

The dominion of sin had been broken, and the kingdom of God was being set up, but the work was not yet fully accomplished. After Christ's death the kingdom came with more power, and more entirely swayed their lives. Christ taught that the kingdom comes gradually and secretly without being observed of men. It was like the unobserved growing of the seed, or the silent working of the leaven. At first it rules in one or more departments of our lives, and day by day its boundaries are extended, until God rules the whole. This gradual extension is noted in the refrain of the hymn, which in successive verses advances from 'All of self and none of Thee,' through 'Some of self and some of Thee,' and 'Less of self and more of Thee,' to 'None of self and all of Thee.' Paul had almost reached the goal when he exclaimed, 'To me to live is Christ.'

III. THE CHRISTIAN PRAYER FOR THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM.—It was the condition of Israel

which made the pious Jew pray for the coming of Messiah's kingdom. One common form of such prayer was, 'May He shortly cause His kingdom to come.' Christ commended the spirit, and taught His disciples to as earnestly desire the coming of the kingdom, both in their own hearts and in the hearts of others. This petition would seem to have more reference to the person using the prayer. The following petition refers to others, 'Thy will be done on *earth* as it is in heaven.' The true Christian who looks at his own rebellious heart, or at the slow progress of God's reign in the earth, must earnestly desire that God's kingdom may come. But it is not enough to desire it: one must pray for it. It must be our daily petition. By this prayer we put ourselves into sympathy with God, who longs to bring in the kingdom. And that can only be as His people desire and pray for it. Our prayers have thus a real work to accomplish in bringing in God's kingdom.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Mount of Transfiguration.

I HAVE read Dr. Grosart's comments on my recent paper on the Transfiguration in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES with considerable surprise. My esteemed friend and I must just 'agree to differ' regarding the place where the event occurred; for he has not convinced me, as I have not succeeded in convincing him. I had the impression that no one now believed Tabor to be the Mount of Transfiguration; and that in the judgment of all the leading modern writers on Palestine, such as Ritter, Robinson, Stanley, Trench, Tristram, Conder, Farrar, etc. etc. etc., Hermon was considered to be the scene of the Divine manifestation, either the top of it, or some retired spot up its side. I find that I have been mistaken; that my good friend, for one, with characteristic courage and loyalty, clings to the old tradition. It seems to me still, however, that the familiar arguments, which I cannot repeat over again here, in favour of Hermon and against Tabor, in spite of Dr. Grosart's ingenious assertions—are irresistible. Of course in a matter which is not absolutely certain, and which is in dispute, neither Dr. Grosart nor I should dogmatise.

I had no wish to do so; I merely expressed my own conviction. My *primary* object, in the paper in question, was not the identification of the locality of the Transfiguration, but the *certification of the fact*. A rationalistic school has resolved the Transfiguration into a dream or vision, or myth, or into a poetic imitation of the transfiguration of Moses—or into an actual occurrence with mythical embellishments. And by circumstantial evidence, drawn from a combination of real coincidences, in the locality now almost universally regarded as the scene of it, I wished to show that the event had actually happened, as narrated by the Evangelists.

But though this was my primary object, I cannot help saying that it seems to me that our leading writers on the Transfiguration have been led by a true instinct to locate the event on Mount Hermon. We might naturally expect that an event which was the lifting up of Christ in glory before the eyes of the whole human race should have taken place on the border-line between the Jews and Gentiles, where the religion of Christ left its narrow home to become the religion of the world; and in close sequence in the same region to Peter's confession of the Divinity of Christ, and the prophecy

of Christ Himself regarding the future greatness of His Church. The other glorified appearances of Christ, described in the New Testament, took place, not within the bounds of Judea or Galilee, but beyond them—the appearance to Paul at Damascus, and to John in Patmos. The fixing of the scene of the Transfiguration on Hermon, on the threshold of the Holy Land, would, therefore, be in keeping with these manifestations. Further, there would be a deep harmony between our Lord's talking with the celestial visitants of His exodus or 'decease at Jerusalem' on the top or side of Hermon, with the conversation which He had with the disciples at the foot of Hermon, at Cæsarea Philippi, about His going up to Jerusalem to be crucified and set at naught. This was the critical era in the life of our Lord. It was at the foot of Hermon that He first indicated the great change that was to come over His life, and that His Father's business led Him to Gethsemane and Calvary, which were henceforth to be always in sight. What more natural, then, than that at the top or side of Hermon He should have His Spirit cheered by the heavenly vision, and His disciples' faith in Him confirmed by a sight of the glory that was to follow the suffering, and to be wrought out by it. And methinks we have an after-glow of the Transfiguration when Jesus descended from the Mount, and walked away with His disciples from Cæsarea Philippi on the road to Jerusalem, and we are distinctly told that as they followed, they were amazed and afraid—as the people in the camp of Israel were when they saw the shining face of Moses. All these coincidences seem to me to make it exceedingly probable that the Transfiguration took place on Hermon.

