

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Egyptian Gazette* of 4th April contains the report of a lecture delivered in Cairo two days previously by Professor Sayce. The lecture was in two parts. In the first part Professor Sayce told the story of the discovery and identification of the mummy of Menepthah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. In the second he explained the ideas which led the Egyptians to embalm their dead.

The winter before last the tomb of Amenhotep II. of the eighteenth dynasty was discovered at Thebes. It was believed that the inmost and last chamber of the tomb had been examined. The various objects found were removed to the Ghizeh Museum. But last winter M. Lortet went back to that tomb. Beyond the 'inmost' chamber of the previous season, he found an 'innermost' and smaller chamber. It was filled with royal mummies. From the outer chambers they had been carried for safety in some time of invasion or fear into this 'innermost' and most hidden chamber. The royal mummies had their royal names in hieratic or in cursive writing. Among them was the name of Amenhotep IV. or Khu-en-aten.

But how could that be? The tomb of Amenhotep IV. or Khu-en-aten, the 'heretic' king of Egypt, had already been discovered close by his royal city and near the mounds of Tel el-Amarna. His mummy was not there, but that was because

his 'orthodox' enemies had entered the tomb and torn his body to shreds. Fragments of the mummy cloths were lying there still. This could not be the mummy of Khu-en-aten.

The mummy was now lying in a case in the tomb, packed up and ready to be shipped down the river to Ghizeh. But M. Lortet had copied the name. Mr. Groff examined the copy. He believed that the hieroglyphics spelt the name, not of Amenhotep, but of Menepthah, the son of Rameses II., and the Pharaoh of the Exodus. When the mummy was carried down to Ghizeh and examined by Professor Maspero in March, it was found that Mr. Groff was right. The actual body of the Pharaoh of the Exodus was lying intact before them.

But was Menepthah the Pharaoh of the Exodus? Of that Professor Sayce has no doubt. For his father was Rameses II.; and Rameses II. (who reigned longer than even our beloved Queen, though God grant she may outreign him yet!) was the great builder of the kings of Egypt. He built Pithom and Raamses and Zoan and the like. And as he hated the Asiatic foreigners who had once ruled over Egypt, and one race of whom still dwelt in the land of Goshen, he built his cities on the borders of Goshen, and used these

foreigners as slaves to build them. When Naville unearthed Pithom he discovered, says Professor Sayce, the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and by consequence the Pharaoh of the Exodus, who was his son. Rameses was the one, Meneptah the other.

But we thought the Pharaoh of the Exodus was drowned in the Red Sea. We had no business so to think, Professor Sayce tells us. It was merely a popular supposition. The Bible does not say that he was drowned. And it has long been known to Egyptians that Meneptah lived to a ripe old age, and that he had never even followed the Israelites in person.

Let us return for a moment to the Atonement. In the *Present Day Paper* (Headley Brothers) for August, there may be found an article by Professor W. N. Clarke of Colgate (the author of that phenomenal book, *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*) on 'The Work of Christ for our Salvation.'

Professor Clarke would fain find more in the Atonement than an exhibition of the love of God. There should be satisfaction somewhere. But when he seeks that satisfaction he meets an insuperable obstacle. The same Person who provides the satisfaction receives it. In the sacrifice of Christ it is God that offers, it is God also to whom the sacrifice is made.

The difficulty is not a new one. In our day it has been felt most keenly perhaps by Dr. Dale, who sought to escape it by the impossible suggestion that the ransom was paid not to God but to an eternal law of righteousness outside of God. There is a better answer than that. It will be found most satisfactorily in that very suggestive book, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, by Mr. J. Scott Lidgett. God provided the propitiation, but he did not offer it. Christ offered it, it is true. And Christ is God. But Christ is also man. And when He offered the propitiation He

was acting not as God, but as man, as the Representative of the human race.

