

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* the longest, and in some other respects the most notable, article will be that on the RELIGION OF ISRAEL. The article was given into the hands of the late Professor A. B. Davidson. He entered upon it with relish. 'I have been preparing for it all my life,' he wrote. But the end came before it was written. Then the article was undertaken by Professor Emil Kautzsch of Halle.

Professor Kautzsch has spent two years upon it. He has recognized its importance; he has discovered its difficulty. It is not merely that the old method of gathering together proof texts is no longer available; the scope of the subject is nearly as much enlarged as the method of handling it is altered. The religion of Israel is more than the religion of the Old Testament. It is the religion of one of the Semitic nations. And it will never again be adequately described without the simultaneous use of both the historical and the comparative methods.

In the article by the Rev. John Reid, M.A., of Dundee, entitled "“Lord” and “The Lord” in Acts,' which is published in this issue, there is a paragraph to which it may be well to direct attention. For it seems to contain not only the simple and satisfactory solution of one of the most

puzzling expressions in the Acts of the Apostles, but also what appears to be a most important discovery in the history of early Christianity.

Mr. Reid has made an independent study of the use of the word 'Lord' (κύριος), whether with or without the article, first in the Gospels and now in the Acts. His results in the field of the Gospels were welcomed with gratitude by many New Testament students. The study of the word in the Acts has been more trying, and the results will be more welcome. But the centre of interest in the new paper is the discovery that the very moment when Christianity ceased to be of the Jews and became the religion of the world is recorded in the New Testament in the use of a most familiar word.

The passage is Acts x. 36. St. Peter is addressing Cornelius. If he had been addressing a Jew he would have been content to say 'preaching peace by Jesus Christ.' But he is addressing a Gentile. The word Christ, that is, Messiah, has no meaning for a Gentile. It carries no associations with it. So St. Peter adds the explanation—'He is Lord of all.' That word 'Lord' has a meaning. But as he uttered it St. Peter did more than make himself intelligible to Cornelius, he said, unconsciously almost, we may be sure, 'Where there is neither Jew nor Gentile.' From that moment, from the utterance of that word,

Christianity entered upon its mission to the whole world.

The first course of lectures under the Constitution of the Bruce Lectureship has been delivered by the Rev. Lewis A. Muirhead, B.D., and has been published by Mr. Melrose, under the title of *The Eschatology of Jesus* (crown 8vo, pp. xxvii, 224; 6s.). If Professor Bruce could have made the choice, this is the lecturer and this is the subject of lecture which he would have begun with. The very name 'Jesus' was made possible in this country by Dr. Bruce. Common enough in Germany, it was avoided here till he boldly set the way. And Mr. Muirhead is just as bold as he was, just as sure that in this direction lies our intellectual salvation, just as heedless if we are following close or lagging far behind.

That is quite commendable. There must be some independent workers in a generation, even in theology. There must be some who not only 'see with their own eyes' (it is a phrase of Mr. Muirhead's), but are unconcerned whether they get us to see along with them or not. If any injustice arises, it is they themselves that suffer. And as there must always be martyrs, they should be the martyrs always who choose the road to martyrdom themselves, not they who are driven into it by others.

Not that Mr. Muirhead will receive deposition from the ministry or even suffer from a 'heresy hunt.' But his view of 'Jesus' is not the view of the men around him. He will therefore suffer from isolation. And, impalpable as that is, is it not what we now mean when we say Hell? To be outside, to know that the door is shut, is that not what we understand now by 'the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched'? Dr. Bruce knew that the door was shut for him in this life—not to men's homes or to men's hearts, he had all his share of affectionate devotion, but to men's minds and to the motives that make

them men. He knew that his countrymen could not accept 'Jesus.' He knew that the name did not carry intellectual conviction or moral weight with them. And Mr. Muirhead knows it also.

