

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

MR. WALTER LOCK delivered his inaugural lecture as Dean Ireland's Professor of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture at Oxford on February 5, and took as his subject, appropriately, 'The Exegesis of the New Testament.' The lecture has now been published under that title, and may be had of Messrs. Parker, in Oxford.

It is a lecture which justifies, if a single lecture can, the choice which was made on Mr. Lock's appointment. For Professor Lock sees how great a thing the interpretation of Holy Scripture is, and how far we have yet to go until we reach it. The pity is, and he sees that also, that we have chiefly to go backwards. For 'the true use of interpretation is to get rid of interpretation, and to leave us alone in company with the author. We need to be able to live with the man, to see his character, his aims, his feelings, his friendships, his favourite books.' And Professor Lock believes that in that respect St. Chrysostom remains still the best interpreter of St. Paul. 'Other commentators excel him in exact philological or dogmatic exposition, but no one combines on such a high level an equal combination of these with a sense that he is dealing with a living character.'

Professor Lock thinks that we must go back to the Fathers to learn the art of interpretation. But

---

VOL. VII.—7. APRIL 1896.

to learn the art of preaching it seems we shall have to go somewhere else. In the *Church of England Pulpit* there is a criticism of the March *Expositor*, and this is the criticism entire: 'The present writer does not profess to be at all optimistic as regards matters ecclesiastical, but this number of the *Expositor* is very comforting as regards one part of church work; it at least shows that, poor as the modern sermon often is, its superiority to the ancient sermon can hardly be exaggerated. Mr. Conybeare gives us an Ante-Nicene Homily of Gregory Thaumaturgus, of which he himself says, "That to a modern reader it must needs appear a rather tawdry effort." To *this* reader it seems mere trash. We should say, if it were preached now, it would raise doubts as to the sanity of the preacher. We are much obliged to Mr. Conybeare, therefore, for giving it to us; it is useful to know what congregations once bore with. And next time "the Fathers" are quoted with that large vagueness which always suggests that the speaker knows but little about them, we shall remember the Homily by Gregory Thaumaturgus.'

---

To a recent issue of the *Expositor*, Principal Brown of Aberdeen contributes a brief note on the words 'Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of *our* faith' (Heb. xii. 2). Thus the words stand in the Authorized Version, and the

Revisers have made no change, except that they have substituted 'perfecter' for 'finisher.' Now it is to be observed that in both versions the word *our* is printed in italics, to show that it is an interpolation—a word put in to fill up the sense. But Dr. Brown doubts very much if it fills up the sense. He very clearly sees and very plainly says that it hides the sense, suggesting another that is both inappropriate and impossible.

For to say that Christ is the author of *our* faith is to say a most unusual thing, and a thing that has no connexion with the context. The writer is urging us to look to the 'great cloud of witnesses' enumerated in the preceding chapter, who witness to the power of faith to triumph over all opposition. And now he turns from these witnesses to a witness nobler still, the faith of Jesus, 'who, for the joy set before Him'—the joy of saving a perishing world by His death—'*endured the cross.*' So the subject of this verse is not *our* faith, but the faith of Jesus, a conclusion which the verb that is chosen strongly confirms. '*Looking away* unto Jesus' (the compound ἀφορῶντες), meaning that His faith transcends that of all others.

But if it is not our faith but His own, then 'author' is an unfortunate rendering, and 'finisher' is little better. 'Captain (as in ii. 10) and Perfecter' are the words which should have been employed, since He both leads the van and brings up the rear of the noble army of believers. And no one need fear to speak of Jesus' faith, for that from first to last Christ as *Man* lived by faith is expressly stated in this very epistle (ii. 11-13). Rather should we recognise in this His absolute oneness with us as concerning the flesh. He is the Firstborn, indeed, among many brethren. Nevertheless, He is not ashamed to call us brethren, and He wants us to think of Him in the same near relationship.

One unfortunate result of Professor Sayce's recent attitude towards the Higher Criticism of

the Old Testament is that a belligerent intention is suspected under everything he now writes. His latest volume (*Patriarchal Palestine*. S.P.C.K. Crown 8vo. 4s.) is reviewed in the *Academy* of March 7, and from first to last this is in the reviewer's mind. It is, therefore, with manifest satisfaction that he notices occasional departures on Professor Sayce's part from the strict standard of critical orthodoxy he has lately professed.

