

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* will contain four new maps. Two will illustrate Professor Buhl's article on ROADS AND TRAVEL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT; and two will illustrate Professor Ramsay's article on ROADS AND TRAVEL IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. The authors of the articles have themselves superintended the preparation of the maps. Each of them will occupy two pages of the *Dictionary*.

The Map which illustrates the Roads connecting Palestine with the neighbouring countries will cover the whole of what is known as the Ancient East. The places where explorations have been carried on will be marked upon it. Professor Ramsay's map of Asia Minor will correct some errors that are retained in even the latest and best maps. Such errors are not due always to carelessness or ignorance, but sometimes to a subsequent re-arrangement of boundaries, or even a shifting of the land or water. It will be necessary also for students of St. Paul to examine Professor Ramsay's map of the Apostle's Travels.

Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, joint-editor with Mr. Abrahams of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, has published a volume on *Liberal Judaism* (Macmillan; 3s. net). Mr. Montefiore is a believer in Evolution and an adherent of the Higher Criticism. It

is not easy for a man to be all that and a Jew. The purpose of Mr. Montefiore's book is to show what Liberal Judaism is; but more, to show that a man may advocate Liberal Judaism and still be a Jew.

For it is freely stated that there is Judaism and Liberal Judaism, and that these two are not one. Mr. Montefiore rejects the separation. He admits that there is Orthodox Judaism and Liberal Judaism, and he holds that both are Judaism. But if a majority-vote or the casting of lots should decide that only Orthodox Judaism is Judaism, then Mr. Montefiore is resolved to be cast forth with Liberal Judaism. Like Luther (and the likeness is so close as to startle one) he says, God help him, he can do no other.

We do not wonder that the Orthodox Jews say that Liberal Judaism is not Judaism. It does not believe in the Inspiration of Scripture. Mr. Montefiore says it does. But the Orthodox Jew denies that Mr. Montefiore's inspiration is inspiration. For he says that it takes place according to law, and that it varies in clearness and power. It takes place according to law. That rules out the supernatural. It rules out physical miracle and prophetic prediction. And it varies in clearness and power. That means that Isaiah was perhaps more inspired than Amos, but perhaps less than Dante;

and it means that there are things in Isaiah which may be neither new nor true.

For inspiration, according to Mr. Montefiore, is not the inspiration of the Bible. It is communion with God. The man who holds the communion has the inspiration, and the measure of the inspiration is the degree of the communion. So Mr. Montefiore agrees with Orthodox Judaism in holding that the New Testament is uninspired. But he contradicts it in saying that the Old Testament is also uninspired. And then he goes so far as to say that Jesus of Nazareth may have been inspired. And how can he be a Jew after that?

If he can, there is worse to follow. Mr. Montefiore does not believe in the dietary laws of the Old Testament. He holds that he is at liberty to eat a rabbit or a hare. He passionately pleads that he is a Jew still, but he knows how passionately it will be resisted. For according to Orthodox Judaism the man who eats a rabbit or a hare is less a Jew than the man who commits adultery. If he breaks any of the moral precepts of the Law of Moses, regard must be had to the weakness of the flesh. He yielded to the temptation, but he regrets it and repents of his sin. He is not a good Jew, but he is a Jew. But the man who eats a rabbit or a hare does so either because he does not *want* to remain a Jew, or else because he does not believe that these prohibitions are from God. In either case, says Orthodox Judaism, he is no longer a Jew.

Soon after the issue of Mr. Montefiore's book on 'Liberal Judaism,' there was published an English translation of Professor Jean Réville's lectures on *Liberal Christianity* (Williams & Norgate; 4s.).

The similarity between the two books is remarkable. Professor Réville departs from Orthodox Christianity as radically as Mr. Montefiore departs from Orthodox Judaism. In both cases the departure is due to the acceptance of Evolution and

the Higher Criticism. In both the departure ends with the rejection of all that interferes with the reign of natural law and the judgment seat of the man's own reason. Inspiration is in both personal communion with God; Dante and Milton are inspired along with Isaiah and Jesus of Nazareth. There is no Messianic prediction and no resurrection from the dead.

But Professor Réville is far more ready than Mr. Montefiore to acknowledge his dissent from Orthodoxy. He delights in describing the antagonism between Liberal and Orthodox Christianity. He declares that Liberal Protestantism (for he prefers that word to Christianity, though he says that it means the same thing) is not Protestant Liberalism. An orthodox person may practise a little liberalism, but that will not make him a Liberal Protestant. The title has a definite use. It is reserved for those—French-speaking Protestants they all are as yet—who reject the doctrines that mar traditional Protestantism and retain the spirit that made both Protestantism and Christianity.

