
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.

'WHICH is the best Grammar of New Testament Greek?' The question would be easily answered if there were a good Grammar of New Testament Greek. But Winer is out of date. And Blass, in spite of its ability and excellent English translation, is too singular to be recommended to the ordinary working student. And more than that, it gives no adequate record of those wonderful discoveries of Greek papyri which, within the last few years, have altered the entire basis of the study of New Testament Greek.

But there is a Grammar in preparation. Dr. James Moulton is preparing it. His father's edition of Winer served the purposes of a whole generation of New Testament students. His is not to be another edition of Winer, but a wholly independent work. The difficulty of such a task can scarcely be overstated; but there is no living scholar who is more capable of accomplishing it. In the interests of New Testament scholarship, Dr. Moulton should be set apart for a year or two from every other occupation until he has finished it.

One part of the work, however, is nearly ready. Messrs. T. & T. Clark announce that within a few months they will publish *Prolegomena to a Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by Dr. James Moulton, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer in New Testament Exegesis at Manchester. Some foretaste of the wealth of new matter for the interpretation of the New Testament which this book will contain, as well as some indication of Dr. Moulton's skill as a writer, has been given to the readers of the *Expositor* in a series of papers during 1904. These papers will be included in the volume of *Prolegomena*. But they will be rearranged and largely extended. The discussions in the volume will give a full and systematic account of the characteristics of the language of the New Testament, Dr. Moulton having kept in touch with all the recent discoveries.

What was it that the elder son heard when he returned from the field? It was the bagpipes. So says Mr. Phillips Barry in the second part for 1904 of that most scholarly annual, the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. And it seems impossible to doubt that he is right.

The Greek word is *συμφωνία*. Now, *συμφωνία* in Greek, perhaps as early as the time of Aristotle, means some musical instrument. It appears as an Aramaic loan-word in Dn 3^5, and is translated 'bagpipe' by almost every competent translator. Again, it occurs in Roman writers in the Latinised form *symphonia*; and that in Latin it means 'bag-

pipe' is proved not only by the passages in which it occurs (Mr. Barry quotes very many of them), but also by the fact that with the meaning of 'bagpipe' it passed into all the Romance languages.

Turn to the word as it occurs in Lk 15^{25}. How has it been rendered in the Church? The Syriac palimpsest, found in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai by Mrs. Lewis, has *ṣephônyō*, clearly a loan-word from the Greek again, and taken in the Greek meaning. In the Western Church 'bagpipe' was the prevalent translation as late as the fifth century, when Jerome set it aside for the more general sense of the antiphony. The Vulgate chose *symphonia*, and Wiclif followed with 'a symphony,' undoubtedly in the sense of bagpipe. Ulfilas alone of the early translators chose the sense of 'singing' (*saggwins*). There can be no reasonable doubt that the verse ought to be translated: 'Now his elder son was in the field, and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard bagpipe and dancing.'

The fact of Conversion, like the fact of the Atonement, is better than the theory; but we should not neglect the theory. Upon the theory of Conversion science has been for some time at work. A considerable literature has been produced. The latest contribution is entitled, *Education in Religion and Morals* (Revell; 5s. net). It is written by George Albert Coe, Ph.D., John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in North-Western University.

In dealing with the theory of Conversion, Professor Coe makes an important distinction. He distinguishes between emotional and unemotional conversions. What he calls emotional conversions we have all been accustomed hitherto to call conversions. We have recognised no other. This is the first important fact which the psychology of religion has brought to light, that there are conversions which are not emotional; that, in short, those who cannot look back and name the day and hour of their conversion, who cannot recall any such experience in the past, may be as truly, as scientifically, converted as John Wesley or Colonel Gardiner.

Emotional conversions, says Professor Coe, occur for the most part at the age of sixteen. But so far is emotional conversion from being the only form of conversion that Dr. Coe declares it to be a kind of afterthought, and to be due to defective training. 'Conversions that occur at sixteen and seventeen seem to me to represent cases in which development of the religious sense did not proceed normally during the preceding four or five years; they are essentially an effort to "catch up."'

