

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHY is it that so very few Jews are being saved? If there is anyone who can answer the question it is the Bishop of Jerusalem. He has had exceptional opportunities of studying it, and he has studied it very carefully. He says that the reason why so very few Jews are being saved is because we insist on making them Gentiles.

---

At the beginning there was a great controversy about Jews and Gentiles. The controversy arose over the question whether Gentiles could be saved without becoming Jews. The Church decided that they could. Now there is no controversy. We simply take it for granted that Jews cannot be saved without becoming Gentiles. The Bishop of Jerusalem believes that that assumption is the chief hindrance to the spread of Christianity among the Jews.

---

Bishop Blyth says that we have no right to demand that the Jews should become Gentiles. That demand was not made at the beginning. It was never made officially throughout the history of the Church. It simply grew up and got to be taken for granted. But we must refuse to take it for granted. We must tell the Jews that they need not become Gentiles. We must tell them, he seems to say, that they may be circumcised

and keep the Law of Moses. And if we do, he believes that many Jews will then be saved.

---

It is in *Church and Synagogue*, the quarterly of the Parochial Missions to the Jews, so ably edited by the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, M.A., with the assistance of the Rev. G. H. Box, M.A., that the Bishop of Jerusalem makes these statements. His article is 'The Revival of the Church of the Hebrews.' He gives it that title because he holds that the Hebrews must be allowed a Church of their own within the pale of the Catholic Church. And he holds that until the Hebrew Church gets its place there, the Catholic Church is one-sided and incomplete.

---

The Hebrew Church once had a place within the bosom of the Church Catholic. Theoretically it has it still. For it never was disannulled. It was simply allowed to disappear. The Bishop of Jerusalem says it is merely in abeyance. The restoration of the Jews to their land is much desired by some amongst us. Bishop Blyth much more desires the restoration of the Jews to the bosom of the Catholic Church. And he would take measures for that restoration at once.

---

He would allow the Jew who embraced Chris-

tianity to remain a Jew. He would allow him the practice of his national rites and ceremonies. He would regard them as incomplete Christianity, but not antagonistic to Christ, who came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets but to fulfil. We teach the Old Testament, he would allow the Jew to practise it. The acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, the only demand he would make, would slowly fill the Old Testament practice with the Spirit and fulness of the New. Thus he would gather together a community of Jews who still were Jews though believers in Christ. And into that community in every place new converts, he believes, would be easily and numerous received. Thus he would restore the Church of the Hebrews to its place in the Catholic Church, and he would obey the Lord's command, 'To the Jew and also to the Gentile.'

---

*The Continental Presbyterian* is an annual edited by the Rev. J. E. Somerville, B.D., and published in Edinburgh by Messrs. Macniven & Wallace. The issue for 1902 contains an article on 'St. Paul at Malta' by the Rev. G. A. Sim of Valetta. The article discusses three questions: the spot where the shipwreck occurred, the residence of the apostle on the island, and the formation of a Christian community there.

---

Mr. Sim, who has studied the whole situation for himself, believes that the traditional *San Paul Bahr*, or 'St. Paul's Bay,' is the spot, the only possible spot, for the shipwreck. He believes that somewhere in what is now the modern Città Vecchia St. Paul spent the time of his sojourn on the island. And he believes it is highly probable that before the apostle departed, a Christian Church was formed.

---

The last matter is the most precarious. On the place of the shipwreck and the residence the locality can be examined, and Mr. Sim is on the spot. On the formation of a Church, or even the existence of converts, the locality gives no help,

and even tradition seems to be at fault. The reasons Mr. Sim gives for his decision are two. First, there were the materials of a Church. For besides the Punic natives, there was probably a small Jewish colony in the island, as well as Greek and Roman residents. And secondly, there was a great preacher. It is scarcely credible to Mr. Sim that St. Paul spent three months in Malta and made no converts there.

