

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

ARE we going to recover the Pastoral Epistles? Some of us had not lost them. But it must be admitted that the names which are ranged against them are both very many and very great. Last year, however, the Rev. J. D. James, B.D., published a book on *The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), in which with great ability he argued for their Pauline authorship. And Mr. St. George Stock of Oxford has reviewed that book in the *Hibbert Journal*.

Now Mr. St. George Stock is not conservative. He has never had any hesitation in setting aside tradition when tradition and his own study disagreed. Yet he holds that the Pastoral Epistles are genuine. And he says: 'I venture to predict that the time will come when the rejection of the Pastorals as spurious will be pointed to as a strange aberration on the part of the critics. If ever works were stamped with the personality of a particular author, these works are stamped with the personality of St. Paul. They are as genuinely Pauline as the Epistles of Cicero to his brother Quintus are Ciceronian.'

What are the arguments against them? They are of two kinds, one external, the other internal. The external argument is the fact that Marcion

rejected them. To which Mr. Stock replies, 'Of course he did. It was a necessity of the situation. His opponents were able to ply him so effectively with weapons from this armoury that it must have seemed to him, as it did afterwards to Baur, that they had been forged expressly for the purpose.'

Apart from Marcion, the external evidence in their favour is 'as strong as it well could be.' The first sentence that we have of Irenæus contains a quotation of 1 Tim. 1⁴ as 'what the Apostle says.' The Pastorals were obviously known to the author of the letter from Vienne and Lyons. 'This evidence from Gaul towards the close of the second century is corroborated,' says Mr. Stock, 'by that of Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria in Africa. But at the beginning of the same century we find Ignatius saturated with Pauline phraseology, and the passages which recall the Pastorals are more frequent relatively than any other. Out of thirty-one instances of affinity with St. Paul's writings, no less than nine are from the Pastorals. Polycarp, again, in his one epistle to the Philippians has twenty reminiscences of St. Paul's language, of which seven are from the Pastorals.'

The external evidence is so strong that one has to account for the strength of it. Mr. Stock accounts

for it by saying that 'these letters, being, as it were, the dying instructions of the great Apostle with regard to the government of the Church, naturally sank into the minds of those who cherished his memory.'

So the argument against them is the internal argument. Now the internal argument turns upon their language. Critics enumerate the words which are found in the Pastorals and in none of the other Epistles of St. Paul. But 'the difficulties of language,' says Mr. Stock, 'have been greatly overrated. These letters do not contain a single word that can be shown to be of later date than St. Paul. All that the facts establish is that the Apostle's vocabulary became more copious the older he grew—a phenomenon by no means confined to himself.'

Whereupon Mr. Stock makes fun of the conservative critics of England cowering before the 'confident neology' of Germany. Even Mr. James, though he has made out so good a case for the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, seems to be satisfied if they can be retained in the Canon; and he is grateful to Riegenbach and Zöckler for thinking that they may have been put together by a disciple of St. Paul. Mr. Stock is not concerned about the Canon. He does not care to consider whether they may be kept in the Canon or not. He is satisfied when he is sure that they are the work of Saul of Tarsus.

The history of the Hyksos has been written at last. The new volume issued by the British School of Archæology in Egypt is entitled *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*. It is published at the School of Archæology in University College, Gower Street, at 25s. net. It is a double volume, and contains forty plates. Some of the chapters are written by the Rev. J. Garrow Duncan, B.D. The chapter which contains the history of the Hyksos has been written by Professor Flinders Petrie.

When a new chapter of history is written now it is written by an archæologist. And the archæologist has a new way of writing it. Professor Flinders Petrie writes his history of those 'shepherd kings' of Egypt off Egyptian 'scarabs.' He takes some black pottery into account also, but the pottery is subordinate. The scarabs give the history.

