

if it happened after he had successfully resisted the brunt of argument and prestige in Jerusalem itself, when we may be sure those Pharisees who had come down to Antioch would bring every possible leverage to bear against the innovators. It is not a sufficient reply that now a new question had emerged in actual practice which Paul had not touched on at the Council, being content to allow the social difficulty to sleep until the first demand of circumcision and the law was settled. This matter of social relation of Jew and Gentile had not now for the first time been thrown into the Church life as a source of discord. Peter and the Church had been made to face it, and, on his part at least, to give an essential answer to it, by nothing less than a divine interposition, when the apostle was led to associate on terms of equality with Cornelius; and we may be sure that never after that could the practical consequences in social life be entirely detached from the question of what obedience of the law was to be required of the Gentiles. These men whom Paul first met in Antioch (Ac 15¹) knew full well the state of affairs in Gentile churches before the question was referred to Jerusalem; and assuredly the edge of the discussion was sharpened by what they were persuaded was bound to follow in social intercourse. It may be observed that in Ac 15 James takes this social fellowship between Jew and Gentile for granted, and in moving the decree, merely enjoins on the new Gentile converts abstinence from those common heathen practices against which the moral sense of the Jewish Christian would revolt, and which if known to be in vogue within the Christian communion, would

render hopeless any further success on the part of the Church in its work among the Jews of these communities. And it is difficult to understand how, after this decree and his statement that no other burden should be laid upon the Gentiles, he could send down men with any right to use his name in restricting the fellowship between Jew and Gentile, which he must have known to exist before the decree was framed. The case of Peter and Barnabas is even more inexplicable.

But the key to the whole situation is discovered if Peter visited Antioch towards the end of Paul's first missionary journey. On the outbreak of the persecution of Herod, Peter escaped to parts unknown (Ac 12¹⁷). Syria, as being beyond the jurisdiction of the tyrant, would afford a most likely place of refuge. Convinced by his experience with Cornelius that he should call nothing common or unclean, he was willing to associate with Gentiles; but the belief had not yet so wrought itself into the fibre of his moral nature, that he was prepared for a bold and consistent practice in the face of the displeasure of a reluctant conservatism. So when representatives of the mother-church—probably all the more insistent because of their narrowness—came to Antioch, Peter had not the courage of his convictions, and even Barnabas, smarting perhaps from Paul's evident displeasure with Mark, capitulated to social pressure.

If the Council at Jerusalem followed this event, the theory as to the permanent estrangement of the two leading apostles, which still lingers with persistency in many quarters, may hurry towards the final resting-place of exploded hypotheses.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Trust in God and Faith in Christ.¹

'NOTHING should be accepted as dogma which cannot be turned to practical account in preach-

¹*Das Christliche Gottvertrauen und der Glaube an Christus.* Eine dogmatische Untersuchung auf biblisch-theologischer Grundlage und unter Berücksichtigung der symbolischen Litteratur. Von E. W. Mayer, a. o. Prof. der Theologie in Strassburg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. M.3.60.

ing and in Christian fellowship?—this is one of Ritschl's fundamental principles. In his view, the ideal system of dogmatics would compel every Christian to say as he read, 'Yes, that is my belief.' A few months ago the editor of *Die christliche Welt* gave an interesting reminiscence of the days when he was studying Ritschl's *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion* at Leipzig, under the guidance of Professor Harnack: at the close of the term, the teacher asked the class to say

how their handbook of theology differed from other text-books in practical value, and the answer which he expected, and received, was that it was possible to preach about every paragraph. In the sub-title of his book, Professor Mayer describes it as a 'dogmatic inquiry,' and probably the remembrance of Ritschl's maxim called forth the statement in the preface, that in the author's judgment dogmatics should form a link *between* historical and practical theology. An exact scientific study of such a subject as Christian faith will help the pastor to meet the spiritual needs of his flock, even though it is not presented in a form adapted for use in the pulpit without further thought.

