

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

5. The last great feature of Samaria was her FORTRESSES, the large number of which lay all round and across her. They were due to the open character of the land and to the fact that, unlike Judah, Samaria had no strong bulwarked centre, on which her defence could be drawn in. But the description of these fortresses must be left for another paper.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS:

ITS GENESIS AND CORRUPTIONS.

THERE are two directions in which the genesis of a doctrine may be traced—onward or backward. We may begin at its birth, or even at an ante-natal period, when it is but a *rudis indigestaque moles*, and its rudimentary parts are only feeling after cohesion and organization. As yet they are not informed by the unifying consciousness which shall determine their ultimate character and organic life. At this early stage we can say nothing but that the embryo is "*congestaque eodem non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum.*" You know not whether this or that factor shall be its chief feature; whether it will ever see the light at all; or if it do, whether it will be a healthy thing, or a monstrosity, or give up its feeble ghost in the infancy of its existence. If it do come to life, the historian has only to follow its course onward through the length of its career.

Or on the other hand, we may begin at its death, and taking its epitaph for our text, write its history backward from the tomb to the cradle.

With my present subject however I propose to adopt neither of these methods, but to commence in the very prime of its life, and after showing what it was *then*, to trace first its ancestry and early life, and afterwards to sketch briefly the weakness of its old age and its dishonourable death. Death, I mean, not of the imperishable Logos

of the Catholic Faith, which is none other than the Doctrine of the Incarnation, but death of that doctrine when sublimated into Rationalism, or lost in the fantastic speculations of the Gnostics.

I need not say that my starting point will be in the writings of St. John. Without foreclosing the enquiry just now, whether the use of the word Logos in its personal and dogmatic sense is S. John's and S. John's alone among the writers of the New Testament, there can be no doubt that it is *pre-eminently* his. Four times in rapid succession it comes in the preface of his Gospel in a sense indisputably personal. Once in the great Intercessory Prayer it is used by the Logos Himself, scarcely less obviously, in the same sense: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Logos is truth." Strangely enough in this passage the Vulgate has translated the word *λόγος* by *sermo*, although in the preface to S. John's Gospel it has invariably rendered the same word *verbum*. But surely He who had already declared *Himself*, and not His words, to be the way, the *truth*, and the life, must here mean that His personality, and not His teaching, is to be the source of His disciples' sanctification.¹

S. John returns to this assertion that Christ's Person is the fountain of all truth. I can, at all events, take no other view of that passage in the First Epistle of S. John in which the Evangelist of the Logos declares first that "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," and then immediately afterwards: "If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His Logos is not in us," (here the Vulgate has "verbum"). The words "Him" and "His" evidently refer to the Eternal Father (1 John i. 8, 10).

¹ Compare Bersier's words upon the text, "I am the light of the world": "Et remarquez qu'en prétendant l'apporter aux hommes, il ne dit pas: 'J'annonce la lumière, je révèle la lumière,' mais bien, 'Je suis la lumière,' ce n'est pas sa doctrine seulement, c'est sa vie, c'est son être tout entier qu'il expose aux regards des générations humaines et dont il prétend faire le foyer éternel dont la clarté doit illuminer leurs ténèbres."—*Sermons*, vol. v. p. 4.

Again, I would interpret in the personal sense 1 John ii. 14: "I have written unto you young men, because ye are strong, and the Logos of God abideth in you." For did not the Logos Himself say, and the same writer record, "Abide in Me and I in you"? Once more, that other passage at the beginning of the First Epistle of S. John: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Logos of Life," clearly indicates a personal Logos, with Whom the disciples had lived in closest communion.

Turning to the only remaining Johannine portion of the New Testament, we find in the Apocalypse (xix. 13) that "He that sat upon the White Horse, who was called faithful and true, whose eyes were as a flame of fire, and on whose head were many crowns, was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and His Name is called the Logos of God,"—a passage requiring no discussion. Having now exhausted S. John's use of the word Logos, let us see whether the other writers of the New Testament were familiar with or employed the same title.

