

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *American Journal of Theology* for the current quarter contains a review of the first volume of the new *Dictionary of the Bible*. The review is intrusted to thirteen scholars, each a specialist in his own department.

Professor Moore of Andover, well known in this country by his incomparable *Commentary on Judges*, opens with an article on the treatment of the Hebrew text. He adds some useful, if minute, particulars. Acco is read by the codices of the LXX in Jos 19⁸⁰, and by many scholars after Reland's conjecture in Mic 1¹⁰; under ADAM (city) 1 K 7⁴⁶ might be mentioned; and the like. Professor Edward Curtis of Yale has received the Hexateuch to examine. 'The aim of the writers throughout has been to give facts rather than theories, to be constructive rather than destructive, and thus to preserve and emphasize, as far as possible, the historical element of the Hexateuch, while freely allowing also the ideal or legendary element. There is a sober conservatism in their treatment, and yet an unflinching recognition of the demands of scientific scholarship.'

The post-exilic writings are examined by Professor Kent of Brown University. He is much pleased with Professor Francis Brown's treatment of the Books of Chronicles—'a thoroughness which is as surprising as it is admirable.' He is not so well pleased with Professor Batten on the

Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. But these books are at present 'a storm centre for discussion and study,' and the final word cannot yet be spoken. We may add that whatever advance can be recorded since Professor Batten's article was written will be found in Dr. Barnes' article on the History of Israel.

But the reviews need not be further followed. They are capable, thoroughly honest and searching. And they have added some things of interest. On the other hand, they not only bear witness to the excellence of the Dictionary, but they also afford evidence of the difficulty of attaining to perfection. The writers of these reviews do not all keep within the bounds of their own department; or, rather, departments unavoidably overlap. And then it comes to pass, *e.g.*, that one reviewer expresses a qualified judgment on Forbes Robinson's 'Egyptian Versions,' another describes it as 'a model of thoroughness' and 'the best presentation of the subject in English.'

But indeed it is not possible for the most competent and careful reviewers to avoid mistakes in handling a work of such extent. There is an instructive review of the DICTIONARY in the current *Jewish Quarterly*. Two omissions are mentioned in the list of English words treated. One is the word 'beaten,' which is used of oil in Ex 27²⁰. The phrase occurs elsewhere, but it

is a literal translation always of the Hebrew, and therefore comes properly under the article *OIL*, not under the English word to 'beat.' The other is the expression 'all to break.' 'A cursory comparison,' says Mr. Jacobs, who signs the review, 'shows at once an absence of all explanation of the curious form "all to break" in Jg 9⁵³.' Perhaps the word 'cursory' is to blame. Mr. Jacobs may have looked only under *BREAK*. But that is not the important word, and under *ALL* will be found a full explanation of the phrase (which is printed in clarendon type to catch even the cursory eye), with illustrations from Tindale and Sir Thomas More.

Dr. Abraham Kuyper is a great theologian. He is described as the greatest living theologian in Holland. Professor Warfield of Princeton describes him, indeed, as 'probably to-day the most considerable figure in both political and ecclesiastical Holland.' A translation of Dr. Kuyper's greatest theological work—or at least of a portion of it—has been recently published in America and England. It is noticed on another page. Here we shall not speak either of him or of his theology. But we shall mention a single crucial example of his exegesis. And we shall remember that theology is built on exegesis.

