

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHEN St. Paul addressed the Athenians on Mars Hill, he said that God 'hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained.' Is it legitimate in reading that verse to emphasize the word *man*? We do not mean in order to distinguish it from God. We mean in order to distinguish it from the beasts.

Dr. Matheson does so. He sends us a Christmas message out of his retirement, calling it *The Sceptre without a Sword* (Clarke, 1s.). He finds it in the prophecies of the Book of Daniel. In the seventeenth chapter of that book there occur the words, 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven. . . . And there was given him a kingdom.' He understands these words to be a prophecy of the reign of man as opposed to the reign of the beast.

Hitherto, he says, the symbol of imperial power had been an animal. First a lion. The lion represents the earliest stage of the world's culture — 'the stage when men roared in the forest and wrestled for the prey.' Next a bear. The bear is the tenacity of grasp upon the conquered object. It is the age of despotism, when an iron hand held the wills of men. Then the panther. The panther is the symbol of cunning, of subtlety, of selfish diplomacy. After that an unnamed beast.

Why unnamed? Because its object is to stamp out all distinctions, to be itself the whole world. 'It is the reign of conventionalism, the rule of conformity, the crushing of the individual man. The masses alone have life; the unit is nowhere. There is room for the thousand, but not for the one. There is a place prepared for the nation, but not a place for Daniel, not a place for you.' At last there comes the man.

Now all these ages of the world have been. The lion has ruled, and the bear and the panther and the horned beast. But when Christmas morning dawned there came the Man. This, says Dr. Matheson, is the message of Christmas. And he says that this is also the meaning of St. Paul on Mars Hill. Do we think the 'day' of which St. Paul spoke was the Judgment Day? Dr. Matheson thinks it was Christmas Day. He says that St. Paul's message to the Athenians was not one of dread but one of hope. Hitherto, ye men of Athens, heroism has been measured by conformity to the beast. Has our hero, ye have said, the strength of the lion, the grasp of the bear, the cunning of the panther? The day is appointed which will change all that. The Man has been ordained, and henceforth *our* heroism will be tested by a different standard. We shall no longer ask, Am I living worthy of Caesar or

Hannibal or Alexander; but, Am I living worthy of Jesus the Christ?

Dr. James H. Moulton of the Leys School, Cambridge, is at present contributing to the *Classical Review* some Notes from the Papyri in illustration of the grammar of New Testament (and similar) Greek. In one of his notes he confirms Deissmann's position regarding the use of the Greek preposition ἐν, with an instrumental dative.

Deissmann in his *Bible Studies* (pp. 118-120) holds that in original Greek ἐν is never used instrumentally. If there is the probability of translation from the Hebrew, as in the Gospels and the Apocalypse, the ἐν may be instrumental, because then it may be simply a rendering of the Hebrew ׁ. But in St. Paul's writings, for example, he will not admit an instance.

The instances usually quoted are Ro 15⁶ and 1 Co 4²¹. In the first, 'that ye may with one mouth (ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι) glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,' he considers that the ἐν simply stands for *in* as usual. The Romans, he understands, are to glorify God *in* the mouth, just as, according to popular psychology, thoughts dwell *in* the heart.

The example of 1 Co 4²¹ is more difficult. 'What will ye?' asks the apostle. 'Shall I come unto you with a rod (ἐν ῥάβδῳ), or in love (ἐν ἀγάπῃ)?' Deissmann concedes that the meaning is instrumental, but he believes that the construction with ἐν is used loosely in parallelism with the phrase (ἐν ἀγάπῃ) following, and cannot properly be brought under any grammatical rule.

With all this Dr. Moulton would probably agree. Or if the apparent examples of an instrumental ἐν with the dative cannot be thus individually explained, he would suggest that 'speakers of Greek were beginning to feel that they could

not trust the dative out alone, and we can understand,' he says, 'the occasional employment of nursemaid ἐν in places where she would have been better left at home, or replaced by σύν.'

'Just as to the naturalist the shapings and shadings of a beetle's wing are not to be despised, so in Hebrew archæology even minutiae, such as the exact spelling of a name or the precise date of a battle, are worth ascertaining if possible.' So says Dr. Gregory Smith in an article in the *Guardian* for 24th December on 'The Psalms and Christianity.' His argument is that the Psalms are unaffected by dates and names. Exactness and accuracy are things to be desired by all lovers of truth; but 'archæological details are irrelevant to the Christian faith.'