They are the 'well-instructed persons' of the following paragraph: 'The dogma of original sin and of the fundamental corruption of the human race is indissolubly bound up with a conception of history which no well-instructed person in our day can possibly hold. The splendid narratives of the Creation and the Fall in Genesis can appear to us now nothing more than legends of a very high religious inspiration, but absolutely devoid of historical or scientific authority. And the experience of humanity proves that the notion of the fundamental corruption of man and of his total inability to do the right, except in the Christian community, is contradicted by countless observations.'

Yet Professor Réville is as anxious to prove that he is a Protestant still as Mr. Montefiore is anxious to prove that he is still a Jew. He holds none of the dogmas of traditional Christianity, yet he is the only true Christian. For Christianity consists

in a single and simple law of life: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.' Professor Réville likes to put it into the form of 'love to the God in man and the man in God.' And he holds that the true Christian or Protestant is he who adapts that law to the circumstances of his day and obeys it. If there is any tradition it is false. It is false because it is tradition. Orthodox Christianity boasts of its traditional inheritance from the past. Professor Jean Réville says that in so far as it is a tradition it is not Christianity.

'If we are not to say that the Atonement (as a work carried through in the sufferings and death of Christ, sufferings and death determined by our sin) is vicarious or substitutionary, what are we to call it?'

The question is asked by Dr. Denney in the book he has published on *The Atonement and the Modern Mind* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d.). He knows the answer. He has prepared the way for it. In the next paragraph it comes. 'The only answer which has been given to this question, by those who continue to speak of Atonement at all, is that we must conceive Christ not as the substitute, but as the representative of sinners.'

Dr. Denney does not deny that this word 'Representative' has some advantages. It recognizes a relationship between the sinner and his Saviour. It insists upon that relationship as necessary to the salvation. It shows that the salvation wrought by Christ is not an accomplished fact, done for the sinner as it might be done for a fallen angel, and finished off whether the sinner appropriates it or not. It recognizes the co-operation that there must be between the sinner and his Saviour, first in kinship and then in will. But he holds that if there is objection to 'Substitute' the objection to 'Representative' is quite as strong.

Dr. Denney is thinking of a criticism of his book

on the *Death of Christ*, which appeared in the *Primitive Methodist Quarterly*. It was written by Professor Peake. He is preparing to answer that criticism. Professor Peake claimed for 'Representative' not only that it was the better, but that it was the only word to express the relationship of Christ to men. He said: 'If we place ourselves at Paul's point of view, we shall see that to the eye of God the death of Christ presents itself less as an act which Christ does for the race than as an act which the race does in Christ.'

Dr. Denney turns that into 'plain English.' 'In plain English,' he says, 'Paul teaches less that Christ died for the ungodly, than that the ungodly in Christ died for themselves.' And then he adds that this is presented as something profound, a recognition of the mystical depths in Paul's teaching. But 'I own I can see nothing profound in it except a profound misapprehension of the apostle.'

Nevertheless Dr. Denney welcomes the word and Professor Peake's explanation of it. He welcomes the explanation because it shows him what the word logically leads to when it is opposed to substitute. It recognizes a 'racial act' in the death of Christ. Christ is ours in the article of His death, and we are one with Him. Dr. Denney replies that Christ is not ours. This very apostle's point of view is, he says, that we are 'without Christ' (*χωρίς Χριστού*). He is not put forward by us, as Dr. Denney claims that a representative must be. He is sent by God, and that is not to make Him a Representative but just a Substitute. It is what Christ does for us, not the effect which that produces in us, still less 'the fantastic abstraction of a racial act,' that is the Atonement of the New Testament.

It is a very rough and ready way of handling prophecy to deny the element of prediction in it. The suspicion arises that the denial is due not to the study of prophecy, but to a little knowledge of Darwinism. It is to look at prophecy after one has

come to the conclusion that God first willed to express His will in law and then allowed the law to crush the freedom of His will. Professor Driver does not deny a predictive element in prophecy. The late Professor Davidson did not deny it.