Professor Coe says this when he is discussing 'the age of joining the Church.' The phrase itself is a curious one, but it is none of Dr. Coe's coining. What he contributes to it is this second important fact, that the proper age for joining the Church is not sixteen or later, but at least as early as twelve. Out of five hundred and twelve 'officers of Young Men's Christian Associations,' the average age of the first deep religious impression was 13.7 years. Professor Coe believes that earlier than that the impression must have been deep enough to warrant their 'joining the Church.' For he has a further list of cases, not yet published, but reaching into the hundreds, in which the 'most distinctive period of spontaneous religious interest' falls on an average at the age of twelve.

One of the earliest difficulties in the Bible is the use of the plural in Genesis 1^{26}, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.' It is also one of the most obvious difficulties. The most casual reader is arrested by it. And if more is not made of it in popular teaching, it is because the Christian teacher accepts the explanation that the plural has reference to the Trinity—'let us, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, make man.'

It is an easy explanation, but it will not do. If

we have gained anything at all by the historical method of studying the Bible, we have gained this, that the doctrine of the Trinity is reached at a much later stage in the history of revelation. In spite of the example of the Fathers, and in spite of the difficulty of suggesting a better, no modern expositor is content with this explanation. Driver agrees with Dillmann that the plural is a 'plural of majesty,' words for lord or master, even when applied to a single person, being often found in the plural, for the purpose of conveying the ideas of dignity and greatness. Delitzsch followed the Jewish Rabbis in holding that God addresses His celestial court and consults with them before creating the highest of His works. The latest interpretation is wholly new. It is the interpretation of Professor Cheyne. Professor Cheyne believes that when God says, 'Let us make man,' He associates with Himself one other person and one alone. That person is the archangel Michael.

Professor Cheyne has just published a new book. It is known by the name of *Bible Problems* (Williams & Norgate; 5s.). But its full title is this: 'Bible Problems and the New Material for their Solution; a Plea for Thoroughness of Investigation: addressed to Churchmen and Scholars.' The volume contains a lecture which Professor Cheyne delivered before the Churchmen's Union, at the Church House, on June 16, 1904, together with elucidatory notes. The interpretation of Gn 1^{26} is found in one of the notes.

Professor Cheyne says that man was made in the image of God and Michael. The Jewish Midrash claims to know a good deal about the activity of Michael in the early events of our history, and Professor Cheyne 'ventures to think that there is more in this assertion of the Midrash than our too often dull exegesis is willing to recognise.' But he does not depend upon the Midrash. His belief that Michael co-operated in the creation of man has 'its own critical basis.'

For who is that 'angel of the Lord,' or 'angel of God,' who occurs so often in the Old Testament? Sometimes he is identified with Jehovah, sometimes he is distinguished from Him. Professor Cheyne believes he is Michael. Michael also is the angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil (Gn 48^{16}). He is the angel who was sent before the children of Israel to bring them to the land of the Amorites. For in all these places Dr. Cheyne believes that 'angel' or 'messenger' has been produced by a late editor of the Old Testament out of the name Michael. Michael means 'Who is like God?' Michael is therefore the repository of the Name of God; 'one might say that he *is* the Name of God.' He is also the Face of God. 'My Face' in Ex 33^{14} means my angel, and my angel means Michael.

Dr. Cheyne is careful to avoid digression. But at this point he rejoices to find that he has secured the key to the singular phrase, 'the angel of His Face,' in Isaiah 63^{9}. The phrase might mean the angel who has admission to His presence. But Dr. Cheyne is not satisfied with that meaning. Most probably, he says, the original meaning was 'Michael his Face'; Face and Name being both archaic expressions for the manifestation of God. And there are other passages in which Dr. Cheyne discovers Michael the archangel.

He discovers him in Mal 3^{1}. 'My messenger' there should be read Michael; the explanatory phrase 'the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in' being simply a scribe's interpolation. He discovers him in Sirach 43^{26}, where Professor Schmidt has discovered him already. He discovers him also in Gn 32^{30}. There Jacob calls the name of a certain place Peniel or Penuel. What is this name? As Dr. Cheyne puts it, 'it is difficult not to see' that it is one of the titles of 'this great being Michael.' For was it not Michael that appeared to Jacob? What more likely than that his name should be transferred to the sacred spot? He finds him last of all in Rev 20^{1}, 'And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand.'

All the commentators are puzzled at the mention of an angel here. Canon Cheyne does not doubt that 'angel' (ἄγγελον) is the translation of an already corrupt text of an older Hebrew Apocalypse, in which *Mal'āk* was written instead of *mikā'ēl*.

