

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

'AN Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile'—how great has been the stumbling-block of the gracious words! Does not our theology teach us that all have sinned and come short? that there is none righteous, no, not one? And this Nathanael is pronounced without guile before he has seen his Saviour.

---

Professor G. F. Genung of Richmond has contributed a short article on Nathanael to the *Biblical World* for November. He does not take the word 'guile' to mean sin in general. He believes that in calling him 'an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile,' our Lord described Nathanael as free from a special and subtle form of hypocrisy. It was not vulgar dishonesty in dealing, falsehood in common intercourse between man and man. It was more spiritual than that. It was more special to the time. Its absence was distinctly a virtue, something of positive and commendable worth. What was this guile?

---

The ordinary Israelite supposed that they who were of the seed of Abraham were sons of Abraham and heirs of the promises. St. Paul taught otherwise. But St. Paul, Dr. Genung believes, was not the first to teach that there was an Israel after the flesh and an Israel after the spirit. When the Son of Man came to the earth He found not a few who claimed to be Israelites

indeed. Abraham their father seemed to look down the generations upon them and demand something more than an immaculate genealogical tree, something indeed like an immaculate personal life.

---

Midway between them and Abraham stood the arresting figure of Isaiah's 'Servant of the Lord.' At first he is identified with the captive nation. The whole nation is invited by the prophet to accept his position and realize his character. But the nation as a whole fails. Then the Servant becomes the ideal centre of the nation. He is now the spiritual heart of Israel, which, by its comprehension of God's redemptive purposes, can be the vital *point d'appui* for the uplift of the nation itself, as well as for the redemption of the world. Here was a conception into which the spiritually minded in Israel could enter, and not merely in admiration and sympathy, but even in personal aspiration. And when the Servant of the Lord is at last in the great climax of the prophecy recognized as an individual, suffering for the sins of the nation and satisfied in its redemption— even then the true Israelite might not shrink from the identification. Why should not he too become anathema for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh?

---

It was a noble ideal. It was in close enough

touch with the better hopes of Israel to become almost a popular ideal. But they who are ideal Israelites are not always ready to pay the price demanded by the realization of their ideal. There were 'Israelites indeed' who called themselves so only because they had outwardly attached themselves to a great spiritual aspiration. They looked for its realization in better conditions, not in a better life. They would not bear the nation's sins, but they would benefit along with the nation in the blessings which the Messiah would bring when he came to suffer and to reign. Grasping at spiritual things for the benefits they brought, their aspirations were an unconscious hypocrisy. They must be distinguished from those like Nathanael, who sought the character more than the comfort. To the Messianic eye seeing him under the fig-tree, Nathanael was 'an Israelite indeed,' but also 'an Israelite indeed, *in whom is no guile.*'

---

What is to be done about the teaching of the Old Testament? The subject was discussed at the Church Congress. It is also touched upon in the admirable address which Canon Driver delivered at the Jubilee of the New College, Hampstead, and which is published in the *Christian World Pulpit* for 14th November.

---

Canon Driver would begin at the beginning of the Bible. First, he says, 'I should explain how, in the opening chapters of Genesis, two writers had told us how the Hebrews pictured to themselves the beginnings of the world and the early history of man; how, borrowing their materials in some cases from popular tradition or belief, in others, directly or indirectly, from the distant East, they had breathed into them a new spirit, and constructed with their aid narratives replete with noble and deep truths respecting God and man; how one writer had grafted upon the false science of antiquity a dignified and true picture of the relation of the world to God; how another writer, in a striking symbolic narrative, had described how man's moral capacity was

awakened, put to the test, and failed; how in the sequel, by other symbolic narratives, the progress of civilization, the growing power of sin, God's judgment upon it, His purposes towards man, are successively set forth.'

---

Then Dr. Driver would pass to the patriarchal age. Here real historical recollections seem to begin. He would show how the skeleton furnished by tradition (and it is only the skeleton that we could reasonably expect tradition to furnish) had been clothed by the narrators with a living vesture of circumstance, expression, and character. 'It was, no doubt, in the process coloured to some extent by the beliefs and associations of the age in which the narrators lived themselves. And in this way the pattern-figures of the patriarchs were created, and those idyllic narratives produced which have at once fascinated and instructed so many generations of men.'

