

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July will contain important papers by the Rev. Dr. Grosart of Blackburn, the Rev. Vice-Principal Harding of Lichfield, and Professor Sir G. G. Stokes, Bart., M.P., President of the Royal Society. The Rev. George Adam Smith's Exposition, which has had to be postponed, will also appear in that issue.

Dr. Martineau's new book, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, may not be the most permanent, but is undoubtedly for the present the most noticeable contribution to recent religious literature. It is more than noticeable, it is in many ways a noteworthy book. In the department of New Testament Criticism of the extremely negative kind, nothing of such importance has been seen since the appearance of *Supernatural Religion*. But *Supernatural Religion* was prentice work to this. Covering a much wider field, it witnesses on every page to a learning that has less parade but much greater reality; and it possesses a charm of thought and language that will make it irresistible where *Supernatural Religion* was helpless.

The volume contains 600 pages, and is divided into five books, round the second of which interest will chiefly gather. The title of this second book is: Authority Artificially Misplaced; and, in 150 pages, it first subjects "the Catholics and the Church" to a criticism which we see described (by Protestants) as "merciless" and "overwhelming;" and then deals, in a manner which, in intention at least, is quite as unsparing, with "the Protestants and the Scriptures."

How do the Scriptures sustain this latest and most brilliant assault?

Two hopeful signs may be discerned.

First, the Protestant doctrine is not what Dr. Martineau conceives it to be.

Protestantism does *not* stake everything upon the authenticity of the books of Scripture. The Reformers held that a book like the *Hebrews* was both canonical and inspired, though its authorship might not certainly be known. And Protestantism does *not* point exclusively "to a field of divine revelation, discoverable only by the telescope, half-way towards the horizon of history." It is Protestant doctrine to say that Revelation is a living Factor to-day:

"No dead fact stranded on the shore
Of the oblivious years,
But warm, sweet, tender even yet."

And this robs Dr. Martineau not only of many of his results, but of the very method by which he reaches them.

The second hopeful sign is this: Dr. Martineau has taken up a position so extremely negative that it is impossible for him to maintain it. While the tendency of Baur's school has been towards a larger and larger comprehension, so that Hilgenfeld, the present head of that school, admits three times as much of the New Testament to belong to the first century as Baur did, Dr. Martineau suddenly makes a leap backwards, and denies the genuine-

ness of every part of the New Testament, except "six letters of Paul, viz. 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Philippians." The Gospels, the Acts, the Apocalypse, and all the rest of the Epistles are unauthentic and post-apostolic.

In order to reach this result, he not only makes every particle of evidence, that shows the least hesitation, to dip his own way, but even resorts to plainly impossible feats of exegesis. A remarkable instance of the former is found in page 203, where the Epistle of Barnabas is assigned to a date later than A.D. 132; that is to say, 35 years later than Hilgenfeld places it, and 50 later than the date Weitzsäcker assigns to it. In this way he completely removes it from the list of witnesses in favour of St. John's Gospel.

In the same way he destroys the testimony of Justin Martyr (p. 201). The famous passage of Justin's he does not admit to be a quotation from John's Gospel: "For Christ said, Except ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθήτε*) ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. But that it is impossible for those who have been once born to enter into their mother's womb is clear to all." It is not the resemblance of that passage to John iii. 3, 4, that strikes Dr. Martineau, but the differences between them. And to make these greater, he says that the true reading in St. John is "from above," though it is not about the reading that there is any question (for there is no other), but about the translation of the word (*ἀνωθεν*) which is read. And it is more than doubtful if the true translation is "from above," and not rather "again," as Justin Martyr has it.

Of Dr. Martineau's exegesis we must give one example. It is found on page 345. When our Lord said to the palsied man, "Son, thy sins are forgiven," the scribes present accused Him in their hearts of blasphemy. To whom Christ made this reply: "That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house?" (Mark ii. 10). These words are generally supposed to mean that, by doing what could be put to the proof (viz. healing the man's palsy), Christ vindicated

His power or authority to do that which could not be so proved (viz. forgive his sins). But that is not Dr. Martineau's view. There are, he says, "*sins in heaven* (i.e. sins in their spiritual aspect) which are reserved for the mercy of God alone." And there are "*sins on the earth*," by which he means the physical results of sin, disease,—this palsy, for example. The latter, Christ, like other "human prophets," had authority from God to remit; so that when He said to the man, "Thy sins are forgiven," He simply meant that his disease was healed; and then to show that He had this authority, why, He just healed his disease and sent him home!