What was the subject of conversation between our Lord and Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration? St. Luke tells us (9³¹) that they spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. And we have usually understood that His decease was His death. But the word is *exodus* (ἐξόδος), which, although it is elsewhere used of death (Wis 3² 7⁶, 2 P 1¹⁵), is literally 'departure,' and may very well be used of more than the act of death, of the agony that preceded, and of the resurrection and ascension that followed it.

But in the second volume of his *Studies of the Portrait of Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton) Dr. Matheson distinctly excludes Christ's death. He says that no one then would have thought of death when you spoke of an exodus. An exodus is a deliverance, but death was then an end. The idea of death as an exodus came from Jesus Himself, and it came at a later hour. No man, he says, of the Transfiguration hour would have dreamed of calling death an exodus; no man would have written, 'They spake of His exodus,' when he meant to say, 'They spake of His decease.'

Of what then did Moses and Elijah speak with Jesus? They spoke of His resurrection, says Dr. Matheson. They passed by His decease. They covered the sepulchre out of His sight. They transfigured the sacrifice in the light of its result. They spoke of His deliverance from the grave by resurrection, not of His entrance into it by death. By His resurrection He would lead the children of Israel over another Red Sea, into a larger land and a wealthier. And Moses, as it were, handed Him his rod of deliverance that He might conduct the children of Abraham from their proud isolation into a union with every country and kindred and people and tongue.

'If I told you earthly things,' says our Lord in His conversation with Nicodemus, 'if I told you

earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?' (Jn 3¹²). The words are very difficult. It seems as if He had been speaking of heavenly things, if heavenly things can ever be spoken about. Why does He call them earthly things? And what are those heavenly things which He still holds back?

Many will remember the striking interpretation which Dr. Adamson offers in his *Studies of the Mind in Christ*. The subject is discussed by Archdeacon Diggle in his *Short Studies in Holiness*, just published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton.

The one 'earthly thing' of which our Lord has been speaking, is the New Birth. Why is it earthly? Archdeacon Diggle thinks because it is in conformity with the laws which govern earthly births. It takes place in us while we are upon the earth, and it takes place according to the well-known laws of all earthly births. Therefore Nicodemus might be expected to understand it, and even to have discovered it for himself.

But there are things which Nicodemus could not have discovered for himself. He could not have discovered that in order to accomplish this New Birth, the Son of God had to make Himself poor; he could not have discovered that He had to die upon the Cross. These were heavenly things, hid yet in the breast of Divinity, things into which the angels desired to look; and they could not be revealed to Nicodemus, nor even to the innermost disciples, until they came to pass and the Spirit was given to explain them.

If that is so, it may seem to make against Dr. Matheson's interpretation of the 'decease' which Christ was to accomplish at Jerusalem. For if He could not speak with the disciples about His death—speak so that they should understand and sympathize with Him, was it not most natural that Moses and Elijah should come and make this great matter the subject of their conversation?

But it only *seems* to make against it. For the resurrection was as 'heavenly' a thing as the death. He who could not understand how the Son of Man should come down from heaven, and come down to die, should as little understand how He could ascend to heaven, how He could *have* to ascend.

In the department of Biblical Theology the most difficult single subject at present is the meaning of the expression 'Son of Man.' The key to its meaning is held by many to be a certain passage in Daniel (7¹³). In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1900, Professor Schmidt of Cornell University writes on the meaning of that passage. He considers various interpretations that have been suggested, and discards them, including an attractive one of his own, which he lets go reluctantly. And then he 'ventures to offer' a new interpretation.

He suggests that the 'one like unto a son of man' in Dn 7¹³ is an angel, and in particular Michael, the guardian angel of Israel. For in the Book of Daniel that is the uniform meaning of the phrase. In 8¹⁵ Gabriel is introduced as 'one having the appearance of a man.' In 10¹⁶ Gabriel is again described as 'one like the appearance of the sons of men.' And so forth. Moreover, in Rev 14¹⁴ 'one like unto a son of man' is a designation of an angel. And in Enoch 87² the four archangels are all 'like white men.'