---

Shall we ever succeed in solving all the difficulties in the construction of the Tabernacle? No model-maker has ever been able to follow the text fully, perhaps none ever will be able. To get things to fit, some departure has to take place, if not here, then there. And it may be that the explanation is the simple and 'critical' one, that the Tabernacle cannot be made because it never was made, but only existed in the writer's imagination.

---

Nevertheless, men will always attempt to reconstruct the Tabernacle. The latest attempt is by the Rev. W. S. Caldecott. Taking the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund aside, he explained his model of the Tabernacle and how he made it. He overcame its difficulties, he said, and adhered to the text, by the simple device of using three cubits of different lengths in the measurements.

---

First he used the 'great cubit' to measure all the areas with. It is a cubit of five palms in breadth, or fifteen-tenths of an English foot. Next he used the 'ordinary cubit' of four palm-breadths, or twelve-tenths of a foot, with which the walls were measured. And then he used the 'small cubit,' of three palm-breadths, or nine-tenths of a foot, to measure the gold and silver work. There is a narrative of the interview in the current *Quarterly Statement*. There is no record that the Committee accepted Mr. Caldecott's ingenious device.

---

Were Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob individuals,

or were they not? In the *Sunday School Times* of America Professor König of Bonn undertakes to show that they were.

The issue lies between individual or tribe. No one need be considered who says that the names are pure invention. Now Professor König admits that the word 'beget' is not at once decisive. Ham 'begat' Mizraim. But Mizraim is a dual word and means the two Egypts, Upper and Lower. The Egyptians themselves called them *ta-ui*, or the two worlds. Again, Mizraim 'begat' Ludim. But Ludim is a plural form and clearly signifies a nation. Yet more unmistakably, Canaan 'begat' the Jebusite (Gn 10<sup>15</sup>), and no one will deny that 'the Jebusite' means the tribe of the Jebusites, whose ancestor, the son of Canaan, would likely have been called Jebus.

The word 'beget' does not settle it at once. The Hebrews evidently could speak of one nation begetting another without a violation of idiom. Still, Professor König believes that when Abraham is said to have begotten Isaac, and Isaac Jacob, the word is used in its literal sense. For that is its usual sense, the metaphorical being quite exceptional. Besides, the names themselves have nothing of the appearance of tribal names about them. The very difficulty of the derivation of such a name as Abraham is a testimony in favour of his individuality.

Cornill suggests that Ishmael and Isaac stand on a level with Eunomos and Eukosmos, the reputed sons of Lycurgus. Professor König says we have but to look at the two pairs of names to see the absurdity of the comparison. Lycurgus was believed to be a great lawgiver; the names Eunomos (that is, 'legality,' or the like), and Eukosmos (that is, 'harmony,' or the like) were his sons only in the tradition which in that way sought to testify to the results of his work among the Spartans. How different are the names Ishmael and Isaac. The one means 'God shall hear,' the other 'One who laughs.' There is no personifica-

tion of qualities in that, there is no reference to any acts of Abraham their father. To Dr. König the names simply explain particular features in the character and lives of the men who bore them.

But there are more serious arguments than this. The first is that tribes and nations never originate through the splitting up of rapidly increasing families, but always by the *amalgamation* of families and of races.

Now, if that is true, especially if the word 'always' is true, the matter is settled. Dr. König has often seen it asserted. He has seen it asserted in Stade's *History of Israel*, in Holzinger's *Genesis*, in Guthe's *History of the People of Israel*. But he has never seen it proved. Once only is the attempt made, in a reference to a book on Siberia, wherein it is stated that in that northern land nations are now rising through the amalgamation of families and races. Professor König does not think one instance enough to establish a rule. And on the other side he holds that in Arabia great tribes have been known to originate after the manner described in the Bible.

Another argument is that 'nations never call themselves after individuals, but the name of the ancestor is in every case at first a comprehensive title, a personification of the people.' So Cornill expresses it. Guthe says more briefly: 'There is not a nation in history that can name its progenitors.'