---

In that manner Dr. Driver would pass through the Pentateuch. He would tell the children, 'without concealment or disguise,' why it is that we cannot always call the narrative historical. He would show that this was the form in which the Hebrews told their own children the story of the Exodus and the Conquest of Canaan. And he would always emphasize the religious teaching embodied in the story—the beautifully drawn character of Moses, and the many striking declarations it contains of the character and purposes of God. For the religious teaching is there, and 'no criticism can eliminate it from the narrative.'

---

Then Canon Driver would turn the children's attention to the three great codes of law contained in the Pentateuch. He would describe their general character and purpose. And he would particularly dwell upon the lofty spiritual teaching of Deuteronomy. From the Pentateuch he would pass to the prophets. He would point out the meaning which prophecy had in its own time and circumstances, and he would again be careful not to rest content with that, but to emphasize

the moral and spiritual lessons which it contains. In this way he believes that the Old Testament would gain in reality, in interest, in appreciation, and that the divine element in it would be placed on a firmer and securer foundation.

Who is it, or what is it, in Jn 1<sup>14</sup> that is 'full of grace and truth'? The verse is *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας*: 'And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.' The adjective 'full' is in the nominative. What does it agree with? It might agree with the 'Word' in the beginning of the verse, and Westcott believes it does so agree. But the 'Word' is very far away. Other antecedents occur that seem more likely because more near. These are 'his' and 'glory' and 'only-begotten.' But 'his' and 'only-begotten' are in the genitive, and 'glory' is in the accusative. How can the adjective 'full,' which is in the nominative, agree with any of these?

Mr. C. H. Turner has solved the difficulty. In the first and fourth numbers of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, of which he is editor, he has solved it. He states that in the early ages of Christianity the adjective 'full' (*πλήρης*) could be used indeclinably. He brings forward evidence for his statement. The evidence is overwhelming. Hort and Blass and Nestle had seen it and stated it already. Mr. Turner has proved it. So we can now say either that *He* was 'full of grace and truth,' or that His *glory* was 'full of grace and truth,' or most likely of all, that the *only-begotten* was 'full of grace and truth.' But we cannot say that there are no more discoveries to be made in the study of New Testament Greek.

In the July (1900) number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* there

is an article by Professor Muss-Arnolt of the University of Chicago on the 'Urim and Thummim.' The article is also published separately at the University of Chicago Press.

There are two difficulties connected with the Urim and Thummim—the one, what the words mean; the other, what the things were. Professor Muss-Arnolt deals with both.

The Septuagint translators rendered Urim and Thummim (אֲרִיִּים וְתֻמְמִים) by *δήλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια*, that is, 'revelation and truth' (Ex 28<sup>26</sup>, Lv 8<sup>8</sup>). They got this translation, no doubt, out of the derivation, which they supposed to be in the one case (יָרָה) *yārāh*, to teach, and in the other (אָמַן) *āman*, to be true. The Vulgate followed the Septuagint, rendering the words, *doctrina et veritas*. And the Roman Catholic commentators have followed Bellarmin in defending this translation and adopting this derivation. 'But,' says Professor Muss-Arnolt shortly, 'there is no foundation for such a view in the Old Testament itself.'

Professor Muss-Arnolt believes that the words are of Babylonian origin. Urim he takes from the Assyrian u'uru, infinitive Piel of a'aru, from which comes also ūrtu, a command or decision. Thummim he derives from the Assyrian tamū, of which the Piel is tummu. So the two words would be the Hebrew form of the Assyrian urtu and tamītu, meaning 'decisions and oracles.' Professor Muss-Arnolt submitted his paper to Professors H. P. Smith and G. F. Moore before publishing it. Professor Smith is doubtful of a direct influence of Babylonian upon Hebrew earlier than the Priests' Code. Professor Moore would apparently accept the derivation, but thinks that it does not exclude a popular Hebrew etymology as well, which he would take to be (אָרַר) *'arar*, to curse, and (תָּמַם) *tāmam*, to complete.