And first with regard to the Synoptic Gospels. I have gone through them carefully, but have failed to find any instance of the personal use of the word, unless it be in S. Luke i. 2: "Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the *λόγος*," and unless, as some maintain, the *λόγος* of the Parable of the Sower may be thus interpreted. I will not deny that the Logos of the Parable is capable of such a construction, but as its traditional sense seems to harmonize with the context, there is no need to press urgently for a Johannine one. Nor can I find in the Acts of the Apostles more than one place in which the word may be fairly construed in the sense of our Gospel. In Acts xx. 32, S. Paul says to the presbyters of Ephesus: "And now, brethren, I

commend you to God, and to the Logos of His grace, who is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." I think the passage an open one. And yet the very offices—*edification and salvation* in its highest sense—here attributed to the Logos, are of course pre-eminently the personal works of Christ, and their mention in connexion with the Logos gives, I think, a presumption in favour of the *personal* sense of the word being the true one.

The Epistles of S. Paul, unless we ascribe the Epistle to the Hebrews to his pen, are absolutely free from the Johannine use of *λόγος*. Nor need we wonder at this if we remember that most of his writings were addressed to Greek-speaking peoples, who might have attached to this word incongruous associations gathered from their own philosophers. In the Epistle to the Romans there was no need for its use, for Logos is a word specially connected with the *Incarnation* of Christ, whereas the great theme of this epistle is the justifying power of the *Atonement*. But in the Epistle to the Hebrews, whoever be its author, the writer seems free to use the title as personally as S. John. Thus in Hebrews iv. 12, 13 we read: "For the *λόγος* of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight, but all things are naked and open unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." Bishops Sanderson,¹ Bull,² and Wordsworth,³ Dean Jackson,⁴ and Dr. Newman,⁵ all interpret the Logos here to mean the Eternal Son of God. Again, St. James (i. 1) writing also to Hebrews, "to the twelve tribes which

¹ iii. 20.² Sermon x., vol. i. 243.³ hoc loco.⁴ Vol. x. pp. 216-218. [Creed.]⁵ Parochial Sermons, *passim*.

are scattered abroad," seems once and again to give this personal meaning to Logos. In chapter i. 18, he declares, after speaking of "the perfect gift that is from above," that "of His own will begat He us with the Logos of truth," a passage singularly like S. John's sublime words (i. 12): "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This interpretation gains much force when we look at the expression in verse 21, τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον, "the engrafted Word" (A.V.), "the implanted Word" (R.V.), "the inborn Word" (R.V. margin), "which is able to save your souls." In what sense half so full and adequate can we take these attributes of the Logos as that which would apply them to the Incarnate Word grafted upon the stock of humanity, regenerating us ("begetting us"), as in verse 18, and eternally "saving" us, as in verse 21?

So far as I know, I have set forth all the Logos passages in the New Testament which seem to me capable of a personal construction. I have followed no commentary upon them in detail, but have sought rather to allow them to throw light upon each other. Let us now try to take their collective sense, and this may help us to discover the true ancestry of the one word which unites them all.

1. The Logos was ἐν ἀρχῇ, and therefore eternal.
2. The Logos was πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, *i.e.* in intimate relations with the Eternal Father.
3. The Logos was Deity absolutely, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.
4. The Logos was the Creator of all things both by counsel and co-operation.
5. The Logos was also eternally πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.
6. In the Logos was life capable of illuminating men.
7. This immanent Light became eminent, *i.e.* went forth out of Himself into the outer darkness, which however would not allow the Light to penetrate it.

8. He gave to the recipients of this Light sonship divine.
9. This Logos also became flesh, and "tabernacled" with man, full of grace and truth. And His glory was seen by man as that of the Only Begotten of the Father.
10. He is the source of sanctification and is the essential Truth, and makes us realize that sin is within us all.
11. He is now crowned with glory and is called Faithful and True.
12. He builds up His Redeemed ones and co-opts them to His own felicity.
13. He scrutinizes and reveals our inmost hearts.
14. He is grafted upon our stock, and gives us eternal life.

