

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

DR. SALMOND'S long-looked-for volume on *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality* has just appeared, too late for notice this month. It is reserved for reading before the next comes round. And it will take a good deal of that. For it is a handsome volume of over seven hundred pages, and it is not Dr. Salmond's way to write pages that may be skipped.

Professor W. M. Ramsay, having read the Notes in last month's issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on St. Paul's use of the word 'Church' (ἐκκλησία), has sent us the sheets from his forthcoming work on *St. Paul the Traveller* (Hodder & Stoughton), in which he discusses the subject. He comes to a conclusion which differs markedly from that of Mr. Wright.

Originally, he says, the word meant simply 'an assembly,' and as employed by St. Paul in his earliest Epistles it may be rendered 'the congregation of the Thessalonians.' But St. Paul was a Roman statesman. He was familiar with the conception which all Roman statesmen held, that every group of Roman citizens meeting together in a body (*conventus Civium Romanorum*), in any portion of the vast Empire, formed a part of the great conception, 'Rome.' If, as a Roman citizen, he came to any provincial town where such a group existed, he was forthwith a member of that group. The group was simply a fragment of 'Rome,' cut

off in space from the whole body, but preserving its vitality and self-identity as fully as when it was joined to the whole, and capable of reuniting with the whole as soon as the estranging space was annihilated.

This conception St. Paul transferred to the Church. But as soon as the idea of 'the Unified Church' grew definite in his mind, he required a term to express it. Ecclesia was the word that forced itself upon him. But in the new sense it demanded a new construction; it was no longer 'the church of the Thessalonians,' but the 'Church in Corinth'; and it was necessarily singular, for there was only one Church.

The new sense of the word Ecclesia or Church took shape gradually. We see it in process of formation in Gal. i. 13: 'I persecuted the Church of God, and made havock of it.' Elsewhere in that letter the term is used in the old sense, 'the churches of Galatia.' But in 1 Cor. i. 2, the new sense of Ecclesia is deliberately and formally employed: 'The Church of God which is at Corinth.'

In the Book of the Acts our word is used in both its senses, but with a distinction which throws some light on the delicacy of expression in that book. In xiv. 23, xv. 41, and xvi. 5, it occurs in

the plural sense of 'congregations,' or 'every congregation.' In all other cases (in the Eastern Text, at least) it is used in the singular, and sometimes markedly in the sense of the Unified Church. Take ix. 31: 'So the church (R.V.) throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria had peace.' Now the point is, that when St. Luke speaks in his own person he uses the word in its developed Pauline sense; but when he is describing St. Paul's earlier work, he, 'with dramatic appropriateness,' employs it in the earlier meaning.

The *Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund for the present quarter contains a note from Dr. A. Moody Stuart on the lapping of the water by Gideon's three hundred men at the 'Well of Trembling.' The 'lapping,' he says, is usually understood to mean that they drank the water out of the palm of the hand. It is, however, something much more picturesque than that. Fifty years ago, in the island of Madeira, Dr. Moody Stuart had an unexpected opportunity of observing what the lapping of an Oriental is. 'One afternoon, as I rode leisurely out of Funchal, there came towards the town a man in the light garb of a courier from the mountains, running at the top of his speed. As he approached me, he stopped to quench his thirst at a fountain. His manner of doing so at once suggested the lapping of Gideon's men, and I drew up my pony to observe his action more exactly; but he was already away as on the wings of the wind, leaving me to wonder and admire. With one knee bent before him, and the other limb stretched behind in the same attitude as he ran, and with his face upward toward heaven, he threw the water apparently with his fingers in a continuous stream through his open lips without bringing his hand nearer to his mouth than perhaps a foot and a half, and so satisfied his thirst in a few moments.'

That is very beautiful, and it is very well expressed. And now if the commentators would

agree upon the *meaning* of the lapping, how content we all should be. But as soon as they come to that, the variety of interpretation is wonderful.