Is Mr. Muirhead so unorthodox then? No, by no means. Give him 'Jesus' and he is almost ostentatiously orthodox. To give him 'Jesus' is to grant that our Lord might be ignorant on any conceivable subject; but Mr. Muirhead rushes to assure us that there is scarcely a single actual subject on which He was ignorant. Did He not question the authorship of the 110th Psalm?—'it does not follow that His mind was not open on that subject in a way impossible to the average Scribe.' Did He say seriously, 'The Scripture cannot be broken'?—that 'does not prove that He had the same idea of inspiration as a contemporary Jewish theologian, or even as the Apostle Paul.' And if anyone asserts that at one time Jesus said He did not know the day or hour of the glorious Advent, at another that it would infallibly fall within that generation, Mr. Muirhead considers it undeniable that 'this inconsistency is chargeable only to the evangelists, and not to Jesus.'

What then are we giving when we give Mr. Muirhead 'Jesus'? We need St. Paul to answer that.

Mr. John Joseph McVey, publisher, importer, and bookseller of Philadelphia, has issued a translation of Gunkel's *Israel and Babylon*. It is one of the many answers that have been made to Professor Friedrich Delitzsch's famous lectures on 'Babel-Bibel.'

Why is it that Professor Delitzsch's lectures have made such a sensation in Germany? They contain nothing that was not quite familiar to all Assyriologists and to most students of the Old Testament. Professor Gunkel says it was first of all because they were delivered before the emperor. Next because the newspapers got hold

of them. And chiefly because what is quite familiar to Old Testament students is often quite unknown to German pastors and people.

Professor Gunkel regrets that the lectures were delivered before the emperor. It gave some people the impression that their contents had the emperor's approval. And when the emperor announced that they had not, it made some people think that Professor Delitzsch was on the way to become a martyr for the truth. He regrets that the newspapers got hold of them. For the newspapers feed upon 'events,' and Professor Gunkel believes that the progress of knowledge is imperceptible; the moment it becomes an 'event' it is checked. And he regrets that the evangelical Church is so lamentably estranged from evangelical science. For had it not been so, lectures like those of Professor Delitzsch would never have surprised the Church as they have done, and found her almost weaponless. But most of all, Professor Gunkel regrets that the lectures were ever delivered.

For Professor Delitzsch had no business to leave Assyriology, where he is a master, and enter the field of the Old Testament, where he is not at home and quite unhappy. What he said about the antiquity of Babylonian civilization was altogether admirable. What he said about the dependence of Israel on that civilization was altogether intolerable. Professor Gunkel does not deny the dependence. He affirms it. But he holds that the originality of the religion of Israel, which Professor Delitzsch denied, is far more conspicuous than its dependence.

Professor Gunkel affirms the dependence of the religion of Israel on the religion of Babylonia. In the later time, in the days of the Babylonian Captivity, so much did Israel learn from Babylon that the character of the nation was wholly changed. It forgot its own language, and learned a new one. Post-exilic Judaism became so transformed by the civilization of the nation under whose influence it

had come, that it was 'bound to the old Israelite people by only a slender thread.'

But even in the oldest times the religion of Israel was largely derived from the religion of Babylonia. Mount Sinai was probably named after the Babylonian moon-god Sin. Mount Nebo, where Moses died, was named after Nebo, the Babylonian Mercury. The story of the Deluge is 'quite indisputably' of Babylonian origin. The Flood, the ark, the contents of the ark, the stranding on a mountain, the sending forth of a dove and a raven, the exit, the sacrifice, the sweet savour which the gods smelt—these could not possibly be coincidences. And when we consider the inconceivable age of Babylonian civilization, and of the Deluge narrative in particular, when we remember that it is not in Israel, but in Babylonia, with its flat plains watered by great streams, that floods have any terror, we cannot doubt, says Professor Gunkel, that the Israelite story came from Babylonia.

But Professor Gunkel holds that the originality of the religion of Israel is greater than its dependence. Even in the stories of the Flood, with all their similarity, the difference is almost immeasurable. We are in different worlds. 'In the Babylonian story, a wild, grotesque polytheism; the gods outscheme and combat one another; they quake before the Flood, and cower like dogs in the heaven; they swarm like flies to the after-sacrifice. The biblical story speaks of One God, whose just retribution sends the Flood, and who graciously protects the righteous man after He has tried him.'

