

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WITH the issue of the number for October, which commences the third volume, THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be enlarged. A powerful programme is in preparation, of which some account will probably be given next month. Meantime it may be useful to indicate in a few sentences with what aim we go forward to the work of the enlarged series. Our purpose is twofold: to record the results of the best study of the Bible in the present day in an interesting and practically useful form; and to stimulate and guide both clergy and laity towards a fuller, more accurate, more fruitful study of the same inexhaustibly precious library. Our ideal has been above our performance, but we shall still keep that high ideal in view, even should we every month experience the disappointment of falling far short of it.

---

It is the study of the Bible in the present day with which we have to do. It is impossible, therefore, to avoid contact with questions that are hot to the touch. We shall not shun such contact when our path lies through them; but we desire to have it understood that our first concern is with the results rather than with the theoretical processes of Bible study. If from either side of any sharply divided camp there come fresh light upon the Word of God, if either side offers the fruit of reverent study of that Word, ever bearing in mind that the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is there, we shall gladly welcome it.

---

Sometimes it may be necessary, in the very carrying out of these aims, to seem for a time to be

departing from them. Thus we announced a few months ago that some articles would be written for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Professor Sayce on "The Higher Criticism tested by the Monuments." Immediately we received a number of communications urging us to let our readers, first of all, have some conception of what the present position of the Higher Criticism was, that they might be able to follow and appreciate Professor Sayce's articles. This reasonable request it has been our special endeavour within the last few months to comply with, distinguished scholars having done us the honour to contribute papers which have dealt with the great standing problems of Old Testament criticism. In a short time we hope to commence the publication of Professor Sayce's promised articles.

---

We are obliged to Professor Swete for directing our attention to a slip in last month's issue. The Cambridge Septuagint is not yet finished, he says, with a sigh. The arrangement followed is that of the Vatican MS. (Codex B), in which Tobit is succeeded by Hosea. The third volume will thus contain the Prophets, the Books of the Maccabees, etc., and complete the work.

---

*The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April contains a very readable paper by Principal Cairns on "Recent Dogmatic Thought in Scotland," a very learned and very stiff paper by Professor H. P. Smith on "The Use of the Vulgate in Textual Criticism," and other articles of present interest and worth. But the article to which most

readers will turn is Mr. L. B. Paton's account of Professor Klostermann's investigations into the origin of the Pentateuch. These investigations, the results of which Professor Klostermann has published in two recent issues of the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, are of more than ordinary importance. We shall endeavour to present their leading points here, but those who wish fuller knowledge, and are debarred from using the original articles themselves, cannot do better than turn to Mr. Paton's long and able survey.

Dr. August Klostermann has been at Kiel as ordinary professor since 1868. His published works are many, and marked by scholarship and independence. In textual criticism he is a foremost authority; so that when he comes forward, as he does in these articles, with arguments which directly assail the very foundation of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, he can neither be passed by as unworthy of attention, nor charged with undue bias towards traditionalism.

Professor Klostermann finds the materials of his assault in that department of study to which he has given special attention—the criticism of the text, or Lower Criticism, as it is called. The higher critics believe that Genesis is a composite of many different writings. They can trace the different hands that have been employed upon it, even to the division of a sentence. The most frequently quoted, because most intelligible, evidence of composite authorship is the use of different names for God. There are thus, we are told, two distinct narratives of the Flood, the work of two distinct authors. One uses the name Elohim, and is called the Elohist; the other the name Jehovah, and is called the Jehovist. Place these narratives in parallel columns, as one sometimes sees them placed, and the evidence of their distinct duality seems irresistible.

But there are difficulties. The Elohist and the Jehovist cannot always be separated so; they rarely come clean away. Moreover, they certainly do not divide the Pentateuch between them. If there are two, there are several hands at work there. And, worse than all, not one of these authors preserves his individuality for any length

of time. In the midst of E., J. suddenly appears; and again E., or some one else, interferes while J. is busy writing. Even when the number of original authors is multiplied, they cannot be kept separate. And so here comes in what is undoubtedly the weakness of the Higher Criticism. We must postulate Editors, or Redactors as they are called—not one but many must be postulated—until the matter offers itself a ready object of merriment, with its mathematical formulæ to represent the many authors and the still more numerous redactors.

