

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE remarkable communication from Mrs. Lewis to this issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is sure to attract attention, and scarcely need be mentioned here. Copies of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be sent to all the great libraries throughout the world, and to all scholars who are in a position to assist in the search.

The fourth volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* has been published. It contains 994 pages or 1988 columns. Its first article is PLEROMA by Professor Walter Lock, its last is ZUZIM by Professor S. R. Driver.

It is the largest volume of the four, and contains more than its share of the great theological articles. Beginning with PLEROMA, it gives us POOR by Professor Driver, an exhaustive article on a theme that is almost new to English readers; POWER OF THE KEYS by Professor Mason, his only article in the Dictionary; PRAYER by Canon E. R. Bernard of Salisbury, who also writes the articles on RESURRECTION and SIN; PREDESTINATION by Professor Warfield of Princeton, an unflinching representation of the Bible doctrine, to be read along with Professor Stanton's article on the WILL; PROMISE by Professor Denney; and PROPHECY by the late Professor A. B. Davidson.

The article on PROPHECY fills forty-one columns. It is the finest work we believe that Professor Davidson ever published. We do not know if that was his own judgment. Of the previous articles which he contributed to the Dictionary, he himself said that none of them was better than JEREMIAH, but most of the reviewers gave the preference to the article in the same volume on GOD in the Old Testament.

There are many other theological articles in this volume. PROPHET in the New Testament has been written by Professor Gwatkin, and PROPITIATION by Professor Driver. Propitiation is a subject which has been strangely shunned of late, even by evangelical preachers, the result, perhaps, of un-scholarly misrepresentation. Dr. Driver's article puts the facts forth plainly and exhaustively. It proves that propitiation is the very heart of the Gospel. RANSOM and REDEMPTION have been contributed by Professor Adams Brown of New York, REGENERATION and SANCTIFICATION by Professor Bartlet of Oxford, RECONCILIATION by Mr. Adamson of Dundee, and REPENTANCE by Mr. W. Morgan of Tarbolton, RIGHTEOUSNESS in the Old Testament by Professor Skinner of Cambridge, and in the New by Professor Stevens of Yale. The SACRAMENTS have been dealt with by Dr. Plummer of Durham, and SACRIFICE by

Professor Paterson of Aberdeen. Then come the two important articles on the SON OF GOD and the SON OF MAN, the former by Professor Sanday, the latter by Professor Driver. Professor Stanton of Cambridge has written TRUTH and WORLD, and Dr. Moulton has contributed an article on ZOROASTRIANISM.

In other departments than that of theology this volume is not so conspicuous. Only a few of the books of the Bible fall within its range. But the Book of PSALMS does so, the article being written by Professor W. T. Davison; REVELATION also, written by Professor Porter of Yale, whose article on the Apocrypha was declared by the late Professor Davidson to be the best thing ever written on that subject. We have also ROMANS by Principal Robertson of King's College, SAMUEL by Mr. Stenning, SONG OF SONGS by Professor Rothstein, THESSALONIANS and the PASTORAL EPISTLES by Professor Lock, TOBIT by Principal Marshall of Manchester, WISDOM by Professor Siegfried, ZECHARIAH by Professor Nowack, and ZEPHANIAH by Dr. Selbie. Some of the great Versions are here. Besides the general article by Principal Bebb, we have the SYRIAC VERSIONS and the SEPTUAGINT by Professor Nestle, who also writes on SIRACH and the TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, the other GREEK VERSIONS by Mr. Redpath, the Vulgate by Mr. H. J. White, and the ENGLISH VERSIONS by Mr. Milligan.

For the Geography of Palestine General Sir Charles Wilson's name is as conspicuous in this volume as that of General Warren was in vol. iii. and of Colonel Conder in vols. i. and ii. Some difficult places have been described by Professor Driver. Professor Max Müller has written on PUT and TARSHISH, Professor Margoliouth on SHEBA, Dr. Pinches on SHINAR, Professor Rendel Harris on MOUNT SINAI, Professor G. Adam Smith on TRACHONITIS, Mr. Ewing on several places in Palestine, Dr. Mackie of Beyrout on TYRE and ZIDON, Professor Patrick and Mr. Relton con-

jointly on ROME, while Professor W. M. Ramsay has as formerly done all the Asia Minor work.