Some say—indeed, this is the favourite explanation—that the three hundred were too eager for the battle to lie down and drink leisurely. Thus, Dr. Black, in his *Judges* (p. 55), says: 'The idea plainly is of one who is accustomed to slake his thirst as opportunity offers, without loss of time.' And the late Professor Elmslie rhetorically improves upon this by saying (*Expository Lectures and Sermons*, p. 17) that 'the majority of them unbuckled their swords and eased their armour, and knelt down to drink,' while 'three hundred kept their swords on, and simply with their hands carried the water to their mouths.' And he adds: 'Gideon said to those three hundred, "You are the men I want"—the men that were so eager for battle that they did not think much about their own comfort.'

Some of our most recent commentators, however, think that the three hundred drank standing in order to guard against surprise by the enemy. So says Professor Lias very frankly (*Judges*, p. 111). Dr. Douglas (*The Book of Judges*, p. 44) is more cautious, and perhaps thereby more characteristic, when he says that 'it is unsafe to venture further than this, that the three hundred were more upon the alert.' This was the judgment of Ewald, who, in his *History of Israel* (ii. 385), describes Gideon as leading 'warriors who like dogs only lapped the water, always on the alert, ready for further pursuit and victory.' But Dean Stanley, who generally follows Ewald, improves upon him here. In his *History of the Jewish Church* (i. 305), he says that, as soon as they reached the brink of the spring, the majority of the soldiers rushed headlong down to quench their thirst, throwing themselves on the ground, or plunging their mouths into the water—and were rejected; but those who took up the water in their hands and *lapped it with self-restraint* were chosen.

Clearly we are rising in the scale of virtue. This is a nobler conception than eagerness for the fray or fear of a sudden surprise. And now Bishop Hervey, who wrote the Commentary on the Book of Judges both in the *Speaker* and in the *Pulpit*, endeavours to combine the ideas of Ewald and of Stanley. 'It can scarcely be doubted,' he says in the *Speaker* (ii. 162), 'that those who threw themselves on the ground were the more self-indulgent, while those who, remembering the near presence of the enemy, slaked their thirst with moderation, and without being off their guard for an instant, were the true soldiers of the army of God.'

All this in modern commentators, who are said to echo one another, is sufficiently perplexing. But when we go to the ancients, the case is very much worse. We may pass by Rashi, who guessed that the most of the men were idolaters in their hearts, and the falling on their knees was a secret act of idolatrous worship. But Josephus should have known what he spoke about. Now Josephus believed that the three hundred whom Gideon chose were not the bravest in the army, but the most cowardly; not the readiest for the fray, but the most anxious to escape it. He says it was their dread of the foe, so powerful and so near, that made them lap the water hastily while the others bent down and quenched their thirst at leisure. Thus God chose the foolish things of the world, for this battle was to be won by Himself, and not by big battalions.

Now it is not the way with the Bible to leave its lessons so hard to glean as this. There must be a reason for this perplexity. Let us look at the narrative itself. The first thing that strikes us is that the three hundred men are said to have lapped with their tongues as a dog lappeth. Well, how does a dog lap? It puts its head down to the water and licks it (the very word here made use of) with its tongue. Do any of our interpreters represent the three hundred lapping so? One and all, they speak of the men as standing upon their

feet and catching the water in their hands. The majority of the army went down upon their knees; but the three hundred who were chosen—well, it is taken for granted that they remained upon their feet. How, then, did they lap as a dog lappeth? How did they reach the water at all? It was a running stream, and it ran below the level of their feet. If they did not even go down upon their knees, how did they reach the water? And how did they lap it with their tongue as a dog lappeth? Professor Dods perceives the difficulty, and in his *Israel's Iron Age* (p. 43), he says: 'You have seen a dog running along the bank of a water, or in the shallow of a stream, or in a ditch, and, without stopping, snatching mouthfuls or tonguefuls of water, too intent on his pursuit to take a leisurely drink, never even while slaking his thirst turning aside or pausing from the chase.' Yes, we have seen the dog, but no one ever saw the man who could do it after him.

