

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is there a more beautiful verse in all the Bible than the seventh verse of the first chapter of the Apocalypse? Is there a verse more beautiful in thought or in expression? 'Behold, he cometh with the clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him. Even so, Amen.' And yet how few of us have heard it taken as the text of a sermon.

Let us judge by the sermons that are published. There are only seven that we know of. There is one in Spurgeon's *Sermon Notes*, one in Mr. Francis Bourdillon's *Short Sermons*, one by Archbishop Thomson in the *Contemporary Pulpit*, one in Mr. H. W. Little's *Arrows for the King's Archers*, one in the *Church Pulpit Year Book for 1908*, one by Mr. Edwin Eland in the 64th volume of the *Christian World Pulpit*, and one in Archdeacon Wilberforce's recent volume entitled *New (?) Theology*. That is to say, there are only two recent sermons on this text worth reckoning with; and even Archdeacon Wilberforce's sermon was preached on behalf of the S.P.G.—not to expound the text, but to secure a good collection.

But Archdeacon Wilberforce has the courage to take the text in its proper meaning. He is the only preacher of them all who unhesitatingly and unflinchingly does so. To the rest the text is

either a mere motto for a sermon on the Second Coming, in which the fact of the Advent is affirmed whatever the manner of it be, so that only the first and least part of the text is taken into account; or else, if the remainder of the text is made use of, it is used as if it spoke of 'a certain fearful expectation of judgment.'

This is not to be wondered at. The commentators have never been quite outspoken about the meaning of the verse. But now at last a commentary has been published which not only expounds the meaning of the Greek words in all its clauses (that was already done by Professor Swete), but which also shows its connexion with the context, and brings out without a moment's hesitation the blessedness of the gospel contained in it, and the limitless length to which that gospel goes.

It is a commentary by the late Professor Hort. Was there ever a man who published so little in his lifetime, and had so much published after his death? There is a feeling abroad, says Dr. Sanday, that injury is done to the reputation of the great men who are gone by publishing works, and still more fragments of works, which they had themselves in no sense prepared for publication. And he says it is doubtless true that there are not many scholars who would care to have such a

test applied to them; 'but Dr. Hort was just one of these few.'

It is to Dr. J. O. F. Murray we owe it that so many of Professor Hort's writings have been published. Great teacher never had more loyal pupil. It is to Dr. Murray we owe it also (although in this instance he has been assisted by Mr. P. H. L. Brereton) that there has now been published a commentary by Professor Hort on the first three chapters of *The Apocalypse of St. John* (Macmillan; 5s.).

Professor Sanday has written a preface to the book. 'I am not sure,' says Professor Sanday, 'that I know any example of Professor Hort's work that is more instructive than the fragment before us. It is no doubt scholarship in undress—utterly in undress, but perhaps on that account all the more impressive. It is all absolutely bare and severe; there is not a word of surplusage. One seems to see a living scholar actually at work; his mind moving calmly and deliberately from point to point, testing each as it comes up by the finest tests available, and recording the results by a system of measurements equally fine. To understand the patience, thoroughness, and searching quality of such judgments, is to understand what the highest scholarship really means.'

Does Dr. Sanday approve of all that has been published? Nearly all. 'With a single very small exception—the little volume *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, in which however there are a few sentences scattered through it that I value highly—I should fully endorse their decision to publish. We could not afford to lose the dry light and careful circumspect method of *Judaistic Christianity*, and *The Christian Ecclesia*. But in positive value for the student I should be inclined to place first of all the exegetical fragment on 1 St. Peter, and the present fragment very near it.'

Now when we turn to the seventh verse of the

first chapter of the Apocalypse, with Professor Hort's Commentary in our hand, the first thing we notice is that it is preceded by a verse and half of doxology. The doxology is interjected. The seventh verse continues what was begun in the first half of the fifth verse. It is the story of the King who comes to take His throne.

