

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

A BOOK is a book to the book-lover whether there is anything in it or not. That is to say, if the edges are uncut, and the margin is ample, and the binding breathes of antiquity, it will secure such attention as only a book receives of all the products of art and man's device. So Mr. George Elmslie Troup may rest assured that his book is a book whatever the critics say.

---

He has given it the simple title of *Words to Young Christians*. That is not so encouraging to the book-lover, who prefers a difficult title to a simple one; Latin, if you can possibly give it him; if not, an unpronounceable English name, like *Theophrastus Such*. But neither in the title nor in the book does Mr. Troup seem mainly to have considered book-lovers; for in the title he plainly tells us that he has written for Christians, and for Christians who are young.

---

And do we not envy him his audience? They tell us that every sermon that we preach ought to contain a clear statement of the way of salvation. But surely the obligation is not there. Ought not every one of our "dear hearers" to have known the way of salvation long ago; and ought they not to be walking in the way of holiness now? But it is not so. And we envy Mr. Elmslie Troup his audience.

VOL. IV.—9.

His audience is an audience of Christians, and of Christians who are young. And so his first "Word" to them is *Habit*. It is a word that in our regular preaching we rarely have the courage to touch. For almost all our preaching is to those who have passed the watershed of life, whose habits therefore are formed. And we know that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a man "of irregular habits" to enter the kingdom of God. If it were not that there is a strong vein of Calvinism in all of us, in spite of our protestation, we could not preach at all to those who are not yet saved while their summer is gone and their harvest is past. But we preach the more earnestly because of it. For we know that with men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible—the only Calvinism that ever lived, and a Calvinism that, thank God, will never die.

---

But we need not this Calvinism when we speak to the young. For then it is scarcely unfair to say that with *men* all things are possible, and *Habit* is the happiest word we know. Therefore, with his unerring instinct, Mr. Elmslie Troup begins with *Habit*.

---

"His unerring instinct." Perhaps the word is barely just. For instinct is an attribute neither of God nor man. But we have no other word to

designate that inheritance which is the long result of innumerable acts of patient faithfulness, when acts have passed into habits, and habits have become unconscious and a part of our vitality. Mr. Troup reminds us here of the story which Herodotus tells about the Scythian slaves who rose against their masters and fortified themselves in an impregnable stronghold, till the sound of the whip was heard in their ears, when all their bravery forsook them and fled. What shall we call it? Surely there was more in it than a habit of obedience; more even than that last result of habit which we call second nature. For in these the inheritance is forgotten. And without inheritance, not all the acts of a lifetime can make habit so unconscious and irresistible. Therefore we call it instinct. And we cannot doubt that Mr. Elmslie Troup bears a name which half explains the unrivalled ease, the surpassing fitness of his "Words to Young Christians."

He begins with Habit. And the first habit is the habit of Obedience. For the Young Christian's first recognition is Jesus Christ as Lord, and his first endeavour a ready and prompt obedience. His text here is Colossians ii. 5, these three words: "Beholding your order."

"The question which awaits you is, What have I to do? And, in the words, 'Beholding your order,' the apostle suggests one very serious and distinct line of duty. Your life is to be orderly. This word he uses (*τάξις*) is a Greek word meaning military array—the close, solid, compact front which a well-disciplined regiment presents, made up of persons under thorough command, who at once, and indeed naturally, answer to their leader's call. Such a result, of course, has not been reached without a great deal of painful training—you are not deceived by the appearance of ease; but it has come as the result of a habit of life on the part of each. Now, if Christian orderliness, which is so essential to Christian effectiveness, is to distinguish you, it is necessary you should begin at the foundation, and become possessed of certain well-defined habits."

Among several articles of exceptional interest in the *Quarterly Statement* for April of the Palestine Exploration Fund, the most entertaining is a long series of letters from Herr Baurath Schick. The first in the series, and by far the longest of the letters, is described as "Reflections on the Site of Calvary."

