

fice where they liked. The former of these is wrongly stated. It is not the law but the narrative of the patriarchs that is in question. *Their* sacrifices are connected with immemorially holy shrines, no law of worship is spoken of. (14) Wellhausen says (p. 22): 'After all, the ruling idea was that which finds its most distinct expression in 2 Kings v. 17—that Palestine as a whole was Jehovah's house, His ground and territory.' Dr. Baxter turns 'the ruling idea' first into 'the highest religious thought of Israel'; and as this does not garble it enough, it is further described, as 'the devout conviction of (say) twenty-five generations of the faithful in Israel.' The idea, of course, was fitly enough expressed by Naaman, for it was one the Israelites held in common with their heathen neighbours.

My materials are far from exhausted, and I may say, as the result of my examination of this part of his book, that it is unsafe to take a single statement of Wellhausen's views on Dr. Baxter's authority without verification. It would not be a great exaggeration, in view of the amazing blunders that he makes, to say that whatever Wellhausen may mean, it is highly probable that it is at least not what Dr. Baxter says he means. And as for the arguments for the critical view, I cannot believe that any one who really understood it would feel

that the work had made any difference to his opinion. I began the book expecting a stimulating discussion of the subject. I put it down feeling that there is nothing to be learned from it. The language he uses about his opponent is comical, when we think of the two books. 'Our infallible critic,' 'self-stultification,' 'domineering dogmatism,' 'pompous neo-history,' 'egregious process,' 'free and easy romancing,' 'his code beats Melchizedek hollow,' 'this incomparable "not a trace" fiasco,' 'ludicrous inconsequence,' 'ridiculous axiom,' 'house of cards,' 'tissue of dissolving inconsistencies,' 'out-Nöldeke's Nöldeke,'—these are some of his choice expressions. After this tiresome examination, let us read once more in our present light two of his testimonials. Long may they retain their enlivening power. The first is from Dr. Story: 'I wish to thank you for your dressing of Wellhausen. You have taken him thoroughly to pieces, and exposed his pretentiousness in a way which would confound anyone but a "Higher Critic." But dogmatic self-satisfaction is the badge of all their tribe.' The second is like it; it is from Dr. Boyd: 'I have enjoyed the bright and incisive way in which you have gone for Wellhausen. As far as I can judge, you have made mince-meat of him.'

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Mizraim or Muzri?

THE recent publication of Herr Winckler's *Geschichte Israels*, Teil I., gives us a suitable opportunity of bringing together the various items of information and conjecture on a somewhat important subject which he has propounded in several works during the past few years.<sup>1</sup> It will not be necessary to discuss them exhaustively. The mere statement of his conclusions stimulates thought. One of them is certain to provoke a vigorous opposition. We shall not attempt much more than to indicate the possibility that the

<sup>1</sup> In this paper we shall make use of the following abbreviations:—K. for *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch*, 1892; F. for *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 1893; U. for *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, 1893; G. for *Geschichte Israels*, 1895.

light which he has focused may contribute to the better understanding of some Old Testament passages.

Everyone is aware that the Hebrew name for Egypt is Mizraim (מצרים), or, in a few places, Mázôr (מצור). On the Assyrian monuments it appears in the form *Muzri* or *Muzur*. But on these monuments the same designation is shared by several other countries.<sup>2</sup> As an Assyriologist Herr Winckler is well aware of these facts, and his suggestion is that in several cases where the original writer of an Old Testament document used the shorter form corresponding to the Assyrian *Muzri* and meant one of these other lands, the Masso-

<sup>2</sup> Herr Winckler does not hesitate to say 'many lands.' He seems inclined to accept Hommel's interpretation of the word as meaning 'military frontier,' which, if correct, would explain the wide range of its application (F. p. 25, note).

retes misunderstood their text, thought that Egypt, the land with which they were familiar, was intended, and wrote its name, *Mizraim*, in place of *Muzri* or *Muzur*. Two of these countries, in particular, claim our attention.<sup>1</sup>

I. Under Shalmaneser I. (about 1300 B.C.) and Tiglath-Pileser I. (about 1100 B.C.) Muzri is the name of a state in Northern Syria, south of the Taurus, embracing parts of Cappadocia, Cataonia, and Cilicia, and reaching as far south as the Orontes. Subsequently, under Assurnatsirpal, it was called Patin, but under Shalmaneser II. a small state near Kuë (East Cilicia) is designated Muzri.

