

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

DID our Lord ever speak in irony? It has been said that He did, and examples have been produced. One of the examples has been found in Mk 14⁴¹, 'Sleep on now, and take your rest.' How could Jesus say that in earnest, it has been asked, when immediately after He has to say, 'Arise, let us be going'?

In a little book called *Here and There in the Greek New Testament* (published by Revell in Chicago, and by Allenson in London), Professor Potwin, of the Western Reserve University, considers that passage. He does not believe that there is irony in it. He believes that if we read the narrative of the Agony in the Garden right through, keeping the eyes of our imagination open, we shall see that there is no irony in it.

Three times Jesus went away a little from the disciples to endure the Agony alone, and yet be not too far away from human sympathy. Twice He returned and awoke them from sleep. He gently chided, but kindly excused them. The spirit was willing, but the flesh was weak. He returns for the third time. This time He does not awake them at once. With eyes of pity He looks upon the forlorn 'o'erwatched' friends. He speaks a few tender words to ears that do not hear. 'Sleep on now,' He says, 'and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the

Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.' He speaks, but they do not hear. They are taking their rest. And for their sakes He could wish that Judas would delay his coming. But it may not be. He hears the steady tread of Judas' band. In simple words He wakes them now: 'Arise, let us be going. Behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand.'

The first part of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1901 has been published. Its first article is on the Address and Destination of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. It is written by Professor W. B. Smith of Tulane University.

Professor Smith does not believe that St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was written for the Romans or sent to Rome. It is true that in the seventh verse of the first chapter are found the words, 'to all that are in Rome.' But Professor Smith believes that these words are spurious. After going through the evidence against them, he says that three things about them are 'as certain as anything of the kind can be.' First, that both in the East and in the West, from very early times, there existed a text without any mention of Rome in this verse; second, that this text was considered so authoritative as to be adopted by the two earliest commentators, Origen and Ambrosiaster, though neither doubted that the Epistle was

addressed to Romans; third, that the idea that the destination was Rome established itself in the minds of men generations before the expression of this destination established itself in at least some of the best MSS.

But we pass to the fifteenth verse of the same chapter, and read the words, 'I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome.' Professor Smith believes that here again we have an early interpolation. For again there are good MSS. which omit the words 'in Rome.' He supposes that some early scribe, thinking that so great an Epistle could only have been written for so great a church, placed the words 'in Rome' on his margin, and scribes who followed him complacently received them into their text. Professor Smith reckons it easy to account for their introduction when once the church in Rome had become famous; but it is inconceivable to him that any scribe could have omitted them after that, and omitted them from both the places where they were found.

Professor Smith does not understand how any one who reads the Epistle can believe that it was addressed to Rome. How could there have been in Rome at the time when this Epistle was written a community of Christians to whom it could be said, 'Your faith is proclaimed throughout the whole world?' And if there were such a community then, how could it be that afterwards, when the apostle arrived in Rome, the leading Jews there knew practically nothing either of him or of Christianity? Wendt is struck with this incongruity, and suggests that Luke has deliberately misrepresented the facts. Professor Smith thinks it more likely that we have misunderstood the letter. If you ask to whom the letter was written, he does not know. He only knows that it was not written to Romans.

There is no easier way of marking the progress of English Etymology within the last twenty years

than by comparing the earliest (1882) and the latest (1901) editions of Skeat's *Concise Etymological Dictionary*. And there is no better word to select for comparison than GOSPEL.

In the old edition we were told that Gospel did not originally mean 'good news' but 'life of Christ.' For there were in Anglo-Saxon two words with the same spelling, but with a difference in the length of the vowel. The word with a short vowel, *gōd* (like German *gott*) was 'God,' but *gōd* with a long vowel was the adjective 'good.' And as the English word 'Gospel' had early been introduced into Germany, and had there taken the form of *gotspell*, that is, 'story of God,' or 'life of Christ,' it seemed to follow that that was the earliest meaning of the English word itself.

