

explain certain phenomena which appear to me to confirm the theory of the Egyptian origin of the Jahwistic tradition. For instance, in Gn 13¹⁰ the tract of land by the Jordan is declared to be equal for fertility to the garden of Jahweh, like the land of Egypt. Again, the S. Palestinian Shur lies, according to Gn 25¹⁸, eastward from Egypt; according to 43³² the Egyptians may not eat with the Hebrews, because the Egyptians consider themselves defiled thereby; according to 46³⁴ the Israelites, as shepherds who are an abomination to the Egyptians, have the land of Goshen assigned them to dwell in. With the geographical vagueness of the references to Palestine contrasts favourably the certainty in the localizing of the neighbouring districts of Goshen and the Eastern Delta, nay, even of more distant Arabian maritime districts, with which the Egyptians of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties maintained active relations. Hagar in her flight came upon 'the fountain in the wilderness, the fountain on the way to Shur; . . . wherefore that well was called Lahairoi; behold, it is between Kadesh and Bered' (Gn 16^{7, 14}).

Finally, we must emphasize also the surprising acquaintance with the conditions in Egypt, which one cannot help recognizing as a marked feature of the Jahwistic tradition. There has been much discussion of the notice in Gn 47^{20f.}, according to which Joseph was regarded as the author of the law which appropriated the whole of the soil for

the king. Modern studies in Egyptology have actually shown that theoretically the king was viewed as owner of the whole of the soil of Egypt (cf. Erman, *Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben im Alterthum*, i. 112). The usufructuary of the land was, according to Egyptian conceptions, simply a tenant by the grace of the king, and was hence bound to pay to the latter a considerable portion of the produce. This impost might be heightened according to circumstances, until it might reach such an amount as to make the lot of the ancient Egyptian peasant akin to that of the modern fellah (cf. Erman, *l.c.* i. 179, ii. 590 f.). The priests alone were exempt from such dues: 'Only the land of the priests,' thus it is that the Jahwistic narrator describes Joseph's agrarian measures, 'bought he not, for the priests had a portion which the Pharaoh gave them, therefore they sold not their land' (Gn 47²²). The situation of the priests which is thus depicted by the Jahwist, proves, then, to be in full harmony with the condition and privileges of the priesthood as hieroglyphic sources show these to have existed during the glorious eighteenth dynasty, and this supplies the proof that we owe the Jahwistic tradition to a race which knew intimately, and from personal experience, the condition of things in Egypt. Consequently, in the discussion of the questions connected with the Exodus, the Jahwist must be considered a witness of the first importance.

(To be continued.)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GALATIANS.

GALATIANS iv. 4, 5.

'When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'When the fulness of the time came.'—The ideas involved in this expression may be gathered from the context. It was 'the fulness of time.' *First*, in reference to the *Giver*. The moment had arrived which God had ordained from the beginning and foretold by His prophets for Messiah's coming. This is implied in the comparison *the promise of the Father*. *Secondly*, in reference to the *recipient*. The Gospel was withheld until the world had

arrived at mature age: law had worked out its educational purpose, and now was superseded. This educational work had been twofold: (1) *Negative*. It was the purpose of all law, but especially of the Mosaic law, to deepen the conviction of sin, and thus to show the inability of all existing systems to bring men near to God. This idea, which is so prominent in the Epistle to the Romans, appears in the context here (vv. 18, 21). (2) *Positive*. The comparison of the child implies more than a negative effect. A moral and spiritual expansion, which rendered the world more capable of apprehending the gospel than it would have been at an earlier age, must be assumed corresponding to the growth of the individual; since otherwise the metaphor would be robbed of more than half its meaning.—LIGHTFOOT.

'God sent forth His Son.'—That is, from Himself; from that station which is described in Jn 1¹: 'The Word

was *with* God.' The pre-existence of the Son is distinctly recognised by St. Paul.—SANDAY.

'**Born of a woman.**'—There is no allusion here to the miraculous conception. The phrase, 'born of a woman,' was of common use. Cf. Mt 11¹¹, 'Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist.' So here the expression is intended to bring out, not the divinity, but the true humanity of Christ.—SANDAY.