Who, then, is Michael? The surprise comes when we answer that, but we have not come to it yet. In the Book of Daniel there is a difficult passage which we must consider first. It is Dn 7^{13}. In the Authorized Version the passage reads, 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.' The difficulty here is not so obvious to the ordinary English reader as in the passage from the first chapter of Genesis. But it arises at once when the English reader turns to the Revised Version. For now 'the Son of man' is turned into 'a son of man.' 'The Son of man' clearly means the Messiah; but what does 'a son of man' mean?

Professor Cheyne holds that it is the Messiah still. But the Messiah is the archangel Michael. For, in the first place, he holds with Professor Kautzsch that the correct translation is not 'one like unto a son of man,' but 'one who resembled a man,' and it could only be said of an angel that he resembled a man. In the second place, the angel can be none other than Michael, the great prince-angel who defends the interests of the people of Israel.

And Michael is the Messiah. There are again two reasons. The first reason is that the most prevalent of the early Jewish interpretations of our phrase is the Messianic. And the second reason is that 'one has a right to expect the subduer of the four beasts in Daniel 7 to be the Messiah or World-Redeemer, because of the strong Babylonian colouring of this chapter as a whole.'

'The strong Babylonian colouring'? Yes, and the surprise comes now. Michael is none other than the Babylonian god Marduk.

Are there few that be saved? If the question were asked to-day, and asked of any of Christ's ambassadors, what answer would be given? Christ said there were few. He did not say few in themselves, for we do not discover Him at variance with that other Scripture which says they are a multitude which no man can number. But he said they are few compared with those who are not saved. 'Enter ye in by the narrow gate,' He said; 'for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many be they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate and straitened the way that leadeth to life, and few be they that find it.' But to-day? If the question were put as plainly to any of us to-day, what answer should we give?

Why should we hesitate to say few if Christ said few? Because we should not mean what Christ meant. We should mean that few would be saved at all. Christ did not mean that. He meant that few would be saved with eternal glory. But He left it open to understand that many would be saved with loss, saved so as by fire.

At least, that is how Christ's answer is understood in a book that has been published by Mr. John Murray. The author of the book is the Rev. James Langton Clarke, M.A., late Fellow of the University of Durham. Its title is *The Eternal Saviour-Judge* (8vo; 9s. net).

The subject of the book is 'The State of the Dead,' and Mr. Clarke has something new to say about it. There are three theories in the Church regarding the State of the Dead. They go by the names of Eternal Punishment, Conditional Immortality, and Universal Restoration. Mr. Clarke has a fourth theory to propose. He speaks of it under the clumsy title of 'Eternal Saviour-Judgeship.' And it must be confessed that he makes a poor

affair of presenting it. But Dr. Illingworth, who introduces the book, does not err when he says that on this subject any one will be heard at present, and Mr. Clarke has something to say.

Mr. Clarke speaks throughout of the 'Eternal Saviour-Judgeship' of Christ, and the discovery that he has made lies in that title. But for the theory itself he by and by offers the simpler name of Reconciliation.

Now, Reconciliation at once suggests Restoration, but they are not the same. Universal Restoration means—but let us use Mr. Clarke's own words: 'Given two men, both of whom have had full knowledge of Christ, and one of whom has lived the life of faith working by love, the other has drawn back unto perdition, Restoration means that the latter shall eventually in some future age be restored to all that he might have been had he lived like the former; Reconciliation means that the latter may, indeed, inherit *a* blessing, but not *the* blessing, which he forfeited by his backsliding or by neglecting so great salvation.'

Every servant receives his talent according to his several ability. If a servant neglects it, the doctrine of Universal Restoration says that though it may be taken from him for a time, he will yet receive it back again. Reconciliation says that though he himself will yet be reconciled to God, and though he may yet be employed on other service, his talent will never be restored to him; the position which he would have had if he had used his talent wisely will never again be his.

Mr. Clarke illustrates his meaning from the Old Testament. He takes the example of Jacob and Esau. Esau lost the Blessing and he never got it again, though he sought it carefully with tears. But he got a blessing. 'Behold of the fatness of the earth shall be thy dwelling, and of the dew of heaven from above.' He could not get the Blessing, because it had already been given to Jacob, and 'the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.' But he got a blessing, and he was afterwards well content.