Next to the Biblical Theology, there is no department so strong as that of Antiquities. The articles on the TABERNACLE and the TEMPLE fall within this volume, the former by Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, the latter by Professor Witton Davies. Professor Kennedy also writes the article on the WEIGHTS AND MEASURES of the Bible, and the articles on SANCTUARY and on URIM AND THUMMIM. An article on POTTERY, illustrated from recent discoveries, is contributed by Dr. F. J. Bliss. Professor Graf Baudissin gives a full account of PRIESTS AND LEVITES, while Professor Bacher has handled the allied subjects SANHEDRIN and SYNAGOGUE. The volume also contains SABBATH by Professor Driver, and SABBATICAL YEAR by Mr. Harford-Battersby, SEPULCHRE by Professor Nicol, SLAVERY by Principal Whitehouse, SHEKINAH by Principal Marshall, PRECIOUS STONES by Professor Flinders Petrie, CONFUSION OF TONGUES by Professor Driver, and GIFT OF TONGUES by Principal Robertson, TRADE AND COMMERCE by Professor Bennett, UNCLEANNESS by Professor Peake, TIME by Mr. Abrahams, WAR by Professor Emery Barnes, WATER by Mr. James Patrick, WOMAN and WORSHIP by Professor Adeney, and WRITING by Dr. Kenyon.

There is an article in the *Sunday School Times* of Philadelphia of 26th April on the superiority of the American Revised Version. The article is written by the Rev. Louis Agassiz Gould. He shows the superiority of the New Testament of 1901 over that of 1881 by printing parallel quotations.

The first quotation he prints is Mt 6²⁷, 'Which of you by being anxious can add one cubit unto his stature?' That is the Revision of 1881, the American Revision reads, 'can add one cubit unto the measure of his life.' The next important

passage is Ac 17²², 'Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are somewhat superstitious.' The American Revisers prefer 'very religious.' Take 1 Co 15³³ next. 'Evil company doth corrupt good manners' says 1881. 'Evil companionships corrupt good morals' says 1901. In Ph 2⁶, 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God,' becomes, 'Who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped.' Mr. Gould says that the new translation of He 11¹ 'is worth the price of the book.' The English Revision gives, 'Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen,' the American, 'Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen.'

Those are the best examples. Of the rest we notice that instead of 'a penny' in Mt 22¹⁹, the American Revision gives 'a denarius,' with the marginal note, 'about seventeen cents.' 'Bewrayeth thee' in Mt 26⁷³ is changed into 'maketh thee known'—which does not seem to hit the meaning. 'The perfect' of 1 Co 2⁶ becomes 'full-grown,' 'mortify' in Col 3⁵ is 'put to death,' 'instant' in 2 Ti 4² is 'urgent,' and 'conscience of sins' in He 10² is 'consciousness of sins'—all good changes, and more necessary than our Revisers seem to have been aware of.

There is an article on the same subject in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April by Professor Whitney. Its title is 'The Latest Translation of the Bible.' It is less laudatory of the American Revision. Professor Whitney is dissatisfied with all the translations that exist.

For he holds that Western translators have never realized the difference between their own and an Eastern tongue. There is a boldness of figure in the East which takes a Western's breath away. This figurative language has for the most part been tamely translated into literal English. And then it has often afforded occasion for pro-

tracted disputes in theology. And besides that, there is a plainness of speech in the Bible which is easily capped in modern Arabic, but which our translators have been afraid to reproduce, being much concerned for the dignity of the sacred page.

When Professor Gould, in his commentary on *St. Mark* in the 'International' series, translated the words of our Lord to the evil spirit, 'Shut up!' (Mk 1²⁵), his reviewers burst into ridiculous laughter. Professor Whitney would probably approve the translation. There is a passage in Lk 12⁴⁹ which, he says, has never yet been translated correctly. The Authorized Version gave, 'I am come to send [how much better *cast*, says Professor Whitney in a parenthesis] fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled?' The English Revisers made two slight changes in the passage, but left the words, 'What will I if it is already kindled?' in their obscurity. The American Revisers were bolder. 'What do I desire if it is already kindled?' is their version. But they were not bold enough. Professor Whitney believes that they were feeling towards the translation, 'What do I care if it has been already kindled?'—that is, by John the Baptist—but did not dare to be so familiar.

