

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.

At the Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends, held this year in Leeds, Professor Rendel Harris delivered an address on 'Christ in Modern Life.' The address was cleverly, but very briefly, reported in the *Leeds Mercury*. In the *Yorkshire Post* only a few sentences were quoted; they were quoted out of their context and made to stand up stark and startling. More than that, the audience itself, vast and intelligent, was unresponsive if not resentful. And yet the address answered its title. If it missed its mark in delivery, that was not because it said less, but because it said more, than the audience expected from its title.

The title, we say, was 'Christ in Modern Life.' Professor Rendel Harris had not chosen it. He did not seem to like it. He said it suggested, 'If Christ came to Chicago,' or 'What would Jesus do?' But his protest was not against the title, it was against the use that has been made of it. For, in a moment, as if the real appropriateness of the title had just struck him, he faced his audience and said: 'If Christ came to Chicago—why not? Is it not conceivable that He might come? If not, what are we here for? What would be gained by a meeting held on the hypothesis that He had done coming? What would it really mean if He only said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," and never "O Chicago," or "O Leeds," or "O Society of Friends"? What would it mean if He never came

even closer than that, if He never came now with His personal appeal in its doubled insistence—Simon Simon, Martha Martha, or Saul Saul? It would mean that He had ceased to care. Our case would then be hopeless enough; for it would mean that He is dead, and we are dying.'

Professor Rendel Harris had lost his audience. They had come to hear him talk about Christ in modern life. But they never imagined that he would really talk about Christ in modern life. Not about Christ Himself in modern life. They gathered in their crowds to hear an address on the influence of Christ, or on Christ as an influence, in modern life. And when Professor Rendel Harris told them that the title was nothing to him if it made Christ merely an influence, if it did not make Him a person in modern life, his audience got out of sympathy with him.

What should a preacher do when he finds that he has lost his audience? He should deliver his message. The prophets were preachers. They were often out of touch with their audience. What did they do? They delivered their message. And sometimes they were killed for it. Succeeding generations built tombs for them, but their own generation killed them. Professor Rendel Harris was in no risk of his life. He only suffered a resentful silence. He did not attempt to

get into touch with his audience. He delivered his message.

The audience was unsympathetic, but it listened to him. Is it really wise, he asked this unsympathetic but listening audience, to bring down good people out of past days into our own? We may encumber ourselves with undesirable aliens. By the accident of changing time they lie outside our life and manners. Their thoughts are not our thoughts, nor their ways our ways. Christ went about doing good, but that was in His own day. Are we sure if He came down into ours that we should feel comfortable with Him?

The case is more perplexing even than that. For Christ was an undesirable alien in His own day. He did not come even in His own day as the flower of its civilization: how much less would He come in ours. Even His own generation saw no beauty in Him to desire Him; even then it was said, 'He was despised, and we esteemed Him not.' If His goodness did not gain Him glory then, how much less would it get Him honour now? Christ in modern life—if Christ is in modern life He is in it as an undesirable alien; He is come as truth denied; He is here as the champion of lost causes, as the leader of forlorn hopes, as the justifier of the poor and needy, as the reformer in Church and State. Christ is in modern life, but He is still the outside superfluous Man—outside the Inn, outside the School, outside the Synagogue, and finally outside the City gate.

Did Professor Rendel Harris mean, then, that Christ is come again, simply to be despised and rejected? He did not mean that. Christ did not come at first simply to be despised and rejected. He came to make men think, and He came to make men true. He is come to make us think, and to make us true, to-day.

When He came first, He came to make the Pharisees think. He quoted the 110th Psalm.

The Pharisees said the Messiah was the Son of David. But in the 110th Psalm David himself calls Him Lord. If David himself calls Him Lord, how is He then his son? He asked the Pharisees to think. He is come to-day to ask us to think about the Higher Criticism.

Had Professor Rendel Harris recovered his audience yet? He suddenly stopped and cried, 'Do you hear me?' 'Speak up,' was the sullen answer that came back. 'I want you to hear me,' he said, 'I want you all to hear me, I want the man in the street to hear me.' It seemed as if he felt that he must get past his own people, past that mighty mass of church-going people of many denominations besides his own, and appeal to the unprejudiced passer-by. 'What do you think of the Higher Criticism?' he cried. 'The churches are trying to keep it out, but the man in the street is rapidly assimilating it. What do you think of it? Christ is come to ask you to think.'