He takes the example of Saul and David. When Saul showed himself unworthy, the kingdom was taken from him and given to another. After the anointing of David the kingdom could never be restored to Saul. But he might have had a lesser blessing. He might, like Esau, have acquiesced in the just judgment of God. He might have gone softly all his years, a peaceful subject now, though not a king.

Mr. Clarke's doctrine of Reconciliation is that the sinners in this life

> Who God's eternal Son despise
> And scorn His offered grace

will come to themselves in the next life and be reconciled to God, though it will never again be with them as though they had not died in sin. Or—as he puts it in reference to the question: 'Are there few that be saved?'—all will yet be saved, but not to the fulness of salvation; with the great multitude of men it will be salvation 'so as by fire.'

Can this theory be proved? Its proof is offered in a long and difficult discussion of the Saviour-Judgeship of Christ. Mr. Clarke begins with the Old Testament types. The judges in Israel were saviours first and judges afterwards. They became judges because they had been saviours. And they did not cease to be saviours when they became judges. As long as they lived they judged Israel, and saved while they judged. In the second chapter of the Book of Judges we have, says Mr. Clarke, the general principle which underlay the appointment of the judges in Israel, not of one judge but of all. Read at the 16th verse: 'And the Lord raised them up judges, which saved them out of the hand of those that spoiled them. . . . And when (LXX "because") the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and saved them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge.'

What have we here? We have, says Mr. Clarke, the clear statement that the judges of Israel were first of all saviours. Othniel and Ehud are expressly so called: 'The Lord raised up a saviour to the children of Israel.' They were not first made judges and then sent to save the people out of the hand of their enemies. They first saved the people and then, because of that, were made judges. And when they were made judges *they continued to save the people still.*

Now, the people whom they saved were sinful. It was on account of their sin that they fell under the hand of their enemies and into all their misery. When the judge saved them from their enemies he had to save them from themselves. His judgeship was corrective. It was also intercessory, 'Samuel cried unto the Lord for Israel, and the Lord answered him.' And it was successful. The judge rescued the people from their enemies first, and then he saved them from their own sins. As long as he lived he was a successful saviour-judge.

Turn to Jesus. He is a Saviour first. 'I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.' And then, because He is the Saviour of the world, He becomes its Judge. 'He humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross; therefore hath God highly exalted him.' 'He hath given him authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of man.' But when He becomes the world's Judge He does not cease to be its Saviour. For, like the judges of Israel, He still maketh intercession for us. And if He makes intercession He exercises all the other functions of the judge. So that Mr. Clarke is bold to adapt the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews and to say, 'Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to *judge* them.'

'He ever liveth.' As long as the judge lived he saved Israel. When he was taken away by death Israel sinned again, and again fell under the power of the enemy. But this Judge continueth ever. All who come unto God by Him are saved to the last. And that all will come is clear to Mr. Clarke on the analogy of the judge in Israel. For it was not the few or the many, but all the people, that he saved and judged.

But the people are not all saved with the same salvation. The judge is a saviour before he becomes a judge. They who are saved by Christ in their earthly life, that is to say, while they know Him as saviour and before they know Him as judge, are saved to the full glory of salvation. The judge is also a saviour after he becomes a judge. But his salvation now is corrective, punitive, painful. They who are not saved in this life, who know the Saviour only after He has become their judge, do not at death pass at once to glory. They have still to be saved, to be saved from their sins. Their Saviour is their Judge, and He saves by correcting them. There are few that enter by the narrow door in this life to glory and the crown. There are many—Mr. Clarke is convinced that they are all the rest—who enter by the broad way of rebellion and recovery to the lesser blessing of reconciliation to God and new service.

Is Mr. Clarke laying upon typology more than it is able to bear? He has other arguments. But he is bold enough to say that his theory is true though there were no Scripture for it. And he thinks that we may expect too much in the way of proof-text. For the state after death has to do with the future, while Scripture has chiefly to do with the present. As Dr. Illingworth reminds us, 'in the Bible there seems to be an intentional reserve about this question, which is in striking contrast to the outspoken description of such books as the Avesta and the Koran.' It is good if Scripture does not contradict the theory. For Mr. Clarke has little doubt that the heart of man and the honour of God demand it.