'**Born under the law.**'—This expression, to the mind of the reader of ch. 3, conveys the idea of *subjection*, of humiliation rather than eminence. 'Though He was (God's) Son,' Christ must needs 'learn His obedience' (He 5⁸). The Jewish people experienced, above all others, the power of the law to chasten and humble. Their law was to them more sensibly, what the moral law is in varying degree to the world everywhere, an instrument of condemnation. God's Son was now put under its power. As a man He was 'under law'; as a Jew He came under its most stringent application. He declined none of the burdens of His birth. He submitted not only to the general moral demands of the Divine law for men, but to all the duties and proprieties incident to His position as a man, even to those ritual ordinances which His coming was to abolish. He set a perfect example of loyalty. 'Thus it becometh us,' He said, 'to fulfil all righteousness.'—FINDLAY.

'**That He might redeem them which were under the law.**'—The redemption was not merely from the curse, but from the *bondage* of the law.—ELLCOTT.

ST. PAUL refers primarily to the Mosaic law, as at once the highest and most rigorous form of law, but extends the application to all those subject to any system of positive ordinances.—LIGHTFOOT.

'**That we might receive the adoption of sons.**'—*Receive*, not *recover*, for the redemption by Christ infinitely transcends the original child-like innocence lost by Adam. The *sonship*, through and for the sake of Jesus, the only-begotten Son. He is the Son by nature and from eternity, we become sons by grace in time. The word 'sonship' or adoption as sons is used only by St. Paul, in five passages, Ro 8^{15, 23} 9⁴, Eph 1⁵; while the term 'children of God' is more frequent. The former suits here better, as contrasted with slavery, and in distinction also from a state of mere pupillage. Both terms, 'sons' and 'children' of God, and the corresponding 'Father,' never refer in the New Testament to the natural relation of man as the creature to God as the Creator, but always to the moral and spiritual relation, which results from the new birth and the communication of the Holy Spirit.—SCHAFF.

It is certainly startling to find St. Paul drawing no essential distinction between the Law imposed upon the Jews and the kind of discipline, in many ways of course inferior, which was provided under paganism. Both were in their degrees preparatory, and both were temporary. When they had served their purpose, and when God's time was ripe, there was given to the world the revelation and the offer of sonship. The Son of God became man and was made subject to the Law, in order that He might liberate men from bondage to law—whether it were Jewish or any other—and enable them to enter upon a sonship which could not otherwise have been theirs. Adoption is the granting by an act of favour of a sonship which could not have been claimed as a matter of right.—ROBINSON.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Man in the Light of the Incarnation.

By the Rev. H. Batchelor.

1. The Incarnation implies the greatness of human nature. God has expressed His attributes in many things; in the Incarnation He has embodied *Himself*. How closely man's nature must be related to God's. He is our Father, we His offspring, not merely in figure of speech, but in reality—so really that the Incarnation of Deity in humanity became possible. We revolt at the heathen idea of God enshrined in an idol of wood or stone, but if man is the offspring of God, the Incarnation becomes credible. In all creation man alone is called God's offspring, made in His own image, and the coming of the Son of God in the flesh is the demonstration of the grandeur of his nature.

2. The Incarnation indicates the high destiny of man. The nature of a thing discloses its primary intention. From the adaptation of an organ we argue to the use for which it is designed. The eye is for light, the ear for sounds, and from the powers of man we infer the purpose of his Maker. From these we argue—(1) that our souls were intended for fellowship with God; (2) that we were framed to *work with* God, finding the model of our benevolence in the love of God; (3) that man was made for dominion and glory.

3. The Incarnation brings out the sinfulness of our race. The greatness of man's sin stands or falls with the greatness of his nature. His sinfulness towards God cannot be exaggerated. If you make him an alien, without ties of nature binding him to God, you lessen his guilt; but his high descent certified in the Incarnation increases it. According to what is sometimes said, man would be too mean by nature to be able to sin, too contemptible to be worth saving. But the assumption of our humanity by our Divine Redeemer ratifies the greatness of his relationship and of his guilt.