He had not recovered his audience. He had lost his audience almost wholly now. They had come to hear about the influence of Christ in modern life, and Professor Rendel Harris was asking them to think. How few of them would have come had they known that they would be asked to think.

Christ is come to make us think about the Higher Critics. The Higher Critics are white ants. The white ants in the tropics will bore through wood; you must build of iron. The white ants of criticism have been at work on the history of Christianity, and on Christ. I believe, said Professor Rendel Harris, that the general history of Christianity, and also its Founder, stand more fairly to-day than ever they did in the sight of men. But I believe that the white ants have got at some things in Christianity. I believe that they have got at the Creeds, and have burrowed deep into the Sacraments.

Let us think of these things. And when we think, let us be true. If we are riding on the

Creeds and the Sacraments, we are riding on a deflated tyre. But a deflated tyre is not a punctured tyre. Let us separate the precious from the vile. Let us think. There may be something worse in our house than white ants; there may be dry rot. Let us be true. When the white ants have eaten our woodwork away let us not pretend to find shelter within it.

Professor Rendel Harris had lost his audience. They resented being asked to think. They resented being told to be true. 'We never were in bondage to any man, and how sayest thou that the truth shall make us free?' Are you free, said Professor Rendel Harris, are you true, in a world *where people are still worshipping a wafer, and where trembling evangelicals are still trying to say that a man sang a psalm in the middle of a fish?* The reporter wrote down that sentence. But Professor Rendel Harris had not recovered his audience.

Mr. Francis Griffiths is the publisher of a new series of 'Essays for the Times.' The ninth issue is an essay on the *Interpretation of the New Testament in Modern Life and Thought*. It is written by the Rev. P. Mordaunt Barnard, B.D.

Mr. Barnard is Rector of Headley, near Epsom, and a recognized scholar. He has contributed certain volumes to the 'Cambridge Texts and Studies,' edited by the Dean of Westminster. He will be found to be one of the most acceptable contributors to the forthcoming **DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS**. Into this forty-page pamphlet he has put more than an hour's writing; he has put himself.

The title of the essay brings it into association with Professor Rendel Harris's address. The men are nearer still. The one is a clergyman of the Church of England; the other is a member of the Society of Friends. But they are nearer than their own breathing; closer than their own hands

and feet. They have one Saviour; one Gospel message; one burning passion to make this Saviour, through this gospel message, acceptable to the men of their own time.

What hinders Christ from becoming acceptable to the men of this generation? Mr. Barnard says it is the New Testament. That is to say, it is our interpretation of the New Testament. For of course the New Testament is always according to the interpretation thereof. There are those in every generation to whom is set the task of interpreting the New Testament to their generation. If they interpret it aright Christ is seen in the New Testament, and the moment that Christ is seen He is acceptable. Mr. Barnard believes that the interpreters of the New Testament in our day are not interpreting it aright. He believes that for the most part they are afraid to interpret it aright.

So greatly has Mr. Barnard lost his confidence in the official interpreters of the New Testament in our day that in this essay he turns to the laity. 'More frankness,' he says, 'is required on all sides. In some ways it is hard for those who hold an official position to take the first step, because they may lose influence if they are suspected of being unorthodox; in public teaching especially they have to be careful not to wound the feelings of old-fashioned and conservative people. But for the laity it is much easier—rigid orthodoxy is not expected of them; and if they would only talk a little more freely, and discuss matters more fully, it would enable the clergy to judge better of the circumstances with which they have to deal.'

The official interpreters of the New Testament, much offended, may ask if Mr. Barnard means to charge them with dishonesty. But Mr. Barnard does not charge them with dishonesty. And even if he did, they must not be offended. They must not be offended even if they themselves feel that they are not always quite straightforward in their interpretation of the New Testament. 'Clergy,'

says Mr. Barnard, 'who intend to be quite straightforward, evade questions of difficulty, partly no doubt because they feel that they cannot themselves really face them, but partly also because they do not recognize that these questions actually are in people's minds, and require answering.'