In the new edition the change is radical. The earliest form is given as *gōdspell*, and it is stated to be simply a translation of the Greek word (*εὐαγγέλιον*) for 'good news.' For between Skeat's editions Murray's great Dictionary has come out. And Murray has shown not only that this is the meaning of the word in its earliest examples, but also that its introduction into German and other languages in the sense of 'life of Christ' was due to a mistake. The word had come to be applied in English not only to the gospel of the grace of God, but also to the books which contained it, as we still speak of the four Gospels; and the German writers, seeing it as written, and not hearing it pronounced, took that to be its proper meaning.

Greater in appearance but much less in reality is the change in the word GOD itself. The old article simply gave the Teutonic forms of the word, and added that it had no connexion with the adjective 'good.' The new article suggests a fundamental Teutonic form *guth-om*, and behind that an Indo-Germanic root *ghu*, meaning 'to worship,' like the Sanscrit *hu*, 'to sacrifice.' So 'God' would be 'one who is worshipped,' or 'one to whom sacrifice is offered.'

And it may be so. But there still is room for brilliant suggestions. Such a suggestion is made by Dr. John Fiske in his Concord Address just published by Messrs. Macmillan, under the title of *The Idea of God*. Dr. Fiske believes that we owe the word to our heathen ancestors. He believes that it is simply another spelling of the heathen divinity *Wodan*. The change from the *w* to the *g* is easy enough, as words like 'warden' and 'guardian' testify. Moreover, there are in Germany town-names like *Godesberg*, *Gudenberg*, and *Godensholt*, all derived from *Wodan*. We have preserved in Christianity the remembrance of this great god of our fathers in the name of one of the days of the week. Mr. Fiske believes that we have taken over the name itself, degrading it, however, from a proper to a common noun.

'It would be difficult for me,' says the Bishop of Durham, 'to describe the feeling, almost of despair, with which I first looked on the desolation of the Tyneside and of the denes of Durham. I could not believe, and I cannot believe now, after thinking of the question for ten years, that such desolation was the necessary condition of securing any part of our rightful inheritance. Surely we have been over hasty in our pursuit of material wealth; and now we have to meet the consequences of our impatience. "Toil, glitter, grime, and wealth on a flowing tide" ought not to be the description of our noblest river. Every form of disorder—ruins and refuse heaps—is a source of demoralization. The remedy must be spiritual.'

It was in an Address to the College of Science, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on the 23rd of March 1900, that the Bishop of Durham spoke in this way. The Address is printed in his new volume, entitled *Lessons from Work* (Macmillan). He has called the Address 'The Spiritual Ministry of Art.'

In a few swift sentences at the beginning Dr. Westcott told the College of Science what Art is.

Art, he said, deals characteristically with Beauty only. Therein it differs from Science and from Literature. The student of Nature or of Life strives to learn and to present all facts. The student of Art learns and presents only those facts which ennoble us, those facts which help us to perceive what is highest about us, which help us to make the wisest choice, that we may feel and enjoy aright. The artist may be constructive or he may be interpretative. If he is constructive, he finds his joy in the power which has been given him to manifest God's glory. If he is interpretative, he brings to others intelligent delight in God's works.

Now if that is so, a man's conception of Art will depend upon his conception of Nature. If he believes that Nature is the sum of things seen, his Art will be simply imitation. But if he believes that throughout, beyond, beneath phenomena there is a divine thought, his Art will be its interpretation. The latter is a prophet.

The world's no blot for [him];
Nor blank; it means intensely, and means good;
To find its meaning is [his] meat and drink.

Is this, then, what Dr. Westcott means by the *spiritual* ministry of Art? No, it is not this. When the artist has found the divine thought that lies beneath phenomena, the divine unity of which phenomena are signs; and when he has lent us his eyes that we may see it with him, his work is not done. At this point there enters a new consideration of which he must take account. It is the Incarnation of Christ.