These departures are chiefly over the derivation of proper names. Whatever opinion Professor Sayce may now have of Moses as a historian, it is evident that he has not yet accepted him as a philologist. For if 'it would have been a miracle if Moses had not written the Pentateuch,' he may be presumed to be responsible for the numerous derivations it contains. But it may be doubted if Professor Sayce accepts a single one of them.

When the Israelites entered the Land of Promise they found, says Professor Sayce, that the spot which was sacred in their eyes, on account of Jacob's vision, the spot which he had himself consecrated and called Beth-el, or House of God, was now sacred to a Canaanitish divinity, On. It was called Beth-On, or the Temple of On,—a name derived perhaps from that of the Sun-god in Egypt. 'Beth-On has survived into our own times, and the site of the old city is still known as Beitin.' And so far all is well. But when Professor Sayce adds 'from whence the tribe of Benjamin afterwards took the name of Ben-Oni, the Onite,' we cannot forget that he is in conflict with the statement of Gen. xxxv. 18, 'And it came to pass as her soul was in departing (for she died), that she called his name Ben-oni: but his father called him Benjamin.' It is true that Ben-oni is not translated in the text, but there can be no doubt that the writer intended it to be taken in the meaning which our English Versions give it in their margin, 'the son of my sorrow.'

Very near the beginning of his volume Professor Sayce comes upon the kingdom of Ammon; and

without a moment's hesitation he says, 'or the children of Ammi.' Then he adds: 'The name of Ammon was a derivative from that of the god Ammi or Ammo, who seems to have been regarded as the ancestor of the nation; and "the father of the children of Ammon" was accordingly called Ben-ammi, "the son of Ammi" (Gen. xix. 38).' But we do not need to turn to that unsavoury passage to make quite sure that the writer of it had a very different derivation in his mind. Ben-ammi is 'the son of my people,' as bene-ammi, in Gen. xxiii. 11, is 'the sons of my people'; and bath-ammi, in Lam. ii. 11, is 'the daughter of my people.'

It is evident that to one who sets sails in a vessel of strict critical orthodoxy these derivations in the Pentateuch are rocks of considerable danger. And those that are below the surface are the most dangerous of all. Professor Sayce's new book has much to say about Mr. Pinches' interesting discovery of the names Jacob and Joseph on a Babylonian tablet. Professor Sayce does not doubt that these names as we have them are abbreviations, the full names being Jacob-el and Joseph-el. Now if that is so, Jacob and Joseph being by derivation verbs, *El* would be the subject of each of these verbs, and we should have a meaning which, as this reviewer says, 'can scarcely have been tolerable, except in rude and primitive times.' And again we are in direct antagonism to the statements of the Hebrew writer.

And not only so, but if Professor Sayce's explanation of the meaning and origin of Jacob and Joseph is right, then, says the *Academy* reviewer, we have a remarkable confirmation of the views of the Higher Critics. For in Gen. xxx. 23, 24, we find two different explanations of the name Joseph. In one verse it is derived from *asaph*, 'to take away'—'God hath taken away my reproach.' In the other it is derived from *yasaph*, 'to add'—'the Lord shall add to me another son.' But the Higher Criticism has already assigned the one verse to the Jehovist, the other to the Elohist. They thus fur-

nish, says our reviewer, 'a remarkable example of the presence of different documents in Genesis,' and Professor Sayce supplies the link that completes the evidence.

But the most important philological item in Professor Sayce's revolutionary book is the derivation of the name Jerusalem. It is well known that among the famous Tel-el-Amarna collection there are letters to the King of Egypt from Jerusalem. Now one of these letters, according to Professor Sayce's reading and translation of the tablet, speaks of 'the city of the mountain of Jerusalem, the city of the temple of the God Nin-ip, whose name is Salim.' If Professor Sayce is right, the 'most high God,' to whom not only Ebed-tob, but also Melchisedek was priest, was Nin-ip. 'But Nin-ip was concerned with hunting and war, rather than with peace. If his name was also Salim, this word can scarcely have meant "peace" as so applied. It possibly might mean "retribution," according to one sense of the Hebrew verb with which it is connected. And it may have come to signify peace as based on retribution. But in any case,' concludes this reviewer, 'the probability is that Salim is used as the Canaanitish name of the by no means peaceful god Nin-ip.'