Is there anything new to be said about the Bible? anything, we mean, about the Bible as a

book—its place in the world, its influence on our life? The President of the University of Chicago has said it. Dr. Harper has been in the habit of addressing his students every year, and he has been in the habit of taking pains with his address. He has now gathered twelve of these addresses together, and published them at the University Press. The title of the book is *Religion and the Higher Life* ($1).

In one of the addresses President Harper speaks about the Bible. He is not himself concerned to know whether what he says is new or not. He does not think that 'since the days of Jesus and the apostles' men have delivered many messages altogether new. But he is sure that it is a message. 'I have come,' he says in the very first sentence, 'with the sincere feeling that I have for you a message.' It *is* a message; and it is new. For newness depends less upon matter than upon the arrangement of matter. And Dr. Harper has brought the Bible and religious experience together in such a way as to say something new.

Religious experience? Well, personal experience, or religious life. Dr. Harper does not mind which phrase is preferred. What he means is that the word experience has a specific use when it is applied to religious feeling. It is something through which a man goes; it is something, perhaps, which comes to him. It is a feeling, an emotion. It is more than that. It is a state of being; it is a life in which, as Emerson has expressed it, the 'individual soul mingles with the universal soul'; or, as President Harper prefers to put it, 'in which the individual soul comes into sympathetic touch with God.' What has the Bible to do with this religious experience?—that is the subject of his address. But we have not got at the religious experience yet.

There are two sides to this religious experience. There is its outward side. That is to say, a man's experience of God has to find outward expression for itself. It expresses itself outwardly in three ways—in worship, in creed, in conduct. It expresses itself in *Worship*. This is what the Psalmist means when he says, 'Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless his Holy Name.' Sometimes the worship is so simple and unconventional that it is scarcely noticed as worship; sometimes it is so elaborate and complex that it bewilders and confounds the beholder. But whether simple or complex, worship is the outward symbol of an inward thought. It may be a feeble expression of the thought; or it may run before the thought, stimulating it and carrying it to higher achievement. But whether before it or behind it, the outward expression of religious thought should never be out of touch with the inward feeling. It must continually be held in scrutiny, yet always reverently. For is not worship one of the ways in which men have handed on their religious experience from one generation to another? Has it not been the great means for the preservation of man's personal experience of God from the very beginning of human thought until now?

Our experience of God expresses itself also in *Creed*. There is the same variety in creed as in worship. Some are simple, some are complex. But a man's creed, not being itself his religious experience, but only one form of its outward expression, is never the measure of his experience. 'Some of the purest and noblest lives ever lived,' says Dr. Harper, 'were largely innocent of even the simplest knowledge of creeds or theology.' But the creed has vast influence on the life. Have you seen the degrading influence upon men's morals of that ancient belief in the Bull as the representative of deity? Have you compared with it belief in the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

There is a third way in which our religious experience expresses itself outwardly. It expresses itself in *Conduct* or *Ethics*. This is what St. James means, this is what he calls pure religion and undefiled, when he says, 'pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this: to visit the

fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.' This is the most distinctive outward expression of *personal* religious life. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' But there is a morality of nations as well as of individuals. By their fruits ye shall know nations also.

That, then, is the outward side of a man's religious experience. That is the visible, recognizable, communicable expression of his inner thought of God. What is the other side? What is it to have one's soul in sympathetic touch with God? President Harper says that a man's inner spiritual life must include three elements—consciousness of sin, fellowship with God, and love for God.

It must include some *Consciousness of Sin.* And Dr. Harper says that the depth of the experience is in proportion to the keenness of this consciousness. There is no way that he knows of by which a man's religious life can be estimated so accurately. He turns to the 38th Psalm, and quotes the 3rd verse to the 8th. He turns to the 32nd, and quotes the 3rd to the 5th. Who turns to these Psalms with him? Not the man most deeply sunk in sin, but the man of the closest walk with God. When our Lord puts the question to Simon the Pharisee, 'Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most?' and Simon answers, 'I suppose that he to whom he forgave most,' we know that Simon is right, and yet not altogether right. For the man of many sins may think he has had little forgiven, and the man of few sins may think he has had much. It is the sense of sin that makes the difference. It is the sense of sin that measures the reality of the inner life.