Now we have had many reflections on the site of Calvary lately, nearly as many as the importance of the subject demands. But Herr Schick's reflections are worth reading after them all.

For, in the first place, Herr Baurath Schick is an authority on the subject. The Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, in their introductory "Notes and News," assure us of this, though we scarcely needed the assurance, telling us that "he has lived, studied, and worked in the Holy City for more than forty years," and that "no one knows more about underground Jerusalem than he." In the next place, he is able to make up his mind, and having made it up and held it there for thirty-seven years, he is able to change his mind and make a public confession of the change. And then, in the third place, and to add piquancy to the profit of these two reasons, he writes in a style that is all his own.

At least, Herr Schick's style is not ours. That is perhaps the only safe thing that can be said about it. It is not an Englishman's style. Taking back the statement that it is all his own, let us simply say that it is the style of a foreigner trying to write English. Now there is one curious feature of such a style. It seems to make the writer say more than he intended. The words with which he is contending seem to get round him, and wheedle things out of him. And he, who in his own language is found decorous and self-contained, chirps and prattles in the foreign tongue, and tells secrets to all the world which he meant to die with.

That is the impression Herr Schick's letter on the site of Calvary gives. At the very outset he makes the amazing confession that he has never considered this matter of such great importance, as if our salvation depended upon it, but is rather "*convinced that the Lord has so ruled it that there should always be some uncertainty respecting it.*" Notwithstanding this, however, he has studied the question "with some diligence," and only regrets that the results of so many years' thought and study are not more satisfactory. These are words of genuine humility, for our author is as far from the pride that apes humility as he is from any other form of deception.

Then he begins his story in this way: "When, in the autumn of 1846, I and my companion, Mr. Palmer, arrived at Jerusalem, we found there the English missionaries, and, besides the Prussian Consul, Dr. Schulz, only one German family and one single young man, a carpenter from Bavaria, who had been already several years resident in Jerusalem, and knew the Arabic language. He was a great help to us, showing us, amongst other things, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and 'Calvary.' I had expected to see Jerusalem standing on a mountain, and was surprised to find that, after crossing the highest ridge, the road *descended* to the gate, and that inside the city the streets still descended to the house of our host, the said carpenter, which was situated in the Wady. I was led to 'Calvary,' which, instead of being outside, seemed to me to be nearly in the middle of the town; and not on a hill, but on the side of a long ridge. My thoughts were: This cannot be the real site, as Golgotha was outside the city, and the old city must have extended at least as far as the present one, if not farther, because the people on the wall could hear and understand the words of Rabshakeh, who was (2 Kings xviii. 17; Isa. xxxvi. 2) standing at the 'upper pool,' which I took to be the present Mamilla pool."

He was confirmed in this opinion by a little German book (*Biblische Geographie für Schulen*

*und Familien*), which he had brought with him, and which said that the Church of the Sepulchre is situated in the wrong place, as Golgotha was outside, and very likely was the rocky knoll north of the present town, called now the Hill of Jeremiah's Grotto. He went and examined this spot, but would not have it. For the hill is not like a skull, and, besides, it is too high; "the priests and nobles who mocked Jesus would not have taken the trouble to go up such a hill, and, by doing so, show some honour to Jesus." No; they spoke to the people who stood round the cross from some public road near it; and so he came to the conclusion that the smaller hill, west of the Damascus road, would better answer the requirements, "and, for myself, I from that time, for two dozen years, called this little hill 'Golgotha,' and on it there are Jewish rock-hewn tombs."

Having thus found his Golgotha, he stood by it. But not so as to exclude the possibility of more light. And, apparently, he abandoned it at the end of four-and-twenty years, though without fixing on another spot, the only conviction that now remained with him being, that wherever the true Calvary was, it was not where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands. That conviction remained till the year 1883.