Of the figures of speech Professor Whitney gives many examples. One of the boldest of the metaphors is found in Hos 14², 'So will we render the calves of our lips.' The Septuagint and the Syriac translations watered this down to 'the fruit of our lips,' and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been content with that. The Revisions attempt a paraphrase, both English and American having 'So will we render as bullocks the offering of our lips.' But it is too clumsy, says Professor Whitney. He does not say how he would render it.

A telling instance of the mischief which a literal rendering of a figure may do is seen in 1 S 20³⁰. Addressing his son Jonathan, Saul says, 'Thou son of the (R.V. "a") perverse rebellious woman.' The

words seem to cast a slur on Jonathan's mother, as well as on himself. Saul has no such intention. His words simply mean that Jonathan is himself a perverse rebel. The same figure is used in the next verse, where Saul says that David is 'the son of death.' But here the translators have dropped the figure entirely and rendered 'for he shall surely die.'

Some reference was made last month to the occurrence of *hendiadys* in the Bible. Professor Whitney finds some examples. In Ro 2⁵ all the versions read, 'After thy hardness and impenitent heart.' But the English idiom is 'After the hardness of thine impenitent heart.' In Mt 11²⁵ our Lord is represented (to our ears) as thanking the Father that He has hid the mysteries of the kingdom from the wise and prudent and has revealed them to babes. It is an instance of *hendiadys*. The Hebrew or Hellenistic idiom joins two co-ordinate sentences by *and* to make a single affirmation. Jesus did not thank the Father for hiding truth from anyone, only for revealing it. The translation may be difficult, but now the sense is clear. Take one more example. 'Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?' (Lk 24²⁶). The versions all retain the *and* with childlike literality. The meaning is, 'Did not the Christ have to suffer these things *in order* to enter into His glory?'

The second part for 1901 of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* opens with an article by Dr. J. P. Peters on 'The Religion of Moses.' The history of the religion of Israel according to the new critical interpretation must be written soon. This is one chapter of it.

Dr. Peters seems to understand that it is the first chapter of it. For he says that the first thing one must find who sets out to write the history of Israel is an ethical foundation for it. And he believes that that foundation must

be sought in the teaching of Moses, or at least in some acts or events connected with Moses.

Does the critical view of the history of Israel find its ethical foundation in Moses? Not in the most popular, the Wellhausian, form of it. The most popular form of the critical interpretation, says Dr. Peters, is a reaction from the impossible traditional picture, and like most reactions it has swung too far. It reduces Moses to the ranks. It makes him a creature of his time. It denies him any ethical or religious outlook beyond that of the commonest men and women among whom he lived and moved. And this it is driven to do, so it believes, in the interests of the evolutionary view of history and of religion.

Now Dr. Peters does not deny the evolutionary view of history or of religion. He does not keep the history or the religion of Israel outside its scope. He believes that no religion, ancient or modern, has been created *de novo*. Each religion has been, to a greater or less extent, evolved out of pre-existing ideas, and has been affected, in its development, by the historical, climatic, and other conditions of the people who adopted it. And if this is true of a religion, it is equally true of every man who possesses a religion. A man is explained by his antecedents and his environment.

But neither a man nor a religion is altogether explained by antecedent and environment. A man is after all himself. He is affected by his environment, but he has something which his environment has not given him. And the greater the man the greater will this peculiar individual element in his character be. Now place the man and the religion together. The religion owes its origin or its new impulse to the genius of the man. If he is the author of it, as Mohammed may be said to be the author of Islam, he uses all the forces of heredity and environment to assist him. But he adds his own individuality,

and that gives individuality to the religion. Dr. Peters says that modern critical students have shown a tendency to apply the doctrine of evolution and environment to the religion of Israel to an extent which eliminates the personal factor altogether. They are determined to stand so straight, he says, that they lean backward. The old view made Moses the creator of the religion of Israel; the new denies that Moses was spiritually or mentally in advance of those about him.

Dr. Peters holds that Moses was the founder of the religion of Israel in very much the same sense as Jesus Christ was the founder of Christianity, Mohammed of Mohammedanism, Zoroaster of Zoroastrianism, and Gautama Siddhartha the Buddha of Buddhism. 'He was a unique man, towering above his time, anticipating future ages, reaching out beyond his own.' The reformers of Israel referred their reforms to Moses. The more the religion of Israel developed, the greater was the inclination to make Moses and his law the standard for comparison.

