

Recent Foreign Theology.

Gebhardt's Psalms of Solomon.

THE Psalms of Solomon were first printed in 1626 as an appendix to the *Adversaria Sacra* of the Jesuit de la Cerda. This was based on a poor transcript made in Augsburg of a Vienna MS. borrowed from the librarian Hoeschel. The second edition in 1713, by Fabricius, gave the same text cleared of a few mistakes. Hilgenfeld (1868-69) was the first to give a really improved text by the aid of a collation of the Vienna MS. Fritzsche (1871) published a text, improved here and there by conjecture; Geiger (1871), one improved by guesses at the Hebrew original. A decided advance was made in the edition of Ryle and James (1891), who had at command three new MSS. (two of which had been discovered by Oscar von Gebhardt): the Copenhagen, Moscow, and Paris ones, of which, however, only the first was fully used. Yet another MS., and that one of special importance, the Vatican, underlies the edition of Swete (in the 3rd vol. of the Septuagint); still, the rendering of its readings is not free from errors. These editions are far excelled by that of Oscar von Gebhardt: *Die Psalmen Salomo's zum ersten Male mit Benutzung des Athoshandschriften und des Codex Casanatensis herausgegeben* (Leipzig, VII. 151 S. 5 Mk.). He has succeeded not only in increasing the material by three MSS. (two at Athos and the Codex Casanatensis at Rome), but also in using the enlarged material in excellent fashion. The introduction, covering eighty-eight pages, shows the master of textual criticism. The account is everywhere lucid, the argument thoroughly convincing. Gebhardt shows that, until the Vatican MS. appeared, there was really only one form of text: the Vienna one is merely a transcript, almost a facsimile, of the Copenhagen one; the Moscow and the Paris ones are copies of the same original, which again was also a copy of the Copenhagen one. On the other hand, the Vatican form of text is considerably different; von Gebhardt shows that it is transcribed from a copy, a second transcript of which is the parent of all other existing MSS. The Vatican MS. therefore stands nearest of all to the archetype, and represents a different line of text-tradition from all the rest. The nearest of these to the parent form

of this line is the MS. of the Athos monastery Jviron; next come the texts of the Codex Casanatensis and the MS. of the Laura monastery, copied from a common original; at the farthest remove is the Copenhagen MS. Thus, considering the unmistakable imperfection even of the Vatican MS., it was impossible, by comparing the latter with the Copenhagen one, to reach satisfactory results; this was only possible when other MSS. appeared. It is obvious, then, how great our debt is to von Gebhardt for not merely giving us an excellent restoration of the text by means of a complete collection of variants, but for first making such a restoration possible. The improved text he gives us, as von Gebhardt points out, is still by no means the original of the translation of the Psalms from the Hebrew. The MS., to which the two lines of text-tradition go back, stood already at some distance from that original, and contained evident mistakes which no one has yet succeeded in completely removing. Important help in doing this would be given by a retranslation into Hebrew made with full mastery of the subject. Franz Delitzsch had planned such a work, and von Gebhardt's edition should have formed the basis for it. With deep feeling von Gebhardt has dedicated the book to Delitzsch's memory.

J. S. BANKS.

Headingley.

Among the Periodicals. Israel's Return from Exile.

IN the *Götting. gelehr. Anzeigen* (1897, No. 2) Professor WELLHAUSEN reviews Meyer's *Entstehung des Judenthums*. His judgment of the book is much less favourable (amounting frequently to a severe condemnation both of the methods and the results of the author) than that expressed last month by Professor Kennedy (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 270). For the present we will content ourselves with indicating Wellhausen's view of Meyer's success in rehabilitating the Chronicler. It may be well to state that while Wellhausen dissented from much of Koster's reconstruction of the history of Israel's Restoration, he did not attempt to defend the genuineness of the official documents quoted in Ezra. For this he was taken to task by

