

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THREE papers which will appear in early numbers are: "Ritschl—Lightfoot—Hatch," by Principal Rainy; "The Humour of Jesus," by Dr. Grosart; and a Criticism of Dr. Martineau, by Dr. Sanday.

Among the many problems of the Old Testament criticism now pressing for solution, one of the most undoubtedly interesting is that of the "unity of 'Isaiah.'" So says Dr. S. G. Green, who, in the course of his series of papers in the *Sunday at Home* on "Isaiah—Prophet, Poet, and Statesman," has come in the number for July to that pressing problem. The issue of the new (fourth) edition of the late Dr. Delitzsch's *Isaiah* in an English translation, the first volume of which is now ready (T. & T. Clark), will give the question a greater prominence and a wider interest than it has yet reached in this country. For it is known that in this latest and last edition of his *Isaiah*, the great evangelical professor of Leipzig alters his position, argues for a dual authorship, and dedicates his book to the two well-known English champions of that dual authorship, Dr. Cheyne and Dr. Driver.

Dr. Green holds by the single authorship. With competent scholarship and in an admirable spirit, he points out what the conditions of the problem are. "The earlier part of the Book had to do with the fortunes of the Judæan kingdom under Ahaz and Hezekiah, when its chief enemies were, first, the confederacy of Syria and Northern Israel; and secondly, the Assyrian power under Sargon and Sennacherib. In both cases the prophet uttered his solemn lessons and glorious predictions

as a *contemporary*. But when we come to the latter part, comprising the twenty-seven chapters from the fortieth to the sixty-sixth, we find that a century and a half has rolled away; the great-great-grandsons of Hezekiah by turns have reigned and been deposed; Assyria has vanished from among the nations; and Babylon, as the great foe to God's kingdom, holds His people in captivity. The destruction of this proud enemy, and the deliverance of Judah, is now the prophet's central theme; while the sorrows and redemption of Zion are shown to typify the saving work and triumph of Him who, in the ages to come, should appear as the true and supreme SERVANT OF JEHOVAH."

These are the facts. Two explanations of them are possible. One is that the prophet, having foreshown the far-off catastrophe of the captivity of Judah, was rapt by the Spirit into a yet more distant future, and divinely beheld the Great Restoration; and that "in the calm evening of Hezekiah's reign," he recorded this glorious vision for the consolation and encouragement of that future age. The other explanation is that we have here a prophetic product of the exile itself; some inspired bard, to us anonymous, having declared to his own contemporaries the divine purposes of judgment and of love, predicting also the new heavens and new earth of Messiah's coming day.

We have used Dr. Green's words nearly as they stand. But now let us hear the words of a distinguished exponent of either position, whom Dr. Green brings forward to witness.

The first is Dr. Bradley, the present Dean of Westminster:—

“The Isaiah of the vexed and stormy times of Ahaz and of Hezekiah is supposed in his later days to have been transported by God’s spirit into a time and region other than his own. . . . He is led in prolonged and solitary visions into a land that he has never trodden, and to a generation on whom he has never looked. The familiar scenes and faces among which he had lived and laboured have grown dim, and disappeared. All sounds and voices of the present are hushed, and the interests and passions into which he had thrown himself with all the intensity of his race and character move him no more. The present has died out of the horizon of his soul’s vision. The voices in his ears are those of men unborn, and he lives a second life among events and persons, sins and sufferings, and fears and hopes, photographed sometimes with the minutest accuracy on the sensitive and sympathetic medium of his own spirit; and he becomes the denouncer of the special sins of a distant generation, and the spokesman of the faith and hope and passionate yearning of an exiled nation, the descendants of men living when he wrote in profound peace of a renewed prosperity.”

“No better summary,” says Dr. Green, “of the single authorship view has been given than that.” The quotation is from a university sermon.

On the other side, he gives the words of Dr. C. A. Briggs, whom he describes as “one of the most moderate as well as learned advocates of the dual authorship.” The quotation is from Dr. Briggs’ *Messianic Prophecy* (T. & T. Clark, 7s. 6d.).