Professor Klostermann does not deny the phenomena. One must be stone-blind to deny them. A child can see that the story of the Flood, to return to the former instance, seems to be twice told. He does not deny the phenomena; but he believes that they can be accounted for in a much simpler way than by the permutations and combinations of the Higher Criticism. His theory is that there existed two different MSS. of Genesis, and when the present text was formed use was made sometimes of one and sometimes of the other and sometimes the same narrative was quoted from both and set down side by side. That is to say, the narrative of the Flood was originally committed to writing by one hand. This was the primitive text. As this text got copied, errors would creep in; its language would even be altered to suit other times; still more, corrections and explanations would be inserted; and thus one MS. might, in process of time and through distance of space, differ very greatly from another. When two or more such MSS. were consulted, for the purpose of preparing an authoritative text, much freedom was shown in the choice of readings, and sometimes no choice at all was made, but both accepted.

This theory Professor Klostermann supports by abundant illustration and exceedingly skilful reasoning. He believes that, in the Book of Psalms, we see this very process carried out. In the formation of that great rounded portion of the Psalter, Ps. ii. to lxxxv. (Ps. i. is introductory), two different collections were used. These collections, or their MSS., belonged to different periods, since the one uses the name Elohim, the other Jehovah. In combining these two, the

editors went on the principle of choosing each Psalm from the collection which was oldest, or seemed to them the best. But in one instance (compare Psalms xiv. and liii.), they take the same psalm from both collections, allowing it thus to appear in the final text twice, Ps. xiv. showing a preference for the name Jehovah (translated "the LORD" in our versions), and Ps. liii. for the name Elohim ("God").

Precisely similar, according to Dr. Klostermann, has been the formation of our present Genesis. "A Jehovist recension and an Elohist recension lay before the compilers, and they have taken extracts from both. Usually the Divine names remain unchanged, but in the section, Gen. ii. 4-iii. 24, which would naturally always be read in connection with i. 1-ii. 3, the name Elohim was later inserted, not because Jehovah Elohim ('the LORD God') was a current form of speech, but simply to indicate to the reader that he might preserve consistency by substituting Elohim for Jehovah. Neither the Divine names nor the names of the patriarchs are in any sense a characteristic of the original text; and when the special Genesis criticism of the day makes Jehovah and Elohim, or Jacob and Israel, the infallible test by which it can draw the line between the vitally connected members of a sentence, I must say that such criticism seems to me, in spite of its apparent activity, to have all the signs of scientific death."

In a still more recent issue of the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, the magazine in which Professor Klostermann's articles appeared, there is an article of a remarkable character by Professor Hausleiter of Erlangen. Its title is, "The Faith of Jesus Christ, and the Christian Faith;" and its object is to prove that in certain places of his writings, but especially in Romans iii. 25, 26, St. Paul speaks not of the faith of the believer, but of the faith of our Lord Himself. Thus, the meaning of the celebrated words, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood" (ver. 25), he would take to mean, "through Christ's own faith in His blood." And again, the words of verse 26, "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus"—literally, "justifying him who is of faith of Jesus" (*δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως*

*Ἰησοῦ*)—would signify, "justifying him who shares the faith of Jesus."

The reasons which Professor Hausleiter gives for his remarkable renderings are briefly these: (1) The name "Jesus" is never elsewhere regarded by the Apostle as the object of the believer's faith; and (2) Jesus Christ could become a propitiator only by reason of His perfect obedience ("through faith"), without which the act of redemption would have been an entirely passive act.

But yet more startling is Professor Hausleiter's explanation of St. Paul's celebrated quotation from Habakkuk: "The just shall live by faith" (*ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*)—Rom. i. 17. "The just," he says, "does not mean just persons in general, but Christ Himself, the just *par excellence*." He it is who, by means of His perfect obedience, manifested in His redeeming death, has obtained the resurrection from the dead, just as He, by the same obedience, put an end to the dominion of the Law, and brought in the reign of faith. In this way, he would show that the prophetic text cited by the Apostle has an essentially Messianic signification.

