

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE issue of the DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS has been delayed a month. It was out of the Editor's hands on the first day of October. But in order to secure copyright in the United States a book has to be published on the same day in both countries. It will be issued this month.

One of the most difficult questions which the translator of the Bible has to consider is what to do with the personal name of God. Should he transliterate, or should he translate it? The question has arisen most recently in Japan.

Bishop Awdry of South Tokyo, Japan, has published a pamphlet *On the Use of the Word 'Jehovah.'* It consists of two parts. The first part is written by the Rev. Armine F. King, of St. Andrew's Mission, South Tokyo, and the second part by Bishop Awdry himself. Mr. King urges that the Name should be translated. Bishop Awdry answers that it should be transliterated. Then, in *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* for October, Dr. W. St. Clair Tisdall examines the arguments on both sides, and tries to reach some conclusion.

But he reaches no conclusion. For the ques-

tion is not simply, Shall the name be transliterated or translated? It is also, What shall be the transliteration, and what the translation? And this double uncertainty makes the whole problem one of the most perplexing that the translator or missionary has to do with.

In the Authorized Version, says Dr. St. Clair Tisdall, the name of God is four times transliterated 'Jehovah' (apart from such compound words as 'Jehovah-jireh'); in the Revised Version ten times. Elsewhere it is translated LORD, both versions using capital letters to distinguish from the translation of 'Adonai,' which is printed Lord. The American Committee expressed their preference for the use of 'Jehovah' throughout. Now the objection to the translation LORD is twofold. It is a mistranslation, and it is the translation (for few consider the capitals) of another word.

It is a mistranslation. There may be uncertainty as to what the tetragrammaton (יהוה) means; but it is quite certain that it does not mean 'lord' or 'master.' It is true that the Seventy have translated it 'Lord' (Κύριος), and that the New Testament has adopted the translation. And there is more in that than Dr. St. Clair Tisdall seems to think; nevertheless, it is a mistranslation.

And it is the proper translation of another word. It is the proper translation of 'Adonai.' There may be dispute as to the oldest form of that name, and as to its place of birth. In a book published this very month—*Adonis Attis Osiris* (Macmillan; 10s. net)—Dr. J. G. Frazer shows no hesitation in identifying it with the Greek 'Adonis,' and therefore with the Semitic (and somewhat disreputable) 'Tammuz.' But all agree that the word has the meaning of 'lord' or 'master.'

If, then, the tetragrammaton is to be translated, how is it to be translated? Dr. St. Clair Tisdall prefers 'the Eternal.' For he says that 'in spite of attempts to make the word afford all sorts of undesirable meanings, the great mass of scholars are of opinion that the Name denotes *He who is.*' And in support of his preference he quotes Mal 3⁶, 'For I, the LORD, change not,' claiming that 'For I, the Eternal, change not' would bring out the argument better.

But there are objections even to so excellent a translation as this. In Sanskrit it becomes 'Svayambhū.' But 'Svayambhū,' the Self-existent, is used as an attribute of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. It is even employed in the Laws of Manu for the impersonal *Anima Mundi*. We are already far away from 'the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy.'

Shall we transliterate, then? Again there are objections. Dr. St. Clair Tisdall has no doubt that the correct transliteration is 'Yahweh.' The editors of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon have proved that. But it will not be easy, and it will take a long time, to get rid of the erroneous but familiar Jehovah. Again, in the Maori tongue, *Yahweh* would be represented by *Iawa*. But in that tongue *iawa* is an exclamation, meaning 'hold!' It is evident, says Dr. St. Clair Tisdall, that the resemblance would lead to misunderstanding, if not to irreverence.

Once more, Bishop Awdry believes, and Dr.

Tisdall seems to agree with him, that some nations would reject the transliteration 'Yahweh' on the ground that it is the name of a foreign God. In Japan this offence has actually been felt. And in any case it is undesirable, they think, to emphasize the foreign nature of Christianity.

So the end is not yet. But the Japanese have a way of settling things when they take them in hand. They may settle this also.

The first paper presented to the Church Congress this year was read by Professor Flinders Petrie. It came under the general title of 'The Bible and the Evidence of the Inscriptions.' But Professor Flinders Petrie is an Egyptologist. So he confined himself strictly to Egypt.

He also confined himself strictly to the facts. 'I do not wish,' he said, 'either to attack or to defend any particular school or view, but only to give such facts and conclusions as seem to throw light on statements in Jewish history.' Now the temptation to do a little theorizing is particularly strong in Egyptology, the points of comparison being so few. But Professor Flinders Petrie resisted it. And thus he was able in a very short paper to mention all the references to the Old Testament which have yet been found upon the Egyptian monuments.