But does it greatly matter? Are these questions much in people's minds? Mr. Barnard has no doubt they are. He has no doubt that it matters momentarily. He believes that much current teaching is positively shocking to the moral sense of people who have learned to think for themselves. They find themselves asked to believe things against which their moral nature revolts. Mr. Barnard mentions the doctrine of the eternal damnation of the heathen. Is that doctrine not preached now? It is sometimes preached still. And even when it is not openly advocated there is a feeling that it lies hidden in the background of orthodox Christianity. Mr. Barnard mentions also the doctrine of original sin. But we shall come to that in a moment.

There is another matter first. The official interpretation of the New Testament is not in doctrine only, it is also in deed. The interpretation in deed is more persuasive than the interpretation in doctrine. Half the charges made against the clergy for not squaring their conduct with their creed are no doubt mere talk. But the other half are sincere. Do the official interpreters of the New Testament interpret the New Testament in their life? Do they make even an honest effort to interpret it in their life?

Mr. Barnard takes an example. He chooses the phrase *Christian Brotherhood*. The phrase 'Christian Brotherhood' is a short summary of certain lines of teaching in the New Testament. The Christian clergy and ministry do, as a rule, interpret the phrase as part of the New Testament teaching quite correctly. But do they live as Christian brothers? It is not enough, says Mr. Barnard, to explain the meaning of the phrase in

its original use. It is necessary also, it is indeed much more necessary, to show what its meaning is in the circumstances in which we are placed. Later in the essay Mr. Barnard says, 'The great movement in support of hospitals is the most important contribution of this generation to the constructive criticism of the New Testament.'

It is not Mr. Barnard's business to mention all the doctrines of Christianity that need to be reconstructed in our day. He is content to mention one. It is the doctrine of Original Sin. What is the doctrine of Original Sin? Mr. Barnard expresses it in the familiar words of the Church Catechism, 'being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath.'

Where did the Church obtain this doctrine? Not directly from the New Testament. No direct statement of this doctrine is to be found in the New Testament. It is only an inference drawn from certain New Testament texts. And Mr. Barnard thinks that that fact is not in its favour. For if the doctrine of Original Sin had been essential to Christianity, he believes that it would have been distinctly formulated by Christ and His earliest disciples. The Church received it from Augustine of Hippo. Augustine won his case by the great weight of his commanding personality, in the face of strenuous opposition. And Mr. Barnard believes that it is his personality, and not the inherent truthfulness of the doctrine itself, that has made it the tradition of orthodoxy through later ages.

But what is the offence in Original Sin? Its great offence to Mr. Barnard is that it contradicts experience. It is not simply that it is outside experience. The doctrine of God is outside experience. 'He that cometh to God must believe (*πιστεύσαι δεῖ*) that He is.' But as soon as faith brings the doctrine of God into contact with reason and experience it is acceptable. The doctrine of Original Sin, says Mr. Barnard, is not acceptable. It is not workable. It contradicts

our sense of moral blame; it contradicts our sense of God's righteousness. No man ever felt himself to blame for the sin that he had not committed. And no man ever felt that the God was righteous to whom unbaptized infants were an object of wrath.

Mr. Barnard says that we must reconstruct the doctrine of Original Sin. It does not need to be swept away. There is truth in it. Its wide acceptance is due to the fact that it contains a certain measure of truth. It is true, he says, that we are 'born in sin' in the sense that the possession of free will induces us to follow our own will in opposition to the will of God. It does not need to be swept away; it needs to be re-stated in harmony with the moral consciousness of the men of our day.

And when the doctrine of Original Sin is reconstructed, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth may be reconstructed also. Mr. Barnard does not think that we need the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. As a doctrine it is connected, vitally connected, with the doctrine of Original Sin. 'It was believed in old days,' says Mr. Barnard, 'that moral guilt was conveyed from the parents to the child in the natural process of generation, and that this process had in itself and of necessity a sinful character; it was therefore considered necessary to hold that Jesus was born in a miraculous manner, and not by the ordinary process of nature, in order that His absolute sinlessness might be guaranteed.'

Mr. Barnard believes that we have passed from that. He believes that we can put that view on one side now. He believes that there is no reason now why we should not hold that the human body of Jesus was produced through the agency of a human father.