Even the intention of the Psalmist, Dr. Gregory Smith holds, has nothing to do with the Christian's application of the words to himself and his own surroundings. Moore's exquisite song, 'When he who adores thee has left but a name,' may be sung with personal feeling by those who have no affection for the 'Emerald Isle,' which is directly and passionately the poet's subject. And in like manner the beautiful words of the 110th Psalm (that Psalm 'so often and so hotly wrangled about'), 'He shall drink of the brook in the way, therefore shall he lift up the head,' may refer originally to some victorious army on its march, but to the believer in Christ they suggest the refreshing influence of the Holy Spirit bestowed on Christ and on His followers in the weary conflict with evil. The Pharaoh of the Psalter may be Rameses or any other—let the archæologists decide that,—to the Christian he stands for the enemy of the soul in the increasing conflict between good and evil.

The use of the 'cursing Psalms' is more difficult. Dr. Gregory Smith gets over the difficulty by accepting the principle of gradual revelation, which 'exculpates the original purport of the

Maledictions,' and then by taking the Psalmist as expressing his abhorrence not of any mortal foe, but of the spirits that tempt him from God. In that sense 'the execrations cannot be too fierce or too pitiless.'

Most difficult of all to a Christian is the Psalmist's occasional assumption of innocence. How can he sing the 17th Psalm, 'Thou hast proved mine heart; thou hast visited me in the night; thou hast tried me, and findest nothing?' Or how shall he sing the 18th, 'I was also perfect with him, and I kept myself from mine iniquity?' Dr. Gregory Smith has an easy answer: 'Through the marvellous condescension of the Son of God in the Incarnation a Christian is identified with the sinless Son of man, and in Him the believer is accepted.'

One of the archæological minutæ which Dr. Gregory Smith somewhat depreciates will be found in the *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archæology for last month. There E. J. Pilcher describes a cylinder seal which through an ancient but unknown history has come into the possession of Mr. Joseph Offord. It is of hæmatite, and measures 23 mm. in length by 15 mm. in diameter. It is figured with two conventional scenes, the one Babylonian, the other Assyrian; and it originally bore a cuneiform inscription in three lines, which is now almost entirely obliterated.

About 400 B.C. the seal fell into the hands of a new owner. It was he that obliterated the cuneiform. Or if it was partly rubbed off already, he completed its obliteration by engraving his name in Aramæan across it. His name was Gehazi.

Never before has the name Gehazi been seen outside the Hebrew Scriptures. And even there it has been suspected, so un-Hebrew does it seem to be, so difficult etymologically, though it may mean 'Valley of Vision.' In its place has been suggested the simpler *Gihoni*. But here is Gehazi itself in the abbreviated form Gehaz (111A=172).

And so 'this little cylinder is an important contribution to biblical onomatology.'

As we write, it is the season when men sing 'Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth among men of good will.' Was there ever a time wherein we desired more earnestly to sing the angels' song and found it harder?

Dr. Matheson says we vex ourselves in vain. He says that when we find the angels' song so hard to sing, we do not understand its meaning; we do not know what we are trying to sing.

'I have always felt,' he says, in the little book already noticed, 'that these words had a very profound meaning—a meaning which our Authorized Version has failed to render.' For the Authorized Version—and for that matter all the versions and all the expositions we know—give the glory to God and promise the peace to man. Dr. Matheson also gives the glory to God. But he says that the peace is promised, not to man but to men. The angels' song, he says, does not promise peace to the earth, but peace to men of good will upon earth. It does not promise that nation will not still rise against nation. It promises that among men, individual men, Christian men, there shall be good will, even though they should be standing in opposite camps, even though they should be found amid the roar of battle. 'The heart of the *man* will beat within the breast of the soldier, and the kinship of soul for soul will not be extinguished by the kindling of hostile fires.'

In the timely little book which the Bishop of Gloucester has published, urging the use of the Revised Version in the service of the Church (*Addresses on the Revised Version*, S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), there occurs a reference to one of the rules by which the Revision Companies were guided, and an explanation is given which alters the aspect

of that rule as it has hitherto been publicly understood.

It is the first rule of all. It runs: 'To introduce as few alterations as possible in the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.' That is the rule which the Revisers are charged with disobeying, and the charge is supposed to have settled the fate of the Revision. Well, they did disobey it. Dr. Ellicott admits that they disobeyed it, *in the sense in which it is popularly understood*. But he shows that the sense in which it is popularly understood is not its proper sense. And he seems to say that if it had been taken in the popular sense, he at least would have refused to work under it.