The first thing is to arrange the scarabs in order. Their order is determined by their workmanship. The most artistic are the earliest, and according to their degradation of type they descend the column of chronology. When the scarabs are arranged in chronological order, the next step is to copy the kings' names that are inscribed upon them, and arrange the kings accordingly. The third step is to see if there is any other evidence from the monuments, or any reference in the literary fragments that remain. The last step is to write the history.

This is the history. As early as the Twelfth Dynasty, a certain Absha and his family came down into Egypt. He was a Semite. The name appears afterwards among the Hebrews in the form of Abishai. His face, as it is shown in the celebrated scene at Beni Hasan, with the aquiline nose and the growth of beard, proves him to have been a Semite of the modern Bedawy type. He was a man of some importance. The Egyptians spoke of him as *haq khast*, that is, 'prince of the desert.' Now the *kh* in *khast* becomes in later times *sh*, and so passes into the Greek *s*. And *haq khastu*, or 'prince of the deserts,' becomes the 'Hyksos' of the historian Manetho.

After Absha, and after the Twelfth Dynasty came to an end, there arrived in Egypt other princes of the desert. One of them came from Haran, first into Judæa, and then into Egypt. He is familiar to us, says Professor Flinders Petrie quietly, as Abraham. He belonged to that branch of the Semites whom we now call Jews. Professor Flinders Petrie does not deny the inspiration of

the Bible, but as a historian all that he says of the Jews is that 'they were in fact a late branch of the Semitic Hyksos migration.'

After the Twelfth Dynasty a long period of gradual decline came over Egypt. Foreign auxiliaries rose into power, just as the Gothic chiefs became rulers of the Roman Empire by means of the army. Such were two kings of Babylonian origin whose names the scarabs give us, Khenzer and Khandy. The Semitic tribes who occupied the great triangle between Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia filtered in as followers of these foreign chiefs, and finding the country an easy prey, gradually swamped it. They subdued Egypt, says Manetho, these ignoble people from the East, without a battle. For they were archers. In a close-fought pitched battle the Egyptians might always triumph, but an elusive cloud of archers destroyed all resistance before the Egyptian arms could touch them. There was first a century of raids, plundering, and destruction; then a 'prince of the deserts' became king of Egypt, and the Fifteenth Dynasty began.

Comparing Manetho with the scarabs, Professor Flinders Petrie discovers two dynasties of Hyksos. The one dynasty reigned from 2533 B.C. to 2249. It consisted of six kings of foreign Phœnician origin. It is known as the Fifteenth Egyptian Dynasty. The other continued from 2249 to 1731 B.C. It is known as the Sixteenth Dynasty. It consisted of thirty-two 'Hellenic' shepherd kings.

Professor Flinders Petrie thinks that 'Phœnician' is the best name to give to a people who came down into Egypt through Syria. But why does he call the Sixteenth Dynasty of kings 'Hellenic'? The name is not new, and Professor Flinders Petrie knows it. It is used by Manetho to describe this dynasty. But Manetho has always been understood to make some extraordinary blunder here. He has either been emended or ignored. Professor Petrie believes that Manetho is right.

For after the Phœnician Semites came down

into Egypt they were cut off by land from their native home by the powerful pressure of the Assyrians. But they still had command of the sea. Six of the kings of the Sixteenth Dynasty give themselves the name of 'sea-kings.' Now the reason why they gloried in being sea-kings was that the sea gave them the control of Cyprus, with its large supply of copper. And as rulers of Cyprus they would be called *Ha-nebu*, or 'Lords of the North.' The term is used for the rulers of Cyprus till later times than this. But *Ha-nebu* is the term that is regularly used in Ptolemaic Egypt for 'Hellene,' the inhabitant of Cyprus being to the Egyptians the chief representative of the Hellenes. And by this piece of clever reasoning Professor Flinders Petrie shows that Manetho was right when he spoke of the Sixteenth Dynasty of 'Hellenic' shepherd kings.

The Hyksos ran into the Seventeenth Dynasty. But their power was passing away. The Seventeenth Dynasty consisted of a century and a half of brief reigns of two or three years each. It was a steady struggle with the invading Berbers. Finally the Southern invaders prevailed. They expelled the 'princes of the deserts,' and picking up the threads of the old civilization again, founded the Eighteenth Dynasty.