It is the quotation in He 10⁵ of Ps 40⁶. The words of the Psalm are: 'Mine ears hast Thou opened'; the words in Hebrews: 'A body hast Thou prepared me.' There is no doubt that it is a quotation, and Dr. Kuyper has no doubt that it is a quotation from the Septuagint version of the Psalm. The words of the Septuagint version and the words in Hebrews are in fact exactly the same (*σῶμα δὲ κατηρίσω μοι*). Moreover, Dr. Kuyper has no doubt that the Septuagint version, which the writer of Hebrews has taken over, is wrong. It was once right. Once it was *ῥα*, that is, 'ears.' But *ῥα*, 'ears,' got corrupted by some copyist into *σῶμα*, 'body.' So the present reading of the Septuagint is wrong. Yet its quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews is not wrong.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews uses the corrupted Septuagint text, but he understands it in the sense of the original Hebrew. Or rather, for this is Dr. Kuyper's point, the Holy Ghost, who is the author of both passages, quotes the outward form of words with which the Hebrews were familiar, but quotes them in the sense which He originally intended them to carry. Now Dr. Kuyper thinks this is impossible if the ordinary German or English translation of the Psalm is right. That translation is: 'Mine ears hast Thou pierced.' It is impossible, he thinks, that 'a body hast Thou prepared me' can mean that. But that is not the right translation. That translation, says Dr. Kuyper, is absolutely untenable, because you could not pin *both* the ears of a slave to the door-post at once. Therefore, the only correct translation is, 'Mine ears hast Thou digged'; and 'digged' means 'opened'; and so the idea is the same in the Psalm and in the Epistle, 'Thou hast prepared me for the service of obedience.'

And if anyone should wonder why 'body' is put for 'ears,' Dr. Kuyper answers that it is so on the principle that the whole may at any time be put for the part. 'If my thumb is hurt, I can use three forms of expression: my *thumb* is wounded, my *finger* is wounded, or my *hand* is hurt. For "the preparation of the ear" can be put "the preparation of the body," provided both are taken in the physico-symbolical sense of spiritual obedience.'

Professor Robertson of Glasgow seems to be the only opponent of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament whom the critics now count worthy of reply. His latest book, *The Poetry and Religion of the Psalms*, is reviewed in the current number of the *Critical Review* by Canon Driver.

Canon Driver finds two weaknesses in the book. The first is that 'Professor Robertson's conclusions are apt to be in excess of what his premisses justify.' The other is, that, after all,

his conclusions are not out of touch with the conclusions of moderate criticism. Professor Robertson believes that we possess pre-exilic Psalms. So do moderate critics. He does not say how many, nor indicate which they are, and neither do moderate critics very confidently. He holds that there is nothing to hinder David from having been a Psalmist. Canon Driver quotes from Robertson Smith: 'We have every right, therefore, to conclude that the talents of Israel's most gifted singer were not withheld from the service of Jehovah,' and calls that 'a sentence which might have been written by Professor Robertson himself.'

Between the moderate critic (and Canon Driver is a moderate critic) and the opponent of criticism there is therefore no gulf fixed. There is scarcely even a river to cross. Perhaps Professor Robertson would seek no more than to restrain the moderate critic from becoming advanced. And Professor Driver is ready to recognize the courtesy as well as the scholarship of the effort.

In the long list of Old Testament names there is none that carries so strong an interest at present as the name of Zerubbabel. It is therefore probable that those who have first read Canon Driver's article in the *Critical Review* will turn next to Mr. Eaton's admirable account of Dr. Ernst Sellin's *Zerubbabel*. They will certainly not be disappointed.

Dr. Sellin, who is Professor of Evangelical Theology in Wien, has adopted in the main the views of Koster regarding the post-exilic history. For he finds that the current interpretation of that history leaves three questions unanswered. It does not explain how it came about that the exiles who returned in 538-536 B.C., who had neither a law nor a hierarchy, gave birth to the legal community of Ezra and Nehemiah. It does not explain why so many of the Psalmists despair of everything earthly, and sometimes

almost of the mercy of God; while the contemporaries of Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah look joyously and hopefully into the future. And it does not explain how two such heterogeneous streams as legalism and heart piety flow peacefully in the common river-bed of Judaism.

To these questions Dr. Sellin finds an answer in the new interpretation of the history. To all three questions he finds one answer. It is that under the influence of Haggai and Zechariah the people took Zerubbabel and made him king, but the Persians came and dethroned him, and he died a cruel death. The establishment of the Messianic kingdom under Zerubbabel was the occasion of all the religious joy and expectation. His overthrow was the cause of all the despair, and the open door for the entrance of legal worship.

