

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHAT did our Lord mean when He spoke of the Kingdom of God? Some time ago the question was asked of four representative theologians in this country, and their answers were published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The editor of the *Biblical World* of Chicago has just put the same question to a number of American scholars. Eleven have answered. Their answers are short and intelligible. They appear in the issue for August.

The editor of the *Biblical World* asked three questions—(1) Does the term, 'the Kingdom of God,' as used by Jesus, have a social content, or does it have reference solely to conduct and a condition of one's spiritual life? (2) Is the term primarily or exclusively eschatological? (3) What are the three or four best discussions of the subject?

To the last question the eleven scholars do not all reply. Those who do reply name eleven books. Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus* is mentioned by four different men. Bruce's *Kingdom of God* and Shailer Mathews' *Social Teaching of Jesus* are recommended twice. The rest are named but once. They are: Herbert Stead's 'Primer' on *The Kingdom of God*, Maurice's *The Kingdom of God*, Baldensperger's *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, Toy's *Judaism and Christianity*, Issel's *Lehre vom Reiche*

*Gottes im N.T.*, J. Weiss' *Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, Weiss' *Biblical Theology*, and Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology*.

To the second question, 'Is the term primarily or exclusively eschatological?' and to both its parts, the answer of every writer is 'No!' The Kingdom of God in the teaching of our Lord does not refer exclusively to the future, it does not refer primarily to the future. Every one holds that it passes into the future at last. It is not complete without its manifestation in the world to come. Some say that it is never seen in its perfection till then. But all agree that, whatever it is, it is in this life that it begins, it is in this life that we chiefly have to do with it.

What is it then? That is the question which these American scholars chiefly strive to answer. It is a difficult question, and the scholars are of varied theological position. It is not surprising that they do not altogether agree upon the answer. The surprise is that they come so close together as they do. For they almost all agree upon two grand propositions.

The first is that the Kingdom of God is 'a relationship between the individual soul and God.' These are the very words of Professor Rush Rhees of the Newton Theological Institution. Professor

G. H. Gilbert of Chicago says that the phrase has not a constant meaning in the teaching of Jesus. In one group of passages (as Mt 6<sup>10</sup>) the predominant idea is the rule of God, in another (like Mt 13<sup>24-30</sup>) it is the company of those who are under the Divine rule, in a third (as Mt 21<sup>48</sup>) it is the privileges of those who are under the Divine rule, and in a fourth class (as Mt 8<sup>11</sup>) it is the place to be occupied in the future by those who are under the Divine rule. But Professor Gilbert finds the spiritual relationship of the individual to God the first step in the realization of the Kingdom. 'The Kingdom of heaven in the sense of *the rule of God* is,' he says, 'exclusively spiritual. It is realized wholly from within, never from without. It is individual, not social.' Says Professor Peabody of Harvard, 'The preaching of the Kingdom of God by Jesus is, I think, not to be detached from His central revelation of the life of God in the soul of man. Nothing could be less accurate than to think of Jesus as primarily a social reformer or organizer or revolutionist. The message to which He felt Himself peculiarly called made Him indeed extraordinarily reticent about changes in social organization. He is not a reformer, He is a revealer.'

The Kingdom of God begins then in the soul of man. To that position only one writer objects. Dr. Robert A. Woods of Boston does not understand a relationship to God that is not a relationship to our fellow-men. In the teaching of Jesus he can find no distinction between 'spirituality' and 'social morality.' He even says that according to the teaching of Jesus they are the last to enter the Kingdom of God who deny that religion is anything else than just the loving relationship of man to man. Matthew Arnold used to say that religion was morality touched by emotion. Dr. Woods does not even need the emotion; it is morality pure and simple. But in saying so Dr. Woods stands alone. All the rest believe that religion or the realization of the Kingdom of God is first of all a transaction between the individual soul and God.

But in the second place the Kingdom of God is social. It is a relationship between man and man. On that point all are agreed. 'It seems very clear,' says Professor Rush Rhees, 'that the relation between the individual soul and God involves such issues in the conduct of the individual toward his fellows as to give to the conception a large social content, and that this social result is essential to the realization of the Kingdom of God—the filial relation of the individual soul to God being the means by which the larger Kingdom is to find its realization.' Professor McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, New York, puts the matter as plainly. He understands Jesus to have preached a genuine Kingdom. This was constituted by the association, first with Himself and then with each other, of disciples who accepted His message. There was thus a social element in the Kingdom from the beginning. 'It meant not simply individual consciousness of divine sonship on the renovation of the individual life, but the association of the disciples of Christ.'