He comes 'with the clouds.' It is a curious preposition. It is translated literally from Daniel (7¹³). It is translated from the Hebrew, for the Septuagint has the commoner word 'upon.' Whether St. John himself translated directly from the Hebrew, Professor Hort does not say. Professor Swete thinks that probably he did not. For the same quotation is made in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (24³⁰), and the same preposition is used. Professor Swete thinks that there may have been a collection of prophetic testimonies in a different Greek version from that of the Septuagint, to which both St. Matthew and St. John had access. However that may be, the statement is that He comes not *upon* the clouds, but *with* the clouds, and that means, says Professor Hort, 'not simply that he has a surrounding of clouds, but that He compels all the clouds into His retinue.' The figure does not lose in sublimity with the accurate rendering of the preposition. Professor Hort adds that the later Jews called Messiah 'the Son of the Cloud.'

The remainder of the verse is a quotation from Zechariah (12^{10, 12}). 'And every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him.' We said that Archdeacon Wilberforce had the courage to interpret the verse accurately. The test of the interpretation is in both clauses—in the word 'every' and in the words 'all the tribes of the earth.' Archdeacon Wilberforce says it is not the lamentation of despair. For is it not said that 'every eye shall see him'? And is it not said, further, that 'only the pure in heart shall see God'? But *every* eye? Archdeacon Wilberforce is not afraid of the taunt of 'universalist'; and he

emphasizes *every* eye. He repeats the words of the last clause, 'all the tribes of the earth.' He says it will be a blessed sight even for those who pierced Him, and for all kindreds of the earth when they wail over Him—a blessed time when the fountain of repentance is opened and a baptism of tears tempers the baptism of fire.

He might have been reading Professor Hort. Professor Hort is equally comforting and equally universal. It is not a wailing, he says, because of punishment on themselves; it is the wailing of sorrowing repentance. The prophecy is not of vengeance, but of conversion. And he adds that whereas in Zechariah the reference is to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, here it is extended to all nations, the language commonly used of the families of the land being appropriated to the tribes of the whole earth.

The verse ends with two short separate exclamations (*ναί, ἀμήν*). One of these words, 'Amen,' has passed into every language on the face of the earth. It is said to signify 'truth.' And when it is translated it is usually translated by 'verily.' The other has so nearly the same meaning that some say they are synonymous, and that they are taken together here because the one is Greek and the other Hebrew, like 'Abba, Father' (*ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ*). Dr. Hort does not believe that they are synonymous. They occur together again in Rev 22²⁰, where they clearly have a separate force, and the one is translated 'Yea' and the other 'Amen.' They occur together once more in 2 Co 1²⁰. What is their meaning? Says Professor Hort, the *Yea* (or 'even so,' as it is translated here) is the divine affirmation; the *Amen* is the human response.

One of the most accomplished scholars in Oxford, a scholar who is at the same time one of the staunchest adherents of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, has come to the conclusion that the Decalogue is due to the authorship of

Moses. He has published his conclusion and the reasons for it in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April.

The article has the modest title of 'A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times.' But the editors have given it the first place in their journal, and more than thirty valuable pages. For they know that if the Decalogue can be shown to come from Moses, or from the age of Moses, the present critical position on the early religion of Israel will have to be abandoned. The author of the article is the Rev. Charles Fox Burney, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College.

Mr. Burney believes that he has made a discovery. But he did not make it in a day. 'It has grown up in my mind bit by bit during a long period.' He is aware that he stakes his reputation on the publication of it. But he publishes it now because recent discoveries, some of them trifling enough in themselves, have enabled him to see the bearing one upon another of the different lines of evidence which he has been pursuing, and to make the general conclusion appear irresistible.

What is that general conclusion? Mr. Burney does not attempt to overturn the 'documentary hypothesis' of the Pentateuch. Some one published a book a short while ago with the title 'What if Moses wrote the Pentateuch after all?' Mr. Burney is incapable of writing such a book or asking such a question. That the Pentateuch is made up of different documents which belong to different ages, and that in consequence the prophetic period of Old Testament History is, broadly speaking, of older date than the legal, 'may now be regarded as proved up to the hilt for any thinking and unprejudiced man who is capable of estimating the character and value of the evidence.' But all that refers to the religion of Israel *after* 750 B.C. What of the religion of Israel before the great prophets began to prophecy?

That is the period with which Mr. Burney has to do.