Now Dr. Sellin admits that neither of Zerubbabel's enthronement nor of his overthrow is there a jot of direct historical evidence. But there is indirect evidence even in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The Persians, contrary to their principle, removed the governorship of Judæa from the royal house of David, so that Zerubbabel was the last of David's line. Was that not the result of rebellion? Again, when Hanani went to Shushan the palace to find Nehemiah, he said that the wall of Jerusalem was broken down (Neh 1³). What wall was that? Not the original wall when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians 150 years before, for that was too old a story now. Nor any wall built by Ezra, for Nehemiah's first visit to Jerusalem was prior to that of Ezra. It must be a wall that Zerubbabel had built about the time they made him king. Then there is the letter of Rehum to the king of Persia. It is inserted in a wrong place (Ezr 4^{7ff.}), but it is genuine, and cannot refer to any wall but one that was recently built. But the strongest arguments that Dr. Sellin produces are taken from the state of depression in which the community were found by Ezra and Nehemiah.

There was a kind of temple, but it had suffered some calamity. The prophets were discredited. And the Messianic expectation was so feeble that the Priests' Code, introduced by Ezra and Nehemiah, easily took its place.

But across this darkness Dr. Sellin sees one broad flash of light. In the midst of the nation's despair one religious genius retained his faith both in Providence and in prophecy. He is called Deutero-Isaiah, since we have nothing better to call him by. Deutero-Isaiah, Dr. Sellin believes, is the author of Is 40-55, and these chapters were written in Jerusalem after the Exile. Such passages as speak of the deliverance through Cyrus as still future are quotations from earlier prophecies of his own, and inserted here for a purpose. He wrote his great book between 515 and 500 B.C., that is, after the overthrow of the Zerubbabel Messianic monarchy, in order to comfort the people.

And the great comfort that he administers is in revealing the Servant of the Lord. Who is this Servant of the Lord? So far as he is not the people, says Dr. Sellin, but a definite individual, he is none other than Zerubbabel. 'Through the overthrow of Zerubbabel all their hopes seemed blasted. It was the sharpest crisis through which the religion of Israel had passed. But Deutero-Isaiah rises superior to this despair. His watchword is: the vocation of the Servant is not ended; he lives, he triumphs, he is the bearer of a covenant between God and His people that will never pass away; because of his wounds Israel is healed; he will see an innumerable seed; he will also enlighten the Gentiles, and will call them into his kingdom.'

The opening article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January is written by Professor Edward L. Curtis of Yale. Its title is 'The Outlook in Theology.' There is no surprise that such an article should be written by Professor Curtis, and we express no surprise that it has a place in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Professor Curtis surveys the whole field. First he considers the general state of the Churches. 'Sometimes,' he says, 'old forms of belief become incorporated into the very structure of a denomination, so that a future growth in the knowledge and wisdom of God is apparently denied to its membership.' It has so fallen out, he believes, with the Greek and Roman Churches. He believes that these Churches have ceased to make any real contribution to religious thought. It is so falling out, he fears, with the Presbyterian Church of America. He trusts it will never so fall out with his own Congregational body.

Then he comes to the Bible. Professor Curtis is one of the most accomplished Old Testament students in America. He knows intimately what the scholarship of a hundred years has been doing with the Bible. Its work is nearly finished for the present, he believes. And he says that 'the general verdict of the Higher Criticism respecting the Old Testament will stand.' The opposing school appears to him a dissolving force. It produces no commanding literature. The Bible dictionaries, and even the commentaries, issued by leading publishers of scholarly, religious literature, present the new views. And the attacks which some archæologists have made upon special points have come to nothing—their own reconstructions of Old Testament history being fundamentally the same as those of the Higher Criticism.

