THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January is a review by Professor Sanday of the 'Cambridge Biblical Essays' (Macmillan; 12s. net). That volume was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES immediately after its issue. And a continued use of it has deepened the impression then conveyed that it is a book of the first importance.

The importance of the book does not lie in the additions which it makes to our knowledge of the Bible. It does not make many additions. That was not the purpose, we may be sure, for which the book was planned and prepared; it is certainly not the end that has been attained. We are always glad of the least addition to our knowledge of the contents of the Bible or even of its surroundings. But we have more occasion for gladness when men whom we can trust tell us how to value and how to use the abundant knowledge which we already possess.

There is Dr. Johns, for example, whose article is on the 'Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament.' We know a great deal now about Babylonian mythology. We have read and written not a little about its influence upon the Old Testament. But what is it all worth? What use can we make of it? This is just what Dr. Johns tells us. This is just what Professor Sanday finds to be 'the most interesting feature in the essay.'

For we no longer need the evidence of the monuments to prove that the Bible is true. It is long since we have seen that the monuments are more in need of the support of the Bible than the Bible of the monuments. Even Professor Sayce told us years ago that 'the Assyrian kings are brazen-faced liars on their monuments.' What we want to know now is the religious value of the early narratives of Genesis.

Well, in order to obtain that knowledge, we must set the early narratives of the Bible beside the early mythology of the Babylonians. And not of the Babylonians only. Nor only of those races which are in closest geographical proximity to the Hebrews. If the Babylonian mythology serves the purpose best, it will be because it is best known, not because it is nearest. What we need, in short, is just what Dr. Johns gives us here—in the words of Dr. Sanday, 'a sympathetic, and therefore (as I conceive) really intelligent treatment, of the early mythologies.'

Our first mistake was to go to the monuments for evidence of the truth of the Bible. That was excessive humility on our part. For the Bible is its own evidence; otherwise it could not possibly

be the Bible. But we made a greater mistake than that. We went to the monuments to prove our own interpretation of the Bible. And that was as excessive arrogance. The monuments have not supported our interpretation. They have shown us that it was a mistaken interpretation. And we have sometimes been led to revise our interpretation; and sometimes we have simply been disappointed. Dr. Johns goes to the monuments in order that by their aid he may understand what the Bible really is. He lays the Babylonian texts by the side of the Hebrew texts that the one may interpret the other, and that out of the comparison he may understand how much is truth and how much is only vehicle, how much is primitive and accidental and how much is eternal.

Professor Sanday quotes considerable portions of Dr. Johns' paper, and some of it he throws into italics. He is evidently anxious, like the rest of us, to get at the back of that word 'myth.' For we speak freely enough of the mythology of Babylonia, but we scarcely dare use the word myth in relation to Israel. If the question were asked, Is the Fall a myth? we should call it another way of asking, Is the Fall a lie? But what is a myth? '*Many so-called myths*,' says Dr. Johns (and Dr. Sanday throws the two sentences into approving italics), '*are primitive attempts to put an hypothesis into words before language has become sufficiently developed for scientific terms to be available. Recourse is invariably had to metaphor.*'

Dr. Johns takes the example of an eclipse. There is good reason to suppose that the Babylonians knew what caused an eclipse, though they may not have known just how the moon got between us and the sun. When, therefore, they said that a dragon had devoured the sun, 'they could not (Dr. Sanday again uses italics) have believed in the actual existence of a dragon, even if their fathers and some ignorant folk among them still did so.'

Pass to the sixth essay in the volume. Its title is 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis.' Its author is Mr. Israel Abrahams, University Reader in Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature. Here the ignorance of the average Gentile is so great that the addition of actual information may be considerable. But that is not why Dr. Sanday pronounces this essay to be one of the most interesting and valuable in the book. It is because it marks an advance in method in the branch of study which it commends. 'Until a comparatively recent date,' says Dr. Sanday, 'prejudice has been too much at work on both sides. Christian scholars have either unduly ignored the assistance which Rabbinic literature might have given them, or else they have collected such data as they could chiefly for polemical purposes. And, on the other hand, Jewish scholars have retaliated in the same polemical spirit.' Mr. Abrahams' article is the same sort of contribution as we have already had from Dr. Johns. The recognition of priority in time on the part of some Jewish Rabbi does not make a great gospel text superfluous or untrue. Bring the Jewish Rabbi's saying into comparison sympathetically. The saying itself may obtain a wider meaning and a deeper, and Christ may be better understood—understood to be the Christ of the Jews as well as of the Gentiles.