But in the year 1883 the Russians bought a piece of ground on the east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and an order came from St. Petersburg to clear the *débris* off it. The Russian Archimandrite who had charge of the work asked Herr Schick to look after it, and draw up a report on the result, and this he undertook to do. But "when the work was ended, and I was about to write the report, I found it not an easy matter; for *merely* to say that this and this was found would have been to show that I did not understand things of antiquity. So I worked and studied very earnestly—first, the lines of the walls of ancient Jerusalem; secondly, the siege by Titus; thirdly, the kind of churches built in the time of Constantine; and fourthly, *how all this may agree*

*and be reconciled with the present buildings and the old remains which were found.*" And then, "to his own disappointment and astonishment," he found the continuation of the old Jewish wall, consisting of large stones, in a long line northward; and, finally, he became overwhelmingly convinced that Constantine had built his church here, and that the old wall ran inside the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which therefore, as being *outside* the city wall, though close to it (John xix. 20), must be the very place where our Lord was crucified, and where the new sepulchre was hewn in which He was afterwards laid.

Then his troubles began. First "a late English bishop" came to see him, and especially to see his famous model of the temple, and he was pleased with what he saw and heard. "But when coming to the question of Calvary, I confessed my belief that the Church of the Sepulchre is genuine, his Lordship became so displeased that he left unfriendly, as if he would have no more communication with a man believing such things!" But the English bishop was balanced, he says, by one from Canada, who came a few days later, and when he heard that the Church stands on the right place, "blessed me, and said, 'It is quite a relief to my mind what you have told me now, and that you believe the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to be genuine.'"

Whereupon Herr Schick came to the conclusion that all mankind are divided into two classes: those who bless him because he has found that the Church is genuine, and those who do not. But he inconsistently adds a third immediately after, for he has met with some who, having no religious motives, at once say: "You must know—I don't believe *anything*," and that is the worst class of all, "whose testimony is of no value, and such I answered according to the rule of Solomon (Prov. xxvi. 5)."

But the greatest trouble came from Russia, in the person of Herr von Manzoorof. For when

Herr Schick's report reached St. Petersburg, and it was read therein that the granite pillars near the eastern street belonged once to the Propylæum of Constantine's Church, "and similar things," Herr von Manzoorof, being President of the Oriental Orthodox Mission, was censured in high quarters for having let such an important place lie waste. Herr von Manzoorof's reply was: "Herr Schick is wrong in his conclusions;" and straightway came to Jerusalem to prove it. He came to convince Herr Schick that he was wrong, and to gather materials for a book which would also convince the persons "in high quarters" who had censured him. He stayed five months in Jerusalem and argued with Herr Schick. "Many hours he talked with me on the subject, but all he said convinced me more and more that I was in the right. And so," he adds, in his inconsequential manner, "it was decided in St. Petersburg to build up the waste place; which has since been done in a rather expensive way." The old remains are "spared" and protected with a roof; the place has become a sanctuary to which Russian pilgrims flock; and from the Emperor of Russia, Herr Schick himself has received "a high Order"; while the book of Herr von Manzoorof is not again mentioned in history.

But Herr Schick's success in St. Petersburg, even with the Emperor's high Order, is but a poor offset against his failure in Jerusalem. He has been brought "by many things" to the conclusion that the place where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands is the place where our Lord was crucified. But he cannot fully prove it; and so at present he frankly confesses that he stands almost alone among the Protestants in Jerusalem in holding this view.

What are their objections to it? They are many; but there is only one of any weight. Neither Herr Schick nor any one else at present can prove where the old wall ran. They cannot, therefore, prove that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is outside the old wall, and at present it

seems to be in the town—in fact, nearly in the middle of the town, as it seemed to Herr Schick himself, when first he came to Jerusalem. But even if he could prove that the stones laid bare when the excavations were made in 1883 mark the line of the old wall, it runs so close by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre that it is hard to believe that the crucifixion could have taken place there, just outside the city wall and no more.