The result is twofold. The Old Testament is reduced to the level of other ancient writings in respect both of its formal composition and also of its historical and scientific contents. But it is lifted far above them—is 'incomparably removed from them,' says Professor Curtis—as a record of Divine revelation and a promise of redemption. Henceforth there will be less attention given to the matter of composition. Attention will be fixed upon the revelation and the promise. The Higher Criticism will give place to what has happily been called the Highest Criticism, which

will preserve to the Church the Old Testament at its full value as a word of God.

With the New Testament it is otherwise. Criticism has still some work to do there. Controversy will continue for a time. Then it will be found that there are portions, even of the sayings of Christ, but especially the opening chapters of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels and of the Acts, which are less certainly historical than the rest. But after that, the Higher Criticism of the New Testament will again give place to its Highest Criticism, and its Divine message will be more distinctively and comprehensively revealed. That work has indeed begun already. Already the Highest Criticism has found in the New Testament a gospel for society as well as for the individual.

But what of Protestant Christianity? Professor Curtis says that the results of Biblical Criticism are radical and revolutionary. They have destroyed the infallibility of both the Old Testament and the New. Is not Protestant Christianity built upon an infallible Bible? Professor Curtis does not think so. 'The Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestantism,' is true, but it must be understood. Orthodoxy has recently misunderstood it, and a whole chain of reasoning has been built on the misunderstanding. The miracle has been taken as the foremost evidence of revelation, especially the miracle of the resurrection. By the resurrection Jesus is proved Divine. Then Jesus authenticates the Old Testament by quoting it. He also authenticates the New Testament by the promise of the Spirit to the apostles. And when the apostles have spoken, the New Testament is complete. Accordingly, says recent orthodoxy, within the Bible thus authenticated, we find certain doctrines,—the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, justification by faith,—and we accept them because they are there.

But that is not the meaning of 'the Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestantism.'

And that is not the older Protestant position. The older Protestant position is that the primary witness to religious truth is the testimony of the Holy Spirit. 'If I am asked,' said that great Protestant, Professor Robertson Smith, 'why I receive Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with the Fathers of the Protestant Church, Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God; because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus, and declaring to us in Him His will for our salvation; and this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words unto my soul.' That is what is meant by 'the Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of the Protestant.'

It is his religion, because it is his only perfect rule of faith and life. But it is not the only source of revelation. Professor Curtis refers to Dr. Clarke's recent *Outline of Christian Theology*, and quotes the statement, 'The phenomena of nature make a real contribution to the knowledge of God, and theology must learn from them.' And he is bold to add that Christian revelation did not close with the New Testament canon, but is proceeding to-day. The revelation in Christ is known to us historically from the New Testament alone. But it is perpetually renewed to us. It is illuminated by the Spirit of God shining in our hearts. It is progressively amplified. It is adapted to new times and new conditions. 'Christians in every generation trusting in God may say, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."''

It must not be said that the Broad Church is dead. It must not be said that it is on its death-bed. In England it has formed itself into an association and started a newspaper. In Scotland,

just a little later, it has done the same. The association in Scotland is called the National Church Union; its organ is *Saint Andrew*. The second number of *Saint Andrew* has just appeared. It contains a verbatim report of the proceedings at the second annual conference of the National Church Union.

The proceedings of the National Church Union at its second annual conference may be read with steady interest and scarce a touch of pain. It was felt by some of the members that the chairman, who was the Rev. Dr. Glasse of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, went out of his way to crack up the High Church movement. It must surely have been felt by many that the Rev. J. Murray, M.A., of Kilmalcolm, had set out on an impossible enterprise when he sought to show that Christianity would do quite well without the miraculous. But Dr. Glasse explained his own position, and said that he 'never for a single moment cracked up High Churchism against Broad Churchism, but wanted to point out that the Society took up a tolerant attitude.' And Mr. Murray was so harmless when he remained general, and so incredible when he became particular, that his paper passed. And so the meeting dispersed with a sense that the Church was not conscious of its full obligation to the children—the Rev. David Watson's paper made that clear; and that textual criticism had something very disturbing to say about the Lord's Supper—Professor Menzies of St. Andrews made that clear.