“In the times of Babylonian exile, Jehovah raised up His greatest prophet, one who mastered the situation, grasped the problem of the exile, and saw its solution in a great act of divine judgment and of redemption. The name of this prophet has not been handed down to posterity. He issued his prophecies anonymously. They were circulated among his countrymen in the different regions of the Dispersion. It was not likely that he could safely attach his name to his predictions, or that they could be circulated in public during the period of the Babylonian supremacy. His prophecies were issued from time to time, and subsequently gathered into that masterly poem which is contained in chapters xl.–lxvi. of Isaiah. It seems to me that chapters xiii., xiv., and xxxiv., xxxv. of Isaiah are from the same great author: they are so complete in themselves, and of such length that he did not deem it best to include them in his final collection. Indeed, they are the preludes to his great composition.”

But is this a question that is arguable at all among devout believers in prophetic inspiration?

There are in the New Testament fifty-six direct citations from this book, of which twenty-two are from the first part (i.–xxxix.), and thirty from the second (xl.–lxvi.). In every case, wherever the book is named, it is called by the name of “Isaiah.” Does this fact not preclude us from opening such a controversy at all? “Yes,” says Canon Liddon, standing with magnificent eloquence and personal power at the head of the defenders of Christ’s “literal words” against the views of Mr. Gore and *Lux Mundi*. But Dr. Green is not found under that banner. “Tell the thoughtful biblical student that the inspiration of prophetic Scriptures stands or falls with the ‘integrity’—meaning the single authorship—of Isaiah; and should he then see reason to doubt the latter, he may be led, by supposed necessity, to deny the former. The only possible way of meeting the facts is by saying that, in accepting the Jewish Scriptures as authoritative and divine, our Lord and His Apostles did not pledge themselves to critical details, like those of authorship. On such points they were content to adopt the accepted view, as when the name of ‘David’ is applied to the entire psalter in Hebrews iv. 7.”

The great controversy raised by *Lux Mundi* has nearly spent itself. What has it brought us? With careful attention we have followed its course in all the leading periodicals, but cannot find that great gain has come either to the science of theology or to the cause of true religion. The real subject of dispute has been the limitations of Christ’s human knowledge—a subject with which it is doubtful if the criticism of the Old Testament has anything to do. But even on that subject, while much that is interesting has been written, especially in a series of letters in the *Spectator* (Nos. 3222–3225) and in the *Record* (Nos. 7556–7564), no fresh light seems to have come to any one. As for the book itself, there is no correspondence between its fame and its merits. Given the position ecclesiastically of the writers, and there is nothing startling in it, except a few pages of Mr. Gore’s essay. Of these we gave a *résumé* in the EXPOSITORY TIMES for March. The best all-round criticism of the book which we have seen is in the *Newbery House Magazine* for June.

Professor Davison, in the *Methodist Recorder*, gives an exposition of one of the most abundantly misapplied verses within the range of Scripture. “We are asked,” he says, “for the meaning of the text, ‘Where the tree falleth, there it shall lie.’” To which he very properly replies, “There is no such text in the Bible. The passage referred to (Eccles. xi. 3) runs thus: ‘If a tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be.’” He then says:

"In the context the writer is urging the importance of faithful fulfilment of duty, regardless of consequences in the future which no man can forecast. The proverbial expression of verse 1, 'Cast thy bread upon the waters,' points the same lesson as St. Paul's, 'Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.' 'But,' the preacher goes on to say, 'we cannot tell precisely how future events will be ordered, but it would be folly on that account to stint our labours and kindnesses, like a husbandman staying his hand to gaze into the sky and wonder what the weather will be. The labourer in the field does not know what rain the clouds contain, which way the wind will blow, nor how the tottering tree will fall. The course of events we must be content to leave, and diligently use our own opportunities, sowing such good seed of the kingdom as we can, leaving results with God.' There is, of course, no reference here to the future life, or the fact that man's lot in the next life is fixed at death, as certain popular hymns, and perhaps popular ministers, have been accustomed to suggest. But the whole passage inculcates fidelity to duty while the opportunity is ours, lest the time come when it will be too late (Eccles. xii. 1, 7, 13, 14)."

