

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

LITTLE can be said yet, beyond what was said last month, about Professor Margoliouth's challenge. Short general reviews of the pamphlet have appeared in the *Guardian* and the *Record*, and Professor Margoliouth has replied to both. Mrs. Gibson has made a somewhat more definite answer in the *Record*, to which Professor Margoliouth has also replied. And having named Professor Driver pointedly in the *Guardian*, he has had the satisfaction of a preliminary letter from him. But all that is preparatory skirmishing, the battle is not begun.

Two things only are brought out. The one is that Professor Margoliouth was himself convinced of the genuineness of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus little more than two years ago. For in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for April 1897 he wrote an article on the famous leaves, and had no suspicion of their being a translation. So if he succeeds in condemning others he will have to admit that he was till recently in the same condemnation himself.

The other thing thus far brought out is that more leaves of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus—be it the original or not—have been discovered and will immediately be published. They cover some ten or twelve chapters. They are in the hands of Dr. Taylor and Dr. Schechter. And Mrs. Gibson

at least expects that they will settle the whole matter.

In the *Expositor* for July, Professor Ramsay gives his judgment on the still unsettled question, What was St. Paul's thorn in the flesh? If his judgment is true, then there is at least one striking likeness between the earliest missionary labour and the latest.

There are two prominent facts regarding the thorn in the flesh. First, the disease was active during St. Paul's residence in Galatia, and yet he could take long journeys. That it was active is evident from his declaration that the Galatians—the Galatian churches in general apparently—saw it and did not despise the sufferer. That it was compatible with long journeys is a necessary belief on either theory of where 'Galatia' was; necessary if you hold with Professor Ramsay that it was South Galatia, more necessary if you believe it was North. Professor Ramsay concludes that it was not a single attack of illness. It was intermittent. Now the apostle was prostrate, now he could travel and preach.

Second, the apostle expected the Galatians to regard the disease with loathing or contempt. Instead of that, they received him as an angel of God. It is clear to Professor Ramsay that there

were these two alternatives : either he was specially under God's curse, or he was specially sustained by God's blessing. Now the inscriptions tell us that there was one disease that was regarded in Asia Minor as due to the immediate action of God. That disease was fever. If a native of that country prayed to the god or goddess to avenge him of his enemy, he prayed that he might be burnt up with fever. For in fever the strength wastes away and there is no visible cause of it. 'May he suffer fevers, chills, torments, pallors, sweatings, heats by day and by night.' That is the translation of a recently discovered inscription.

Professor Ramsay knows about the fevers of Asia Minor. He knows that they come in recurring attacks, and when they pass they leave the sufferer weak but fit to move to higher latitudes. He knows also that one of their most trying accompaniments is severe headache. It is just as the apostle describes it, like a hot bar thrust through the head, like a stake in the flesh.

And Professor Ramsay's judgment is in the line of tradition. The tradition in Asia Minor, which was current as early as the second century, was that the extreme physical pain which accompanied St. Paul's disease, and which he called the stake in the flesh, was severe headache. If we are to give any weight at all to tradition, says Lightfoot, we must give weight to this. Like the minute description of the apostle's face and figure, his headaches have come down by an unbroken tradition from the second century to our own.

In the same number of the *Expositor* Professor Cheyne goes a-hunting after 'husks,' and finds some in unexpected places. The husks which the swine did eat were, as we know, the pods of the carob tree. Well, Professor Cheyne finds them in 2 K 18²⁷, which he translates in this way : 'But the Rab-shakeh said . . . Has he not sent me to the men who sit on the wall, that they may eat their carobs (תְּרוּבִיּוֹת) and drink their sour

wine with you?' The student of Hebrew will see at a glance the 'textual emendations' that furnish the translation.

He finds them also in Is 1^{19, 20}. The translation of the English versions is : 'If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land : but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword : for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.' The phrase 'ye shall be devoured with the sword' is not very easy to take out of the Hebrew. Some render 'ye shall be made to eat the sword.' And Duhm, altering a little, has simply, 'ye shall eat the sword.' But that is difficult both to understand and to do. So Professor Cheyne emends—

'If ye be willing and obedient, the best (fruits) of the land shall ye eat ;

But if ye refuse and rebel, carob pods shall ye eat (תְּרוּבִיּוֹת תֹאכְלוּ),

For Jahwè's mouth hath spoken it.'

