

guide. God continues to speak clearly and distinctly in the Bible. It is still the supreme written authority of religious belief. For religious belief does not depend upon an inspiration that keeps men free from scientific or historical error. The

processes of divine revelation, grace, and redemption have appeared to Dr. Curtis larger and more glorious, Christianity has become more genuine and real, since he found himself freed from the burden of forced interpretations.

The Missionary Methods of the Apostles.

BY THE REV. JOHN REID, M.A., DUNDEE.

It is proposed in a brief series of papers to examine the New Testament records, with reference to the missionary methods of the apostles. We begin with the form in which the gospel was presented.

In the Four Gospels we have the form in which the 'good news' was proclaimed by the Saviour Himself. The Johannine representation is now accepted as historical by an increasing number of competent critics (Wendt, Beyschlag, etc.). The light and beauty of the grace and love of God in Jesus Christ, shine there with a radiance which is the hope and glory of man for time and for eternity. If the work of the first preachers had fallen into oblivion, there could have been no question as to the form in which they proclaimed the 'glad tidings of great joy.' The Four Gospels would have been regarded as the fixed and universal types of their preaching. Every one would have concluded that the kingdom of God was their theme, and that the grace, laws, and life of that kingdom, as revealed by Christ, were the distinctive elements of their message. It was this gospel which they had heard. It was for the proclamation of this that they had been chosen (Mk 3¹⁴). It was this which they preached, when He sent them forth throughout the towns and villages of Galilee (Lk 9¹⁻⁶). It is too often forgotten that their preaching did not begin at Pentecost. The message which they delivered in these early days, must have been the message they had heard from Him. Their preaching must have been modelled on His. The oral tradition, and the form of preaching, were already taking shape during the lifetime of our Lord. The message may even have been revised and corrected by Him. Further, nothing is more certain than that it was the gospel as they heard it, which they were

commissioned to preach. They were to 'make disciples of all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have said unto you' (Mt 28^{19, 20}). Such were their 'marching orders.'

But when we read the rest of the New Testament, it does not appear, at first sight, that the earliest preachers fulfilled this definite and solemn charge. The record of the preaching of the original apostles, so far as it is given in Acts, does not contain a single reference to the kingdom of God. It is Philip, one of the seven (8¹²), and Paul (14²² 19⁸ 20²⁸ 28²³⁻³¹) who preach (*κήρυσσεν*) 'the things concerning the kingdom of God.' In the section of the New Testament following Acts, we only find general or idealised references to the kingdom of God in 2 P 1¹¹, Ja 2⁵, He 12²⁸ (possibly also in 1⁸), Rev 1⁹ 12¹⁰ (possibly also in 1⁶ 5¹⁰ 11¹⁵). It is Paul again who seems most faithful to this distinctive phrase. He refers to it thirteen times in his Epistles. The fuller record of Paul's activity which we possess, no doubt accounts in large measure for his apparent superiority in this matter.

In the Acts of the Apostles the bulk of preaching is more concerned with apologetics than evangelization. On the day of Pentecost Peter's sermon is taken up (1) with a defence of the men who spoke under the influence of the Holy Spirit (2¹⁴⁻²¹), and (2) with the proof of the Messiahship of Jesus, by the fact of the Resurrection (2²²⁻³⁶). In both parts he makes large use of O.T. predictions (Jl 2^{28, 29}, Ps 16⁸⁻¹⁰). In Ac 3-5 Peter uses the same method. It is the fact of the resurrection and the predictions of prophecy on which stress is laid. Stephen practically follows the same lines. When Paul speaks in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, he too employs the apologetic method, lays stress on the Resurrection, and

draws upon the Psalms and Prophets to prove and impress his words (Ac 13¹⁰⁻¹¹). That this was his usual method in speaking to Jews, may be seen from what is recorded of his preaching at Thessalonica (17²⁻³), at Athens (17¹⁷), at Corinth (18⁴), at Ephesus (18¹⁹ 19⁸), and at Rome (28²³). It is not too much to say that so far as preaching to Jews is concerned, this appears to be the form which was generally adopted. The teaching of Jesus as given in the Gospels seems to drop out of sight. The chief aim of the apostles appears to have been to prove the Messiahship of Jesus.

