

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PRINCIPAL BROWN, of Aberdeen, has died at the age of ninety-four. Above all other gifts, he had the gift of exposition. It is not as a scholar, it is not as a theologian, that we shall think of him, it is as an expositor. And as an expositor he was at his best in the doctrinal simplicity of the Gospels. There is a book in six large volumes, called *The Critical and Experimental Commentary*. Five volumes of that book should have been dead long ago. But Dr. Brown's single volume on the Gospels has kept the whole alive until now.

It is not as a scholar that we shall remember Principal Brown. Yet his scholarship was sound, and his interest in scholarship characteristically keen. He has often been heard to say that surely someone would come and give us a new dictionary of the Bible. At last he learned that the task was undertaken by a former pupil of his own. From that moment he kept pace with the progress of the work. He asked innumerable questions; he offered innumerable suggestions. He was most deeply interested in the attempt that is to be made to cover the obsolete or obsolescent words of the English Versions. Within a week or two of his death he was writing down with his own hand and sending to the editor words that should be handled,

and the leading passages in which they are found.

The announcement of a discovery is like the review of a book. It is possible to make too much of it, and then the public suffers. It is also possible to make too little of it, and then the author suffers. But the greatest wrong is done when an interesting discovery is made and the discoverer finds that people are disappointed with it when they see it, because unauthorized and exaggerated reports had led them to expect something more interesting still.

This ill fate, we fear, has befallen Mr. B. P. Grenfell, of Queen's College, Oxford. Last winter Mr. Grenfell discovered a number of papyrus rolls at the site of the ancient Oxyrhynchus in Lower Egypt. They were mostly written in Greek, and they ranged in date from the Roman conquest to the Arabian period. One hundred and fifty of these rolls of papyrus were sent to the Gizeh Museum, the rest were shipped to England. Of the rolls and fragments of rolls that were shipped to England, one possesses exceptional interest. It is a single leaf of papyrus. It is believed to run back to the third century A.D. It contains Sayings of our Lord, some of which are found in the Gospels and some are not.

This leaf of papyrus may turn out to be an actual portion of the long lost Logia of Papias. If it does, Mr. Grenfell is to be congratulated on his good fortune. But, first of all, he will have to bear the resentment of a disappointed public. For as soon as the discovery was made, it got noised abroad that the whole Logia of Papias was on its way to England, and the wildest excitement prevailed. That is Mr. Grenfell's misfortune, not his fault. Let us now wait patiently till we know what his discovery is.

Two editions of the precious leaf, which measures $5\frac{1}{2}$ by $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches, have just been published at the Oxford University Press. In one edition the page of papyrus has been reproduced by the collotype process, which preserves the colour of the original. The other is a tone block. Both editions contain translations and notes by Mr. Grenfell and his fellow-worker, Mr. A. S. Hunt.

The Rev. Horace Noel, of Woking, sends a note to the *Record* of June 25, on the translation of Job 42⁷⁻⁸. Mr. Noel believes that, on the ordinary translation, these verses land the believer in inspiration in a dilemma. The words are spoken by the LORD to Eliphaz the Temanite; and the ordinary translation—the translation of both the English Versions—is: 'Ye have not spoken of Me the thing that is right, as My servant Job hath.' Now the speeches of Job's friends, of whom Eliphaz was one, are either inspired or they are not. If they are not inspired, how, asks Mr. Noel, can we account for the quotation of words of this same Eliphaz by St. Paul? He plainly quotes them 'as carrying Divine authority.' If they are inspired, how can we understand Jehovah saying, 'Ye have not spoken of Me the thing that is right'?

Mr. Noel believes in the inspiration of Eliphaz as well as of Job. The difficulty is to him a real and an important one. His method of over-

coming it is a new translation. He seizes the word in the Hebrew which our English Versions agree in rendering 'of Me.' The word is 'elai' (עֵלַי). 'Nothing is more certain,' he says, 'than that the right rendering of that word is "unto me."'

Mr. Noel disclaims Hebrew scholarship. But he quotes 'a really good Hebrew scholar' to the same effect. And then he shows that the meaning to be found in the words, 'ye have not spoken unto me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath,' is that Job's friends had not humiliated themselves before Jehovah as Job had done. He finds an exact parallel in Ps. 32¹⁻⁵. 'Like Job, David at first refused to acknowledge his sin, and so long as he did so God's hand was heavy upon him day and night. At length David, like Job, gave way and submitted himself. He says, "I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." The pronoun here translated "unto" is the same as in Job 42⁷⁻⁸.'