But why Michael in particular? Simply because no other angel is so closely identified with Israel. It is Michael who everywhere represents the new world-power, Israel. And in Dn 10²¹ he is distinctly declared to be the celestial prince of Israel.

Professor Schmidt claims that this interpretation satisfies all requirements. The heavenly being who has the appearance of a man is the same as he who appears in other passages of the book; no new meaning is required for this particular passage. This being is, moreover, no product of the author's

imagination, but a well-known personality, even the guardian angel of Israel. As the Messianic idea grew, the work of Michael and his position as Israel's representative were shifted to the shoulders of the Messiah. And then it was as the Messiah that Jesus used (or is represented to have used) the name.

That Jesus did use the name 'Son of Man' so as to identify Himself with the Messiah, Professor Schmidt is not certain. This is the impression made by the Gospels as they stand. But Professor Schmidt is not sure of the Gospels as they stand. Behind our Greek Gospels he seems to see Aramaic Gospels, or bits of Gospels. In particular he thinks that there was an Aramaic 'Apocalypse of Jesus,' parts of which have been preserved in Mt 24¹⁻⁵¹, Mk 13¹⁻³⁷, and Lk 21⁶⁻³⁶, which, under the influence of Daniel, gave the title, 'Son of Man,' to Jesus in the Messianic sense. This Apocalypse was translated and found its way into the Greek Gospels, carrying the Messianic application with it. But as this Apocalypse of Jesus, from its reference to the murder of Zechariah ben Barachiah (Mt 23³⁵, Lk 11⁵¹; cf. Josephus, *B.J.*, iv. 335, 343), cannot have been itself written long before the end of the first century, Professor Schmidt finds himself in a critical position of some difficulty. But it is enough for us that he holds that in the Gospels as we now have them, however it got there, the title 'Son of Man' means the Messiah.

Professor Zenos of the University of Chicago has contributed an article to the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* on 'Symbolo-Fideisme.' That 'ugly and hateful barbarism,' as one of its most sympathetic reviewers has called it, is the name of a new system of theology, the Ritschlianism of France. It is not called after its founder as Ritschlianism is, because no one claims to be its founder. The name it is known by was actually given to it in derision—as some think the name Christian was first given. But it was at once

adopted by its adherents. And as it is likely to be found in future manuals of historical theology, it may be well to set it down here accurately that the name first appeared anonymously in the *Église libre* of 3rd August 1894.

The system itself is about ten years old. Or rather its first public appearance was made about ten years ago. How long before that time men were secretly brooding over it cannot now be told. But about ten years ago its adherents formed themselves into a school, which, with that singular helplessness in the choice of names which characterizes them, they called the School of Paris (*L'École de Paris*). The leading members were the historian Jundt, the Philonian scholar Massebieau, the journalist Frank Puaux, and three professors of Divinity in Paris, Auguste Sabatier, Eugène Ménégoz, and Edmond Stapfer.

The three professors are its three theologians. And each of them confines himself to his own department. Professor Sabatier is a systematic theologian, and to him we owe the fullest and most direct exposition of the system. His chief book, *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la Religion d'après la psychologie et l'histoire*, has been translated into English and published under the title of *Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton). On its appearance in France Professor Ménégoz wrote a full review of it, and spoke of it as 'the most important doctrinal treatise issued from the press in France since the publication of Calvin's *Institutes*.' Professor Sabatier has also published *The Vitality of Dogma* (in English, by A. & C. Black) and *Religion and Modern Culture*, the former an inaugural lecture at the Protestant Faculty of the University of Paris, to which he belongs; the other, a paper read at the Congress of the Science of Religions at Stockholm in 1897.

Professor Ménégoz is an exegetical theologian. His chief work is on *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. But he has also published a

Study of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and two smaller but significant works, *Du Rapport entre l'Histoire Sainte et la Foi Religieuse* and *Le Salut d'après l'enseignement de Jésus*. Professor Stapfer, before he became known as—what shall we call him?—a Symbolo-Fideist, had written a book on *Palestine in the Time of Christ*. He has since published a Life of Christ in three small volumes, which have been translated and issued by Scribners in America, and in the second volume he frankly states that his interpretation of the Life of Jesus arises out of his new position as an adherent of *Symbolo-Fideisme*. He is the historical theologian of the system. Many articles also, some of them directly expository of the system, have been contributed to the *Revue de Théologie* and the *Revue Chrétienne*.