Dr. Elder Cumming has seen the difficulty also. And in seeking to meet it, he gives yet another interpretation of the incident. 'Those men,' he says (*Scripture Photographs*, p. 159), 'have taken the place of the dog, lapping the water with their tongues—they have neither pride nor fear.' But surely the majority of the army who went down upon their knees had less pride than the three hundred, if they stood upon their feet. If Dr. Elder Cumming is right, and the idea is exceedingly agreeable to the narrative, then it was the three hundred who fell down flat to drink the water out of the stream; it was the rest of the men who only bowed down upon their knees to drink.

And, but for one phrase in it, this is the natural interpretation of the narrative. The incident occurs in the seventh chapter of Judges, and there the action is twice described. In the fifth verse we have it thus: 'Every one that lappeth of the water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself; likewise every one that boweth down upon his knees to drink.' Well, the three hundred lapped with their tongue as a

dog lappeth, and the rest bowed down upon their knees to drink. Who, if there were no more than this to guide him, would doubt that the three hundred fell down flat, put their faces to the water as a dog does, and lapped it as a dog lappeth, while the rest went only down upon their knees and drank it out of their hands? But there is another verse, and there is a phrase in that verse which alters it altogether.

The sixth verse says: 'And the number of them that lapped (putting their hand to their mouth) was three hundred men; but all the rest of the people bowed down upon their knees to drink water.' Now, if the clause which we have placed in parentheses were not there, this verse would convey the same meaning as the other. But that clause alters everything. Is it possible that that clause is a mistaken insertion?

The latest and, so far as we are able to judge, the most capable commentator on the Book of Judges we have had in recent times, says that it is. Professor Moore (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Judges*, p. 202) says 'the words, "with their hands to their mouths," are, as the Greek version (A) shows, a gloss, and in this place an erroneous gloss,' and he shows how the evidence goes against it.

Now we confess to the utmost reluctance to accept an interpolation in the Bible. We should almost as readily make one. But if there is a case for it anywhere in the Old Testament, it seems to be here. Yet it is possible that it is nothing more than a displacement. If this clause stood at the *end* of the second verse instead of in the middle, it would only increase the clearness. For it is easy to understand how the majority of the army, who were already on their knees, drank of the water by putting their hands to their mouths. But it is hard to conceive how men of ordinary arms could stand upon their feet and catch the water out of a running stream beneath

them, and then lap it with their tongues as a dog lappeth.

To those who believe as we do, that scholarship is truth, and always wins its way in the end, it must be gratifying to find that in the active ministry of all the Churches there are at the present day so many men to whom the title scholar justly belongs. Names will occur to every one, we need not give them here. But we have been led to the observation by reading an article in *The Methodist Times* of November 7, by the Rev. Frank Ballard, M.A., B.Sc. In form a review, and withal a most appreciative review, of Professor Laidlaw's *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, it is in reality an able article on the Psychology of the Bible, especially on the meaning of the words 'Life' and 'Death' there, and it proves that Mr. Ballard has more than a surface knowledge of that subject.

The review, we have said, is appreciative. To Mr. Ballard this book has come, not as solace to his own soul only, but as a gift to his congregation; and he advises every Christian teacher to possess and study it. Nevertheless, on three separate pages he touches it, and strives to make it better. First, he will not have it that 'regeneration is the cause of conversion,' or that 'in regeneration there is a power conferred; conversion is the exercise of this power.' He holds that conversion comes before regeneration, assuredly and necessarily before it. 'Conversion is indeed all of grace, but the *potentialising* grace is given to all without exception.' He quotes Professor Banks: This gift 'holds good of the unconverted before conversion, of those who never are converted, of the heathen who have never heard of Christ.' And he adds: 'All other doctrine than this doubly wrecks itself, on Scripture and on fact.'

Next, Mr. Ballard denies that the Hebrew word *nēshāmāh* (נֶשְׁמָה), which means the spirit, is ever applied to animals. Once Dr. Laidlaw believes it is. The place is Gen. vii. 22: 'All in whose

nostrils was the spirit (A.V. "breath") of life.' But, says Mr. Ballard, the word occurs twenty-five times in the Old Testament; in twenty-four out of the twenty-five occurrences its reference to animal life is unthinkable; the remaining case is Gen. vii. 22. But if it is again examined, he believes that it will be seen that ver. 21 describes the case for animals, ver. 23 sums up the case for men and animals, and thus ver. 22 is left to state the case for men. Finally, he regrets that Professor Laidlaw has used the Authorized Version where he believes the Revised is better.

