

and position of Nicodemus. As a Pharisee, he had not submitted to the baptism of John. He had not confessed his need of repentance, of which it was the symbol. Likewise, as a Pharisee, he had not admitted the claims of Jesus as Messiah. He regarded Him as a teacher—a teacher from God, but not as the Messiah of God. His attitude as to these two questions was the attitude of his class, and it hindered him and his associates from entrance into the kingdom. No one could enter, without experience of the change of mind symbolised by the baptism of John, *i.e.* without *Repentance*. No one could enter, without the spiritual experience which gave power to see in Jesus of Nazareth the Christ of God, *i.e.* without *Faith*. Life arising out of repentance and faith, is the life of the kingdom. JOHN REID, M.A.

Dundee.

II.

It seems to me that the words addressed by our Lord to Nicodemus about the need of being “born of water and the Spirit” may be best explained by supposing a reference in them to the words of the Baptist, who contrasted himself as only *baptizing with water* with the Messiah who was to *baptize with the Holy Ghost*. Our Lord had just assured Nicodemus that unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. The question then arises, How is this new birth brought about? And the answer is, By the power of the Spirit.

This new birth is just another name for that “baptism with the Spirit” of which John spoke. John’s “baptism with water” was only a preparation for this more excellent baptism. The baptism of John is spoken of as “the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins.” John’s teaching was to the effect that all men alike, Pharisees as well as others, needed repentance, and the baptism which he administered to those who came to him professing repentance was a pledge of the forgiveness which God will bestow on all who are truly penitent. When our Lord tells Nicodemus, then, that he must be born of water, He tells him that *he*, Pharisee though he is, needs the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. But He tells him also that, for actual entrance into the kingdom of God, something more is needed, something which John’s baptism only prefigured—the more excellent baptism with the Spirit.

While a reference to *Christian* baptism seems here altogether out of place, a reference such as I have supposed to John’s baptism is not at all out of place, and accounts for the peculiar language employed by our Lord. It is to be noted that Wendt, while holding it probable that there is an allusion here to Christian baptism, thinks that there was no mention of water in the “Johannine source,” and that this allusion was an addition of the “bearbeitende Evangelist,” the *deus ex machina* of whom he makes such liberal use.

ROBERT A. MITCHELL.

Aberdeen.

A Friendly Reply to Professor Kennedy.

BY THE REV. CANON T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., OXFORD.

THIS is but an incomplete reply; life is too short to write complete replies even to friendly reviews. Nor does Professor Kennedy need to be assured that any assistance which he can give in the work of self-criticism will be valued by the present writer. Perhaps, however, he will see upon reflection that his review does not deal with the points which most required to be mentioned. It is precisely “the more positive and permanent results” (if such exist) which needed (as I humbly think) to be emphasised, because in so many quarters a “dead set” has been made against the book reviewed, and that, whether avowedly or not, upon apologetic

theological grounds. But Professor Kennedy passes these over, in order to show why my “thesis” (the term is, of course, as the reader of the book will see scarcely accurate—“thesis” and “conclusion” are not synonymous) cannot be accepted. This omission is very serious, because it keeps the reader of the review in ignorance of the fact that my argument, at any rate, proves very much, even if conceivably not as much as I hoped. It would be perfectly possible for any one to construct out of my material a book which would be more acceptable at present than my own to most of the younger critical English students. Professor

Kennedy is not consciously unfair, but I can hardly help criticising the omission referred to. With regard to his detailed criticisms, I am grateful to him for so candidly expressing his own bias (on p. 248, no. 3); he has certainly hit the mark. When Professor Davidson's *Old Testament Theology* appears, I may return to this subject. At the foot of the first column of the same page, Professor Kennedy has, however, perhaps made a little mistake. He may be more familiar with the *Bampton Lectures* than I am just now, but I should have thought that what he said applied to some extent to the view of Ps. li. expressed by Professor Driver in his *Introduction*, and not to me. On page 249 (col. 2, foot) I notice a regrettable slip. Professor Kennedy writes that "one very material fact is carefully kept in the background." Such an expression as "carefully" ought not, as I conceive, to be used. Does Professor Kennedy really mean it? I cannot believe it. Professor Kennedy may have studied Zoroastrianism more than I have done myself; but, honestly, I cannot help doubting it. Meantime, until convinced that I have misunderstood my authorities, I am bound to repeat that "it is a correct inference from the notices of the classical authors that the leading ideas of the Avesta were prevalent before the close of the Achæmenian period, and, if prevalent at all, had doubtless been so for long"; and that "it will also be disputed by few critics that in the main the ideas and sacred texts of Achæmenian Magdaworship are reproduced in the Avesta (see *e.g.* *Oxford Z. A.* i.; *Intro.* p. liii)."

Professor Kennedy adduces M. Darmesteter against me. Either he has not read the passage of *Bampton Lectures* from which I have quoted, or else he has borrowed his reference from me, to turn it against myself.¹ Of course, the former hypothesis is preferable; but it suggests that Professor Kennedy has, here at least, imperfectly read the book. I am, at any rate, glad that he does not urge as an objection the late date of the Avesta in its present form; indolent critics, like M. Renan, are fond of excusing themselves from considering the possible influence of Zoroastrianism on this ground. Very little, in fact, is generally known to biblical critics of the recent works of Zend scholars (there are others besides M.

¹ Perhaps Professor Kennedy hardly estimates the bearing of M. Darmesteter's words "taken as a whole." It is very honest of him to quote them, as they are against his own view.

Darmesteter!); they perhaps dip into some convenient book, and there is an end of the matter. Some of my reviewers lay more stress on my view of possible Zoroastrian influences on Judaism than I do myself. But this is all the more reason why such scholars should follow the example of thoroughness which I have at least endeavoured to set.

