

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE volume for 1901 of *Hermathena* has been published. It contains two articles of biblical interest. The one is by Dr. Eagar of Dublin on the 'Hellenic Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews.' The other is by Dr. J. H. Bernard on the 'Greek MSS used by St. Jerome.' We hope to return to both. Meantime let us be content to mention a footnote to Dr. Eagar's paper.

Through the whole Greek of the New Testament, says Dr. Eagar, there is a strongly marked difference in meaning between the words Heaven and Heavens (*οὐρανός* and *οὐρανοί*). The difference, he says, is clearly seen in the Lord's Prayer, though it is not shown in our English versions. The first clause of the prayer is 'Our Father which art in the heavens' (*ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*). If the clause read 'in heaven' the meaning would be, says Dr. Eagar, exactly as in Robert Buchanan's 'Devil's Prayer': 'Our Father, who in heaven art —not here.'

For 'heaven' in the singular is contrasted with the earth, as in the third petition: 'Thy will be done in earth as in heaven' (*ἐν οὐρανῷ*). But 'the heavens' include all places of God's dominions, terrestrial as well as celestial; and we are taught to pray to our Father who is in the

heavens that are here as well as there, upon the earth as well as in the sky.

Dr. Blass has published his edition of the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, and Mr. Burkitt has reviewed it in the *Classical Review* for November. Mr. Burkitt reviews it unfavourably. He has no pleasure in unfavourable reviewing, and in this case he dislikes it exceedingly. For he knows that Dr. Blass is a great scholar, who has done great things for New Testament scholarship, and that he has spent much labour and ingenuity on this work in particular. But Dr. Blass's *St. Matthew* contains a text of his own formation, and Mr. Burkitt believes neither in the text itself nor in the principles on which it has been formed.

Mr. Burkitt once saw a letter in which Dr. Hort wrote something about one of Tischendorf's many editions of the New Testament. 'He still thinks,' wrote Dr. Hort, 'that he may read exactly as he pleases.' That judgment, in Mr. Burkitt's opinion, would now apply to Dr. Blass. Not that he ever accepts or rejects a reading without a reason. But the reasons that appeal to him are not those that would appeal to anyone else, since they rest on literary or even

religious fitness, as often as on documentary evidence.

Mr. Burkitt gives Matthew 17²⁷ as an example. St. Peter is commanded to go to the sea and cast his net and take the first fish that comes up, 'and,' says the Lord, 'when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a shekel' (εὕρησεις στατήρα). Dr. Blass omits the words 'when thou hast opened his mouth,' and then changes 'thou shalt find a shekel' into 'it will fetch a shekel *when sold*' (εὕρησει στατήρα). For this reading, which conveniently gets rid of the miracle, Dr. Blass claims the support of St. Chrysostom. But Mr. Burkitt shows that St. Chrysostom is a hearty believer in the miracle, in which he sees as clear a proof of Christ's power over the sea as when He made Peter walk on the waves. Mr. Burkitt himself is willing to let any miracle go, as soon as textual or any other criticism pronounces against it. But as there is no evidence whatever against this particular miracle, outside Dr. Blass's fancy, he is compelled for the present to retain it.

At the end of the twelfth chapter the Book of Acts is divided into two parts. Mr. Rackham, in his new commentary, noticed on another page, calls the first part the Acts of Peter, the second the Acts of Paul. It is a question whether v.²⁵, which is the last, belongs to St. Peter or St. Paul. In favour of its belonging to the Acts of Paul is the fact that the previous verse contains St. Luke's formula for closing a section: 'The word of God grew and multiplied.' But the question is really decided by the choice we make between two disputed readings.

According to the Received Greek Text and the Authorized Version, 'Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John whose surname was Mark.' The Revised Version makes only two insignificant changes. But some MSS read 'Barnabas and Saul returned *to* Jerusalem,'

and among them are the Vatican (B) and the Sinaitic (κ), the two MSS which were followed by the Revisers almost everywhere else where they agree. Why were they not followed here?