He has not forgotten that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is distinctly taught in the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel and implied in the first two chapters of St. Luke's. But he

notices that in St. Matthew's Gospel, and also in St. Luke's, the pedigree is not the pedigree of Mary but of Joseph. He observes that the Virgin Birth is not mentioned or implied in St. Mark's Gospel, 'which is thought on good grounds to be the nearest to the original preaching of the apostles.' He observes further that neither Jesus Himself nor any New Testament writer ever founds any argument upon the circumstances of His birth, except that the writer of St. Matthew's Gospel regards them as the fulfilment of prophecy. But this argument from prophecy is of no weight. 'For,' says Mr. Barnard, 'even if the word used by Isaiah really meant Virgin, no one would deny that St. Mary was a virgin previous to the birth of Jesus.' He observes, finally, that neither St. John nor St. Paul ever refers to the miraculous birth of Jesus; and it is to him practically impossible to believe that they would have failed to do so had they known it.

Mr. Barnard does not deny the Virgin Birth of our Lord. He denies that it is essential to Christianity. With a most unmistakable modesty and under the deepest sense of responsibility he denies that it is necessary for the official interpreters of the New Testament to believe and to teach it.

It is well for the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel that they are in the Bible. If they had been in any other book they would by this time have been dropped out of it. For the evidence is against them. But because they are in the Bible they are kept there. And they are not only kept there, but from time to time scholars rise up to defend them. They have been defended by Scrivener and by Dean Burgon; and even the other day, in the last two numbers of the *Church Family Newspaper*, they have been defended by Dr. Charles A. Waller.

Dr. Waller adopts the Burgonian style of defence. He summons into his presence the scribe of the Vatican manuscript and proceeds to cross-

examine him. He calls him Mr. B. 'Mr. B., you have, I understand, omitted the last twelve verses of St. Mark from the copy of the Gospel written by you to the order of the Bishop of Cæsarea. Is that so?' And Mr. B. answers, 'It is.' But as this cross-examination is still proceeding we shall not report it further. It will be more profitable to turn to Professor Goodspeed.

Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed, of the University of Chicago, has contributed an article to the current issue of the *American Journal of Theology* on 'The Original Conclusion of the Gospel of St. Mark.' Professor Goodspeed thinks the present conclusion is not original. He thinks the time is past for proving that. Is it possible still to find out what the original conclusion was? That is the purpose of Professor Goodspeed's paper.

There is no manuscript in existence which contains the original conclusion. That is to say, all the manuscripts of St. Mark without exception go back to one mutilated ancestor, in which whatever may originally have followed the eighth verse in the last chapter was wanting.

But is Professor Goodspeed sure that St. Mark's Gospel did not originally end with that eighth verse? He is quite sure. It is incredible to him that St. Mark ended his Gospel with the words 'for they were afraid.' It is not merely an inappropriate word to end a Gospel with. It is not merely an abrupt termination. It leaves the narrative in mid-air. It relapses into silence at the most interesting and vital point in the whole history. In the seventh verse the promise is made of an appearance of the risen Jesus to His disciples in Galilee. Some fulfilment of that promise is expected. Professor Goodspeed cannot believe that St. Mark's Gospel could have originally ended without giving some account of that appearance.

So the original conclusion has been lost. And the present conclusion, or conclusions, for there

are two different forms in existence, have been furnished in order to take its place. But they do not fill its place. They do not carry on the narrative where it is broken. They give no account of that of which an account is promised and most required, the appearance of Jesus to His disciples in Galilee. Is it possible to recover the original conclusion still? Professor Goodspeed thinks it is possible.

Professor Goodspeed believes, as most of us believe, that St. Matthew and St. Luke made use of St. Mark in the composition of their Gospels. He believes that at the time when they used St. Mark's Gospel, that Gospel was complete. There may be things in the Second Gospel which it did not contain then, but he is confident that it contained one thing which it does not contain now, its own original conclusion. For the probability is that St. Mark's Gospel lost its conclusion on account of neglect. The conclusion may have occupied the last page. If the MS. were cast aside and neglected, the last page would be the most liable to be torn or worn away. But if St. Mark's Gospel was neglected, the neglect must have been due to the appearance of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. These Gospels were found to be fuller than St. Mark. They seemed to contain all that St. Mark contained, and they contained a good deal more. The wonder to Professor Goodspeed is, not that St. Mark's Gospel was neglected and got mutilated, but that it did not altogether perish.