4. The Incarnation should inspire us with hope. Truth lies neither with those who deny man's greatness or those who underrate his sin. Were he not so great he could not be so evil. He is a ruin; but what is that? The wreck of something great. And terrible as his state is he is not beyond recovery, and the Incarnation is the Divine testimony that he can be lifted again to the fellowship from which he fell.

5. The Incarnation suggests that the perfection of our humanity is unattainable unless God dwells in us. Not that God must be incarnate in every man, but that each must have the fulness of the Divine Spirit which accompanied the Incarnation. The sinless life of Christ is nowhere ascribed to the power of the Divinity as simply incarnate in Him, but we see His human faculties actuated by the fulness of the Holy Spirit dwelling in Him. And the life of the Holy Spirit is accessible to us. Christ is thus our example, and His life is the pattern and pledge of our future perfection.

6. The Incarnation demonstrates that our souls are dear to God. His condescension is overwhelming evidence of it. No one could represent Him, He must come in His own person. Hence God 'sent forth His Son.' He had a work to do to which no other was equal. He crowned His incarnate life with His redeeming death. He not only died, but died 'for our sins.' Why this love? We are His offspring, He is our Father. He loves as a father loves his children, and the whole story of the incarnate life of our Lord proves how dear men's souls are to God.

II.

The Adoption of Sons.

By the Rev. A. C. Price, B.A.

Christ has not only bought us out of condemnation, but into God's family,—we receive the adoption of sons.

1. *The Grace of Adoption.*—Adoption is strictly a New Testament term. It signifies first the act of adopting into the family one who does not belong to it, and then the condition of the adopted one, *i.e.* sonship. The idea meets us in the Old Testament, but it is only in the New that it is fully explained to what extent we are God's sons. It is an act of pure grace on God's part. Outcasts by sin, He puts us into the relation of children.

2. *How the Sonship becomes ours.*—It comes through union with Christ, and so it is distinguished from the sonship sometimes ascribed to the whole human race. It is not by blood nor by the will of the flesh, but to as many as received Him Christ gave the right to become children of God. United with Him by faith we are accepted in Him, and so His sonship becomes ours.

3. *The Nature of the Sonship.*—It is not bestowed on us apart from Christ but in Him.

Having been crucified with Him He lives in us. Our old personality is superseded by a new, that of Christ. Henceforth His Sonship is ours, and God is His Father and our Father—ours in Him.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

The Fulness of the Time.—Time has two chapters. The Old Testament records the first. The New Testament records the beginning and predicts the ending of the second. The birth of Christ is the fulness of the first half of time. The reign of Christ is the fulness of the second half.—
MARK GUY PEARSE.

Born of a woman.—The position of women in the ancient world was, as a rule, one of deep degradation. There are some great and saintly women in ancient Israel—Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, Huldah. There are women who are socially or politically great in paganism, without being at all saintly—Semiramis, Aspasia, Sappho, and the wives and mothers of the Cæsars. But, as a rule, in antiquity woman was degraded; women were at the mercy of the caprice and the passions of men. They lived as they live to-day in the Mohammedan East, at least generally, a life in which the luxuries of a petty seclusion scarcely disguises the hard reality of their fate. And yet women were then, as now, the larger part of the human family; and one object, we may dare to say, of the Divine Incarnation, was to put woman's life on a new footing within the precincts of the kingdom of redemption, and this was done when the Redeemer Himself, God's own eternal Son, owning no earthly father, yet deigned to be 'born of a woman.' The highest honours ever attained to by, or bestowed upon, the noblest or the saintliest members of the stronger sex surely pale into insignificance when they are contrasted with this altogether unique prerogative of Mary.

The Adoption of Sons.—The old Romans, in adopting, first selected a slave; then obtained his emancipation; then, in the presence of witnesses, flung a father's mantle over him, and then registered his name among the citizens. Has not that old adoption its parallel in Christian adoption? God finds us slaves—led captive by Satan. He sets us free. He puts upon us the best robe of His Son's righteousness, and registers our names in the roll of heaven's citizens as His sons.—A. C. PRICE.