Professor König does not seem to deny the general truth of this assertion, he denies its universal application. He denies its application to the Hebrews. The Hebrews of the days of Moses had no immense stretch of history to look back upon. They came into being only six hundred or four hundred years (according as the Hebrew or the Greek of Exodus 12<sup>40</sup> is preferred) before the deliverance from Egypt. Dr. König sees no impossibility in their preserving the tradi-

tion of their origin all that time. He thinks it probable that they had already begun to keep genealogical lists. Do not the Arabs make out the pedigrees of their very horses and hand them down from generation to generation? There is nothing to hinder the Israelites in Egypt and the Wilderness from knowing Abraham as their father.

But there is a third argument. In the very traditions themselves Cornill discovers the evidence that nations and not individuals are dealt with. Is it not said to Rebekah, 'Two nations are in thy womb'? And is not the transaction between Jacob and Laban a manifest device to explain the fact that the Israelites and Aramæans regarded the mountains of Gilead as their dividing line? Professor König answers that it is just as likely that the choice of the mountains of Gilead as the dividing line between the two nations rose out of the transaction between Jacob and his uncle. And the words, 'Two nations are in thy womb,' mean no more to him than that Jacob and Esau were to be the heads of two nations. It is merely a matter of style.

Then, when he has answered the critics' arguments, Professor König gives reasons on his own account.

His first reason is that if the pedigrees of the patriarchs were invented to explain existing relations of tribes, it is very puzzling to find that Gad and Asher—tribes whose territories lay far apart—are represented as having been born of the same mother as well as the same father. It is puzzling also that Reuben is represented as having had improper relations with Bilhah, the mother of Dan and Naphtali, whose territories lay far away from his, not with Zilpah, whose son Gad lay alongside the tribe of Reuben. It is puzzling to understand why Reuben (being a tribe and not a man) should be spoken of as having had these improper relations at all. Critics say that it is a fiction invented to express the

desire of Reuben to lord it over the other tribes. But history knows no such desire. Judah and Ephraim sought the first place. But in the Song of Deborah Reuben is ridiculed for keeping at a safe distance when the fatherland was in extreme peril.

Dr. König's second reason for accepting the personality of the patriarchs, and for believing that the history of the early Hebrews is more reliable than criticism is at present inclined to admit, is that it was a custom in Israel from the earliest times to erect memorials of great events. These memorials are very numerous in the Old Testament. There are the 'heap of witness' of Gn 31<sup>47</sup>, the pot of manna (Ex 16<sup>38</sup>), the tables of the law (34<sup>35</sup>), the budding rod of Aaron (Nu 17<sup>10</sup>), the stones taken out of Jordan (Jos 4<sup>6</sup>), the stone 'Ebenezzer' (1 S 7<sup>12</sup>), the sword of Goliath hung up in the tabernacle at Nob (1 S 21<sup>9</sup>), the pillar which Absalom reared (2 S 18<sup>18</sup>), and more. These monuments testified to actual events, of which records were no doubt otherwise preserved, as in the Book of Jashar and the Book of the Wars of the Lord; the events were not invented to explain the monuments.

Finally, the very fact that Israel claimed a pre-Mosaic existence is to Dr. König proof of that existence. If it had not been, there was no reason why they should go back behind their great Law-giver, under whom the foundations of their political independence were laid and the most important principles of their religious history unfolded.

The smallest scientific Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament is published by Messrs. Rivingtons and written by the Rev. Kerson Lake, M.A. Mr. Lake has now contributed an article to *The American Journal of Theology* for January on 'The Text of the Gospels in Alexandria.'

The attention of students of the New Testament text has for some time been concentrated on the 'Western' text and its phenomena. Mr. Lake

does not find that that study has borne fruit at all commensurate with its duration and intensity. Westcott and Hort rejected this type of text because they counted it corrupt and licentious, but they admitted that it possessed both very wide and very ancient attestation. The only result of recent study upon it is to show that its attestation is wider and older than Westcott and Hort knew, and that perhaps Westcott and Hort were not well advised in rejecting it so emphatically.