It is popularly understood that 'consistently with faithfulness' means 'faithfulness to the general sense and spirit of the original.' That is to say, if a word or phrase in the Authorized Version did not *misrepresent* the general sense and spirit of the Hebrew or the Greek, it was to be allowed to stand. If the Revisers had understood the rule in that way, it is certain that we should have had a very different revision. But the Revisers did not understand it in that way.

Dr. Ellicott admits that some of them did at first. He clearly remembers that at one of the early meetings of the New Testament Company, a discussion arose as to the meaning of this word 'faithfulness.' An alteration on the phraseology of the Authorized Version had been suggested. Some one objected to it on the ground that the language of the Authorized Version sufficiently represented the sense of the original. The discussion became general. Dr. Lightfoot took an earnest part in it. He said that such a Company could not be called together again for many years to come. Their revision therefore must be thorough. If a rendering could be suggested that was more accurate and more true to the original than that of the Authorized Version, that rendering must be adopted. The Company agreed. Again and

again a suggested rendering was set aside as unnecessary, but only on the ground that it did not represent the original more accurately. 'Faithfulness' was taken to mean, in Dr. Ellicott's language, 'faithfulness to the original in its plain grammatical meaning as elicited by accurate interpretation.'

'And they sing as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four living creatures and the elders.' So the prophets prophesied. For the Psalms are full of it. So it was from age to age in Jewry. For every new age found new wonder in God and the ways of God, and sang the new song. So must it be throughout the Christian ages also. For the new song of Christianity is not to be learned when we get to 'glory.' It is to be learned now and sung now. It is the song of the Redeemed, but the Redeemed are to sing it upon earth.

The Redeemed do sing the New Song upon earth. When 'they sang an hymn' that night on which He was betrayed, before they went out to the Mount of Olives, it was no doubt an old Jewish hymn they sang, though they had begun to put new meaning into it. But they will not be content with Jewish hymns always. Soon the New Song was made as well as sung.

And it is made, as it must be made, to be sung 'before the throne, and before the four living creatures and the elders.' Now the song that it has been found most difficult to compose and sing is the song before the elders.

It is Mr. Beeching who says that the difficulty in the singing of the New Song is to sing it before the elders. Mr. Beeching has published, through Messrs. Macmillan, a volume of sermons, calling it *Inns of Court Sermons* (4s. 6d.), because he preached the sermons in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn. The title of the first sermon is 'Religious Poetry,' and its text is this verse from the

Apocalypse. Mr. Beeching finds that it has been hard to sing the New Song—hard, he means, to compose and sing it—from the first day in which the Redeemed in Christ began to sing it until now. But he says it has been hardest to sing it before the elders.

For 'the purpose of all poetry is to illuminate our experience of the world; it is one method of interpreting life to us; and the means it employs are passion and imaginative thought.' Now it is comparatively easy for the Christian to express with passion and imaginative thought his delight in God—for that is what Mr. Beeching understands by singing the New Song before the throne. And it is comparatively easy to express his soul's delight in nature—for that is what Mr. Beeching understands by singing the New Song before the four living creatures. But when the Christian poet seeks to interpret anew to the Church the meaning of the life of man—for that is how Mr. Beeching understands the singing of the New Song before the elders—he finds it very difficult.

It is comparatively easy for the Christian poet to express his soul's delight in God. His feelings of admiration and hope and love and worship are then so simple, that there is little chance of conflict between his passion and his creed. He can even take the religious lyrics of the Jewish Church and sing them before the throne. The only alteration that he has to make upon them, and it is enough to make it in thought, is that now he sings them not only before the Father and the sevenfold Spirit, but also before the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne.

It is comparatively easy also to sing the New Song before the four living creatures. For the Christian creed is so broad that it takes in the beauty of nature. If only the beauty of nature is ascribed to God the Christian poet can sympathize both with Cowper, who lays the greater stress on God's transcendence, and also with Wordsworth,

who lays the greater stress on His immanence. He can even sing the song of those poets who are not called religious, if they are only true to nature. Let them faithfully describe the glory that moves them to song—the light that most truly *is* on sea and land for those who have eyes to see it—the spirit in things—

Be it love, light, harmony,
Odour, or the soul of all
Which from heaven like dew doth fall—

let them render this faithfully, and the religious man can join in the song and supply the interpretation that is lacking. For he knows that the love and light and harmony are due to the interpenetration of things by the Creator-Spirit of God.