When we examine the Acts in reference to work beyond the Jews, we find that the record is exceedingly abbreviated. In Samaria, Philip 'preached Christ' (8⁵), and 'the things concerning the kingdom of God' (8¹²). To the Ethiopian eunuch (8²⁷⁻⁴⁰) he 'preached . . . Jesus,' from Is 53⁷⁻⁸. In the pre-eminent case of Cornelius, the record is more concerned with the way in which Peter is induced to go to Cornelius, than with what he said to him. In the case of Cornelius, however, Peter recognizes that there was no necessity to give information about Jesus, saying, 'Ye know the word which was published throughout all Judea' (10³⁷). When they who were scattered abroad by persecution reached Antioch, they spake to the Greeks ('Ελληνας), 'preaching the Lord Jesus' (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, 11²⁰). Throughout these passages there is a general absence of any detailed or prominent reference to what is recorded in the Four Gospels.

When we examine the Acts, again, for an account of Paul's preaching to Gentiles, we find the same general characteristic. At Paphos, the deputy desired to hear 'the word of God' (13⁷), and was 'astonished at the doctrine of the Lord' (διδασχί, 13¹²). At Philippi, it is said 'these men . . . show us the way of salvation' (16¹⁷). At Athens, Paul speaks to philosophers like a philosopher, and does not mention the name of Jesus, referring to Him as 'the man whom He hath ordained,' . . . in that He hath raised Him from the dead. Probably his mouth was closed by the burst of mockery which greeted his reference to the Resurrection (17²¹⁻³³). At Corinth, for a year and six months, he 'taught the word of God' (18¹¹). In describing his three years' work at Ephesus, he says, he had 'testified both to Jews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ' (20²¹). He again

summarizes his method in his speech before Festus and Agrippa, saying that 'he had showed unto them at Damascus, and at Jerusalem, . . . and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance' (26²⁰).

It is evident from this examination of Acts, that the gospel, as we have it in the works of the evangelists, is not presented with such prominence, or detail, as would impress a general reader. With the single exception of 'the teaching of the Lord,' which astonished the deputy at Paphos, we find no plain, outstanding indications that it formed part of the preaching of the first missionaries. If this were found to be the case, we could only say that they were 'false witnesses of God.'

It is, however, our conviction that a careful study of the records, with an adequate consideration of the conditions under which the first preachers laboured, will clearly establish the fact that they were faithful to their charge, and preached the gospel which their Master gave to them. The proofs of this are numerous, and all tend in the same direction.

1. The absence of detailed reference to the teaching and life of Jesus in Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, is sufficiently accounted for by what he says of Jesus, that he was 'a man approved of God among you, by miracles and signs which He did in the midst of you, *as ye yourselves also know*' (Ac 2²²). The gospel history was familiar to them. The same reason explains the form of speech to Cornelius (Ac 10³⁷; see also 26²⁶).

2. In almost every record of preaching in Acts, there are constantly recurring phrases which gather significance as we view them together, such as, 'to gladly receive the word,' 'to receive the word,' 'to hear the word,' 'to speak the word,' 'to speak the word of God,' 'to speak the word of the Lord,' 'to speak Thy word,' 'to leave the word and serve tables,' 'to give ourselves to the ministry of the word,' 'to publish the word of God,' 'to publish the word of the Lord,' 'the word of the Lord was carried through the whole region,' 'witnessing to the word of His grace,' 'the word of the Lord increased.'¹ Such phrases are found no less than

¹ ἀποδέξασθαι τὸν λόγον (2⁴¹), δεχέσθαι τὸν λόγον (8¹⁴ 11¹ 17¹¹), ἀκούσαι τὸν λόγον (4⁴ 10⁴⁴ 13⁷⁻⁴⁴ 19¹⁰), λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον (8²⁵ 11¹⁹ 14²⁵), λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (4³¹ 13⁴⁶), λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου (16³²), λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου (4²⁸), καταλείψαντες τὸν λόγον διακονεῖν τραπέζαις (6²), τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου

twenty-three times in Acts. Note also the words of Mk 16²⁰, 'They went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming "the word" (τὸν λόγον) with signs following.' No one can fail to see from these references, that 'the word' was the chief element of preaching. Fuller space is given to the treatment of questions arising out of the preaching. Luke would have given details of this preaching of 'the word' had not his Gospel been already in existence. His Gospel and the Acts are parts of one work. Having written in the Gospel what he had heard from eye-witness and ministers of 'the word,' it was enough to mention that the apostles and others preached 'the word,' as it was plainly evident what was meant by the phrase. When we remember how often our Lord referred to 'the word,'¹ and how Luke calls his informants eye-witnesses and ministers of 'the word,' it becomes plain that to the early preachers 'the word' was a technical phrase for the gospel as Jesus preached it. This becomes the more evident when we find in Acts these other significant phrases: 'to preach (evangelize) the word,' 'to preach that Jesus is the Christ,' 'the word which he sent preaching peace by Jesus Christ,' 'that the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel,' 'to preach the word of the Lord.'²

A very large number of the instances in which these significant phrases occur, refer to the missionary preaching of the Apostle Paul (cf. Ac 13^{5-7, 12, 44, 46, 48, 49} 14³ 15^{7, 35, 36} 16⁶ 17¹¹ 18¹¹ 19^{10, 20}). We cannot believe that the accurate historian Luke (see Ramsay) would use the same words to describe the preaching of Paul and the other apostles and evangelists, had the message not been the same. Paul's own words in Gal 2²⁻⁶, and the corresponding narrative in Ac 15, should have

προσκαρτερήσομεν (6⁴), κατάγγελλειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (13⁵ 17¹³), κατάγγελλειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου (15³⁶), διεφέρετο ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας (13⁴⁰), ἐπὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος (14²), ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου ἤβησε καὶ ἴσχυεν (19²⁰).

¹ τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας (Mt 13¹⁹), ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων (Mt 13²⁰), θλίψις καὶ διωγμὸς διὰ τὸν λόγον (Mt 13²¹), ἐλάλει τὸν λόγον (Mk 2² 4²¹), ὁ σπειρῶν τὸν λόγον (Mk 4¹⁴) ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Lk 5¹), μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐμῷ (Jn 8^{31, 37, 43}), ὁ λόγος ὄν ἐλάλησα (Jn 12⁴⁸), τὸν λόγον μου τῆρειν (Jn 14²⁴, etc.).

² εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον (Ac 8⁴), εὐαγγελίζομενοι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (5⁴²), τὸν λόγον ἀπέστειλεν . . . εὐαγγελίζομενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (10³⁶), ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (15⁷), εὐαγγελιζόμενοι . . . τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου (15³⁶).

been enough to exclude the idea that there was any essential difference between them (see also Eph 2¹⁰⁻²⁰ 3³⁻⁵, 1 Co 15¹¹). Further, the intimate relationship which existed between Luke and Paul, makes his testimony as to what Paul preached all the more valuable (cf. Ac 17⁷ 19^{9, 13-20, 23} 21¹⁵). It is also an assurance that Paul must have become familiar with all that he had written in his Gospel, and possibly even with the different sources from which he gathered his materials. In fact, Luke's Gospel should be regarded as holding the same relation to the preaching of Paul, as the Gospel of Mark holds to the preaching of Peter. Could Luke have recorded that Paul said at Miletus, 'Ye know . . . how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you,' that he 'had not shunned to declare . . . all the counsel of God,' or that he 'commended them to the word of His grace which is able to build them up' (Ac 20²⁰⁻³²), had he not preached 'the word' unto them?

3. The Epistles of James, Peter, and John bear out the conclusion that 'the word' was the chief element in the preaching of the first missionaries. In James, 'the word' lies behind all his teaching, as 'He begat us with the word of truth,' 'ye received the implanted word,' 'become doers of the word,' 'if any man is a hearer of the word and not a doer.'³ In Peter, it is the same,—'being born again . . . by the word of God . . . and this is the word which by the gospel was preached unto you,' 'the pure milk of the word,' 'stumble at the word,' 'obey not the word.'⁴ In John, we find the phrases: 'His word is not in you,' 'keepeth His word,' 'the word which ye heard,'⁵ etc., and what they heard was that which 'we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled of the word of life' (1 Jn 1¹).