But within the last few years there has arisen a more serious difficulty than that. It is the wide acceptance of another site. To the north of Jerusalem, and just above “Jeremiah’s Grotto,” there is a little hill which is so prominent and so close to the great road leading out of Jerusalem, that it seemed almost to offer itself as the true Calvary. And when it was observed that the peculiar formation of its rock might easily suggest a skull, the necessary proof seemed to have been providentially preserved. Many years ago it was chosen as the most likely site by several travellers and residents in Jerusalem, Herr Schick himself being of the number. Two things alone were wanting to give it fame and permanence—the conquest of a great authority, and the sentiment of a great name. Major Conder supplied the one; General Gordon supplied the other. And now the knoll is popularly known as the “Skull Hill,” though we hear of other names than that; Major Conder having a day or two ago protested against being prematurely buried there, for they were calling it “Conder’s Tomb.”

This is the history of the progress which the “Skull Hill” has made in popular acceptance, as it is told by Herr Schick in his garrulous, interesting way: “About the time when I gave up the idea I had so long had, that the traditional Calvary is the wrong one, and became converted, as above stated, to the conviction that it is genuine, Dr. Selah Merrill, the American Consul, maintained that the so-called ‘Skull Hill’ is the real Calvary, and pointed it out to travellers as such. Also he wrote a pamphlet to prove this, and his

arguments, partly such as were used before, partly some new ones, convinced some people, but not all, as the arguments were not striking enough. But now came the late General Gordon with the idea that this rock was intended to be the site for the temple, but the builders refused it, and built the temple farther down on the ridge, and that Christ was crucified here instead, and that it became thereby the ‘Corner Stone.’ He called it the ‘Skull,’ taking this notion (as he showed me on the map) from the Ordnance Survey map, scale 2500, where the contour 2549 shows in reality the form of a skull; and as at the western foot of the hill a rock-cut tomb existed and had been cleared, he decided that this was the Tomb of Christ. Many travellers, especially English, on such authority gave the matter attention, and went there and believed, and also Americans, as their Consul showed the place to them; and so the matter became widely known, and the question filled very many minds in such a way that the hill and the tomb were made a kind of fetich. It seems the enthusiasm has already passed the culminating point, and that the matter will be treated more soberly.”

In the new edition of Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible* the matter is treated soberly enough. Sir Charles Wilson, who writes the article on Jerusalem, writes in an unimpassioned manner throughout; and he discusses and disposes the claims of the “Skull Hill” with surprising brevity and calmness, not once mentioning the name of General Gordon. For Sir Charles Wilson believes neither in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre nor in the Skull Hill; but would hesitatingly find the place of crucifixion on another hill or spur to the east of Jeremiah’s Grotto, and directly to the north of the temple. That is the third claimant, and we are left to our choice among them.

The fourth and last volume of Professor Max Müller’s Gifford Lectures has just been issued, and is included among the books of the month. To the student of theology it is probably the most *interesting* of the whole long list of this month’s

publications. For Professor Max Müller has not lost the cunning which all his life long has stood him in such good stead. Having to deal so largely in "vile second-hand carcasses," as the *Innocents* doctor with professional bluntness puts it; scarcely ever able to "fetch us out a nice *fresh* corpse"; he nevertheless so wraps it round with fresh bandages, cut as we might almost say from yesterday's newspaper, that we cannot complain of even a musty smell.

Thus there is a lengthy account in the beginning of this volume of the rise and decline of the sacred literature of Persia; an account much, and no doubt unavoidably, interspersed with unpronounceable—in many cases actually unspellable—names. But just when we begin to feel weary of the unfamiliar exercise of trying to pronounce them and comprehend the history, Professor Max Müller adroitly introduces a subject of which we spoke together only yesterday, and our interest returns immediately.

The subject is the relation between the Avesta and the Old Testament. It is quite fresh and new, and full of interest. For it has been touched by the almost magic pen of Professor Cheyne of Oxford; and for the moment both Egypt and Babylonia have, on the question of influence and originality, to give place to Persia, and we are even less concerned about the influence of Platonism and Philo on the New Testament than about the influence of Zoroastrianism and the Zend Avesta on the Old.