The Incarnation has given a new significance to all Nature and to all Life. It has brought into all that touches our senses an element which Dr. Westcott is not afraid to call Sacramental. This element separates the materials of Art into two classes; and alas! it separates the artists themselves. For there are artists who remain content with the general aim of Art, 'to present the truth of things under the aspect of Beauty.' But there

are also artists who recognize that it is the special aim of Christian Art to realize Beauty in the light of Faith. Both find the objects of their Art in humanity and nature. Both seek an ideal underlying these. But the one remains content with the ideal which man as man suggests; the other sees an ideal beyond the human, the pledge of the spiritual destiny of the finite in the Word made flesh. The one has no higher ideal than that of the ancient Greek, and despairs of realizing it; the other with an infinitely nobler ideal finds victory in the very sense of his defeat.

The Bishop of Durham illustrates his meaning by a reference to a picture in the National Gallery. It is Francia's Pietà. 'The picture,' says Dr. Westcott, 'is ridiculously labelled "The Virgin and two Angels weeping over the dead body of Christ." No one is weeping, and the student as he looks and looks will feel that the artist desired to suggest that the Lord lives still. The picture is indeed a revelation of life through death. The eyes of the Virgin are red with weeping; but her tears are dried now; she has learned something of the mystery that has been made known. One of the angels raises in her hand the hair of the Lord, and appeals to the spectator to witness that nothing even of earthly beauty has been lost. The other joins her hands together in adoration, as acknowledging the Divine Presence in Him whom men might call dead. All this is clear, if not to the picture-hanger, yet to anyone who reverently labours to discern what he saw whose eyes were opened.'

But surely this insight is only for the few? Not so. It is for men as men, made in the image of God, and thus capable of intelligent sympathy with His works. The obligation therefore lies upon us to strive untiringly to bring back the sense of the beautiful, the sense of the divine, which Art develops, to toilers in the fields, in the mines, in the workshops. Here, says Dr. Westcott, lies the solution of some of our saddest problems,—such problems as the

desolation of the Tyneside and of the denes of Durham.

'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich.' 'He was rich'—when was He rich? It is usually understood to have been before His Incarnation. But in the most recent commentary on the Pauline Epistles Dr. James Drummond doubts that. And in his newly published book on *The First Interpreters of Jesus* Dr. Gilbert doubts it also.

Dr. Drummond doubts if there is any reference in this passage to our Lord's pre-existence. For if St. Paul had been thinking of a pre-existing Person, Dr. Drummond does not believe that he would have called Him 'Jesus Christ.' 'Jesus' is the name of a man who lived and taught in Palestine; and 'Christ' is the official title of a man who was 'anointed' for a special work on earth. So if there was a pre-existing Being, and if St. Paul recognized Him, He was not Jesus Christ, but was incarnate in Jesus Christ. To say that Jesus Christ was pre-existent is, in Dr. Drummond's opinion, to affirm pre-existence of a human personality.

The obvious answer is that St. Paul used the name for the Person of the Incarnate Son, without considering the original meaning of each of its parts. But Dr. Drummond will not allow that. He admits that the name 'Jesus Christ' was used loosely in this way afterwards. But he does not think St. Paul would have used it so. He thinks he would rather have said, 'For ye know the grace of *the Son of God*.'

Besides, he thinks the meaning is unnecessary. He would translate the passage in another way and pass the difficulty easily. He would say, 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He was poor.' He would not say, 'He *became* poor,'

but 'He *was* poor.' He thinks the Greek (*ἐπρώχεν*) will bear that rendering. Then the riches and the poverty were Christ's at one and the same time. And the meaning is that though He was spiritually rich, Christ became materially poor, that we through His poverty might become spiritually rich.

Dr. Gilbert also is anxious to save the apostle from speaking of Christ's pre-existence. But he cannot agree with Dr. Drummond. All he can say is that 'nothing in this verse *requires* us to go outside the historical career of Jesus.' St. Paul may have been thinking of Christ's pre-existence, and he may not, we cannot tell.

But when Dr. Drummond and Dr. Gilbert have dealt with 2 Co 8⁹ in their own way, they are far from being out of the wood. They next have the great passage in Philippians to explain. Of this passage (Ph 2⁶⁻⁸) they both give long and elaborate explanations.

Dr. Drummond's note is longest and most elaborate. He begins as he began his examination of the other passage. He doubts if St. Paul would have used the name 'Christ Jesus,' if he had been thinking of pre-existence. Again he says that he would rather have used the expression 'Son of God.' He then takes up the clauses one by one.