Mr. Burney believes that the character of the religion of Israel before the prophets began to write (that is to say, throughout all the period of Joshua, the Judges, and the early Kings) has been misunderstood. It has been supposed that the prophets were the creators of the religion of Israel. Before their day, that is before 750 B.C., the Israelites professed no religion that could properly be called ethical. Their ideas and practices scarcely differed from those of the Canaanites around them. And by the dominant school of criticism, 'animism,' 'fetishism,' and 'totemism' are expressions that are freely used to describe them. It is Mr. Burney's purpose to show that from the time of Moses the Israelites possessed a religion which is entitled to be called both ethical and spiritual; a religion which was in direct antagonism to that of the Canaanites who dwelt in the land; a religion upon which the prophets worked, not to overthrow it, but to restore it to its earlier purity and to develop it in its own direction.

He believes that this ethical religion dates from the time of the Exodus. He cannot carry it further back than that. He does not deny that the religion of Israel owes much to the religion of Babyloniã. He distinctly says that we cannot study the religion of Israel rightly except in the light of a systematic comparative survey of the two religions. But he holds that the influence of Babylon upon Israel is so ancient as to be a matter for the student of archæology rather than for the student of religion. Before the days of Moses the ancestors of Israel should be spoken of, not as Israelites, but as Semites; and they should be regarded as sharing in the idolatrous unethical beliefs of the Semites, or, in Mr. Burney's graphic phrase, in 'the common Semitic savagery.'

The religion of Israel began with the Exodus.

More than that, in Mr. Burney's belief it began with Moses. For Mr. Burney has great faith in the creative power of a personality. He is not the man, however, to neglect the evidence lest it should run counter to a fascinating theory. He believes that the true ethical religion of Israel, the very religion which Amos preached and Hosea practised, began with Moses, because along several different lines of evidence it can be traced back to Moses and no further. And if you ask him to say more definitely what he means by the religion of Israel, his answer is, the religion which is embodied in the Decalogue. The very reason why he assigns the Decalogue to Moses is that it embodies the religion which was practised by the Israelites whom Moses gathered into a nation and led through that great and terrible wilderness.

He is aware that there are objections and that he must meet them. There is the objection that the Decalogue breathes the spirit of a later age than that of Moses. But he has no great regard for objections which rely upon considerations that are purely subjective. That argument requires no special refutation.

More important is the objection that the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus appears to contain a second decalogue, a decalogue of a ceremonial character, and therefore belonging to the legalistic period of Israel's religion, which, in common with all Higher Critics now, Mr. Burney believes to have succeeded and not preceded the prophetic period. Mr. Burney's answer is that the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus, which contains this ceremonial decalogue, has no connexion with the twentieth chapter, which contains the ethical decalogue. In short, he believes that it is not a decalogue, but a summary from the hand of J of chapters 20-23, which are from the hand of E. These chapters contain both the Decalogue and also the Book of the Covenant. And this summary, if that may be called a summary which is no doubt a fragment of a quite independent

account, is all that J gives us of these two important documents.

The only serious objection is found in the historical narratives of the Old Testament itself, in the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. From these books we gather that 'there existed in Israel during the greater part of the period of the residence in Canaan a kind of Jahweh worship, which found expression in the representation of Jahweh under the form of an image, and which was bound up with the practice of rites (whether of divination or of another character) in which the use of images played a prominent part.' That objection is so formidable that Mr. Burney uses two-thirds of his space in its removal. For it is evident that those who worshipped Jahweh under the form of an image, either did not know, or else disregarded, the second commandment.

It is now that Mr. Burney becomes most original and most interesting. He uses, we have said, two-thirds of his space in removing this objection. We need not use so much. But he has several lines of argument, which he works out independently before he brings them to a common conclusion, and we shall take them up separately also.

The first line of argument is that when the Israelites entered Canaan under Joshua, certain Israelite tribes were already settled there. We know the evidence for this. There is first of all the mention of Israel on the stele of the Egyptian king Merenptah. Merenptah, or his successor, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Yet on this stele he mentions Israelites as raided by him *in Palestine*. Then there is the evidence of the Tell el-Amarna letters. These letters speak of a people called the Habiri, who entered Canaan about 1400 B.C., that is to say, some 150 years or more before the entry of Israel under Joshua. Mr. Burney does not assert that the Habiri were Hebrews, but he thinks that that identification is as likely as any other that has been proposed. In

any case, their mention in the Tell el-Amarna letters is evidence that there was a wave of immigration into Canaan from the East a century and a half before the Conquest, an immigration, moreover, of tribes who were in all probability closely allied to Israel.

