

The Sunday School Times.

JOHN D. WATTLES, }
PUBLISHER.

PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER 2, 1882.

{ VOLUME XXIV.,
NUMBER 48.

Copyright 1882 by John D. Wattles.
Entered at the Post-office at Philadelphia as "second-class matter."
The Sunday School Times will be sent post free for a year to any address in the United States or Canada for \$2.00. It will be sent on trial to any subscriber every week for three months for 50 cents.
For sale by newsdealers. Price five cents.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:	
Notes.—Who Need the Teachers'-Meeting? Aroused by Thanksgiv- ing. Exit—The Old-time Christmas Festival. A Danger in Lead- ing Knowledge Gained Through Experience. More Special Writers on the Acts. The Last Twelve Verses of Mark.....	753
Getting Back to Christianity.....	753
NOTES ON OPEN LETTERS:	
Histories of Rome. The Case of Jael.....	754
FROM CONTRIBUTORS:	
Unspoken Music [poem]. By the Rev. Samuel W. Duffield.....	755
The Genuineness of Mark 16: 9-20. By Professor R. B. Warfield.....	755
Sunday-school Reminiscences. By Talbot W. Chambers, D.D.....	756
Christmas and Anniversary Giving in the Sunday-school. By the Rev. Sylvanus Stall.....	756
The Quickening Spirit. By the Rev. H. T. Scholl.....	757
FOR CHILDREN AT HOME:	
The Oriole Family. By Miss Annie E. Wilson.....	757
LESSON HELPS:	
Lesson Calendar.....	758
[Lesson XII. December 17. After his Resurrection. Mark 16: 9-20.]	
Lesson Analysis.....	758
Lesson Bible Reading.....	758
Lesson Surroundings.....	758
Critical Notes.....	758
The Great Commission. By Charles S. Robinson, D.D.....	759
Illustrative Applications. By H. Clay Trumbull.....	760
Teaching Hints. By M. C. Hazard.....	760
Hints for the Primary Teacher. By Faith Latimer.....	760
Question Hints. By Miss Anna T. Pearce.....	761
Blackboard Hints.....	761
Orientalisms of the Lesson. By Professor Isaac H. Hall.....	761
BOOKS AND WRITERS:	
Illustrated Poems.....	762
Boys' Books of Mythology and Romance.....	762
Wild Animals and Birds. Landseer Series of Picture Books. Red Cloud. After the Freshet.....	762

The more a teacher has studied his lesson, the more likely he is to feel the need of the further help of the teachers'-meeting. He wants to know what points in the lesson have perplexed others, and what points have seemed to them of practical value, in order to direct his own thoughts and energies most effectively for his class. It is only the poorly furnished teacher who thinks he can get on as well without the teachers'-meeting as with it. The trouble with him is, that he doesn't know how much more he needs to know.

One of our readers is exercised because the President's Thanksgiving Proclamation has appeared in our columns. To his mind, that looks too much like "politics;" and when he reads a religious paper he wants to be free from all disturbing causes. The quicker that man drops The Sunday School Times, the better it will be for his quiet of mind. If there is one thing in this world that we are determined on, it is to keep our readers stirred up. We fairly delight in a reader who can be aroused to opposition by an invitation to thank the Lord. He's a model reader, as we look at it.

The old-time Christmas festival—whereat sugar-plums and rattle-boxes, dolls and picture-books were distributed by the Sunday-school to its scholars as if in reward for their coming to learn about Jesus—is passing away, and it will soon be numbered with church-lotteries, and church-fairs, and church-debts, as a sin and a folly of the "good old days" of our fathers. It is now a very common thing—and always a commendable one—for the scholars to come together at Christmas time with their offerings to Jesus, as on his Birthday. Wherever the scholars are trained to this plan, they enjoy it; and it would be a praise-worthy plan even if they did not enjoy it. In enforcement and illustration of the principle involved,

the Rev. Sylvanus Stall, who has had much to say about the duty and the modes of Sunday-school giving, tells our readers, this week, of "Christmas and anniversary giving in the Sunday-school."

