

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Biblical World* for July contains a short answer to the question, 'In whose house did Jesus eat with publicans and sinners?' The question is important, because, in answering it, some eminent scholars discover a flat contradiction between St. Luke and the two preceding Gospels. St. Luke says plainly that it was in the house of Levi. But, according to Meyer, Holtzmann, and now also Professor Gould, it is 'doubly certain' that St. Matthew and St. Mark say it was in the house of Jesus Himself.

'Doubly certain' is Professor Gould's phrase. The double certainty arises in this way. St. Mark (2¹⁴) says 'He (*αὐτὸν*) was sitting at meat in his (*αὐτοῦ*) house.' The recurrence of the same pronoun shows that the same person is meant. Jesus was sitting at meat, therefore the house was the house of Jesus. St. Matthew gives no pronoun. He simply says (9¹⁰), 'He sat at meat in the house.' That makes his language point in the same direction. Thus these two evangelists, *using different language*, point to the same conclusion, and that conclusion becomes thereby 'doubly certain.'

Well, there is no doubt that St. Luke says it was Levi's house. His words (5²⁹) are, 'Levi made him a great feast in his house.' So the Revised Version. The Authorized says, 'in his

own house'; but that emphasis is unnecessary; the meaning is clear without it. If, then, St. Matthew and St. Mark say it was in the house of Jesus Himself, there is surely a flat contradiction.

But do they say it? St. Matthew says nothing. For argument's sake he is useless. 'In the house' may be in Levi's as easily as any other. Nay, since Levi is Matthew, it were easy to argue that this is the evangelist's modest way of speaking of his own house. What does St. Mark say? He says, 'And as he passed by, he saw Levi, the son of Alphaeus, sitting at the place of toll; and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him. And it came to pass that he was sitting at meat in his house, and many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus and his disciples.' The words are, 'He was sitting at meat in his house.' Jesus was sitting at meat. But in whose house? The pronouns being the same, the persons must be the same, say Professor Gould and the rest. But St. Luke uses these very pronouns, and yet, according to Professor Gould, 'says plainly that it was in the house of Levi.' 'Levi made *Him* (*αὐτῷ*) a feast in his (*αὐτοῦ*) house.' So the pronouns are not decisive. And since the narrative throughout reads as if Jesus were the guest, not the host; since the charge was that He ate and drank *with* publicans and sinners, not that

He entertained them; and since St. Luke says plainly that Jesus was a guest in Levi's house, we may rest content that that is what St. Matthew and St. Mark say also, and find our contradictions somewhere else.

One of the features of the new *American Journal of Theology* is entitled 'Critical Notes.' The title is used with a comfortable largeness of meaning. For of the three Critical Notes in the second number—the number for the present quarter—one is an examination of Schaff's way with Servetus, one is a plea for a new theology, and one is an intelligible exposition of a central Pauline phrase.

The author of the exposition is Professor W. A. Stevens of Rochester. The phrase is 'the righteousness of God.' It occurs elsewhere, but Professor Stevens has it specially in mind as it occurs in Rom. 3^{21, 22}.

It will be remembered that Sanday and Headlam, in their commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, devote a 'detailed note' to the meaning of this phrase. There they come to the conclusion that the grand Pauline idea of the Righteousness of God is a forensic idea. That is to say, God's righteousness is seen in its 'going forth,' and it goes forth not to *make* men righteous, but to *account* them so. And when they have come to that conclusion, they abide in it. 'To this conclusion we feel bound to adhere,' they say, 'even though it should follow that the state described is (if we are pressed) a fiction, that God is regarded as dealing with men rather by the ideal standard of what they may be than by the actual standard of what they are.' For the facts of language are inexorable; 'justify' and 'justification' (*δικαιῶν* and *δικαιοσύνη*) are rightly said to be 'forensic'; they have reference to a judicial verdict, and to nothing beyond.

Professor Stevens takes his departure there. He accepts the forensic sense. He says it is a commonplace of Protestant exegesis, if not

of biblical philology, that *δίκαιος*, 'just,' and all its cognates, have more or less often in St. Paul a forensic sense. But he says that what that forensic sense precisely is, it is by no means matter of agreement yet.