And he finds them most unexpectedly of all in 2 K 6²⁵ : 'And there was a great famine in Samaria : and, behold, they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver, and the fourth part of a kab of dove's dung for five pieces of silver.' So the Revised Version. For that is the best that can be made of the present text. 'Surely,' says Professor Cheyne, 'this is hardly what we expect; the narrative is rather painfully interrupted by improbabilities.' So he emends again, and this is the rendering he proposes : 'Now there was a great famine in Samaria (behold, they were besieging it), until a homer of lentils (חֹמֶר לְעֵשֶׂב) was sold for fifty shekels (see LXX), and a quarter of a cor (בֵּר) of carob pods (תְּרוּבִיּוֹת) for five shekels.' And he claims that henceforth we are no longer to charge the Israelites with eating ass's flesh, or rack our ingenuity to show that dove's dung was surely something else.

One of the Revisers, who was also a theological professor, used to entertain his class with anecdotes of the Jerusalem Chamber. The anecdotes derived

their interest from the circumstance of their occupying the lecture hour rather than their own amusement. But there was one that made a distinct impression. Besides the Company that sat round the table, said the Reviser, there was one who was never in the room, but whose word, transmitted mostly by letter, carried more weight than that of any member present. He was too aged and too deaf to be present. He sat in his far-away study and wrote notes which often turned the vote and decided important translations. This mysterious unseen figure, moving the minds that made the Revised Version, caught the imagination of those theological students.

It was Dr. Frederick Field of Norwich. When the Revised Version of the New Testament was issued, on the 17th of May 1881, Dr. Field wrote some notes upon it, which he published three months later under the title of *Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia*. Rather, he did not publish but printed it, and sent copies to some of his friends. It is a paper-covered, unpretentious quarto of 155 pages. In process of time copies came into the second-hand market. But they were very scarce. One student we know waited for years, and failing to pick up a copy got the use of one from a friend and wrote it out with the hand from beginning to end. *Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia*, is so often referred to in the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE that it takes its place in the small list of abbreviated titles. It is known as *ON*.

A new edition of *ON* has just been published. It comes from the Cambridge University Press (8vo, pp. xvii, 268, 7s. net), and is edited by Mr. A. M. Knight of Gonville and Caius College. It contains the whole of the original quarto and much more. First there is the Latin Autobiography which Dr. Field prefixed to his edition of Origen's *Hexapla*, in which he traces his descent from Oliver Cromwell, and confesses his deliberate choice of a life of ease and retirement, 'not to indulge a lazy disposition, but to have freedom for such pursuits as I thought I had some pro-

ficiency in.' Next there are many additional Notes in their proper place, which were left ready for publication when Dr. Field died in 1885, at the age of eighty-three, together with some footnotes which were found jotted on the margin of his own copy of *ON*, and which consist chiefly of classical illustrations. And, finally, there are two short essays printed at the end of the volume. The one is on 'Conversion' as a scriptural term, the other is on the reading of Acts 20²⁴. Both had been published previously, and have been treasured by many in pamphlet form.

We presume that the old quarto is known. The additions are new and refreshing.

In Mt 11²⁸ Dr. Field prefers 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden' to the rendering of A.V., 'All ye that labour and are heavy laden,' which is accepted by R.V. In itself the word (κοπιῶντες) may be translated either way, but the use of the LXX, he holds, is in favour of 'weary.' He quotes 2 S 17², 'I will come upon him while he is weary (κοπιῶν) and weak handed,' and Is 40³⁰, 'Even the youths shall faint and be weary (κοπιασοῦσι).'

In Mk 6²⁰ A.V. reads: 'For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly.' But for 'he did many things' (πολλά ἐποίησεν) R.V. prefers the reading, 'he was much perplexed' (πολλά ἠπόρει). Dr. Field prefers the old reading. The new is supported by great manuscripts (BL^{MS}), but the old has the support of all the versions except one. He thinks the new reading arose out of another occasion. In Lk 9⁷ it is said that when Herod heard of all that was done by Jesus 'he was perplexed' (διηπόρει). His perplexity in regard to the character and claims of Jesus has been transferred by some early copyist to his relations with the Baptist.