1. The Revised Version of 1 Kings x. 28, 29, runs thus:—'And the horses which Solomon had were brought out of Egypt; and the king's merchants received them in droves, each drove at a price. And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred shekels of silver, and an horse for an hundred and fifty; and so for all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria, did they bring them out by their means.' The primary objection to the statement as it stands is that Egypt can never have exported horses in large numbers, seeing that it does not possess the broad pasture-lands on which alone great numbers of horses can be reared. And if it be replied that Assurbanipal speaks of carrying off horses from Egypt, the answer to this is that they were not paid as tribute,—which would, indeed, have implied regular breeding on a large scale,—but were taken as booty.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, the Cilician Muzri is the very country to which the horse-dealer would resort. Amongst the revenues of Darius, Herodotus (iii. 90) enumerates:—'Ἀπὸ δὲ Κιλικίων, ἵπποι τε λευκοὶ ἐξήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσιοι, ἐκάστης ἡμέρας εἰς γινόμενος. On an Assyrian inscription<sup>3</sup> the only tribute stated to have been paid by Tabal (Cappadocia) is 'great horses.' The *Togarmah* of Ezek. xxvii. 14, which traded in the fairs of Tyre 'with horses and war-horses and mules,' is usually identified with Armenia, and, in any case, is not far distant from Tabal.

To return to our English translation. The most

<sup>1</sup> Cf. K. pp. 5, 21. The latter passage is interesting because of the manner in which it shows the growth of the idea in the author's mind.

<sup>2</sup> See W. p. 173; F. p. 28, note.

<sup>3</sup> F. p. 28, note.

cursory comparison of it with the Hebrew shows that it is somewhat forced. The M.T. is as follows:—

ומוצא הכוסים אשר לשלמה ממצרים ומקוה  
 סחרי המלך יקחו מקוה במוזר  
 ותעלה ותצא מרכבה ממצרים בשש-מאות ונו'

And here is the LXX:—

καὶ ἡ ἔξοδος Σαλομῶν τῶν ἱππέων καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου  
 καὶ ἐκ Θεκοῦτε ἔμποροι τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐλάβανεν  
 ἐκ Θεκοῦτε ἐν ἀλλάγματι. καὶ ἀνέβαιναν ἡ ἔξοδος ἐξ  
 Αἰγύπτου ἄρμα ἀντὶ ἑκατὸν ἀργυρίου κτλ.

Is it not exceedingly probable that the LXX were right in taking מקוה<sup>4</sup> as parallel to מוצרים, the initial מ in each case being a preposition? It is quite as obvious that they were wrong in fixing on Tekoa, which has always been the centre of a pastoral district, but never was or could be a feeding-ground for large cattle or for horses. There remains the Kuë of the monuments, East Cilicia, and this is the very name (קוה) in our text. Hence the land mentioned in conjunction with it is far more likely to have been the Cilician *Muzri* than the Egyptian *Mizraim*. Winckler, therefore, renders: 'And the export of horses for Solomon was from Muzri and \* Kuë: the king's merchants bought them from Kuë at their price. The export of a war-chariot from Egypt cost six hundred &c.' Egypt is retained in ver. 29, because that country, rather than Cilicia, would be the emporium for war-chariots (cf. Canticles i. 9). Its legitimate employment in ver. 29 may have occasioned its intrusion into ver. 28.