What the Urim and Thummim were is a more difficult matter. Many opinions are quoted here,

some of delightful simplicity, others as guardedly obscure as the things themselves. As a specimen of the first kind take Professor Witton Davies in his book on *Magic, Divination, and Demonology*: 'The Urim and Thummim were simply two stones put into the pocket attached to the high priest's ephod; on them were written some such words as "yes" and "no." Whichever stone was taken out, the alternative word upon it was looked upon as the divine decision.' Professor Muss-Arnolt finds that altogether there are three competing explanations. The Urim and Thummim were either stones in the high priest's breastplate, or sacred dice, or little images of 'truth' and 'justice,' such as are found hung round the neck of an Egyptian priest's mummy. He does not agree with any of them.

He himself believes that they are a Hebrew adaptation of the great 'Tablets of Destiny,' of which so much is made in the early mythological literature of Babylon. In the Babylonian story of the Creation, it is stated that Tīāmat raised her son Kingu to have dominion over all the gods, and in token of his supremacy (or to secure it), 'She gave him the *Tablets of Destiny* and laid them upon his breast,' that is, hung them round his neck, saying, 'Thy command be never annulled, the word of thy mouth be authority.' There was much consternation among the gods. But Marduk, the son of Ea, came forward to fight Tīāmat and Kingu. He won the great battle. 'Moreover,' says a later tablet, 'Kingu, who had been great above them all, he defeated and did unto him as he had done to the other gods. Then tore he from him the *Tablets of Destiny*, that did not belong to him. With his own seal he sealed them and laid them on his own breast.'

So it was the possession of the Tablets of Destiny that gave supremacy in the Babylonian pantheon and absolute dominion over men. And when the Babylonian priests delivered oracles (tērēti, sing. tertu), they derived their power

so to do ultimately from Ea and his son Marduk, to whom the Tablets of Destiny belonged. The seer consulted the god, who answered Yes or No.

Now there are some interesting points of contact between the Tablets of Destiny and the Urim and Thummim. Professor Muss-Arnolt discovers four. The Urim and Thummim, according to Ex 28<sup>80</sup>, Lv 8<sup>8</sup>, and other passages, rested within the breastplate, that is, on the high priest's breast, and only when so resting were they efficacious. Only when the Tablets of Destiny rested on their possessor's breast were they efficacious also. Again, in Babylonia only those gods possessed the Tablets of Destiny who were in some way mediators and messengers between gods and men. In Israel the Urim and Thummim belonged to the high priest as mediator between Jehovah and the nation, and even kings bowed in obedience to their decision as to the oracle of God. Then we know that the twelve stones on the breastplate of the Hebrew high priest were 'engraved in the manner of a seal' (Ex 28<sup>21</sup>). When Marduk tore the Tablets of Destiny from the breast of his dead foe, Kingu, he 'sealed them with his own seal.' And finally, Marduk, bearing on his breast the Tablets of Destiny, presided at the annual assembly of the gods, where the lot was cast and the fate determined for king and nation. 'It is the general opinion,' says Professor Muss-Arnolt, 'that the Urim and Thummim were consulted only in cases where the safety of king or nation was concerned.'

The most effective argument now used against the literary criticism of the Old Testament is to point to the history of Homeric and other criticism. It is effective because its force is easily felt and it is unanswerable. Dr. Peters of New York contributed a paper to a recent issue of the *New World* on 'Archæology and the Higher Criticism,' in which he pointed out that not only in the criticism of Homer, but also of the Veda, of Buddhism, of the Avestan literature,

and even of the New Testament, there had taken place 'a most remarkable change of view with regard to the value of subjective or literary evidence alone.'