They were not followed here, because for once they seemed to unite in contradicting common sense. In the end of chapter 11 it is stated that Barnabas and Saul were sent from Antioch to bring relief to the brethren that dwelt in Judæa. At this point St. Luke inserts the murder of James and the escape of Peter. Then he returns to Barnabas and Saul, and says, in v.²⁵, that when they had fulfilled their ministry to the poor brethren in Judæa, they returned—the great MSS say *to* Jerusalem, but surely the little MSS are right for once, which say that they returned *from* Jerusalem, which is the capital of Judæa, to their own headquarters in Antioch.

Mr. Rackham does not believe that the little MSS are right. He believes that this verse belongs to the Acts of Peter. Jerusalem and not Antioch is still the centre of the history. It is therefore the natural form of expression to say as yet, even of Barnabas and Saul, that they returned or came home to Jerusalem. With the first verse of the next chapter the scene is changed. Thereafter Antioch is the Church's home, and the apostles will be found returning always thither.

But does not St. Luke say that it was *when they had fulfilled* this ministry that they returned? The ministry being to the brethren in Judæa, it would be exercised chiefly in Jerusalem. How could they return to Jerusalem after they had fulfilled it?

Mr. Rackham tells us that if we had observed St. Luke's style more closely, we should not have been troubled with that difficulty. St. Luke is fond of using participles. He expresses his chief fact by a finite verb, and then adds other facts in participles. These participles must be taken in order. Accordingly the correct translation here

s this: 'They returned to Jerusalem and fulfilled their ministry and took with them John.' This habit of Luke's style, he says, was missed very early. The meaning of the verse was lost. The sense seemed to demand 'from Jerusalem,' and the change was accordingly made. But the great MSS were either too early or too faithful to make the change, and they are once more found on the side of the purest text and the most appropriate meaning.

The *Jewish Quarterly Review* for October contains a review by Mr. Claude Montefiore of an American volume of sermons. The writer of the sermons is a well-known, almost notorious, Rabbi of Philadelphia, Dr. Joseph Krauskopf. The volume is called *A Rabbi's Impressions of the Oberammergau Passion Play*.

Rabbi Krauskopf was interested in the Passion Play because of the part played in it by the Jews. He understood that the Jews were represented as playing a black part in the Passion. He believed that that was a misrepresentation, and that it was doing injury to the cause of Judaism throughout the world. So he went to Oberammergau himself to see.

When Dr. Krauskopf reached Oberammergau and saw the Passion Play, he found that he had not been told half of the dark and dastardly things that were attributed to the Jews. He was much distressed. The representation he believed to be a complete misrepresentation. And he returned to America to show that he had witnessed the Play with eyes of rare discernment and to denounce its evil influence in language of rare momentum.

Mr. Claude Montefiore reviews the sermons with sympathy. He had heard strange things of Dr. Krauskopf. He calls the report of 'the sort of things which Dr. Krauskopf is wont to say' *absurdulous nonsense*. These are the sermons of a Jew who is a Jew indeed. It is true that 'a strong

liberal or reform position' is taken up; it is true that 'Jesus is spoken of with high reverence and honour.' But these are not things that are likely to offend Mr. Montefiore. 'Sermons,' he says, 'more emphatically Jewish, it would be impossible to find.'

What then does this emphatically Jewish preacher, with his reverence and honour for Jesus, think of the Jews of our Lord's day and their attitude to Him? He thinks that they have been entirely misrepresented and maligned. He saw the misrepresentation in the Passion Play. But the Passion Play rests on the Gospels. He believes that in the Gospels there is a double and dreadful misrepresentation—a misrepresentation of the actual Jesus and a misrepresentation of the actual Jews.

Dr. Krauskopf believes that the actual Jesus of Nazareth was a very different person from the Jesus of the Gospels. 'There is not a word of truth,' he says, 'in all these trumped-up charges against the Rabbis, in all the Gospel-recorded bitterness of Jesus against the Scribes and Pharisees, or of the Scribes and Pharisees against Jesus.' 'If there ever was a time,' he says, 'when peace was needed among Israel itself, that was the time; and if ever there was a man to knit the people in closest bond of mutual sympathy and helpfulness in the hour of the country's direst distress, Jesus was that man. Not he the man to brand the teachers of his people "hypocrites," "scorpions," "whited sepulchres." There was not enough of gall in him to force such words to his lips. He who preached to love the enemy, to bless those that curse, to do good to those that harm, to resist no evil, certainly could not harm or curse them that had not harmed or cursed. From his earliest childhood at his mother's breast he had drunk in the Jew's reverence of the teacher in Israel, of the judge who judges in God's stead; and in all his studies of the history of Israel he had not come across a time when the teachers of Israel were more

deserving of reverence than in that age that produced a Philo, a Hillel, a Gamaliel, a Jochanan ben-Saccai.'