Those then are the two grand propositions upon which these writers are almost all agreed. But there is a third which they suggest though they do not all agree upon it. Is there an outward organization here on earth of the Kingdom of God, and as an outward organization does God come into direct intercourse with it? In other words, Is the Kingdom of God simply another name for the Church?

That the Kingdom of God is another name for the 'Invisible Church' no one of these writers, we imagine, would deny. That is not the question. The question is, Does the Church of Christ as visibly organized upon earth, represent the Kingdom of God in its present earthly manifestation? Three of the writers touch that question deliberately.

Professor Peabody says that when one considers the total impression to be derived from the teaching of Jesus, the Kingdom of God certainly seems

to have been in His mind not a remote Utopia, or a political rule, or even a church, but a spiritual brotherhood, potentially present and world-subduing. Professor Gilbert says that the Kingdom of God in the sense of 'the company of those who are under the Divine rule,' is the equivalent of 'church' in Mt 16<sup>18</sup>, but neither term has any outward organization in the teaching of Jesus. And Professor Marvin Vincent says that in its present stage it is not identical with the Church. He holds, in apparent opposition to Professor Gilbert, that it implies and involves organization. He looks upon the Church, too, as 'ideally its representative.' But he adds, 'Though the Church is where the Kingdom is, the Kingdom is not always where the Church is.'

No student of Hebrew feels himself entitled to be called a Hebrew scholar until he has discovered a new explanation of the name Jehovah. In Hebrew it is a word of four letters (יהוה), and they call it affectionately the Tetragrammaton. It is true that the Hebrew scholar is ready soon to give up his own explanation, as he has already rejected the explanation of everyone else. Still the Hebrew student must become a Hebrew scholar, and he crosses the line with a new explanation of the Tetragrammaton. The latest explanation, as we write, is by Mr. G. H. Skipwith. It is published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for July.

It is true that Hebrew scholars reject all other explanations, and then despair of their own. But the explanations are not lost. They show us that one more way of explaining the Tetragrammaton is impossible, and clear it out of the way. They sometimes even carry us a step nearer the actual explanation. For we all believe that an actual explanation is lying somewhere ahead of us. And, indeed, they are sometimes—like Mr. Skipwith's explanation—so credible that we rest for the time in the comfortable assurance that the actual explanation has been found.

Mr. Skipwith believes that the Tetragrammaton is a war-cry, and its meaning, GOD WILL BE WITH US.

The ancient Arabic war-cry, says Professor Robertson Smith, was usually the name of the tribe, or the name of the god of the tribe. Mr. Skipwith believes that in the age of Thothmes III, there existed in Syria pastoral tribes of Hebrew race, invoking the tribal deity under the respective appellations of Jacob-el (יעקב אל) and Joseph-el (יוסף אל). In course of time Egypt extended its power over the territories in which these tribes fed their flocks, and the tribe of Joseph migrated or was deported, into Egypt. It was subsequently joined by the more important tribe of Jacob. The tribes united and found an expression for the union in the new tribal invocation, Isra-el. Then followed a period of servitude. At last the oppressed people found a deliverer in one of their own race. This leader, in order to unite and stimulate the sufferers whom he addressed, proclaimed a new *symbolum fidei*, a new name for the nation's God. He devised or adopted the name JEHOVAH.

Now Jehovah (יהוה) means simply 'He will be.' And that is plainly nothing in itself. But *el*, or God, is understood as its subject. Maspero tells us that it was the practice in Egypt to shorten royal names by leaving out the name of the God. Ptahsnofrui, 'Ptah has made me good,' is contracted into Snofrui, 'He has made me good'; Khnumkhufui, 'Khnum has protected me,' is contracted into Khufui, 'He has protected me.' There was a similar custom in Palestine. Jacob and Joseph are contracted names. The full forms, Jacob-el and Joseph-el, have been found in the lists of Thothmes III., and other ancient monuments. Here, however, the contraction was due to the need of brevity in a war-cry. Jehovah, therefore, may be taken for Jehovah-el, and its meaning, *God will be*.