A quarter of a century ago the Wolfian theory as to the origin of the Homeric poems was still extremely influential. The theory, which spoke of the *Iliad* as made up of a great number of smaller poems gathered into one at a later time, was supported by archæological evidence, or what was then taken for archæological evidence. It was claimed, for example, that if writing was not absolutely unknown, it was not possible then to write poems of such length, and no man could have composed and carried them in his mind without writing them down. It was also held that the historical atmosphere of the poems was incorrect. The very existence of Troy was denied. And in some quarters there was an inclination to resolve the Homeric poems, as a whole, into Sun myths.

Then Schliemann began to excavate. Beneath the mounds of Hissarlik old Troy was found. It had even been destroyed and afterwards rebuilt. Further discoveries at Hissarlik, Mycenæ, and elsewhere showed that the descriptions of these cities in the Homeric poems were historically correct, and rested upon personal or good contemporary evidence. It was also proved that writing was known and commonly practised at a much earlier period than formerly was supposed. The difficulties in the way of the antiquity and integrity of the Homeric poems had been created by the critics themselves. They were once more accepted as the work of one man and the product of an early age.

Roman history has passed through a similar critical experience. At first the traditional history of Rome, with Romulus and Remus suckled by the wolf, was accepted literally. These stories were next explained rationalistically, the wolf being a symbol of the fierce training of the

lads, and such-like. Then came the period of extreme scepticism. All the early narratives were discarded. Roman history began at the close of the kingdom, or even a little later. Before that there was nothing reliable or recognizable.

Then Lanciani began to excavate. Aided by his results Mommsen worked over the literary material anew. Roman history has been reconstructed and carried back almost to the days of Romulus and Remus.

The study of the Veda, of the Avestan literature, of Buddhism, has passed through a similar history. Once the tendency was to bring dates down to a late time, to deny reputed authorship, or everywhere to find composite authorship, and to reconstruct texts with minute subdivision. To-day the inclination among Indian and Persian scholars is to push back the dates of the sacred books, to accept the traditional views in a modified form, and to maintain unity of authorship.

And over the New Testament we know how the pendulum swung forward once, and how far it has swung back in our day. But in the field of the Old Testament the tendency is all the other way. 'The Pentateuch,' says Dr. Peters, 'is divided by each new critic more minutely than by the preceding, and the inclination is to refer its composition, or at least its final composition, to an always later date.' He takes Cornill as an example. Cornill finds the following constituents of the Hexateuch: J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, J<sup>3</sup>, E<sup>1</sup>, E<sup>2</sup>, D, Dh, Dp, P<sup>1</sup>, P<sup>2</sup>, P<sup>x</sup> (where <sup>x</sup> signifies an indefinable number of writers of the P school, a substitute for P<sup>3</sup>, P<sup>4</sup>, P<sup>5</sup>, etc.), H, Rj, Rd, Rp, and a number of fragments not included in any of these. Nor is it the Hexateuch only that is so treated. 'The book of Isaiah is divided, partly on the ground of style, partly on the ground of thought, into a large number of sections, some of which are ascribed to Isaiah, some to later unknown prophets, and some to redactors who have worked over earlier material of Isaiah himself. While practically all critics

are agreed in separating the book of Isaiah into two main portions—of which the latter, chapters xl.–lxvi., is regarded as exilic and post-exilic, the Deutero-Isaiah—there is absolutely no agreement among critics as to the further subdivision of either of these main divisions of the book. Nevertheless, each succeeding work shows an inclination toward greater minuteness of subdivision, the extreme point up to the present having been reached by Dr. Cheyne.’

Is the study of the Old Testament likely to return to the old paths? Dr. Peters does not think so. Back from the extreme subdivision of the Old Testament books and the very late dating of so much Old Testament literature, he believes we shall go. But we have not returned to the old paths in respect of any of the subjects mentioned, and he believes that least of all shall we do so in respect of the Old Testament.