Then Sety I., whose reign appears to fall towards the end of the fourteenth century B.C. mentions a State in Western Galilee, which he calls Asaru or Aseru. This name corresponds with the name of the Israelite tribe of Asher. Again, the word Gad, which is the name of another tribe, means 'fortune,' and is probably connected with the name of the deity Gad, the patron of fortune, who is mentioned in Is 65¹¹, and whose name frequently occurs in Phœnician and Aramaic inscriptions. It is found also as the name of a place, Baal-Gad, in the far north of Palestine, and of Migdal-Gad, a stronghold of Judah.

Now, Asher and Gad are the two tribes whose descent is traced, not from a wife of Jacob, but from a concubine, Leah's handmaid Zilpah. 'May we therefore infer,' says Mr. Burney, 'that the meaning of this tradition is that these two tribes were regarded as occupying in some way an inferior position among the tribes?' If so, then Dan and Naphtali, sons by another concubine, will occupy the same inferior position. Mr. Burney's conclusion regarding these four tribes is, not that they were Canaanites, as others (like Paton and Hogg) have said, but that they were members of the great Aramaean migration, possibly Habiri, who pressed into Canaan and settled there, perhaps some centuries before the Israelitish invasion under Joshua.

In any case, whatever their names were, Mr. Burney believes that there were tribes of Israelites in Canaan before Joshua. These tribes took no part in the Exodus, and they knew not Moses. If they worshipped Jahweh (and Mr. Burney believes that they did), they might worship Him

under the form of an image without being troubled by the second commandment.

Let us pass to another line of evidence. Let us consider the origin and antiquity of the Divine name Jahweh. The Divine *title*, Mr. Burney prefers to say. For he holds it conclusively proved that the title Jahweh or Jahu, so far from being peculiar to Israel, was well known to the Babylonians, and that with them it was not the name of any particular god, but a generic name for Deity, like El. The evidence is found in certain proper names which have been discovered on the monuments. There *Ilu-bi'di* and *Iau-bi'di* are interchangeable, just as in Hebrew the name *El-nathan* might interchange with *Jeho-nathan*.

That Jahweh was not originally a proper name is perhaps Mr. Burney's greatest discovery, and he takes some time to prove it. His best argument he owes to Mr. C. J. Ball, who is at present lecturing on Assyriology in Oxford. In the Epic of Gilgameš there is a passage in which the word *ja-u* occurs. The passage, because of the occurrence of that word, has hitherto baffled the interpreter. Gilgameš, smitten with grief at the death of his friend Eabani, and anxious to discover whether the common lot of humanity can be avoided, hears of a man, *Nuah-napištim* by name, who dwells in the island of the blest. He reaches the land where *Nuah-napištim* dwells 'afar off at the confluence of the streams.' As Gilgameš is making stupendous efforts to bring his ship to land, *Nuah-napištim* views him in the distance, and says to himself—'He who comes (yonder) is he not a *ja-u* man, and has he not the right hand of a hero?' The expression, we say, has hitherto defied the expositor. Mr. Ball believes that a '*ja-u*' man is a 'god'-man. In an earlier part of the Epic, Gilgameš is described in the words—'Two-thirds of him are god, and his third part is human.' So now in speaking of him as a *ja-u*-man, *Nuah-napištim* is simply laying emphasis upon his nature as partly human and partly divine.

Well, if Jahweh was at first only the title of deity, when did it reach the position of a proper name? Not in the days of Abraham. Abraham dwelt in Ur of the Chaldees, the southern seat of the worship of the moon-god Sin. He removed to Harran, the northern seat of the worship of the same deity. To Abraham Jahweh would still be merely a title of divinity. Jahweh as a proper name, and as the name of their own proper God, was revealed to Israel in one day. This, Mr. Burney believes, is the revelation that is recorded in the third chapter of Exodus. This is the meaning of the words in Ex 6²—'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name Jahweh I was not known to them.'