God will be—what? No doubt it is well if the predicate could be completed, but it does not

follow that it must be completed. It may be that God leaves the completion to the imagination or experience of the worshipper. Is He not content with revealing Himself, as 'I will be what I will be?' But the experience of the true worshipper was always able at last to fill the meaning out. With the help of Ex 3<sup>12</sup> and other passages, we also are able to fill it out. 'Certainly I will be *with thee*,' says the God of Israel. It is His revelation of Himself to the nation at this great moment in its history. It is His new name. They shortened it because it must be their tribal war-cry; but they knew that its full signification was **JEHOVAH WILL BE WITH US** (יהוה עמנו).

Now a good explanation usually explains other things besides itself. Mr. Skipwith claims that his explanation of 'Jehovah' explains the phrase, 'Jehovah of Hosts.' It is simply 'The God of Hosts will be with us'—the hosts of heaven, which form the court and council of Jehovah, being invoked to fight on behalf of the armies of Israel. And it explains the more difficult expression 'Immanuel.' For if Jehovah means 'God will be with us,' then when Isaiah desired the unborn babe of his prophecy to carry the name of sweetest promise, what higher name would he give it than the name of Jehovah Himself? The child could not of course bear the actual name of Deity. But the name of Deity had a meaning to Isaiah. It meant 'God will be with us.' And Isaiah gave it that name—*Immanuel*.

'The Autobiography of Jesus' is the enticing title of an article by Professor B. W. Bacon in the *American Journal of Theology* for July. In these days of rapid discovery, the mind runs out, first of all, upon the expectation of some new document in early Christian literature. But the interest is not evaporated when we find that it is part of the old documents, only in a new setting. For Professor Bacon succeeds in making that setting, which is so novel, as to be almost incredible at first, a plausible thing in itself, and the

possible explanation of that most perplexing scene in the life of our Lord, which we call His temptation.

A paper on our Lord's temptation has recently appeared in **THE EXPOSITORY TIMES**. Another and more radical paper will appear anon. Some account of this American article may appropriately come in between. For if it is true, as Professor Bacon believes, that the period of the temptation was 'the all-important period, when the Messianic consciousness of Jesus was ripening towards its bloom,' the study of the temptation is one which commends itself equally from the religious and scientific point of view; and if conducted with due reverence, no research, as he most truly adds, can be so rich in helpful return to the devout spirit.

Professor Bacon believes that the period of the temptation was that in which Jesus became conscious of His Messianic vocation. Or rather, to be precise—for he is very precise himself—he believes with Beyschlag that 'the moment of the baptismal vision was that in which for the first time, and with overwhelming force, the conviction burst upon Jesus of His personal call to the Messiahship.' Weiss holds, on the contrary, that this conviction had come to Him already, in the quiet ripening of His own thoughts, and that the baptismal vision was only its Divine corroboration. But Professor Bacon cannot agree with that. He cannot believe that until He was called *from God*, Jesus would have harboured for a moment the thought of His personal Messiahship. For so He would have done what the writer to the Hebrews (5<sup>5</sup>) expressly says He did not—'glorify Himself to be made a high priest.' But Professor Bacon's strongest objection to an earlier knowledge on Jesus' part of His Messiahship is the fact that the baptismal vision was followed immediately by the temptation in the wilderness.

For if Jesus had long since determined His Messianic calling in His own mind, why this over-

whelming revulsion of feeling now? But if the great revelation came to Him now, then it was natural—might we not say it was inevitable—that it should be followed by such a great revulsion of feeling? Might we not say that it was natural, if not inevitable, that the moment the conviction of His high calling came upon Him, He should have to face and repudiate unworthy conceptions of it? So Professor Bacon believes that the reason why ‘immediately the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness,’ was because immediately He had reached the knowledge of His unique altitude, and that is just the moment with Him, as with everyone of His followers, that Satan must have Him that he may sift Him as wheat.

Satan desired to have Him. That reference at once raises the question, What was the nature of His temptation? It is in answering that question that Professor Bacon makes his discovery.