In chap. 1 Professor Mayer inquires into the meaning of the expression, 'Trust in God'; the familiar explanation—'a complete surrender of the heart and will to God'—is accepted as sufficient for most purposes, though a more exact definition is needful in a scientific discussion. Ritschl identifies trust in God with love to God interpreted as a will which acquiesces in the purposes of God; this, however, is misleading, for, as Mayer shows, such a disposition results from unreserved trust in God, and is psychologically to be distinguished from it. Belief in God, even in its lowest forms, imparts a supernatural sanction, but outside Christianity such belief never rises to absolutely unconditional trust. In some religions unconditional trust was impossible because the Deity was not regarded as omnipotent; in others, because the gods were held to be respecters of persons, only members of a particular caste or nation being entitled to claim their help, and then only after the due performance of prescribed sacrificial rites. Even in Judaism, the noblest pre-Christian religion, the divine favour is made to depend upon the fulfilment of moral conditions; 'the Lord loveth the righteous' (Ps 146⁸), but 'the Most High hateth sinners' (Sir 12⁶). How different is the teaching of Christ, who declared that divine blessings are freely offered, not only to those who cannot claim to be sons of Abraham, but also to those who do not possess any moral worth. In this respect Christianity is unique among religions, it has reached a height beyond which—evolution notwithstanding—farther ascent is impossible. 'A higher elevation is logically inconceivable, the Absolute is realized.'

In regard to the relation between trust in God and faith in Christ, Mayer finds neither agreement nor clearness in manuals of doctrine; therefore, in chap. 2 he investigates at length the teaching of the theologians of the Reformation from Luther and Melancthon, Calvin and Zwingli, to Freylinghausen and Baumgarten, Schleiermacher and Frank. On this subject Herrmann leaves something unexplained, whilst in Ritschl's writings there are passages which convey the impression that he failed to distinguish trust in God from faith in Christ.

Chap. 3 is devoted to a survey of New Testament teaching. In the synoptic Gospels it is easy to show that Jesus was continually exhorting His disciples to trust in God; but the more difficult question is, Do they contain any evidence that religious faith in Jesus Himself had any place in His teaching? Mayer thinks that an affirmative answer is improbable, but to arrive at this result he is compelled to dismiss Mt 18⁶ = Mk 9⁴²—'one of these little ones which believe on Me,'—with the remark, 'but the authenticity of the expression is disputed.' The command of Jesus (Lk 8⁵⁰) 'Fear not, only believe,' may possibly imply a demand for faith in His healing power; but it must not be forgotten, Mayer adds, that Jesus condemned those who sought after signs, and perhaps in this passage, as in others, he is exhorting to trust in God. If, in the consideration of separate texts, Mayer's judgment sometimes seems to halt or waver, it is only fair to say that his motive appears to be an anxiety not to overestimate the evidence, for in a cogent argument he proceeds to show that publicans and sinners must have been convinced that the words and deeds of the Nazarene did faithfully represent the words and deeds of God, or the gracious attitude of Jesus would have afforded no guarantee that God's attitude towards them was the same as his. The evidence of the other New Testament books is examined with equal care; in the Johannine writings, *πίστις* generally refers to faith in Christ, and when *πιστεύειν* has an object, it is almost always Jesus. Of saving faith, as expounded in the Pauline Epistles, faith in the resurrection of Jesus is shown to be not only an important constituent, but the basis.

Chap. 4 summarizes the results of the previous inquiry. In the New Testament, faith in Christ is set forth as the best means of estab-

lishing and confirming unconditional trust in God; it is not the result of trust in God, but its presupposition and its cause. Two kinds of faith in Christ may be distinguished: John gives prominence to the thought that it is God Himself who speaks and acts in Jesus; Paul dwells rather on the resurrection of Jesus, who, as the beloved of God, becomes the Prince of Life. Paul's view is held to be included in John's, for to know that Jesus is the representative of God, is to know that He is the beloved of God, and to know that He has power to give eternal life is to know that He Himself possesses eternal life. Hence faith rests on the historic Jesus, but the Christian preacher should not be content with giving a biography of Jesus; he should dwell on the truth that the historic Christ promised rest to the weary and heavy-laden, and made penitent sinners welcome to the blessings of God's kingdom. On the much-disputed question of the necessity for belief in the resurrection of Jesus, Mayer, who accepts the fact, contends that evangelical faith is essentially a belief in the Unseen; hence, whilst granting that after the death of Christ the appearances of the risen Jesus restored the shattered faith of the Church; and in the case of Paul were the exclusive or at anyrate the chief originating cause of faith, Mayer argues that so long as our Lord was on earth, His inner life proved His kingship in spite of His lowly surroundings, and that a picture of His personality may to-day arouse in many hearts the conviction that He is the source of supernatural blessings.

This brief digest of Professor Mayer's conclusions will indicate his position; his book stimulates to thought, and is a noteworthy contribution to the discussions to which theologians have been roused by the writings of Ritschl.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Steuernagel's 'Introduction to the Hexateuch.'¹

DR. STEUERNAGEL, who has already contributed the commentaries on *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua* to

¹ *Allgemeine Einleit. in den Hexateuch.* Von Lic. Dr. C. Steuernagel, Halle a. S. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauernmeister. 1900. Price M. 1.

