of His resurrection? Is an unreal narrative,—a narrative which, if interpreted historically, "justly gives offence,"² to be regarded as typical of the great and real miracle which is the foundation of Christianity? In a word, is any other view fairly compatible with the nature of the comparison than that our Lord regarded the Jonah-sign as a reality, and the particular deliverance of Jonah as a fact? and if He did so, further critical inquiry is foreclosed. The Jonah miracle may seem amazing; but still more amazing, if we consider it in detail, is the resurrection from the dead. Our conclusion, then, is that our Lord was here referring to an historical event, though we have no power of supplying anything, whether from contemporary history or otherwise, which might seem to make the event more readily conceivable to those who have made up their minds to disbelieve it.

We now pass to a few selected instances of our Lord's references to definite prophecy, and more particularly to those that related to Himself.

It is, however, difficult to make a selection, as all our Lord's references to prophecy really convey, almost equally strongly, the same impression, viz. that our Lord distinctly recognised the inspiration

¹ Dr. Cheyne, in an article in the *Theological Review* for 1877, p. 212.

² Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 214.

of the prophets of the Old Testament, and the predictive contents of their writings, and especially their pervasive references to Himself, His work, His sufferings, His death, and His exaltation. How He regarded the prophets collectively as speaking of these things, we are thrice reminded by St. Luke,—once, before His sufferings, with a detail that brings to the memory the express words of the great prophecies in the latter portion of Isaiah; once, after His resurrection, when he vouchsafed to interpret to the two disciples at Emmaus, “beginning from Moses and from all the prophets,” the things foretold in all the Scriptures concerning Himself; and yet a third time, even more solemnly,—as it was probably immediately before the Ascension,—when, as the evangelist studiously records, He opened the mind of the apostles, that they might understand the Scriptures, and particularly those relating to His sufferings and resurrection; so that thus we may rightly say that, in the Lord’s last address on earth, the collective testimony of the prophets and of all Scripture formed the subject of His parting and verifying words.

And so it was during the Lord’s whole ministry. His references and allusions to prophecy were very numerous. Twice He refers to those words of Hosea which characterised all the tenor of His ministry. Twice He cites Isaiah by name; once in reference to the dulness of heart of the nation to whom he had vouchsafed to come;¹ and again, when rebuking the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, and showing that their very worship was vain in the eyes of God. When He speaks of the Baptist, He refers to Malachi, and discloses the true and ultimate meaning of the prophet’s words, introducing in them, as he does so, a change which makes the prophet the very mouthpiece of the Eternal Father. When he purges the temple, in the few words in which He vouchsafes to give the reason for the act, He refers to two of the old prophets. In His last great prophecy He alludes by name to that one of the old prophets,—I am referring to the prophet Daniel,—to whom modern criticism more particularly denies the name of a prophet, and even of a trustworthy historian;² and when He stands before the High Priest and the Sanhedrim, He adopts words from the same prophet which all present at once recognise and—

with perhaps two solitary exceptions³—wildly act upon.

It is, however, as we have already implied, when His sufferings and death are nigh at hand, that the Lord’s references to prophecy became more distinct and emphatic. There are two occasions on which our Lord cites definitely prophetic words under circumstances which preclude the possibility of any other supposition than that He knew them to have a Messianic reference, and cited them accordingly. The first occasion is immediately after the celebration of the Last Supper, when the dispersion of the apostles was foretold. Here our Lord, significantly changing the imperative to the future,⁴ uses words from Zechariah which, from the manner in which they are introduced (“it hath been written”), cannot be regarded as semi-proverbial, but as a definite reference to prophecy. On the second occasion, under the same solemn circumstances, our Lord quotes words from the great Messianic prophecy of Isaiah, which He not only applies directly to Himself, but enhances by the further declaration that they *must* be fulfilled in Him, and that “that which concerneth” Him,—that which the prophet had foreshadowed, and He Himself had recently foretold, its having its fore-ordered issue and fulfilment.