These letters were addressed to Christians. 'The word' had been preached to them, and was in their possession or knowledge, else the references quoted above would have been meaningless. It is

³ ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας (1¹⁸), δεξάσθε τὸν ἐμφυτον λόγον (1²¹), γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου (1²²), εἰ τις ἀκρατῆς λόγος ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ ποιητῆς (1²³).

⁴ ἀναγεγεννημένοι . . . διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ . . . τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς (1^{23, 25}) (ῥῆμα is used for λόγος, because of the O. T. quotation which precedes it), (τὸ λογικὸν ἄθλον γάλα, 2²), οἱ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λογῷ (2⁸), and εἰ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ (3¹).

⁵ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν (1¹⁰), ὅς δ' ἂν τηρῇ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον (2⁵), ὁ λόγος ὄν ἠκούσατε (2⁷).

impossible to escape the conclusion in the case, at least, of Peter and John, that 'the word' could only refer to that which they had received from the Master. They knew no other 'word.' The phrase was certainly technical to them. The remarkable familiarity with the 'word' or teaching of Jesus which James displays, is a proof of the prominence given to that teaching in the early Church. As one of those who did not 'believe on Him' during His earthly ministry, the knowledge which he possessed could only be obtained from others. It would have been impossible for him to become so saturated with that teaching, had it not been the chief subject of study and discourse in the early Church.

4. We now turn to the Epistles of Paul to discover, if possible, what place this word of the gospel had in his preaching. At first sight the endeavour seems hopeless. His letters are so free from references in detail to the words and works of Jesus, that it has been said 'laborious search . . . proves nothing more than a general acquaintance on his part with the spirit of Christ's teaching' (*Paul of Tarsus*, by a Graduate, p. 360). Sabatier's book on *The Apostle Paul* has no more valuable section than that which deals with his knowledge of the historical Christ (Trans. pp. 76-85). He says: 'at first sight Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ seems to have been very limited. But we should be mistaken in yielding to this first impression. Modern criticism . . . sometimes fails to perceive the simplest and most obvious facts. It is forgotten, for instance, that Paul was a missionary before he was a theologian, and that he must have preached the Gospel in places where neither Jesus nor the Messiah had ever been heard of. Must he not of necessity have described this strange Person and explained His title? . . . All this preaching and historical instruction about the life of Jesus, necessarily belong to a period of Paul's life antecedent to that which gave birth to the great Epistles' (*The Apostle Paul*, pp. 77, 78). There is no need to repeat the evidence of Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ which Sabatier gives in such admirable detail, or even to explain how this knowledge had been obtained. It is enough to indicate that he must have known much about Jesus before he was converted (cf. Ac 2²² 9² 10³⁷ 22⁴ 26²⁶). Further, his retirement in Arabia and Tarsus gave him sufficient opportunity to familiarize himself with the oral tradition, which may even

then have been, in part at least, committed to writing. His relations with Barnabas and Mark and his intimacy with Luke would give him unequalled facilities for acquiring the fullest information. It is simply inconceivable that a man like Paul, with such devotion to Christ in his heart, could have been indifferent to the knowledge of Christ which others possessed. It was ever his passion 'to know Christ' (Ph 3⁸⁻¹⁰), and that of itself is enough to assure us, that he did not neglect the common sources of knowledge which were within his reach. Undoubtedly his own declaration in Gal 1¹¹⁻¹² seems to be an emphatic contradiction,—'The gospel which was preached by me is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by revelation of Jesus Christ.' But it is a fair interpretation of this remarkable passage to regard it as referring to his conversion, when he first received the gospel as a personal blessing, and was commissioned to be a preacher. The verses which follow (Gal 1¹³⁻¹⁶) refer distinctly to his conversion, and they are a continuation and explanation of vv. 11, 12. The 'revelation' (ἀποκαλύψις) of v. 12 is to be identified with, and interpreted by, the 'to reveal' (ἀποκαλύψαι) of v. 16.