2. Benhadad is said (2 Kings vii. 6) to have raised the siege of Samaria because his army heard 'a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians, to come upon us.' Now, there is not the slightest likelihood that Israel collected a mercenary army from regions so far apart as Egypt in the south and the Hittite territory in the north. Even if that process of disintegration had already begun which characterised the Twenty-Second and following dynasties, we have no reason for believing that the local Egyptian kings would

<sup>4</sup> Which, on any other interpretation, remains 'das in jeder Hinsicht befremdliches מקוה' which Kamphausen found it, so recently as the publication of Kautzsch's *Bibelwerk*.

serve as *condottieri* for Israel. But the countries of *Muzri* and of the Hittites were at this time ruled by a number of petty sovereigns who would willingly lend out their swords on hire. We should expect, too, to see their names connected together, as on Shalmaneser's monolith *Hamath*, Israel and *Muzri* follow each other. It may also be noticed that 2 Kings vii. 6 thus exhibits the same conjunction of names, Muzri, the Hittites, and the Syrians, as 1 Kings x. 28, 29.<sup>1</sup>

II. The second Muzri is in Northern Arabia.<sup>2</sup> This is evinced by the comparison of four of Tiglath-Pileser's inscriptions, the substance of which is that the Great King appointed a certain Idi-b'il to be viceroy of Muzri in Arabia. The locality is more closely defined by its being mentioned in connexion with Tiglath-Pileser's siege of Askalon. It may be safely identified with the territory afterwards occupied by the Nabathæan Arabs. Bordering, as it did, on Egypt, the Arab tribes may have transferred to it the familiar name of its great neighbour.

Are there any Old Testament notices which suit this district better than others?

1. Here is the Revised Version of Ps. lx. 9 :—

'Who will bring me into the strong city?  
Who hath led me unto Edom?'

עיר מצור (*ir mâzôr*) is thus rendered 'the strong city,' מצור (*mâzôr*), as we have already remarked, being the shorter form which in three passages takes the place of מצור (*Mizraim*) as a proper noun. It has been customary to think that Petra is referred to, that rock-fortress which at one time was the capital of Edom. But a much more perfect parallelism would be obtained if, in each clause, we had the preposition ער and the name of a country, ער-מצור and ער-ארם. The M.T., strangely enough, has no preposition in the first member of the verse. The words עיר and ער would easily be mistaken for each other. Edom and Muzri were contiguous, so that when the northward movement of the Arabs began, in about the sixth century before our era, the Edomites were speedily absorbed.<sup>3</sup> In the conflicts between Israel and Edom which are described at 1 Kings xi., and referred to in Ps. lx., the Arab tribes of Muzri might not unnaturally take part with their

neighbour, and so become involved in the vengeance invoked by the patriotic Israelite.<sup>4</sup>

2. Both accounts of the disputes between Sarah and Hagar (Gen. xvi. and xxi.) call the latter a *Mizri* (מצרית), which has, of course, been taken to mean an *Egyptian*. But it is not easy to reconcile the idea of her being of Egyptian nationality with other Biblical statements. She is the ancestress of the Arabs, a Semitic, not a Hamitic race (Gen. xxv. 12-18). Her name (הגר) can hardly be dissociated from that of the Arab tribe of *Hagarenes* (הגרים, Ps. lxxxiii. 6). When she flees before the face of her mistress, she goes to the land of Muzri, for the angel finds her 'by the fountain in the way to Shur' (xvi. 7), and her descendants 'dwelt from Havilah unto Shur' (xxv. 18), *i.e.* in the North Arabian district which Tiglath-Pileser mentions. What more natural than that she should take refuge in her native land? She is a *Mizri*, but from *Muzri*, not *Mizraim*, and she takes a wife for her son, not from the land of Egypt (xxi. 12), but from the land of her fathers.

3. The Assyrian inscriptions mention the *Nachal Muzri*.<sup>5</sup> This is the *Nachal Mizraim*, 'the river of Egypt,' of Josh. xv. 4, and other passages, the southern boundary of the Promised Land. Its modern name, Wady el-Arish, is derived from the town el-Arish (Rhinocolura), which stands where the wady debouches on the Mediterranean. To say the least, it is not unlikely that the Hebrew name originally corresponded exactly with the Assyrian, and that when Muzri ceased to be the designation of the Nabathæan district, after the eighth century B.C.,<sup>6</sup> the true meaning of *Nachal Muzri* ceased to be understood, and the ever-abiding *Mizraim* forced its way in. If 'the river of Egypt' is original, it can only be because the wady lies in the direction of Egypt: its head is in the district with which we are concerned.