But if 'he did many things' is right, what were the 'many things' which Herod did? The

question is often asked, but to ask it, says Dr. Field, is to miss the point. The point is, not that he did many things, but that there was one thing he would not do. Demosthenes says of a certain king who was threatened with hostilities by a neighbouring power that he sent ambassadors to say he was ready to do everything. We understand that to mean an unconditional surrender. Herod did not make an unconditional surrender. The remark, says Dr. Field, is as old as Elsner that Herod did many things, but not that principal thing which John was urging upon him, he did not send his brother's wife away.

In Lk 2¹² the shepherds are told that they shall find a babe, and in v. 16 it is added that they found the babe. Dr. Field wonders that even the Revisers did not catch the distinction. In the first case it is the simple verb 'to come upon' (ἐδρῆσεν); in the second it is the compound (ἀνεύρον), which means 'to search and find,' 'to discover.' St. Luke is the only New Testament writer who uses the compound verb, and Hobart pointed out long ago that it is the word used by medical writers of finding out the seat of a disease. In this case it was the seat of the remedy that was found out.

The longest of the new Notes is on Lk 2⁴⁹. The Authorized Version reads, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' The Revised Version prefers, 'Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?' The words (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου) are certainly susceptible of either translation. Dr. Field gives examples of both. But he holds decidedly by the second.

For, in the first place, he is quite sure that Jesus used words which were perfectly intelligible to His hearers. It is true that His parents 'understood not the saying which He spake unto them.' But that was not because they had any difficulty with its grammatical structure; it was because they did not see its appropriateness in the mouth of the speaker, its bearing on the actual circum-

stances. At a later period our Lord told His disciples that 'the Son of Man should be delivered unto the Gentiles, and they should scourge Him, and put Him to death, and the third day He should rise again.' There could be no doubt of the grammatical meaning of that sentence; yet we read that 'they understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.'

The words which Jesus used, then, were intelligible to His hearers. And if He spoke in Aramaic, they were intelligible to His Greek translator. But His translator has chosen a phrase which does not at once suggest the meaning 'about my Father's business.' To almost every reader of Greek it suggests another meaning. The presumption is that the words of Jesus distinctly bore that other meaning.

That other meaning is the one chosen by the Revisers. Dr. Field gives many examples of it. Thus in Gn 41⁵¹ Joseph says, 'God hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house.' The Hebrew is unmistakable, as it contains the word for 'house' (וּמֵתָ כָּל-בֵּית אָבִי), but the LXX is simply, 'and all the of my father' (καὶ πάντων τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς μου) exactly as in St. Luke.

But if examples do not prove it, then Dr. Field believes that a study of the context will take all doubt away. The complaint of Mary is that they had suffered much anxiety in *seeking* Him. 'How is it,' He replies, 'that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?' If they had known that, they would not have had to seek, they would have gone straight to the Father's house to find Him. But if he had said, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' that was no answer to their complaint. He might be about the Father's business anywhere, they could not tell where to seek and find Him.

In the war between faith and unfaith there is always some science or other in evidence. At the

present moment it is Anthropology. So the opening article in the current number of the *London Quarterly* is on 'Anthropology and Christianity.' Its writer is Professor Alexander Macalister of Cambridge.

Professor Macalister is scarcely prepared to grant the name of 'science' to anthropology yet. As yet little more has been done by anthropologists than to collect the data of a science. These have not been adequately tested, classified, and compared. In physical anthropology help has come from the cognate branches of biology. But in sociology, in psychology, and in comparative religion 'we are as yet a long way from the reduction of the phenomena to subordination to comprehensive general laws.' But it is just when a science is at this stage that it is dangerous. For then you can make anything of it you please, and use it for any purpose. The popular writers, the writers who purvey for the non-scientific public, are in their best form when the science is in its worst. And it is not surprising to hear Dr. Macalister say that their attacks on Christianity, in the name of anthropology, have received far more attention than they deserved.