'The mind of the Lord may be said to move in the world of will.' We have not found that sentence in a sermon. We ought to have found it there; for the purpose of every sermon is to move the will. If a sermon does not move the will, it does nothing. And yet—we cannot say that men never preach about the will, but we can say that if they do, their sermons are rarely reported.

'The mind of the Lord may be said to move in the world of will.' The sentence is found in a volume on *The Temptation of our Lord* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), which contains the Hulsean Lectures for 1906. The lecturer was the Rev. H. J. C. Knight, B.D., Principal of the

Clergy School, and Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

It is with the will, says Mr. Knight, that our Lord has to do in all His ministry. He has to do with the will in four different persons—'with four wills,' as Mr. Knight expresses it. And His ministry is determined by His attitude to these four wills. To each of the four He assumes a 'distinct deliberate and inflexible attitude.'

The Father's will is first. Towards the will of the Father His attitude is that of resolute filial submission. His ground-principle of life is 'Not my will, but thine be done.' His prayer for all the children of God is, 'Our Father—thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.'

His own will is next. Now, notwithstanding His absolute submission to the will of the Father, His own will is His own. It is real, it is distinct, it is independent, it is responsible. He has the will to do the Father's will.

The third will is ours. 'The human will,' says Mr. Knight (and we have not read words lately that invite more thought or yield more advantage to the preacher), 'is with Him the object of a constraining and compassionate love, but also of a profound and awful respect.' He recognizes it as conditioning His own Messianic action. He uniformly refrains from attempting to overpower or violate it. Even Elijah to Elisha said, 'Go back again, for what have I done to thee?' For Elisha must not be made a follower by any other awe than the awe of constraining love. 'Foxes have holes,' said our Lord, and He had a far clearer vision than Elijah of the madness of leading the will into an unwilling captivity. We often think how much it cost Him to offer the human will a love worth accepting. We rarely think how much it cost Him to wait upon its wilfulness. 'Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life.' 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I—but ye would not!'

The fourth will is the will of the devil. Is the will of the devil a personal will also? Says Mr. Knight: 'If the Gospels trustworthily reflect Christ's mind, nothing else than the conception of a personal will underlies the way in which He uniformly spoke of the Evil One. It was a will in active antagonism to the will of the Father and to His own will. And He offers it nothing but uncompromising hostility. It is a will which rules and disposes, which desires and purposes; and which, as a will, can touch the wills of men.' The references are Lk 4⁶, Jn 8⁴⁴ 13².

Christ's attitude to the will of the devil, says Mr. Knight, is one of uncompromising and irreconcilable hostility. It is incomparably summed up in the Apostolic words, He partook of human nature, 'that he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is the devil.' He saw Satan as lightning descend from heaven. The descent was for conflict. And He knew that His whole ministry was a war against him in all his lightning splendour. But He knew that He had authority 'over all the power of the enemy,' and the capacity to bestow that authority upon others. As prince of this world he is to be dethroned. Christ will dethrone him by drawing all men unto Himself. He will draw all men to Himself if He is lifted up from the earth.

The will is rarely referred to in modern preaching, and when it is referred to, the will of the devil is usually left out. Mr. Knight does not leave it out. Our Lord did not. He moved, says Mr. Knight, throughout His ministry as one who had to meet 'a strong man armed.' He knew what it would cost Him to 'bring to nought' the devil. 'Through death,' says the Apostolic writer, Jesus knew that it must be through death. He knew that, for a season, there must be the apparent triumph of 'the power of darkness.' But He had counted the cost. His will is set against that hostile will irrevocably. He is not a holy one standing aloof from an evil will and by nature abhorring it. He is there to destroy that will, and

He has fixed both the end and the means. In the world of will Christ moved from the beginning to the end.