4. In the *Abel-mizraim*<sup>7</sup> of Gen. i. 11, Herr Winckler sees the same boundary as has just been touched on.<sup>8</sup> His argument is too lengthy and complicated to be reproduced here. The line which it follows will be sufficiently evident from

<sup>4</sup> G. p. 194.

<sup>5</sup> F. pp. 26, 36; U. p. 168.

<sup>6</sup> Or even earlier; see F. p. 36, note.

<sup>7</sup> More correctly, as in LXX and Vulg., Ebel-mizraim (אֵבֶל מִצְרַיִם, not אֵבֶל מִצְרַיִם); see Dillmann, *Die Genesis*<sup>5</sup>, p. 470.

<sup>8</sup> F. p. 36.

<sup>1</sup> See W. p. 171; G. p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> See F. p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wellhausen, *Die Kl. Proph.* p. 205.

the summary which he gives: 'Jacob is embalmed in Egypt, and, in accordance with the Egyptian custom, is mourned for seventy days. His body is then carried to Canaan to be buried in his native land. When they arrive at the frontier and reach the country of his ancestors, the lamentation after the native fashion takes place. The narrative can scarcely have any other sense. The Egyptian lamentation in Egypt, and the Hebrew one on Hebrew soil are obviously contrasted, and the locality where the latter was celebrated must therefore be looked for on the border of the Canaanite territory.' This theory does, at any rate, meet the difficulty which Dillmann<sup>1</sup> found insuperable. He asks: 'Why this solemnity in the land east of the Jordan?' The answer was probably once given in the course of the narrative, but is now lost.' And he appends Tuch's improbable suggestion: 'Was it that the foreign attendants were not permitted to enter the Holy Land of Promise?' Unsatisfactory, however, as it is to record a *non liquet*, we are constrained to say that, like that proposed under No. 3, the present identification is not clear.

5. Gen. xx. and xxvi. are regarded as duplicates by the adherents of the Higher Criticism. The former narrative represents Abimelech as king of the land which we are now growing accustomed to call Muzri,<sup>2</sup> for Abraham comes into contact with him whilst he dwells 'between Kadesh and Shur.'<sup>3</sup> Those who share the assumption that the stories are duplicates will anticipate Winckler's conclusion that the Muzri of the one is the Mizraim of the other. Perhaps the intrinsic probability of that equation may in turn recommend the assumption.

6. With the exception of No. 5, the suggestions which we have passed in review detract in nowise from the authority of the Old Testament narratives. They insinuate no doubt about the facts: these are but placed in another, apparently more suitable *milieu*. The case stands otherwise with the point now to be mentioned. Herr Winckler does not believe that Israel ever sojourned in Egypt. In this, of course, he is not alone.<sup>4</sup> He attempts to

<sup>1</sup> *Die Genesis* <sup>5</sup>, p. 470.

<sup>2</sup> On 'Sojourned in Gerar,' 'King of Gerar,' etc., see F. p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> See remarks above, on II. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* p. 128 f.; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.* i. p. 348; Justi, *Gesch. d. Orient.* v. p. 272.

show<sup>5</sup> that 'the Sinai or Horeb on which Yahweh dwelt' was not in the peninsula where we are accustomed to look for it; but was not far from Edom, in the land of Muzri, of which we have already heard. He lays somewhat violent hands on those passages in the prophetic writings which speak of the abode in Egypt. For instance, Amos ii. 9-11 is a Deuteronomic interpolation which breaks the context, and we are told that a Pindar or a Homer would not speak thus—although it were claimed that Amos is either the one or the other. Amos ix. 7, again, which is in reality a splendid example of the prophet's breadth of view, is contemptuously dismissed as needing no discussion.<sup>6</sup> He asserts that the vividness with which the memory of Egyptian bondage appears to have maintained its hold on the Israelite mind is a mere illusion, a literary phenomenon, implying nothing more than that acquaintance with Egyptian life and manners which lay within the reach of all cultivated Israelites in later times.