Professor Davidson knew well that the old definition of prophecy, Prophecy = Prediction, was so partial as to be untrue. But he saw that the Hebrew prophet believed himself able to predict the future. He saw that without the power of prediction he was so much the less a prophet. For if the prophet speaks for God, it would be strange if he should be able to refer only to the present and the past. It is true that we do not need to know isolated occurrences in the future, that we should be none the better saints if the day of our death were revealed to us. But God is a God of connexion. Few things do occur in isolation. And the prophet who could not see with the inner eye the issue of events that were taking place in his time and predict that issue with assurance, was scarcely worth the name of prophet.

Professor Davidson went further than that. In his volume on *Old Testament Prophecy*, now issued by Messrs. T. & T. Clark under the editorship of Professor Paterson (10s. 6d. net), he says that we are entitled to look for the direct fulfilment of prophecy, and not of the main ideas of the prophet only, but 'perhaps also some, or even much, of the formal details.'

He has no doubt whatever of the main ideas. How could he have any doubt? If Prophecy is reduced to the general statement, 'Be sure your sin will find you out,' with occasional contemporary application of it, the Hebrew prophet would have done little more for his nation than the Greek philosopher did for his. There is no doubt that he was a foreseer as well as a seer. There is no question there. The question is, Ought we to be content with the fulfilment of the general idea of the prophecy, or should we look for the fulfilment of the details?

Professor Davidson believed that sometimes, perhaps often, we should look for the fulfilment of the details. He is bold enough to say that it is more after the spirit of prophecy to hold that Zechariah predicted the actual entry of the Messiah into Jerusalem *riding on an ass*, than to say that he used the phrase merely to express how peaceful and lowly He would be.

Such a statement is not to be appreciated without some study of prophecy. And the best approach to the study of prophecy is Professor Davidson's own book. For, as he passes on, he opens up, in the very chapter with which we are dealing, wonderful avenues of insight into the prophetic mind. Was the Hebrew prophet a poet merely? Was he merely a poet when he sang of the day when the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the little child should lead them? In the West a poet may say that and be a poet only. In the East we may doubt if a poet is ever a poet only. We may doubt if he would think it worth his while to be a poet, if he could not be a prophet also. The Hebrew prophet was a poet because he was a prophet. He sang of a redeemed earth because he could predict its redemption. He included the wolf in his picture because he had keen sympathy with all the creatures which his God had made, and yet more because he saw how it might come to pass that the creature also should be delivered from the bondage of its corruption and enter into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

There is a certain mystery about Saul's malady which has never yet been cleared up. The mystery makes the character and career of Saul more piquant. But it is possible that piquancy may be got at the cost of a great lesson. Was Saul guilty of some secret sin? Dr. Charles Creighton believes that he was. He believes that Saul's sin was indulgence in hachish.

Hachish is an intoxicant drug, the disreputable intoxicant drug of the East to-day, as opium is

the respectable narcotic. Its use can be traced to a great antiquity. In his *Chrestomathic Arabe*, De Sacy proves that it was in use among the Arabs as early as the sixth or seventh centuries of our era. And the probability is very great that it was known and indulged in at least as many centuries before Christ. For the fibre of that hemp plant (*Cannabis sativa*), from the flowers of which hachish is gathered as a resinous dew, was used for cordage in very early ages.

Mr. Charles Creighton, M.D., writes on 'Indications of the Hachish Vice in the Old Testament' in the French periodical, *Janus*, for the months of May and June. He acknowledges the difficulty of proving that Saul was addicted to this vice. It is scarcely possible to prove that any one was addicted to any secret vice in antiquity, so carefully are such things concealed under unsuspecting forms of words. But his suggestion seems to supply the key to certain obscurities of the narrative, and it certainly deserves the consideration of the student of Religion and the Old Testament.

Dr. Creighton begins with Jonathan. Or rather he begins with a passage in the Song of Solomon, and then passes on to the case of Saul and Jonathan. The passage is Canticles 5¹, 'I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse; I have gathered my myrrh with my spice; *I have eaten my honey-comb with my honey*; I have drunk my wine with my milk.' The phrase to be noticed is the one he has thrown into italics. It is certainly suspicious. To eat the honey-comb along with the honey is unusual and not very pleasant. It suggests a minor poet at his wits' end to fill out a line.

But the Hebrew is 'I have eaten *my wood* (עֵץ) with my honey.' That invites investigation. The LXX did not know what to make of it, or purposely made something very proper and commonplace of it, for they render 'I have eaten *my bread* (ἄρον μου) with my honey.' It was the Vulgate that hit upon the paraphrase of 'honey-

comb' (*favum*)—a bold licence, says Dr. Creighton, and a platitude to boot, for there is neither wit nor point in making one eat the honey-comb along with the honey. Dr. Creighton takes it that the word wood or thicket is used for the hemp plant; and if he had been producing the Vulgate translation he would have made it, *comedi cannabim cum confectione mellis*—which is the elegant way of taking hachish in the East to this day.