For there are more forensic senses than one. Forensic means simply 'legal.' It is that which belongs to the *forum* or court of justice. And when in the Pauline thought the sinner is justified, it simply means that he is pronounced by the judge to be just. He is not made just—a judge has no such function to perform as that. But if the sinner is pronounced just when he is actually not just, is it not a transaction on paper? Is it not a legal fiction? It depends on what you mean by 'just.'

By 'just' or 'righteous' *you* probably mean virtuous or good. St. Paul did not mean that. A Jew of the Jews, he could not mean that. To him to be just was to be acquitted. He stood before God's law. He was 'under the law' before God (*ὑπόδικος τῷ Θεῷ*). No doubt he was bad also—vicious, unclean, whatever you will. And he would not deny that he was. But it was not his uncleanness that troubled him; it was his condemnation. It was not his moral condition, it was his legal standing that disturbed this Pharisee of the Pharisees. To be right with God's law, to have its condemnation removed,—in short, to be justified,—that was his passionate longing.

Thus it is almost absurd to suggest that in the mind of St. Paul righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) was goodness, or to be justified (*δικαιοῦσθαι*) was the same as to be made just. The point is that righteousness was not even imputed goodness, nor was justify to impute or reckon good. That were a legal fiction indeed. If the former is forbidden by the inexorable demands of language, the latter is forbidden by the inexorable laws of the human mind. Nor has this notion ever been able to escape the bite of the old sarcasm, that the God who pronounces a sinner good when he is not good is a very proper God for such a sinner.

In the mind of St. Paul, to justify was simply to acquit. Whether the person was good or bad belongs to another place. Here the question is one of legal standing. Man is *ὑπόδικος*, under God's law. He must be taken from under the law, justified or made just. Yes; *made* just. For now that we see that the matter is not of man's moral character, but here only of his relation to the law of God, we are no longer afraid to speak of him as made just. We know it simply means that he is no longer under the law's condemnation—that, so far as the law is concerned, God has in Christ made him a just man.

A recent writer has spoken of the Jewish 'passion for pardon.' It was the Jewish passion for pardon that gave the world its great doctrine of Justification by Faith. Your passion and mine may be for morality. St. Paul's was also for morality afterwards; but his earliest passion was for pardon. And it is just pardon he means when he says that 'the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.'

The current number of the *London Quarterly Review* contains an article on 'The Structure of St. Paul's Doctrine.' It is something to find an article on such a subject anywhere at present. But, no doubt, St. Paul will return to his own again. This article proves that there is one good student at least who has never bowed the knee to the Baal of 'Back to Christ.'

After a rapid survey of past efforts to discover the structure of the Pauline doctrine, the writer ventures the generalization that the defect of the Tübingen school and of German historical construction generally lies in its inadequate grasp of *personalities*. Paul is lost behind Paulinism; the man is torn into shreds and then labelled 'motive' and 'tendency.' Even our Lord Jesus Christ

Himself seems at times to be resolved into a resultant of the currents and forces that gave Him birth. It is a method that serves for boundless speculation, but it is barren of assurance. And it contradicts the plainest things we see. There is not the most ordinary person but he is a little more than the outcome of his circumstances. Great men are as truly the creators as the creatures of their time. St. Paul was not the Apostle of the Gentiles because he could not help it, but because it pleased God to reveal His Son in him.

So, in this writer's judgment, the French theologians are nearer. There is Reuss, for example, who says that the doctrine of St. Paul is the natural corollary of his history. Christians have found themselves at home in his system, not because they could speculate as he is said to have done, but because he lived as they have to live also. 'The life of St. Paul,' says Reuss, 'is the key to his theology; the life of the Christian will be its demonstration.'

'It pleased God to reveal His Son in me.' That was on the Damascus road. And then and there on the Damascus road the Pauline doctrine began. So the order of apprehension was not salvation first and Christ next. That is the mistake even Reuss makes, and others have made it after him. 'He revealed His Son in me.' It was Christ first. Salvation through Christ followed after.