I cannot obviously discuss in full all the details of Dr. Grosart's comments. Let me simply notice the most prominent. I repeat the fact, that Hermon is a snow mountain, on which the snow continues more or less all the year round. It would not be necessary for our Lord to ascend to the actual top to find snow. At the time of His visit to Cæsarea Philippi there would be snow on the slopes, more than 3000 feet below the highest summit. I was at the foot of Hermon at the end of March, and there was deep snow in the upper ravines at a height of about 6000 feet. Jesus took the disciples up into a high mountain apart by themselves; and St. Mark tells us that Christ's 'garments were shining

exceeding white as snow'; and I cannot help thinking that this direct comparison of Christ's garments with snow—and the association of the mentioning of snow with the climbing of a high mountain—is not 'a grotesque element,' or a 'pseudo-realism,' but one of those incidental picturesque touches which indicate the verisimilitude of the narrative—the harmonious local colouring of the scene.

Of course there are clouds upon Mount Tabor, such as Dr. Grosart says he saw, and was enveloped in. But the sacred narrative refers to a particular kind of cloud; to a cloud that comes quickly and departs quickly, such as is peculiar to lofty, and especially snow-clad, mountains, and rests upon them alone, when all the inferior heights are clear. For I hold that, in the economy of miracle, the cloud was a natural phenomenon appropriate to the place, and the Shechinah was the tabernacle of Christ's flesh transfigured within it. Major Conder says, in his *Tent Work in Palestine*, vol. i. p. 265: 'There is one remarkable peculiarity of Hermon, namely, the extreme rapidity of the formation of cloud on the summit. In a few minutes a thick cap forms over the top of the mountain, and as quickly disperses and entirely disappears. In the accounts of our Lord's Transfiguration, we read that whilst staying at Cæsarea Philippi He retired with His disciples to a "high mountain apart"; and there can be but little doubt that some part of Hermon, and very probably the summit, was intended. From the earliest period the mountain has been a sacred place. . . . This solitary peak seems wonderfully appropriate for the scene of so important an event; and in this connexion the cloud-formation is most interesting, if we remember the cloud which suddenly overshadowed the apostles, and as suddenly cleared away, when they found "no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves."'

I did not limit the 'booths' on the housetops at Baniyas to that spot. I could not have done so, for I saw them elsewhere in Palestine, though not at Tabor. I only remarked that it was a most interesting coincidence that there should be at the foot of Hermon such 'booths'; and that Peter might have seen them before ascending the mountain with our Lord, and that in all probability they might have suggested to him the booths or tabernacles, to which he referred when on the hill.

I am astonished that one, so well informed on all antiquarian subjects as Dr. Grosart, should

assert that the worship of sacred trees at Banias or Cæsarea Philippi is 'an anachronism'—that is, that this peculiar worship was not in existence when our Lord visited the spot, and that the sticking of rags to such trees is an Arab and comparatively modern observance. Every student of anthropology and folklore will assure him, on the contrary, that it is one of the very oldest of all superstitions. It was an essential part of the Baal- or nature-worship, which existed at the source of the Jordan in the times of the primitive Canaanites; and the hanging of the shreds of clothing on the trees at Banias, which I saw, was only a very late survival of it. Let Dr. Grosart read Dr. Frazer's *Golden Bough*, or Professor Robertson Smith's chapter on Sacred Trees in his *Religion of the Semites*, or Tylor's books on Anthropology and Primitive Culture, and he will find innumerable testimonies to the great antiquity of the custom I have alluded to. I did not instance this remarkable custom at the foot of Hermon to institute an impossible comparison with our Lord's miracle, but merely to show that the place, by a curious coincidence, had been sacred to the healing art from time immemorial; that the people had a simple, childlike faith in supernatural power, such as the father of the lunatic child manifested when he said, 'Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief'; and that there was thus on the spot an atmosphere of belief, as it were, favourable for the working of a true miracle, as contrasted with the supposititious ones which the people wished in their own nature-worship.

Of course the same things often affect different minds differently; and Achilles' shield has always two sides. But Dr. Grosart must not run away with the idea that, by his pleasant acid, he has obliterated all my 'water-marks.' I see them still as clear and significant as ever. I am sorry that they have been of no use to him, though they may be, I trust, to others. Having had this little tussle with the foils with the buttons on, let us now shake hands like good friends, and cry 'Quits'!