It is not probable that even on a subject of limited range, say the site of Calvary or the date of Daniel, any man can claim a monopoly of the truth. It is highly improbable that on a subject of wide-reaching consequence like the Christian Doctrine of Immortality one man should be able to offer us in one volume the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Having then a desire to know the true teaching of Scripture on this momentous subject, we have read not only Dr. Salmond's book, but also the criticisms it has received, and the result has much surprised us. Some reviews we must have missed, but we have gathered not a few. Yet there is not one of all we have seen that assails his main conclusion. There is not one that does more than peck at an occasional sentence, as a canary might peck at your out-

stretched finger without once dreaming of drawing blood.

But the most surprising thing is that the men who have committed themselves most openly to positions that are wholly opposed to Dr. Salmond's, have agreed to remain silent. We are perfectly willing for our part to accept any doctrine of the future that can be shown to be biblical—by a fair and a full interpretation of the Bible. Therefore we should read even yet a scientific defence of Annihilationism, Restorationism, or any other *ism* or *ation* that was ever supposed to be discovered there. For let it be said once more, this subject is too terrible to assert of it, 'Now we have all the light we shall ever receive.' Therefore it is we have read all these reviews. But they come to nothing.

Yet there have been some able reviews. But they have been on the author's side. There is Professor Davison's, for example, in the *Methodist Recorder*. Professor's Davison's review fills but a little over two columns, but then, like the apostle who bore about in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus, it bears about in every line the marks of a hard-won familiarity with every step of the argument. But Professor Davison is not a critic. With Professor Salmond's main conclusion he is in absolute agreement. Dr. Salmond, of course, does not measure the teaching of Christ by current Jewish beliefs. But he rightly considers that when our Saviour used a word like *Gehenna*, possessing certain associations in the minds of His hearers in the way He did, it is 'difficult to avoid the conclusion that it points to a future without hope for the sinner who passes in his sin into the other world.'

Only once, and in a matter really insignificant, though it has been deluged in literature, does Dr. Davison criticise Professor Salmond's finding. It is the matter of the Preaching to the Spirits in Prison. Dr. Salmond searches the subject diligently. And at last, with no offensive certainty, concludes that the passage means no more than

this, that Noah warned the antediluvian patriarchs to turn from their evil ways and save themselves from impending danger. But Professor Davison cannot accept it. He, too, knows 'the difficulties which beset every proposed explanation of this obscure passage.' Yet he thinks that Dr. Salmond's rendering is more improbable than the other, that Christ personally preached to the spirits of men in Hades. But he will not admit that that can have no other meaning than that He preached the gospel there. 'The passage,' he says, 'may very well mean, what we hold it does mean, that our Lord proclaimed Himself and His dominion in Hades, claiming for His own "the things under the earth," asserting Himself as "Lord both of the dead and of the living."' "

Messrs. Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier have just published in this country a small book which handles a great subject in a way that is surprisingly fresh and attractive. The book is entitled *The Christ in Man*; the author is Mr. James M. Campbell; the great subject is the presence of Christ in the believer.

Salvation, according to the faith which has been delivered to most of us, is a double substitution. It consists of two parts,—Christ for me, Christ in me. First, Christ must take the place of my guilty self; and then Christ must take the place of my sinful self. The former substitution, Mr. Campbell thinks, has been well handled already, but the latter has been unaccountably ignored. So he deals very happily with the latter.

We shall not go through the book before you, extracting the marrow of Mr. Campbell's divinity. It is so accessible that to do so would be to deprive him of his right and you of your pleasure. It is enough if, first of all, we say that it is characterised not only by clear thought on so momentous a subject, but also by most felicitous phrase, as when Mr. Campbell reminds us that this is the true doctrine of the Real Presence; and if we add that the little book is introduced by Professor

Bruce of Glasgow, who advises the readers of the volume to read the Gospels along with it.

In an enlarged form, though at a reduced price, Dr. Sanday has issued the third edition of his Bampton Lectures (*Inspiration*. Longmans. 8vo, pp. xxix + 477. 7s. 6d.). The enlargement is due to the presence in an Appendix of a Sermon which Dr. Sanday preached before the University of Oxford on the 21st of October 1894. The sermon is included in the new edition, because it is in close touch with the subject of the Lectures. And Dr. Sanday draws attention to it in his new preface, saying that not only is it an expansion and development of one of the main positions in Lecture III., but 'in the mind of the writer it was also a leading idea—if not *the* leading idea—in the whole series.'