We are now ready to gather the lines of evidence together. When the Israelites who came out of Egypt with Moses entered Canaan, they found that the land was already partly taken possession of by kinsmen of their own. These kinsmen may have been those who were afterwards known as the tribes of Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. They knew the name of Jahweh, the God of Israel, though Jahweh may yet have been little more than a title of deity to them, as it had been to other Semites, like the Babylonians. But to the Israelites who entered Canaan under Joshua, Jahweh was more than a title for God. He was more than a common possession of the Semitic race. He had become the God of Israel. When Moses had gone down into Egypt to deliver them, he had gone down with the great name *I AM*, and *I AM* had become their deliverer. To their minds He stood distinct, not only from the gods of Egypt, but even from the great Semitic moon-god Sin. Through the wilderness of Sin He had guided them, and at Sinai, the very seat of the moon-god, He had proved Himself superior; so superior that Mt. Sinai in Arabia is now associated, and will be for ever associated, not with the Semitic moon-god Sin, but with the mighty power of Jahweh, the God of Israel.

And more than that, and very much more, the God who led the Israelites through the wilderness was a God of righteousness. Mr. Burney seems to think that a distinctly ethical quality attached to the name of Jahweh even before the days of Moses. But however that may be, it was the experience of the wilderness that made His righteousness unmistakable. The march through that great and terrible wilderness could never be other than a trying one. Without the sense of Jahweh's leadership it could not have been accomplished. But the one thing that above all other things was impressed upon the Israelites was the fact that when they were obedient they prospered, when they were disobedient disaster overtook them. And obedience did not mean the offering of bulls and of goats to appease a capricious deity. It was the obedience of the heart. It was the surrender of the will. It was perseverance in right doing between man and man.

With this conception of Jahweh as a God of righteousness, we say, the Israelites entered Canaan. Mr. Burney believes that the conception had already become embodied in the Decalogue. He believes that the hand which accomplished that master-stroke of national policy was the hand of a leader of men, the hand of a religious genius, such as appears only occasionally in the whole history of the world. He believes that the Decalogue came from the hand of Moses. But when the Israelites entered Canaan and settled down in the land there were two strong forces with which the ethical religion of Jahweh came into contact.

One of these was the religion of the Canaanites. The Canaanites still dwelt in the land, and although the whole evidence of the historical books seems to Mr. Burney to show that the Israelites never ceased to recognize the essential antagonism that lay between their own religion and the religion of the Canaanites, it is not to be wondered at if there were occasional lapses into idolatry.

The other force was the religion of the tribes of Israel who were already settled in the land. Being their kinsmen, the Israelites who had come out of Egypt at once associated with these tribes. And although we see, in the Book of Judges especially, that in the great national movement under Deborah three of them held aloof, showing that the amalgamation was yet far from complete, nevertheless they could not forget that they belonged to the same stock, that they worshipped the same God and had ultimately the same religious and ethical interests. But the Jahweh whom these tribes worshipped was not the great I AM who had been made known to Moses, nor had He led them through the wilderness. Is it to be wondered at that throughout the historical books there are not only occasional lapses into idolatry (which are admitted to be lapses and repented of), but that there is also a worship of Jahweh under the form of an image, like Jeroboam's bulls at Dan and Bethel, and that the high places, as long as they lasted, were a perpetual menace to the pure worship of Jahweh?

Mr. Burney has no desire to take away from the glory of the prophets of Israel of the eighth century B.C. It is a glory that cannot be matched throughout all the history of religion and of ethics. But the prophets of the eighth century B.C. never claim that they are making a new departure. Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, attack the social and religious abuses of their time, but they attack them *as abuses*. They regard themselves not as the founders of a new type of Jahweh religion, but as carrying a burden of reformation. They are sent to insist upon religious essentials which the people once knew and ought never to have forsaken.

In his *Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, noticed on another page, Mr. A. H. McNeile has an 'Additional Note' on the name 'Jahweh.' Mr. McNeile has no new theory to offer. But in his Additional Note he gives a competent

summary of all that is known at present about the name 'Jahweh.' And best of all, he exercises his judgment in accepting the best translation of the Name that has yet been offered.