There is a danger in the indiscriminate, and too common, lauding of knowledge obtained through experience, over knowledge obtained from other sources. A young man might be named who, although not a student of medicine, is in the habit of dosing himself with various poisons, merely that he may know from personal experience what are the effects of those poisons; and it is to be feared that this is but an illustration of what is constantly being done in the moral sphere. It ought to be impressed on the minds of all young people, that there are things which it is not desirable to know, and that to know them by experience is a cause for shame. When one's experience leads him to look with equanimity or with approval on that from which before he rightly shrank with disgust, it is a sufficient sign that his experience has been unhealthy and improper. The look of amazement, or of horror, on the face of a "green" youth, on the first revelation to him of some too common phase of iniquity, is as honorable to him as the knowing wink of another who has grown callous by the experience of iniquity, is disgraceful to its giver. "Experience teaches fools;" and in some things it is only fools who will be willing to learn by experience.

The list of special writers already announced for our columns in conjunction with the lessons from the book of Acts, has drawn forth warm commendation from various quarters. Zion's Herald kindly refers to it as, "including almost every eminent name on both sides the water." Yet there is quite a number of eminent names from both Europe and America which we hope yet to add to that list. We have announced no name until the desired article was either already in hand or explicitly promised; and we are confidently awaiting favorable answers from writers in no way inferior to those already named. We add this week the following:

Power from on High.

By Bishop G. F. Pierce.

Antioch as a Centre, as suggesting the Divine Strategy of Missions.

By Professor M. B. Riddle.

Diversities within the Apostolic Church—Jewish and Gentile Christians.

By Professor Llewellyn J. Evans.

Angel Messengers in the Book of Acts.

By Dr. George Dana Boardman.

Communism in the Early Church.

By Professor J. P. Gulliver.

Apostolic Opinions Concerning the Deity of Christ.

By Professor L. T. Townsend.

One of the important changes introduced by the New Testament Revisers is in the familiar passage (1 Tim. 2: 16) formerly rendered, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine," etc. This now reads: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching," etc. This new reading suggests, that if we are to find profit in teaching from the inspired Scriptures, we must first

know what scriptures are inspired. There are portions of the Bible—as we have known the Bible—the genuineness of which are called in question by reverent Bible scholars. It is certainly worth our while to consider the matter of the correctness or error of the popular and the traditional view on every such passage. Just now our Sunday-schools are taking up the last twelve verses of the Gospel according to Mark, as that book stands in our Bibles; and they must face the fact that the genuineness of those verses as an integral portion of the original text, is denied by some and doubted by others. President Woolsey expresses his opinion against their genuineness, in his Critical Notes. And now, at our request, Professor Warfield, of Alleghany Theological Seminary, gives his view on the subject. Next week, we shall lay before our readers the argument of the venerable Dr. Thomas J. Conant for the genuineness of these verses. And so those who are interested in this question (and who is not?) will have helps to its fuller understanding, in order that they may arrive at an independent judgment on its merits.

GETTING BACK TO CHRISTIANITY.

The student of religious and secular history does not need to read much, or to think very deeply, before discovering the ebb and flow of spiritual and intellectual currents. At one particular time, it may be, all seems lost or won; it is only by taking a large view that we discover that

... "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process
of the suns."

The narrow mind, noting only the present moment, is now elated and now depressed; but meanwhile the eye of an Ezekiel, looking far beyond, beholds the holy waters rising until they form a river that cannot be passed over.

Amid the religious discouragements of the past few years—discouragements due to indifferentism, or materialism, or this or that phase of contemporary doubt—there have been clear evidences of the rising tide. There is, to be sure, a somewhat common tendency, among optimists, to magnify the importance of "significant facts." But it is something more than mere optimism that convinces us that the power of distinctly anti-Christian forces is less than ten years ago. Some doubters have moved upward but a little; others have made greater advances; but the general direction has been plain. It was not an accident, nor was it, as has been claimed, the mere weakness of mental decay, which led Emerson, in his last years, back to the regular services of the denomination which he had "outgrown." There is some meaning in the regular attendance at a church which must be called distinctly conservative by the standards of the same denomination, of a preacher who, a few years since, was scarcely a deist, and who saw no higher purpose in life than "to stand erect and ask questions." We have hitherto noted the plain disposition, on the part of "cosmic" or "neo-pagan" poets to accept, of late, the doctrine of the personal immortality of the soul. Not less significant, on another plane, is the definitely theistic—not pantheistic—motive of the followers of the Transcendentalists, on Concord soil. Darwin, in his later years, while disavowing all religious, and still more all Christian, purpose, accumulated