This statement of the divine necessity that prophecy *must* be fulfilled in Himself is in truth one of the strongest arguments in favour of the Traditional view of prophecy, especially in its relation to our Lord, that can be adduced. It is a direct testimony on the part of our Lord, of the truth and reality of the Messianic prophecy of the old covenant. It is a testimony that was, at least three times, explicitly given;—once in the passage we have already considered; once at the betrayal at the garden of Gethsemane; and once again, after the resurrection, in even more comprehensive language, when, in the last address on Olivet, the ascending Lord set His final seal on Messianic prophecy in the great authenticating declaration “that all things *must needs* be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning me.” Nay, we may add to this, if we take what seems to be the natural connexion of the passage; we may reverently say that

³ Joseph of Arimathea (Luke xxiii. 50, 51), and probably Nicodemus; cf. John vii. 50.

⁴ See Turpie, *Old Testament in the New*, p. 152 (London, 1868).

¹ Turpie, *Old Testament in the New*, pp. 88 sq.

² Kuenen, *Prophecy and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 147.

even on the Lord's cross of suffering the fulfilment of prophecy was the subject of His divine thoughts. The words "I thirst" were spoken that Scripture might be fulfilled. And when the words of the prophetic psalm were substantiated to the very letter, then all things were indeed accomplished;¹ and with the words of the old Psalmist on His lips, He who came to fulfil prophecy, and fulfilled it in all His blessed ministry, fulfilled it with His dying breath.

Only one reference remains to be noticed. It is different in character to all that have been alluded to; and it seems to show that, in one instance at least, our Lord did pronounce a judgment on prophetic Scripture which, when carefully considered, must be regarded as having a very far-reaching significance. The reference is to Ps. cx. (Sept. cix.),—a reference given in substantially the same form by the first three evangelists. What we may deduce from this passage is this: First, that the psalm was written by David, and that thus this particular superscription is right. Secondly, that David was here writing by direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, that the reference to the Messiah is so distinct, that David may be regarded as consciously speaking of Him.² All this seems patently to be deducible from what Professor Ladd justly calls this "decisive utterance."³ It is perfectly true that we can draw no inference from this particular case as to the Davidic authorship of other psalms, or as to the nature of the inspiration of David in other psalms which we may believe to have been rightly ascribed to him; still the passage stands as a kind of beacon light, displaying to us what, in one instance at least, was the judgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in reference to Messianic prophecy. Surely with the rays of such a light upon us we may accept the words of an apostle, and believe that neither this nor any other prophecy ever came by the will of man, but that "men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." The attempts on the part of modern criticism to explain away the impression which this memorable passage will not fail to leave on any candid mind, are many, but all singularly hopeless. It may be perfectly true that our Lord is asking a question rather than making a statement;⁴ but if the

question is of such a nature that it plainly involves and implies the recognition on our Lord's part of certain facts and truths, why are these facts and truths not to be put in evidence as recognised by Him, and as having the seal of His authority? The true answer to this is—Because it is inconvenient to modern criticism, which has settled that the psalm is of a very late date, and has no Messianic reference at all.

But is not modern criticism utterly wrong? Let us put this to the test by this simple question—Is it to be regarded as probable that, if the psalm had really been of this late date, there was no one in the gathered company of Pharisees to whom the words were addressed who knew that it was so? If this was *not* probable, then why did not some one of these experts at once traverse the Lord's question by the easily made statement that David never wrote what was imputed to him? If, on the other hand, it *was* probable, then can we possibly believe that a metrical fabrication claiming to be a psalm of David and an oracle of God, and challenging attention by setting forth a doctrine so unfamiliar as the Messiah's everlasting priesthood,⁵ could have crept into the jealously guarded Scripture, three or four centuries after the date of Ezra's Bible, and remained there undetected? Whatever else may be said of the scribes, they were certainly careful and jealous guardians of the very letter of the Scriptures.

We are thus, apart from other considerations, forced by common sense to believe that the psalm *was* Davidic, and was known to be so by our Lord and those to whom He was speaking. And we are confirmed in this by what followed. The question produced a startling effect. It raised, on the authority of David, the question of the Divinity of the Son of David; and we read, as we might expect to read, that no man "durst from that day forth ask Him any more questions."