And now it is time to ask in what direction shall we look for the parentage of this New Testament Logos, to whom so much is attributed of personality and work? Shall we seek the root of the idea in the philosophies of the West, or in the theosophies of the Semitic races? Here arises a real obstacle in our path. For "the doctrine of the Logos has run in two parallel lines,—the one philosophical, the other theological; the first expressing *reason*, the second *word*; the one is Hellenic, the other Hebrew." Sketched in brief, the Greek Logos appears to us in three well-defined stages, marked off by the names of Heraclitus of Ephesus, the Stoics, and Philo the Hellenized Jew.¹

(1) In the theories of Heraclitus, which are mainly in the realm of physics, the Logos seems to have the function of correcting deviations from the eternal law that rules in things. It is neither above the world, nor prior to the world, but *in* the world and inseparable from it. Man's

¹ Vide Professor Salmond's article "Logos," *Encyc. Brit.*, 9th ed., vol. xiv., for several historical points here and below.

soul is a part of the Logos. It conducts the antagonisms that go on in nature. It gives order and regularity to the movement of things, and makes the system rational; but it is not clear whether it itself was possessed of consciousness or not. The Logos of Heraclitus is thus removed *longo intervallo* from the Logos of S. John.

(2) Between Heraclitus and the Stoics, there intervenes the Logos of Plato and Aristotle. And here a word of caution may not be out of place against trusting to Christian apologists who are determined at all hazards to find in the writings of Plato a clear pre-intimation of the Logos of the Gospels. Thus *e.g.* Auguste Nicolas in his "*Études philosophiques*,"¹ professing to quote from the *Timæus* of Plato, says that the Logos is therein called the "Saviour God," and that *Timæus* thus invokes Him: "At the commencement of this discourse let us invoke the Saviour God, that by an extraordinary and marvellous teaching He may save us by instructing us in the true doctrine."² But most people will, I think, agree with Dr. Jowett in his introduction to the *Timæus*, "that there is no use in attempting to define or explain the first god in the Platonic system, who has sometimes been thought to answer to God the Father; or the first world or eternal soul, in whom the Fathers of the Church seemed to recognise 'the first-born

¹ Tome ii. 121: "Du reste, en maint endroit des œuvres de Platon on trouve exprimée la doctrine d'un médiateur qu'il appelait le verbe (*λόγος*), par l'entremise duquel devait s'établir un rapport d'enseignement divin entre l'homme et Dieu, et qu'à cet effet il appelait *Sauveur, Dieu, Fils de Dieu.*"

² French writers are notoriously free in their renderings of classical authors, and I am quite unable to identify the invocation in the *Timæus*, relied upon by the amiable and able French *magistrat*. I do not think there are more than two passages even remotely resembling his version:

'Αλλ', ὦ Σώκρατες, τοῦτ' γε δὴ πάντες ὄσοι καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ σωφροσύνης μετέχουσιν, ἐπὶ παντὸς ὀρυγῆ καὶ σμικροῦ καὶ μεγάλου πράγματος θεὸν αἰεὶ πον καλοῦσιν. ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς περὶ τοῦ παντὸς λόγου ποιείσθαι πῆ μέλλοντας ἢ γέγονεν ἢ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ παντάπασι παραλλάττομεν, ἀνάγκη θεοῦ τε καὶ Θεὸς ἐπικαλουμένους εἶχεσθαι πάντα κατὰ νοῦν ἐκείνοις μὲν μέλιστα, ἐπομένως δὲ ἡμῖν εἰπεῖν. (Plato, vol. vii. 251. Valpy, London, 1826.) See also cap. xxii. *Timæus*, last four lines.

of every creature.'” In point of fact the order-keeping spirit of this world was, according to Plato, *νοῦς* or *σοφία*, not *λόγος*. The *λόγος* was only a subordinate principle scarcely attaining to personality.