Now about Jonathan. The occasion is Jonathan's great victory over the Philistines (1 S 14). The words in point are: 'And all [they of] the land came to a wood; and there was honey upon the ground. And when the people were come into the wood, behold, the honey dropped; but no man put his hand to his mouth: for the people feared the oath. But Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with the oath: wherefore he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and dipped it in an honey-comb, and put his hand to his mouth; and his eyes were enlightened.'

The first thing to observe is that the words translated 'honey-comb' are literally 'honey wood' or 'honey thicket' (עֵצַת הַדְּבַשׁ). It is again the Vulgate that has started exegesis in the wrong direction, says Dr. Creighton, by translating 'honey-thicket' as before by *favus*, 'honey-comb.' There is no mention of honey or honey bees. The word never means 'comb,' but wood or forest of some dense growing plant. The statement, says Dr. Creighton, is that they came to a field of hemp and found its resinous exudation dropping from the flower-stalks with the heat.

And what did Jonathan do? Dr. W. B. O'Shaughnessy, in his *Bengal Dispensatory* (1842), says that in Central India and the Sangor territory, men clad in leather rush through the hemp fields in the hot season; the soft resin adheres to the leather, from which it is afterwards scraped and kneaded into balls. In Nipal, he adds, the leathern dress is dispensed with, and the resin is

gathered on the skins of naked coolies. Jonathan's method was simpler. He touched the hot flowers with the end of his stick and carried it to his mouth. The mere taste of this 'honey' is said to have 'enlightened his eyes.'

So, for the moment at least, Jonathan was a hachish-eater. Dr. Creighton believes that he was so habitually, and his father with him. He thinks there is evidence to show that hachish-eating was a vice of the royal palace, and that this was the very reason why Saul said, 'Cursed be the man that eateth any food until evening, that I may be avenged on mine enemies.' It was not the question of urgency merely. It was the fear of the 'enlightening.'

For if the hachish 'enlightens' the eyes for a moment, it dulls the senses, unnerves the heart, and destroys the reason, in the end. This is the explanation; thinks Dr. Creighton, of Saul's terror on the eve of the battle of Gilboa. This is the meaning of the madness that he was subject to at intervals. And this is the reason why the kingdom was taken from him and given to another.

Dr. Creighton thinks that the hachish merchants were the Amalekites, and that that explains Samuel's hatred of Agag and all his race. Those 'sinners' the Amalekites—it was fitting that Saul the hachish-eater should be sent to destroy them. It was a last great opportunity given to him to recover himself and crush the hated merchants of his vice. But he could not do it. He spared Agag. And if we sympathize with his weakness, and wonder at the wrath of the prophet, who rose and slew Agag the Amalekite with his own hand, it is well, Dr. Creighton thinks, that we should consider the mischief that Agag had done to Saul and to his kingdom.

As for Saul's madness. One thing is clear, that music has no power over ordinary madness or any form of melancholy. The example of David playing before Saul has introduced the harp into a

lunatic asylum occasionally, but it has had no effect. There is one sort of mental aberration, however, which music touches. It is the insanity of the hachish-eater. In the year 1845 Dr. J. Moreau published his valuable work, *Du Hachish et de l'Aliénation Mentale*, in which he describes 'la puissante influence qu'exerce la musique sur ceux qui ont pris du hachish.' Music, he says, even the roughest, the mere vibrations of the strings of a harp or guitar, excite one to something like delirium, or plunge one into a great melancholy.

Dr. Moreau does not refer to Saul's madness. It had not occurred to him to look for an example in the Old Testament. It is the more surprising that he so closely describes the case of Saul. And Dr. Creighton adds that nothing is more characteristic of hachish-eating than ungovernable fits of temper—such fits as Saul had when he threw his javelin at David to strike him to the wall.

Mr. R. Somervell, M.A., late scholar of King's College, Cambridge, has published a small volume, through Mr. Elliot Stock, which he calls '*Eternal Life, its Nature and Sustenance; a Reflection*' (2s. 6d.). The book is little, and it is not all his own. Nearly one-half of it is a summary of M'Leod Campbell's 'Christ the Bread of Life.' And yet, if Mr. Somervell is right in what he says, this little book of his is worth the greatest of the month's publications.