The July issue of the *Evangelical Magazine* contains a sermon by the Rev. J. Gershom Greenhough, M.A., on 'The Gospel of Glory.'

The text is 1 Tim. 1¹¹. Mr. Greenhough quotes from the Revised Version: 'According to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.' He quotes from the Revised Version reluctantly. For 'it robs us of that familiar and dearly-loved expression, "the glorious gospel," and we do not like to let it go.' But truth is better than sentiment. There is no doubt about the correctness of the Revisers' rendering. And, after all, we need not lose the sentiment in gaining the truth. It is not less the glorious gospel because it is the gospel of the glory. It is the glorious gospel just because it shows us in a living picture the glory of the blessed God.

Well, according to the apostle here, this is the gospel. It is the showing forth to men of the glory of the blessed God. There are other definitions elsewhere; that is the definition here. And 'I do not see,' says Mr. Greenhough, 'how the most orthodox person can object to it.' 'So Paul thought that God's choicest gift to men was an express image of Himself, that the most comforting and inspiring message which could be conveyed to men was that which told them just what He is, which unburdened their minds of misconceptions of Him, and removed from their eyes all the veils of priestcraft and the films of superstition, and portrayed His dear unseen face in such consummate and undefiled beauty that the weary eye could find rest in beholding, and the heart throb with rapture that was lifted up in prayer.'

So the gospel of the glory of God is the good news that the otherwise unimaginable beauty of God is seen in the face of Jesus Christ. Now, the face of Jesus Christ is a stricken face. His visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. Why, then, does the apostle say 'the glory of the *blessed* God?'

Behind that word there lies a history. In the literature of ancient Greece it is applicable to the gods alone. This was their special glory that they were blessed. But what did their blessedness mean? It meant that they were far removed from the sorrows of men. They lay beside their nectar, untouched by human pain or poverty.

The gods that haunt the lucid interspace
Of world and world, where never creeps a cloud
Or moves a wind, and never smallest star
Of snow doth fall, nor lowest roll of thunder
Moan, nor sound of human sorrow mounts
To mar their everlasting calm.

The apostle has to tell of a blessed God also. He uses the word, thinks Mr. Greenhough, with a sense of the history behind it. He has a gospel to preach. It is the gospel of the glory of the blessed God. But what a difference in the blessed-

ness! His God is blessed, not because He lives in selfish isolation. The hand of the Man of Sorrows smote that chord of self, which, trembling, passed in music out of sight. It is the gospel of the blessed God, who was tempted in all points like as we are; who endures the Cross, despising the shame.

When a new thing has come into the world we require a new name to call it by. The people of Antioch recognised a new thing in the following of Jesus Christ, and called it Christianity. The modern Jews have found a new thing. They call it by the almost impossible name of Zionism.

Mr. Samuel Schorr describes Zionism in the *Record* for June 25. It is the movement in favour of a return to Palestine. It began in 1882. That year the persecution in Russia led to the formation of the Chovevei or Lovers of Zion Associations. Ten years later it took root in England. To-day it has won to itself nearly all the Jews of wealth and intellect in our own and in every land. The Rev. Hermann Golancz, M.A., preached last month in St. John's Wood Synagogue, and said he believed that a return of the Jews to Palestine was inevitable—similar to the return from Babylon.

Now the children of Abraham are circumspect. Before they entered the Promised Land they sent their spies to search it out. They had first to find if it was worth the entering. The modern Jews had that to find first also. So they too sent their spies to search out the land. A few weeks ago eighteen spies were despatched to Palestine. They included Rabbis, authors, journalists. Mr. Zangwill was one of the number. The spies have just returned. Unanimously they have brought back a good report of the land. It is agreed that they ought to go up and possess it.

The Jews are agreed that they must return. On two things, however, they are not agreed. They do not agree as to how they shall get there, nor

what they shall do when they have got there. The great question in discussion at present is how they are to get there. An enterprising journalist in Vienna, whose name is Dr. Herzl, has proposed a scheme. He recommends that a Jewish state be formed in Palestine independent of the Turks by the simple plan of buying it. Next August a great conference of Jews will be held in Munich to discuss Dr. Herzl's scheme. Meantime the Rabbis of New York have met and condemned it. The discussion in Munich is expected to be lively and eventful.