Are we going to recover the Pastoral Epistles? We wrote the notes on this question and turned to the *Church Quarterly Review*. In the number for the current quarter, just come in, there is an article on the language and style of the Pastoral Epistles. It is an anonymous article. All the articles in the *Church Quarterly Review* are anonymous. This anonymous reviewer believes that we are about to recover the Pastoral Epistles. He believes that we have been very foolish to allow them to be lost.

The case for the Pastoral Epistles, we have said, turns upon their language. Not upon their style. These two things are different. The opponents of the Pauline authorship of the Epistles do not deny that their style is Pauline. They admit, they assert, that their anonymous author was saturated with St. Paul's style. It is his vocabulary that is not St. Paul's.

Now there is only one way of proving that the vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles is not the vocabulary of St. Paul. That is by proving that it is later than St. Paul. For no unprejudiced person will deny that a man may enlarge his vocabulary with his years. The opponents of the Pauline authorship do not deny it. They are not really concerned to deny it. For what they have to prove is not that these Epistles were not written by St. Paul, but that they could not have been written by St. Paul because they belong to a later age. If it can be shown that the new words used in the Pastoral Epistles could have been used by a contemporary of St. Paul, then they may just as well have been used by St. Paul himself.

The writer of the article in the *Church Quarterly Review* believes that every one of the words which are peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles could have been used by St. Paul. How many are there of them? Von Soden tells us that there are 897

words in the Pastoral Epistles, of which 304 are not used elsewhere by St. Paul, and 171 are not found anywhere in the New Testament. It is a noteworthy fact. It is a fact, says this writer, which challenges our attention. He does not ask his readers to verify von Soden's list. They may not have von Soden's list beside them. But he takes it for granted that they all have beside them Thayer's *Greek New Testament Lexicon*. Now, at the end of Thayer's *Lexicon* there are lists of words peculiar to each of the books of the New Testament. The list for the Pastorals is larger than von Soden's list. It rises to 197. 'So,' says our writer, 'in taking Thayer's list, we shall be meeting this argument at its strongest, besides having the advantage of appealing to a work generally accessible.'

Now let us bear in mind what our business is. It is to discover whether the words which are peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles belong to a later time than St. Paul. The writer's method is to take them one by one. We need not take them one by one after him. Here is his final analysis of the list:—

Words not peculiar to the Pastorals	6
Words not contained in the Pastorals	4
Alternative readings	3
Words found in the Septuagint	73
Words closely related to Septuagint words	10
Words found in classical authors	28
Words found in Aristotle	8
Words found in Polybius	5
Words found in Strabo	1
Words found in Philo or Josephus	10
Words arising out of a new subject-matter	13
Words present owing to pure chance	4
Words formed from Pauline words	7
Words formed from Biblical words	5
Words formed from pre-Pauline words	2
Miscellaneous residue discussed separately	18

TOTAL 197

What does he mean by 'words not peculiar to the Pastorals'? He means words which, *according to the text of the Revisers*, are found in other books of the New Testament. And by 'words not contained in the Pastorals,' he means words which the Revisers' text has thrown out. The rest of the

entries explain themselves. It will be seen that eighteen words remain for separate examination. He examines them separately. One after another he shows that they were used by some contemporary of St. Paul or that they might have been used, not one of them having anything in it which refers it to a later time.

Principal Donaldson of St. Andrews has written a book about Woman. It is a subject which has attracted him for a long time. The book is for the most part a collection of articles which he has been writing for the last thirty years. His interest is as keen as ever. He has affectionately revised all the articles for this volume, and he has added about eighty pages of notes and references.

The title of the book is *Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and among the Early Christians* (Longmans; 5s. net). Even if Principal Donaldson had confined himself to Greece and Rome his book would have been interesting and instructive. But when he comes to the Early Christians, he has to deal with a matter of the most urgent importance. It is a matter which most of us shrink from. But we cannot shrink from it for ever. For the final test of every religion will be its morality. The final test of the Christian religion will be, What has Christianity done for woman?