HUGH MACMILLAN.

*Greenock.*

## Ἄρπαγμος.

PHILIPPIANS ii. 6.

PROFESSOR BEET has done me the honour of courteously replying in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of

August last to an article in *The Thinker* of April, in which I sought to justify Lightfoot's view of ἄρπαγμος (Phil. ii. 6) against the Professor's criticism in *The Expositor*, THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and his own commentary on the passage. My article was elaborate and detailed, possibly too much so: Dr. Beet's reply is brief and somewhat general, probably not too much so. His opinion is that I have done nothing to controvert his view. The only adequate rejoinder on my part would be (as it appears to me) the reproduction of the article; but, as this is impossible, I must now leave the verdict in the hands of those who are sufficiently interested in the subject to read the article and the reply side by side.

J. MASSIE.

*Mansfield College, Oxford.*

## The 'History of Religion.'

IF anyone is seeking a compact scientific manual to the introduction of the study of the religions of the world, he may be thankful to hear of this book. It will be an inducement to such a one to know that this is not a ponderous tome either in bulk or in style. Some 438 pp. octavo of very clear readable type enable this author to discourse of all the great religions of the world in a way that is clear, succinct, and interesting to a degree. Its value is also greatly enhanced to the beginner by the fact that Dr. Menzies has added to each chapter a short list of books where the particular subject may be more intimately studied.

Our author starts with his own definition of religion, which, however, he makes good as against Max Müller and Herbert Spencer. Religion he takes as 'the worship of the unseen powers from a sense of need.' He further assumes that the religions of the world are one and the development continuous. He adopts, of course, the general conclusion of students of his science that while there may be isolated instances of degeneration, there is no ground for the theory of a fall. And yet he records the existence of tribes where civilisation has degenerated, and admits the possibility that religion may also decay. Fetichism, indeed, is

<sup>1</sup> *History of Religion.* By Allan Menzies, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Andrews. (Murray.)

only and always the result of decay from a higher form of religion.

With this definition and assumption he takes up in Part I. The Religion of the Early World. This he sketches in its development in faith and in practice until he can record the growth of the national feelings, and with these that of the national religion. In the discussion as to what in man's environment first drew out his feelings in religion, Dr. Menzies sides with Hartmann, or rather with Pfeleiderer, as against Müller, and finds that 'with the exception of the doctrine about death and the abode of spirits, we must regard the worship of nature as the root of the world's religion.'

Part II. is taken up with The Isolated National Religions. Part III. with those of the Semitic groups. (The bulk of this section goes, of course, to the story of Israel's religion. We have a very readable résumé in a remarkably short compass of the 'critical' story of Israel's religion.) Part IV. is occupied with the religions of the Aryan group.

The concluding section is allotted to the Universal Religion. And here the only chapter is that on Christianity. Here the writer has, of course, to observe the limitations of his science, and seeks to make his statement 'such as the reasonable adherent of other religions will feel to be warranted.' This restriction he follows, perhaps, more closely than some of us may think necessary, and yet we read that Christ's person counts for more in 'his religion than that of any other religious founder in his, and necessarily becomes an object of faith to all who enter the communion. The doctrine does not produce its specific effect apart from the person of Jesus. . . . Jesus was more than a teacher . . . He appears as the true Messiah, in whom all human wants are met and all human hopes fulfilled.'

One cannot read the book through without arriving at a new and higher sense of the perfection of beauty that is in Christ. And this he receives not by any depreciation of the other ways in which God has led man, but by the kindly exhibition of their successes and failures. Because these nations also were seeking after Him, we realise something of the measure of the fulness in which God reveals Himself in Jesus of Nazareth.

J. HAY DEAS.

Stonehouse.

## An Illustration.

'What I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light.'  
—MATT. X. 27.

THESE words not only enshrine for us a great spiritual law, without obedience to which we cannot be Christ's disciples, but there seems to be in them a suggestion still deeper and more wide-reaching. They are a prophecy of promise and a whisper of hope. Do they not constitute Christ's own answer to those bitter problems of life that press upon us all—the blighted hopes, the unceasing struggle, the strong dashed down in the first sweetness of success? I remember once seeming to receive His reply, as I walked along a quiet road, just after sunset. There was a wonderful sky—huge masses of sombre cloud overspread its whole surface, save just on the horizon, where, on the very verge, was one small clear space, lit by a bright golden glow, that, later, changed to burnished silver, against which one could count the very twigs of the trees.