Jesus and the Pharisees were therefore never in opposition. Jesus 'never preached a doctrine, advocated a reform, that was not strictly Jewish.' 'There was nothing that Jesus ever preached that had not the heartiest endorsement of the Rabbis of Israel. Not a precept that he ever uttered that had not proven him a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His every word breathes of the religious and moral and social atmosphere of his time. His every act is the translation into deed of the aspirations of the pious and cultured Jew in the days of Palestine's bondage under the cruel Roman. His every teaching with regard to the Scribes and Rabbis, members of the Sanhedrin, was that they sit in Moses' seat, and whatsoever they bid that should be done. His very manner of teaching, his aphorisms and quotations, his parables and illustrations, is the manner of the Rabbis of his time. Not a reform principle that he taught which they had not taught; not a ceremonial abuse to which he objected which they had not objected to; not an ethical lesson that he enjoined which they had not enjoined; not a prayer that he offered which they had not offered; the very Lord's Prayer was a specimen of the kind of prayer they prayed; the very "Golden Rule" was the rule taught in every school.'

How is it then that the Gospels have come so utterly to misrepresent Jesus and the Rabbis and the relations between them? It is because, in Dr. Krauskopf's opinion, they are of quite late production. They do not actually reflect the time of Jesus, because they do not belong to it. They reflect the ideas of the times in which they were written. The 'bitter denunciation of the teachers of Israel,' contained in the Gospels, 'is the language of the later-day Romanized vindictive theologians of the Church militant.'

But here Mr. Montefiore finds himself out of

touch with Dr. Krauskopf. The accepted date, says Mr. Montefiore, for the Gospel of Mark, is 70 to 80 A.D., which at the latest (and even Mr. Montefiore's date is much later than the accepted date in his own country) is only fifty years from the life of Jesus. The picture of Jesus and of the Rabbis is complete in the Gospel of Mark: where do you find time for the 'later-day Romanized vindictive theologians of the Church militant'?

And even if you make the Gospels as late as Dr. Krauskopf does, how are you to separate the truth from the error that is in them? Mr. Montefiore finds that Dr. Krauskopf follows the method of all the late-dating critics of every school: 'Whatever Jesus says in favour of the Law and of the Rabbis is true and authentic; passages which point the other way are unhistorical.' And more than that, he finds that Dr. Krauskopf's Jesus, like the Jesus of the late-dating critics, is a historical impossibility. 'The Jesus of Dr. Krauskopf,' he says, 'might have been a milder and gentler man than the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, but, in spite of Paul, such a Jesus was not and could not have been the founder of Christianity. Not even all the "parallels" drawn up by Dr. Krauskopf between Talmud and New Testament will suffice to destroy the originality of the "Man of Nazareth." Without a Jesus, who in life and tenets was not a mere replica of any other contemporary Rabbi, the Gospels are an even greater puzzle than before.'

As for himself, Mr. Montefiore cannot see that the rôle ascribed to the Jews in the Gospels is so very improbable. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. He failed to show then (Mr. Montefiore thinks He has failed to show yet) that the Old Testament passages on which he based his claim could possibly have applied to him. He asserted or admitted that he was the 'Son of God' in some special or peculiar sense which made it an assertion or admission of blasphemy to his hearers. If they did not admit his

Messiahship, why should they have believed in his Divinity? If they did not believe in his Divinity, why should they not, with their intense and passionate monotheism have shown their hatred of a blasphemer? Therefore, concludes Mr. Montefiore, 'though there is doubtless a

great deal of exaggeration of theatrical effect and of designed contrast between light and darkness, good and bad, in the alleged behaviour of the Jews at the catastrophe at Jerusalem, the main outlines seem to me neither antecedently improbable nor morally atrocious.'