Professor Menzies said that his paper was intended to be a report of the great discussion that is going on in Germany about the Lord's Supper. The discussion started in 1891, with a paper by Professor Harnack in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Harnack produced evidence from some obscure sects and even from Justin Martyr, a representative of the practice at Rome in the middle of the second century, that in the celebration of the Supper in the early Church water was sometimes substituted for wine; and he argued

that our Lord laid no stress on the particular substance. Either leavened or unleavened bread would do, and either wine or water.

The argument was at once attacked. It was not denied that certain sects used water for wine, nor even that such a usage could be traced for several centuries. But this was not considered sufficient to prove that wine or water was a matter of indifference either to the Church or to Christ. Harnack's views on that point are not likely, says Professor Menzies, to prevail.

That, however, was but the starting-point for a discussion of deeper consequence and wider range. What did our Lord say, and what did He do on that night in which He was betrayed? The whole question arose as to the accuracy of the varying narratives and their relation to one another. Professor Menzies gave a translation of the narratives, and we had better reproduce it here.

MARK xiv. 22-25.

And as they were eating, He took a loaf and said the blessing, and broke it and gave it to them, and said, Take, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And He said to them, This is My covenant-blood, which is shed for many. Verily I say to you, I will never drink again of the fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

MATT. xxvi. 26-29.

And as they were eating, Jesus took a loaf and said the blessing, and broke it and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink of it, all of you; for this is My covenant-blood, which is shed for many, for forgiveness of sins. But I tell you I will not drink henceforward of this fruit of the vine, till that day when I drink it with you new in the kingdom of My Father.

ST. PAUL (I Cor. xi. 23-25).

For I received from the Lord, what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was given up, took a loaf, and after giving thanks, broke it, and said, This is My body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of Me. In the same way also the cup

after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood; this do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.

LUKE xxii. 17-20.

(a) In Codex D (Cantabrigiensis).

(17) And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, divide it among yourselves; (18) for I say to you, from henceforth I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And he took a loaf and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is My body.

(b) In the Vatican Codex B.

(17) And He took a cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. (18) For I say to you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And He took a loaf and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is My body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, This cup, the new covenant in My blood, poured out for you.

Well, the first question is, Have we here four accounts or only three? Westcott and Hort depart for once from their beloved Vatican and follow the Cambridge Codex D. According to Codex D, St. Luke has practically no account of the institution of the Supper. Professor Blass, who believes in Codex D, says quite plainly that it has been omitted by St. Luke, just as it has been omitted by St. John. Thus we have only three. But the weight of authority in Germany has gone the other way. It is held that the end of ver. 19 and all ver. 20, as we find them in our Authorized Version, ought to stand. And so we have four different narratives after all.

Now when these four different accounts are placed together they are seen to fall into two groups. St. Matthew and St. Mark agree together against St. Luke and St. Paul. The first two say, 'This is My body,' the second two add 'which is for you.' To the word 'covenant' in St. Matthew and St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul add the adjective 'new.' They also add the sentence, 'This do in remembrance of Me,' and they say that the new covenant is 'in' or 'by means of' Christ's blood.

Next, when St. Luke and St. Paul are compared together, it is clear that St. Paul is the earlier, and Professor Menzies thinks it probable that St. Luke is dependent upon St. Paul. St. Luke, it is true, has the phrase 'shed for you,' which is not given by St. Paul. But it comes somewhat awkwardly into the grammar of the sentence, and may have crept in from the other Gospels. The Sinaitic Syriac version omits it. In any case, St. Luke can hardly be independent of the narrative in First Corinthians, which was written so much earlier. Then Professor Menzies believes that St. Mark's account is the original of St. Matthew's. And so we have but two accounts finally to compare, a short and simple narrative in St. Mark, and a larger, more elaborate narrative from St. Paul.