This article by Professor Hausleiter is noticed in the first number of a new and exceedingly welcome French magazine, the *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*; and there, in three sentences, Professor Bois of Montauban states what seems to us the one insurmountable obstacle to the acceptance of Hausleiter's interpretations. They contradict, he says, the very theme of the Epistle to the Romans. That theme is incontestably *Christian* faith regarded as the subjective condition of justification or of *salvation*. "It is this condition that the Apostle recalls whenever he speaks of the redemption, and it is therefore upon it that he insists in these celebrated passages also in the first and third chapters of the Romans."

The April issue of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* opens with an account of the Jews in France at the present time, by Rabbin S. Debré. This is followed by what looks at first sight the driest of all dry articles on "Jewish Ethical Wills," by the Editor, but which turns out to be most pleasantly

written and full of interest. The ethical will, that is to say, a will which disposes, not of money and estates but of good sound practical advice for the conduct of life, was a well-established usage among the Hebrews, from very early times. As examples of ethical wills in the Bible, Mr. Abrahams mentions the blessing of Jacob, the dying request of Joseph to his brethren, the address of Moses to the people of Israel, the advice of David to his son Solomon, the restriction laid by Jonadab the son of Rechab upon his children against the use of wine, and his exhortation to dwell in tents, and the injunction of the prophet of Bethel on his sons: "When I am dead, then bury me in the sepulchre wherein the man of God is buried; lay my bones beside his bones" (1 Kings xiii. 31).

"In several of these passages," says Mr. Abrahams, "the verb used is some form of צוה, 'to command,' and in later times there has been a tendency to interpret the verb in a restricted sense, so that צוה comes to mean to 'give a צוואה' that is, to leave an ethical will. When Isaiah prophesies the death of Hezekiah, he bids him לְבִיתְךָ צוּ ('set thine house in order,' 2 Kings xx. 1), and the meaning may be 'Give your household directions for their conduct after your death.' There can be little doubt that this is the signification of Deut. xxxii. 46, where Moses says, 'Set your heart upon all the words which I testify unto you this day, which ye shall command your children.' Even more striking in this connection is a passage in Genesis xviii. 19, where God says of Abraham, 'For I have known him, in order that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord.' The latter text, in particular, has been made the basis of an actual rubric, to be found in modern Jewish codes, enjoining on every father, as a bounden duty, to leave moral exhortations for his children's guidance."

Of the way in which Jewish fathers fulfilled in later days this bounden duty, Mr. Abrahams gives some very beautiful and some very curious examples, while he admits the general sameness and conventionality of the ethical will. "I never kissed my children," says Alexander Suesskind, "nor took them in my arms, so as not to accustom them to

silly talk, such as people are in the habit of addressing to the young." Naphtali Cohen, Rabbi of Posen, who died in 1719 leaves this in his last will and testament, addressed to his wife:—"My Beloved Esther, once from our great love we clasped hands and mutually promised that, when either of us two died, the other would pray to die soon afterwards, that we might quit the world together. But this wish was not right, and you have my pardon if you live a hundred years. I altogether undo our compact. If you die first, which God forbid, you must do the same. I ask you not to marry again, though I know I need not say it; but I add the words out of my overwhelming love for you." Moses ben Nachman's testament, which is in the form of a letter to his son, belongs to the end of the thirteenth century: "Humility," he says "is the first of virtues; for if you think how lowly is man, how great is God, you will fear Him and avoid sinfulness. Look not boldly at one whom you address. Regard everyone as greater than thyself." David Altaras leaves orders that no rhymes should be engraven upon his tombstone, and tells why he ate no meat in Lent. And there are more curious ethical wills than these.

But one of the finest examples of the ethical will, before tradition drove the freshness of nature out of it, may be found in the Apocrypha. The fourth chapter of the Book of Tobit Mr. Abrahams describes as in itself a complete and beautiful ethical will. "Tobit's directions to his son, who is about to leave him in search of fortune and a wife, have inspired, unless I am greatly mistaken, the writers of many a later testament. Thus, besides being intrinsically one of the noblest in Jewish literature, the fourth chapter of Tobit is in truth the earliest specimen of the Jewish ethical testament, if by that term be understood the elaborate form which post-Talmudic authors have so successfully cultivated."