The Gospel and the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR N. GLOUBOKOVSKY, THE ECCLESIASTICAL ACADEMY, ST. PETERSBURG.

THE Gospels are the law books of the New Testament. The word *εὐαγγέλιον* (good tidings) in the ancient classic Greek, as used by Homer, Aristotle, Plutarch, meant properly a reward for good news, in token of gratitude and as an expression of mental satisfaction, especially in relation to the gods; and, further, every communication itself which contained something agreeable. Both these nuances of meaning—'a reward' and 'glad tidings'—are found in the LXX when the Greek translators of the Old Testament render the Hebrew word *besorah* (1 S 31⁹, 2 S 4¹⁰ 18²⁰. 22. 25. 27, 2 K 7⁹), as well as in the works of Cicero, Josephus, etc.

But besides this use, the word *εὐαγγέλιον* preferentially and in its strict sense was applied in the Old Testament to the Messianic prophecies which announced the New Testament kingdom of inner peace and of release from the burthen of sin (Is 40⁹ 52⁷ 60⁶ 61¹⁻²). Therefore *gospel* was for a Jew chiefly prediction respecting the glorious coming of the Messiah—the promised Reconciler. Quite naturally, when the latter made His appearance in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, this term was made use of (comp. Ac 13³², 1 Co 9¹⁴) in order to point out what He had done for the salvation of mankind. In this case 'gospel' marks off the fact itself—'great joy' (Lk 11¹⁰), 'the mystery' (Eph 6¹⁹) of the redemption by 'the power of God' (Ro 1¹⁶) for 'salvation' (Eph 1¹³) and 'pacification' (Eph 6¹⁵), 'through the grace' (Ac 20²⁴), in 'the kingdom' (Mt 4²³ 9³⁵ 24¹⁴) 'of God' (Mk 1¹⁴), which the believer ought to enter with hearty obedience (Ro 10¹⁶, 2 Th 1⁸) and a contrite recognition of his sinful weakness (Mk 1¹⁵), through an effort

(Ph 1²⁷) of self-sacrificing (2 Ti 1⁸) declaration (Ac 20²⁴) of his gospel hope (1 Co 9²³), of the eternal (comp. Rev 14⁶) 'glory of the great God' (1 Ti 1¹¹; comp. 4⁸) and 'Christ' (2 Co 4⁴). In fine, 'gospel' is 'the coming of God the Word, even the Lord Jesus Christ, who for the salvation of the human race was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary.'

But if the word 'gospel' denotes properly the historical work of the salvation of mankind, only the Lord Jesus Christ may be called properly the author of it. An evangelist may be so called only as it can be gathered from Christ's own words (Lk 4¹⁸, Mt 11⁴⁻⁵; comp. Lk 7²²), and from testimonies both of the New Testament (Mt 9³⁵; comp. 4²³, Mk 1¹⁴) and Church writers (St. Ignatius, *Trall.* 10⁹). And, indeed, the gospel is called the gospel of the Son of God (Ro 1⁹), the gospel of Jesus Christ (Mk 1¹; comp. Ro 15¹⁹, Gal 1⁷, Ph 1²⁷), and from its original source in God, the gospel of God (Ro 1¹ 15¹⁶, 2 Co 11⁷, 1 Th 11²⁻⁸⁻⁹, 1 P 4¹⁷).

It is, however, perfectly natural to find that this term soon began to be transferred also to the accounts of Christ's work in all its details,—all the more readily that the Saviour Himself so designated the announcement of certain episodes of His life upon earth (Mt 24¹⁴ 26¹³; comp. Mk 14⁹; comp. Jn 12⁴). It is not difficult then to see how and why reminiscences of the apostles not only spoken but written, began to be called 'Gospels' (St. Justin the Martyr, 1st Apol. chap. 66). It is quite possible that the books of the Gospels obtained this appellation very early; it is at least found to have been used by almost all the original codices both of the Greek and versions, and St. John Chrysostom