Nowack's series, now publishes a general Introduction (of some forty pages) to the Hexateuch, which closes the third volume of the first division, namely, 'the Historical Books.' After a preliminary examination of the origin and the propriety of the names *Pentateuch* and *Hexateuch*, Steuernagel goes on to examine the value of the tradition as to the authorship of the six books that make up the Hexateuch. He rightly starts by emphasizing a circumstance which is too often forgotten, namely, that all these books are *anonymous* works, and he has of course no difficulty in showing that, even if a certain amount of literary activity on the part of Moses must be conceded, it is yet impossible that the Pentateuch as a whole can have come from his pen. His reasons for this conclusion, most of which are familiar enough to scholars, will be generally felt to be convincing. And if the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is built upon slender foundations, it may be said that there is no evidence at all in favour of Joshua's having written the book that bears his name. The next section of the Introduction justifies the prevailing distinction of 'sources' in the Hexateuch, two of the principal necessities for this practice being found in the existence of doublets and more or less contradictory accounts of the same thing. A concise but sufficient account is given in § 4 of the History of O.T. Criticism from the time of Astruc (†1766) down to the present day, the 'documentary,' 'fragmentary,' and 'supplementary' hypotheses being all carefully explained, special attention being of course bestowed upon the labours of Graf, which, thanks especially to Wellhausen, have been crowned with such brilliant success. The grounds on which the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis rests are exhibited in § 5, while § 6 characterizes the different sources, and proves abundantly that it is necessary to regard D, P, J, E, not as individuals but as schools representing different tendencies, and that a distinction of J¹, J², E¹, E², etc., is unavoidable. On the question of how much Ezra's law-book, read to the people, included, Steuernagel disagrees with Wellhausen, Dillmann, and Kittel, who think it was the whole Pentateuch, and is unwilling to admit even that it included all that we now find in P. His argument will be found well worthy of study. The account in § 7 of the combining of the different sources until finally the present form of the Hexateuch was reached, is appropriately followed by

a table illustrating very clearly the process gone through, and the approximate date when each stage was reached. Dr. Steuernagel may be congratulated on having written in small compass a very lucid and satisfactory sketch of the History of the Hexateuch, which is worthy of his own reputation as a scholar, and of the high character of Nowack's *Handkommentar*.

Kraetzschmar's 'Ezekiel.'¹

MUCH has been done for Ezekiel within recent years. In fact it may be said that, from being one of the least understood, he has become to us one of the most intelligible of the prophets. It is true that we are severely handicapped by the corruptness of the text of his book, although, thanks to Cornill, Toy, and others, not a little has been done for its recovery. We are exceedingly fortunate in now possessing a first-rate commentary on Ezekiel in each of the two great series, edited by Marti and Nowack respectively, Bertholet's work in the *Kurzer Hdcomm.* being now followed up by that of Kraetzschmar in the *Handkommentar*.

The Introduction starts with a discussion of the prophet's name, which our author (following Ewald, Davidson, *et al.*) takes to mean 'God is strong' rather than 'God makes (or 'let God make') strong' (Gesen. *et al.*). He is sceptical about Ezekiel's having been a priest, and still more about his having actually discharged priestly functions in Solomon's temple. Kraetzschmar gives a succinct account of the prophet's life as far as this is known to us, and estimates carefully the different influences which coloured his mode of thought, and supply the key to the understanding of his book. Our author has the courage to propose to understand all the so-called 'symbolical' actions of the prophet as having been *actually performed*, and also accords what some will be disposed to consider too much favour to Klostermann's views as to the physical disabilities from which Ezekiel suffered. Kraetzschmar rightly emphasizes the service which Ezekiel, like Jeremiah, rendered by insisting upon the doctrine of *individual* responsibility, and does justice also to the 'Verfassungs-

entwurf' of the last nine chapters he wrote. A discussion of the important dates during the activity of Ezekiel is followed by an account of the plan and contents of the book and the state of its text, and the Introduction closes with a Bibliography which is gratifyingly full, and which takes account (as is not the case with all German commentaries) of the work of English scholars, such as A. B. Davidson (in *Camb. Bible*), Skinner (in *Expositor's Bible*), Moulton (in *Modern Reader's Bible*), not to speak of the services rendered to the text in this country by Ginsburg, and in America by Toy. The commentary itself, it is hardly necessary to say, is an extremely careful piece of work, and the student who turns to it for direction, philological, exegetical, archæological, geographical, or historical, will not be disappointed.

Miscellaneous.