But it is very difficult to sing the new song when its subject is the life of man. For a true song must have passion and imaginative thought. And to be a New Song, a Song of the Lamb, it must be both fresh felt in passion and fresh dipt in thought.

Passion—deep feeling—alone will not do. It is too often considered, says Mr. Beeching, that feeling alone is equipment enough for a sacred poet. And therefore our hymn-books are full of hymns that are not true songs, but only verses. They may be the fruit of true experience, they may gratefully acknowledge the facts of revealed religion; but they bring no fresh insight to recreate the experience, they bring no imagination to illuminate the facts. There are many emotional verses in our hymnals on our Lord's Atonement, but Mr. Beeching asks if any of them strike home so deeply or so freshly to our heart the old truth that 'God so loved the world,' as those lines of Shakespeare—

Why, all the souls that were were forfeit once;
And He that might the vantage best have took
Found out the remedy.

Now it is not strange that it should be hardest to sing the New Song before the elders. There

are three reasons for it. The first reason is expressed by St. Paul when he says, 'That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual.' There is a natural explanation of man's life with its joy and sorrow, its sin and death, and there is a spiritual, and it is not the spiritual that comes first, it is the natural. Let it be death that has to be explained. When the poet, if he is a Christian poet, has time to think upon it, the Christian aspect of it occurs to him. 'But at first,' says Mr. Beeching, 'when the shock comes, it is not the reflective mind that is at work, recalling and reconsidering the traditional religious interpretation, and perhaps taking fire at that to a re-interpretation. It is the imagination that is at work, roused by deep feeling. The fact of death lies once more in its naked awfulness before the poet, as the world lay before Adam, compelling him to utter the dread name, and shudderingly he names it. It is the final loss that appals him. The lamp is shattered; the wine is spilt; the silver cord is loosed, the golden bowl is broken; the pitcher is broken at the fountain, the wheel is broken at the cistern.'

Those words of Ecclesiastes just quoted are poetry, but they are not religion. The verses 'wrung from the greatest poet of our own day by the death of his friend'—

Break, break, break,
At the foot of thy crags, O Sea!
But the tender grace of a day that is dead
Will never come back to me—

those verses also are poetry but they are not religion. These are the first thoughts about death, and that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and only afterward that which is spiritual. 'And the worst is,' says Mr. Beeching, 'that before this arrives, the impulse to sing has gone.'

Another reason is that 'the heyday of the blood in which the passion is strongest, and the imagination most active, is often a day of revolt

against tradition, and especially against that traditional interpretation of the deepest facts of life which we call Christianity.' Mr. Beeching points to Shelley—'expelled for the waywardness of youth from this University [Mr. Beeching preached this sermon first before the University of Oxford], but whose sepulchre has lately been built in his own college with exceptional honour.'

And the third reason is that Christianity is essentially a religion of joy, but it is the sombre aspects of life which appeal to the poetical sensibility most keenly.

The sweetest songs are those that tell
of saddest thought.

No doubt the greatest poets, if they are Christians, soar above this pessimism or at least rise out of it. For the most part, however, says Mr. Beeching, they need large space to accomplish it. Milton accomplishes it perfectly 'within the sonnet's humble plot of ground' in the famous sonnet on his blindness, in which the line 'They also serve who only stand and wait' contains the new thought the poet wins for us, and yet has all the passion within it of that which has preceded—'the systole and diastole of the poet's heart pleading with his Maker.' But it is in the space of the epic, or in the drama with its slow development, its crisis, its catastrophe, that the vindication of the spiritual force of life is most successfully accomplished. In the Shakespearean drama, says Mr. Beeching, there is no fate—no fate, at least, of which man is not master—and no laws but the laws of the spirit.

Messrs. Longmans have published a paper which Professor Sanday read in October before the Tutors' Association in Oxford on Harnack's '*What is Christianity?*' (8vo, 1s. net). Professor Sanday did not read the Paper because there was a gap in their programme which the Tutors' Association desired to fill up. There are certain questions at issue in New Testament criticism

at present. Harnack's book makes them stand out with unwonted clearness. And Professor Sanday deliberately chose the book as an opportunity of 'taking our bearings' in regard to them.