The question of how to get there is the question at present. The other question, what they are to do when they get there, has scarcely been considered yet. It is advisable it should be considered before they go. But meanwhile all they seem to be clear about is that they are going to Palestine to carry out the 'Mission of Judaism'; they are not yet clear what the 'Mission of Judaism' is.

The *Biblical World* for June contains a brief synopsis of an article which appeared in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1896 on Stoicheiolatry.

Stoicheiolatry will not be found in the index to either the *Biblical World* or the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Neither E. J. G., who writes the synopsis, nor Professor Hincks, of Andover, who writes the original article, once uses the word. Stoicheiolatry is the title of an article in the present issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. We presume it is the coinage of the writer there. It is not a captivating word. But it is correctly formed. It seems to stand for a fact. There is no other word to express that fact. And if the necessity that knows no law is upon us we shall be able in time to endure it.

The article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES was written in independence both of the article by Professor Hincks and of its synopsis. It was written before them both, nevertheless it properly

comes after them. And without considering the synopsis further, we shall give the sum of what Professor Hincks has to say, that we may introduce the article by Mr. Kean, and lead to a possible solution of three of the texts that are most 'hard to be understood' in all the Epistles of 'our beloved brother Paul.'

The texts are Gal. 4⁸ and Col. 2⁸⁻²⁰. One phrase occurs in all three. In Greek it runs τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. The Authorized Version translates it in Galatians 'the elements of the world,' but gives 'rudiments' for 'elements' in the margin. In Colossians it just reverses that arrangement. The Revisers have given 'the rudiments of the world' in all the places, with 'elements' in the margin of all. If Mr. Kean is right, that phrase contains the warrant for the coinage of the un-gainly word Stoicheiolatry.

The interpretation of the phrase is a most perplexing problem. Says Professor Hincks: 'Perhaps no other New Testament expression has divided commentators so evenly.' The question in dispute is whether the words which are translated 'rudiments' and 'world' should be taken here in a physical or in an ethical sense. In the Ancient Church, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Theodoret, and Theophylact of Bulgaria, make them physical; while Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Tertullian, Gennadius, and perhaps Eusebius, count them ethical. Among mediæval and modern scholars, Neander, Schneckenburger, Hilgenfeld, Klöpffer, Weizsäcker, Lipsius, Spitta, Everling, and Ritschl accept the physical meaning; Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, de Wette, Meyer, Weiss, Lightfoot, Sanday, Schaubach, and the English-American Revision decide to accept the ethical.

Henceforth another name must be added to the list of those who hold the physical interpretation. It is the name of Professor Hincks. For if the phrase is given its physical sense, it is a combination of words which, to Professor Hincks,

presents no difficulty. *Kosmos* is the natural world, and the *Stoicheia* are its elements or elemental forces, here used in a special sense, as we shall see.

The ethical meaning, on the other hand, suffers from some serious embarrassments. Let *Stoicheia* receive an ethical sense, and call it 'rudiments,' that is, first principles or A B C. Is *Kosmos* then to be ethical also? Meyer says Yes; Lightfoot says No. And these two split the ethical camp in twain. Lightfoot holds that when, in Gal. 4³, St. Paul says, 'When we were children we were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world,' he means under the rudiments of religion given by the physical world, the world of nature in which we live. Meyer agrees that he speaks of the rudiments of religion, of elementary religious truths, but he holds that they are not those of the natural world, but those of the world of men, the elementary truths which belong to mankind in general.

This difference among the advocates of the ethical meaning offers a slight objection to that meaning, but Professor Hincks takes no great account of that. What, he asks, is the sense we have got on either meaning of the word? Take Lightfoot's meaning first. *Stoicheia* is ethical, but *Kosmos* is physical. *Stoicheia* means first principles, and *Kosmos* is the physical world. What sense does that give us? If we ignored or were ignorant of the context, we might take it to mean 'the elementary truths of physical science.' Would it ever convey the meaning which Lightfoot thinks it is meant to convey—'the rudiments of religious truth taught by the earth'? Take Meyer's meaning next. Both words are ethical now, and the translation is 'the rudiments of men in general.' What does that mean? 'The elementary religious ideas possessed by men in general' is intelligible, and a very simple idea, if it would stand. But it will not stand. For *Stoicheia* never means 'elementary religious ideas,' but simply 'elements' or A B C. An intelligible sense is gained by inventing an impossible meaning for this word.