"The chief doctrines," says Professor Max Müller, "which the Jews are supposed to have borrowed from the followers of Zoroaster, are a belief in the resurrection of the body, a belief in the immortality of the soul, and a belief in future rewards and punishments. It is well known that these doctrines were entirely, or almost entirely, absent from the oldest phase of religion among the Jews, so that their presence in some of the psalms and the prophets has often been used as an argu-

ment in support of the later date now assigned to these compositions. Here there are no chronological difficulties. These doctrines exist, as we shall see, at least in their germinal stage, in the Gathas, while of the more minute details added to these old doctrines in the later portions of the Avesta, or in the still later Pehlevi writings, there is no trace even in the post-Exilic books of the Old Testament. This point has been well argued by Professor Cheyne in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June, July, August, 1891."

In that statement there is more than one assertion fairly open to challenge. But as Professor Max Müller passes from it immediately to another point, and passes at once to the other side, we may follow him without more protest for the moment.

He passes to another point, on which he says, "We can observe an even more striking similarity between the Old Testament and the Avesta." It is "the strong assertion of the oneness of God." And he passes to the other side. For he thinks that on this subject the Persians are debtors to the Jews. "The sudden change from the henotheism of the Veda to the monotheism of the Avesta has never been accounted for; and I venture to suggest, though not without hesitation, that it may have taken place in Media, in the original home of the Zoroastrian religion. It was in the cities of Media that a large Jewish population was settled, after the king of Syria had carried away Israel, and put them in Halah and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes (2 Kings xviii. 11). Now, however difficult an exchange of religious ideas may be between people speaking different languages, the fact of their worshipping either one god or many gods could hardly fail to attract attention. If, then, the Jews impressed their neighbours with the conviction that there could be but one God, a conviction which, in spite of many backslidings, seems never to have ceased altogether to form part of the national faith of Israel, everything else

would naturally have followed, exactly as we find it in the Avesta, as compared with the Veda. One of the ancient gods, the Asura Varuna, was taken as the one and supreme God, the God above all gods, under the name of Ahura Mazda; the other Devas, if they claimed to be gods, were renounced, and those only who could be treated as secondary spirits were allowed to remain—nay, were increased in numbers by such spirits or angels as Ameretat, Haurvatat, Vohumano, and all the rest.”

It cannot be strictly proved, he says. But still less can it be proved that the Jews owed their monotheism to the Zoroastrians. On the whole, he thinks that Zoroastrian borrowing from the Jews in Media is the easiest explanation of “many things in the Avesta” that have not yet had any satisfactory explanation.

“But there is a still more startling coincidence.” These are Professor Max Müller’s words, and if it is a coincidence we heartily agree. It is nothing less than the discovery in the Avesta of that sublime and exalted name of Jehovah, “I am that I am.”

The passage occurs in the Ormazd Yasht. “Zarathustra asked Ahura Mazda: ‘O Ahura Mazda, most beneficent Spirit, Maker of the material world, thou Holy One, What Holy Word is the strongest? What is the most victorious? What is the most glorious? What is the most effective? What is the most fiend-smiting? What is the best healing? What destroyeth best the malice of Dævas and men? What maketh the material world best come to the fulfilment of its wishes? What freeth the material world best from the anxieties of the heart?’” To a question of such magnitude, it was befitting that an answer should come of some solemnity. And so there follows a long and awful list of the fiend-smiting and other names of Ahura, and the twentieth name is this: “I am what I am.”

At least that is how Professor Max Müller translates the name. And although Professor Darmesteter gives it less familiarly, “My twentieth name is Mazda (the all-knowing one),” yet Dr. Haug is with Professor Mux Müller, and it is scarcely possible to doubt that they are right. For the text is *visastemo ahmi yat ahmi Mazdau nama*, of which a word for word translation is: “Twentieth, I am what I am, Mazda by name.”