He says that Christ's offer to men is Life. It is not forgiveness of sins, though that is promised; nor holiness, though that is demanded. It is Life. 'I come that they may have life.' 'I give unto them eternal life.' 'I am the way and the truth and the life.' 'Even as thou gavest him authority over all flesh, that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life.'

It is true that these sayings are all quoted from the Fourth Gospel. They are none the worse

for that. And although they cannot be directly paralleled from the Synoptics, it is clear to Mr. Somervell that 'eternal life' was in the Synoptic teaching Christ's ordinary offer. How otherwise would the lawyer in St. Luke (10²⁵) and the ruler in St. Matthew (19¹⁶) and St. Mark (10¹⁷) come and ask how they might inherit 'eternal life'?

And St. Paul is in agreement. 'The free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.' It is the only complete expression of the gift of Christ. It includes the revelation of the Father, forgiveness, peace, holiness. As Hort says, 'This is the one character of the gospel that takes precedence of all others; its many partial messages are unfoldings of its primary message of life.'

But why life? What is life that it should be the sum and substance of all that Christ came to give us? It is a metaphor of course. It is an application to the spirit of that which we know in physical organisms, the opposite of which we call death. Already it is metaphorically used of the intellect, when we speak of certain powers of thinking, reasoning, judging as indications of intellectual life. What is life when transferred to the region of the spirit?

It is something that has to be sustained with food. So has the natural life. And as the word for the natural life is chosen for it, so also the words for the sustenance of the natural life are chosen to express its sustenance: 'I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' And then, when the Jews were perplexed and murmured, with greater emphasis and greater perplexity, He said, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves.'

Will He condescend to tell us what those words mean? Only if we have ears to hear. In another place He says, 'As the living Father hath sent me,

and I live by the Father, even so he that eateth me, he also shall live by me.' So He lives by the Father. He eats the Father. He eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Father. How does He do that? 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work.'

It was on the occasion of His journey to Galilee. He must needs go through Samaria. When He came to Jacob's Well He sat down upon it and sent the disciples into the town to buy food. It was food for the body they went to buy; but when they came back they found that He had forgotten the needs of the body. They invited Him to eat. 'I have meat to eat that ye know not of.' He had been doing the Father's will, and so He had been feeding on the Father. It was a solitary and a sinful woman. But it is not the will of the Father that one of these little ones should perish. He had had a full meal and was not hungry.

Well, if Christ's meat was to do the will of the Father, our meat is to do the will of the Son. If when Christ did the Father's will He lived by the Father; when we do the will of the Son we live by the Son. And to eat His flesh and drink His blood is just to do His will.

Thus far it is simple and unmistakable. But a difficulty is at hand. It is not in the very next step. For the next step is this. That if feeding upon Christ is doing His will, then eternal life is the absence of the will of self and the acceptance of the will of Christ. He that believeth, that is, feedeth, on Him, hath eternal life. The difficulty is not there.

The difficulty faces us when we come to those words about feeding upon Christ which are most of all familiar to us. 'This is my body; this is my blood; this do in remembrance of me.' There are three ways of understanding these words.

One way is to take them literally. That is to

say, some understand that the bread represents the flesh of the Son of Man and the wine His blood; and to eat the bread and drink the wine is somehow to eat His flesh and drink His blood. To some it is a very literal act, to others it is less so. But to all of this way of thinking it is necessary to eat the bread and to drink the wine in order that they may have life in themselves.

Another way is to pass the words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' and rest upon the words, 'This do in remembrance of me.' Then the Holy Communion is simply a memorial supper. It is not a memorial of the Last Supper merely; it is a memorial of the life that was given 'a ransom for many.' It is a memorial however. The bread and the wine are shared because He said, 'This do in remembrance of me.'

Mr. Somervell does not believe that either of those ways is the right way. There is a third. He does not believe that the Supper is a mere memorial, because nowhere does Christ lay emphasis upon memorials. Everywhere He emphasizes a present Christ. His own meat is to do the will of the Father; our meat is to do His will—it is never to remember His death or dying love. Nor does he believe that the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine are the necessary conditions for receiving the gift of life and sustaining it. If it were necessary to receive the consecrated elements in order to have life in us, then our mode of nourishment would be different from His own. 'I live by the Father'—and that, He explained, means, 'I do the will of the Father'; 'even so ye live by me'—not by receiving bread and wine, but by doing My will.