So Professor Hincks returns to the physical. *Stoicheia* is physical, and *Kosmos* is physical. Moreover *Kosmos* must mean this physical world, and not the physical universe. For in Col. 2²⁰ St. Paul speaks of the Colossians as living 'in the world,' using this very word. Therefore *Stoicheia* cannot mean here the 'heavenly bodies,' as some of the Fathers fancied. It must be taken either in its general sense of the elements of nature, the physical features of this world's life, as the succession of the seasons and the alternation of day and night; or it must be taken in the special sense of *the heathen deities*, which some writers have hinted at already—Klöpffer, Spitta, Everling, Lipsius—which is accepted by Professor Hincks, and which Mr. Kean works out with singular persuasiveness in the article which will be found on another page.

No book of the Bible seems to have so many capable commentators working on it as the Book of Acts; and no book of the Bible needed them more. There are especially Mr. Headlam (who has written the article for the forthcoming DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE), Professor Ramsay (who, it is much to be hoped, will yet produce the epoch-making edition), Mr. T. E. Page (whose brief commentary on the Greek text was published in 1886), Mr. A. S. Walpole (who co-operated with Mr. Page in publishing an English edition in 1895), Mr. F. Rendall (who pursues the commendable practice of giving both Greek and English with separate notes to each: his book came out a month ago), and above all, Professor Friedrich Blass of Halle.

It was in 1895 that Professor Blass published his edition of the Acts of the Apostles. It was written in Latin, and published in Göttingen by Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. Next year there appeared an appendix, under the title: 'Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur Romanam.' It was published in Leipzig by Teubner. The *Editio Philologica*, as the greater work is called, was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY

TIMES of March 1896, to which Professor Blass made brief reply in the issue for September. Now there may be found a full review of both the works by Mr. Page in the *Classical Review* for July of the present year.

Mr. Page describes the exegesis of the book as 'terse, clear, and scholarly,' and then just touches it. He points out that at Acts 20²⁸, in the vexed passage, 'the Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood,' Dr. Blass rightly reads with most MSS. the 'Lord' (τοῦ Κυρίου) for 'God' (τοῦ θεοῦ)—which the revisers have not dared to do—and 'wisely dismisses the whole controversy in a brief phrase of sound sense.' In the language of Professor Blass the brief phrase of sound sense is this, 'Solita confusio inter Κύριος et θεός (etiam v. 32), alias innocua, hic magnas turbas dedit, quia διὰ τ. αἰμ. τ. ἰδ ad θεοῦ referendum.' That is, 'the usual confusion between "Lord" and "God" (also occurring in ver. 32), although harmless elsewhere, has caused great trouble here, because "his own blood" has to be referred to God.' It was natural, Dr. Blass thinks, to substitute 'God' for 'Lord' in an age when it had become the custom to speak of Jesus as 'God.' And he might have added, says Mr. Page, that 'the Church of God' would be written here by mistake the more easily that that phrase occurs eleven times in St. Paul's Epistles, while 'the Church of the Lord' is found in this place only of all the New Testament.

Mr. Page refers to another passage in which this word 'Lord' has its part to play. It is the speech of St. Peter in Acts 10³⁴⁻³⁹. Mr. Page does not think that Dr. Blass has succeeded in making the sequence of thought in that very difficult speech quite clear. But he has made a suggestion regarding the most difficult phrase in it which Mr. Page calls 'brilliant,' and adds that 'it deserves the most careful consideration.' In ver. 36 there occurs a parenthesis in our English bibles. The words are put in parentheses simply because no one knows what else to do with them. They are no part of the sentence.

They have no connexion with the context. In the Revised Version the whole verse reads: 'The word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all)—that saying ye yourselves know.' Dr. Blass makes the simple suggestion of omitting Κύριος, 'Lord.' Whereupon we have the clear and pertinent sense: 'The word which he sent . . . through Jesus Christ, that (word) is for all men.'