The nearest to a complete return has been made in the case of Homer. But the Homeric poems are not the same as they were before the Wolfian hypothesis was sprung upon them. Schliemann claimed that he had proved Homer accurate to the minutest historical reference. Further research showed that it is only in respect of the general atmosphere of the poems that they can be described as historical; they are not, and probably were never meant to be, sober history throughout. Mommsen and Lanciani have not taught us to read Roman history as our fathers did. Rome has a far-back story, it is true, but Livy is not reliable in detail. In respect of the Avesta, men are holding their hand till the evidence is fuller. And even in the field of the New Testament it is not as many of us would like it. ‘There is an inclination,’ says Dr. Peters, ‘among extreme conservatives to be jubilant over Harnack’s results, but in reality Harnack renders the old conservative view impossible, quite as much as the extreme radical position of Baur and the later critics, who were more or less influenced by the Tübingen school of criticism.’

There are two great reasons why the swing of the pendulum is likely to be least in the criticism of the Old Testament. One is that only extreme critics have carried the criticism to extremity. Strong men, in the fulness of knowledge and in the fearlessness of the truth, stand firm midway. Dr. Peters names Dillmann, who finds in the minute subdividing only ‘hypotheses of embarrassment,’ and Professor Driver, who ‘speaking of the Yahwistic and Elohist narratives in the Pentateuch (J and E), holds that even in the matter of the lines of demarcation between these and the parts assigned to the redactor, we can seldom claim more than a relative improbability.’ He might also have named Professor A. B. Davidson, who, though he received, along with the rare gift itself, the rarer power to restrain it, has once and again let go his biting wit against the tendency to crowd the time of the Maccabees with the flower of Israel’s literature.

But there is another reason, and a greater, why the Old Testament criticism is likely in the main to stand. In other cases the return of the pendulum has been chiefly due to the findings<sup>o</sup> of archæology. Here, says Dr. Peters, where archæology has been most talked about, it has had but little influence.

Dr. Peters does not mean that Biblical Archæology has done nothing for us. He only means that it has done little to reverse the results of literary criticism. ‘The actual gains of recent archæology are great and many. At the outset he mentions one of vast significance. Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, Babylonia have all contributed to it. It is the proof that in these lands there existed civilized nations—in some cases highly civilized nations, from at least 4000 years before Christ. Nor did they stand apart. Great empires were established. Free communication was held between one empire and another. ‘The whole of Western Asia, with Egypt and the Islands of the Sea, was in the sphere of civilization long before the time of Abraham.’

But take them separately. What have we got from Egypt? Some customs alluded to in Genesis have been made clearer from comparison with Egyptian life. We have not yet found in Egypt a single Hebrew name, however, or had a single occurrence in the Bible incontestably established. In one inscription the name of Israel has been found. But it has only thrown our knowledge into confusion. For, if Meneptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, how is it that in the tablet discovered by Petrie he can speak of the people of Israel as 'spoiled' in *Palestine*?

Certainly the Tel el-Amarna tablets have furnished a great amount of extremely valuable knowledge regarding the condition and daily life of the nations that had to do with Egypt in the fourteenth century before Christ. They tell us that Jerusalem was already a centre of worship and known by that name; that almost all the other prominent cities which are mentioned in the Bible were already in existence; that the people of Palestine spoke a language either identical with or closely akin to Hebrew; and that Babylonian was then the medium of official correspondence. But none of these things touch the Higher Criticism. And no reference has hitherto been found on any Egyptian monument to the events in the later history of Israel in which Egypt plays a part.

In Phœnician the most important discovery is perhaps the Marseilles sacrificial tablet. Other inscriptions have been found in various places. They show us the close relation between Hebrew and Phœnician, both in language and in script, and they illustrate some of the antiquities of the Bible, as the titles given to priests and judges, or the names belonging to the divinities. In Moab the great discovery is the Mesha stone, which gives us a new view of the relations between Moab and Israel about the time of Ahab, 'confirming, and to some extent correcting, the statements of the Bible'; and that is all. From Northern Syria light has been thrown on the geography of David's

conquests, and the narrative in the Bible confirmed. Some knowledge has also been gathered of that important people, the Hittites, and many of their inscriptions have been found, if only we could learn to read them. Discovery has revolutionized our views of the early history of Arabia, but done nothing for the Bible or against it.