If we must find a probable source for all the incidents recorded in the Gospels, then we cannot hesitate to agree with Professor Bacon, that the account of the temptation in the wilderness came from the lips of the Lord Himself. But if Jesus Himself told the story of His temptation, is it not open to suppose that He told it, not as it actually came to Him, which it might be quite impossible for us to understand, but symbolically, using imagery as the means of most clearly and most impressively conveying the actual fact? Professor Bacon thinks it is extremely probable. He used imagery on other occasions. In speaking of the temptation of Simon and the Twelve, did He not boldly adopt the imagery of Job? Did He not use imagery, and exactly similar imagery, when He said, ‘I beheld Satan as lightning fallen from heaven?’ Jesus the sinless has the story to tell of an awful struggle with sin.

Every word that He speaks has been fierily furnaceed  
In the blast of a soul that has struggled in earnest.

But it must be told in symbol. Professor Bacon believes it certain that the imagery of the tempta-

tion is the imagery of Jesus’ own narrative. And thus he delivers himself at once from the mediæval theory which clothed every suggestion to evil in the bodily form of the Evil One, and from its modern successor, the so-called vision theory, which suggests that the temptations were only delusive enticements spontaneously springing up in the pure and spiritual mind of Jesus. But that is not Professor Bacon’s discovery.

His discovery is the time when Jesus told the story of His temptation. The baptism and the temptation are, in Professor Bacon’s view, ‘the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.’ Two of the evangelists begin with the story of the birth, but he doubts if Jesus Himself would have begun with that. Whether historically trustworthy or not—and Professor Bacon says nothing whatever about that—the story of the birth could not have come from the lips of Jesus, who rested His Messianic claims on no questions of birth or pedigree, but lifted Himself to a totally different level by His question to the scribes, ‘The Christ, whose Son is He?’ But though the baptism and temptation are the beginning of the gospel, the account of them could not, Professor Bacon holds, have been told to the disciples till the closing weeks of the ministry.

For Professor Bacon believes that St. Mark is right, ‘as against certain disputed appearances of the other Gospels,’ in representing the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi as the first, unambiguous accepted recognition of Jesus as Messiah by others, or claim to the title and office on His part. On any other supposition, it is incomprehensible to him that Jesus should so solemnly welcome Peter’s ‘great intuition,’ that He should recognize Peter as the first stone of the new temple made without hands, and bestow upon him the symbol of the keys of the kingdom. It is incredible to him that Jesus should charge the twelve to tell no man that He was the Christ, if the fact had been already communicated to others.

But if for the first time at Cæsarea Philippi Jesus elicits the recognition of Himself as the Messiah, it must have been just then and there, says Professor Bacon, that He told the story of His temptation. For, 'in justice to His hearers, He must make known both on what ground He has come to believe Himself called of God to this supremely exalted station, and also in what sense He understands His mission.' As St. Paul, from the moment that he knows his apostleship to be impugned, immediately tells the story of his 'call,' so 'it is impossible that Jesus should ask others to believe Him to be the chosen of God, and not relate to them in the same breath how it had been divinely made known to Him.'

And when Professor Bacon examines the Gospel text, especially the text of St. Matthew, he thinks he can lay his finger on the very spot where the story should come in. Just when Jesus has spoken His 'strangely harsh answer to Peter's well-meant expostulation—quite too harsh in the absence of anything more to explain and soften—*Get thee behind Me, Satan*, thou art a stumbling-block unto Me; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men—just then, in St. Matthew's Gospel, there occur sayings which have no immediate connexion, and seem to belong to a different place. Let these sayings be removed; let the narrative of the temptation take their place; let the narrative end with the words, 'For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then shall He render unto every man according to his deeds; verily, I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom'—and then Professor Bacon's discovery is made. He has discovered the place and significance of the story of the temptation.

'It has been known for some months past that the most startling discovery in Egypt within recent times was made last winter by Mr. Quibell. But

the secret of all its details has been jealously guarded. No one has been able to draw the discoverer out. A prominent Paris scholar succeeded in obtaining a few photographs. A great French explorer knew of certain rumours which he had heard while in Egypt. A well-known German Egyptologist succeeded in getting on the track of small bits of information. The English authorities who were in possession of the chief material were not allowed to write upon the subject.'

Thereupon the *Sunday School Times* of America, which tells the story in the words just read, determined to find the facts and publish them. Professor W. Max Müller of Philadelphia was sent to England. From England he went to France, from France to Germany, and then he secured enough of the facts to write an article on them. It is published in the *Sunday School Times* for 30th July.