Well, what *is* the leading idea in Dr. Sanday's Bampton Lectures? Let us turn to this sermon in the Appendix and see. Its text is the Revised Version rendering of Exodus xxxiv. 6, 7: 'And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin: and that will by no means clear the guilty.' Now that text states two things about God. It states that He is at once infinitely righteous and infinitely merciful. Not that the adverb 'infinitely' is used. But its meaning is there. In the simple speech of those early days the words chosen mean that,—they mean that God is both infinitely righteous and infinitely merciful.

Now it matters little to what century that writing is ascribed. Give it a place anywhere between the tenth and the seventh B.C. In any case it is most remarkable. No doubt the summit is not yet reached. 'I stopped a little short of the end of the second verse, which adds, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and upon

the children's children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation.'" That also is true; but it is truth in its sternest aspect. And when we come to Ezekiel, and read his clear affirmation of individual responsibility, 'The soul that sinneth it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son,' we know that we have risen beyond the older sterner expression, and we are on our way towards the highest development of this announcement in the teaching of St. Paul. Still, all through, from Exodus to Romans, it is the same double truth that is there: 'Gracious, and that will by no means clear the guilty,' 'Just and the justifier'; and the question is, Where did Israel get it?

Was it experience that gave Israel this wonderful insight? Did her own history enable her to realise, as no other nation realised, the infinite righteousness and the infinite forgiving love of God? Not the infinite forgiving love, at least. 'Full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth; keeping mercy for thousands,'—we could imagine a nation making that comfortable discovery as it sate at ease under its own vine and fig-tree, contemplating the heavens the works of His hands, and the wonderful things which He had done for the children of men. But when had Israel this enjoyment, and how long did it last? Surely to Israel, if to any nation good fortune came late and vanished early, evil was of long and bitter endurance.

Nor was it that Israel looked out upon the things around her and returned and said, 'The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious.' No nation by natural or scientific searching has ever found out a God slow to anger. And as a matter of fact, when Hebrew prophet or psalmist does look out into the world and sets down what he sees, the language which he uses is quite different: 'The earth is full of darkness and cruel habitations' (Ps. lxiv. 21, P.B.); 'Destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace:

have they not known' (Rom. iii. 16, 17, from Isa. lix. 7, 8).

And having reached this point, Dr. Sanday suddenly stops, and asks whether *we* should have found out by any search or process of induction that God is plenteous in mercy. There has been a real amelioration of social conditions. The number of those who have reason to 'praise the Lord for His goodness' has greatly increased. And yet the phrases with which we are most familiar, are they not such as the 'battle of life' and the 'struggle for existence'? For along with our softer manners has gone a deeper insight into the workings of nature and the life-history of other creatures besides man. And when we say 'plenteous in mercy,' then nature, 'red in tooth and claw with ravine, shrieks against our creed.'

But if no experience and no experiment can discover that God is plenteous in mercy, what guarantee have we that it is true? *Try it.* What experiment cannot discover, experience may very well verify. There are some things indeed which cannot be obtained in any other way than this, by first making the venture. 'There are two lines of Wordsworth's "Poet's Epitah,"' says Dr. Sanday, 'which often run in my mind, and seem to me to describe a number of processes besides that to which they are applied: And you must love him, it is said of the poet—

And you must love him, ere to you  
He will seem worthy of your love.

How many things are there which must be loved first before they can be properly understood? How many propositions are there which we must begin by accepting as true, begin by acting upon and testing and applying steadily to practice, before we can form any idea of the amount of real evidence there is for them? There is an anticipatory action in the human mind which sometimes forms its propositions first and proves them afterwards, and which could not prove them in any other way. In the strict terminology of

logic we should call such propositions hypotheses. They are assumed provisionally, in order to be tested by degrees as to whether they can be received as part of the permanent stock of the mind or not. In the language of logic and formal reasoning, we should have to call these propositions in the Book of Exodus hypotheses.'