There is one thing in this volume which distinguishes it from the previous volume of 'Theological Essays,' which was published in 1905. The contributors to the 'Theological Essays' were members of the English Church, and all but one were of the clergy. The present book, on the other hand, 'contains essays by members of several religious bodies, and among the essayists are five laymen.' Professor Sanday likes that. And when he reaches the eleventh essay on Jesus and Paul, which is written by Professor Anderson Scott of Westminster (Presbyterian) College, it is evidently a particular pleasure to him to find it so good, and to be able to say that it is 'a really helpful contribution, grappling with the subject at closer quarters and more along its whole breadth than

anything that I remember to have seen upon it in English.' But the next essay is by Professor Percy Gardner, and it is no surprise to find Dr. Sanday arrested there.

For Professor Percy Gardner is a most difficult writer to deal with. He is so fair, and yet so unfair. He makes so many concessions that it seems ungracious to grudge him his own little individualities. And yet these individualities, with all the sweetness of their expression, are really enough to carry away the foundation upon which rests the whole gospel of the grace of God.

Dr. Sanday has always been gentle with Professor Percy Gardner. He is gentle here. We are not quite sure that he would be so gentle if he realized how little of the historical in the New Testament Professor Gardner really leaves with us. Even here, where the subject is the Speeches of St. Paul in Acts, so much is taken away of the speeches at Lystra and at Athens that Dr. Sanday is constrained to enter an emphatic protest. But he passes from it, to notice, with unmistakable pleasure, an incidental paragraph on the subject of inspiration, and to say that 'the essay would have been well worth publishing if it had contained nothing else.'

This is the paragraph: 'From the present point of view the question of inspiration or non-inspiration of a book is not primary. For how does divine inspiration act upon a writer? In two ways: first, by strengthening and intensifying his natural powers; and second, by producing in him what W. James has called an uprush of the sub-conscious. I should prefer to call the last an inrush of the super-conscious. It makes a man a vehicle of deep-lying forces, so that he builds better than he knows. He may think that he is writing for a society, or even for an individual, when he is really writing for future ages, and to meet needs of which he is unconscious.'

That is the paragraph. What does Professor Sanday say about it? He says: 'The appeal to the sub-conscious is, I venture to think, fraught with great promise, not only in this, but in many other directions. It happens, by a coincidence, that I am myself having recourse to it for another purpose at the present time. But on this subject of inspiration, I fully believe, with Dr. Gardner, that it opens out new vistas; and I am very grateful to him for the form which he has given to his statement.'

The last essay in the book is by its editor, Professor Swete. It is an essay on the religious value of the Bible. It is not a summary or criticism of the contents of all the essays that have gone before. The essayists were allowed to write in their own way, and the essays are allowed to stand on their own merits. But it expresses the spirit of the book; and if it had been found at the beginning it would have been a useful lead to the understanding of the great gift which these Cambridge scholars have given us.

Dr. Sanday is delighted with it. It 'breathes all the *mitis sapientia* of Dr. Swete.' It is 'not only characteristic of its author, but it may be said to be also characteristic of the present day and of the book as a whole. It shows that wide tolerance and open-minded recognition of good from all sides which marks the age to which we belong.'

Then Professor Sanday quotes this paragraph: 'The Gospels exhibit this pattern, and it is this which gives them a religious value that even in the Bible itself is unique. No criticism, whether of the sources of the Gospels or of their historical details, can greatly affect their value in this respect. It is independent of our acceptance of the miracles. That it can even survive an abandonment of the Catholic Doctrine of the Person of Christ, or a refusal to analyze the impression which the Gospels convey upon that subject, may be seen from the earlier lectures of Adolf Harnack's *What is Christianity?* No more enthusiastic appreciation of the religious value of the Gospel life of Jesus can be found than in that remarkable book, which is

nevertheless written from the standpoint of a Christology that can satisfy no Catholic Christian.'