How are we to account for this striking coincidence? It is no coincidence, says Professor Max Müller. There are coincidences in plenty in comparative theology, and they are startling enough, proving to Professor Max Müller that truth is universal and not the special inheritance of a single tribe. But this is too remarkable for a coincidence. Not even in comparative theology is anything quite so startling found. It is no coincidence, he says, but a borrowing. *And the borrowing is on the side of the Old Testament.*

This conclusion, certainly not the least unexpected part of the discussion, is reached in a somewhat remarkable way. The names of Ahura Mazda, including this twentieth name, “I am what I am,” occur in the Ormazd Yasht. Now the Yashts are the latest parts of the Zend Avesta, some of them being as late as the fourth century B.C. The name, “I am that I am,” occurs in Exod. iii. 14. Thus, one would scarcely have anticipated much difficulty in deciding the question of priority and originality. Of course Professor Max Müller abides by the results of the Higher Criticism. But that does not serve him greatly either. For “this passage, as I am informed by the best authorities, is now unanimously referred to the Elohist section. Dillmann, Driver, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cornill, Kittel, etc., all agree on that point.” “The Elohist writer, therefore, who is supposed to be not later than 750 B.C.,” could not well have borrowed from a Persian Yasht of the fourth century.

But it is open to suggest that the verse in Exodus is interpolated by a later hand; and this Professor Max Müller does. For "it looks like a foreign thought." Pass over the fourteenth verse, he says, where the name occurs, and in the fifteenth you have not only an answer to Moses' question of the thirteenth verse, but you have the answer that you expect. "And God said [more-over] unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac,

and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever" . . . "This," says Professor Max Müller, "is what we expect, for it was actually in the name of Jehovah, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that Moses brought the people out of Egypt; nor is there any trace of Moses having obeyed the divine command and having appealed to 'I am that I am' as the God who sent him. Nay, there is never again any allusion to such a name in the Old Testament, not even where we might fully expect to meet with it."

## Frederick Godet.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR GRETILLAT, NEUCHÂTEL.

ON the 25th of October last, a delegation of the former pupils of Dr. Godet and of his friends called on him and delivered to him the following address, along with a presentation of plate:—

"DEAR AND REVERED BROTHER,—In the name of your former pupils, with whom some of your friends have wished to join, we come to express on your eightieth birthday the gratitude, affection, and respect towards you with which their hearts and ours are alike filled.

"They are of different countries, they belong to various Churches, they are not all of the same age; but they are of one heart in regard to the step which we are now taking. In their name we address you as follows:—

"Our Churches owe you much: the reverence with which they regard you, and the authority which you possess among them, prove it better than any words of ours.

"We, who have been permitted directly to receive your instructions, owe you still more. You have been to us more than a learned doctor, guiding us in the study of the Scriptures and unveiling to us their treasures. You have been a friend and a father always ready to direct, to raise and encourage us. Your care and affection never failed us. You have taught us to love our common Master, by giving us in your person the example of profound piety combined with undoubted knowledge. You made some of us decide for the pastoral career, and confirmed the vocation of others.

"We know what you will answer. You will say, like St. Paul, that it is not you who have done all this, but the grace of God in you. We know this;

we believe it. We thank Him, first of all; and while blessing Him for the gift which He has bestowed by you on our Churches, we ask Him long to spare you still among us.

"May He preserve your powers of heart and mind, as He has done till now, from the effects of age; may He satisfy your old age with goodness, and rejuvenate you like the eagle; may He permit you to finish the labours you have undertaken for Him at a time of life when others think they have earned the right to rest; and may the work it has been given you to finish remain a blessing to the Church, and for the glory of the Master to whom you have consecrated your strength and your life.

"Such are the feelings and the prayers of all your students and friends whose names are subscribed to this address."

(Here follow 247 signatures.)

Some days afterwards the subscribers of the preceding address received the following circular, of which we give the chief part:—

"TO MY FORMER STUDENTS AND THOSE FRIENDS WHO HAVE JOINED THEM IN CELEBRATING BY A PRESENT MY EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY.

"DEAR AND HONOURED FRIENDS,—I wish I could express to each of you in particular the sentiments with which my heart has been filled in receiving the touching address and the magnificent gift by which you have been pleased to testify your affection for me. . . .