In a book of much learning and more audacity, by Dr. G. H. Bateson Wright, the Principal of Queen's College, Hong Kong (*Was Israel ever in Egypt?* Williams & Norgate, 8vo, 7s. 6d.), there occurs the following autobiographical reminiscence:—

'It was the custom at Queen's College, Oxford, twenty years ago, for undergraduates at the end of Term to appear before the "Dons" in Common Room, when the lecturers would comment upon the signs of improvement, or otherwise, perceptible in the examination papers written at "Collections." I well remember Mr. Sayce's addressing the late Provost, Dr. Jackson, in March 1874, to the following effect:—"Mr. Wright, Sir, has done a very creditable paper, showing that he has made a careful study of the Book of Isaiah; but"—and this with a friendly smile of encouragement—"but I think that a little more experience and further study will satisfy him that he has not fairly represented the arguments in favour of the dual authorship of Isaiah." Thenceforth I determined to inquire into critical questions without an *à priori* bias that they must be wrong because they disagreed with tradition. I am therefore indebted for my present liberal views to the author of *The Verdict of the Monuments*.'

And so, from that day Dr. Wright has gone on his way till he has produced this book. And in this book, to take a reference at random, he says that Man (Adam) marries Life (Eve), and they

bear a son Possession (Cain). The second son of Eve was Vanity or Disappointment (Abel). The allegory then runs thus: Mankind, infused with Life, begat Success and Disappointment; Success surmounted or killed Disappointment, and the result was Settlement (Seth), a third son.

And from that day Dr. Sayce has gone on his way till he has written this article in the *Contemporary Review* for October, and delivered this address at the Norwich Church Congress. In the article he says that the pivot on which the whole Old Testament question turns is the Pentateuch. 'If, then, I were to be asked if I believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, I should answer that such a belief seems to me to involve considerably fewer difficulties than does the contrary belief of the higher criticism.' He admits that this is a change from his attitude of fifteen years ago; but he has reasons for the change. In the first place, it has now been proved, by the Tel el-Amarna tablets, that 'in the century before the Exodus people were reading and writing and corresponding with one another throughout the civilised East, from the banks of the Euphrates to those of the Nile.' We have learned, therefore, 'not only that Moses could have written the Pentateuch, but that it would have been something like a miracle if he had not done so.'

Secondly, 'a study of the literature handed down to us by the Babylonian and Assyrian kinsfolk of the Israelites tells strongly against the disintegration theory of the biblical critics.' The authors of the day used older materials in compiling their histories; but they did not use 'scissors and paste and the apparatus of a modern German study.' Either they passed the materials which they used through their own mind and threw them into their own shape and expression, or they faithfully and openly copied them. 'Of slicing and patching there is no trace; and the faithfulness of the copies is astonishing. Where a word or character had been lost in the original tablet, the copyist is careful to state that there is

a "lacuna" or a "recent lacuna"; where the form of the original character was doubtful, each of its possible later representatives is given. Even the compiler of the "Babylonian Chronicle," in describing the great battle of Khalule, which laid Babylonia at the feet of Sennacherib, candidly confesses that he "does not know the year" when it took place.' Is it surprising then, asks Professor Sayce, 'that my brother Assyriologist, the illustrious Orientalist, Professor Hommel, should declare his belief in the literary honesty of the Pentateuch, or should maintain that while there is evidence of the use of older documents in the Book of Genesis, it passes the wit of man to separate and distinguish them'?