Nay, we must go further back. 'It pleased God to reveal His Son in me.' He possessed that God already. Says our writer, 'The vision of the glorified Jesus that made Saul of Tarsus a Christian apostle revealed to him the Son of God as his Saviour; but that God, whose Son Jesus Christ now proved Himself to be, was already known to Saul's faith.' It was the God of his fathers, the God who said, 'Out of darkness light shall shine,' who now 'shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of His glory in the face of Christ.' Saul's conversion to the faith of Jesus was right on

the lines of his youthful creed. *God* was there in Christ reconciling Saul unto Himself, and it was not new things that had no existence before, but the old things that became new to him from that very hour.

So the structure of St. Paul's theology begins with the doctrine of God. Now, when it pleased God to reveal His Son in Saul, what difference did that make to Saul's thought of God? Perhaps the 'righteousness of God' was there already, and 'sin,' and 'holiness,' and the watchword 'God is one,' and 'O the depth of the riches and the wisdom and the knowledge of God.' But if it had not pleased God to reveal His Son in Saul, where should we have looked for 'the grace of God,' or 'the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord,' or 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ'? Only an Israelite indeed could have framed the grand thesis of the Epistle to the Romans, that in the Gospel 'God's righteousness is revealed from faith to faith.' For 'God's righteousness' here is not to be resolved into 'a righteousness from God.' In that our author agrees with Sanday and Headlam. Righteousness belongs to God: it is His own property, it is His nature as apprehensible to men and ascertained from His Word. Only an Israelite could have spoken so. But only an Israelite in whom God had revealed His Son could have found this righteousness in the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Only an Israelite could have found God just, but only an Israelite who had seen the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ could have found this just God just to Himself, yet 'justifying him who is of faith in Jesus.'

But the discovery was Christ. So in the structure of St. Paul's doctrine, the doctrine of Christ comes next. And it is the doctrine of the *Person* of Christ, the doctrine of the Son of God. 'It pleased God to reveal His *Son* in me.' This was the grand discovery. 'Thou blasphemest,' said the Jews, because He said, 'I am the Son of God.' Saul was one of them then. 'Thou blasphemest,' he said more angrily than they all. And now that

Jesus *is* the Son of God, has St. Paul lowered his thoughts of it? 'Immediately,' we are told, *immediately* after the vision near Damascus he went and preached 'that this Jesus is the Son of God.' There is no record that he stayed to explain how much less that title carried than he had formerly fancied. He never stayed to explain. From first to last this Jesus is no less than He is in Romans ix. 5, 'God blessed for ever, Amen.'

Then comes the Soteriology. For this Christ, who is God, is given to us as a gift. He is not ours. 'Christ is God's.' But He is given to us for a time and for a purpose. The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom. This is the heart of the Pauline Soteriology, not simply that Christ died, the just for the unjust, but that *God* was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, that God *spared* not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all, that 'God commends His own love to us' in the cross of Jesus Christ. And this opens the way to the doctrine of the Spirit, and the Spirit to the doctrine of the Church, and the Church to the doctrine of the Kingdom—which is the order of this able writer's ideas of the 'Structure of St. Paul's Theology.'

In New College, Oxford, as already stated (but on the 6th not the 11th of May), a debate took place on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. For in Oxford, at the present moment, two great rival theories confront one another as to what is the true and original text of the New Testament. The Regius Professor of Divinity (Dr. Ince) presided. Three speakers were called upon from either side: on the one side, Prebendary Miller, Mr. Gwilliam, and Mr. Bonus; on the other, Professor Sanday, Mr. Allen, and Mr. Headlam. The utmost courtesy was observed throughout. And the single note of regret that can be detected is that 'inevitable limits of time hampered all the speakers,' and in particular that Mr. Miller's reply was cut short 'by the inexorable approach of the college dinner-hour.'

The debate has now been published. It has been published through Messrs. George Bell & Sons (8vo, pp. xvi + 43), under the editorship of Mr. Miller, and with a Preface explanatory of the rival systems.

The Preface is described by Mr. Miller as 'a thoughtful suggestion.' We owe the suggestion, apparently, to Dr. Sanday. It is to him, at least, we owe it that the system of Westcott and Hort is described by Dr. Kenyon of the British Museum. It is taken from his recent work, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. The system of Burgon and Miller is described by Mr. Miller himself.