The points of contact are few. But every year adds to their number. And they are sometimes very significant. Last year the site was discovered of the temple which the Jews built when, under the high priest Onias iv., they went down into Egypt to escape the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes. The place is Tell el-Yehudiyeh; it is twenty miles north of Cairo.

The site was discovered, and the foundations of the temple were discovered also. The temple in Egypt had been just half the size of Solomon's temple in Jerusalem, a span for a cubit being the measurement throughout. No doubt it was built

after the pattern of the temple of Zerubbabel, which also must have been half the size of Solomon's temple. And to make the likeness as close as possible, the mound on which the temple in Egypt stood was constructed on the model of the Temple Hill in Jerusalem.

Now we knew much of this already. We knew it from Josephus. But was Josephus to be trusted? The excavations show that 'in every respect the accounts given by Josephus are in accord with the facts, and his apparent discrepancies are now also explained.'

From the temple of Onias, Professor Petrie passes to the Jewish colony in Egypt in the days of Jeremiah. For his method is to begin at the latest events, and work back to the earliest.

'O ye remnant of Judah, Go ye not into Egypt.' Thus came the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah. But they went down into Egypt, and took Jeremiah with them. 'So they came into the land of Egypt; for they obeyed not the voice of the LORD: thus came they even to Tahpanhes.' Tahpanhes is the modern Defenneh, thirty miles south of Port Said. And there is 'Pharaoh's house' still, and the 'pavement which is before the entry,' where Jeremiah buried the stones, and prophesied that Nebuchadrezzar would set up his throne upon them, and spread his royal pavilion over them (Jer 43¹⁰).

When we reach the period of the Kings we come upon a difficult historical question. It is the date of the campaign of Tirhaka against Sennacherib (2 K 19⁹). The only occasion upon which this campaign could have taken place was, according to the annals of Assyria, in the year 701 B.C. For in that year Sennacherib made his one and only expedition to these parts. But the reign of Tirhaka did not commence till 691 or 693 B.C. How could he have gone out against Sennacherib in 701? Professor Flinders Petrie answers: 'We now know that Tirhaka was acting in the Delta,

probably as regent of the Ethiopian king, for nine years before his own sole reign in 693 B.C.' And he thinks it quite natural that he should be called king by the Jews, to whom he was the sole representative of the Ethiopian kingdom.

A similar difficulty about So or Sua is similarly removed. In 2 K 17⁴ So is called king of Egypt. This was in the year 725 B.C. But Shabaka (whom Professor Petrie identifies with the Biblical So) did not begin to reign till 715 B.C. But what is Shabaka or So called on the Assyrian monuments? Professor Petrie believes that he is called Sibe. Now it is recorded that as early as 720 B.C. Sargon attacked Sibe, who was then *tartan* or commander-in-chief in Musri, that is, in Egypt, and Professor Petrie concludes that So was acting as viceroy for the distant Ethiopian king before his own sole reign began.

In this, it will be observed, Professor Flinders Petrie not only identifies the So of 2 K 17⁴ with the Sibe of the Assyrians, which all other scholars do, and with the Shabaka of the Egyptians, which some scholars think impossible, but he also identifies Musri with Mizraim, the ordinary Hebrew name for Egypt, which a few scholars very decidedly do not. He knows that they do not. 'A desperate effort,' he says, 'has been made to separate the Musri of Sibe from Mizraim or Egypt, and to prove that another kingdom of the same name joined the eastern frontier of Egypt.' But he holds that one fact has not been taken into account—the fact that Egypt politically included Sinai then as now. And he adds that there is not a single occurrence of the name Musri which is not applicable to the political limits of the kingdom of Egypt.

After mentioning Zerah of 2 Ch 14⁹⁻¹⁵, whom he identifies with Osorkon I., Professor Petrie passes to Shishak (1 K 14²⁵), and for once forgets his good resolution. 'The riot of negation,' he says, 'which has tried to emend the name of Shishak into an entirely different form (the reference is

no doubt to Professor Cheyne's suggestion that Shishak is a corruption from Cush) in order to disconnect it from the campaign of Sheshank, only shows how rabidly unhistorical so-called criticism may become.'