It was on that last night in which he was betrayed that He instituted the Supper. He did not introduce a new mode of nourishing the spiritual life. He had already explained that when He spoke of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, He meant identification of will, surrender

of the human will and glad acceptance of the divine will. How could He unsay all that? How could He introduce disorder now? How could He say that after all it was no metaphor He had been employing, but that in deed and in truth it was necessary for man to eat His flesh and drink His blood?

Mr. Somervell meets objections. The objection will be made that then the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is only a symbol. If the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine are nothing in themselves, if they merely signify the doing of the will of God, then the importance attached to the ordinance in the New Testament and in the Church is out of all proportion to its real value. Mr. Somervell replies, 'Only a symbol?' What are the regiment's colours but a symbol? Yet when the soldier has given his life to rescue them from the enemy, we have never felt that his life was given for nothing.

The objection will also be made that it is possible to receive Mr. Somervell's view and hold the other also. Is it not possible to believe that the elements are symbols and also instruments; that they figure the doing of the will of our Lord, and yet are the means by which it is done? Mr. Somervell does not think that it is possible. In the history of the Church he sees the impossibility. First, there was the spiritual conception wherein the elements were symbols of that eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of the Son of man, which signified the daily doing of His will. Then came the conception that the eating and drinking were ends in themselves. The Fathers sometimes tried to hold both views together. Slowly the material view gained the day, till transubstantiation became a dogma and test of Catholic orthodoxy. They cannot be held together. In time the presence of Christ in the heart will be beaten by the presence of Christ upon the altar.

The deeper objection will be made that the

belief in the real presence has actually been the occasion of spiritual blessing. Against that objection Mr. Somervell has nothing to urge. He is most loyal to the Church, most reverent to the administration of grace. Why should the Communion not be a means of grace? It is at least an act of obedience to the command: 'This do in remembrance of Me'; and every act of

obedience brings a blessing. 'But,' he says, 'the grace given is one thing, and our theories as to the nature of the giving and receiving are another; and we must be on our guard against supposing that the reality and value of a spiritual gift are dependent upon the accuracy of what is really only an intellectual conception of the way in which it is given.'

Theodor Mommsen.

FUNERAL ORATION BY PROFESSOR A. HARNACK, D.D., PH.D., BERLIN.¹

The peace of God be with us all!

LORD, Thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of men. For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night. The days of our years are threescore years and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore years; yet is their pride but labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away. Amen.

DEVOUT MOURNERS,—In deep grief and with hearts full of pain, we have gathered round the bier of Theodor Mommsen. Quenched is the light of that eye in which the world and its history were so clearly mirrored; the spirit which arranged and controlled its visions has returned to its Creator.

Neither disease nor weakness, neither trouble nor care nor grief could check the revolution of the brazen spokes of the wheel of that life which is now ended. The wheel stopped only when the limit appointed to human life was reached, only when the work given him to do was ended.

Our grief for his loss is of the profoundest. Our sorrow is shared by this whole city, whose burgess-roll included his name, and by the University and the Academy, whose pride and joy he was. It is shared by our King and our Fatherland, nay, by the whole outside world which can recognize and

appreciate genius; above all, by Italy and by that city, the eternal Rome, to whose history the labour of his life was devoted.

All these have lost him. High and low, old and young, know that a star has grown pale and a crown fallen. They mourn, but they do not repine, for his course was finished, and even with those near to him, those to whom he was husband, father, friend, repining should be swallowed up in gratitude to God, who gave them such a possession, and gave it so long.

Not on his account do we lament, but on our own; for in Theodor Mommsen there has been taken from us not only the acknowledged master, but a part of our own life and history. We have been rendered poorer, and who can make up this loss to us?

Thanks to him we had been brought into living contact with the days of our fathers, with glorious days in our history, both external and internal, with lofty, commanding spirits. But it was not only as a messenger but as a witness of these times that he stood in our midst, leading himself a life such as none of us can live after him, none of us fully appreciate. How we shall miss him!

But at the present moment it becomes us to control our natural feelings, the feelings of the heart, and to pay the last honour to the mighty dead by calling up as vivid a picture as we can of his character and his work. We move this picture into the light of the Eternal, the light of the Lord of history, as we inscribe upon it the Scripture saying: 'I have chosen you and appointed you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should abide.'

¹ The Oration here translated was pronounced by Professor Harnack at the funeral service of Professor Mommsen in the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church, Berlin, on 5th November 1903. The original has since been published by Hinrichs, Leipzig (price 50 pfennigs).