

III. THE RIGHT USE OF WEALTH IN THE SERVICE OF GOD.—How are we to look at money, lands, power, influence? We cannot avoid the connexion with these things. We cannot live without those things which money buys for us. Money is power to do both good and evil. Like every other privilege, wealth means risk and danger. Paul warns Timothy that ‘they who will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.’ The only right and

safe course is to treat money as though we were the stewards of it, and God the owner. Our temptation is to make it an end in itself, as though the chief object in life were to accumulate it. Our very power to earn it comes from God, and wealth is power stored for the accomplishment of great ends. By the use of it many of God’s great purposes are fulfilled. It is the unrighteous mammon, by a right use of which we prepare ourselves for receiving the true riches.

Recent Literature on the Apocrypha.

THE recent literature on the Apocrypha that is worth gathering is not hard to gather. For we all deplore the neglect in which the Apocrypha lies, but few of us set to remedying the neglect either by reading it or encouraging commentators to write on it. Yet this very neglect has an advantage; in one way a really great and conspicuous blessing. Men write about the Apocrypha for love, not for money. If the commentaries on the Apocrypha of the Old Testament are few, they are worth having.

Begin with Bissell. Its full title is *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, with Historical Introductions, a Revised Translation, and Notes Critical and Explanatory*. (T. & T. Clark. 8vo. pp. 680. 15s.) It belongs to the ‘Lange’ Series. For when Professor Schaff found that there was no volume on the Apocrypha in the German edition of that series, he heroically resolved to remove the reproach from the English edition, and he found the right man in Professor Edwin Cone Bissell. It is least known, it is perhaps most worth knowing, of all the ‘Lange’ Series. For Dr. Bissell had the scholarship; he had also a freer hand than his colleagues, there being no German original to follow doubtfully or dissent from. To a great extent it is pioneer work. Yet it stands to-day as surely as any volume of the series. Until Mr. Ball came with his ‘Variorum’ edition, we had no textual or translational criticism to be compared with Dr. Bissell’s. And even yet there is no single volume but itself that combines translation, emendation, exposition—and all in good scholarship and a reasonable spirit.

Much less ambitious is the volume on the Apocrypha published under the direction of the Tract Committee of the S.P.C.K. (Crown 8vo. 4s.) It is not a new translation, but follows the Authorized Version, and its notes are either expository or homiletical. It is issued, in short, for the use of the laity in scholarship. And a better volume for their use could not easily be produced. Clear type, fine paper, comfortable size, have kept it hitherto unsurpassed as the edition for the ordinary English reader.

Under the title of *The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures*, the Rev. W. R. Churton, B.D., published in 1884 a volume which ought to have had a better reception. (Whitaker. Crown 8vo, pp. 607. 7s. 6d.) Following sometimes the Old English Bible, as he calls it, sometimes the Cambridge Bible, Mr. Churton divides the text (it is the text of the Authorized Version) into paragraphs, and some of the poetical parts he exhibits as poetry. He writes a short but really valuable introduction to the Apocrypha as a whole, and shorter introductions to each of its books. But the best feature of his work, the feature which makes it worthy of the reception which it has not received, is its margins. There is no commentary proper, there is only these margins; but they are better than the most elaborate commonplace commentary. An obscure phrase is frequently lit up by a reference to some other apocryphal or canonical expression, and the versions are called upon at every turn to give their aid in the case of doubtful passages.

Following the order of issue, the next work

worth noticing is the edition of the Apocrypha in the *Speaker's Commentary*. (Murray. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. xlvi + 534, 648. 5s.) The editor-in-chief was Dr. Wace; the books were distributed among seven different authors, and Dr. Salmon of Dublin wrote the General Introduction.

The great fault of the *Speaker's Commentary* (especially in the Old Testament part) is the inequality of the work it contains. As Dr. Driver has frankly said, there are commentators of Old Testament books who have not acquired the most elementary idioms of the Hebrew tongue. There are also commentators who stand almost alone for scholarship and all commenting capacity. That is the weakness of the Apocrypha also, but its weakness is nothing like so weak. All the apocryphal commentators have a respectable knowledge of the original language in which their book is written or is found; and some of them (let us be bold and name Mr. Lupton and Mr. Ball) have that and all the commentator's other accomplishments, even in high attainment.

Again the *Speaker's Commentary* was often hindered by its apologetic aim. Terror seized hold of many of its commentators that the ark of God, or at least the cart it lay in, was shaking. The commentators on the books of the Apocrypha are not so apprehensive. They approach their subject more as scholars than apologetes. They risk a correction of their text without the thought that they are risking their reputation or their life.

Thus it comes to pass that once again the two volumes of the *Speaker's Commentary* that are least known are probably, taken all in all, the best worth knowing.

The 'Variorum' Apocrypha comes next. (Eyre & Spottiswoode. 8vo, pp. 276. 6s. 6d.) 'Variorum' simply means an edition with *various* readings and renderings. Dr. Cheyne, Dr. Driver, and Dr. Sanday had made the Variorum edition of the Old and New Testaments absolutely indispensable to every student of the Bible. It was Mr. C. J. Ball, the editor of some apocryphal books in the 'Speaker,' that was chosen to make the Variorum Apocrypha indispensable also, *and he actually did it*. Though he covered far less ground (because there was far less ground to cover, so few comparatively having written on the Apocrypha), he covered it so conscientiously and selected his readings and renderings so wisely,

that the Variorum Apocrypha has been unhesitatingly bound up in the same volume with the Variorum Old and New Testaments. And then that volume is the most useful, for the ordinary *student's* purposes, of all the editions of the Bible in the market.