pattern of nobleness in a book that was written to teach morality to a people who were already trained to count such conduct as hers hideously atrocious! Do let us give the Bible something like decent treatment in an examination of such of its facts as are not at once altogether clear to us! But even if it should be claimed that Jael was guilty of "the grossest falsehood, treachery, inhospitality, inhumanity, and cruelty," in her conduct toward Sisera, and yet was commended of God, we should insist that God's approval of her devotion to his people was not because but in spite of any immoralities on her part in her manner of proving that devotion. Isn't that a fair way of looking at it?

UNSPOKEN MUSIC.

BY THE REV. SAMUEL W. DUFFIELD.

How strange it seems!—for it came so soon,
This little fancy which holds me still;
This broken strain of a voiceless tune
Which sings like a ripple upon a rill—
Which sings at night and which sings at noon,
And weaves its mystery through my will!

Who was its author? None on earth
Ever could write it, ever could say
On reed or viol its thought of worth,
As it gambols and flashes through the day;
For the lilt of its tune is a baby's mirth,
And the joy is of sunshine and leaves at play.

O dear sweet music! O angels' song,—
To drop on my life like dew on grass,
As I tread the dusty way along
Where the sultry locust shrills as I pass;
And no one can hear it, or do it wrong,
Nor can I tell it to lad or lass!

THE GENUINENESS OF MARK 16: 9-20.

BY PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D.

The question of the genuineness of Mark 16: 9-20 stands first among the textual problems of the New Testament in both interest and difficulty. The evidence in regard to it is, briefly, as follows:

The External Evidence.—Codex Sinaiticus (Σ) omits the passage. Codex Vaticanus (B) omits it, but leaves the rest of that column and the whole of the next blank. This phenomenon (which is not unparalleled in either B or other manuscripts) can be accounted for in this case only on the hypothesis that the passage, although well known to the scribe of B, was omitted from its exemplar. The whole weight of B, due to its habitual character as the best manuscript we have, is therefore thrown against the passage, while a fourth-century witness for it is obtained in B's scribe. Codex Regius (L) closes after verse 8; but, at the top of the next column, proceeds thus: "These also are somewhere current: 'But all things that were commanded, they immediately announced to those about Peter. And after this Jesus also himself, from the east even unto the west, sent forth by them the sacred and incorruptible proclamation of eternal salvation.' There are, however, also these current, after: 'For they were afraid' (verses 9-20)." L, therefore, witnesses against verses 9-20; its exemplar contained only the shorter conclusion, or, more likely, none. As the shorter conclusion is undoubtedly spurious, the preference of L or its exemplar for it points us back to a still earlier ancestor which closed with verse 8. Codex 22 closes the Gospel with verse 8, marking that point as "The end;" but, after this note, "In some of the copies the evangelist finishes at this point; in many, however, these also are current," inserts verses 9-20, closing again with "The end." This double ending must point again to earlier documents omitting the passage.

On the other hand, all other manuscripts contain the passage, including the Alexandrinus (A), Ephremi (C), Bezae (D), Monacensis (X), Tischendorfianus IV. (Γ), Sangallensis (Δ), Rossanensis (Z), and the cursives 1, 33, 69, etc. Seven of the cursives are furnished with scholia to the effect that, although wanting in some manuscripts, yet the best or most contain it; and some twenty-two others contain scholia defending it, and thus, so far as Pseudo-*Victor* is not *meaninglessly* copied, witness to a survival of doubt.