*We* should have to call them so. But let it never be forgotten that Moses and the prophets did not call them so. Neither by reasoning nor by happy guess did they discover that God is plenteous in mercy. Hypothesis is tentative, and is conscious of being tentative. But the language of the Book of Exodus is not tentative. 'There are regions of exploration in the Bible where the mind seems to be groping its way in the twilight; but this is not one of them. The great leading propositions of the Old Testament are not put forth tentatively. They take the shape nearly always of dogmatic indicatives and categorical imperatives. 'There is no verb at all,' says Dr. Sanday, 'in the two verses I have quoted. They are simply an enlarged "Name," in the pregnant biblical use of the word "Name." We could imagine them inscribed on the rocks of Sinai in letters of light for the assembled people to behold, and once beheld to take into their lives and never let them go again.'

Thus on every side we are hedged in and driven upon the only explanation that remains. How did Israel know that the Lord, the Lord, He is a God full of compassion and gracious? By revelation. It is the only avenue left open. 'Shall we be wrong,' asks Professor Sanday, 'if we say that the writer of the Book of Exodus, or of the document which we have incorporated in the Book of Exodus, was "inspired" to write it? Shall we be wrong if we say that he wrote it in obedience to a prompting from the Spirit of God?'

Now it is nothing that some men should put it so. But that Professor Sanday should put it so is most significant and hopeful. For it is at

this point that all the battles and bickerings of our day meet and concentrate. Is the Bible a record of revelation? Were the men who wrote it inspired — moved, influenced, acted on (use what verb you will) — by the immediate presence of God in the Spirit? That is the question of our day. And Dr. Sanday answers, 'They were.'

## Apostolic and Critical Teaching on the Position of the Pentateuch.

BY THE REV. E. P. BOYS-SMITH, M.A., HORDLE VICARAGE, LYMINGTON.

IF it is true that history repeats itself, none the less is it the fact that it often does so in very unexpected fashion. Twice in the course of Christian history the position of the Pentateuch in the divine education of the world has become a burning question,—once during the apostolic age, and now again to-day. But so different are the causes which have raised the question on the two occasions, and so unlike the methods which have been employed to answer it, that few people notice the parallel, or realise that the apostles and the critics have given replies which are fundamentally alike.

### I.

In the apostolic age the position of the Pentateuch became a question for theology through the pressure of practical difficulties. As soon as baptism was extended to men of foreign blood, there was left no halting-place till the Church made good her claim to catholicity. For many of the Gentile Christians were destitute of Jewish habits, ignorant of Jewish traditions, careless often of Jewish obligations,—in a word, their life was neither moulded nor controlled by the Jewish law. How were Jews zealous for the law to hold fellowship with them as brethren in Christ were bound to do? Every meal was a bar to intercourse; countless points of conventional conduct raised questions of casuistry; and divisions were felt to be deepest in religious rites. Of course there arose the vital question, What is the true relation of the Jewish law to the faith of Jesus Christ and to the Christian life?

Unless the whole position is to be misconceived, it is important to observe that the point at issue was not the relation of Judaism as a whole to

Christianity, but strictly the purpose and obligation of the law. Or to state the matter under another aspect, it was not the relation of the Scriptures of the old covenant to the new covenant of Christ which was in dispute, but only the relation of the Pentateuch to the gospel. The Jews were themselves accustomed to draw a marked distinction between the other sacred writings and the law. The discussions on the limits of the canon were hardly closed in the earlier half of the first century, though its contents were practically determined. To the law supreme importance was ascribed; but the books of the Prophets and the Kethubim were considered of inferior authority. Tradition reached back easily to the time when the Hagiographa were a floating collection of holy writings not marked off definitely from others, and of uncertain number; and in the Jewish schools the dicta of a Hillel counted for as much as the words of an Isaiah. The Pentateuch alone was viewed as the fountain-head of truth. On this 'law' the scribes and Rabbis spent their strength. Round this they drew their 'hedge' of usage and tradition. This they declared to have been kept complete in heaven before being made known on earth to Moses, being in its own nature eternal. Besides this recognised distinction in the schools, there was a real difference in character between the Pentateuch and the other sacred writings which practical men felt. For the Prophets and the other Scriptures deal with moral and spiritual principles without attempting to condense them into a binding system. In them religion is as elastic as life itself. But the Pentateuch consists largely of positive commands and limitations which regulate behaviour often in minute detail. And it