We admit that we have robbed Dr. Martineau's exegesis of all its felicity of language, but we believe that we have given an accurate view of the exegesis itself. And we have just one question to ask: Does Dr. Martineau really believe that the Greek (*ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας*) will stand the rendering, "to forgive sins on the earth"?

It is the gallant endeavour to hold a position which cannot be held that has driven Dr. Martineau to straits like these.

In the April number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, which takes the place of the old *Presbyterian Review*, Professor De Witt, of New Brunswick, has some interesting Notes upon the eighth Psalm. His translation of the second verse differs considerably from that of the Revised Version:

R. V.	DE WITT.
Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou established strength,	Of the praises of children, even babes unweaned, hast Thou founded a fortress,
Because of Thine adversaries, That Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.	For response to Thy foes, To silence the hating and vengeful.

He describes the expression, "Thou hast founded a fortress" (*יָסַד מְצודה*), as the central and controlling element in the first clause; and there is little doubt that, as against the Revised Version, he translates both verb and substantive correctly. The verb always signifies *to lay a foundation* for a building, not to complete (establish) the structure; and the sense demands that the abstract word, "strength," be taken here as poetically used for

the concrete (צָרַף) "stronghold." Most editors agree with this: Cheyne—"Thou hast founded a stronghold;" Delitzsch—"Thou hast founded a power, *i.e.* a fortress, retreat, bulwark, rampart."

Then his translation of the second clause, "*for response to thy foes*," is obtained by a literal rendering of the preposition (לְ) "because of." It is simply (לְ) "for" prefixed to the shortened form of the word (תַּעֲנֶה), which means "an answer;" hence "for answer to, for response to." This makes "silence" better than "still" in the last clause, and suits the subject of the first, the *praises* of the children.

But a more important point is that in the first clause Professor De Witt comes very near to the sense, and even the words of the Septuagint, which our Lord quoted when He said (Matt. xxi. 16), "Have ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected *praise*?" All agree that the translation of the Septuagint is, as Dean Perowne puts it, "clearly wrong," for stronghold, not *praise*, is the meaning of the word as it stands here. Still, the *sense* is right; for the word translated "mouth" (פִּי) is freely used for that which proceeds out of the mouth (*sayings*, Ps. xlix. 14), and here the context clearly suggests *praise*. It is out of the *praises* of the children that the fortress is founded.

Dr. Cheyne has an idea that the "babes and sucklings" of this psalm are *true believers*, and refers for support of his interpretation to Matt. xi. 25, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Professor De Witt makes no reference to this interpretation, which would, of course, create an additional difficulty in the application of the words made by Christ. The advantage which Dr. Cheyne gains is that a connection can then be traced between this verse and the rest of the psalm. Let it be granted that they who sing God's praises are the "Israelites indeed," what more natural than that the psalmist should go on to describe the subject of their praises—the wonderful works of God? Of this Professor De Witt says nothing. But it seems possible, by following out

a hint which Mr. Burgess gives in his most valuable "Notes" (*Notes on the Hebrew Psalms*, by the Rev. W. R. Burgess, M.A.: Williams & Norgate, 2 vols.), to trace a natural connection between the verses of the psalm without resorting to Canon Cheyne's interpretation of the words "babes and sucklings."