EARTH was waiting spent and restless,
With a mingled hope and fear;
And the faithful few were sighing,
'Surely, Lord, the day is near;
The Desire of all the nations,
It is time He should appear.'

Still the gods were in the temples,
But the ancient faith had fled;
And the priests stood by their altars
Only for a piece of bread;
And the oracles were silent,
And the prophets all were dead.

In the sacred courts of Zion,
Where the Lord had His abode,
There the money-changers trafficked,
And the sheep and oxen trod;
And the world, because of wisdom,
Knew not either Lord or God.

Then the spirit of the Highest
On a Virgin meek came down,
And He burdened her with blessing,
And He pained her with renown;
And He pained her with renown;
For she bare the Lord's Anointed
For His cross and for His crown.

Earth for Him had groaned and travailed
Since the ages first began;
For in Him was hid the secret
That through all the ages ran—
Son of Mary, Son of David,
Son of God, and Son of Man.

W. C. SMITH.

Sermons for Reference.

- Alford (H.), *Quebec Sermons*, vi. 88.
Batchelor (H.), *Incarnation of God*, i.
Brooks (P.), *Sermons for Festivals and Fasts*, 54.
Church (R. W.), *Message of Peace*, 29.
" " *Village Sermons*, ii. 29.
Clifford (J.), *Social Worship*, 36.
Cunningham (W.), *Sermons from 1828 to 1860*, 393.
Gibson (J. M.), *A Strong City*, 133.
Harper (F.), *Year with Christ*, 128.
Holland (H. S.), *On Behalf of Belief*, 187.
Liddon (H. P.), *Sermons ii. (Penny Pulpit)*.
Pearse (M. G.), *Gospel for the Day*, 212.
Potts (A. W.), *School Sermons*, 95.
Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, vii. 329, viii. 225.
Westcott (B. F.), *Historic Faith*, 58.
Clerical Library: Three Hundred Outlines, 172.
Studies for the Pulpit, i. 503.

'The Ritschlian Theology.'

BY THE REV. W. MORGAN, M.A., TARBOLTON.

MR. GARVIE has brought to the by no means easy task of expounding Ritschlian Theology not only keen insight and wide accurate scholarship, but also what is not less necessary, and even more rare, an open mind. He is always willing to go behind traditional dogma to the facts of revelation or experience which dogma expresses or interprets, and to entertain the question whether such facts have been presented in their purity and completeness. The result of his careful and eminently sympathetic study is a work, which for clearness, fulness, and fidelity to the sources leaves little to be desired. While intended, in the first place, for those unacquainted with German, it will prove a valuable and indeed indispensable guide to the student of German who aspires to master the original literature of what is beyond all question the most significant theological movement since the days of Schleiermacher.

Mr. Garvie has not been sparing in criticism; and yet what strikes the reader is not so much the points in which he differs from Ritschl, as the very wide agreement both in method and results.

¹ *The Ritschlian Theology: Critical and Constructive. An Exposition and an Estimate.* By Alfred E. Garvie, M.A. (Oxon.), B.D. (Glas.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899.

He frankly concedes the Ritschlian contention that traditional dogma contains elements derived from a temporary metaphysic, that metaphysical ideas often obscure historical facts, and that there is need for a new dogmatic construction. With Ritschl he rejects the Scholastic method of manipulating formulas, whether the material be derived from ecclesiastical findings or from the New Testament writings. He rejects the claim of Mysticism to a knowledge of God or of the Risen Christ; that is not mediated by historical Revelation. And, finally, he refuses to accept the traditional Christology, with its *reductio ad absurdum*, the Kenotic theory; and concedes that we must begin, not with a presupposed Divine nature as omniscient and omnipotent, but with Christ's historical life and work.

Mr. Garvie's criticism concentrates in the main round two points, and as these relate to Ritschl's *method*, his objections necessarily extend to many of the particular doctrines in Ritschl's system. To take first the objection which receives the lesser prominence, though it may not be the less important, he thinks that Ritschlians have not attached sufficient weight to the apostolic writings as an *authoritative* interpretation of Christian facts.