The subject is too large for discussion at the end of a short paper. Two remarks must suffice. Egypt, no less than the Cilician and Arabian districts to which Herr Winckler has directed attention, bore amongst Semitic peoples the name Muzri. So far as the *name* is concerned, it has at least an equal right with the new claimant to be considered the starting-point of the Hebrew movement towards Canaan. If other arguments are decisive against it, they must be yielded to. Meanwhile it may be remembered that a critic so little disposed to be tender towards the Hexateuch as Professor Wellhausen has in his latest utterance on the subject fully accepted the fact of a Hebrew abode in Egypt. He says<sup>7</sup> that somewhere about the middle of the second thousand years before

<sup>5</sup> Following Smend's comparison of Judges v. 4—

'Lord, when Thou wentest forth out of Seir,  
When Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom,

The mountains flowed down at the presence of the  
Lord,  
Even yon Sinai at the presence of the Lord, the God  
of Israel.'

with Deut. xxxiii. 2—

'The Lord came from Sinai,  
And rose from Seir unto them etc.'

<sup>6</sup> 'Amos ix. 7 bedarf mit seiner archäologischen Aferweisheit ("die Philister aus Kaphtor und die Aramäer aus Kir") Keiner Besprechung,' G. p. 54.

<sup>7</sup> *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 1895, pp. 9-11.

Christ the Hebrew families out of which Israel subsequently grew forsook, in great part, their old home in the extreme south of Palestine, and migrated to the neighbouring Egyptian pasture-land called Goshen. He traces their stay in that country, and their deliverance thence by Moses, on the same lines substantially as the tradition with which we are familiar. His adhesion to this view is, we think, a striking token of the fact that Hebrew history will not allow itself to be begun, as Herr Winckler would begin it, with the reign of David. The second remark is, that if the story of the Exodus is a baseless fiction, a painfully large portion of the Bible must be rewritten. The siege of Samaria was raised by Benhadad, whether the Aramæans in his army thought the relieving troops came from the north or the south. Hagar is none the less the mother of Ishmael, if the desert in which she took refuge was her native land. But if Yahweh did not call His son out of Egypt, all the accounts we have of this event are but 'the baseless fabric of a vision,' and all the allusions to it in the Psalms and the Prophets are idle fancies. Kittel<sup>1</sup> weighs the evidence on both sides carefully, and his conclusion will commend itself to many unprejudiced minds: 'There is no event in the entire history of Israel that has more deeply imprinted itself in the memory of later generations of this people than the abode in Egypt, and the exodus from the land of the Nile. Samuel, Saul, Solomon, almost David himself, stand in the background compared with the Egyptian house of bondage, and the glorious deliverance thence. Evidently we have here no mere product of the legends of the patriarchs, but a fact which lived deep down in the consciousness of the people in quite early times, from Hosea and the Book of Samuel onwards, a fact graven deep in their memory. It would betoken a high, a more than normal degree of deficiency of historical sense in the Israelite national character, if a purely mythical occurrence gave the keynote of the whole national life, and formed the starting-point of the entire circle of religious thought as early as the days of the first literary prophets.'

JOHN TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Hebrews* (Eng. trans.), vol. i. 185. The entire section is judicious and helpful.

## The New 'Herzog.'

To theological students who read German, no announcement could be more welcome than that of the issue of a third improved and enlarged edition of Herzog's *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, under the editorship of Dr. Albert Hauck of Leipzig.<sup>2</sup> Twenty years have passed since the second edition appeared, and during that period biblical knowledge has advanced by leaps and bounds. Ancient monuments have been deciphered and newly-discovered manuscripts have been collated, critics both destructive and constructive have been incessantly active, so that many articles in the familiar 'Herzog' have become obsolete, and others stop short just at the point of greatest interest to the present-day seeker after truth. The statement of the publishers will therefore be received with great satisfaction, that the new edition, whilst preserving the essential features and the scientific character of the work, will contain a large number of articles entirely rewritten, and many new articles upon subjects not included in the former issues.