Now, this debate is of more than academic interest. For it is very well known that it is not a new translation, but a new text underlying the translation, that gives the leading colour to the Revised Version of the New Testament. That new text was due to Westcott and Hort. Burgon and Miller say it is false. They say it is not a true text, for it proceeds upon false principles. They say that the true text is the Traditional Text, and that the Authorized Version, although not founded entirely upon the Traditional Text, is very much nearer it than is the Revised Version, and therefore very much to be preferred. So we cannot appreciate the question, 'Authorized or Revised?' until we appreciate the controversy of the texts. We cannot even understand the Versions themselves till we understand something of the texts from which they come.

We find the text of the New Testament in manuscripts, and the manuscripts are of two kinds, *Uncials*, because written in 'capitals,' and *Cursives*, because written in running hand, the Uncials being the older. We do not find the text we now possess—either Westcott and Hort's, Burgon and Miller's, or any other—in any single manuscript. One manuscript must be compared with another. When disagreement occurs, the most probable reading will be accepted. And the result will be checked by the witness of early Versions into

other languages, and by quotations found in the Fathers.

Well, there is no question that the overwhelming majority of Manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers witness to the Traditional Text. If the question is to be settled by numbers, then Burgon and Miller have it. And Burgon and Miller hold that it ought to be settled by numbers. Of the whole mass of evidence—Manuscripts, Versions, Fathers—they claim that nineteen-twentieths support the Traditional Text. And they ask 'how it can be that one-twentieth shall be supposed to override the verdict of all the rest?'

But Dr. Sanday puts a case. 'Suppose,' he says, 'you have a manuscript from which, from time to time, fifty copies are made. On Mr. Miller's theory, those fifty copies would entirely outweigh the manuscript itself, whereas all of them would contain such corruptions as are to be found in the original manuscript, and each of them would have its own corruptions as well. Clearly, the single manuscript is of more value than the whole fifty.'

In short, Dr. Sanday holds that manuscripts, like men, have a genealogy, and to know their worth you must know something of their kith and kin. That is the secret of the theory of Westcott and Hort. Westcott and Hort were not the happy discoverers of that secret. Griesbach, in the end of last century, had discovered and roughly made use of it. But Westcott and Hort, having the command of a far larger range of materials, having the command also, perhaps, of a more scientific temper, so used that secret that they founded upon it a system of textual criticism, which has gained the assent of most of the textual scholars of to-day—a system which, in Mr. Miller's language, is everywhere now in vogue.

Westcott and Hort set the solitary Manuscripts and Versions in families. They find that a certain number of authorities have a tendency to exhibit

the same readings, so they group these authorities together,—whereupon they find that there are three great families. In the first family are found the great Uncials, B, \aleph , and L, a few Cursives, such as 33 (Evan.), 61 (Acts), and the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions; the next consists of the Uncial D, the Old Latin and Old Syriac Versions, and a number of interesting Cursives, as 13, 69, 81, for the Gospels—44, 137, 180 for the Acts; while A and C (generally), the later Uncials, and the great mass of Cursives and the later Versions, form the third group, numerically overwhelming.

When the groups are formed, the effort is made to trace their history. And now the Manuscripts themselves are found to furnish a surprisingly useful aid. In a certain number of instances, when one group offers a special reading and another group offers another, the third group is found to combine the two. Take the ending of St. Luke's Gospel. \aleph , B, C, L, with the Memphitic and one Syriac Version, have 'blessing God'; D and the Old Latin have 'praising God'; but A and twelve other Uncials, all the Cursives, the Vulgate and other Versions, have 'praising and blessing God.' Now, is the combined reading (or 'conflate' reading, in Hort's terminology) likely to be older than the two separate readings, or are they likely to be older than it? Is it more likely that a scribe finding two separate readings in the copies that were before him, combined the two; or is it more likely that, finding the two combined, he selected the one or the other? The motive for combining, say Westcott and Hort, would be praiseworthy—the desire to make sure of keeping the right word by retaining both. But the motive for separating would be vicious, since it involves the deliberate rejection of words of the sacred text. Therefore they conclude that, whether 'blessing' or 'praising' be older, they are both older than 'praising and blessing' together.