What we have to explain is why this corrupt text is so widely attested and why this widely attested text is so corrupt. Mr. Lake thinks we cannot do that as we have been attempting it. We must change our method of attack. Let us approach the 'Western' problem, he says, not by a frontal movement on the Codex Bezae or the Old Latin or the Old Syriac versions, but by a flank movement directed against the 'Neutral' or 'Alexandrian' texts. This will bring us at once before the great uncials  $\aleph$  and B on which Westcott and Hort rely. If it shows that they are less trustworthy than Westcott and Hort considered them (and Mr. Lake firmly believes it will show that), then it may also show that the rejected 'Western' text is more worthy of consideration.

Mr. Lake takes us to Alexandria. He bids us forget for a moment that text to which Westcott and Hort gave the name of 'Alexandrian,' and try if we can find out for ourselves what the text of the Gospels was which the earliest writers who lived in Alexandria used. He means Clement, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril. We may not find this out in every particular, for the works of these early Alexandrian writers are still waiting for their critical editor. But we shall, at least, discover the type of text they had in their hands, and that is enough for our purpose.

Take Clement of Alexandria first. We find that the text which Clement used was a 'Western' text. It is not identical with any other 'Western'

text we know. It is not identical with the Western text of the Old Latin or of the Old Syriac. It sometimes differs from the one, and sometimes from the other; it sometimes differs from both. Still it is a text whose peculiarities are so predominantly 'Western' that it cannot be called anything else than a 'Western' text.

We pass to Origen. We have now reached a later stage in the history of the text of Alexandria. Origen's text is no longer distinctly 'Western.' It is what Westcott and Hort called 'Neutral.' It is best represented by  $\aleph$  and B. How this change arose it is not easy to say. The older 'Western' text of Clement is not entirely forgotten. It crops up here and there in Origen. But it is no longer fashionable. The fashionable text is the text which Westcott and Hort (calling it Neutral or no-sided) adopted as nearest to the original. And it is to be noted as very significant that in Alexandria it does *not* represent the oldest type of text, but only the second oldest.

The third type of text used at Alexandria is found best in the writings of Cyril. It is in the main a recension of the 'Neutral' text, and is chiefly remarkable for certain small grammatical and stylistic changes. It is best represented in CL, the Bohairic version, and the great cursive 33. It is the text which Westcott and Hort called specially the 'Alexandrian' text. It also contains 'Western' readings. And Mr. Lake does not believe that they were imported from some other place. It is extremely improbable, he thinks, that strange readings thus imported would have been accepted by Alexandrian scribes. He believes that these 'Western' readings are survivals still of the oldest Alexandrian text, the text which was mainly 'Western' itself.

Then Mr. Lake draws his conclusions. His first conclusion is that Westcott and Hort's edition is a failure. It is a failure 'without which we should be poor indeed,' but it is a failure. It

has not succeeded in reconstructing, as it claims to do, the original Greek of the Gospels. Its text is one that was dominant in Alexandria, not in the first, but in the second stage of the history of the text in that city. We must therefore regard it and the MSS on which it is based as secondary rather than primary authorities for the text of the New Testament.

And his second conclusion is that no one can tell at present what the primitive text of the Gospels was. We have it in no manuscripts, we have it in no versions. We must give ourselves in the days to come to gather it. And we shall have to pay far more attention than we have done to the quotations in the early Fathers. No one can tell what the primitive text of the Gospels was, but Mr. Lake believes that it is more nearly represented by the despised and rejected 'Western' than by any other.

The editor of the *Guardian*, in his issue of 12th February, has published the sermon which Professor Sanday preached before the University of Oxford on Sexagesima Sunday in 1902. It is a sermon on Reunion.

The text is Isaiah 11<sup>12, 13</sup>, 'And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and they that vex Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.'

Dr. Sanday is struck with the modernness of that ancient prophecy. Spoken long before the coming of Christ, it is central now. Deep and earnest is the prophet's yearning for union: it is the deepest and most earnest yearning of many of us to-day. So the history of this tiny people Israel is typical of the greatest movements that spread over the face of Christendom and the world.