Well, what is this new thing called *Symbolo-Fideisme*? Its double name expresses its double-sidedness. Two principles are combined in it. One is that faith is an act of union with God and is fundamental in religion. The other is that faith must always seek forms of outward expression; but these forms are not essential to religion, they are only the signs or symbols by which the presence of the faith within makes itself known. Sabatier, it is said, worked out the idea of the symbol, that ever-varying outward form in which true religion expresses itself; and Stapfer emphasized the inner essential fact of faith.

Take an example. Professor Zenos takes it from the little book by Ménégoz on the Trinity. It will illustrate at once the system and the risk that any new system runs of falling into some old heresy. The doctrine of the Trinity, says Ménégoz, is not formally expounded in the New Testament. But the data for a doctrine are there, and we must state it for ourselves. Professor Ménégoz states it for himself, and says that 'the Father is God transcendent; the Logos is God immanent in humanity, revealing Himself in history, and manifested in His fulness in Jesus Christ; the Holy Spirit is God immanent in us

giving testimony to our spirit.' Put it more concisely: The Father is God transcendent; the Son is God immanent objectively; and the Holy Spirit is God immanent subjectively; and these three are one. But the three are distinct as we represent them in our thought, and in distinguishing them we conceive of all the three as personal. And each has His special rôle in relation to humanity. We represent them to our mind scarcely otherwise than the Church Fathers; but we are conscious that our representation is purely subjective, and that, as a matter of fact, there are not three persons in God, but a single Person manifesting Himself to our spirit under three different personal aspects.

That is perhaps as good, as favourable, an example of Symbolo-Fideism (we may drop the *e* and make it English) as could be given. How nearly it touches Sabellianism is evident. Professor Ménégoz holds that it is not Sabellianism. For, whereas the persons of the Trinity in Sabellianism are successive manifestations of God, according to his view they are activities coexisting and running parallel at all times. But the point is, that even for his own view Professor Ménégoz claims only a superficial and temporary value. We must speak of three persons in the Trinity, but that is merely a sign or symbol necessary to our present thought; essentially faith knows that there is only one God.

Year after year for many years has the subject of the Higher Criticism been up at the Church Congress. This year there was a variety. The subject was up, but it took the special form of 'Old Testament Criticism in its bearing on Teaching.'

The subject was opened by the President of Queens' College, Cambridge. Dr. Ryle began by a stroke, the full force of which could only have been felt when the second speaker was on his feet. He began by quoting two sentences from an

article in the *Dictionary of the Bible* by Professor Margoliouth. The sentences admirably express and plainly accept the broad results which the Higher Criticism claims to have reached. 'The greater portion of the Old Testament,' says Professor Margoliouth, 'does not consist of works produced by single individuals embodying their own ideas in their own language, but of the work of schools, or societies, who compiled, abridged, and edited. The main streams have perhaps been separated by critics with success; but each of these main streams is made up of a variety of smaller rills, so to speak, which cannot be localized.'

The full force of these sentences, as quoted by Dr. Ryle, could only have been felt, we say, when the next speaker was on his feet. For the next speaker was Professor Margoliouth himself, and Professor Margoliouth's speech was an unqualified repudiation of the Higher Criticism and all its 'results.' He would not even give it the credit of originality. It was as old and stale as Manasseh. 'King Manasseh,' he said, 'if the Talmud is to be believed, stumbled on certain of the difficulties which in modern times vexed Bishop Colenso; but whereas Colenso remained a bishop, Manasseh appears to have abandoned the Jewish faith.' To attribute a book to an author who had not written it, he described as forgery, and he said that in *secular* class-rooms they entertained no doubt of the immorality of forgery. 'But when we come to the lecture-room in which Biblical Criticism is taught we find ourselves regarding forgery as a normal and even praiseworthy act. Wholesale forgeries, such as the Book of Daniel, awake no indignation; indeed, while acknowledging the author to be a forger, we are invited to bestow on him the honourable title of Prophet.'