Professor Menzies ventures to compare these two narratives carefully. The first question is, Where did St. Paul obtain his narrative? He says he received it from the Lord. Professor Menzies does not understand that to mean that it came to him as a direct revelation. It means, he thinks, that the apostle claims more for it than his own personal authority, that it is a tradition which he possesses in common with the Christians of the older Churches. The Lord was its ultimate source, but the channel may have been the apostles, especially St. Peter, whom he knew best.

And it is from St. Peter that St. Mark's account comes also. For the saying of Papias that St. Mark wrote down St. Peter's recollections is meeting with much acceptance now. Whereupon we find ourselves in this position. The oldest and most independent accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper may both be traced to the reminiscences of St. Peter.

So the great differences between the narratives of St. Mark and 1 Corinthians are due to the master-mind of St. Paul. 'St. Mark is a historian who deals in carefully treasured reminiscence. He does not compose freely, but repro-

duces materials furnished to him in various ways, adding to them, no doubt, in many passages, some arrangement and colour of his own, but in the passage before us giving surely the exact words of his source. St. Paul, on the other hand, comes before us as a Church statesman, who has practical ends to serve in the Churches he has founded, and who holds very strongly a doctrine which he regards as the one and only gospel.' St. Paul, therefore, makes certain changes on the original tradition. The changes are made in the line of his doctrine, and in the interests of a fuller church service. The words 'took,' 'blessed,' 'broke' are here, but he omits the word 'gave'; for the worshippers are not required to carry their thoughts back to the Galilæan disciples. 'A cup' is changed into 'the cup,' and it is placed after supper, for it is no longer a part of the common meal, but a separate religious rite. More important, 'Take, this is My body' becomes 'This is My body for you,' a doctrinal change in accordance with 'my gospel.' And most important of all, the words 'This do in remembrance of Me' are added, whereby the simple family meal of St. Mark, in which no repetition or commemoration was thought of, is converted into a memorial observance on the part of the Christian Church after the pattern of the Passover.

Professor Menzies does not say that he himself believes it was St. Paul who converted the simple family meal of St. Mark into the Lord's Supper. He says it is the view that has found best support in Germany, and he quotes Weizsäcker, Jülicher, and Spitta in its favour. He says that it is a view surrounded with great difficulties, and that he has not yet determined to adopt it. But he says that in any case this controversy will never have any influence on the celebration of the Lord's Supper in our Churches. 'Whether the Lord founded the ordinance consciously or unconsciously, whether the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," proceeded first from Jesus on earth or from Christ in heaven, He is the founder of the ordinance, and we shall use these words.'

But he also says that inasmuch as the New Testament lays down no strict ritual of the Lord's Supper, those Christians who appeal to the New Testament as the standard of their religion, 'are free themselves, and must allow liberty to others, to connect with the acts done in the ordinance such views and doctrines as appear to them most true and most in accordance with the spirit of their Master, so long as due regard is paid to reverence and order and charity.'

Dr. Petavel on Immortality.

BY THE REV. FRANK BALLARD, M.A., B.SC., HULL.

IF one should rush to interfere between two such disputants as Dr. Beet and Dr. Petavel, there would appear just cause for indictment on the ground of presumption. Inasmuch, however, as the letter addressed by the latter to the former was avowedly an 'open' one, it may be assumed that every Christian teacher at least was also desired to ponder its contents. I trust, therefore, that no apology is necessary for venturing to differ from some of the findings of the esteemed Continental divine who thus publicly asks an English professor to go 'one step further.' So many backward

steps seem to some of us necessary, before Dr. Petavel's standpoint could be reached, that just now, when many and vigorous attempts are being made to revive a heresy which the consensus of Christendom long ago dismissed as unworthy, any one may be forgiven a sincere attempt to contribute to truth upon a question of such grave importance.

The whole question of Conditional Immortality is confessedly too vast to be taken in hand in a few pages of a magazine. So inevitable was the reaction in the popular mind from the ghastly