The first part of the first volume has just been published, and the entire work will consist of eighteen volumes of 800 pages each, and is to be completed within nine years. Nearly 200 writers, representing different schools of thought, have promised their assistance, 'the common basis of work being faith in the revelation of God in Christ Jesus, and love to the Church of the Reformation.' The list of contributors includes the names of Baudissin and Herrmann of Marburg; Buhl, Gregory, and Socin of Leipzig; Caspari and Zahn of Erlangen; Cremer and Zöckler of Greifswald; Harnack and Strack of Berlin; Beyschlag, Kittel, Orelli, Schürer, and Weizsäcker. In the new edition, which is well printed on good paper, a survey of the literature on each subject, including books and magazine articles quite recently published, is given at the beginning of each article. For purposes of reference, the marginal numbering of the lines on each page is also a great convenience.

An excellent example of the thoroughness of the work is furnished by the article entitled 'Abendmahl' (The Lord's Supper), which occupies forty-five out of eighty pages in the first number. The subject is treated by three specialists; Cremer writes on the Scripture teaching as to the institution

<sup>2</sup> Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. London: Williams & Norgate.

of the ordinance, its purpose and its meaning. Loofs contributes a full historical survey of church doctrine on this vexed question; Rietschel revises the late Dr. Stähelin's article on the observance of the Lord's Supper in the Churches of the Reformation, whilst the modes of celebration in the Ancient Church and in the Roman Catholic Church respectively are reserved for discussion in later articles on the 'Eucharist' and the 'Mass.'

Dr. Cremer lightly passes over the objections of critics like Paulus and Strauss, who cast doubt on the accuracy of the Gospel narratives, and quotes with hearty approval the judgment of Beyschlag: 'The institution of the Lord's Supper is the most certain of all the certainties about Jesus that tradition has preserved for us.' At much greater length the views of more modern critics are discussed: Jülicher and Spitta deny that at the farewell supper Jesus intended to institute a rite which His disciples were afterwards to celebrate, and their denial is based upon the variations in the Gospel narratives, special attention being called to the fact that the words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' are found only in the accounts given by St. Luke and St. Paul. In reply, Dr. Cremer bases an important and forceful argument on the words of St. Paul: 'I received of (*ἀπὸ*, not *παρὰ*) the Lord that which I also delivered unto you,' etc. (1 Cor. xi. 23). If the apostle at his baptism (comp. Acts ii. 42, 46, ix. 19, xxii. 16) received 'from the Church as from the Lord' what he afterwards taught to the Corinthians concerning the Lord's Supper, its institution and its obligation, then his clear and emphatic witness carries us back to a date twenty years earlier than the writing of this confessedly genuine letter, and shows that among the first generation of believers 'no other opinion ever prevailed than that Christ had appointed the Holy Supper as an ordinance for His Church.'

The omission of the words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' from the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark is rightly held to be of little importance when due weight is given to the mention of 'the covenant' in *all* the accounts in connexion with the giving of the cup. The disciples could not possibly understand Christ's words, 'This is My blood of the covenant,' to mean that the 'giving' was to be limited to them, whilst His reference to the 'many' in the following clause renders such an interpretation even more unlikely. The words, as they stand, unquestionably include the thought

of an arrangement made for the 'many' (comp. John xvii. 20). The silence of St. John needs no further explanation than that which is suggested by the plan and purpose of his Gospel, which assumes acquaintance with the facts related by the other evangelists. No explanation of the significance of the Lord's Supper can be regarded as satisfactory, unless it includes all the words of Christ as they are recorded 'in *all* our sources'; but the difficulties of some critics are shown to have their origin not in so-called discrepancies in the narratives, but in erroneous views of the person and work of Christ: 'The reference of the Lord's Supper to the death of Christ is held to be impossible,' and this because 'the reference to the death of Christ involves acceptance of the view which, without exception, the New Testament writers give of the person of Christ.'

The method adopted by Dr. Buhl in his short biography of *Aaron* is an illustration of the influence which the Higher Criticism is likely to exert upon writers of the lives of Old Testament heroes. 'In all the sources of the Pentateuch the prominence of this eminent man is equally emphasized, but in some details the several portraits have characteristics of their own.' Accordingly, the passages relating to Aaron in the Jehovistic and Elohist documentary sources are first examined, afterwards those which are found in the so-called Priest-codex. The conclusion arrived at is that 'in both the documentary sources, J and E, the priesthood of Aaron is recognised, although when the tabernacle is mentioned, only Moses and his assistant, Joshua, are named' (Ex. xxxiii. 11).