All forms of the Latin version contain the passage, except the oldest (African) form of the Old Latin. All forms of the Syriac version contain it, although the Harclean, as reported in White's edition, enters the shorter ending in the margin (which is the more valuable part of the Harclean) with the note, "These also are somewhere added." The Thebaic is not extant here;

but the Memphitic contains the passage. The oldest forms of the Armenian and (Æthiopic) reject it. The Gothic contains it.

Eusebius is the first Father who discusses its genuineness; and he not only did not read it himself, but tells us that most of the accurate copies did not contain it. He is copied by many subsequent writers, especially by Jerome and Victor of Antioch. An anonymous *Hypothesis* omits it, apparently independently. Moreover, no traces of the verses can be found in the writings, even when voluminous, of a great many of the earlier Fathers; and this silence, in the case of Clement of Alexandria, is important; while, in the cases of Cyril of Jerusalem and Origen, it is almost conclusive that their Bibles did not contain verses which they fail to quote on such provocation as they had. It is well-nigh certain, on the other hand, that Justin, and absolutely certain that Irenæus, read them in their Bibles; while, later, they were read by the heathen writer quoted by Macarius Magnes, by Marinus, the Apostolical Constitutions, Didymus, Epiphanius, perhaps Chrysostom, and many late writers.

Dean Burgon has farther pointed out that, so far as we know the early lection-systems, they seem to have contained this passage; but, as we cannot trace them earlier than the middle of the fourth century, at which time it is admitted that the Syrian type of text (which contained these verses) was widely accepted, this fact has small significance for our argument.

In estimating and drawing conclusions from this evidence, our first care must be to avoid lending two votes to one voice. And, since the Syrian evidence is all repeating evidence, and is in no sense independent, we must protect the ballot-box, and simplify the problem at once by sifting out the Syrian repeaters. This leaves the testimony standing somewhat thus:

Insert: C Δ D 33, all Lat. (except Afr.), all Syrr. (except Hel. marg.), Memph., Justin, Irenæus, Mac. Mag., etc.
Omit: B Σ (L) (22) manuscripts known to Eus., Lat. Afr., (Hel. mg.), (Æth.), Arm., [Clem. Al.], [Orig.], Eus., [Cyr. Jer.], etc.

The sole question to be settled is, "Which of these groups is the weightier?"

Dr. Hort has shown, as the result of a very large induction, that the combination of B and Σ offers a unique criterion of excellence, and that a very large proportion of the readings supported by them in unison are certainly genuine; and it is generally admitted that when B Σ are supported by other first-rate witnesses they are almost always right. They are here supported by such strong and independent testimony that it is difficult to doubt but that they transmit the true text. The application of the genealogical method will reach the same conclusion. All the witnesses which contain the verses partake of Western corruption, so that it is possible to explain their community in this reading on the hypothesis of a corrupt (Western) origin for it. On the other hand, the documents which omit the verses cannot be all referred to one class: B is neutral, Lat. Afr. is Western, and L is largely Alexandrian. Their community in the omission of the verses cannot be explained, therefore, as a common class corruption. If it be a corruption to which they witness, it is one which had crept into the stem from which all three independent classes diverged before the divergence of any of them. Whether it be the *aboriginal* reading which they transmit, or not, therefore, it is, so far as our documents are concerned, the *original* one. The external evidence, therefore, though not without its peculiarities, is decisive as to the spuriousness of the passage. And it is to be observed that this conclusion stands unaffected by the piling up of any number of items of evidence for the genuineness of the verses, so long as they come from Western and Syrian sources. It is the result of weighing rather than of counting heads.