It is from Assyria and Babylonia that the great finds have come. 'We have the Babylonian form of the Flood story almost complete, which we are able to compare with the Hebrew version; we have the story of the Creation, and perhaps that of Adam and Eve; we have the Tower of Babel, and much more than all that.' These discoveries have placed much material in our hands for the comparative study of Semitic religion. They have established an intimate connexion between Babylonia and Palestine from about 4000 B.C. to 1300 B.C. This connexion, then lost, is again picked up in the time of Ahab, and it continues thereafter till Assyria and Babylonia were no more. Now, these discoveries, says Dr. Peters, have not been without effect on the criticism of the Old Testament. But they face both ways. Sometimes they support tradition, sometimes they flatly contradict it. They have established the substantial accuracy of the books of Samuel and of Kings; but they have shown both Daniel and Esther to be unhistorical.

Last of all, there is Palestine itself. The land of promise, it is the land of promise still. But the fulfilment has been meagre. 'Beyond the Siloam inscription, the inscription from the temple barrier of the New Testament period, a fragment of an inscribed tablet from Lachish, and an insignificant seal or two, nothing has yet been found in Palestine.'

Is all this, then, an encouragement to the literary critics to neglect archæology? Far from it. The critics have themselves already recognized the necessity of knowing what archæology has done at every step. For although the findings of the spade

have not seriously displaced the findings of the pen—at least, of the responsible and moderate pen—yet there is no discovery that can be ignored; and sometimes the most minute discoveries open the way to important and direct critical results.

Take a single striking example. In the first chapter of Leviticus the sacrificial animals are named. They are the ox, the sheep, the goat, and two kinds of doves. Why these and no others? Because these were the animals used by the Hebrews for food. The laws regarding their preparation for sacrifice in the second chapter are the rules for preparing them for men's ordinary tables. And, altogether, it is evident to Dr. Peters that they simply used for sacrifice all the domestic animals they had. The Egyptians had ducks and geese. But Palestine was quite unsuitable for ducks and geese. The ox, the sheep, the goat, and the dove were all they knew of and could rear.

But where was the barn-door fowl? It had not yet been introduced into Western Asia. It is unknown to Egypt, as to Palestine, until the time of the Persians. A native of Central Asia, the hen was brought to Babylon and thence to Palestine and Egypt by the Persians when they came to

conquer. It is evident, therefore, that the Levitical Code was finally fixed before the Exile. Not devised merely, not merely promulgated, but accepted and sacred beyond alteration. For, otherwise, chickens would certainly have been added to the sacrificial list. There is a certain *extra* legal sacrifice, still made by the Jews on the day of Atonement, in which a cock is the victim. That sacrifice is traceable back perhaps to the very Exile. But the fact that it is not strictly legal, not in the Code, shows that already when the Jews and the Persians met in Babylon, the Levitical Code was beyond alteration.

Now in that first chapter of Leviticus, critics had already found a literary difference between the part referring to the doves and the rest of the chapter. Archæology bears them out. While oxen, sheep, and goats might be used for sacrifice and for food at any time after the Israelites entered the land east of the Jordan, doves belong to settled towns and villages. Before they were used, the Israelites had finished the conquest of Canaan and settled in their homes. That first chapter of Leviticus bears evidence of growth, as the critics say; but of growth that came to an end before the Exile—as critics that are extreme deny.

---

## The Value of the Ascension.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. E. R. BERNARD, M.A., CANON OF SALISBURY.

THERE is in our day an influential school of theology which bids us find our evidence for the events of the Lord's life in the 'value' which they severally have for our individual souls. According to this school, the contents of the Christian faith are matter for what they call 'value' judgments, and only in a secondary way for historical investigation. The records of what Christ did and said can only be believed as true,

<sup>1</sup> Prepared at the request of the Committee of the Church Congress in Newcastle.

so they say, in proportion as they are felt to guide and illuminate the individual believer. From such a view I entirely dissent. I will not now stop to point out the danger which such a system incurs of disregarding altogether the historical character of the gospel, or, still further, the falseness of the philosophy on which such a theology is built. But the teaching of the school of Ritschl, erroneous as we believe it to be in important particulars, suggests a salutary lesson with regard to the subject which we have before us. There is no