At this point comes in the evidence of the Fathers. When Chrysostom quotes from Scripture

he quotes such passages as this according to the reading that combines them both. Now, Chrysostom was Bishop of Antioch in Syria at the end of the fourth century. Other writers who lived in or near Antioch about the same time also quote the combined readings. And in fact it is found that the writers of Syrian Antioch are the first to show a partiality for the text in which these readings occur, and which is represented by the group of authorities that has been mentioned third. Hence this type of text, which is the text of the later Uncials and Cursives, the Traditional Text of Burgon and Miller,—the text that generally underlies our Authorized Version,—has been described by Westcott and Hort as the 'Syrian' Text, and held to be later than the other two.

Of the other two, one is found mainly in Latin manuscripts, and in those (like D) which have both Greek and Latin texts, and therefore has been called the 'Western' Text, though it is certain that it had its origin in the East, probably in or near Asia Minor. It is a small group of authorities. But the third is smaller still. And yet the third, in Westcott and Hort's opinion, is by far the most important group of the three. Small as it is, they divide it into two. First there is a type of text which is found most regularly in the quotations of Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and other Alexandrian Fathers, and so is called the 'Alexandrian' Text. It is not continuously represented by any existing manuscript. It is most characteristic of C in the Gospels, and of A and C in the Acts and Epistles, while \aleph and L and certain Cursives occasionally agree with it. Lastly, there is the type of text which can be claimed by no restricted locality, and is therefore described as 'Neutral,'—the type which most frequently exhibits the readings that have least suspicious aberration, the type which represents most nearly, in the judgment of Westcott and Hort, the original text of the New Testament. It is headed by the great Vatican Manuscript known by the letter B.

Thus it is manifest that between the rival systems of New Testament criticism of to-day there is a great gulf fixed. The 'Syrian' Text is the Traditional Text. 'We maintain,' says Mr. Miller, 'that it represents the text which issued from the pens of the writers of the New Testament.' Westcott and Hort maintain that it is the latest and least authoritative of all their four. There is a great gulf fixed, and it was to see if anything could be done to bridge it that the Oxford debate was held.

It has not bridged the gulf. Yet it was not held in vain. For, in the first place, Dr. Sanday admitted that he thought Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort had pressed their preference for the Uncials B and \aleph too far. In the second place, he acknowledged that if the early date of the Peshitta Version could be proved, a very strong claim would be made for the Burgon and Miller theory. And, in the third place, he went so far as to say that in his opinion the Traditional Text was really due to some early but deliberate revision.

In the first place, Dr. Sanday confessed that in his opinion Westcott and Hort had sometimes pressed their preference for Aleph and B too far. The 'Western' Text and the text represented by these two Uncials branched off in the second century, and so the true reading may be found in either of those two branches, and Dr. Sanday thinks it quite possible that the right reading may sometimes be preserved in the Western branch, and not in the branch represented by Aleph and B. And when Mr. Headlam afterwards spoke, 'That,' he said, 'is really the point at issue before scholars at the present day.' It is not, you observe, whether the 'Syriac' or Traditional Text is oldest. Towards that, which is the vital point, neither Dr. Sanday nor Mr. Headlam makes any concession whatever. It is whether the 'Western' Text does not really contain some considerable element of truth. Mr. Headlam does not think so. But Dr. Sanday, who does not count it a safe inference that because a manuscript is right in nine cases it

must be right in the tenth—Dr. Sanday thinks it quite possible that in the tenth case the 'Western' Text may have it.

In the second place, Dr. Sanday acknowledges that the sheet-anchor of the Burgon and Miller system is the early date of the Peshitta. This Syriac Version is the oldest of all the authorities that belong to the Traditional group. If the Peshitta could be carried back beyond the date of the so-called Syrian revision, then the Syrian revision would be proved an invention, and the field be practically won. But, at present at least, the Peshitta cannot be carried back so far. It is true that Mr. Bonus believes the Peshitta to be a direct translation from the Greek, and that it must have come into existence 'scarcely later than the latter half of the second century.' But Mr. Allen holds, on the contrary, that the Peshitta is a late stage in a long recension of the same Syriac Version, the Lewis Codex and the Curetonian representing earlier stages. And Mr. Headlam still maintains that up to the present moment nothing has been found which carries our knowledge of the Peshitta further back than the beginning of the fourth century, say 310 A.D.