And Professor Sayce holds that Oriental archæology can go further than prove that Moses could, after all, have written the Pentateuch. It can show that *there is no one else so likely to have written it*. For, in the third place, contrary to the finding of the higher criticism, the Pentateuch is full of truth and colour which carry it back to the time of Moses, and of all men in his time, most probably to Moses' own hand. 'Let us take, for example, the tenth chapter of Genesis, in which the geography of the Oriental world is described. There we are told that Canaan was the brother of Mizraim or Egypt. The assertion was strictly true as long as Canaan was a province of Egypt; when it ceased to be so, the statement was not only true no longer, it was contrary to the daily experience and political beliefs of every inhabitant of Palestine. But it was only during the rule of the eighteenth and nineteenth Egyptian dynasties that Canaan obeyed the government of the Pharaohs. With the fall of the nineteenth dynasty it was separated from the monarchy of the Nile, not to be again united to it, except during the short space of years that followed the death of Josiah. After the Mosaic age we cannot conceive of a writer coupling Canaan and Egypt together.'

Close upon the article in the *Contemporary* came the speech at the Norwich Congress. Its line of

argument is the same. But now Abraham receives more attention, and Moses less. If there is any critic foolhardy enough to ask how Abraham the Hebrew, speaking a Hebrew tongue, could have been called out of Ur of the Chaldees, where presumably a Babylonian tongue was spoken, Professor Sayce is able to answer him. For it is five years since Professor Sayce conjectured that a certain king of Babylonia named Khammurabi (who is known as the conqueror of the Arioch, king of Ellasar, of Gen. xiv.), was not a native Babylonian. Either he himself or some ancestor of his came from Southern Arabia, and conquered Babylonia, and then reigned over it. Wherever Khammurabi and his people had come from, their speech was close kin to that of the Hebrews. Hence it was just in the dynasty of Khammurabi that a man speaking the Hebrew tongue, or a tongue that would speedily develop into the Hebrew, could be called out of Ur of the Chaldees. And it is just in the dynasty of Khammurabi that 'the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred.' Five years ago Professor Sayce was convinced that this alien dynasty in Babylon was of the same ancestry as the Hebrews in Canaan. And now Mr. Pinches has confirmed his conjecture. In some contract tablets belonging to the dynasty of Khammurabi, he has discovered the names of 'Yakub-ili and Yasup-ili,—that is, Jacob-el and Joseph-el,—and proved that 'in the very century to which the Bible assigns the lifetime of Abraham, Hebrews with Hebrew names must have been living in Babylonia.'

Professor Sayce's speech was received at the Congress with much surprise and mixed appreciation. The Rev. George Ensor, who, the day before, had described Professor Sayce's arguments as 'usually most brilliant, commonly most precarious,' called attention to 'the extreme significance of Professor Sayce's statement of that morning.' But the Rev. G. Harford-Battersby described the 'statement' in question as the fire of one friendly regiment into another. And in *The Guardian* for November 6, as well as in *The*

*Church of England Pulpit* for November 9, the Rev. Edward G. King calls Professor Sayce's method inexcusable, 'inasmuch as, when he comes to the Book of Daniel, he himself adopts the methods and results of the Higher Criticism in the most thorough manner.'

When Professor Sayce had read his paper at the Church Congress it was fitting that Mr. Pinches should follow and read his. He did not trouble the higher critics, or apparently give them a thought. For Mr. Pinches is the archæologist who makes the discoveries, and he leaves it to other men to make the applications. In this paper he had many discoveries to report, besides that discovery about Jacob and Joseph which he generously allowed Dr. Sayce to announce.

He had something to say about the Garden of Eden. He has not found the Garden of Eden itself, but he has found a Paradise not far from the place where the Garden of Eden is believed to have been. There was a time when the Persian Gulf extended much farther inland than it does now. At that time there lay upon its shores a city called Eridu, of which the meaning is 'the good,' and there 'between the mouths of the rivers which are on each side' was the home of the sun-god Tammuz of the Abyss. It was a lost Paradise, but they somehow thought it existed still, and lay between the mouths of its rivers, and in the midst of it grew a tree, glorious in a glorious place.

Mr. Pinches has further discovered the proper spelling of the name we call **JEHOVAH**. That Jehovah is not its proper spelling, we are all agreed; but we are not agreed, scarcely two persons are agreed, as to what its proper spelling is. Mr. Pinches has discovered it. He does not tell us where, and he does not tell us how. He simply says: 'The true reading I am now able to announce as Yahwah.'