Before looking at the meaning of the Name, however, let us look at the Name itself. Where did it come from? Mr. McNeile's Additional Note occurs at Ex 3¹⁴. That is the place at which Moses says to God, 'Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?' And God answers, 'I AM THAT I AM'; and adds, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.'

Now when Moses went down into Egypt, and told the children of Israel that I AM had sent him unto them, it is improbable that that was the first time they had heard the Name. An entirely new name, says Mr. McNeile, would have meant to them an entirely new God. But if the name was in existence already, how long had it been in existence, and where had it come from? Mr. Burney thinks that it came from Babylon. Mr. McNeile does not believe that. He is not sure that the supposed traces of it in Babylonian literature are genuine. But even if they are, they only point to the introduction of foreign (that is, Western Semitic) cults.

Nor does Mr. McNeile believe that the Name is North Syrian. If the North Syrian name Iau-bi'di really contains the name of Jahweh, as Ili-bi'di contains the name of El, and if these two names can be compared with Jeho-iakim and El-iakim, that only implies after all that the name of Jahweh came to be known to other Semitic tribes besides the Israelites. But Mr. McNeile thinks it probable that Jahweh was the name of the God worshipped by a small number of tribes or clans in the region of Sinai, and that the Israelites already knew something of Him, so that Moses

was able to bind them together by a common worship when he went down into Egypt with the name I AM.

The worth of Mr. McNeile's 'Additional Note' lies, however, in what it says about the meaning of the Name. The name Jahweh, whenever it occurs, is simply the third person singular of the imperfect tense of the verb *to be*. If we could translate the imperfect tense by the present, then we could translate the Name *He is*. When Jahweh is speaking of Himself, however, He of course uses the first person, which may therefore be translated I AM, as it is translated in Ex 3¹⁴.

But it is not quite satisfactory to translate the imperfect tense as if it were a present. As Driver states in his *Hebrew Tenses*, and as Mr. McNeile quotes the statement from him, 'the Hebrew imperfect denotes either *habitual* action or *future* action.' Now, in his article on GOD in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, Professor A. B. Davidson argues that the form Jahweh is intended to represent *future* action. Mr. McNeile accepts the argument. He believes that when we speak of Jahweh we are using a word which means 'He will be,' and when Jahweh spoke of Himself, He said not I AM, but I WILL BE. And when He repeated His name He said, I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE.

There is one thing more. The verb *to be* is not the verb of simple existence. As Davidson puts it, it does not mean *to be essentially* or ontologically, but *phenomenally*. In other words, it means not simply *to be*, but *to be something*. God says, 'I will be that I will be'—what He will be He does not say. He deliberately leaves that unexpressed. He leaves it to the future to discover that. He sends Moses down into Egypt with the message, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I WILL BE hath sent me unto you.' It was a challenge to faith. If they knew Him in the past, they would know Him better in the future. But what He will be to them He does

not say. That will depend upon their faith in Him and their obedience.

What will He be to them? We have an advantage over the Israelites here. They could only look forward; we can look back. They could only walk by faith; we can walk by sight. What has He been to them?

He has been Creator and Preserver. But they knew that already, we may suppose. At least they knew that He was their Preserver. The suggestion has been made, and Mr. McNeile does not altogether reject it, that the verb which forms the name 'Jahweh,' and which we translate to *be*, originally meant to *fall*. And so Jahweh was He who causes rain or lightning to fall. But whether He was originally a so-called Nature-God or not, we may safely assume that, if the Israelites knew anything about Him at all, they knew that He was a God who made His sun to rise upon the evil as well as upon the good, and sent His rain upon the just and also upon the unjust.

What will their first discovery of Him now be? It will be that He is a Deliverer. It will be that He is a God who has pity. And that when He has pity He sends deliverance. We must not anticipate. But is it not said that He who came as the express image of God's person had compassion upon the multitude, and that His compassion at once translated itself into action—that He healed them and fed them, and delivered them out of their prison-house? The Israelites will discover immediately that God is a Deliverer. For Jahweh said, 'I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; and I am come down to deliver them.'