The situation is a most curious one. No doubt it means that when Professor Margoliouth passed his *Dictionary* article for the press he was a Higher Critic, and now he is not. But the difference in time is inconsiderable, while the

difference in position is very great. What has thrown Professor Margoliouth in this brief interval out of the ranks of Criticism? It is not offence at the methods which the critics use, nor even at the results which they have reached. It is the discovery in an old lumber-room in Cairo of a few dirty leaves of an old Hebrew manuscript. The critics believe that these leaves give us part of the original Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus. Professor Margoliouth believes that they give us only a translation into Hebrew. There have been many words over it. Some of them have been pretty high. And Professor Margoliouth has found himself set determinedly against the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, and all that uphold it.

It was on that account that the managers of the Newcastle Church Congress sent for him. Professor Ryle would speak first and tell the audience what the Higher Criticism was and why they should teach it. Professor Margoliouth would follow and tell them that whatever they taught they must not teach that, for it was wholly false and was being fast discredited. And it all came off as it was arranged. Only Professor Margoliouth delivered a much more astonishing address than could have been anticipated, and Professor Ryle delivered his dramatic blow at the beginning.

We have seen what the Higher Criticism is. Why does Professor Ryle think we should teach it? It gives us, he says, a better idea of the way in which the Scriptures of the Old Testament came into existence. The old idea,—no more than a 'traditional vague supposition,' however,—was that the writers obtained their materials in a supernatural way while in a state of spiritual trance or ecstasy. But St. Luke speaks in his Prologue of his labours in collecting materials for his Gospel. Even so the writers of the Old Testament gathered their materials by human industry from human sources. There is inspiration, but it is not there. The inspiration is in that

spiritual force which uses these materials to work the works of God in the human heart.

But more than that, Dr. Ryle claims that criticism is a far better apologetic than tradition. Tradition says that since Scripture is inspired, it can contain no flaw or contradiction. And when apparent flaws or contradictions are discovered, they have to be explained or explained away by methods that are rarely convincing and not always straightforward. Criticism does not deny the possibility of faults or flaws; it deals with them when they are found by the laws of historical or scientific evidence. For the Spirit of God may use for His purpose either a historical occurrence or a popular story or an allegorical picture. And the man who takes the story of Jonah literally should not reproach the man who takes it allegorically.

And yet more. Criticism, says Dr. Ryle, has disentangled science from religion. The books of the Bible were not written to teach science but religion. The patriarchal narratives tell us something of the nomad life of the early Israelites, but from the Tel el-Amarna tablets we learn far more history, see far more of the condition of Canaan during the patriarchal age than from many chapters of Genesis. We have been wont to teach the Old Testament as if it were a storehouse of facts, and to demand a mechanical acquaintance with these facts. Let us go to the monuments for that. But if we would understand the divine election and the spiritual discipline of Israel and of man, let us read the early narratives of Genesis, that matchless series of simple scenes, so true to nature, so rich in moral beauty, so matchless in purity of pathos.

And Dr. Ryle claims that along with these great gifts the Higher Criticism has given us a new interest in the Old Testament. We may read it for pleasure or for benefit, for the means of sanctification or for weapons of controversial war—but we read it now. In particular we read the prophets. For centuries, he says, the prophets were

ignored as mysterious oracles, or honoured merely for the precious texts which sparkled like gems upon the dim and obscure surface of an unexplored literature. Modern scholarship has laid bare their intimate relation to the political and social problems of the day. 'The books so long shunned and avoided are seen to burn with living fire, and the servant of God is impelled, as it were, by this new appearance to draw nearer and see this great sight. The dulness has gone from these names; they live once more for modern uses, political and social as well as spiritual.'