In examining the record for evidence as to what Paul preached, we must remember that it is exceedingly brief and incomplete. Except for a few references in Acts and in his own letters, the missionary period of his life, say from 35 to 52, or 53 A.D., a period of eighteen or nineteen years—has been completely passed over. During that time, as far as we can judge, he wrote nothing. It is only from 52 or 53 A.D., that we have letters from his hand, that is, practically after the close of his missionary labours. They deal with matters that were in dispute, with questions of morality, in Churches which he had already founded. They are largely occupied with the edification of believers. Properly speaking, they are not concerned with the work of evangelization. They were occasional utterances (παρέργα), forced from him by the necessities of the Churches, and the false teaching of his foes. The only exception is the Epistle to the Romans. To preach the gospel where it had not been heard,—that was his passion, his life-work. Christ sent him not to baptize (or to write) but to evangelize. 'Woe is me if I preach not (εὐαγγελίζωμαι) the gospel'—that was his only dread. It is one of the ironies of

history that the record of this man's real work, in which he spent nearly twenty years, and suffered innumerable hardships, has perished, while a few of his occasional writings, in which he had no pleasure, have survived. '*Litera scripta manet!*' Yet in these letters, written without regard to evangelistic work, we find references which in the most casual, but emphatic way, give information as to his missionary labours. When we gather them together, and view them in relation to the significant phrases of which we have spoken, their meaning is unmistakable, e.g.: 'When ye received the word of God which ye heard from us'¹ (1 Th 2¹³, cf. also 1^{5, 6, 8} 2⁹, 2 Th 2¹⁴); 'If an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which we preached' (Gal 1⁸, cf. also 4^{13 66});² 'The gospel which I preached unto you' (1 Co 15¹, cf. also 10¹⁴ 11⁴).³ [The words, 'I delivered unto you first of all' (ἐν πρώτοις, 1 Co 15³), refer to the order of importance, not to the order of time (Meyer).] 'Having heard . . . the gospel of your salvation' (Eph 1¹³);⁴ 'At the beginning of the gospel' (Ph 4¹⁵).⁵ In the letter to the Colossians whom he did not evangelize, we read of 'the hope which ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel' (Col 1⁵).⁶ Would Paul have referred to what they had heard in this way, if 'the word' of the gospel had not been the basis of their faith and life? He testifies here to what the missionaries had preached to them. The Epistle to the Romans holds a unique position among his writings. From its general character, we should expect a definite statement as to the matter and form of his preaching. But it is addressed to a community already evangelized, whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. It is a presentation of the gospel 'as the superseding of Judaism' (Meyer, *Romans*, vol. i. p. 31). It therefore does not give us the gospel, as he preached it to Gentiles, but the arguments and method by which he commended its acceptance to Jews, and Gentiles who were familiar with Jewish ideas. The Church at Rome must have been largely, if not altogether, composed of

¹ 1 Th 2¹³, παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ὑμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

² Gal 1⁸, εἰάν . . . ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελισθῆται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα.

³ 1 Co 15¹, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐαγγελισάμην.

⁴ Eph 1¹³, ἀκούσαντες . . . τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν.

⁵ Ph 4¹⁵, ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

⁶ Col 1⁵, ἣν προακούσατε ἐν τῷ λογῷ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ.

Jews and Gentile proselytes (Beyschlag), or a letter like this would have been written in an unknown tongue. It is only such a community which could have been established or confirmed (στηριχθῆναι) by it. We cannot therefore appeal to it for information as to how the gospel was first presented to Gentiles. But the phrases already quoted from other letters refer to the time when the gospel was first preached in the different communities. (Note the aorists.) And the phrases themselves leave little doubt as to the form in which it was preached. To suggest for a single moment that Paul did not preach the gospel which Jesus preached, is to cast dishonour on a noble spirit, and to show an utter absence of power to understand his circumstances or to interpret the abbreviated record of the work of the Church's early days. The master passion of his life breaks out in the last letter he wrote, 'Do the work of an evangelist' (ἔργον ποιήσον εὐαγγελιστοῦ, 2 Ti 4⁵).

5. It is worth noticing that we occasionally find the phrase 'teaching and preaching that Jesus is the Christ' (διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, Ac 5⁴², cf. 15³⁵), which points to a double function of the preachers. They evangelized those who had never heard the gospel, but they taught those who received and believed it (cf. also Ac 2⁴²). In both of the above instances, the twofold function is carried on during a lengthened stay in the same place. If the Four Gospels provide the general form of evangelization, the letters of the N.T. provide illustrations of the teaching given to believers.

6. When we remember how frequently in the Four Gospels the phrases, 'the word,' 'the gospel,' and 'to preach the gospel' are used to describe the teaching of Jesus, it is almost impossible to believe that they had a different meaning when used in the rest of the New Testament. The difficulty raised by the general lack of reference to the kingdom of God in the work of the apostles, may be best explained by the fact that 'the word' or 'the gospel' is a more general description of the contents of the teaching than 'the word of the kingdom' or 'the gospel of the kingdom.' The Saviour Himself uses the briefer form more frequently than the longer form. Besides, as missionary work extended beyond Jews, the phrase, 'the kingdom of God,' had not the special significance which it had to them.

7. The fact that the four books which record

the life and teaching of Jesus, each received the designation 'the gospel' (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*), strongly supports the conclusion, that it was their contents which the first preachers repeated (*εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*). The interesting account given by Papias of the Gospel of Mark as a record of the preaching of Peter, is an additional testimony, pointing to the same conclusion. Indeed, it would be impossible to account for the preservation and dissemination of the teaching of Jesus, and the wide prevalence of the Christian life, had it not formed the chief element of the early preaching. The historical Jesus is the only basis of Christian life. 'Other foundation can no man lay save that which is laid, —which is Jesus Christ' (1 Co 3¹¹). 'The only faith concerning Jesus Christ as Lord [which is] worth possessing is that which springs out of

spiritual insight into its historical basis' (Bruce, *Apologetics*, p. 404).

The conclusion, then, to which we come is that the Four Gospels, as we have them, represent the general form in which the first preachers proclaimed the glad tidings of great joy. They give the substance of their preaching. The facts of the Resurrection and the death upon the cross had special prominence in the preaching, as was inevitable and right. They hold the same prominence in the Gospel record. The Epistles are not specimens of evangelistic work. They are specimens of the early teaching given to Christians, in connexion with the many questions which sprang out of a reception of the gospel, and the endeavour to carry its spirit and truth into life and conduct.

Requests and Replies.

It is evident that there is no agreement amongst Hebrew scholars as to the right pronunciation of the sacred name, as your pages testify. Is it too much to suggest that the time-honoured JEHOVAH should be adopted by all writers? It is perhaps as correct as Jahweh, Yahwè, etc., and is certainly more pleasant to the eye and ear. Why not?

Y. D.

THE sacred tetragrammaton יהוה is an impf. of הוה, an old form of היה. The impf. *Qal* of היה in the Massoretic text is pointed יהיה (Yihyeh). The guttural, of course, prefers the *a* vowel before it, and the pointing might be יהיה or יהיה; so יהיה or יהיה (Yahveh or Yahweh), the form of the word very generally adopted by O.T. critics at present. If the Massoretic pointing is adhered to, יהיה is impf. Hiphil, and the meaning of the expression as a name is, 'he who causes to become or to come to pass,' 'he who is continuously causing to become.' That is to say, under this name (the only proper name of the God of Israel) the Divine Being is presented as continuously creating or bringing to pass. The simpler meaning of the *Qal*, however, appears more suitable to the *locus classicus*, Ex 3¹³⁻¹⁵; that is to say, 'the God of redemption will become, will continuously become, to His Church all that the Church needs Him to become.'

The pronunciation Yehovah (Jehovah) arose from the Jewish practice of substituting אֲדֹנָי for יהוה in the reading or reciting of the text, and (in vocalized editions of the text) attaching the vowels of אֲדֹנָי. יהוה. If this Jewish practice is followed, the pronunciation will be Jehovah. The other is grammatically the more correct.

In the classroom my practice for years has been to explain the origin and meaning of the word, but to adhere to the pronunciation Jehovah, on the ground that it is awkward to use Jahweh or Yahweh in the study, and Jehovah in the pulpit. It may be doubted whether any great advantage will be gained by the change to Jahveh, and no little confusion will be caused should this pronunciation be adopted in the public services of the Church.

GEO. G. CAMERON.

Aberdeen.

An Indian Christian would like to know the best modern treatise on God's providential ruling of the world. M'Cosh's *Method of Divine Government* seems to be more suited for Christian countries, and too limited in its outlook. A. C.

THE late Professor Bruce's Gifford Lectures at Glasgow might answer the requirement, as reconciling the idea of Divine action with the modern