They never forgot their deliverance. We speak of the Exodus from Egypt as the moment of their birth as a nation. They spoke of it as their Deliverance. And the two things which impressed them about it were the 'high hand'

with which Jahweh delivered them, and the 'provocation' with which, after their deliverance, the people provoked Him. All through their history they remembered the mighty works. All through their history they were amazed at the ingratitude of those in whose sight the mighty works had been wrought. When they told their children the story, they always ended with the words, 'And their carcasses fell in the wilderness.' It was an awful fate for those to whom the land of the Amorites had been promised. It was a warning for the disobedient in all their generations. And yet, when Jahweh was ready to make His next great revelation to them, they missed it. They almost all missed it, through disobedience. For the next great discovery was Salvation.

Salvation is greater than deliverance. For sin is greater than sorrow. It is a great thing certainly to be delivered out of some deep distress. It is a great thing to realize that we are delivered by Jahweh. But the greatest of all things is the deliverance from sin, the deliverance which we call Salvation.

The Israelites did not know that Jahweh had come as a Saviour. They did not recognize Him. One of the reasons why they did not recognize Him was that they were thinking of their fathers' provocation, and not of their own sin. Another reason was that He did not come under the name of Jahweh. He came under the name of Jesus. It is true that Jesus means Saviour. It is true that when He came it was announced that He would save His people from their sins. But Jesus was supposed to be the son of Joseph. And just as their fathers said, 'As for this Moses we wot not what is become of him,' so they said, 'Is not this the carpenter, and are not his sisters here with us?' They were offended in Him. And when Jahweh was making His new revelation to them, they were crying out, 'Away with him! Crucify him!'

I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE. What will He be?

Already He has been Creator and Preserver, Deliverer and Saviour. We have made these discoveries. For the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt and the salvation from the bondage of sin are acts of history. They both belong to our past. In relation to them both we walk by sight. And how great is our astonishment, first at the provocation in the Wilderness, and next at the crucifixion on Calvary. Is it possible that, in our astonishment at the blindness of the Israelites, we are in the same condemnation through disobedience?

It is possible. For Jahweh has not yet made

the last revelation of Himself. To us still He says, I WILL BE. It is not given to any generation of men to walk entirely by sight. In the last book of the Bible there is a hint that when the new revelation comes it will come with a new name. But to whom will it come? It will come to him that overcometh. 'He that overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name' (Rev 3¹²).

The Self-Consciousness of Jesus and the Servant of the Lord.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., TORONTO.

III.

The Influence of Isaiah.

WHEN did Jesus become conscious that His Messianic career must issue in death? Is any light attainable on the problem? How is this conviction related to His Messianic consciousness as a whole? How is it related to His consciousness of Sonship? We will attempt to discuss these far-reaching questions, not with the view of reaching definite, far less, final answers, for that is impossible, but in order, at least, to indicate that much remains to be done in this direction; that hints may be collected from the Gospels which, in any case, suggest possible solutions; that many scholars have made rash assertions because they have not clearly realized the situation. Take, for example, such a statement as that of Schwartzkopff, by no means a hasty investigator (*Prophecies of Jesus Christ concerning His death*, etc., Eng. tr. p. 26): 'No doubt he must have clearly seen from the beginning that suffering awaited him in his Messianic mission. . . . But that did not necessarily mean that the struggle would end in death. . . . [Old Testament] predictions made no

reference to a death of the Messiah. No doubt Is 53 foreshadowed the death of the Servant of the Lord, but this was explained away by the exposition of the Rabbis.' This paragraph implies that Is 53 had no special importance for the consciousness of Jesus, who would, Schwartzkopff supposes, be guided by the interpretations current in His time. We may narrow down our inquiry, then, to this: Did Jesus identify Himself with the O.T. figure of the Servant of Jehovah, and at what stage in His consciousness of Messiahship did this identification take place?

Even a cursory study of the Gospels reveals most clearly the extraordinary influence of O.T. Scripture on the mind of Jesus. It is not too much to say that His thought is steeped in O.T. religious conceptions. This can be in no sense surprising. The converse would have been quite inexplicable. If His human nature were to undergo any development at all (and, of course, a real humanity presupposes this, as the N.T. explicitly recognizes), a supremely powerful influence