We have now concluded our examination of our Lord's references to history and to prophecy, and the results at which we have arrived would seem to be as follows.

First, that the impressions conveyed by a general survey of the references to history and to prophecy appear to be substantiated in each case by the more detailed examination. This examination has, we believe, been carried out with fairness and

⁵ See Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, § 230, vol. ii. p. 413 (transl.), Edinburgh, 1875.

¹ Observe the carefully chosen word *τελειωθη*.

² Cf. Delitzsch, *in loc.*

³ *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 63.

⁴ *Lux Mundi*, p. 359.

impartiality, and with due regard to recognised principles of scriptural interpretation. The conclusions to which it leads are, certainly, that the historical references were to real events, and to acknowledged facts in history; and that the prophetic references imply throughout a clear recognition on the part of our blessed Lord of the inspiration of the prophets He referred to, of the reality of their predictive knowledge, and of the distinctness of their Messianic foreshadowings and prophecies.

It is with these conclusions that we are here more particularly concerned; because if they are correct, they do distinctly negative, not merely several of the results of the Analytical view and of the conclusions at which its advocates have arrived, but even some of the ground-principles of modern criticism. This is very plainly felt by the supporters of that movement, and may account for the earnestness and even bitterness with which any reference to Christ is deprecated in matters alleged to belong exclusively to the domain of critical inquiry. We have touched upon this in a foregoing paper, but we may again ask, Why are we to be precluded from

this reference to the Great Teacher? Had He not the words of eternal life? Did He not come into the world to bear witness to the truth? If He is the Light of the world, the true Light that lighteth every man, are we to dispense with that Light in a domain where it is more particularly needed? We have seen in this article the blessed nature of the guidance we receive in regard to God's Holy Word when we turn to Him,—the freshness, the freedom, the life that breathes through His teaching of that Word; how events and facts seem quickened with a new life when He alludes to them, and how the sure word of prophecy is made more sure to us when He is the interpreter. The more we enter into detail the more vividly is all this impressed upon us.

We conclude, then, this article with the hope, and indeed the belief, not only that we have substantiated that which we have sought to substantiate—not only that we have shown that many of the results of modern criticism in reference to God's Holy Word are inconsistent with the teaching of Christ, but that we have also incidentally demonstrated the rightfulness of the appeal to *Christus comprobator*.

Contributions and Comments.

“Bedellium.”

PERMIT me to add my testimony to that of Rev. Canon Tristram, in your number for March last, in favour of the pearl as the original material intended by the term *bedolach* in Gen. ii. I think, however, that in its association with gold and the “*shoham* stone,” it may be held to include any pearl-like minerals or other bodies available for personal ornament. So understood in this place, the terms gold, *bedolach* and *shoham*, will represent native gold, the materials of beads, etc., and stones suited for the manufacture of implements, all much-prized treasures of primitive man. The researches of Loftus have shown that all of these precious objects are found in the part of the Laristan mountains drained by the river Karun, which from its geographical position should be the Pison of the early writer in Genesis, who obviously desires to place his Eden in the *Idinu* of the ancient Babylonians,—a region with which he shows much acquaintance, and seems even to

be aware of its probable condition in antediluvian times as well as in the period to which he himself belongs. I have discussed this subject, in connection with what we know of early man in the East from other sources, in *Modern Science in Bible Lands*.¹

J. WM. DAWSON.

M'Gill College, Montreal.

“The Spirit Breathes.”

JOHN iii. 8.

MR. BROWN'S remarks on John iii. 8, in March number, do not make it one whit more easy to accept the *interpretation* of πνεῦμα as wind. Besides, the difficulties of *translation* still remain. It is absurd to suppose that the same word can be read as “wind” and “spirit” at the beginning and end of the same verse. If πνεῦμα means “wind” at the beginning of ver. 8, it must

¹ Second edition, London, 1892, pp. 109-124.