For those reasons and in those ways Professor Ryle would give Criticism a place in the modern teaching of the Bible. For Criticism is not content with negative results, nor does it stay its hand when literary structure and historical sequence have been ascertained. It is a revelation of God as a God of order; it lays the foundation of a theology of progress. If it tells us that to all appearance Israel began with nothing which other nations did not have, it tells us also that while the religion of Edom and Moab and Ammon evaporated like smoke, the religion of Israel gathered strength and beauty, inspired and upheld the race in its day of overthrow, and transformed the remnant of Israel into an undying Church.

What has Professor Margoliouth to place over against all that? He would not once look at the things which Criticism claims to bring us. What does he offer instead? He has two alternatives to offer. 'Either,' he says, 'we may look forward to the ultimate re-establishment of the belief in verbal inspiration, which was the view of the late Bishop of Liverpool' (a return stroke not unworthy of a skilled disputant); 'or we may hold with the doctrine formulated by Canon Liddon in his last University sermon, that while a certain number of concessions might be made to the imperfection of the medium whereby the divine revelation was communicated, there was no inconsiderable number of matters, the mainten-

ance of which was necessary for the continuance in belief of persons who were not afraid to follow their premisses to their conclusion.'

We are not quite sure that we understand Professor Margoliouth's second alternative. But for the first the subsequent speakers gave him little encouragement. And yet the subsequent speakers were men who would fain have been with him if they could. There was Dr. Frederick Watson, for example, Hon. Canon of Ely, and Vicar of St. Edward's, Cambridge. 'If we admit,' said Canon Watson, 'that the Bible is a book as truly human as it is Divine, we must not recoil from the consequences. Men argue that since the Bible is God's Word it must be free from all imperfection. The argument is equally valid that since the Bible is man's word, it cannot be thus free. I hope I shall not pain any one when I express my own opinion that the Bible is not free from imperfection, error, and mistake in matters of fact. Let me add that it is a conclusion to which I have slowly and reluctantly come. For example, it would seem impossible to deny the existence of errors in the Old Testament numbers. These errors arise from different causes; but it is clear to my mind

that they cannot be merely corruptions of transmission, the errors of later scribes. I think that we ought to confess that some of Bishop Colenso's arithmetical puzzles were incapable of solution.'

And there was also Dr. Chadwick, the Bishop of Derry. He would put the matter to one small and simple test, and he chose the first chapter of Matthew. In that chapter it is said that 'all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David to the carrying away into Captivity are fourteen generations, and from the carrying away into Captivity to Jesus Christ are fourteen generations.' Here, said the Bishop of Derry, was a plain statement of a plain historical fact. Was it the literal truth? Every one of them knew that the second list of fourteen was obtained by leaving several names out, and the third list by reckoning Jechonias a second time. And the author when he wrote it knew this well. Explain this action as they might—he thought the object was a mystic one, namely, by reckoning six sevens to make the Church occupy the place of the seventh seven,—but in any case it was evident that the writer was not careful to state historic fact with literal prosaic accuracy.

What Have We gained in the Sinaitic Palimpsest?

BY AGNES SMITH LEWIS, M.R.A.S., HON. PHIL. DR. (HALLE-WITTENBERG), CAMBRIDGE.

I.

St. Matthew's Gospel.

THE text of the four Gospels from the Syriac palimpsest which I discovered in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai in 1892, has, since its publication in 1894, attracted an increasing amount of attention from all lovers of biblical science, and has more than justified the high opinion formed of its value by its first transcribers, Professor Bensly, Professor Rendel Harris, and Mr. Burkitt. And since I succeeded in filling up some of the *lacunæ* left by these earnest scholars,

during my third visit to Sinai in 1895, it has been pronounced by Professor Harnack to be 'one of the most important, yes, probably altogether the most important of witnesses for our Gospels' (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, Mai 1898, p. 197). I propose to give in this paper a detailed list of those of its readings which may possibly affect any future revision of our English New Testament, or will at least have to be taken into consideration. But I must first state some of the reasons why so