Professor Sanday finds Harnack's book worthy of praise, and he does not grudge to praise it. He mentions at once 'its fresh and vivid descriptions, its breadth of view, and skilful selection of points, its frankness, its genuine enthusiasm, its persistent effort to get at the living realities of religion.' The nearest parallel he can recall in English is Matthew Arnold's theological writings: *St. Paul and Protestantism, Literature and Dogma, God and the Bible*. Harnack's theological training gives him an advantage over Matthew Arnold, and, curiously enough, his book is also a greater literary success than any of Matthew Arnold's, being so much more compact and well proportioned. Nor does Harnack ever commit himself to unfortunate definitions like Matthew Arnold's 'stream of tendency which makes for righteousness.' But, on the other hand, Professor Sanday doubts if he has anything quite so original as Matthew Arnold's account of the doctrine of *Necrosis (Die to live!)*.

Professor Sanday has read not only Harnack's book, but also the criticisms that have been passed upon it. They range themselves on opposite sides, the Ritschlian organs praising, the Lutheran and orthodox condemning. Of the latter Dr. Lemme of Heidelberg is most uncompromising. To Lemme Harnack's book is simple Nihilism, a radical breach with all dogmatic and ecclesiastical Christianity. Lemme even challenges Harnack to say whether or not he denies the life after death.

Professor Sanday is less concerned with the Ritschlianism of the book than with its truth. If Ritschl and his school should lay stress on the tangible facts of present religious experience, he will not disapprove, for the Bible represents the eternal life as beginning here and now. He will rather accept that as an explanation of the little

attention that Harnack gives in his book to the doctrine of immortality, and not blame him for denying what he only omits.

But does Harnack omit the doctrine of a future life? Professor Sanday does not think so. He quotes one passage. It is, as Dr. Sanday says, so unequivocal, and it is also so important, as uttered by Harnack, that we had better quote it also.

'Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the matter of the appearances, one thing is certain—this Grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal. It is useless to cite Plato; it is useless to point to the Persian religion, and the ideas and the literature of later Judaism. All that would have perished and has perished; but the certainty of the resurrection and of a life eternal which is bound up with the grave in Joseph's garden, has not perished, and in the conviction that *Jesus lives* we still have those hopes of citizenship in an Eternal City which make our earthly life worth living and tolerable. "He delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage," as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews confesses.'

If there are those who say they believe that *Jesus lives*, and mean that He lives merely in His influence on the world, they cannot run for shelter to Harnack. For, as Dr. Sanday points out, that statement is 'not a matter of words and phrases, the whole argument requires that the life after death should be real.'

But Professor Sanday is not come altogether to bless. He is somewhat disappointed with Harnack's book. He is disappointed in more ways than one. He is ready, as he always is ready, to emphasize the matters of agreement, and to emphasize them first. But he has matters of disagreement also. And he names the principal in a sentence. Harnack says that what he offers is a 'reduced' Christianity—a Christianity, that is to say, reduced from theological and ecclesiastical

Christianity. Dr. Sanday believes that it is unduly 'reduced.' He finds that in reality it consists of the teaching of Jesus and nothing more.

And even the teaching of Jesus is unduly 'reduced.' The Fourth Gospel is excluded. 'Our authorities,' says Harnack, 'for the message which Jesus Christ delivered are — apart from certain important statements made by Paul—the first three Gospels. Everything that we know, independently of these Gospels, about Jesus' history and His teaching, may be easily put on a small sheet of paper, so little does it come to. In particular, the Fourth Gospel, which does not emanate or profess to emanate from the Apostle John, cannot be taken as an historical authority in the ordinary meaning of the word.'

Dr. Sanday is disappointed with that. He has watched for some time 'a certain oscillation of opinion' regarding the Fourth Gospel. He had hoped for another outcome than this. To this he enters 'an emphatic protest.' Such an estimate as this, he says, has often been asserted, but has never been proved. The Fourth Gospel does not stand apart in this way. It simply develops features in the history and personality of Christ to which the other Gospels clearly point. 'On the basis of the Fourth Gospel,' says Dr. Sanday, 'St. Paul and the primitive Church are intelligible, but they are not intelligible otherwise.' He grants freedom in the handling—though the amount is often exaggerated—that very freedom showing that the writer 'must have been in a position of command, and very sure of his ground.' And this tells for, not against, the beloved disciple. After all, 'the indications of trustworthy character long ago alleged remain where they were.' And the most real objection to the Fourth Gospel is an objection to the supernatural. But to remove the supernatural, says Professor Sanday, is to reduce *all* the Christian documents to a chaos.

Professor Harnack does not remove the super-

natural. As a Ritschlian he does not make much of it. But his position is a distinct advance on the older Rationalism. He seems to recognize the presence of an exceptional and perhaps unique cause, producing exceptional and perhaps unique effects. He sees possibilities beyond the range of our common experience. And he leaves room for the substantial truth of the greater part of the narrative. Clearly his language regarding the Fourth Gospel is not only unjust to the Fourth Gospel, but unjust also to himself.