But if Moses was the founder of the religion of Israel in the same way as Mohammed was the founder of Mohammedanism, why is the religion of Israel not called Mosaism? Dr. Peters answers, because we do not feel that we have sufficient information regarding the life and teaching of Moses to warrant the use of the name. We know less about Moses and his work than about the life and work of any of the great founders of religion. For Moses lived in a more remote age and under conditions less civilized and less adapted to the exact transmission of tradition than any of the others who have been named.

It is evident that Dr. Peters does not accept the history of Moses as it stands in the Pentateuch. He mentions the points of that history. They are familiar enough. We need not mention them after him. What incidents in the traditional career of Moses does he accept?

He accepts the sojourn in Egypt of the tribes of Israel, or at least a section of them. He believes that they dwelt in Goshen and were oppressed by the Egyptians there, the oppression taking the form of conscription for enforced labour. He believes that the Israelites rebelled and fled to the wilderness, and that in that flight they felt, through the force of certain providences, that they were brought into a peculiar relation to the Deity. He believes that Moses was their leader in the flight and the interpreter of God's action towards them. He believes that in the wilderness of Sinai and Horeb the Israelites found kindred tribes. These tribes were either some of those which were afterwards known as the twelve tribes of Israel, but which had not gone down into Egypt nor shared the oppression there; or else they were tribes, like the Kenites and Kenizites, of somewhat more remote kindred, but still capable of amalgamation with the Israelites who fled from Egypt. The dwelling-place and sanctuary of these tribes, he believes, was the Horeb-Sinai wilderness. Moses was connected with one of them and even with its priesthood.

The early history of Moses, you see, is soon written. Those are all the facts that even Dr. Peters feels it safe to rest upon. But now Moses assumes the leadership of the whole of those tribes that have gathered in the wilderness, and at that moment his genius or inspiration makes itself felt and the religious history of Israel begins. For it is evident to Dr. Peters that Moses united the tribes of Israel by a religious bond, and that that bond had a local association, connecting them with the wilderness that lay to the south and east of Judah. It is the Song of Deborah that makes this clear to him. That song may not have been written by Deborah, but at least it is contemporary with the prophetess and with the events which it narrates. Now the Song of Deborah describes the tribes of Israel as a united people, bound to Yahveh their god and bound to one another under Him. If any tribe or portion of a tribe denies the bond and refuses to come to

the aid of Yahveh and the nation, the curse of a nation and a god is invoked at once—

Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of Yahveh,
Curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof;
Because they came not to the aid of Yahveh,
To the aid of Yahveh like heroes.

Before the tribes of Israel could have recognized the claim of Yahveh, before the curse of Meroz could have had any terror, a bond of union must have been formed, and Yahveh must have been recognized as the one God over all. Now it is clear that this bond was made in the wilderness and under Moses. Because, though the tribes are settled in Palestine when the events take place which are recorded in the Song of Deborah, yet Yahveh is not the God of the land of Palestine yet. His dwelling-place is still at Horeb-Sinai, in the wilderness of Seir, where the home of the Israelites used to be. When the battle with the native Canaanites is to take place, Yahveh comes forth out of Seir, He marches out of the field of Edom.

This leads us to the name by which the God of Israel is known, the name of Yahveh. For whenever a religious bond was formed between various tribes, it was formed under the recognition of one God, and the God thus recognized received a new name. As Mohammed united the tribes of heathen Arabia under the name of Allah, so Moses united the scattered tribes of Israel under the name of Yahveh.

Not that Moses was able, or perhaps attempted, to obliterate the older names for God among the Israelites. The evidence of proper names is enough to show that El or Elohim was still the favourite designation for God among the Israelites down to the time of the kingdom. Nor is it claimed that Moses was the first to make use of the name of Yahveh. On the contrary, it is clear to Dr. Peters that the name was already in existence, that it was the name of the God of the tribes who inhabited the Sinaitic wilderness when

the fugitives from Egypt under Moses' leadership joined them. What Moses did was to persuade those who had fled with him out of Egypt to embrace the God of the wilderness of Sinai as their God under His name of Yahveh. He was the God of the land. Horeb-Sinai was His home. That name is general, and covers the mountainous territory to the south and the south-east of Palestine. It was there that He had, according to tradition, first made Himself known to Moses. Moses himself was already bound to Him as worshipper and priest. And when he persuaded the tribes which fled from the oppression of the Egyptians to receive Him as their God, he formed that union which created the nation of Israel, and he laid the foundation of that religion which in Christ Jesus is to become the religion of the world.