Dr. Caspar Gregory furnishes an interesting sketch of the life and work of his friend and collaborateur, Dr. Ezra Abbot, one of the best known of the American company of New Testament Revisers. Two of his books are selected for special praise. *The Literature of the Doctrine of a Future Life* is said to be 'the best bibliography extant on any subject,' the 5300 titles given having been copied in most cases from the original works, and being often accompanied by notes indicating the position of the author or the history of the book; *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* is described as 'containing very important contributions to this question, and amongst others the best which had then appeared on the relation of Justin to the Fourth Gospel.' The article closes with a graceful tribute to the

memory of the scholar with whom Dr. Gregory had six years' happy fellowship during the preparation of the Prolegomena to the eighth edition of Tischendorf's *New Testament*: 'If the book has enjoyed the favour of the critics, this is owing to the kindly

counsel and the wise hand of my sainted friend. He was one of the most learned, upright, genial, and modest men the world has ever known.'

J. G. TASKER.

Wesleyan College, Handsworth.

## At the Literary Table.

### THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

THE INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY. HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. BY GEORGE PARK FISHER, D.D., LL.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. Post 8vo, pp. xv + 583. 12s.) It has now become clear that whatever else the editors of the International Theological Library demand of their authors, they demand writing that can be read. When Dr. Driver's own *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* appeared, this was at once recognised as a meritorious and most unexpected feature of it, that it could be read without effort. Dr. Newman Smyth's *Ethics* and Dr. Bruce's *Apologetics* followed, and it grew gradually clearer that a living nervous English style was to be a feature not of one volume only, but of the whole series. This is the fourth volume. And this is its first and most unmistakable characteristic. To write a History of Christian Doctrine from the Apostolic Age to the end of the Nineteenth Century, touching upon all the great doctrines and all the leading men, and keep it within the compass of one moderate volume, was no easy task itself. But Professor Fisher has accomplished that; and he has written it not only so that we can read it, but so attractively that we cannot help reading it. And yet he has dealt with his materials at first hand, translating, sifting, judging in every instance for himself.

That, then, is the first feature of Professor Fisher's *History of Christian Doctrine*, and it is more than we either know or acknowledge. The second prominent characteristic is its scientific fairness. Tennyson says he sings because he must: no doubt Dr. Fisher writes lucidly because he cannot help it. But this is no accidental thing. The author is aware of it, has kept himself alive to the necessity of it from page to page; and, when he

writes his preface, claims it as his own. 'The primary end,' he says, 'has been to present in an objective way, and in an impartial spirit, the course of theological thought respecting the religion of the Gospel. Whatever faults or defects may belong to the work, the author can say with a good conscience that nothing has been consciously inserted or omitted under the impulse of personal bias or prejudice. The precept of Othello is applicable to attempts to delineate theological teachers and their systems—

Nothing extenuate  
Nor set down aught in malice.'

Take it for all in all, we have not seen a History of Christian Doctrine like this before. It differs as the poles from the dull dogmatic works of the German historians, on whom we hitherto have had to lean.

STUDIA BIBLICA ET ECCLESIASTICA. VOL. IV. (Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press*. 8vo, pp. 324. 12s. 6d.) The Cambridge *Texts and Studies* (of which two parts are issued this month) and the Oxford *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* are really identical in intention, and probably both caught their conception from the famous *Texte und Untersuchungen*. The only difference between them is that the Cambridge Series appears in unbound parts, as the *Texte* do, while the Oxford Series comes out in well-bound volumes. And if there are disadvantages in the Oxford method, there is this advantage that the papers may be almost as short or almost as long as you please. Only one of the five papers which this fourth volume contains could have been issued in the *Texts and Studies*, for only Mr. Watson's 'St. Cyprian' is *long enough* for that. Yet should we not regret it exceedingly if the