But the most remarkable discovery which Mr. Pinches has made (if he has made it) is the dis-

covery of Darius the Mede. In the Babylonian Chronicle it is stated that, 'On the night of the eleventh of Marcheswan, Gobryas [descended] against [Babylon], and the son of the king died.' At least, that is Mr. Pinches' translation. And Mr. Pinches believes that the statement refers to the event narrated in the Book of Daniel, which tells us that Belshazzar, king of the Chaldeans, was slain in the night, after he had held a high festival, and Darius the Mede, a man of advanced age, received the kingdom. Well, it is easy to show that 'the son of the king' who died, and Belshazzar the Chaldean king, who was slain, are one and the same. For the Greek historians tell us that Nabonidos, Belshazzar's father, had already surrendered to the Persian army, and that, therefore, Belshazzar, 'the son of the king,' was now the rightful occupant of the throne. He might be called the king, as the Bible does, or he might be called 'the son of the king,' as the Chronicle calls him. We can easily accept Belshazzar; but where do we find Darius the Mede?

Mr. Pinches believes that he is simply the Gobryas of whom the Chronicle informs us. The author of the Book of Daniel, or of this portion of the Book, finding the name Gobryas in his authority, and knowing nothing whatever about him, substituted the name Darius, which he knew very well indeed. So Darius the Mede is that Gobryas, whom we know better than the author did, to whom he has transferred the name of Darius the king, whom he knew better than we do, 'ignoring the fact that he was of a different nationality, a later date, and a much younger man.' The report of the Church Congress says that Mr. Pinches' remarks were received with loud applause: the editor of the *Record* doubts if the audience knew what they were applauding.

The discussion to which both Professor Sayce and Mr. Pinches made these contributions was entitled 'The Authority of Holy Scripture.' The title, no doubt, explains the attitude. But as Mr. Pinches took a larger view of his subject than

Professor Sayce, Mr. Burkitt, who came next, left the authority of Holy Scripture entirely alone, and read an admirable paper on the New Syriac Manuscript of the Gospels which Mrs. Lewis found at Sinai.

Mr. Burkitt's paper is one of the clearest presentations of a technical subject we have ever seen. Occupied mainly with showing that the new Sinaitic Gospels are all on the side of the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, the paper closes with a discussion of the last twelve verses of St. Mark, and the genealogy of our Lord in St. Matthew.

It is well known that the 'Sinaitic Gospels' do not contain the last twelve verses of St. Mark. Thus the earliest texts from Carthage, from Egypt, from Palestine, and now from Syria, are all against these verses; the only second-century evidence for them comes from Italy and Gaul. Quite lately Mr. Conybeare discovered a note in an Armenian manuscript of the Gospels which seems to ascribe the twelve verses to Aristion, who is known to us through a celebrated passage in Eusebius as the contemporary of Papias. Mr. Burkitt is not quite sure, however, that this is a real tradition, and not the guess of some ancient Armenian scholar. But whether Aristion be their author or not, it is evident that 'the Gospel of St. Mark, as it has come down to us, is imperfect at the end—that is, that all our manuscripts are probably derived from a single copy which had lost its last leaf.' And Mr. Burkitt thinks that not only the textual critic, but all those who are attacking the great literary problem of the relation of St. Mark to the other Synoptists should recognise this clearly.

On that most vexed question of the genealogies of our Lord, Mr. Burkitt has very plain and important things to say. He believes that the genealogy in St. Luke contains the names of our Lord's actual ancestors up to David and beyond. 'But the genealogy in St. Matthew is too artificial to be the record of an actual line of descent. It

is rather the evangelist's statement of the claim that Jesus Christ was the Heir of David.' It was therefore 'shaped into its present form' by the evangelist himself, not borrowed from a previously existing document.

In the last words which our Lord spoke before He left the Garden of Gethsemane there is an apparent contradiction. It occurs both in St. Matthew and in St. Mark. In Matthew xxvi. 45, 46, the words are: 'Then cometh He to the disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going; behold, he is at hand that betrayeth Me.' And in Mark xiv. 41, 42, they are practically the same. The contradiction is felt by the most careless reader, and up to the present the most careful study has failed to remove it.