The Internal Evidence.—That the structure of the Gospel, which was evidently intended to observe the limits of apostolic witness-bearing (Acts 1: 22), is broken in upon by the removal of verses 9-20; that the plan of chapter 16 is left incomplete by their omission; that their omission leaves even the paragraph torn in two, and the jagged and mutilated end of verse 8 sticking painfully out into space,—all this is plainly true, but scarcely relevant. It is relevant as proof that the Gospel was not intended to stop at verse 8; but irrelevant as proof that verses 9-20 constitute the originally intended ending. True as it is that the omission of this section leaves Gospel, chapter, paragraph, almost sentence, incomplete, it may be equally true that the section must be omitted; and such arguments are valid to the contrary only when urged in conjunction with strong external evidence, or else with strong internal evidence that

this is the very kind of ending, not only in general contents, but also in form, connection, phraseology, which we would expect. Dean Burgon does, indeed, argue that the style, structure, and phraseology of this section is Marcan, but with the result of only showing that much that is invalid has been urged against its Marcan origin, that its style is generically like Mark's, and that no conclusive argument against its authorship by Mark can be derived from its style alone. But it is one thing to prove that no peculiarity of style exists, such as will force us on that ground to deny the passage to Mark, and another to show cause, on grounds of style, why denial based on other grounds should not be persisted in.

Moreover, this whole argument from style is invalidated by its conjunction with another consideration equally strenuously urged. We are invited to observe, and that most justly, that this section is not at all such as a scribe would invent to complete an apparently mutilated document. It is redolent of an early age, bases itself, not on the written Gospels, but on largely independent tradition, and, especially, does not round out the mutilated paragraph broken off at verse 8. No scribe, we may readily admit, could or would have forged so badly fitting a conclusion precisely for the purpose of relieving the harshness of the break. But the argument is, on that very account, equally valid as proof that neither did Mark write it for this purpose. It calls attention, indeed, to two important facts: 1. The section was not made by a scribe for this place, but, if not genuine, must have been adopted by him from some early writing; and, 2, Mark could not have written the section for this place. Its insertion does not repair the jagged tear at verse 8. We have to turn to Matthew and Luke to learn what actually happened after the visit to the tomb. Mark's narrative is like a beautiful arch, one of whose supporting columns has fallen and its place been supplied by another which does not fit. The rough jutting end of verse 8 points to something other than what is supplied by verses 9-18. And if there are marks in the arch that its present is not its original prop, so, also, are there marks in the column that the present is not its original position. As verse 8 demands a different succeeding context, so verses 9-18 demand a different preceding context. There is no subject expressed in verse 9, and therefore it originally followed a context in which Jesus was the main subject; in verse 8, the women are the subject. The "but" with which verse 9 opens is exactly the opposite of what we would expect from verse 8. The renewed specification of time in verse 8, so soon after verse 2, and so unnecessarily varied in form from it, is surprising, if not even feeble. The "first" is, in this context, strange; and the description of Mary Magdalene, after verse 1, inexplicable; while verses 8 and 10, in the present arrangement, are too nearly contradictory to allow us to lightly suppose that so vivid a writer as Mark could have so expressed himself. If we add that the style and phraseology of this section, although generically like, is yet specifically unlike, Mark's, so that at least twenty-one un-Markan words and phrases occur in it, while some of his most characteristic expressions do not occur, it must become clear that, so far from the intrinsic evidence rebutting the strong external evidence of the spuriousness of the passage, it adds a weighty confirmation to it.

The transcriptional evidence leads to the same conclusion. To assume that the section was omitted on account of harmonistic difficulties is to assign a remedy much too heroic for the disease; to suppose that a liturgical "The end," at this place, was mistaken for the end of the Gospel, is to commit several anachronisms at a stroke, and brand the early scribes with complete idiocy. It is equally impossible to account for the distribution of the omission on the supposition of a late loss of the last leaf of Mark, containing verses 9-20, from an important exemplar which then propagated itself in this mutilated condition. On the other hand, it is easy to see how the abrupt ending of verse 8 would tempt a scribe to find a remedy. That such temptation did exist is clear from the existence of the shorter ending; and it can hardly be asserted that different scribes might not have added different endings. Moreover, the apparent plausibility of the present ending, rounding out the Gospel and hiding the jags of verse 8 from the careless eye, combined with its actual inferiority, as not really fitting the place into which it is squeezed, is exactly what we expect in the work of a scribe, and clinches the argument that he, and not Mark, is responsible for its presence here.

Results.—Summing up rapidly the results of this conclusion, we may say:

1. This passage is no part of the word of God. The evidence will prove not only that Mark did not write it