This Book of Tobit, about which Bishop Westcott wrote with enthusiasm many years ago and wondered greatly at the neglect in which it lay in England, is one of the books which, as Mr. Thomson puts it, "influenced our Lord and His Apostles." The title (*Books which Influenced our Lord and His Apostles: being a Critical Review of*

*Apocalyptic Jewish Literature*, by John E. H. Thomson, B.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 8vo, 1891, 10s. 6d.), is startling and not altogether free from reproach. But the book is a fair, honest introduction to a subject which is as much neglected to-day in England as it was when Bishop Westcott wondered at it. Mr. Thomson does not review the whole Apocrypha, he centres himself

upon the Apocalyptic in it. But he goes through that important department so as to give one who follows him a good working knowledge of its character and influence. May his work be the harbinger of better days for the Apocalypses of the Old Covenant; in them we may yet find the "key" which will unlock the wholesome treasures of instruction that lie in the Apocalypse of the New.

## 1 Corinthians vii. 14.

### A REPLY TO A REQUEST.

BY THE REV. D. W. SIMON, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY,  
CONGREGATIONAL THEOLOGICAL HALL, EDINBURGH.

WHAT does Paul mean by the words ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἅγια ἐστί; *Else verily your children are unclean; as it is, however, they are holy* [clean]? Before trying to interpret them let me quote the context, from ver. 12 to ver. 17. *If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And [if there is] a woman which hath a husband that believeth not, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not put him away. For the husband that believeth not is sanctified in [with and through] the wife; and the wife that believeth not is sanctified in [with and through] the husband: else verily your children are unclean; as it is, however, they are holy. But if the one that believeth not departeth, let him [or her] depart. The brother or sister is under no constraint in such cases; but God hath called us to [be at] peace. For dost thou know, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or dost thou know, O husband, whether thou shalt save thy wife? Yet, as God hath distributed to each one, as God hath called each one, so let each one walk.*

1. As to the ὑμῶν,—the argument seems to require that it be referred to parents such as are here in question. The point is this. Your children are counted *holy*, not *unclean*, because either the father or mother is a *believer*. Why should not a husband be counted *holy*, not *unclean*, because his wife is a *believer*; or a wife because of the faith of her husband? If, however, ὑμῶν referred to parents, both of whom were believers, as many commentators suppose, the retort might fairly have been made: "The cases are not parallel,—not even as much so as otherwise: we can understand how children should be *holy*, not *unclean*, whose father and mother are both believers; but it is a different thing as between a husband and wife, one of whom is not a believer—nay more, a heathen."

2. The next question is as to the force of ἅγια and the negative ἀκάθαρτα—*holy*, *unclean*. The word ἡγιάσται, *is sanctified*, used of the non-believing husband or wife, must clearly have essentially the same force as ἅγιον, and may be rendered *is in the position or stands in the relation of a ἅγιος*—one who is not *unclean*, but *holy*. If we put either a different kind or more of meaning into ἡγιάσται than we put into ἅγια, or *vice versâ*, clearly the parallelism will be destroyed. It might be urged, indeed, that the relation between children and parents is so different from that between wife and husband, that a different meaning may well be put on the two words; but then the argument itself would fall to the ground, for its force lies in the assumption of some sort of affinity between the two forms of relationship.

We have then ἅγια, *holy* (and ἡγιάσται = strictly, *has been sanctified, is in the position of a sanctified being or thing*), on the one side, and ἀκάθαρτα = *unclean*, on the other side. Each indicates, and to some extent determines, the force of the other. When Paul implicitly characterises children whose parents are not believers as ἀκάθαρτα, which, of course, he does, in describing the others as ἅγια, he cannot intend to attribute to them positive moral impurity, uncleanness of the kind ascribed to the δαιμόνια or πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα in the Gospels (Matt. x. 1; Mark iii. 11; Luke vi. 18, etc.). Nor can he use ἅγια in the sense of positive moral purity, uprightness, as it is used in ver. 34 of this chapter.

Do the two words then denote merely "ceremonial" purity or sanctity and the reverse? This is the view taken by some. There is no doubt that they are used in some such way, as, for example, ἀκάθαρτος in Acts xi. 8, where Peter says, *Nothing common or unclean (ἀκάθαρτον) hath at any time entered into my mouth; and ἅγιος in the Epistle*