Coming to the Stoics, we find a distinct advance upon the doctrine of Heraclitus. The Logos of the Stoics is an intelligent reason, analogous to the reason in man. It determines the world and lives in it. Regarded as the law of generation, it is called the *λόγος σπερματικός*, and works in dead matter. The *unexpressed* thought in man is *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*; *expressed*, *προφορικός*.

(3) The third stage of the development of the Logos is attained in the writings of Philo, a Jew of Alexandria, descended from a noble and sacerdotal family, and pre-eminent among his contemporaries for his talents, eloquence and wisdom. He was born about 25 years B.C. He was of the sect of the Pharisees, and was deeply versed in the scriptures of the Old Testament, which he read in the Septuagint Version, being a Hellenistic Jew, unacquainted (it is supposed) with Hebrew. He wrote also in the Greek language. He is not known ever to have visited Judæa, and cannot be shown to have any knowledge of the events of our Lord's life there transacted. It cannot be supposed that he was a convert to Christianity when we remember that the Gospel was not extensively and openly promulgated out of Judæa until ten years after the resurrection of Christ, and that there is not the most distant allusion to him in the New Testament. In a paper of my present dimensions, I cannot discuss at length the nature of the Philonian Logos. A sufficiently exhaustive conspectus of it will be found in the Introduction to Dorner's *Person of Christ*, or, in a more interesting fashion, in Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus*. It is, however, necessary to my present purpose to summarize Philo's views, and to distinguish them from the Logos of the New Testa-

ment. And, first, it must be admitted that not only does he call the *λόγος* the world-thinking and world-making power of God, but also Son, First-born of God, the link between God and the world; the Mediator, High-Priest, Advocate, Surety, Archangel, Pillar. But he also calls the *world* "a son of God," and so prevents us from necessarily attaching personality to his *λόγος*.

(1) With Philo, the *λόγος* is first a Divine *faculty*, of thought, or creation, or both. But if this *λόγος* be distinct from God, and contains all wisdom and thought and power, the Father of the Logos is left without one or other of these.¹

(2) The Logos of Philo is *activity*—which both thinks and creates. But he goes on to explain that this Logos is only the place (*ὁ τόπος*), the store-house in which are lodged the archetypal ideas of the first creation—the scroll of paper upon which the Divine Architect mapped out His creative plan.

(3) Again the Logos is the ideal world, the original plan of the present world, and therefore cannot be a person.

(4) And lastly the Logos is the active Divine principle of the sensible world. This might be mistaken for personality. But if we begin to suppose that this Logos was derived by a true sonship from God the Father, as the Logos of S. John was begotten of the Eternal Father, we are met by the difficulty already mentioned, that the sensible world is again and again called the "younger son of God," just as the Logos is called His "elder Son."

In a word, the Logos of Philo wavers between attribute and substance, between the personal and the impersonal.

¹ Cf. Sartorius, *Die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe*, p. 9: "Nicht als wäre der Sohn, oder hätte er ein anderes Wesen neben dem unendlichen Vater; dann hätte ja jeder das Seine für sich selbst, dann hätten sie ja nicht Alles gemein, dann ständen sie sich in gegenseitiger Begrenzung dualistisch einander gegenüber, die Unendlichkeit gleichsam halbierend, nicht allmächtig, sondern halbmächtig als zwei Halbgötter."

And yet this is the Logos whom S. John has been accused of stealing and transplanting into the Gospel of Christ!