If, however, it were right to reduce Christianity to the teaching of Jesus, then Dr. Sanday could go along with Harnack most of the way. He is particularly pleased with Harnack's doctrine of the Kingdom. He quotes: 'The Kingdom of God comes by coming to the individual, by entering into his soul and laying hold of it. True, the Kingdom of God is the rule of God; but it is the rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals; *it is God himself in his power.*' He quotes also Harnack's description of the triple meaning of the Kingdom: 'The Kingdom has a triple meaning. Firstly, it is something supernatural, a gift from above, not a product of ordinary life. Secondly, it is a purely religious blessing, the inner link with the living God. Thirdly, it is the most important experience that a man can name, that on which everything else depends; it permeates and dominates his whole existence, because sin is forgiven and misery banished.' And 'all that,' he says, 'I venture to think is exactly right.'

But it is not right, and it is not possible, to reduce Christianity to the teaching of Jesus. And when Harnack comes to deal with the Person of Christ, Professor Sanday decidedly parts company with him.

For, in the first place, Harnack wants to have a Christianity without a Christology. He would have the Christian life without any doctrine as to Christ's Person. He is impatient of dogma, and even of doctrine in any form. He says that

to put a 'Christological' creed in the forefront of the Gospel and say that men must first learn to think rightly about Christ, is to put the cart before the horse. And he even declares that the gospel (that is, the message of Jesus, not the Gospels) has to do with the Father only and not with the Son; he even asserts that Jesus desired no other belief in His Person and no other attachment to it than is contained in the keeping of His commandments.

Dr. Sanday shows that to deny its place to the Person of Christ is to disorganize the teaching. The teaching about the Kingdom involves the Messianic claim. For 'the Messiah is God's Vicegerent in that Kingdom, and it is through Him that it is accomplished.' And he further shows that Harnack's own language in other parts of his book demands a doctrine of the Person of Christ, which contradicts these negative assertions. Along with other passages, he quotes these words from p. 142: 'With the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah the closest possible connection was established for every devout Jew between Jesus' message and His Person; for it is in the Messiah's activity that God Himself comes to His people, and the Messiah who sits at the right hand of God in the clouds of heaven has a right to be worshipped.'

And, in the next place, Harnack cuts Jesus' teaching off from the testimony of the first generation of Christians. Not only does he reduce

Christianity to the teaching of Jesus, he reduces it to his own mutilated version of that teaching.

At first, it is true, he makes a show of appealing to the interpretation of the earliest followers of Christ. He says that we must listen to what the first generation of His disciples tell us of the effect which He had upon their lives. He even proposes to go beyond the first generation. 'We shall follow,' he says, 'the leading changes which the Christian idea has undergone in the course of history, and try to recognize its chief types. What is common to all the forms which it has taken, corrected by reference to the Gospel, and, conversely, the chief features of the Gospel, corrected by reference to history, will, we may be allowed to hope, bring us to the kernel of the matter.'

But his appeal to history is a promise that is not kept. The moment the testimony of the early Christians conflicts with Harnack's own theories it is overruled. How otherwise could he get rid of Christology? St. Paul has a high Christological doctrine of the Person of Jesus, Harnack has not. He can only retain his own by rejecting that of St. Paul. And thus Harnack misses his grand opportunity. For the question of deepest interest at the present time is how far the remaining books of the New Testament rightly interpret the data contained in the Gospels. Harnack was called upon to answer it. He has said much on questions of less account. He has not answered that question.

The Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees.

BY THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, M.A., B.D., DUNDONALD.

THE following four hymns are taken from the so-called Psalter of Solomon (3, 6, 5, 10), which represents the somewhat unskilful Greek version¹ of a Hebrew original composed a century or so

¹ Probably made for use in the worship of Greek-speaking Jews throughout the Palestinian synagogues, though the liturgical traces are scanty and indistinct.

earlier, *i.e.* 80-40 B.C. The greater part of this Psalter, as a whole, reflects the mood of the more pious Pharisaic circles in Palestine during the years that followed Pompey's siege and capture of Jerusalem² in 63 B.C., and the collection forms

² The glory of the renovated earthly Jerusalem (Ps 17³³⁻³⁶) is partly reproduced in Apoc 21^{23f.}, as is the rule of the