Now when Professor Goodspeed began his investigation he thought he had a very simple task before him. St. Matthew and St. Luke both used St. Mark. He thought he had nothing more to do than to write down all that was common to these two Gospels after Mk 16⁸. After that, as before, the common material would no doubt have originally belonged to St. Mark. But he speedily found that there is no common material after that point.

He turned to the Gospels separately. He observed that in the record of the Passion Week and all that comes after, the use made of St. Mark by St. Matthew is different from the use made by St. Luke. St. Luke makes a comparatively limited use of the Second Gospel; St. Matthew takes over practically everything that St. Mark affords. St. Luke actually omits occasionally what St. Mark has, or substitutes other material for it. St. Matthew certainly has gone to other sources besides St. Mark, but, whatever else he incorporates, he is careful to incorporate all that St. Mark contains. It is in St. Matthew, therefore, that we may reasonably look for the original conclusion of St. Mark.

Now this part of St. Matthew is short and simple. Mt 28¹⁻⁸ corresponds with Mk 16¹⁻⁸. If the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel is contained in St. Matthew, it is contained in Mt 28⁹⁻²⁰. In this passage there are but three elements. The first is the appearance to the women (28⁹⁻¹⁰); the second, the bribing of the watch (28¹¹⁻¹⁵); the third, the appearance of Jesus to the disciples in Galilee (28¹⁶⁻²⁰). Which of these contains the original conclusion of St. Mark?

The first joins with Mk 16⁸ in a fashion that leaves nothing to be desired. 'They went forth and fled from the tomb, for trembling and astonishment possessed them; and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid.' That is St. Mark. St. Matthew goes on: 'And behold, Jesus met them, saying, Hail. And they came and laid hold of his feet, and worshipped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not: go tell my brethren to depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me.' The 'fear not' of Mt 28¹⁰ corresponds well with the 'for they were afraid' of Mk 16⁸. And the renewed promise of an appearance in Galilee, already once made in St. Mark (16⁷), binds the episode afresh to the Marcan narrative. All that we need now is the record of this appearance.

That record is the third element in St. Matthew's

narrative. Professor Goodspeed does not think that the second element in St. Matthew was taken from St. Mark. The second element is the bribing of the watch (28¹¹⁻¹⁵). It is simply the sequel of an incident already related by St. Matthew, the setting of the watch (Mt 27⁶²⁻⁶⁶). But the third element is the appearance of Jesus to the disciples in Galilee (Mt 28¹⁶⁻²⁰). If the first element was taken from St. Mark, no doubt this element was taken also. For the first ends with the words: 'Go tell my brethren to depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me'; this begins with the words, 'And the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them.'

Professor Goodspeed is not sure if the whole of this element originally stood in St. Mark. St. Mark's narrative, when it breaks off at 16⁸, demands two things for its completion: the reassurance of the women and the reappearance of Jesus in Galilee. These two things St. Matthew records, and the conclusion seems to Dr. Goodspeed inevitable, that he derived them from his chief narrative source, the Gospel of St. Mark. But he is not so sure about the other things. In particular, he is far from sure that the words of the 19th verse, 'baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' stood originally in St. Mark; he is far from sure that they stood originally even in St. Matthew.

Well, what was the original conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel? Professor Goodspeed believes that the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel was on this wise—

'But go, tell his disciples and Peter, he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him as he said unto you.

'And they went out and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment possessed them. And they said nothing to anyone; for they were afraid. And behold, Jesus met them, saying, Hail. And they came and took hold of his feet, and worshipped

him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Be not afraid : go tell my brethren to depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me. And the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came to them, and when they saw him, they worshipped him : but some doubted. And he spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'

'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets' (Mt 5¹⁷). Why should they think so? Not because of anything He had been saying, but because of what He had been doing. He had been eating and drinking with publicans and sinners.

We know that the Pharisees did not like that. They were complimentary enough to Him to prefer that He should spend His time in their society. They murmured that He received sinners and ate with them. But more than that, it was contrary to the Law. The men and women whom He received were sinners. They were known and openly acknowledged to be sinners. They had broken the law and now lay under its condemnation. They were outcasts here; in the hereafter, if there was a hereafter, they would find themselves in hell. No doubt there was the notion (it may have begun to spring up in the mind of an occasional tender-hearted Pharisee already) that Abraham sat at the mouth of hell to rescue his children from that doom. But Jesus would not wait for Abraham. He had begun to rescue them already. 'I am come,' He said, 'to seek and to save that which was lost.'