With regard to Professor Kennedy's criticisms on the use made of the reported oppression and captivity of the Jews under Artaxerxes Ochus, I will simply remark that, if I err in crediting this report, I err in excellent company. Professor Kennedy brackets me with Graetz; is he ironical? I have not myself, in the *Bampton Lectures*, quoted Graetz on the subject referred to, but only on the spuriousness of a passage of Hecateus. But if the book were not so easily accessible, I would quote from Th. N[öldeke] and W. R. S[mith] in their articles "Persia" and "Psalms" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (vols. xviii. and xx.). Gutschmid's works I have not myself at hand. But it is certain that this very sceptical critic agreed with Nöldeke, and so does a rising French theologian, Henri Bois (*Revue de Théologie*, Lausanne, 1891). Nor does Gelzer, to whom Professor Kennedy refers, deny the "absolute sincerity and extraordinary love of truth" shown by both Julius Africanus and Eusebius. As to Stade, whom my friendly reviewer boldly adduces against me, it should be noticed that the story of the defilement of the temple by Bagôses is, according to him, "raised above all doubt." It is by a mere slip that Professor Kennedy has not mentioned this; but, for all that, he evidently ought to have mentioned it, if Stade is really so "critical." Nor will the reader of the review be likely to guess that this same Stade does not venture to doubt that there is something at the bottom of the report of the chastisement of the Jews by Artaxerxes Ochus.

Into Professor Kennedy's other criticisms I have no time to enter with the fulness which they deserve. I should be perfectly willing to qualify to a greater extent in an introduction to the Old Testament. For instance—(1) I would willingly give more space to the view that Psalm lxxii. is a dramatic lyric, written in the character of a contemporary of Solomon, and presupposing the post-Exilic idealisation of that king,—a lyric intended, conceivably, to illustrate a prose life of Solomon. (2) The passage quoted on p. 248 from *B.L.* p. S4, has to do with the reason for the rare occurrence

of *elyōn* in certain pre-Exilic writings. After what I had written on the *subsidiary* character of the linguistic argument, I was hardly likely to give a reviewer such a handle against me as Professor Kennedy supposes. The fact that the passages in Numbers and Deuteronomy are poetical is adduced to illustrate the theory that the pre-Exilic prophets and narrators discountenanced the term. (3) I notice with interest a hint that he is not really so "moderate" as one might suppose. For whereas Professor Driver thinks that "the psalms alluding to the king (Ps. ii., xx., xxi., xxviii., lxi., lxiii., lxxii.) will presumably be pre-Exilic" (*Introd.*, p. 363; in another sentence, he says the same of Ps. cx.), Professor Kennedy only claims that they "must, I do not say exclusively, but chiefly, be assigned a home before the fall of the Hebrew monarchy" (p. 279). Altogether, I am heartily pleased with the spirit of this reviewer. His remarks on p. 246, col. 2, together with some

similar observations of Professor Whitehouse in the *Critical Review*, help to efface the indignant sense of injustice which recent experience has aroused within me. But until a reviewer is able to place himself nearer my point of view, and join with me in solving the complicated problem of the Psalter, it will not be likely that reviews will give me much help. For, after all, the ordinary outside criticisms may be supposed to have occurred long ago to myself.

I cannot help adding a word of sincerest thanks to Professor Kennedy for his generous words in his review in the *Thinker* for February, which has only just reached me. Such language humbles me more than I can say. In return, let me express my high sense of the scholarly character of Professor Kennedy's criticisms. We are all, I hope, moving on, and he may live to understand my own point of view as thoroughly as I, from experience, can understand his. (Compare my reply to Professors Davison and Kennedy in the *Thinker* for April.)

Expository Papers.

Isaiah ii.-iv.

A DISCOURSE BY AN OLD TESTAMENT PROPHET
FROM A POPULAR TEXT.

THE text (chap. ii. 2-4) is a prediction of the glory of Zion in the latter days; the sermon (chap. ii. 5-iv. 6), a warning addressed to the people, that by their own carelessness and presumption they were acting in such a manner as to exclude themselves from the promised blessing.

Note first the text (ii. 2-4). A comparison with the parallel passage in Micah (iv. 1-4) suggests the thought that Isaiah here quotes from his contemporary, or that both prophets cite in a similar connection the prediction of an older prophet. One gathers from the use which Isaiah makes of it, that, whatever its source, it was a prediction universally accepted as of Divine authority. A day was coming when God's presence should be so clearly revealed in Judah and Jerusalem that all the nations of the world coming under the influence of Divine truth would resort thither. Then wars should cease, and a universal reign of peace and righteousness begin. Prophet and people both believed this,—to both it was an ideal which could be realised,—but they held their belief with a difference.

Isaiah believed in it, and in quoting the popular prophecy as the text of his exhortation applied it thus: There is God's scheme of grace. He has chosen Zion. The glory of the Lord, consisting of truth, righteousness, and peace, is to abide here on His holy mountain, and that Divine light cannot be hid, but must beam forth till it enlighten every land. This is not the dream of the Idealist. You may realise now the future glory by trying to make it a present fact. This is the essential condition of the promised glory of Zion: God dwelling among His people. Obedient to His teachings, they are to live and move in the light of Divine truth. That Divine light is not something to be idly waited for. It is here. Walk now in the light which shines round about you, and already the kingdom of God is come.

The people, believing in the prediction, read and applied it differently. Ignoring its practical spiritual aspect, they looked upon it as a promise of outward national prosperity. Like the prophet, they believed that it might be speedily fulfilled, but only in a narrow, selfish, worldly spirit, and their anticipations led to an empty vanity, under whose influence, forgetting their responsibilities, they thought altogether of their privileges as the favourites of heaven. They read in the outward prosperity