Meyer, who will have it that Ezra iv. 7 should read that the letter to Artaxerxes was *written in Persian and translated into Aramaic*, and that this is a note in the document itself, meaning that from the first the latter was bilingual. Then the Aramaic copy is supposed to have been preserved to us. All this Wellhausen regards as utterly improbable. Why was an Aramaic copy needed? Not certainly for the use of Artaxerxes, and to suppose with Meyer that the bilingual edition was drawn up for despatch to Jerusalem implies what seems sufficiently absurd, that the inquiry of the Persian officials received the same publicity as the king's decree. Or are we to adopt the alternative that these officials were so considerate as to furnish the Jews with a bilingual copy of their accusation against them? Meyer's argument for a Persian origin, grounded upon the occurrence of Persian loan-words in Ezra iv.-vi., is held by Wellhausen to be futile. Following the same principle, a Persian origin might be claimed for the half of Daniel, to say nothing of a great part of the Syrian literature. Then as to the edict of Cyrus, which is alleged to have been discovered by Darius (Ezra vi. 3 ff.). Meyer himself admits that according to Haggai and Zechariah the foundation stone of the temple was not laid till the second year of Darius Hystaspis, and that this happened at the initiative of the Jews themselves. Yet this edict of Cyrus, which is not addressed to the Jews, commands the temple to be built at the king's expense. Meyer seeks in vain to minimise these facts and to water down the decree to a simple permission to the Jews to build. If this edict was issued by Cyrus, it must surely have received that publicity for which Meyer contends in the case even of a letter from the king's subordinates (Ezra iv. 7 ff.). How comes it then that the provincial officials know nothing of it, and have to request Darius to search the archives to discover if it exists? And why did not the Jews appeal to their possession of the sacred vessels as a proof of Cyrus' command to build? (Cf., however, 1 Es. iv. 43 ff., where those vessels have not yet been restored in the reign of Darius.) The desperate attempts of Meyer to explain away contradictions between this decree and what he himself holds to have been the course of the history, and the amount of Jewish colouring and editorial additions he admits, make one wonder what he finds left to defend. But if the edict of Cyrus is not genuine, Wellhausen

naturally distrusts the other documents referred to in the same connexion, and in particular the decree of Darius to which the first edict forms the introduction. Also the decree of Artaxerxes in Ezra iv. 17 ff. is moulded on the same lines. There is the same ransacking of archives, and an edict is the result. It is rather remarkable that if we have an exact reproduction of the original royal decree, the usual preface is wanting in this and in every other instance, 'The king of kings . . . speaks thus to his servant.' Wellhausen holds then that the correspondence between the court and the provinces, introduced in Ezra iv.-vi., is simply a dramatised form of narrative. It is doubtless true enough that Persian officials reported to the king the building of the temple and the walls of Jerusalem; they may even have asked for directions, but what the Chronicler gives us, especially in chap. iv., is a Jewish caricature of Persian customs. As to the firman of Ezra vii. 11 ff., which Artaxerxes is said to have given to Ezra, Meyer again admits considerable Jewish redaction, but holds that it is substantially genuine. Ezra, according to this document, received from the king full powers to introduce the Law of his God, and to enforce obedience by pains and penalties (Ezra vii. 25 f.). Why, then, does he defer imposing the law upon the Jews till the arrival of Nehemiah thirteen years afterwards? In view of this and other circumstances, Wellhausen cannot see his way to accept of the genuineness of the firman, although he does not doubt for a moment that Ezra had the favour and support of Artaxerxes.

Meyer, as well as Kusters, can 'reconstruct' history. It may be as well to give one or two instances of this, lest Professor Kennedy may last month have unintentionally conveyed the impression that the *Entstehung* is almost wholly on traditional lines. The Samaritans, we are told, did not force themselves upon the Jews, but resisted overtures from them, because they felt at first a repugnance for the new-Jewish religion. Finally, however, they accepted the latter *en bloc*, but then, unfortunately, the Jews would have nothing to do with them. Again, it was not in the time of David but after the Exile that the Béné-Caleb attached themselves to Judah. Once more, Nehemiah, we are told, had no special sympathy with Ezra, but paid him the deference due from a layman to a priest, who was at the same time the writer of the Torah of Jahweh.