Not then by ascending the Hellenic stream have we found the true source of the Johannine doctrine. For S. John's is not a Logos of abstract, impersonal reason, but the all-making, God-revealing, Flesh-assuming Word. Let us then like the African explorers in patient search of the wells of the Nile, once more launch our boat in a new essay, and pray the Spirit of Truth "*timidæ dirige navis iter.*"

But before we set sail on the waters of Israel, let us pause and speculate a little on our chances of success. And first, we have noticed that the New Testament writers who make use of our word are engaged mainly with *Hebrew* disciples. This is especially clear in the Revelation of S. John, a book literally steeped in Hebraisms, e.g. "New Jerusalem," "the doctrine of Balaam," "that woman Jezebel," "the key of David," "Abaddon," "Gog and Magog." The Epistle of S. James and that to the Hebrews bear on the face of them for what people they were primarily intended. Even this then, that the word Logos was a word specially to and for the Hebrew converts, affords a considerable presumption that our present voyage is more hopeful than our Greek adventure. But to my mind we have a still far richer promise of success when we consider the fundamental difference between the Oriental and Occidental conceptions of the means of uniting God and man. The East sets out from God the Infinite; the West from man the finite. Hence in all Indian religions, the doctrine of frequent incarnations of God in human form, for the purpose of teaching men the truth, and re-conducting them to heaven. In Greece, on the other hand (as also in the religions of Rome and the north), men become gods, and ascend Olympus by virtue and valour. The Eastern is salvation from without, the Western from within. In the

West man celebrates his own apotheosis; in the East man glorifies the mercy of God which stoops to manhood. Now the Hebrew religion on its natural side belongs to the great family of Eastern religions, the religions of incarnation. Inasmuch then as the Logos of S. John is distinctively an incarnation, we are far surer of finding its source in Hebrew than in Grecian lands.

Briefly stated, S. John's Logos, as applied to Christ, is the sum and climax of three Hebrew conceptions: (1) The active, creative word whereby God made all things, and revealed His will to His people; (2) the Angel of the Covenant or Angel of Jehovah; and (3) the Chokmah or Wisdom of God. Of course, I do not mean the bare total of these conceptions, but their union and *coronation*.

I.

THE MEMRA.

(1) *The Creative and Revealing Word*. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." Psalm xxxiii. 6, cf. S. John i. 3.

(2) *This Memra executes Divine judgments*. "I have slain them by the words of my mouth." Hosea vi. 5, cf. John v. 22.

(3) *Heals the sick*. "He sent His Word and healed them." Psalm cvii. 20. In all accounts of the miracles, Jesus *speaks*.

(4) *Has qualities almost personal*. "His Word runneth very swiftly." Psalm cxlvii. 15. "My Word that goeth out of My mouth shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please." Isaiah lv. 11, cf. S. John xvii. 4: "I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.

II.

THE ANGEL OF THE COVENANT.

By different names is the great Theophany known. Now the Angel of the Covenant, now of the Presence, now of Jehovah. Sometimes He is identified with Jehovah or Elohim, as when speaking to Moses at the burning bush ; at other times He is distinguished from Him, as to Abraham on Mount Moriah. And again He appears in both aspects, as in Judges ii. 1: "And the angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, . . . and I said I will never break My covenant with you"; and in Judges vi. 22: "And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of the Lord, Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God! for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face." May we not see in this varied presentation of the Theophany a foretoken of the Logos, who at times shrinks not from saying, "I and my Father are one," and yet at others declares, "My Father is greater than I?"

III.

THE CHOKMAH OR SOPHIA, OR WISDOM OF GOD.

The Doctrine of Wisdom appears in the Books of Job, Proverbs and the Apocrypha. At times this Chokmah or Wisdom of God appears to take the place of the Word of God in creation ; thus in Proverbs iii. 19: "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth." At another time it is strongly personified, as in Proverbs viii. 22 sqq.: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was. . . . Then I was by Him as one brought up with Him : and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him." The wisdom of God develops the hypostatic notion still more clearly. "She

is the worker of all things: in her is an understanding spirit, holy, only-begotten, manifold, subtle, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good, kind to man, steadfast, sure, free from care, having all power, overseeing all things. For she is the brightness of the Everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of His Person."¹ Compare with this such passages as Ephesians iii. 10: "God created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the *manifold wisdom of God*"; and Hebrews i. 3: "Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His Person, and upholding all things by the word of His power." The wise man continues, "She is the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from the glory of the Almighty; in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God and prophets. Wisdom reacheth from one end to another mightily; and sweetly doth she order all things." And again in Proverbs viii. 5, she cries: "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled," with which we may compare the sixth chapter of S. John.