Professor Sanday, we say, quotes that paragraph, and he asks: 'Would it have been written so lately as ten years ago, even by Dr. Swete?' But it has been written now. It has been written by Professor Swete of Cambridge, and Professor Sanday of Oxford agrees with it. 'That is the temper of Cambridge; and it is also the temper of Oxford, and (I think I may add) of enlightened opinion in this country generally. We do not intend to let the anchor drag loose from our own moorings; but we do intend to welcome that which is good, from whatever quarter it may come; and we shall judge those who differ from us, not merely on party lines, but on the extent to which the opinions which they express commend themselves to reason and conscience.'

Professor Cheyne has sent to the *Christian Commonwealth* of February 16 a review of Mr. Claude Montefiore's *Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. It is a review of four great columns in length. For the book appeals to him. He looks at our Lord with something of the same admiring detachment of mind as that with which He is regarded by Mr. Montefiore, and he is pleased with Mr. Montefiore because Mr. Montefiore the Jew is so well pleased with Jesus.

Professor Cheyne is 'not offended either at an occasional unfavourable criticism of sayings of the Master or at a frank recognition of imaginative elements in the Gospels.' It is true that Mr. Montefiore is a Jew, and 'a fervent Jew.' He does not believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and he does not believe that He is the Messiah. But what of that? 'If Jesus was really more perfectly man than we were taught to suppose, and if He has been more absolutely identified with one of God's "countenances" (to speak in Semitic fashion) than is justifiable by the ascertainable facts, need we feel our Christianity imperilled?'

The book appeals to him, even to the length of its *a priori* canons of criticism. Mr. Montefiore cautions us against supposing that a given passage is authentic in proportion to the age of the 'source' which records it. Dr. Cheyne agrees. And he agrees when Mr. Montefiore says that the point is, where would tradition remember truly, and where would it consciously or unconsciously add, alter, and embroider? It is a pity he does not tell us how we are to know what tradition would be likely to do.

Again, Mr. Montefiore warns us against 'the illusory canon' that the noblest and most original sayings must be authentic, as being worthy of none but Jesus. And again Professor Cheyne agrees. 'One of the noblest,' says Mr. Montefiore, 'is surely, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Lk 23^{34}). And yet this is almost certainly not authentic.' Now it is a remarkable circumstance that Westcott and Hort, who knew quite as well as Montefiore and Cheyne how the external evidence stands, while coming to the conclusion that this saying did not originally belong to St. Luke's Gospel, are nevertheless quite emphatic about its being an authentic saying of Jesus. Their words are: 'Few verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than this first of the Words from the Cross.' In short, they simply accept 'the illusory canon' that the noblest and most original sayings must be authentic as being worthy of none but Jesus.

But if Professor Cheyne is pleased with Mr. Montefiore's Commentary, he is most of all pleased with it when the author undertakes the emendation of the Gospel text. There are two passages which he particularly commends.

The first is Lk 11^{41}. The literal translation is, 'Give for alms the things that are in it, and behold all things are clean unto you.' That, says Professor Cheyne, is impossible. He goes back with Mr. Montefiore to the Aramaic. In Aramaic *zakki*

means 'give alms,' and *dakki* means 'cleanse.' Read, therefore, 'Cleanse what is within, and surely all is clean to you.'

The other passage is the Parable of the Good Samaritan. It is a parable that has been misnamed. There is no Samaritan in it. Following the great Jewish scholar J. Halévy, Mr. Montefiore says that the Samaritan was not a Samaritan, but an Israelite. 'Priest, Levite, and Samaritan,' he says, 'is no less queer and impossible than Priest, Deacon, and Frenchman would be to us to-day. Most probably the alteration was simply due to the uncomprehendingness of Gentile Christians, who did not know that "Israelite" was commonly used for a man who was neither Priest nor Levite.' Professor Cheyne cannot say whether the alteration was deliberate or accidental. He is quite sure it is an alteration.

But beyond his pleasure in the Commentary, and beyond his delight in the textual criticism, Professor Cheyne approves of the book because of the 'reverent admiration' which Mr. Montefiore feels for Jesus. He quotes two passages. 'The love of Jesus for children must have been a historic and characteristic trait. He must have been one of the most sympathetic and human of men.' That is the one passage. And this is the other: 'How much strength has not the prayer at Gethsemane given to endless human souls! And why should it not, even though for us Jesus is neither God nor Messiah, give strength to Jewish hearts also? We must restore this hero to the bead-roll of our heroes.'

One of the Assistant Masters at Harrow has translated and edited the work entitled *Jéhovah* of Professor Westphal of Montauban, and he has persuaded Dr. Ryle to write a foreword. Dr. Ryle is now a bishop. He has been a bishop for a good many years. But there was a time when he was the strongest Old Testament teacher in Cambridge, and this foreword shows that he has still the teacher's instinct for the instruction that has life in it.

What Dr. Ryle was in Cambridge has been told by Professor James Hope Moulton in an article 'About Some Teachers' in the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for February. Dr. Moulton says: 'By far the greatest power in the University in my time on the religious side was Professor Herbert Ryle. Lucid and learned, fearlessly progressive but deeply reverent, Professor Ryle's teaching was among the best I ever knew. He was extremely popular and influential with the men, and seemed to have reached an ideal sphere when they made him Head of a "House." Why, oh why did the authorities insist on his taking up a hereditary position on the bench of bishops?'

But we say, and in spite of that wail, it is evident that the Bishop of Winchester has not lost his interest in the Old Testament. For the book to which he has written this foreword—it is called in English *The Law and the Prophets* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net)—is a book which no man would give his name to unless he approved of it, and no man would approve of it who had not been moving forward with the progress of Old Testament study.

For Professor Westphal is not simply a follower of Wellhausen. Far as he is removed from the traditional reader who takes the books of the Old Testament in their familiar order, and squares the ethics of Judges with that of Isaiah, he is as far removed from the popular critic of the moment who calls the opening chapters of Genesis fragments of Babylonian mythology, denies the existence of the patriarchs, and discovers Jehovah in the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai—a little local deity worshipped by some Kenite tribe. And it is not that he is simply a conservative critic. It is not that he simply occupies a middle position. Let us touch the three topics just mentioned. And let us take them up in their inverse order.

The first, then, is the origin of Jehovah the God

of Israel. The most popular belief at present is that Moses and the Israelites found Him at Sinai, a God worshipped by some nomad tribes accustomed to encamp there. Professor Westphal does not believe it. If the Israelites came to Sinai, they came there under the protection of a God of some kind, and with some name to be known by. Now there is no case in history, he says, of a nation abandoning their own God and accepting the God of another nation simply because He made Himself terrible by means of 'a few claps of thunder.' And how is He said to have recommended Himself? By chastising them. 'The peculiarity of Jehovah, from His first appearance, is to command, and to strike mercilessly when disobeyed'—a strange début, says Professor Westphal, for a deity who, without any previous record, sought to supplant the old teraphim of Israel.

'But if, on the contrary'—and we shall quote Professor Westphal's exact words now—'under the new and suggestive name given Him by Moses' reformation, He is the same ancestral God whose blessings are bound up with the life of the Hebrew patriarchs, and if, in the events of a supreme crisis, He has just shown Himself the deliverer of the tribes which call upon Him, then everything becomes clear and intelligible.'

The next thing is the existence of the patriarchs. Jehovah is represented as saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' This is said to have been the credentials with which Moses was sent down into Egypt. Well, if Moses ever was sent into Egypt, and if he did deliver the Israelites, what other credentials had he? What other explanation is there of the authority he obtained over the Israelites? Just as the reforms of Moses are necessary to the understanding of the prophets, so, says Professor Westphal, historical continuity requires the nomad life of the patriarchs, the distress of the descendants of Abraham, and the miraculous deliverance of the Exodus, to account for the authority of Moses and the building of the national constitution on the Law (the Torah) of Jehovah.

There remain the early narratives of Genesis, the first eleven chapters, which seem to have no connexion with the history of the Hebrews, and are said to contain traditions which are common to all the Semitic nations. Is it a mere literary accident that has linked these traditions to the call of Abraham? And is it a scientific duty to let them sink back again into the common heap of Oriental myths? Professor Westphal thinks our duty lies elsewhere.

For, in the first place, it is a fact that no Semitic religion contains all the traditions recorded in the early chapters of Genesis. Nowhere else are they grouped in the same way, and nowhere else is any one of them found described with the same fulness or precision. In the next place, the call of Abraham is unintelligible without them. Says Professor Westphal, 'If the Bible story began with the call of Abraham, the drama of salvation, of which the history of the patriarchs is the first act, would open without anything to explain its subject, or to interest us in the plot, and the later acts would leave the riddle still unsolved. "God said (what God?) to Abraham (who is that?), in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (what is the meaning of that?). Re-read the opening pages of Genesis and everything is accounted for. What was reputed a handful of Semitic traditions, unconnected with the history of Israel, becomes the forecourt of the temple where God waits to teach and redeem humanity.'

The last thing is that Professor Westphal does not attempt to square the ethics of the Book of Judges with the ethics of the Book of Isaiah. He does not believe that 'the whole of Revelation was completely contained in each successive moment of its history. This, he holds, is a common but most regrettable error of writers of Bible Histories. They strive to demonstrate the scientific accuracy of the account of the Creation, 'as if the men who

wrote it had known the theories of Galileo and of Darwin.' If the subject is the religion of Abraham, they attribute to him the monotheism of Moses, as if God had never needed to say to Moses, 'Hear, O Israel, thy God is the only God there is.' In the stories of Jephthah, Samuel, or Elisha, everywhere and always we assume that the men of the Old Testament were, from the outset, all equally acquainted with the moral and religious content of the revelation preached by an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, if not even by Jesus Christ and St. Paul.

Professor Westphal calls this historical heresy. In art it would be called a lack of perspective. It would recall the paintings of the earliest masters, of Cranach or of Albert Dürer. And what is the effect of it? Its effect is to suggest that men who behave at times like the uttermost barbarians have been taught all the will of the just and holy God, and have even been commanded to behave thus barbarously. Professor Westphal takes the revelation of God in the Bible as historical and progressive. And he takes these words loyally and courageously in the fulness of their meaning. He tells his pupils that in the early stages of Bible history there was not a direct, immediate, and adequate revelation of the true God, but an indirect and educational revelation, which was to the true knowledge of God, as the shadow of blessings to come, to use a Biblical phrase, is to the glorious light of Christ, or as the milk which children enjoy is to the meat which only the adult can digest.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Aberdeen.

Part II.

IV. (*continued*). This incidental allusion to the true nature of the Eucharist in 1 Co 10^{16-21}, therefore, must not be read as if it were a formal description according to the conditions of time and sequence. It is an exposition of truth, into which time does not enter. Paul shows what is the real meaning of the Church ceremony (which he understands as being familiarly known to the Corinthians), partly by direct interpretation, and partly by contrast with the rites of pagan dæmonic powers, rites which had an outward similarity to the Christian rite, but which were absolutely opposite in character and power. Nowhere does Paul show more clearly that he conceived the universe as a balance, more or less uneasy, between vast contending forces. The world around us cannot be understood, according to his view, as an inert mass: it is a war of tremendous powers, sweeping the life of man with them towards evil or towards good. In such a simple situation as the invitation given to a Corinthian Christian by some pagan friend are involved infinite possibilities and mighty forces of good and bad, of right and wrong. By participating in the pagan ceremonies, which were a necessary accompaniment of every pagan feast, the Christian entered into a fellowship united through dæmonic powers, and was thereby repelled from the fellowship which is cemented by the Christian sacrament.

No one can read this passage intelligently without perceiving that Paul regarded the Eucharist not as a mere symbolic ceremony, but as a force of infinite potentiality in the life of man and in the constitution of the Church. So far as we can judge, Mark and Matthew regard the ceremony as teaching of important truth through parable; but the teaching is the prediction of the Saviour's death. They do not intimate any wider meaning in the acts and words; and they do not show any appreciation of force and driving power inherent in the due performance of the rite. To Paul the rite has far greater significance than we should gather from the narrative of Mark; and yet his opinion on this matter is seen only from his chap. 10, and would not readily be gathered from chap. 11, as we shall see.

We take κοινωνία δαιμονίων in the sense of 'a communion and fellowship (of men with one