A few years ago, however, a Norwegian scholar, Director J. Aars of Christiania, proposed a solution in the *Theologisk Tidsskrift for den norske Kirke*. This was in January 1886. The proposal by and by attracted attention in Germany, and Dr. Aars was persuaded to repeat it in the German tongue. It accordingly appears in the third number for this year of the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, pp. 378-383.

The contradiction is so sharp that the attempt has been made to render the first two verbs by an interrogative: 'Sleep ye now, and do ye take your rest?' So Luther gave it in his translation: 'Ach wolt ihr nun schlafen und ruhen?' But this translation is possible only if the adverb rendered 'now' (*τὸ λοιπόν*) can mean 'still.' Of that meaning, however, there is no evidence, and Aars declares it is impossible.

But he says that that adverb may be translated 'so' or 'so then'; and as the verbs may be indicative as readily as imperative, he would translate



the sentence: 'So you are asleep, and taking your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that betrayeth Me.'

This meaning of the adverb seems to have escaped the notice of commentators. But it is given by Sophocles in his Lexicon. It is also found in Jebb's Appendix (1887) to Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook of Modern Greek*. There are

passages in Plato where it is the most natural meaning. And even in the New Testament itself one place, at least, is found, 2 Tim. iv. 8, where it seems the most appropriate translation: 'So then there is laid up for me a crown of rejoicing.' Dr. Aars has evidently hit the mark. His rendering has been adopted by Dr. Caspari and the rest of the Committee for the new Norwegian translation of the New Testament, and in *The Biblical World* it is accepted by so careful and competent a scholar as Professor E. D. Burton of Chicago.

## The Song of Songs.

BY THE REV. J. E. FOX, M.A., CANON OF WAIAPU, NEW ZEALAND.

PREFACE.—This paraphrase would never have been written had not the author met with Professor Godet's 'Study' on the Song of Songs. The explanations, the dramatic arrangement, and the interpretations of this most interesting study have been followed throughout, with trifling exceptions.

If any object to my free treatment of sacred words, I may shelter myself behind Tate and Brady, and many others, who have paraphrased Bible words in hymns, unblamed.

There is a story that a critic to whom Pope submitted his MS. of the *Iliad* returned it with the remark, 'It is a pretty poem, Mr. Pope, but you must not call it Homer.' I fear my verses will never be so highly praised. I am very sure they are not Scripture. They may, however, direct attention to a somewhat despised and little understood part of Scripture, and suggest therein a depth and fulness of meaning wholly unsuspected by most readers, and capable of great development. If Godet's views are right, the New Testament alone fully interprets the Song of Songs. If they are wrong, in whole or in part, the New Testament (which indeed never quotes this book) remains, and there we shall still find the eternal realities supposed to have been adumbrated so long before. Such realities, I mean, as the bond between the Christian and his Friend—*φίλος*, אהב, lover—the Lord Jesus;

the divinity and grandeur of love; eclipses of the consciousness of God's presence and their end; the defeat of the attraction of the world by the attraction of God; and the final consummation of union with Him in eternal peace and joy and love.

### PROLOGUE.

[Spoken by one of the captives in Babylon, once a 'son' or pupil of prophets.]

*By Babel's waters, worn with grief I sat,  
And on the fringing willows hanged my harp,  
Until I wept my fill. It might not be.  
My tyrant master came with mock and gibe:  
'Sing, harper, sing me one of Zion's songs.'  
And I must sing, for all my heaviness.  
'A love-song,' bade he more imperiously.  
No heart have I for such; yet one I know—  
Of simple theme. A rural maid is left  
From her sweet country home and her betrothed  
By harem-agents of King Solomon;  
And, though besieged by flatteries and bribes  
And smooth cajoleries of court and king,  
Still in her palace-prison bravely scorns  
Its meretricious splendours, and endures  
Unshaken in her love and loyalty.  
To him, my lord, a love-song and no more;  
To me a holy parable. Enough!  
His angry gesture threatens.—Harp-strings, sound!*