Professor Max Müller has been successful. So far as we can see, silence still sealed the lips of the fortunate discoverer himself. But Professor Flinders Petrie was communicative; so were Mr. F. L. Griffith and Dr. J. Walker. And although we are not yet able to realize the vast importance of the find, enough is told us to make it easy for us to believe Professor Max Müller's statement that Mr. Quibell's find reveals more of the life, art, and history of 'prehistoric' Egypt than all other discoveries that have been made.

The finds were made in Upper Egypt. There are twin cities there on either bank of the Nile. The one on the eastern bank was called Nekhbet by the ancient Egyptians, Eileithyia by the Greeks; its name is now El-Kab. The one on the western bank was called Nekhen, then Hieraconpolis, or 'City of the Hawks'; it is now Kom el-Ahmar, which means 'The Red Hill.' The latter is the scene of the discovery. In the Greek age, as in the present, it was an insignificant settlement. But when it had the name Nekhen (or some earlier one), that is to say, four, five, or even six

thousand years B.C., it was a city of great importance. Now a city that once was great and then lost its greatness is the place to look for treasure. Mr. Quibell looked there, and found it.

He found an old temple. It was old even in the time of King Pepy (to follow Professor Max Müller's spelling) of the sixth dynasty, for that king restored it. And in the small rooms of that temple and on a spot slightly east of it, he found the prehistoric relics. Just before entering its chambers he discovered 'a wonderful monument in the shape of a hawk, more than two feet high, with two high feathers, and the royal serpent (*uraeus*) on the head.' It is a god, of hammered gold laid over wood and bronze, and the weight of the gold is more than eighty sovereigns, so that it is the largest piece of gold ever found in Egypt. 'To judge from objects near it, this idol, which may have been extremely old, was

buried there for safety's sake by kings of the twelfth dynasty, somewhat before 2000 B.C.'

This idol is of artistic value. It is not old enough to be of great historic value. Inside the temple itself were the objects of historic value found. They are chiefly globes shaped like mace-heads, bowls, knives, and statuettes, and they are very many. Over a hundred 'mace-heads' and bowls were found buried in one trench. Some are in a poor state of preservation, for the ground was not quite free from moisture, and the ivory has rotted; some were deliberately shattered, as was done with so many objects when given to the dead. But enough remains to prove to us the reality of 'prehistoric' art, to vex us with the difficulty of 'prehistoric' hieroglyphics, and even to teach us something of the history of 'prehistoric' Egypt. We wait the publication of Mr. Quibell's volume now.

## Samuel Rolles Driver.

BY THE REV. G. A. COOKE, B.D., LATE FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

If the disciple is to write about the master it can only be with that admiration and gratitude which everyone who has come under Dr. Driver's training cannot help feeling. We look back to the 'Advanced Hebrew' lectures at Christ Church as to the time when we were taught how to lay the foundation of solid and accurate scholarship. Dr. Driver is the most stimulating of teachers, not because he makes any appeal to the imagination or clothes his words in any particularly attractive form, but because he is so intellectually satisfying. His lectures are an education in scientific method. There is the searching examination of the grammar of the text, the masterly grouping of illustrative material, and then the carefully worded, exact induction. It is all perfectly lucid, sober, and complete. To hear Dr. Driver expound the usages of a Hebrew preposition is an intellectual treat, as satisfying as any demonstration in a scientific laboratory.

Like all great scholars, Dr. Driver has his characteristic method, which is the outcome of

his own experience: he never went to any German university to learn it. Briefly, his method may be said to be, grammar first, criticism afterwards. For years before he made public his conclusions upon the literary and historical criticism of the Old Testament, he devoted himself to an exhaustive study of its language. He had previously undergone a thorough training in the classical, mathematical, and philosophical schools of the university, in all of which he had highly distinguished himself; so that he brought to the study of the Semitic languages a singularly well-equipped and disciplined mind. The chief product of his linguistic studies is the well-known *Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, which appeared in 1874; 2nd edition, 1881; 3rd edition, revised and improved, 1892. This book marks an epoch in the study of the language of the Old Testament. It was the first attempt in English to deal with Hebrew syntax in a way at once philosophical and comprehensive. It placed the author immediately in the front rank of living Hebraists,