

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes.
Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit
or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the
copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the
ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the
links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

Now is it likely that an author, soaked *ex hypothesi* in Pauline literature, would rarely or never slip into the use of the most frequent Pauline name for Jesus? But in Mark the term *χριστός* has its full official significance and has not become a proper name equal to *Ιησοῦς*. Only once (ix. 41) is *Xριστός* used by Mark in what is not necessarily an official sense.

The writers of our gospels were naïve and unsophisticated, and would drop most readily into the current nomenclature. To watch their use of the words *χριστός*, *κύριος*, *Ιησοῦς*, might thus lead to instructive results.

I should be glad if these tabulated statistics, along with the fragmentary notes, serve as suggestion for fresh lines of investigation more thorough and complete.

F. HERBERT STEAD.

AT THE SIGN OF THE BIBLE.

IN the story of Mary's anointing the feet of Jesus at Bethany (Mark xiv. 3-9; John xii. 1-8), both gospels speak of the perfume as *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς*. The adjective, if it is a pure Greek word, must mean either "liquid" or "genuine." But neither alternative is free from objection, and many scholars have inclined to find in it a local designation, or possibly a commercial term of foreign origin. Following up this clue, the Rev. W. Houghton has observed that the main ingredient of spikenard, which is the unguent we have to do with, is the root of an Indian plant, which among other names is called *pisitâ* in Sanskrit. He therefore suggests that the *πιστικός* of Scripture is the Greek form of a technical designation of the nard, derived from the name of this its principal and most costly constituent.

* *
*

The incident of the anointing throws a curious sidelight on our Lord's conduct in respect of almsgiving. The distribution of charity, even with every care and precaution, is not an unmixed

benefit. At best it is but the inevitable remedy of a worse evil. Nevertheless, till the roots of wrong are extracted, almsgiving is a duty. The value of the vase of perfume amounted to a considerable sum of money. The dishonest steward of the apostolic company regretted that this amount did not come into the treasury, and so under his selfish manipulation. His discontent found expression in the suggestion that it would have been a use of the offering more after Christ's heart to have sold the ointment and entrusted the price to His treasurer for distribution to the poor. Manifestly one chief destination of what went into the purse of Jesus was the liberal relief of distress. Christ was a munificent almsgiver. Indeed, here, in His very defence of the claims of personal affection, He by reversion establishes a perpetual benefaction for the unfortunate. "The poor ye have always with you, but Me ye have not always." By that declaration He makes the needy His heirs, and diverts to them the great stream of practical benevolence, that should in all ages be evoked by His love and directed towards His person.

* *
*

It is remarkable that Jesus should have made so much of Mary's tribute of almost romantic homage, and should have assigned it such a prominent place in the proclamation of the evangel. For the deed had little, if any, official significance. It was not done in public, but in the inmost circle of His closest friends and followers. In His external work and influence Jesus could not be helped by it. Value it had none, beyond its worth for His heart, as the exquisite expression of a love that words could not utter nor diffidence repress. Our Lord's impassioned vindication of the deed, and its guerdon of immortal fame, are the Divine recognition of the transcendent worth to God of human love and worship.

* *
*

We say that the motive of our Lord's redeeming life and death was love of sinful men. If we believe what we say, we mean that what carried Him through His long self-sacrifice was actual love of heart for actual men and women. Love's supreme craving is the hunger for answering affection. Responsive, sympathetic, understanding love is to it the very breath of life and the material of new achievement. Among His disciples, in the homes of His friends,

on the mountain top, in Gethsemane, we recognise this instinctive yearning of love in Jesus. That evening in Bethany, surrounded by disciples full of earthly hopes excited by the great miracle done on Lazarus, our Lord sat with a full heart, lonely amid their loving but worldly spirits ; for to His presaging mind the miracle of wonder was the warrant of His death. That this was His mood is manifest from the complexion the anointing takes in His words of commendation, which just reveal the unstudied flow of His thought and emotion. “She hath anointed My body beforehand for the burying.” Was it a presentiment of this sad future that prompted Mary’s loving act ? And was it this solitary fellowship of sympathy in love and sorrow, that gave to her deed its unique preciousness for the heart of Jesus in that hour of grief and loneliness ?

* * *

It is perhaps true that our Lord’s words (accurately rendered) do not alone afford an adequate basis for this reading of Mary’s intention. But it seems to lie in the essential structure and spirit of the narrative, and to form the explanation and justification at once of its beauty and its peculiarity. Mary’s attachment to our Lord was all along a uniquely sympathetic one. The disciples, wrapped in their secular and somewhat selfish thoughts of His kingdom, heard His premonitory words about His approaching death, but could not understand or believe them. The love of Mary, being more purely personal, made those words about Himself of supreme significance, while her quick sympathy with her Lord made her sensitive to the reality of that shadow of death and disaster that had settled down on His spirit, and made a chill in the sunshine of His Divine heart. So she went, and prepared for that dark day a fragrant tribute of affection, that should be sweet about the body of her dead Lord. But, perchance, she thought, if His death were one of violence, might it not be impossible for love to minister to Him then ? Moreover that night her heart was too full to wait. Why keep the sweetness of her worship for the coldness and silence of death ? Censorious eyes and hard hearts may misjudge her, but He will understand all she cannot say. And He is her Lord and Master. So she went and anointed Jesus “afrehand for the burying.”