The Pharisees did not like it. He said 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance.' He

said that the publican, an openly confessed sinner, went down to his house more just before God than the Pharisee. He was turning the ideas of right and wrong upside down. If He was not breaking the law Himself, as these sinners had broken it, He was doing worse than that, He was destroying both the law and the prophets. The Pharisees did not like it.

But the sinners liked it very well. The common people—'this people' that knoweth not the law and are therefore cursed—heard Him gladly. There was the joy of surprise in all He said and did. There was the hope of higher esteem. There was the home-coming, safe and thankful, in the strong arms of this Good Shepherd. The sinners liked it well.

Did they like it too well and take it too easily? He ate and drank with them. They liked that. He was good, and He made Himself one of them. They were sinners, but He did not seem to mind their sinfulness, and He was like God. Perhaps sin is not such a sinful thing after all? Perhaps after all God does not so greatly mind? Perhaps Jesus has come to open the kingdom of heaven to all *sinners*? Then Jesus said, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets . . . verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.'

Did they think sin was not so sinful?—'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' Did they think Jesus had come with His 'I say unto you' to set the law aside? His 'I say unto you' makes the law more sweeping in its range and more searching in its claim. Did they think that in the new kingdom God would be content with a less rigid rule of righteousness? 'I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.' He is not come to destroy the law or the prophets; He is come to fulfil them.

But He is rescuing sinners. He is seeking and saving the lost. Is that the way to fulfil the law and the prophets? Yes, that is the way. The Pharisees thought the law and the prophets were given for the sinner's condemnation. Even John the Baptist thought the Messiah was coming to fulfil the law and the prophets by cutting down the fruitless trees and casting them into the fire. So the Pharisees hated Him and cast Him out of the vineyard and killed Him. And even John the Baptist sent messengers to Him, 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?' They did not know, even the Baptist did not know, that the law was given, not to check and punish, but to show how to love. Even John the Baptist does not seem to have remembered that the whole law is comprehended in that one saying, 'Thou shalt love.'

He came not to destroy the law or the prophets. But some things will get destroyed. The flower is before the fruit. When the fruit comes the flower perishes. Give your boy his books of adventure; the day will come when he will cast them out, but

the love of literature will remain with him. Give your little girl her dolls; some day they will lie forgotten and forlorn, but the love of children will remain in her woman's heart. What a struggle it was in the days when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. The temple must go and the ark and the mercy-seat; the priests and the sacrifices must go: even the covenant itself must pass away. We shall never know what it cost that heroic soul to write down the words: 'In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.'

Some things get destroyed. But not the law or the prophets. For the law and the prophets are love, and love never faileth. He came not to destroy love. He came to touch it into life, to foster it into a flame. We love, because He first loved. They that are least in the kingdom of heaven have already a righteousness that exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. They are already perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect.

The Spiritual Value of the Creation Story.

BY THE REV. A. H. M'NEILE, M.A., B.D., FELLOW OF SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

BEFORE entering upon the study of the spiritual value of the Creation story, it may be useful to suggest a few books which bear upon the story itself. The best known is probably Professor Driver's *Commentary on Genesis*, in the series known as the 'Westminster Commentaries.' He also has some useful remarks upon it in Hogarth's *Authority and Archeology*, pp. 9-18, and in an article in the *Expositor* of January 1901, 'The O.T. in the Light of To-day.' A somewhat more technical treatment will be found in the article on 'Cosmogony,' in Hastings' *D.B.*, by Whitehouse, and in Dillmann's *Commentary on Genesis*, which has been translated into English. The relation of the Creation story to modern science is dwelt on by H. Morton in *The Cosmogony of Genesis and its*

Reconcilers. The Babylonian cosmogony is discussed in Jastrow's work, *The Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians*. An enlarged German edition has recently been published, but the earlier edition was written in English, and the cosmogony will be found on pp. 407 ff. The actual text of the Babylonian poem is translated by L. W. King of the British Museum, in *The Seven Tablets of Creation*.

It is not our present purpose to examine minutely the details of the Creation story in their relation to modern scientific discovery, though some of them will come before us in the course of our study. It is of little practical use to investigate the extent to which the ideas of the early Semites happened to coincide with, or to differ from, the conclusions