AMONGST those who have helped to popularize in France and elsewhere the principles of the so-called 'symbolo-fidéisme,' none has laboured more earnestly or successfully than Professor Ménégos. The cardinal doctrine of salvation by faith (*foi*) alone, independently of beliefs (*croyances*), underlies all that he has written, and we are quite at one with him in holding that it was never more necessary than it is at present to emphasize this principle. It is now twenty-one years since he published his *Réflexions sur l'Évangile du Salut*, hence he has had ample time to test his system, which still emerges essentially unchanged from the crucible of his own thought and of hostile criticism. Professor Ménégos has rendered a service in publishing the work that lies before us, *Publications diverses sur le Fidéisme et son application à l'enseignement chrétien traditionnel* (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1900), which contains afresh in their maturest form the author's *Réflexions sur l'Évangile du Salut*, and no fewer than thirty-seven other treatises or extracts from treatises published at various times by the same author. The reader who desires to learn what men like Ménégos and A. Sabatier really hold, and who are anxious to retain the substance and the permanent ideas of the Christian religion, while discarding its contingent and fleeting forms, will do well to procure this volume. They will find in Professor Ménégos an extremely interest-

¹ *Das Buch Ezechiel übersetzt und erklärt.* Von Lic. Dr. R. Kraetzschmar, Marburg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Glasgow: F. Bauermeister. 1900. Price M.6.

ing guide, who combines admirably reverence and reasonableness.

The second *Jahrgang* of the extremely interesting and useful series, 'Der alte Orient,' published under the auspices of the *Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft*, opens with an account of the Political Development of Babylonia and Assyria from the thoroughly competent pen of Dr. Hugo Winckler. We have much pleasure in commending strongly to our readers this and every issue of the series to which it belongs. The publisher is Mr. J. C. Hinrichs of Leipzig, and the year's issue (four parts) costs two marks, or each part separately, sixty pfennigs.

It is unnecessary, after our numerous former notices, to do more than mention the appearance of the first issue for the present year of Messrs. Schwetschke & Sohn's *Theol. Jahresbericht*. It deals with the exegetical literature published in the Old and New Testaments during the year 1899, and is edited, as usual, by Professors Siegfried and Holtzmann. The longer we use this publication, the more are we struck with its combination of conciseness and completeness. Its editors appear to overlook nothing. The present issue costs nine marks; the whole year's issue (four parts, with index), thirty marks.

Pfarr-Vicar O. Herrigel of Offenburg (Baden) has published in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift f. wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1900, xliii. (N. F. viii.), 2, a paper to which New Testament scholars will turn with extreme interest. It contains what must be regarded as the final views of the late Professor C. Holsten on the results of historical criticism as applied to the Canon of the New Testament. These views, which it would be unfair to mention, and for which readers must turn to the original article, were given during the winter session of 1894-95, and are now reproduced verbatim from Mr. Herrigel's shorthand report of what the late Professor dictated.

Among the Periodicals.

The Sirach Controversy.

IN the current number of the *Revue des études juives*, M. Israel Lévi publishes Sir 36²⁴-38^{1a} from a *third* MS. (one leaf), and also a fragment containing parts of chaps. 6 and 7 from the same MS. of which Schechter published parts of chaps. 4, 5, 25, 26 in the April number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. The third MS. has in the text most of the readings which in G. Margoliouth's and Schechter's parallel MS. are written on the margin,—even in cases where they yield no sense (e.g. שחת and מננב in 36¹⁹),—thus establishing the important point that these are *real* variants, and are taken from a MS. (or MSS) which must have a history beyond them long enough to give rise to such corruptions. This MS. has modified Lévi's view, and though he does not enter into particulars, he now accepts the substantial genuineness of at any rate large parts of the Hebrew. B (the Oxford MS., and corresponding MS. in Schechter) is 'in the main original, but in parts the archetype from which it comes has been *completed* by retroversion from the versions, and sometimes corrected under their influence' (p. 25); in A (3⁵-16^{2b}) some verses are held by Lévi to be authentic, but others, on the ground of internal evidence, are regarded by him as the result of retranslation (p. 30). He apparently accepts the whole of the text published by Adler in the last number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (i.e. Sir 7²⁹-12¹). Lévi has thus distinctly abandoned his former view that the whole of the Hebrew fragments represent a retranslation.

It may be added that 37³ in Lévi's MS. has accents and vowel-points, like 9^{3a}, 4 10² 11⁶⁻⁸ in Adler's text, and thus, as Lévi remarks (p. 10), confirms the statement of Saadya in the *Sefer Ha-Galuy* respecting the copies of Ecclesiasticus of his time.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.