* * *

An interesting contribution to the problem of the Song of Solomon has been made by Dr. Stickell, author of an able monograph on Job, but better known for many years as an expert in oriental coin-lore. He holds the book to be of early date, dramatic in structure, intended to be spoken by living actors, and the theme of it love. The new point in his treatment, which is throughout genial and instructive, is the assertion that besides the generally recognised characters we must admit a pair of lovers, a shepherd and shepherdess of Lebanon, distinct from the Shnlamite maiden (who is a vinedresser) and her betrothed. This couple are introduced in three scenes, i. 7-8, i. 15-ii. 4, iv. 7-v. 1, and play their part parallel with, but quite distinct from, the action of the other personages.

* *
*

The suggestion meets some difficulties in the dramatic theory of the book, but of positive evidence there is of course not much to build upon. The objection, that two entirely unconnected movements should be presented in the same piece, is parried by the illustration of the separate but parallel treatment of two themes in a musical double fugue. And that what is done in the sister art may be attempted in drama is proved by Prof. Budde, who cites as an illustration of the precise method in question a bridal play of the Silesian poet Andreas Gryphius, in which he intertwines but does not intermingle two sets of actors and two streams of action. The possibility of Stickell's position may therefore be conceded, and even its probability, provided his general conception of the book is well founded. But skilful as is his analysis, and graceful his interpretation, he can hardly hope to have said the last word in the discussion. The enigma of the Song still waits to be solved.

* *
*

As the result of an elaborate analysis of the book of Jonah in the *Zeitschrift für die Alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft*, Prof. Boehme arrives at the conclusion that the book is certainly of composite origin. The kernel of the story is from the pen of a Jehovistic writer, with whose work there has been incorporated an Elohistic narrative, running parallel with the second half of it, and frequently diverging from it. There are besides editorial adjust-

ments and complementary additions (e.g. the poem) from at least one other hand.

* *
*

The theory of the union in the book of divergent versions, which has already been ably argued by Koehler and others, should it succeed in establishing itself, will have a curious bearing on current critical constructions of the literary origin of the piece. It would put out of court the notion that the composition is a pure theological projection or polemical allegory, in which only the names Jonah and Nineveh are borrowed from history, and would support the view, that the narrative rests on a basis of prophetic tradition, which has been made the vehicle or embodiment of great religious ideas.

* *
*

The first part of Kittel's *Geschichte der Hebräer*, in the series of handbooks of Ancient History, issued by Perthes of Gotha, has appeared. It has been preceded by Tiele's treatment of Assyrian, and Wiedemann's of Egyptian history. The aim of the series is to give "a clear, connected, and precise narrative, coupled with criticism of divergent views, but free from spun-out discussions and researches." This ideal, so rarely realized even when sought, has hitherto been kept well in view; and promises to make the series one of the most useful and convenient. Dr. Kittel's contribution is written with charming simplicity and clearness, is abreast of the latest and best information, holds a middle—some people would say an opportunist—position in disputed questions, maintains its own views with moderation, and states the opinions of opponents with singular fulness and fairness.

* *
*

This opening portion carries us only to the death of Joshua, but it includes the inevitable discussion of the critical construction of the Hexateuch. The main positions of the author were already known from his essays in the *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*. In connexion with the recent statement in these pages of the opinions of Delitzsch and Dillmann, it may be of interest to give the dates assigned by our author to the chief elements of the Hexateuch. The work of the older Elohist (E) was written in the northern kingdom about B.C. 900, while the Jehovahist (J)

wrote in Judæa later, say, between 830 and 800. The Priestly Code (P) contains at least three constituents of very diverse ages. There is first P¹, consisting of ancient pieces, originating in the tenth and ninth centuries; then P², the work of the proper author of this document, produced in the eighth century; to which P³, (the holiness-laws in Leviticus, etc.), was added somewhere between Hezekiah and Jeremiah. Parallel with this last contribution to P, must be reckoned the production of Deuteronomy, probably in the time of Manasseh. These several elements were worked together during or more likely subsequent to the exile. Dr. Kittel is therefore, like Dillmann, at issue with the central contention of the Graf school of critics.

* *
*

It is curious to compare the dates finally fixed by Vatke, and published in his posthumous *Einleitung in das alte Testament*. The older Elohist he makes a contemporary of Isaiah (say B.C. 722). The Priestly Code he places in the last years of Hezekiah (about 700), the Jehovahist between 700 and 650; the holiness-laws (Lev. xvii.-xx., etc.), about 650. These combined made the law book of Josiah, while Deuteronomy belongs to the close of the kingdom (say, between 599 and 588). Fifty years ago Vatke had anticipated and defended the late date of the Priestly legislation. In his new commentary on Genesis Delitzsch expresses astonishment at Vatke's change of front. "No doubt, were the latter still with us, the feeling would be reciprocated. Evidently we are still far from having reached a condition of stable equilibrium in Old Testament controversy. It is not wonderful to find Horst concluding a criticism of the extreme (not to say wild) theories of d'Eichthal and Vernes with a salutary reflection upon "the exceeding uncertainty of even those results of criticism that are to-day reckoned most certain."

W. GRAY ELMSLIE.