The subject of this song is stated in the first verse and repeated in the last. It is the glory of God's great name *in the earth*, not in the heavens. The heavens tell of the glory of God certainly; the moon and the stars show forth His majesty. But they are not the greatest manifestations of His power and glory. Greater than these is man himself. "What is our hope or joy or crown of glory?" cried the Apostle; and he answered, "Are not even *ye* in the presence of our Lord Jesus at His coming?" So the crown of glory of God is not the heavens, "the work of His fingers," but the sons of men, created at the bidding of His loving heart, and made capable of love and obedience. When, therefore, the enemy and avenger comes to seek to rob God of His glory, where shall he make his attack? Just where the adversary always does make his attack, where the glory is greatest, and the position weakest—on His servants, the Jobs and Simons among men. "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you." "But—" added Christ; and we know what it meant. What is the psalmist's *but*? Says the psalmist, "God hath founded for Himself a fortress against the assaults of the adversary." And this fortress, he adds, is in the very place where the attack has been made; in the hearts of men, in the love that gives itself forth in praise; in the weakest seemingly of all the creatures of His hand, even among the weakest of the weak, in the lips of babes unweaned. The glory of God has always been most strikingly manifest in His choice of weak things to confound mighty. The foundation of His glory is in the *earth*, says the psalmist—in *man*, as contrasted with the universe of being; in *childhood*, as contrasted with full-grown manhood.

We have mentioned Mr. Burgess' *Notes on the Hebrew Psalms*. Let us refer to the book again in connection with two of the most difficult verses in

the Psalter, the 10th and 11th of Psalm cxvi. Let us look at some of the translations.

With the words of the Authorized Version we are very familiar—"I believed, therefore have I spoken; I was greatly afflicted; I said in my haste, All men are liars." The Revisers present quite a variety—

10. I believe, for I will speak;
[Or, I believed, when I spake thus,
I was greatly afflicted;
11. I said in my haste [or, alarm],
All men are a lie [Heb. liars].

Perowne differs widely from both—

10. I believe (in Him);—for I must speak:
I was greatly afflicted.
11. I said in my confusion,
"All men are liars."

Perhaps still further removed is Delitzsch's rendering—

10. I have retained faith, when I spake:
"I am very sorely afflicted."
11. I have said in my despair:
"All men are liars."

Cheyne wavers between two opinions, and frankly says that both connexion and rendering are obscure. In his "parchment" edition of the Psalter he translates—

10. I believed when (thus) I spoke,
Though I was sore afflicted,
11. Though I had said in mine alarm,
"All men are liars."

But in his Commentary (1888)—

10. I was confident that I should speak (thus);
but as for me, I was sore afflicted;
11. I said in mine alarm,
"All men are liars."

In connection with the 11th verse, there is a famous pulpit effort to read and give the sense—"I said in my haste, All men are liars: Indeed, David, ye would have been safe enough had ye said it at your leisure"—the point of which is now lost under the new translation. The revisers retain "haste," but with hesitation, as the margin shows; while in their rendering of the second line they endeavour to bring out their view of the *sense* of the passage, since they believe that the psalmist's "hasty" words were not a sweeping indictment

against the veracity of his fellow-men, but the more philosophical statement that the life of man is vanity and vexation of spirit. The chief difficulty, however, is not here.

It is in the 10th verse that the perplexity lies. The Authorized Version follows the Septuagint (*ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα*), "I believed, therefore have I spoken." But it is an impossible rendering; for the conjunction in the Hebrew (כי) means *because*, not *therefore*. It is this little conjunction which creates all the difficulty. And the difficulty, as Mr. Burgess points out, arises from its *position*. As it stands (כִּי אֲדַבֵּר כִּי אֶמְצָא), the literal rendering is, "I have believed because I speak." The *because* seems misplaced. We expect, "Because I have believed, I speak." He explains that it is simply a Hebrew idiom: the conjunction, which ordinarily precedes its verb, is placed *after*, for the purpose of throwing a strong emphasis upon the verb. We might express it in English thus: "It is because I have believed that I speak." The same idiom occurs in Ps. cxviii. 10, where the R.V. gives no equivalent for the conjunction at all, but which may be rendered: "All nations compassed me about: it is in the name of the Lord that I will destroy them." And again in Ps. cxxviii. 2, where the R.V. boldly transposes the little word: "For thou shalt eat the labour of thine hands." It ought to be: "It is the labour of thine own hands that thou shalt eat."

Thus the literal translation of the verses will be: "It is because I have believed that I speak (*i.e.* of God as gracious and righteous—see the preceding verses). I myself was sore troubled; (and it was *then* that) I said in my distrust, The whole human race is a failure."