Professor W. Muss-Arnolt, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, contributes "Some Semitic Etymologies" to a recent number of the *Academy*. The most important is the word "Selah," a word of frequent and erratic occurrence in the Psalms. What does it mean? Interpreters are greatly divided. The general opinion is that it is a musical term of some kind. But Mr. Muss-Arnolt says if it were a musical term we should above all expect it in the Hallel-psalms, where it does not occur at all. He connects it with the Assyrian *Su-la-a*, which means "beseeching," and *Sullû*, "to pray," and explains it as "prayer." "Thus *Selah* (סֶלָה), or *prayer*, meant that, at the place where the word occurs, the chanting of the Psalms was interrupted by silent or audible prayer." Thus in Psalm ix. 16, we read: "Jehovah has made Himself known; He has executed judgment, snaring the wicked in the work of his own hands." Now follows *Higgayon Selah*, i.e. meditation and prayer by the congregation; and then verse 17 continues in the same strain as verse 16.

In the parable of the Unjust Judge, which forms the International Lesson for 24th August, there occurs a word, the extraordinary force of which is mercifully weakened to English ears in both our versions. The unjust judge says, according to the Authorized Version, "Because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me." What the judge

meant to say plainly was, that being already "troubled" by the widow's importunity, he was in danger of something more serious. If he expressed this by the tame word "weary," or even "wear me out," of the Revisers, he must have been as feeble in speech as he was faulty in behaviour. But in reality his speech is exceedingly forcible and not too delicate; just what we should expect from such a man. Translated literally, "Though I neither fear God nor regard man," he says, "yet because this widow annoys me, I will give her justice, lest, if she keeps coming, she assault me at last."

But even "assault me" is a very mild rendering. It conveys the meaning, but it lacks the force. Any one who will consult Thayer's Grimm will see that the word which the judge chooses means "to give a blow beneath the eye," or, as Grimm puts it, "to beat black and blue." This, with one exception, more apparent than real, is its only signification in classical Greek. That we are not tied up, however, to the literal blow beneath the eye, is evident from the only other occurrence of the word in the New Testament. This is in 1 Cor. ix. 27, where St. Paul is made by the Revisers to say, "I buffet my body." Here the special "blacken the eye" is lost, but the general idea of "giving a beating" is retained; and we can see how inadequate would be such a rendering as "I weary my body," or "I wear my body out." It is a beating from the widow that the judge professes to fear. No doubt there is, as Godet says, a touch of pleasantry in his words. It is such pleasantry as a rough, regardless man would indulge in.

Professor Marshall, in the *Expositor* for July, asks the question: Did St. Paul use a Semitic Gospel? and in the course of answering it in the affirmative, makes some very interesting suggestions. He believes that in 1 Thess. v. 3, the Apostle is quoting the same words of Christ as we find in Luke xxi. 34. He places the two in parallel columns thus:—

LUKE xxi. 34.	1 THESS. v. 3.
"And lest that day come suddenly (αἰφνιδίως) as a snare (ὡς παγίς)."	"Sudden (αἰφνιδίως) destruction cometh on them suddenly (αἰφνιδίως) as a travail (ὡς σπασίς ἢ ὄδιν) upon a woman with child."

The resemblance of the first part is evident; but what has "as a snare" to do with "as travail." This is the point of interest. Let us suppose that Christ spoke Hebrew (or rather Palestinian Aramaic), and that His words were recorded more or less fully in such fragments as we know existed before St. Luke wrote his Gospel. Then

the difficulty disappears. The Hebrew word for "snare" חֶבֶל and for "travail" חֶבֶל are identical; that is, their consonants are the same, and there were no vowels in those days. If, therefore, our Lord spoke in the language of Palestine, and used this word (חֶבֶל), which *might* mean *either* "as a snare" or "as travail," then may not St. Luke have translated it in the former way, and St. Paul in the latter?