What has Christianity done for woman? That is the question which Principal Donaldson has to face. That is 'the article of a standing or a falling Church' in our day. The test has already been applied, and we cannot escape it longer. Mr. Joseph McCabe has written a book about Woman, and declares that Christianity has brought woman into a worse condition than it found her in.

Mr. McCabe takes up woman at two periods of her history, one in Egypt 2000 years before Christ, the other in the United States 1850 years after. What was the position of woman in Egypt? He

quotes from Flinders Petrie, and says she was the mistress of the house, her husband being merely a sort of boarder or visitor who had to keep up the establishment. She inherited equally with her brothers, and had full control of her property. She could go where she liked, or speak with whom she liked. He has to admit that there was polygamy 'in theory'; but the first wife, he says, was generally able to exact conditions in her marriage contract which effectually prevented it. He thinks that at least in the earlier times her marriage was indissoluble. At all events, the inscriptions show, he says, that she remained to the end of life the beloved of her husband and the mistress of her house.

That was the position of woman in Egypt 2000 years before Christ. What was her position in the United States after '1800 years of culture under Christian influence'? In the city of Boston about 1850 (under English Common Law, Mr. McCabe adds parenthetically), and he quotes now from Mrs. Cady Stanton: 'Woman could not hold any property, either earned or inherited. If unmarried, she was obliged to place it in the hands of a trustee, to whose will she was subject. If she contemplated marriage, and desired to call her property her own, she was forced by law to make a contract with her intended husband by which she gave up all title or claim to it. The status of a married woman was little better than that of a domestic servant. Her husband was her lord and master. He had the sole custody of her person and of her minor children. He could punish her "with a stick no bigger than his thumb," and she could not complain against him.'

Now there are two things to be said about this. The first is that Mr. McCabe's test of what Christianity has done for woman is a material rather than a moral test. It touches but a part of the subject, and the least vital part. The other thing is that ancient Egypt is an unfair instance. Extremely little is really known about the position of woman in ancient Egypt. Nor was it from

ancient Egypt that Christianity accepted woman; it was from the Egypt of the early Christian centuries. Mr. McCabe's exalted Egyptian woman was passing out of existence, as he himself acknowledges, at the very time of which he writes, 2000 years before Christ. What was the position, what was the morality, of the women of Egypt when they first heard of the gospel of Christ?

Let us turn to Principal Donaldson. His work is the work of a historian, not an apologist. He has no bias in favour of Christianity. He quotes from Bishop Wordsworth's book, *The Ministry of Grace*: 'Of all the revolutions,' says Dr. Wordsworth, 'introduced by Christianity into the social life of mankind, the new position given to women has been perhaps the most remarkable and the most fruitful of results.' Principal Donaldson quotes these words, but he does not altogether agree with them. He thinks they are not quite cautious enough.

Yet when Principal Donaldson speaks of the religion of Egypt he differs entirely from Mr. McCabe. In the first place, he mentions a fact which Mr. McCabe has unaccountably overlooked. After pointing out how many perplexities still surround the position of woman in Egypt, he says that, nevertheless, some things are quite clear. It is certain, for instance, that it was usual for brother and sister to marry, and the arrangement was deemed particularly suitable when inheritance of property was concerned. And then when he is dealing with the Egypt, not of 2000 years before, but of the very time into which Christ was born, he quotes from Mahaffy, and says: 'Cleopatra was but the last of a long series of princesses, probably beautiful and accomplished, certainly daring and unscrupulous, living every day of their lives in the passions of love, hate, jealousy, ambition, wielding the dominion over men or dying in the attempt. But alas! except on the dull and lifeless effigies on coins, we have no portraits of these terrible persons, no anecdotes of their tamer moments, no means of distinguishing one Cleopatra from the rest

amid the catalogue of parricides, incests, exiles, bereavements.'

Come now to Christianity. And let us refuse, first of all, to separate Christianity from Christ. For the whole history of Christianity has been an effort to get back to Christ. And to judge its success at any selected period or in any selected country is to cut out a block and present it as the living tree.