Is this consciousness of sin the recognition of a high estate once held by man, but long since lost? Or is it the recognition of the survival in him of lower, even animal, conditions, out of which, in an upward ascent, he is gradually but surely being lifted? This is a question of the keenest interest to many of us. With this question the attention of some of us is for the first time really held. It is a question which President Harper counts it scarcely worth his while to ask. It is the fact, not the explanation of the fact, that he is interested in. For it is the fact, not the explanation of the fact, that forms a part of the religious experience. 'Do I feel,' he says passionately,—'do I feel this awful, this terrible lack in my own soul? this falling short of the standard clearly fixed before my eyes? this tendency to be dragged downward in spite of constant struggle? this separation by an almost impassable gulf from all that is high and pure and holy?' That, he says, is the question. And he can conceive no true religious experience that has not some such feeling in it.

But the inner spiritual life of a man must also include some sense of *Fellowship with God.* Now, the sense of fellowship is in direct contradiction to the sense of sin. And yet these two are found together in the same human soul, at the same moment of time; and found together in such a way that their contradiction produces harmony, the strength of the feeling of divine fellowship being in exact proportion to the consciousness of sin.

Last of all, there must be *Love for God.* This is not a discovery of the New Testament. It is a higher reach of religious development than fellowship, but it was achieved even in Old Testament times. The frequency of the verb 'to love' is no measure of its occurrence. There are other verbs to express it. Have you considered, for example, the force of the phrase 'to know Jehovah'? Dr. Harper says that the full significance of this word *know* can scarcely be overestimated.

For the love of God to man, and the love of man to God, are essential elements in the religious consciousness. It needs not passionate utterance. It is the calmness and peace of fellowship felt in their fullest exercise. Here is its ideal expression in the words of the 16th Psalm, 'I have said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord, I have no good beyond thee.' Of course, the love of God carries with it the love of man. And of course the love

of God and man comes to its maturity in Christ. President Harper closes this part of his address by saying that, 'after all, the greatest contribution of the new religion introduced by Him was the conception of love instead of fear as manifested toward the Deity, love instead of selfishness as manifested toward one's fellow-men.'

But what has the Bible to do with all this? It is when President Harper asks this question that he begins to be original. His first word is a word of warning, and it is both new and true exceedingly. Do not, he says, put on one side the religious life, and on the other side the Bible. An unread, unstudied, untried Bible is nothing. There is in the Old Testament the story, the most interesting story, of the discovery of a long-lost Bible. As long as it was lost it was nothing. But when it was discovered Shaphan read it before the king. 'And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his clothes.'

An unread Bible is nothing. An unstudied Bible is nothing. And an untried Bible is nothing. For a mere knowledge of the contents of the Bible will not do. 'I know men,' says Dr. Harper—we all know men—'who can repeat entire chapters, and even books of the Bible, not to speak of verses, whose lives and thought, so far as one can judge, remain wholly uninfluenced by the knowledge.' 'There is even a certain scholastic knowledge'—but you stop him there. Is the President of the University of Chicago going to lift up his voice against learning? No, no. He has already stopped himself. 'You will not misunderstand me,' he pleads; 'the most accurate and extensive learning is needed in connection with the archæological, exegetical, and theological examination of biblical material.' But the most flawless scholarship, if it is alone, will do little for the man whose heart calls for consolation, whose soul needs lifting up from the depths of wretchedness.

Then President Harper brings the Bible into touch with the religious experience, both in its outward expression and in its inner life. But we need not follow him further. Surely this is within the reach of all of us to do. Let us pass from him with this one word. We are urged to-day, on many hands, to read the Bible less and other literature more, and the argument is that all that is contained in the Bible, and is good for the higher life of man, is found in modern literature, and in a form that is more agreeable to modern manners. President Harper is modern too. He knows our modern manners. But he knows that 'in these days, if never before, we are expected to go to the original sources for our information upon everything.' And he knows that for the divine life in man, 'the only source, as well as the original source, is the Bible.'

The Living God.[1]

By the Rev. William Sanday, D.D., Litt.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford.

'But the Lord is the true God; he is the living God, and an everlasting king.'—Jer x. 10.

It is just the middle one of these three clauses of which I wish to speak more particularly. 'The living God' is one of the most characteristic of the Divine Names, both in the Old Testament and in the New. It occurs many times over; but a verse like the text has the advantage of putting it in its true position, of making it as central as it really is in the religion of Israel. The other phrases serve to heighten the effect; they are, as it were, buttresses to the main building. Jehovah

[1] Preached at Trinity Church, New York City, 23rd October 1904.