In the same number Wellhausen has a short review of Van Hoonacker's *Nouvelles Études*, already noticed by us. The two are at one as against Koster's that a return took place under Cyrus, and that the lists of Ezra ii. and Neh. vii. contain the names of exiles who returned *before* the time of Ezra, but Wellhausen does not believe in the founding of the temple until the second year of Darius. He rejects emphatically Van Hoonacker's exegesis of Hag. ii. 15-19, holding that after the analogy of 1 Sam. xvi. 13, xxx. 25, מן היום הזה וְעַתָּה can refer only to the future and not to the past (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1896, p. 72). He continues to reject also the theory of Van Hoonacker, which places the arrival of Ezra at Jerusalem in his official capacity in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II. (398 B.C.). Wellhausen finds Van Hoonacker's strength in the extreme clearness and accuracy with which he states the position of his opponents (Koster is fortunate in having such an antagonist), while his weakness lies in his being trammelled by dogmatic considerations, and in his fixed idea that the critical investigations of his opponents are dominated solely by a determination that their pet theory of the post-exilic origin of the Priests' Code shall not be endangered.

The Kingdom of God.

This forms the subject of an article in the *Rev. de Théologie* (January 1897) by Pastor APPIA of Turin. Starting with a reference to the opposition that is frequently supposed to exist between the eschatological and moral conceptions of the Kingdom, our author seeks to show how these two can be combined, and how, to be complete, our notion of the Kingdom must take account of another element, the mystical, which can be used as a connecting link between the other two. The first, the eschatological conception, emphasises the Divine action in the establishing of the Kingdom; the second, the moral, emphasises human activity; while the third, the mystical, emphasises the communicating of the Divine-human life of Jesus Christ, which is based upon two conditions: the gift of the Holy Spirit upon God's side, and on man's side the faith which receives and obeys.

1. The eschatological conception was the predominant one amongst the Jews of our Lord's time. After a rapid but careful survey of the

changing fortunes of this conception in Old Testament times, Appia points out how the 'Kingdom of Heaven' had become a familiar phrase in Jewish theology, to designate the new order of things to which the national and religious hopes of the people of God attached themselves. John the Baptist and Jesus *shared these hopes*, although they corrected and supplemented them. While repudiating the gross carnal elements of the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah, Jesus retained the essential notion of a decisive intervention of Providence to secure the victory of the Messiah over all hostile powers and to establish His kingdom. Appia thus makes no attempt to explain away, on the contrary he heartily accepts, the notion which undoubtedly appears in some parts at least of the New Testament, that there will be a final supreme crisis, when the conflict between the Messiah and the Prince of this world shall reach its climax, and the Parousia of the Son of Man shall take place. The 'psychological moment' destined for this supreme intervention is known only to the Father, but certain signs shall herald its approach; its arrival is conditioned on the one hand by the faith and prayers and the missionary activity of the Church, and on the other by the intensity of the antichristian reaction.

2. The moral conception, according to which the Kingdom of God is the spiritual society composed of all those who conform their life to the law of love, is the favourite in many quarters at the present day. We are told that the eschatological and apocalyptic elements are a '*fecule hébraïque*' without any normative value, and of which Christianity does well to rid itself. 'The Kingdom of God is within you' is the motto often heard from Ritschlians, who bewail the fact that the apostles did not advance upon the lines marked out by their Master, and that they gave to His favourite conception, the Kingdom, only a very subordinate place. Such notions as those of a realisation of the Kingdom in the future through the personal return of Christ have no charm for this school. As J. P. Lange pithily puts it: '*Le bureau eschatologique est fermé chez Ritschl.*' While admitting fully the immense value of the moral conception of the Kingdom and the important place it occupied in the teaching of Jesus, Appia finds that too much stress is laid by Ritschlians on the activity of man, amounting practically to a doctrine of justification by works.