Does not that sky, I said, present a parable of many lives? All their days on earth full of darkness and questioning, unable to make out even the outline of objects around them, still less to see the guiding posts that mark the path for others, may it not be that at last, without any gradual illumination in which we on earth may share, they may, just like the dark line that edges that mass of cloud, merge suddenly into the clear radiance of eternal day, to understand, and for the first time to utter in the light, what they have been taught in darkness?

G. CURRIE MARTIN.

*Reigate.*

## The Galatia of St. Paul's Epistle.

I AM most grateful to Professor Findlay for his review of my *Church in the Roman Empire*, by which he helped me to correct sundry inaccuracies and faults. His recent six arguments are known to me from your clear summary in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

I. I quite agree with him that 'the "region of Phrygia and Galatia" points to a new region of travel.' His argument is here directed against a fault in my book, page 77, where I accepted an

explanation given by Mynster, Renan,<sup>1</sup> etc., but inconsistent with my own view stated in the same chapter. It is corrected in preface, third edition (with acknowledgments to Professors Findlay and Weise), and in the text, fourth edition. In *St. Paul the Traveller*, I have tried to show how strongly this argument tells *in favour* of the South-Galatian theory.

2. Professor Findlay thinks I group Galatians with Thessalonians. That is not so. I accept fully the grouping of the Epistles in four classes, of which 1 and 2 Thessalonians are the first class. In my *St. Paul*, I explain on external grounds the great step that separates Thessalonians from the period of the four great Epistles. Professor Findlay goes beyond the facts, if he speaks of 'the accepted place (of Galatians) beside Romans.' The only opinion that can be fairly called 'accepted' is the general agreement of conception, aim, tone, and thought in the class Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, which I assign to *the third journey*; and Dr. Clemen states as the *gewöhnliche Ansicht* (which comes near 'accepted view') that order of the four Epistles, which I maintain, and which Professor Findlay denies. He follows Lightfoot's strange error in dating Galatians after Corinthians; I hope he does not imitate his other even stranger error in placing Philippians before Colossians.

3. If there is anything clearer than another among the difficulties of the period, it seems to me to be that the policy in Iconium, etc., was Paul's. Professor Findlay says that it was Paul and Barnabas's jointly. We differ absolutely. He says that in Galatians it is never 'suggested that the Galatians knew' Barnabas. On the contrary, one of the time-honoured arguments (not one that I laid the slightest stress on) has been that Barnabas is alluded to as a person familiar to the Galatians.

4. I have neither said, nor implied, nor thought that Paul wrote 'his letters only to churches of the first rank.' The church to which Paul was writing was for the moment first in his mind. The remarks

<sup>1</sup> 'So ist dieselbe nicht neu, hat vielmehr schon an Mynster, an Renan u. a. Vertreter gehabt,' as Dr. Zöckler says in his polemic, *Theolog. Stud. Krit.* 1895, p. 68.

under this head are away from the question. And Pontus is 'beyond Galatia' only to those who, like Professor Findlay, look from the west: in fact, Pontus is naturally a much earlier recipient of the gospel than Galatia; and, when 1 Peter i. 1 was written (about A.D. 80), I believe (supported by Dr. Zöckler's powerful arguments, North-Galatian as he is) that there was no church in Ancyra and the other great cities of North Galatia.

5. The argument from Paul's 'having fulfilled the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum' would prove, on Professor Findlay's method, that Paul had preached in Commagene, Cappadocia, Lycia, Caria, etc., districts in closer connexion with the great line of communication from Syria to the west than was North Galatia!

6. The final argument puts the whole question in brief. He supposes that 'this region was lost to the Pauline mission.' In other words, to make the North-Galatian theory possible, he has to suppose that North Galatia entered into Christian history for the space of eight or nine words in Acts, received an Epistle, and again disappeared. I am again in perfect agreement with Professor Findlay: he has taken the only way. But is this not a slander on his Galatians? Charity thinketh no evil. Professor Findlay should be charitable to the creation of his own brain.

Dr. Zöckler, the latest North-Galatian champion in Germany, proves conclusively that Ancyra did not receive Christianity at an early period; and he therefore rejects the view held by Lightfoot and Findlay, and declares that the Galatian churches were at Persinus and some villages of the western corner of Galatia (quoting Dr. Chase and others as agreeing with him).

As to the intention of Luke in Acts, I cherish the hope of converting Professor Findlay to a higher opinion of St. Luke's merits as a historian; and I would conclude by repeating a sentence of his, merely inserting in it the word 'not.' 'It is *not* possible to press too far the correspondence between Acts and the Epistles' (provided, of course, that one does so in a rational way).

W. M. RAMSAY.

*The University, Aberdeen.*