In the next place, let us refuse to judge Christianity by the laws and institutions of Christian countries. Christ did not come to make laws or establish institutions. He came to give life. As the life enters, the laws that are made and the institutions that are established will be free and humane. But it is folly to surrender the essential test and accept one that is dependent upon times and places and circumstances. Christ left no laws about inheritance or the property of married women. He left the spirit of self-sacrifice.

Now when we ask what Christianity has done for woman, taking Christ into account, we find two things. The first is an entirely new estimate of woman; the other is an entirely new estimate of sin.

First, Christ introduced an entirely new estimate of woman. Much of Principal Donaldson's book is taken up with the women of Greece. We know more about them than we do about the women of Egypt. How did the Greeks regard their women? In Athens, he says, we find two classes of women who were not slaves. There was one class who could scarcely move a step from their own rooms, and who were watched and restricted in every possible way. There was another class on whom no restrictions whatever were laid, who could move about and do whatsoever seemed good in their own eyes. There arose, he says again, a most unnatural division of functions among the women of those days. The citizen-women had to be

mothers and housewives — nothing more; the stranger-women had to discharge the duties of ‘companions,’ but remain outside the pale of the privileged and marriageable class.

We need not inquire further. We see at once the estimate of woman that the Athenians had. They despised the one class, they degraded the other. They degraded the other till these unprotected women, ‘finding all true love but a prelude to bitter disappointment, became rapacious, vindictive, hypocritical ministrants of love, seeking only, under the form of affection, to ruin men and send them in misery to an early grave.’

Christ introduced a new reverence for woman. And He made no distinction. Did He reverence the pure, and loathe the fallen? He made no distinction. He revered equally Mary the Virgin Mother and Mary Magdalene. That was the first thing He did for woman.

The second thing was to introduce a new aversion to sin. He separated sin from custom and human law. He set it in the face of God and of eternity. The Athenian ‘companion’ was not a sinner, because Athenian law and custom said she was not. Christ came into touch with sin as the Son of Man. ‘That ye may know,’ He said, ‘that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins.’ Sin henceforward is to be sin in the presence of the Son of Man.

Again, he introduced a new aversion to sin by making it known that sin is not in the act, but in the attitude. There is a question in the Shorter Catechism which says, ‘Are all sins equally heinous in the sight of God?’ And the answer runs, ‘Some sins in themselves, and by reason of several aggravations, are more heinous in the sight of God than others.’ Now our Lord’s estimate of the heinousness of a sin was different from the estimate of His

time. He knew what the Pharisees were, and He knew the publicans. In the estimate of His time the sins of the Pharisees were as the small dust of the balance against the sins of the publicans. But when He spoke of the publican and the Pharisee who went up to the temple to pray, He said, ‘This man went down to his house justified rather than the other.’

The sin of the Pharisees was in their attitude to God, in their attitude to Himself. ‘If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin.’ Therefore the woman that had fallen came and obtained the forgiveness of her sin and discovered her position of reverence; but the Pharisees went on sinning, and prepared themselves for the unslumbering judgment of God.

Are some sins more heinous in the sight of God than others? They are. But not the sins that are more heinous in the sight of man. Christ differed from His contemporaries in His estimate of the heinousness of particular sins. And, even yet, we who are His followers have not brought our estimate into line with His. If we had followed Him as we might have done, we should have introduced the spirit of self-sacrifice into our laws and institutions, making it impossible for Mr. McCabe to taunt us with injustice between husband and wife. And, far more than that, man and woman would have stood together, equally revered by God and reverencing one another; detesting sin and detesting it equally, whether the sin of man or the sin of woman. When we reverence woman as He revered her, and detest sin as He detested it, we shall not condemn the woman taken in adultery more than we condemn the man who casts the first stone at her. And when the woman knows that she is revered as He revered her, the great evidence for the Divine origin of Christianity will be the position of Christian women.