It is, then, I venture to think with many modern writers, in the combination of these three Hebrew mysteries, and not in the philosophy of Greeks or Hellenized Jews, that S. John sees the parentage of his own *λόγος*,—eternal, creative, life-giving, incarnate and adoptive. The very heart of his evangel is that "the Logos was made flesh and dwelt among us." I do not mean, I repeat, that S. John merely collects into his Logos the attributes of the Memra, the Angel and the Wisdom. But the sum of these is his starting-point from which to unfold the redeeming work of the Logos made flesh.

¹ Wisdom vii. 22–viii. 1.

There remains to us now the sadder task of tracing the corrupted and therefore decaying old age of this glorious doctrine of the Gospel; and we have not long to wait before finding the influence of the Greek idea in both the early Christian writers, and, in wilder forms, in the heretical schools.

The first important philosophical epoch in the post-apostolic age is the rise of the Gnosis, or Gnosticism. We have seen how sparingly the term Logos was applied to our Lord in the New Testament. But in the metaphysics of the Gnostics, the supreme tendency was towards complete idealism. One can easily see that to men who denied all objectivity, such a subtle doctrine as the Logos would prove an invaluable organ in the order and government of a purely spiritual world. To them, of course, such a phrase as "the Logos became flesh" must have been an ineptitude and an offence.

Basilides held that the Logos emanated from the *νοῦς* as the *νοῦς* emanated from the Father.

According to Valentinus the Logos was the child of the Nous and Truth.

Cerinthus taught that the Logos descended upon Christ at His Baptism.

Of more orthodox writers, Justin Martyr, a Samaritan by birth, attempted, like many writers of our own time, to gather up into one conception the Hebrew and Hellenic ideas—the "reason-Logos" and the "word-Logos." Origen, with his characteristic disregard of traditional restraints, not only calls the Logos "a second God," but seems to insinuate that this Logos dwelt in Jesus only in a more complete and perfect way than in other men,—a tenet at once Arian and Socinian. Returning for a moment to the category of men who corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel by their jangling disputations and endless sophistry, the Sabellians taught that the Logos was a faculty of God,

the Divine reason, immanent in God eternally, but without distinct personality until its historical manifestation in Christ.

Practically this is the end of Logology as a shibboleth in the history of heresy. Doubtless in Spinoza and Socinus there is a partial disinterment of its remains.

In one sense then the doctrine of the Logos has died. But truth can never die. Caricature and corruption find their grave at last. But the spirit of truth survives them in "an ampler æther, a diviner air." And so at her altars the Church doth ever sing her Gloria in Excelsis to the Logos of S. John, "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and WAS MADE MAN." And her holy psalmists take up the strain of Adam of St. Victor :

Verbum vere substantivi,
Caro cum sit in declivi
 Temporis angustîa,
In æternis verbum annis
Permaneri nos Johannis
 Docet theologia.

J. M. DANSON.

BREVIA.

The Canon of the Old Testament, by Herbert Edward Ryle, B.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London, Macmillan, 1892.

Professor's Ryle's investigations into the question of the Canon were to all intents completed and his work written before the appearance of Buhl's book on the same subject, and in the light of this fact the virtual identity of his results with those of Buhl becomes the more significant (EXPOSITOR for April). A better guarantee of the general trustworthiness of their conclusions, so far as there is evidence to go on, could hardly be got. Buhl's book is somewhat scholastic in manner and intended rather for the pro-