In the third place, and last, Dr. Sanday was bold enough to assert that the Syrian Text was due to deliberate revision. Mr. Miller presses the argument: Why, if the Syrian or Traditional Text is the latest and least of all the four, is it found in almost universal acceptance at the end of the fourth century? 'I will end,' says Dr. Sanday, 'by venturing to do what Dr. Hort, with his great care and circumspection, has never done. It constantly seems as if his argument was leading up to it, but he never lets the name pass his lips. He thinks there was a *revision* of some kind; that is simply a way of describing the phenomena of the Manuscripts on what appears to be the easiest hypothesis as to their origin. He thinks that a kind of revision took place at that time, and was a more or less continuous revision. I confess it

has always seemed to me that that revision was probably connected with Lucian of Antioch and his school, which exercised great influence all through the fourth century. This type of text is prominent in his disciples, most prominent indeed in Theodore of Mopsuestia, where it reaches its

culmination. The school was in close contact with the Syriac-speaking churches and writers, and I have always suspected, although I cannot prove it, that this Traditional Text, of which Mr. Miller is so fond, owes its origin ultimately to Lucian of Antioch in Syria.'

A. B. Davidson, D.D., F.F.D.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. S. D. F. SALMOND, M.A., D.D., F.E.I.S., ABERDEEN.

II. HIS WRITINGS.

In a former paper we said something of Professor A. B. Davidson as a teacher, and of the academic chair as the first source of his remarkable influence. Great, however, as he is in that position, he is not to be measured by that alone. He is not only a teacher ranking with the most select few in the large roll of theological lecturers; he is also a writer, and one of a penetrating faculty and original vein. We should, indeed, give a very imperfect idea of what he is, and a very inadequate account of what we owe to him, if we did not attempt some estimate, however rapid, of his published works. There are other things of which it might also be fitting to speak, especially the services which he rendered as a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee. But these must be passed over in order that some attention may be given to his writings.

His contributions to theological literature have a distinct value, which is gratefully recognised by all students, and best appreciated by those most competent to judge. They are also of considerable amount, and there is more in preparation. He is largely involved in the new *Dictionary of the Bible*, which is announced by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, and those who have seen certain articles now in type for that important publication know them to be of great interest to the scholar. He is also engaged on two works which are peculiarly congenial to him, and from which much is anticipated — a *Commentary on Isaiah* and a treatise on the *Theology of the Old Testament*. The one is to form part of the *International Critical Commentary*; the other is to make one of the volumes of the *International Theological Library*.

These are subjects which belong to the most favoured studies of his lifetime. In both he is an acknowledged master, and his promised volumes are looked for with eager expectancy. He has never been in haste, however, to rush into print. In this, as in other things, he has aimed at the *multum* rather than the *multa*. Of all our recent scholars, the late Dr. Hort of Cambridge is the one to whom he may be best compared as a writer. There is much in common between the two. In both we have the same rigorous standard of values in authorship, the same punctilious carefulness of statement, the same precise and finished style, the same exacting ideal which makes it natural to shrink from quick production or frequent publication, the same jealousy of all that comes short of the best and most honest work.

There are two kinds of literary producers. There are those who write easily and steadily with all the regular continuity of well-set but level instruments, and turn all they have to say into print—preachers who make books of each series of sermons, *litterateurs* who make volumes of each set of papers that see the light in magazine or journal. And there are those who take the pen only when the fire burns, who seem slow where others are precipitate, who refuse to write but at their best, and limit themselves to one or two subjects which they make their own by severe self-repression and lengthened silence. Neither class is to be despised. Each has its audience, by whom it is appreciated and whom it profits. But it is the more restricted work of the latter that has the finest quality, the most quickening influence, the most enduring worth. It is to this class that