There is one feature in the Babylonian narrative of the Flood with which Dr. Delitzsch is much delighted. The Noah of the Babylonian story is represented as sorrowing over the fate of the drowning multitude around him. This is the touch that makes Dr. Delitzsch say that the Babylonian legend 'appeals to us with far greater force than the biblical narrative.' Professor Gunkel

admits its appeal to modern sentimentalism. But its force is considerably diminished when we remember that the Babylonian Noah did not warn his fellow-citizens of their danger, but, on the contrary, preached smooth things and promised prosperity all the while the ark was abuilding.

Something has been said on another page of the use of the name 'Jesus' in place of the more familiar 'Christ.' It had better be said now that there is worth in such a name. There is apologetic worth. When Professor Peake began his lecture at the Central Hall in Manchester on the question, 'Did Jesus rise again,' he found it necessary first of all to prove that there was a Jesus to rise. In apologetics we must begin where the apology can take hold.

There are those who doubt that there ever was a Jesus to rise. Mr. Peake had to prove first that 'Jesus was an historical character.' How did he prove that? First, by calling attention to the self-consistency of His character, and the impossibility of inventing it. Next, by pointing to the originality of His teaching taken as a whole. Finally, and especially, by quoting certain sayings which no one would ever have invented and put into an imaginary hero's mouth. The sayings are such as: 'Why callest thou me good?'; 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'; and the confession that He was ignorant of the day of His second coming.

But when Jesus is proved to be historical, what have we got? For Professor Peake's purpose very little. An historical Jesus, who did and said the things which the Gospels report, is not, after all, the person whom Professor Peake wishes to commend. So he proceeds to the proof of the Resurrection. We must know Jesus after the flesh? Well, the moment we know Him so, let us pass on. Let us say, 'I know Him so henceforth no more.' We must know the power of His resurrection.

Now there are two ways of proving the Resurrection. There is a negative way. Answer all the theories that have been invented to account for the belief in the Resurrection. That is a good way. For it is not difficult to answer them. But there is a better way than that. There is a positive argument for the Resurrection, and Professor Peake uses it with effect.

This is the argument. The first Christians believed that the Jewish Messiah had been crucified. How did they come to believe that? Some expectation of a Messiah all the Jews had. It can be proved that they had no expectation of a suffering Messiah. Here Mr. Muirhead's book on *The Eschatology of Jesus* is of great value. He shows that, scanty as the evidence is, it is yet sufficient, for it is all one way. 'Nothing,' says Mr. Muirhead, 'is more certain in our information regarding Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, in or near the time of our Lord, than that they did not include the idea that He should suffer vicariously for the sins of His people.' Shortly after this time there is found in *Fourth Ezra* (circa 70 A.D.) the idea that the Messiah is to die, but that is 'only an incident in an eschatological programme, which assigned to the Messiah no other function than that of living for 400 years with the godly previous to a final judgment executed by Jehovah Himself.' Still later, in the fourth century A.D., the *Targum of Jonathan*, 'perhaps the most authoritative document of what may be called Patristic Judaism,' admits that there is a reference to the Messiah in Isaiah liii., 'but carefully excludes from the scope of the reference what would be to Christians just the most relevant passages.'

Where did the first Christians get their idea, not that the Messiah might suffer and die merely, but that His sufferings and death made Him the Messiah? When Trypho the Jew is pressed by Justin Martyr, he admits the doctrine of a suffering Messiah, because he sees that it is contained in the Old Testament. But he admits it most reluctantly. Why did Justin Martyr glory in it?

Not only did Justin glory in a suffering and dying Messiah, but he gloried in a Messiah who had been crucified. Trypho could not do that. Trypho could not stand the Crucifixion. For to a Jew death was one thing, crucifixion quite another. To suffer and to die was the lot of all men, and might be the lot of the Messiah, but to 'hang upon a tree' was the lot only of the criminal, and brought him under the curse of God's law. Trypho knew the law. He interpreted it, as all his countrymen interpreted it, saying that the words 'cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,' meant 'cursed is he that is crucified.' He could believe, however reluctantly, that the Messiah might come to die; but nothing would make him believe that the Messiah could come under the curse of God—nothing short of faith in Jesus as the Messiah.