The first clause is, 'Who being in the form of God.' The margin of the Revised Version states that the Greek for 'being' (*ὑπάρχων*) means 'being originally.' Dr. Drummond objects to that, and quotes certain passages (Lk 8⁴¹, Ac 17²⁹, 1 Co 11⁷, Gal 2¹⁴) which seem to him to contradict it. Then he comes to the word 'form.' St. Paul does not use the word (*μορφή*) except in this passage. But from his use of cognate words Dr. Drummond determines its meaning here. 'Jesus,' he says, 'was in the form of God, not through identity of metaphysical essence, but through participation in the Divine Spirit of Love, giving to

His soul, as it were, the divine impress, and making Him supreme among men, through the perfection of His communion with God.'

The next clause gives him more trouble. In the Authorized Version its words are 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God.' This suggests the sense that Christ being in His essential nature God, thought He was not committing robbery in being equal with God. But that sense, says Dr. Drummond, is out of keeping with the sentiment of the passage, and is, besides, a 'vapid truism.' The English Revisers translate 'counted it not a prize.' On which Dr. Drummond remarks that it is so immoral a sentiment that one must hesitate before attributing it to the apostle. Jesus taught His disciples to be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect. How could St. Paul say that Jesus Himself did not count such perfection a prize? He thinks the American Revisers must have seen these difficulties, for they translate 'counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped.' But Dr. Drummond is not satisfied with even the American Revisers' rendering. It seems to say that Christ was already in the form of God, but to be on an equality with God was something higher than that, and instead of grasping at that higher thing at once, He emptied Himself and became a servant, in order that He might get it afterwards as a reward for His humility.

Dr. Drummond's own translation is this: 'Did not think the being on an equality with God was grasping.' The clause does not say Christ was actually on an equality with God. It only says that the way to be on an equality with God is not by grasping, not by seizing everything (the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them), but the very opposite of that, by renouncing all these things. Well, Christ did renounce these things, as the apostle goes on to say. He emptied Himself. He took the form of a slave. He realized the Divine in humanity, through absolute self-renunciation.

He discovered and He taught that the way to equality to God is the way of the Cross.

The next clause thereupon becomes easy: 'But emptied Himself, taking the form of a slave.' The usual interpretation is that this was the way in which He forsook the form of God, the way in which He renounced His equality with God. Dr. Drummond believes that the apostle's meaning is the very opposite of that. This was the way in which Jesus showed that He was in the form of God; this was the way in which He found equality with God. 'Whosoever will be first among you, let him be your slave.' He will be first, not as the reward of his slavery, but just by being your slave, at the very time when he is your slave. He who was in the form of God appeared to men in the form of a slave. It was His appearance, His voluntary appearance, in the form of a slave that gave Him the form of God.

Now if the apostle had ended here, Dr. Drummond might almost have claimed a victory. But the apostle does not end here. He adds 'being made in the likeness of men.' What will Dr. Drummond do with that? He believes that the apostle is speaking of a man. To say that a man was made in the likeness of men is surely to be guilty of a rapid truism, as Dr. Drummond himself would express it. It seems to mean that the Person of whom the apostle is speaking was not a man until He was made in the likeness of men. It seems to refer, and it is usually understood to refer, to our Lord's Incarnation.

But Dr. Drummond will not admit that it refers to the Incarnation. He has several objections to take. First, if it means that the Son of God became man, it does not say so, or it says so in a very peculiar fashion. Secondly, it implies that He assumed the appearance of man, but was not really human; and that would destroy all the force of St. Paul's doctrine of the Resurrection. Thirdly, it ought to run,

'made in the likeness of *man*,' not 'in the likeness of *men*.' And lastly, the whole clause is in the wrong place; it ought to precede and not to follow the clause 'taking the form of a slave.' So Dr. Drummond does not believe that St. Paul refers to the Incarnation.