The difference between the prophet and us is a difference of distance. But it is not distance in the past, it is distance in the future. He is one with us in his yearning for union, he differs from us in his burning faith that union is near at hand. We do not think it is near at hand, says Dr. Sanday; we think it is very far off. And then he turns and asks if after all it is so far off as we think. Is it not rather that we measure time as God does not measure it? In His sight and in the sight of the true prophet a thousand years are as one day. Had he measured time as we do, the prophet's sight would have been strained to see the fulfilment of his prophecy in the far, far distant future. But prophecy is really timeless, says Dr. Sanday. 'The time of its fulfilment is a very secondary matter. The certainty is the great thing—the certainty that God will some day comfort His people and bind up the stroke of their wound.'

Therefore this is the great lesson to those who yearn for reunion—and Dr. Sanday expresses it at once: Do not trouble about times and seasons which the Father has kept within His own power; do not be impatient and cry, Where is the promise of His coming? and above all, do not seek to hasten His coming in ways that He may not approve.

Five years ago this mistake was made in the Church of England. Dr. Sanday does not name, and he will not blame, those who made it. 'Their action was not, perhaps, that of the wisest and most far-seeing statesmanship.' It was not statesmanship that was at work at all. Rather was it a chivalrous instinct, a truly Christian instinct, which felt that our divisions were not Christian, and made one great effort to diminish them.

Dr. Sanday will not blame them. He will not even regret—at least he will not regret too much—that they made the attempt. He is proud of the spirit and manner in which they made

it. 'Those who acted for the Church of England did so with a combination of knightly dignity and Christian zeal of which we may well be proud.' And on the other side, the little band of French clergy, who were their best allies, were no whit behind them. Moreover, he thinks they were not far from succeeding. 'If report spoke truly, even at Rome itself the issue for some time trembled in the balance; the word of recognition for which we waited was all but spoken, when the tide suddenly began to ebb as before it had flowed.'

And yet it was a mistake. Its failure has checked the whole course of the movement and thrown it back. 'It may take some years—we do not know how many—to recover the lost ground.' Moreover, it had not a large enough body of opinion behind it. Even if it had been successful, Dr. Sanday doubts if success would not have been more embarrassing than failure. For the Church of England is not ready for union with the Church of Rome yet. To diminish the breach on that side might have widened it on the other.

Therefore Dr. Sanday believes that for the present time it is the duty of English Churchmen to watch and pray and do nothing. In the inner chamber of their minds they may, no doubt, do much. But for the rest, let them deliberately adopt a policy of strict *non-aggression* and *non-intervention* as regards all other religious bodies. Let them adopt a policy of working out their own Christian calling as best they may, with the least possible interference and friction outside.

Let us clear our minds of controversy, cries Professor Sanday, during this time of waiting. And his language trembles with emotion as the picture of such a time rises up before him.

'What an effect it would have upon Church life,' he says, 'if each congregation could go on worshipping God in its own way without any sense of antithesis or contradiction, how much happier would its worship be; and, because happier and more undisturbed, how much more acceptable, we would hope, to God Himself?'

And what a change would come over the field of theological study. Every branch of that study would be remodelled, and all in the interest of impartial truth. 'Think,' he says, 'of our dogmatics, rewritten with a view to no foregone conclusions, but simply seeking to ascertain the balanced mind of the Church universal. Think of our Church History, no longer concentrating all its light or all its shade on one side, but letting both freely and delicately intermingle with each other, as they do in the subtlety of nature. Think of our exegesis, not always anxiously considering to what its admissions may lead, but seeking earnestly to discover the original sense by the best means in its power.'

To cease from controversy, it seems a little thing. Yet these are some of the gains it would bring. And there would be no losses to reckon against the gains. In the pursuit of the truth, the highest attainable truth, there would be no loss to lament. The only loss would be the loss of the assumption that what we believe to be true must be true for all the world. And even that assumption we might be ready to lose with less regret.

Dr. Sanday does not think this happy consummation is at hand. But he thinks we might begin to look for it. He thinks that we may set our faces toward Zion, even though we know that we have a considerable journey before us.