This is the positive argument for the Resurrection. The first Christians believed that the Messiah had been crucified. That revolution in their thinking was not wrought by belief in an historical Jesus. It was not wrought by the sight of suffering and of death. It was wrought by belief in the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead, making Him, first in spite of, and then because of His sufferings and death, the Christ of God.

The University of Leiden has called an Englishman to succeed Professor van Manen. A few days after Mr. Kirsopp Lake arrived from Oxford he had to deliver his Inaugural Lecture. The Chair is of New Testament Exegesis and Early Christian Literature, but Mr. Lake is first of all a student of the New Testament text, and he spoke upon 'The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament.' He spoke in English. At the close of the lecture he looked his students in the face. 'I am very sorry,' he said, 'that for a few months I shall be handicapped by my inability to use your language, but I hope that by next September I shall be in a position to lecture in Dutch, at least partially, even though it may be

necessary to apologize for frequent solecisms, and for an imperfect pronunciation.' The lecture is published in this country by Messrs. Parker & Son of Oxford.

Professor Lake chose Textual Criticism for his Inaugural Lecture because he believes that there is a vital connexion between the Criticism of the Text, its Exegesis, and Theology. He believes that there is a right order in studying these subjects, and that that is the order. We must be critics of the New Testament text if we are to be successful exegetes, we must be close students of exegesis if ever we are to be theologians. And Professor Kirsopp Lake proves it.

He proves it by one great example. But before coming to the example let us see what Professor Lake thinks of the present state of Textual Criticism. He thinks that we are at the beginning of a new period in the Textual Criticism of the Gospels. In the nineteenth century textual critics were occupied with constructing the 'true text' of the Gospels. That process culminated in the great work of Westcott and Hort. They did not succeed in constructing the 'true text.' In that, though it was their one great aim, the work of Westcott and Hort was a failure. They succeeded in showing that the Textus Receptus was not the true text. But when they took the Vatican manuscript as the best representative and practical embodiment of the true text, they were wrong. The Vatican manuscript probably does no more than represent the text that was current in Alexandria in the third century. The true text, says Professor Lake, cannot be found in any manuscript or group of manuscripts, nor in any selection from manuscripts that can ever be made. Greek manuscripts, as a whole, represent but one type of a text and its corruptions; the Latin versions and the Fathers represent another type; the Syriac versions a third; and Clement of Alexandria may provide us with a fourth. The failure of Westcott and Hort—Professor Lake calls it a magnificent failure, better

than most men's successes would have been—was due to their neglect of the other sources for the text, the attempt to construct a true text out of the Greek manuscripts alone.

Professor Lake says that something has to be done before even a beginning is made with the construction of the true text of the Gospels. All the local texts have to be edited. At the close of the second century Africa had its own local text of the Gospels, Alexandria had its own local text, there was another local text in the East, and perhaps there were others elsewhere. None of these local texts was the true text. Each of them 'presents a definite series of interpolations and a definite series of omissions.' They have to be edited. And, inasmuch as the number of manuscripts exhibiting any local text is not large, it becomes the duty (Professor Lake seems to look upon it as a privilege) of the textual critic to employ conjectural emendation.

Then when all the local texts have been edited, we may begin to construct the true text. What will its character be? It is too early to answer yet. But Professor Lake is sure that it will not be the text of Westcott and Hort, for he believes that there are corruptions in *all* the manuscripts in existence, and that the true text will never be found by using manuscripts alone. And so we come to his great example.

It is the passage to which we appeal for the institution of the Sacrament of Baptism. It is the words in St. Matthew 28<sup>19</sup>, 'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' Those words are found in all the manuscripts. Yet Professor Lake does not believe that they belong to the true text. He believes that they are an interpolation in the true text, an interpolation made perhaps in Africa. He believes that Mr. F. C. Conybeare has proved that.

For Mr. Conybeare has shown that Eusebius quotes Mt 28<sup>19</sup> at least eighteen times, and always

in the form, 'go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name,' omitting all reference to baptism. It is true there are four passages in which Eusebius quotes the usual text. But two of these are in the writings against Marcellus, which are wrongly attributed to Eusebius; and as for the other two, Professor Lake says simply, 'I do not feel at all sure that the reading in these two passages is so far above suspicion as to justify the statement that Eusebius knew the traditional text.'