At the point where anthropology first touches the doctrine of the Bible, man has made two discoveries. He has discovered God and his own soul. An earlier point of contact is claimed by some in the name of physical anthropology. That point is the creation of man. But Professor Macalister holds that evolution is at present in too fluid a state to base a disagreement with the doctrine of the Bible upon it. All that can be said about the doctrine of derivation, as he calls it, is that it furnishes us with a good working hypothesis which is in accord with such facts as we know of man's structure and history, and serves to unite these facts and make them intelligible. But it is premature to say what form the theory will finally assume. The older crude Lamarckian and Darwinian forms have given place to Weismannism. Weismannism is probably only a preliminary

stage towards a more satisfactory form of the hypothesis. All that can be affirmed at present is that there is nothing in physical anthropology which denies a First Cause, nothing which contradicts the biblical narrative of the Creation, if it is critically interpreted.

But when in biblical phrase man stands 'in the Garden of Eden,' anthropology joins hands with the narrative in the Bible. Man has a soul, a sense of responsibility. That sense is awakened in him by a simple taboo—there is a forbidden fruit-tree. The momentous moral decision which man makes in the Garden of Eden, and which is described as the opening of the eyes, is in strict accordance with the findings of anthropology. From that time forth man has a distinct sense of right and wrong, and anthropology has succeeded in showing that there is not on the face of the earth a race or family of man that does not possess that sense.

Professor Macalister hints, as he passes, that we may have to consider our theological language again. He finds we speak of the Fall of Man. He does not find that phrase in the Bible. And he does not say if anthropology will finally countenance it. All he says at present is, that there is complete agreement between the biblical story and the findings of anthropology as to the discovery of man's soul, the development of man's moral sense.

And this leads on to another discovery. The soul of man does not die. How soon after the discovery of the moral sense man discovered its indestructibility we cannot tell. But we know two things. The first is that as far back as the Bible carries us man has the sense of his soul's immortality. The other is that over all the earth man has it still. Anthropology carries us back to the first discovered remains of man. He is already burying his dead in hope of a blessed immortality—sending food, clothing, weapons, companions into the other life along with his dead. And anthropology carries us over the face of the earth.

'It is true,' says Professor Max Müller, 'and I believe has never been contested, that even the lowest savages possess words for body and soul.' 'A belief in the persistence of life after death,' says M. Renouf, 'and the observance of religious practices founded on the belief, may be discovered in every part of the world, in every age, and among men representing every degree and variety of culture.'

The other great discovery is the discovery of God. How soon man discovered God, the Bible does not tell us, and anthropology does not know. When the Bible speaks its opening word, God is there. As far back as anthropology can carry us, God is there. Once more they are in agreement. And that God was there at the beginning, anthropology again assures us, because belief in God is as universal as belief in the soul.

Again Dr. Macalister hints that we may have to revise our terminology. He speaks of the *discovery* of God and of the soul. We have been wont to speak of their *revelation*. He does not object to revelation. He says, indeed, 'The God is revealed to man as he observes His working in nature; the soul is discovered by man as he finds it revealed by introspection into the working of his own life and thought, and by observation of the life and action of his neighbours.' But that is scarcely the conception we have been wont to hold of revelation. We must weigh our words, he seems to say. We may have to

change some of the names we give to the facts which the Bible teaches us. With the facts themselves anthropology is in complete accord.

And there are more surprising things than even those that have been named on which anthropology and the Bible agree. Professor Macalister gathers them together at the end of his article. It is enough if we simply state them here. Anthropology finds that mankind universally recognizes the existence of certain obligations on the part of the individual towards God and towards his fellow-men, which are connected with corresponding penalties for breakers of them. The Bible agrees with that. Anthropology finds that among almost all mankind above the very lowest grade of culture, there is a belief in, or an expectation of, the incarnation of the god. The Bible agrees with that. Anthropology finally finds that, coincidentally with the belief in incarnation, there is a belief or expectation of the death of the representative of the god and of his rising again, and a further belief that through this resurrection the race is to be benefited. The Bible agrees with that.

At the last moment we have received Professor König's examination of Professor Margoliouth's pamphlet. It speaks for itself. But we may say here that of all the scholars we knew, König and Nöldeke seemed to us most competent to review the pamphlet, and we sent it to Professor König because he had taken no part in the previous controversy over the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus.