

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Jewish Quarterly Review*, which began in the year 1888, ended in the year 1908. It was edited by Mr. Israel ABRAHAMS and Mr. Claude G. MONTEFIORE. Out of its ashes have arisen two Reviews, a new *Jewish Quarterly Review*, to be edited by Professor Felix ADLER and Professor SCHECHTER in Philadelphia, and the *Jewish Review*, to be edited by Mr. Norman BENTWICH and Dr. Joseph HOCHMAN, and to be published by Messrs. Routledge & Sons in London.

The first number of the *Jewish Review* has been published. Its most significant article is a review of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S volume on *The Synoptic Gospels*. The review is signed by Mr. Gerald FRIEDLANDER. The signing of reviews is a feature of the number. It does not seem to mean that the editors decline responsibility for the reviewers' opinions. In this instance at any rate reviewer and editors are evidently at one. For in the editorial notes we are told that while the *Jewish Review* is to provide a platform for the discussion of Jewish questions in a critical and scientific spirit, yet 'in its religious views it will be frankly conservative,' and that 'we stand for traditional Judaism.' The reviewer of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S book stands for traditional Judaism.

Mr. MONTEFIORE believes that the religion of the future will be 'a developed and purified

Judaism,' upon which Mr. FRIEDLANDER remarks that his exposition of Liberal Judaism 'leaves little to differentiate it from that modern phase of Christianity preached in the New Theology, and known as Unitarianism.' From the developed and purified Judaism which is to be the religion of the future, Mr. MONTEFIORE hopes that the name of 'perhaps the greatest, as certainly of its most potent and influential teacher, will not be excluded.' Mr. FRIEDLANDER will have nothing to do with Jesus.

'We are amazed,' he says, 'by the reverence and affection displayed by Montefiore for Jesus.' And lest Mr. MONTEFIORE or any other should reply that he does not know the Jesus of the Gospels, Mr. FRIEDLANDER proceeds at once to declare his knowledge. 'Montefiore,' he says, 'frequently dwells on the "pity" motive of Jesus.' Mr. FRIEDLANDER does not believe in it. When Mr. MONTEFIORE asserts that 'in this pity, this profound and yearning compassion, there lies probably a true and fundamental characteristic of the historic Jesus,' the reviewer demands proof to support the statement. He refers to Mt 8^{11, 12}, 'And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping

and gnashing of teeth.' In that passage, he says, 'Jesus excludes all the people from the peace and happiness of his kingdom, and without the least pity, sentences them to the outer darkness, to weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

But Mr. FRIEDLANDER'S sorest complaint is that Mr. MONTEFIORE approves of the principle of Jesus that there is 'no such thing as religious impurity in a material sense.' It 'cuts athwart the whole scheme of dietary laws.' It 'abrogates the distinction between clean and unclean which forms an important part of Jewish life.' He calls it an inept principle—'one of the most inept principles in the Gospels'—and he evidently thinks that it will not work. For 'is not drunkenness the curse of England, the cause of nearly all the crime and misery? And yet Mr. MONTEFIORE approves of the saying that there is nothing outside a man, which entering into him can make him unclean' (Mk 7^{15, 18}).

The *Jewish Quarterly Review* of Philadelphia has not appeared yet. But in the *Open Court* for April there is an article by a liberal Jew which may be set beside the review of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S book. The article is written by Rabbi A. P. DRUCKER, of whom the editor of the *Open Court* says that he is a member of the Conference of American Rabbis and of the Rabbinical Association of Chicago. The title of the article is 'The Old Testament as a Text-Book.'

Rabbi DRUCKER thinks the time has come for both Jews and Christians to give up the Old Testament as a text-book. We have now reached that stage of religious development which was attained by ancient Greece in the days of Plato. It was during the lifetime of this philosopher that the discovery was made that the old myths and stories about the gods were unsuited to the people's advanced philosophical and religious conceptions. We to-day, says Rabbi DRUCKER, are confronted with the same difficulty in regard to the Bible. He holds that we have not only surpassed the

teachings of the Bible, but have also outgrown its very conception of God. And he is not afraid to say of the stories in the Bible what Plato said of the deeds of the gods, that 'they corrupt the virtues of the people.'

By the Bible Rabbi DRUCKER means, of course, the Old Testament. Now it may be that only the Jews are bound to defend the morality of the Old Testament. Our Lord's 'I say unto you,' it may be claimed, frees the Christian from the necessity. Yet this is a matter of a little more than curiosity to the Christian. We have joined with the Jews in making the Old Testament a text-book. We retain it as a text-book even in these days of 'advanced philosophical and religious conceptions.' What objection, then, has Rabbi DRUCKER to the God of the Old Testament?

He is jealous, he says, and revengeful. He covets honour and praise. He is even cruel and barbarous. And for illustration he refers to the destruction of the Canaanites, the anger of His prophet Moses at the sparing of the Midianite women, the denunciation of Saul for suffering the king of the Amalekites to live, and the death of Uzzah for steadying the ark.

More seriously, the God of the Old Testament, says Rabbi DRUCKER, is untruthful. 'We read unblinkingly how he bids Moses tell Pharaoh that the Children of Israel are to leave Egypt for a three days' journey only, when in reality he is planning that they shall never return.' He also orders the Israelites to borrow gold and silver vessels, ornaments and jewellery, from the Egyptians under false pretences. And he shows himself 'hardly less vainglorious than untruthful,' for he hardens Pharaoh's heart so that he will not suffer the Israelites to depart, 'for a mere whim, to prove his strength, to show off, as it were.'

Last of all, Rabbi DRUCKER makes the charge that Yahawe (the spelling 'indicates the pronunciation used at the Jewish Theological Seminary of

New York') is depicted in the Old Testament as ignorant of the future. He is so ignorant that he made man, and then when he found out the mistake, sent a flood to exterminate him. And he is ignorant in smaller matters as well as in greater. He sends Saul to be anointed by Samuel, and then repents that he has set him up to be king and sends Samuel to take the kingdom from him.

Well, we have heard all this before. And perhaps we have not been so much disturbed by it as we should have been. But what will the Jews do with it who are 'frankly conservative' and 'stand for traditional Judaism'? What will the Jews do with it who are amazed at the reverence paid to Jesus, and do not know the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool' (Is 1¹⁸). The passage is well quoted after an attack on the Old Testament. How many passages in the New have brought as much consolation to sinning men?

But is the passage correctly translated? The latest commentaries on Isaiah are those of Mr. G. H. Box and Professor GUTHIE, the former being published independently in 1908, and the latter as part of the new edition of KAUTZSCH'S *Die heilige Schrift des A.T.* in 1909. And both these commentaries offer the translation, first suggested by WELLHAUSEN, which turns the promise into a question.

Mr. C. F. BURNEY discusses the translation of the passage in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April. He quotes the translation of Mr. Box:

Come now let us argue together, says Jahweh:

If your sins be as scarlet
shall they become white as snow?
If they be red as crimson
shall they become as wool?

And he quotes the vindication which Mr. Box offers in a footnote: 'The language of promise and forgiveness is quite out of keeping with the stern logic of a legal plea.'

First, then, is it a legal plea? Mr. BURNEY admits that it is usually understood so to be. But he does not believe it. The case for the court of justice, he says, rests on the one word translated in the Authorized and Revised Versions, 'let us reason together.' This word Dr. SKINNER translates, 'let us implead one another,' and adds: 'The idea is that of a legal process in which each party maintains his own case.' Mr. BURNEY examines the use of the verb elsewhere. He comes to the conclusion that the meaning here is 'let us right ourselves,' which he takes to mean 'let us enter into right relations with one another.'

With this translation the necessity of finding ourselves in a court of justice vanishes. Mr. BURNEY recommends us to rid our minds of the idea of a judgment-scene, and connect vv. 18-20 with the passage immediately preceding. Then the opening words of v. 10, 'Wash you, make you clean,' will show that the idea of the washing away of sins, even so heinous as those of apostate Israel, is prominent in the prophet's mind.

Nor will Mr. BURNEY allow that so gracious an offer of forgiveness is inconsistent with Isaiah's idea of the character of Jahweh. Certainly Isaiah has conceived the idea that the holiness of Jahweh is awful and unique. But where has he expressed its awfulness most emphatically? It is in that sixth chapter in which he describes his own call and the keen sense of his own sinfulness which the vision of God's holiness produced in him. Now in that passage the prophet's sin is as graciously forgiven, and the word that is used to declare it—'purged'—is the translation—contains the same idea of wiping away and making bright and clean as is prominent in the verse before us.

But against the translation which would turn the

promise into a rhetorical query, Mr. BURNEY has another argument. If this is a question, there is no interrogative particle to tell us so. If it is a question, the question is left to be asked by the speaker's tone of voice. Mr. BURNEY does not believe that there is another instance of a sentence such as this, in which a question is left to be asked by the tone of voice of the speaker.

No site in Palestine has been held to be more surely established than the site of Jacob's Well. But the Rev. Asad MANSUR, Pastor of Christ Church, Nazareth, suspects the identification. He has published his suspicion and the reasons for it in the *Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* for April.

His first reason for rejecting the claim of the present well to be Jacob's Well, is that Jacob's Well was near to a city of Samaria called Sychar. Where was Sychar? Some say Sychar is a local corruption of the name Shechem; some say a deliberate corruption to express the intemperance of that Samaritan city, Sychar meaning 'drunken.' Mr. MANSUR believes that Sychar and Shechem are distinct names, but that Sychar was just outside the walls of Shechem, to which it formed a suburb, where wine was pressed or sold, or where public-houses were built.

His second objection is that Jacob is nowhere said to have dug a well where 'Jacob's Well' is now found, and there would have been no sense in his doing so. For there was, and is, plenty of spring water in the neighbourhood, which could be reached without any of the digging that this deep well must have demanded.

His third reason is, even if there was a well in our Lord's day where the present 'Jacob's Well' is found, the woman of Samaria was not likely to pass all the other excellent and accessible wells in order to draw water from it. Mr. MANSUR is aware that this objection has been met in two ways. It

has been suggested that the woman was at work in the fields and came to Jacob's Well as nearest, to get water both for herself and for those who may have been working in the field with her. To that Mr. MANSUR replies by pointing to the season of the year. It was yet four months till the harvest, and as the harvest begins in the middle of April, the time was the middle of December. What could the woman be doing in the field at that season? And even if she were in the field and at work,—though what the nature of the work could be, no one can tell,—still there would be no need for a rope and water-jar to find water then. A small jar filled from a house or from some fountain on the way would be sufficient at that time of year both for herself and for any others who might be with her.

The other way to meet the objection is to suggest that Jacob's Well was a sacred well. The woman may in her piety have passed all the other wells purposely in order to draw water from this well with its sacred associations. To which Mr. MANSUR replies that this woman's character before her conversion is well known to us. He cannot conceive that she would feel more respect for a holy place than other women in her town.

His last reason is that the present 'Jacob's Well' is probably not a well at all, and never could have served the purpose either of Jacob or of the woman of Samaria. Mr. MANSUR does not believe that the present Jacob's Well is more than a cistern. It is dry in summer, and the water that is found in it in winter drains into it, he believes, from its sides. 'When I was in Nâblus in the month of March, I was told that the monks bring the water to the well from the village of Askar.'

Mr. MANSUR's own opinion is that the well at which our Lord conversed with the woman of Samaria was in the north of the city of Shechem. Opposite to that quarter of the present town of Shechem, which is now known by the name of *Hâret el-Hableh*, there is an opening in Mount

Ebal, with gardens and fields. 'I feel much inclined to reckon this opening as the parcel of a field which Jacob bought and in which he dug the well. There are several springs in the *Hâret el-Hableh*, and wherever you dig to a depth of fifteen feet or even ten, the water springs up in a copious fountain. There is a well here called the Well of the Prophets, on which a Muhammadan mosque has been built, called *el-Anbia* ('the prophets'), and by the word 'prophets' the Muslims mean 'the sons of Jacob.' I venture to believe, then, that if Jacob dug a well in the neighbourhood, it is to be identified with this well or some well near it.

There are sermons for undergraduates, and there are sermons for others. But even the undergraduates who listened to the sermon preached by Professor INGE before the University of Cambridge, and published in the *Guardian* for May 13, must have been gratified by the compliment paid to their penetration. The subject of the sermon was the apocalyptic element in Christ's teaching.

It is the most difficult subject to handle in all the range of Apostolic Christianity. And its difficulty is at its greatest. It is, as Professor INGE calls it, 'the storm-centre of Christian apologetics at the present time.'

The early Christians looked upon the Ascension as little more than the necessary preliminary to their Lord's return. In the words of Professor INGE, it was 'the penultimate scene of a drama which was very shortly to have its *dénouement* by the reappearance of the Messiah on the clouds of heaven.' This is a fact which, however unwelcome, we must face. And recent critics of Christianity are determined that we shall face it, together with all that follows from it. But while this is one fact, there is another fact which also has to be faced. If the coming of Christ is represented in the New Testament as immediate, it is also represented as dim and distant, the end (if the end at all) of a long, slow process of growth.

Nothing, says Professor INGE, but our uncritical manner of studying Holy Scripture could have hidden from us so long the double thread which runs, entangled but not united, through the New Testament. On the one side, we have the whole scheme of salvation presented to us under the forms of time and place. The place is Judæa. The time is the generation of men then living. God's final interposition—the 'coming' of Christ—is to be external, sudden, violent, wholly miraculous. And it is bound up with certain beliefs about the structure of the universe. The earth is, as it were, the first floor of a three-storied building. Jerusalem is the centre of the earth. And the end of all things is at hand.

On the other side, there is a Kingdom which is in this world but is not of it. Christ is the Head of it. The indwelling Spirit of Christ is its guiding star. It passes through a long probation as a Church militant, its practice based on the counsels and the example of its Head. And salvation is the attainment of eternal life—that is to say, of a higher state of existence, beyond this bourne of time and space, a blessed state to be fully realized in the future, but which in a measure may be realized on earth.

We are now told that Christianity began with the former of these conceptions, and ended with the latter. 'All through St. Paul's Epistles we can trace the gradual evanescence of the crude Messianic belief, and the approximation to the spiritual religion which we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in a still more advanced form in the Fourth Gospel.'

And Professor INGE does not deny that this is so. But the serious aspect of the matter is seen when it is further asserted that our Lord Himself knew only the former conception of the Kingdom. It is asserted that Jesus 'never contemplated founding a Church or instituting a rule of life for future generations; that His one message was "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand"—or, in

modern language, that the world was coming to an end. He went about warning His countrymen of an impending catastrophe, in which all existing conditions would be subverted, and a supernatural Messianic reign established.'

Now, if this view of the preaching of Christ is accurate and adequate, Professor INGE is not mistaken when he says that Christianity is 'torn up by the roots.' For these predictions were falsified in every particular. And the same critics allow us to claim very little else as His authentic teaching. 'It is true that there are some Christians, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, who do not regard this treatment of our Lord as intolerable. I confess,' says Professor Inge, 'that I can neither agree with their arguments nor understand their position.'

But both conceptions are there. And they are contradictory. How does Professor INGE propose to resolve the contradiction?

Well, in the first place, he will not allow us to retain the lazy belief into which we have fallen, that Christ promised to return to the earth at a far distant date, which was unknown to Himself. It is true, we are told that the day and the hour were unknown; but the predictions, as they stand in our documents, clearly assert that the return, or 'coming,' of the Son of Man was imminent. He will not allow us, therefore, to say that the disciples simply antedated the fulfilment of the prophecy and that it still holds good. Professor INGE then uses these serious words: 'Our Lord is recorded in the Gospels to have made predictions which certainly have not been, and cannot now be, fulfilled—predictions, moreover, which, if they were an essential part of His message, must have profoundly modified the whole of His practical teaching, making it only suited to the brief interval before the end of all things should come.'

So there is no doubt about the difficulty of the

subject. How does Professor INGE propose to deal with it? It was when he proceeded to his proposals for dealing with it that the undergraduates who listened to him must have recognized the compliment which was paid to their penetration. If they were students of psychology, that might have made it easier for them to follow. Professor INGE considers the subject mainly from the psychological side. For he thinks that the solution of the problem must be found in that region. He begins with John the Baptist.

John the Baptist preached a moral preparation for a supernatural catastrophe. So did Jesus. Indeed, He used identical language. But note the difference in meaning. Jesus had a doctrine of Fatherhood. John had not. By means of His doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, Jesus was able to make His preaching of repentance and the imminence of judgment a message of mercy and of hope. John preached judgment to come, pure and simple. He had no way of connecting moral amendment with the impending catastrophe so as to change the centre of gravity from fear to love. Jesus also urged repentance in view of the imminent end. But the repentance He preached was the first step in a life of filial obedience and joy.

Whereupon the Jewish apocalyptic ideas began to lose their force and to pass away. The apocalyptic language was still used. But it was now only the husk: Jewish Messianism was shattered from within. The disciples did not see this at once. They knew that some great change was taking place. Their minds were filled with a great hope, a dazzling, blinding hope, which only grew stronger after the tragic end of the earthly mission. Their Master was restored to them. He was with them still. The Kingdom of God was creating itself in their hearts. They felt that they were living in the very hour of the fulfilment of prophecy, and they could use, and did use, the old familiar language, but they used it with a new meaning. 'When a man is possessed by the

Spirit of God, and feels all heaven within him, he may use the language of his childhood about the gold and jewels of heaven's streets, and the winged messengers of the King; but assuredly his faith is not childish or materialistic.'

But is there any evidence that the disciples did not use the common apocalyptic language in the common sense? There is the evidence of result. By their fruits ye shall know them. We know the apocalyptic type of religion. It is a real type. It exists. 'Its normal results,' says Professor INGE, 'are either political insurgence or selfish quietism—in either case indifference to social morality, neglect of duties, nervous excitement, and rapid evanescence.' Is this the religion of the follower of Christ? Is it the religion of Christ Himself?

But when Professor INGE has vindicated the spiritual character of the religion of Christ and His disciples, he proceeds at once to admit that in the teaching of Christ and in the teaching of His disciples there are passages which are purely apocalyptic in character. And he admits that

their apocalyptic character is not in the language merely, but in the thought. His explanation is to cut the knot. These passages are misinterpretations of Christ's actual teaching on the part of His disciples, or they are later interpolations. 'Very few critics,' he says, 'accept as authentic the apocalyptic prophecy in Mk 13: may there not be one or two more innocent interpolations of the same kind?'

This is a little disappointing. But the truth is better than our pleasure. If it is so, let us see that it is so. It is still more disappointing, perhaps, to find Professor INGE admitting 'the further possibility that our Lord in becoming man may have been willing to share, to some extent, the current popular delusions both with regard to the Messianic hope and to demoniacal possession.' But he insists that this concession must certainly not be stretched so far as to admit that He fancied Himself filling the rôle of Daniel's 'son of man' in the near future. 'Such a notion would not be compatible with sanity, far less with those attributes which all Christians believe Him to have possessed.'

The Alleged Catholicism of the First Gospel and its Date.

BY THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., LECTURER IN THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE IN THE UNIVERSITY, AND ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

It seems to be universally believed that the First Gospel reflects a fairly advanced stage of ecclesiastical development. And it is in consequence as universally believed to be comparatively late in date. Professor Peake, *e.g.*, argues against some who date it not much later than the year 70 A.D., 'that the Gospel seems to reflect a somewhat later period of ecclesiastical development. Nothing forbids the view that this rather Catholicised Gospel may have been written towards the close of the first century.'¹ Now, that the book does

represent a certain stage of Church development is certain. What is uncertain is the date to which the Gospel must be assigned in consequence. The Church may be said to have begun its career from the moment that the disciples realized that their Master had left them to preach the gospel. At what stage in its future development must our First Gospel be placed?

I propose to state in the following pages the evidence which seems to me to make it abundantly clear that the book cannot have been written after the Fall of Jerusalem, and that it may have been

¹ *Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 123.