This simple Hebrew idiom gives a very natural explanation of one of our Lord's most gracious but most perplexing utterances. Who has not been puzzled with the words spoken of the woman that was a sinner: "Her sins which are many are forgiven, for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little"? The clauses, we feel, *ought* to be transposed. But that is the order of the Greek, and much ingenuity has been expended in efforts at explaining them as they stand. But what if the Greek is itself under the influence

of this Hebrew idiom? St. Luke (the words occur in Luke vii. 47) is full of Hebraisms. We should then translate: "It is because her many sins are forgiven that she loveth much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little"—and the whole difficulty is removed.

The following characteristic note on Instrumental Music has been sent us from a letter of the late Professor Delitzsch:—

The Hebrew word *zimmer* and the Greek *psallein* no doubt originally signify *to play on the harp*; but the language of the Old Testament embraces vocal and instrumental music in the one word *zimra*. When it is said in Ps. cxlvii. 1, "It is good to sing praises to our God," it may with equal right be

rendered, "to harp to our God;" for *zamra* (here infinitive) signifies to sing and to play.

Since the time of David, song and music were an integral part of the Old Testament worship; and the language has also a homonymous term for vocal and instrumental music—the Levitical players are called *meshôrêrim*, "singers."

If instrumental music is played in heaven (Rev. xiv. 2), it is permissible also here below in honour of God. This one passage in the Apocalypse is alone sufficient to show that the ecclesia militans may, in the same manner as the ecclesia triumphans, take instrumental music into her service. No art is so ennobled in Scripture as music. They make music in heaven. Accordingly I say in my Commentary on Genesis (p. 176), "music is eternal as love."

Professor Franz Delitzsch.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER, D.D.

IN Professor Franz Delitzsch, who passed away, after an illness of about five months, on March 4, 1890, in his seventy-eighth year, Christian scholarship has lost one of its most highly gifted and influential representatives. Though known probably to the majority of English students only by his commentaries upon parts of the Old Testament, these writings represent, in fact, but a part of the literary activity of his life, and, except to those who can read between the lines, fail entirely to suggest the wide and varied practical interests to which his energies were largely dedicated. The outward story of his life may be told briefly. He was born at Leipzig, February 23, 1813; and, having graduated at the University of his native city in 1835, he became Professor at Rostock in 1846, at Erlangen in 1850, and at Leipzig in 1867, the last-named Professorship being retained by him till his death. From his early student days he devoted himself to the subject of theology, and laid the foundation of his knowledge of Hebrew literature (including especially its post-Biblical development in the Talmud and cognate writings), as well as of Semitic philology generally, under the guidance of Julius Fürst, editor of the well-known *Concordance* (1840), and H. L. Fleischer, who was destined in future years to become the acknowledged master of all European Arabic scholars. What may be termed the two leading motives of his life, the desire, viz., to make the Old Testament better known to Christians, and the New Testament to

Jews, were first kindled in him by the apparent accident of his meeting in these early years two agents of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. His first publications, which appeared during the time that he was *Privatdocent* at Leipzig, were, however, philological or historical. The first of all (if the writer is not mistaken) was a learned and interesting work on the history of post-Biblical Jewish poetry (*Zur Geschichte jüdischer Poesie*, 1836), followed, in 1838, by *Wissenschaft, Kunst, Judenthum, Schilderungen und Kritiken*, and *Jesurun, seu Isagoge in grammaticam et lexicographiam linguae Hebraeae*, in which, following his teacher, Fürst, he developed etymological principles which were far from sound, and which afterwards, at least in great measure, he abandoned. In 1841 he edited a volume of *Anekdoten* in illustration of the history of mediæval scholasticism among Jews and Moslems. The next work which deserves to be mentioned is of a different kind—a devotional manual bearing the title of *Das Sacrament des wahren Leibes und Blutes Jesu Christi*, which attained great popularity in the Lutheran Church, and has passed through several editions (the seventh in 1886). In 1842 there appeared a Dissertation on the life and age of Habakkuk, which was followed in 1843 by the first of his exegetical works, consisting of an elaborate philological commentary on the same prophet—part of a series of commentaries which was projected by him at this time in conjunction with his