He believes that we have all missed the word on which the emphasis lies. It lies on the word 'men.' Of the two Greek terms for 'man,' the one used here (*ἄνθρωπος*) signifies the genus man, and it is of the genus man that the apostle has usually been understood to be speaking. But sometimes it is used in a derogatory sense, and sharply contrasted with the other word (*ἄνθρωπος*). Dr. Drummond believes that it is so used here. He thinks that in certain other passages St. Paul uses the word in this depreciating sense. Thus in 1 Co 15³² to 'fight with beasts like any common man' (*κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*); and in 1 Co 3³ to 'walk according to a man' is to fall below the level of one's Christian profession, and yield to vulgar human passion; and, 'Are ye not men,' in the next verse, means, 'Do ye not sink back into the common herd?' Then the meaning of the clause, 'being made in the likeness of men,' would be, 'being made like one of the crowd.'

Whereupon the succeeding clause explains itself. 'Being found in fashion as a man' means simply being found in the garb of a common man. The word 'found' expresses surprise. Men looked for the world's Redeemer, and they found Him in the garb of a common suffering man. This is the last clause Dr. Drummond deals with, the rest explains itself.

Dr. Drummond is Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, and a scholar of the highest reputation. He is on his guard against prepossession, and declares in regard to this very passage that his only desire is to find out what the apostle meant. Yet when we read his paraphrase of the whole passage, it is impossible not

to feel that as an expositor he finds much less in the passage than an ordinary reader would find. He may be right, and he may be wrong, but if he is right he has stripped the passage of half its glory.

This is his paraphrase. 'Have the humble and self-renouncing mind which you know was in Christ; who, though He was spiritually the image of God, did not think that the being on an equality with God consisted of selfish grasping, but emptied Himself of all self-regarding claims and advantages, and assumed the image of a slave, being among us as one that served, and made like the common run of men; and being found in His outward fashion as an ordinary man He humbled Himself, and was submissive to the will of God, even to the extreme of dying on the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted Him.'

Dr. Gilbert is as unlikely to accept the ordinary interpretation of this passage as Dr. Drummond. Yet he does not follow Dr. Drummond. He refers to Dr. Drummond's view in a footnote. But he simply calls it 'a view wholly counter to the ordinary theological interpretation of this passage.' He does not follow Dr. Drummond. He flatly contradicts him, or rather, he simply

sweeps all Dr. Drummond's elaborate explanations aside, and says that St. Paul does believe in a pre-existent Christ, and that he states his belief in a pre-existent Christ in this passage.

But what does Dr. Gilbert mean by a pre-existent Christ? Not that the incarnate Jesus Christ existed before the Incarnation. Jesus Christ pre-existed only in idea, just as the pattern of the Tabernacle pre-existed in the Mount, before the Tabernacle was made. Dr. Gilbert finds the best illustration of his meaning in the Book of Proverbs. There Wisdom is personified and speaks. She says that she was formed from everlasting, that she was with Jehovah as a master-workman, and the like. Thus Wisdom, the Wisdom of God, though only an ideal, is treated as an independent being. So is it with the Divine and eternal ideal of the Messiah. First the ideal existed in the mind of God, and then it was incarnated in the historical Christ. And if it is answered that the ideal is spoken of in this passage as doing certain things, Dr. Gilbert replies and says that so is Wisdom spoken of in the Book of Proverbs. Therefore he concludes that the Lord Jesus Christ did not exist before His Incarnation, except as an idea in the mind of God.

Divine Revelation in the Light of Old Testament Criticism.

BY THE REV. J. E. M'OUAT, M.A., B.D., LOGIEALMOND.

THE questions of Biblical Criticism which for a generation or more have occupied the attention of students, are now finding their way through the pulpit and the press to the general Christian public, and not only awakening an ever-widening interest, but causing in many quarters no small uneasiness and suspicion. The time has now come when something must be done to allay the concern thus produced in many earnest minds; and while it is scarcely yet possible to attempt a

full reconstruction of faith in the light of modern research, the general results and tendencies of all competent criticism are sufficiently well determined to make it at once needful and practicable to seek some readjustment. The purpose of this paper is to attempt a helpful consideration of some of the new aspects of the Old Testament Scriptures thus presented for our acceptance; and that from a standpoint in full sympathy with the old views, and yet open to any fresh light