Professor Petrie cannot tell us who was the anonymous Pharaoh whose daughter was married to Solomon. The dates would suggest that he was the last, or the last but one, of the Twenty-first Dynasty of Tanis. 'These kings had little or no political power, and securing a retreat into Palestine would be a great advantage for them in case of trouble with the rival dynasty of Thebes.'

Then Professor Petrie comes to the period of the Judges. He calls it 'the dark period of the Judges.' It was dark for Israel, and it is dark for the modern historian. Its one clear and cardinal fact is that throughout the whole period there is no reference to conquest or intrusion from Egypt. That means that the long series of Egyptian conquests and raids, which extended from 1580 to 1186 B.C. (the sixteenth year of Ramessu III.), had come to an end before the Israelites entered Canaan. Put the entry into Canaan at 1175 B.C. Then the Exodus must have taken place after 1215 B.C. For it is not at all likely that it took place during the strong reign of Ramessu III. It must, then, have fallen in the reign of Merenptah (1234-1214 B.C.), or perhaps more likely in the disorganization of the kingdom under his four weak successors (1214-1203 B.C.).

But about the Judges. Professor Flinders Petrie is convinced that in the Book of Judges there are three separate narratives of three contemporaneous events or series of events. One series of events belongs to the North, another to the East, and the third to the West. On adding the periods for the events of each division he finds 118 years for the North, 122 years for the East, and 121 years for the West—practically identical times. Now from the beginning of the reign of

Rehoboam in 937 B.C., we have Solomon 977, David 1017, and Saul beginning about 1030 B.C. That places the beginning of the judgeships about 1150 B.C., and leaves 25 years, more or less, for the slow conquest of Canaan under Joshua.

And that is all clear and convincing. It is true that the narrative in the Bible does not separate the events in the time of the Judges into three contemporary strata, but seems rather to make them succeed one another in unbroken line. And Professor Flinders Petrie is most reluctant to depart from that. But then the Exodus would be thrown so far forward that the Israelites would be in Canaan while the Egyptians were still sending their expeditions there. Whereupon we should have to ask how they were allowed to leave Egypt while the Egyptian king was so powerful, and how there is no reference whatever to any expedition or interference from Egypt while Joshua and the Judges were accomplishing their work.

When Professor Petrie reaches the Exodus his survey is practically over. But in approaching the narrative of the Exodus, he has one serious difficulty to deal with. It is the question of the number of the Israelites who left Egypt under Moses and journeyed through the Wilderness.

The number is too large. Of that Professor Petrie has no doubt. 'The study of the Wilderness of Sinai leads strongly to the opinion that the climate, the rainfall, and therefore the population have not altered in historic times. The ancient inhabitants cannot therefore have exceeded the 5000 or 6000 of modern times. And the Israelites, who could barely succeed in conquering them cannot have been much more numerous.'

The enormous numbers of the Book of Exodus are an old offence. Did they not start Bishop Colenso on his critical career? And many have been the attempts to reduce them. Professor Flinders Petrie finds their solution in the list themselves. The word *alf* means not only :

'thousand,' but also a 'family.' In the original lists there was a record for each tribe of the number of its families (or tents) and of the hundreds of its people. At a later time, when the population of Israel had greatly increased, the lists were misread as thousands and hundreds, instead of families and hundreds.

There has been much interest in the Report of the Commission on Ritual. There has been much discussion of its recommendations. But another Commission has been sitting. Who has taken an interest in it? Its decisions have been issued. Which of us has canvassed them? Yet its recommendations seriously affect a far greater number than can ever be affected by the recommendations of the Commission on Ritual; and it has to do with a matter of far more vital interest to us all. It is the Commission on the Bible appointed by the present Pope.

Writing from Rome on Sunday, the 22nd day of July, the correspondent of *The Tablet* said: 'The Biblical Commission moves slowly—so slowly that its published decisions average rather less than one a year; the Biblical Commission is cautious—so cautious that hitherto its decisions have been little more than a succinct *negative* to certain theories advanced to solve some great Biblical difficulties. But this week the Biblical Commission has published five answers to five very important questions, and it has in four cases replied with an *affirmative*, which will greatly relieve students of the Scriptures.' Upon which we remark that the students of the Scriptures who are relieved by these four affirmatives, after taking into account the negative which precedes them, must be very much in need of relief.

The first question is this: 'Whether the arguments amassed by critics to impugn the Mosaic authorship of the sacred books known as the Pentateuch are of sufficient weight, notwithstanding the very many evidences to the contrary contained in

both Testaments taken collectively, the perpetual agreement of the Hebrew people, and the constant tradition of the Church, as well as the proofs furnished by internal criticism of the text, to justify the statement that these books have not Moses for their author, but have been compiled from sources for the most part posterior to the time of Moses?' To this question the answer is, 'No.'

Does the answer mean that, in the opinion of the Commission, the Pentateuch was wholly written by Moses? No, it does not mean that. The wording of the question, it will be seen, is cautious. What it does mean, the four questions that follow make sufficiently clear. The second question asks whether Moses may possibly have entrusted the writing of the Pentateuch to some other person or persons. And the answer is, 'Yes.' But at the same time the question asserts that the work, if written down by another, was approved by Moses as the principal and inspired author, and was made public under his name. The third question asks whether Moses may have used written documents or oral traditions from which he selected some things and inserted them in his own work. And the answer is, 'Yes.' The last question is whether the Pentateuch as we have it now may contain some things which were not in it when it left the hands of Moses—glosses, faulty readings, or the like. The answer is, 'Yes; due regard being paid to the judgment of the Church.'

Now there is a certain childlike simplicity about these questions and answers at which robust critics will be apt to smile. But we, for our part, have no inclination to smile. There are men and magazines in our midst that commit themselves to statements that are quite as childlike as these, and we are ready enough to smile. But these answers are signed in the name of the Commission by its secretaries; and the *Italie* informs us that immediately after the original document (which is of course in Latin), and above the secretaries' names, there appears the following sentence: 'The secretaries having reported as above to His Holiness

on June 27, 1906, His Holiness approved the foregoing answers, and ordered the publication of them.' If the Pope has gone so far as that, the Pope may go still further. The danger lies there, and that danger is much too serious for a smile.

What is it that the Pope has approved of? He has approved of the statement that the first five books of the Bible, as they now stand (with the exception of possible mistakes of interpreters or scribes), were written and published in the time of Moses, either by himself or under his direction and sanction. Now we do not know a single Old Testament scholar in any Protestant country who would sign his name to such a statement as that. And if we may judge from what has been done in the past, we believe that the time will come when the Church of Rome will repent of it.

For there is an article in the current number of *The Dublin Review*, which, incidentally perhaps, and unconsciously, but most significantly, recalls the experience of the Church of Rome in the past. In this article we read: 'The able young seminarist who cares for Biblical exegesis now knows that the *comma Johanneum* is only found in two Greek texts, and those comparatively modern, and not earlier than the fourth century in a Latin text. The supposition that it is a gloss would be for him, therefore, far the most natural and the most helpful even to his faith.' What is the *comma Johanneum*? It is the passage in the First Epistle of St. John (5⁷) about the three heavenly witnesses. It is the words: 'There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One.'

Well, it so happens that in the current number of another Roman Catholic periodical, *The New York Review*, there is an article on the three heavenly witnesses. And that article shows that in the Church of Rome the passage has had a strange and instructive history.

Some years ago the Church of Rome was face to

face with the question of the genuineness of that passage, as to-day it is face to face with the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch. And in the year 1897 (it is not very long ago) the Inquisition issued the following decree: 'In a general Congregation of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition, held in the presence of the most eminent and reverent Lord Cardinals, Inquisitors-General against heretical pravity, the doubt was proposed: Can it be safely denied, or doubted, that the text of 1 St. John v. 7, which reads: For there are three who give Testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One, is authentic? Having given a most diligent examination to this whole matter, and having ascertained the will of the Consultors, the most eminent Cardinals gave order that the answer be, No! On Friday, the 15th day of January 1897, in the customary audience granted to the Assessor of the Holy Office, His Holiness Leo XIII., when informed of the foregoing decision, approved and confirmed the answer of their Eminences.'

Does the Church of Rome hold by that answer to-day? She does not. A book has been published, under the title of *Das Joanneum Comma*, by Dr. Karl Künstle, Professor in the Catholic University of Freiburg. 'This little work,' says the writer of the article in *The New York Review*, 'has now been a full year before the public, and notwithstanding that it not only denies the genuineness of the Three Witnesses text, but maintains that it is the interpolation of the heretic Priscillian, it has met with no ecclesiastical censure, and is not likely even to provoke a serious reply.'

Can the Church of Rome afford to issue such decrees, and then ignore them? Perhaps she can. But that is not the most serious aspect of the matter. When the decree of the Inquisition was published in 1897, it came, says Hetzenauer, as a bolt from the blue ('wie ein Blitz aus heiterem Himmel'). What did Catholic students do? They said that it did not prevent them from examining the passage to see whether it were genuine or not.

They said that it did not assert the authenticity of the verse, but only that its non-authenticity was not yet proved. One of them even said that the decree meant no more than that 1 Jn 5⁷ 'contains a dogmatically powerful witness to the Trinity idea as this existed in the mind of St. John.' The writer in *The New York Review* speaks of interpretations like these as 'contrived by Catholic theologians to extricate themselves from the evidently uncomfortable position in which the Inquisition has placed them.' And with the intellectual or moral value of this sort of interpretation he wishes to have nothing whatever to do. He is right. It may be that the Church of Rome can afford to make decrees and ignore them, but no Church on earth can afford to drive its students more than once or twice to such intellectual and moral makeshifts.

'Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named' (Eph 3¹⁵). That is, of the Father. Of that there is no question. 'I bow my knees unto the Father (*πατέρα*), of whom the whole family (*πατριά*)'—the assonance is unmistakable. The father is the head of the family, and the family has its name from him. So it was in Hebrew society: so it is in the universe of God.

But the word 'family' is a highly unfortunate rendering. For the English word 'family' is not derived from the highest in the household but from the lowest, not from the father but from the servant. It was so with the Roman word, from which the English word is taken. *Famulus* was the servant, and *Familia* was the household of servants. And in the oldest English use of the word a man could speak of his family who had neither son nor daughter. 'I was a single man,' says Defoe, 'but I had a family of servants.' There never was a word which more completely missed the Apostle's meaning. But who will suggest a better?

The family of which the Apostle speaks takes its name from the highest, and not from the lowest.

And if it takes its name, it takes its character also. For to the mind of St. Paul a name was more than a label. It was the expression of the character of the person carrying it. This is brought out by Westcott, and it does not seem to be noticed anywhere else. 'The name,' he says, 'is designed to express the essence of that to which it belongs.' And so the whole family in heaven and earth derives more than its name from its Father; it derives the character which makes it His family.

But what is this whole family in heaven and earth? We have been reading Westcott's *Epistle to the Ephesians*. Long looked for, it has come at last. And although in some ways, no doubt, somewhat disappointing, it was well worth waiting for (Macmillan; 10s. 6d.). We have been reading it and comparing it with other commentaries on Ephesians. We have compared it with Dr. T. K. Abbott's commentary, with the Dean of Westminster's, and with the present Bishop of Durham's. In respect of the passage before us the most instructive comparison is with the present Bishop of Durham's commentary.

For there is an old-standing dispute as to the right translation of this verse in Ephesians, and these two successive Bishops of Durham take opposite sides in it. Dr. Moule defends 'the whole family in heaven and earth,' which is found in the Authorized Version and is most familiar to us. Dr. Westcott prefers 'every family in heaven and on earth,' which is the rendering of the Revised Version.

Dr. Moule does not deny that the Greek demands 'every family.' At least he admits that the Greek of the classics would demand it. But he is not so sure about the Greek of the New Testament. He believes that the grammar of New Testament Greek is not so precise, but that here and there we are allowed to take the context into account and depart from the ordinary translation. He believes that we are allowed to do so here, and he does it.

Dr. Westcott gives himself no such liberty. He does not even discuss the question. Like the Dean of Westminster, he evidently considers the demands of the grammar so imperative that it is not worth discussing. Dr. Moule says that if you keep 'the whole family,' you obtain a truth that is characteristic of the Epistle throughout—the spiritual oneness of the holy Community. Dr. Westcott says that 'it is characteristic of St. Paul to recognize the variety and unity of the manifold life in earth and heaven.'

What, then, if we follow Bishop Westcott, does the Apostle mean when he says that every family in heaven and on earth has its name and character from the Father? In this the commentators are of little use. They take it for granted that we know there are families upon earth, and they remind us that in the belief of the Jews of St. Paul's day there are families in heaven also. But this only shows the misfortune under which we lie, of having to translate the Apostle's word by 'family.' For if the word 'family' comes from the servant rather than from the lord of the household, and was at first used in English in the sense of a body of retainers, that is unfortunate enough. But it is equally unfortunate when used of the families in heaven. For, in our modern use of the word, the family belongs to the father by generation, and if there is anything that we know about the angels in heaven it is that they have no generation, that they 'neither marry, nor are given in marriage.'