Now Eusebius lived in one of the greatest Christian libraries of the fourth century. If the texts at his command had contained the words 'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' Professor Lake cannot see how he could have omitted them. And since it can be shown that neither did Aphraates of Nisibis nor Justin Martyr know these words, he thinks that a very strong case has been made out against them. He thinks, in short, that the true text when it is constructed, will not contain them.

What will be the result? The result will be that the command of our Lord to go and make disciples of all nations will be seen to have been understood in one part of the early Church in one way, in another part in another way. The African Church (probably) understood it to include baptism, and so got the usual formula for baptism introduced in their text of the Gospels. But the Syrian Church did not so understand it. Thus the question of the reading directly affects the exegesis. We are compelled to ask for ourselves, Did our Lord mean baptism, or did He not? And if we decide that He did not, there arises the further question of theology. What then, we go on to ask, is the true place of Baptism in the scheme of Christian doctrine?

Professor Lake goes on to that question. This passage in St. Matthew is not the only passage in which Baptism has been found. There is a passage in St. John. Has textual criticism any-

thing to say of John 3<sup>5</sup>, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit'? If the true text is to be found in the manuscripts, textual criticism has nothing to say, for these words are found in practically all the Greek manuscripts in existence. But Professor Lake holds that the true text will not be found in the manuscripts. To get at the true text everything has to be taken into account, manuscripts, versions, quotations, and conjecture.

Now Professor Lake would not have suspected Jn 3<sup>5</sup> if he had not already suspected Mt 28<sup>19</sup>. For if there were no doubt that Christ instituted Baptism in the formal manner of St. Matthew, there would be little occasion for surprise that He should insist on Baptism as the avenue of entrance to the kingdom. But the rejection of Mt 28<sup>19</sup> compels the examination of Jn 3<sup>5</sup>.

And when Jn 3<sup>5</sup> is examined exegetically, it is observed that the whole narrative would be more homogeneous if the words *of water and* were omitted. 'Christ is explaining that the kingdom of God can only be entered by a change in the life of man, which makes him no longer primarily material, but primarily spiritual and only secondarily material. This change is compared to birth, and as Nicodemus did not understand the meaning of the comparison, an explanation is given. That explanation is first set out in v.<sup>5</sup>, and then is expanded and made more plain in the following verses, ending with the phrase, *so is everyone that is born of the Spirit*, the antithesis throughout being the usual one between Flesh and Spirit, or in Professor James' phrase, between the *once-born* and the *twice-born*.'

But it will not do to cut out the words *of water and* simply because the passage is easier without them. It must at least be shown that there was

some reason for interpolating them. Professor Lake believes that there was a reason. The necessity of Baptism to entrance into the kingdom, or in other words, the fact of Regeneration by Baptism, was an article of belief in the early Church. The Baptism was more than the Regeneration. In the Apostolic Constitutions and in the Clementine Homilies this very passage is interpreted as if it had to do with Baptism and with nothing else. Is it surprising that the words expressing the necessity of Baptism should have been inserted into the passage which speaks of Regeneration? Professor Lake thinks it will be less surprising if we remember that Hilary quotes the 8th verse with the same words *of water and* inserted into it, and that he is supported in this by the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions, as well as by the Sinaitic Codex.

But Professor Lake can go one step farther. He believes that there is one item of direct evidence. He finds it in Justin Martyr. In the 61st chapter of his *Apology*, Justin Martyr gives a description of the regeneration of converts, which he associates with Baptism in the name of the Trinity. In support of his theory he quotes words which Professor Lake believes to be from the Fourth Gospel, and indeed the very verse before us. But how does he quote the verse? Without the words *of water*. He says, 'For Christ said, Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.' He quotes the verse without the reference to baptism, although it is his very purpose to prove that Regeneration is associated with Baptism. In order to prove that, he goes on to quote a passage from the Book of Isaiah. It does not seem to Professor Lake possible to believe that Justin knew either the present text of Jn 3<sup>5</sup> or the baptismal formula in St. Matthew.