Of the ritual of the religion of Moses not much can be affirmed. Its most significant embodiment was the Ark. There is no question in Dr. Peter's mind that the Ark is to be traced back to the Mosaic period of Israel's history, and that it was brought with Moses out of the wilderness.

Now the unique circumstance connected with the Ark was that it was carried from place to place. This involves two surprises. First it involves a double tradition. By the one the dwelling-place of Yahveh is at Horeb-Sinai. By the other it is the Ark which moves from place to place. But more remarkable than that, it involves the entirely new idea of the God being no longer confined to a locality or a building, but being capable of moving as the march of His worshippers led Him—or leading His worshippers with Him wherever He marched. There is no such conception in any of the nations that were akin to the Hebrews or surrounded them in Palestine. The nearest analogy is the boat in which the Egyptians carried their god in solemn procession through his land. And on the whole Dr. Peters is inclined to think that the Egyptian boat was the source of the Hebrew Ark. But the connexion is by no means obvious. And in any case it seems to show that

under the skilful guidance of Moses there was a certain giving and taking among the tribes that assembled in the wilderness. If the fugitives accepted the God of the land, the tribes who dwelt there permitted Him to be moved from His home, and carried about from place to place.

The Ark contained no image of God. There are those who hold that, from the time of Moses to at least the time of David, the Ark contained a rude stone or fetich, and that its presence in the camp of Israel was really a proof of Israel's idolatry. Dr. Peters does not believe it. That in the time of David the Ark contained the two tables of the Law is evident to his mind, and that in the unethical period between David and Moses a rude stone fetich should have been displaced by the two tables of the Decalogue is simply beyond belief. Dr. Peters holds that the Ten Commandments were contained in the Ark as it moved from place to place in the wilderness. He believes that Moses was their author.

The great difficulty is with the Second Commandment. Its form in the Ark Dr. Peters believes to have been, 'Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image.' Yet David consulted Yahveh by means of an ephod; in David's time teraphim, sometimes of considerable size and in human shape, were in use as household deities;

Jeroboam set up golden bulls, and neither Elijah nor Elisha, nor yet Amos condemned them. Dr. Peters believes that during all this time the Second Commandment was known to Israel, but simply was not understood to refer to such 'aids' to the worship of Yahveh. It was supposed to forbid the worship of other gods under the form of images. When the party of reform, led by Hosea, began to denounce all such 'aids' to the worship of Yahveh as essentially idolatrous and rebellious, the Second Commandment received a new interpretation, and was then used with irresistible effect in carrying the reformers to victory.

If, then, the religion of Moses had the Decalogue within it, it is worthy of the name of religion. Dr. Peters is assailed with the impossibility of so spiritual a code arising out of so primitive and heterogeneous a nation or being of any use to them. But he does not give way. The second pentad of the Decalogue is the most spiritual, and yet it is just the second five of the Ten Commandments that are paralleled in the Egyptian sacred law. Dr. Peters has not forgotten his evolution. He believes still in heredity and environment. He sees that as Moses may have got the idea of the Ark from Egypt, so also out of the confessions which may still be read in the Egyptian Book of the Dead he may have received the spiritual thoughts which he afterwards embodied in the Ten Commandments.

The Jewish Passover in the Christian Church.

BY THE REV. GEORGE M. MACKIE, M.A., D.D., BEYROUT.

THE Hebrew manual for the Jewish Passover relates with evident approval about Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Joshua, Rabbi Eleazar, Rabbi Akiba, and Rabbi Tarphon, how that they began talking, one evening, about the deliverance from Egypt, and were still deep in the discussion when their pupils opened the door, and announced to their surprise that it was time for Morning Prayer!

I. PASSOVER AND THE WRITERS OF THE EPISTLES.

1. *Preparation for Passover.*—The Passover night is still regarded in Israel as 'a night much to be observed unto the Lord' (Ex 12⁴²). That which once recalled how the nation began has ever since the Dispersion been maintained,