What are we to do? In their margin the Revisers bravely suggest 'fatherhood,' and fatherhood has the immense advantage of retaining the Apostle's word-play. But fatherhood is not the meaning. It was Wiclif's rendering, after the Vulgate *paternitas*. And, after Wiclif, it has once or twice been used in the translation of this very verse. But 'fatherhood,' in the sense of family or clan, has never been recognized in English. There is nothing for it but to retain the word 'family,' and try to understand the meaning of it. And when we try to understand what St. Paul means

when he says that from the Father every family in heaven and on earth takes its name, we had better begin with the earth.

Now, since he was a Hebrew, the modern idea of the family was not so familiar to St. Paul as the idea of the tribe or clan. For, as Professor McCurdy reminds us in his *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments* (ii. 38), the clan was the centre and basis of the community of Israel. The most obvious mark of the clan was blood-relationship, which might be real or fictitious, but did not at all correspond to the relationship existing between the members of the modern family. But the essential thing in this blood-relationship, the thing which gave the clan its existence and stability, was the understanding that a real kinship existed between the god of the clan, who was its head or father, and the members of it. This kinship or fellowship (for those two conceptions were scarcely distinguishable to the Semitic mind) was well seen at the time of sacrifice. For then the god was not merely propitiated, he was understood to share the sacrificial meal in fellowship with his worshippers.

This divine headship of the clan became the great bond of kinship among its members. And the ceremonies of religion were at once additional motives of union and marks of tribal membership. Thus the clan was a religious community. It was religious in its derivation from its Head, from whom it was understood to have its being and its name, and it was religious in all the acts of its political and social life. It was a great conception. It made for unity, for strength, for the recognition of brotherhood, and for the worship of God. But it had one element of shortcoming in it. Each clan had its own particular god.

The day came when it was revealed to Israel that this was an element of shortcoming and of sin, and must be cast out. This was the task that was laid upon Samuel and the prophets. It was not an easy task. It was not easy to persuade the clan to give up its own particular god, and

pass first into the nation, and then into the world. And it was not rendered more easy by the fact that in doing this all that made for strength and brotherliness and religion in the constitution of the clan must be preserved and reappear in the constitution of the kingdom. It was so difficult that even when St. Paul wrote to the Ephesians, the ideal had been only partially realized. The clans and tribes had become the nation of Israel, but the nation of Israel still held itself aloof from the nations of the world.

St. Paul wrote his letter. He said he was about to engage in an act of worship. He was about to bow his knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Should he think of Him as entering into fellowship with one nation only? No. He will keep the sense of fellowship and all that makes for brotherhood in the clan, but he will bow his knees unto Him of whom every nation and tribe upon earth is named.

And not only on earth, but also in heaven. For

this man is a prophet. The God whom he worships is the God of all the tribes in the universe, the tribes on earth and the tribes in heaven. He seems to turn in that word 'heaven' to his kinsmen according to the flesh. Do the Gentiles among the Ephesians know most of the nations of the earth? The Jews have speculated most about the family in heaven. It is a saying of their Rabbis that 'God does nothing without consulting the family above.' St. Paul will leave no family or tribe outside the sweep of his thought. Be they above or be they below, the God of his Lord Jesus Christ is the God of them all.

It was a great thing to say, though it is said almost in a parenthesis. It is great in its contents as well as in its comprehension; and it is worthy of this great Epistle. Clement of Alexandria attributes the saying to our Lord Himself, associating it with St. Matthew 23⁹, 'Call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven.' We almost admire him for the mistake he makes.

The New Testament

IN THE LIGHT OF RECENTLY DISCOVERED TEXTS OF THE GRÆCO-ROMAN WORLD.

BY PROFESSOR DR. THEOL. ADOLF DEISSMANN, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

II. The Importance of the Texts for the Philological Interpretation of the New Testament.

THE first great fact that impresses the investigator is that the New Testament speaks practically the same language as was spoken by simple and unlearned men of the imperial age. That is the first and most easily proven example of the importance of our texts, namely, that they have for the first time made the New Testament intelligible from the point of view of the historian of language. This thesis, when first maintained ten years ago, met with more or less lively opposition in theological and philological circles, but professional opinion has since then become so much enlightened that at the present time the

whole science of New Testament philology is being revolutionized, and all workers at this subject are agreed that historical investigation of the language of the New Testament must begin with the language of the papyri, inscriptions, etc. In the latest annual report on the progress of classical antiquities,¹ Professor Witkowski, of Lemberg, reviewed the work already done, and came to the conclusion that the language of the New Testament must be considered in its connexion with the language of the texts we are discussing. Some other scholars may be men-

¹ *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 1904, i. Bd. cxx. pp. 153-256.