These are all the editions of the Apocrypha worth noticing. There remain (1) a critical edition of the Book of Wisdom; (2) two Texts; and (3) the 'Westminster' Revision.

An edition of the Book of Wisdom, presenting in triple column down the page the Greek text, the Latin Vulgate, and the Authorized Version, was issued from the Clarendon Press in 1881 (4to, pp. viii + 224. 12s. 6d.) The author was the late Rev. W. J. Deane, M.A., better known perhaps by his more recent volume of *Pseudepigrapha*. It is a work worthy of Mr. Deane and of the Clarendon Press. Besides the threefold text, there is an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and a Commentary. The Introduction fills forty-three broad pages, and seems to discuss everything that needs discussion. The Commentary is very full also, and, if occasionally somewhat superfluous, often quite felicitous and always unassuming. The critical Notes are excellent so far as they go; they alone do not go far enough. An Index in three parts, Greek, Latin, English, gives it completeness. It is such an edition of the Book of Wisdom as we should gladly see followed in respect of all the other books of the Apocrypha.

Two editions of the Apocrypha presenting the text pure and simple are published by Messrs. Bagster. The one has the Greek and the English (A.V.) in parallel columns; the other, which was quite recently published, has the English only. They need no comment, only commendation. Both are quite accurate, clearly printed, and convenient.

The Revised Version remains. It was on account of the Revised Version of the Apocrypha that this Survey was undertaken. For the Revised Version, being the best edition and most lucid explanation of the Apocrypha ever published, marks an epoch in the history of the Apocrypha, and deserves all the recognition we can give it.

It has had a curious birth. When the Revised Version of the New Testament was issued in 1881, the Company of Revisers was divided into three Committees, and set to the revision of the Apocrypha, each Committee receiving one or more books to revise and be responsible for. A fourth Committee was formed in 1884, when the completion of the Revision of the Old Testament set the Old Testament Revisers free. These four Committees worked independently, and it does not appear that their independent work received the supervision of the combined body or of any number of it. So that the Revision of the Apocrypha was accomplished in the same way as the Authorized Version was made.

But the men who wrought upon it were scholars. That at least is clear, and it is a great gain. Where they have come short it is not for lack of knowledge, it is for lack of materials to work on. They have the detachment of scholars also. Neither church nor creed nor inquisitor has hindered them from telling the truth as they found it. They have been bold

enough to call large spaces interpolations, and cut them clean away.

They fail in one respect only—at least some of them fail. They have too much consideration for the English of the Authorized. Take the first book of all, and take the very beginning of it. In 1 Esdras ii. 30 we read: 'Then king Artaxerxes his letters being read,' instead of, 'Then the letters of king Artaxerxes being read,' and so again and again; at iii. 21: 'It maketh to speak all things by talents'; at iv. 22: 'All men do well like of his works.' There is no question that the Revisers have seriously erred in retaining so many obsolete forms in the Old and New Testaments (how needless and distracting, for example, is the ever-recurring 'which' for 'who,' and yet that is a mild example), but they have been quite outdone by the Revisers of the Apocrypha.

Yet it is a fine product of modern reverence and modern scholarship. No earlier time could have done it. May some later time come when materials will be found and men will be found to do it better.

Contributions and Comments.

Hebrews ii. 9.

[In the end of the year there was received for the department, 'Requests and Replies,' the following question: 'In what sense was Jesus crowned with glory and honour, *that* by the grace of God He should taste death for every man' (Heb. ii. 9, R.V.)? The question was sent to Principal Brown of Aberdeen for reply. His reply was given in December, almost exactly as Dr. Henderson quotes it below. So difficult is the passage that the discussion of it is heartily welcome.]

Principal Brown, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December last, says, as regards this verse, 'the one, question is this—Does the writer of this epistle mean here that Jesus was made a little lower than the angels *in order that He might suffer death*, or that *in reward of His having suffered death* He is now crowned with glory and honour? Dr. Brown holds the *latter* to be the true sense. As the question is one much disputed, and on which scholars of the first rank have taken different sides, Dr. Brown will not count it a discourtesy

if I ask space to give my reasons for dissenting from the form in which he states the question, as well as from his conclusion.

It is a safe assumption surely to start from, that the clauses of this ninth verse, which are repeated from vers. 7 and 8, are employed in the same sense throughout. In vers. 7, 8, we have three distinct statements quoted from Ps. viii. regarding '*man*.' (1) 'Thou madest him a little lower than the angels.' (2) 'Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands.' (3) 'Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet.' As Dr. Brown admits this is spoken of '*man*.' Indeed, it seems hardly open to doubt that the psalm describes man as created by God, in accordance with Gen. i. The reference of the psalm is backward to man's primal state, not forward to Jesus as '*the Son of Man*.' There is no more reason for interpreting Ps. viii. 4 as prophetic, than Ps. cxliv. 3 or Job vii. 17. The fitness of the quotation of the psalm by the writer to the Hebrews lies in its testimony as regards '*man*,' to whom, and not to