3. The mystical conception of the Kingdom of God is deliberately rejected by the school of Ritschl as not only useless but dangerous. The Holy Spirit has no place in their system, being simply the collective spirit (*Gemeingeist*) of the Christian Church. Appia, on the other hand, holds that it is a distinct loss to overlook this aspect of the Kingdom. He has no sympathy with the tendency to go behind the teaching of the apostles to the direct teaching of the Master, seeing that the latter expressly taught His followers to look to the future for a revelation still higher than they had received through His earthly ministry. And if the expectation of St. Paul that God at last is to be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28) shall be realised, this must be through the Holy Spirit's communicating the Divine life to every citizen of the Kingdom. For the development of this and other important aspects of the Spirit's work, we must refer readers to the article itself, which is as interesting as it is clear.

Finally, Appia points out how each of the three above conceptions, if held exclusively, has its special danger. The eschatological conception tends to the same extreme as modern socialism, it looks for redress too much to external changes. The moral conception tends to appeal too con-

fidently to man's own powers, to exaggerate his moral capabilities, while minimising the evil of sin, and to place him under the sway of a law more elevated and more spiritual, indeed, than the old one, but a law all the more difficult on that account to keep, and consequently all the more a source of despair to those who seriously attempt to keep it. The mystical conception, too, has dangers, and has at times occasioned abuses, which go far to explain, although they do not justify, the Ritschlian aversion to it. The mystic, pure and simple, may easily mistake unreflecting impulses for heavenly inspirations, he may cultivate religious emotions as if these were an end in themselves, and may gauge piety less by purity of life than by heightened feeling. The safeguard against these evil tendencies is to combine all the conceptions, and especially to make the mystical the *trait d'union* between the other two. Appia holds that thus safeguarded, the Kingdom should occupy the central place in Christian dogmatics which is accorded to it by Ritschl, and that it is possible to establish an organic connexion between this conception and all the great cardinal doctrines of the gospel.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

Sermonettes for Children on the Golden Texts.

I.

'Jesus Christ healeth thee.'—Acts ix. 34 (R.V.).

1. Peter had been making a tour of the cities and villages of Judea and Samaria, and he came to Lydda. He found Christians there already, and one of them palsied. We are not told in as many words that Æneas was already a Christian, and we may suppose, if we like, that Peter was the means of making him so. But it is nearly certain that he was already on the Lord's side. His soul was healed, his body wanted its healing now. And the day was coming when the body would be healed also. For the follower of Jesus, having lain down to sleep, awakes and finds a whole soul in a whole body. But Æneas got healing of the body before that day, sooner, indeed, than he or anyone else expected, for palsy was and is an incurable disease. Peter came to him, and said, 'Æneas, Jesus Christ healeth thee,' and he was healed immediately.

2. Peter did not say, 'I heal thee.' He was an honest man, and knowing that he did not do it, he did not claim to do it. If he had claimed to do it himself, he could not have done it. He had had a lesson in that. Once he had

boasted that, though all men should deny Jesus, he would never deny Him; and then he did it helplessly three times right on end. He knows now that he can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth him.

3. He says, 'Jesus Christ healeth thee.' That was a sermon, a full sermon, with all the necessary introduction, heads, application. 'Jesus' means the Man of Sorrows who came to *save*, the Son of Man who gave Himself a ransom; 'Christ' means the risen and anointed King. No doubt Æneas had once looked for the Messiah or Christ, who was to redeem Israel; Peter's short sermon says this Jesus of Nazareth is He. So it contains a historical fact—Jesus is the Christ; a redemptive fact—Christ is Jesus, *i.e.* a Saviour; and a regal fact—Jesus the Saviour is Christ, thy King and Lord.

4. Then the word *healeth*. To Æneas it may have meant only the healing of the body. But Peter was not likely to be content with that, and Jesus never was so content. If not already, very soon Æneas would know that when Jesus Christ heals, He heals the whole person.

5. Finally, notice the tense of the verb: 'healeth thee.' Peter does not say 'will heal thee,' still less 'may or can heal thee,' and still less does he say 'may He heal thee.'