One of the puzzling, however trifling, differences between St. Matthew and St. Mark, Professor Marshall would get rid of in the same way. St. Matthew (x. 10) gives the words of our Lord, "Provide no gold, nor silver, . . . nor shoes, *nor* a staff (μηδὲ ῥάβδον);" St. Mark (vi. 8), "He charged them that they should carry nothing for the journey, *except* a staff (εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον)." In the language of Palestine in Christ's day, "nor" would be וְאִי and "except" אִלֵּא, differing in the single initial letter, which Professor Marshall thinks may, through illegibility or some other cause, have been misread, and so mistranslated. But which would be the correct form, he does not say.

The Authorized Version has a remarkable way of getting over this difference. They translate Matt. x. 10, "nor yet *staves*," and in the margin give, "Greek, *a staff*." That is to say, their text has the word in the singular (as all the MSS., with one or two very inferior exceptions, have), but they translate it by the plural. Their purpose is, of course, to remove the seeming discrepancy between the two accounts. Alford's explanation is well known. He says: "They were not to procure *expressly for this journey* even a staff; they were to take with them their usual staff only."

The Church Times gives the following recipe for "extempore preaching": "Lay the foundation by getting up *Pearson on the Creed* thoroughly, and writing out an analysis like that of Dr. Mill, on blank leaves in your Bible. Make notes of the ten volumes of Isaac Williams, crabbed but full of meat. Analyze the sermons of Bull, Sherlock, Barrow, Melvill, Liddon, Wordsworth, and Trench. And when you want to preach in a hurry, try Dean Burgon's first and second series, which you will find ready to hand."

Progressive Christian Theology.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR MARSHALL RANGLES.

CHRISTIAN theology, the orderly or scientific presentation of Christian doctrine, though often despised like the Lord to whom it relates, is, and must remain, the queen of sciences. Its themes are the sublimest, its facts the most stupendous, its basal truths the most authoritative, and the bearing of its teaching on the weal of mankind the mightiest and most enduring. In him who studies it *con amore*, it excites intense interest. With Luther it ranked first: not because he was a cold theologian devoid of æsthetic taste and emotion; for next to it in his favour was music, and his thoughts were mostly aglow with sensibility. Many of far less capacity than he have found delight in the same science. There have been periods when, in general estimation, it was the loftiest plane of thought, and that on which the giant intellects of the time put forth their full power. Nowadays, the shallowest orator or journalist feels safe in pointing at it a stale gibe. Its obsolescence and uselessness are taken for granted; or it is challenged to produce its *raison d'être*, or commanded to reshape itself in harmony with modern advancement, which is sometimes an euphemistic mode of advising it to commit suicide. Even when diluted to the extent of Unitarianism or to "natural religion," it

is still too much for some complainers. "Advanced thought," says Dr. Martineau, "like dress and manners, is not without its fashions and its fops; and many a scientific sciolist who would bear himself *comme il faut* towards such questionable deceivers as 'Final Causes,' now thinks it necessary to have his fling at 'Paley and the Bridgewater Treatises.'"

I do not propose to perform the easy but needless task of showing that theology is indestructible so long as the human intellect retains its present constitution and its sense of relation to God and the future world: in truth, more indestructible than politics, natural science, or art. Comte's impotent sentence of death alike on metaphysics and theology is contrary to the evidence of history, and nullified by our laws of thought and our spiritual instincts. In the human mind metaphysics and theology are ineradicable and interdependent. Dr. Martineau tells us of an eminent English positivist who, on hearing a letter read which reported that Professor Fiske, a fellow-unbeliever, "found in the psychical evolution of man an intimation of individual immortality," exclaimed, "What! John Fiske say that? Well; it only proves, what I have always maintained, that you cannot make the