Thus Mr. Page touches the exegetical notes. But it is not in the exegetical notes that the special interest of this edition lies. As is well known, there are two versions of the Book of Acts extant. The one held sway in the Eastern Church, the other prevailed in the Western. Dr. Blass distinguishes them as α and β . The Eastern or α text is the text of all our modern editions and all our modern versions. The Western or β text is best represented in the famous Codex Bezae of Cambridge. In other words, the text of Codex Bezae differs so often and so surprisingly from the Received Text, and it is so well supported by the Syriac version and other authorities, that critics have been led to describe it as a different text altogether, and Dr. Blass has been led to propose the most extraordinary solution of the phenomenon that in textual criticism has ever been made.

His solution is that St. Luke wrote a rough copy of the Book of Acts (perhaps on the back of some other manuscript), and that he then wrote a fairer copy and despatched it to his distinguished friend Theophilus. The fairer copy is the Received Text (α). But the original autograph was treasured by his friends, passed into the possession of the Western Church, and is now represented by Codex Bezae.

The theory is 'gratifying to the imagination,' says Mr. Page. He also says that it 'needs very strong evidence before it can be accepted.' He examines the evidence. He comes to the con-

clusion that it is not only inadequate, but 'points the other way.'

'On the whole,' concludes Mr. Page, 'the value of the β variants seems very small. The question of their origin may occupy the attention of scholars with ample leisure, and does not seem to admit of any solution; but they add practically nothing to our real knowledge of the Acts, while they frequently spoil what they seek to improve.' The final verses of our present text are an example of what Mr. Page refers to. These final verses as they stand are a model of powerful composition, while the rhythmic beauty of their closing cadence

—μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκολύτως in Greek, in English 'with all boldness, unforbidden'—might strike even an unpractised ear. But, says Mr. Page, 'when there is a desire to drag in theological formulæ, nothing is sacred.' The β text tacks on to it the words, 'saying that this is the Christ, the Son of God, through whom all the world is to be judged?' (λέγων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ μέλλει πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κρίνεσθαι). 'Not inaptly,' says Dr. Blass, 'is that placed at the end of the book.' But Mr. Page does not agree with him; and he adds the sly remark that *on his own theory* St. Luke did not agree with him, for after writing the words he deliberately struck them out.

Paul and Jesus.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR HOYLE, LEEDS.

A GOOD deal of the depreciation of Paul the Apostle may be traced to the revolt against supernaturalism that has marked the latter half of this century. It is a new development of an old position, and, partially, a strategical movement to the rear. The ultimate goal of these assailants, for the most part, is everything miraculous. If Paul can be got out of the way, then the rest are easily put aside. Paul has elevated supernaturalism into a system, made every Christian in some sense a miracle, and linked the Personal intervention of a Personal God to the deepest facts of our spiritual consciousness. So long as this system is accepted, even in its broad outlines, supernaturalism is safe. But get this out of the way, and, with flying banners, the assailants will march over all the rest. There is a show of retreat. Twenty years ago, all theology was of chaos and black night; now this position is somewhat modified. We may keep our theology, provided it has no mysterious depths and awful outlines; that is to say, provided it is no theology at all. Then Jesus is held up to us, but a Jesus one can hardly recognise. His life is a poem, dear and refreshing to the heart of man. He is the great unweaver of ethics. Simplicity and gentleness

and intellectual beauty are His distinguishing characteristics. About Him is nothing polemical or dogmatic, but the sweet seduction of an entirely human sentiment, so penetrative and so persuasive, that one feels, when putting down these accounts of Jesus, as a certain woman did, 'what worries me is that it doesn't wind up with a wedding.'

Such a Jesus as that Paul never knew. Such a Jesus as that has no sort of connexion with the teaching that 'it is Christ Jesus that died, yea, rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.' If we think other than thus about Him, we may at once put down Paul's Epistles. They are of no further use. They are plucked up by the very roots. But *was* Jesus just a Teacher with a handful of charming precepts? Had He *no* system? Had His system no mysterious depths, no awful outlines? I cannot dwell long on this, but I have observed that, just as those who object to theology do not really object to theology at all, only to some other person's theology, so those who say that Jesus has no system, usually have no system of their own. Jesus *had* a system. Every man whose life is at all based on reason *must* have