

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

foundly different from the modern conception." Fifteen years had passed since the previous edition of his Commentary had been published. During those years much that influenced the attitude of scholars had taken place. It was the investigations of Kuenen, and especially the marshalling of the evidences under the masterly hand of Wellhausen, that drew from Delitzsch this concession.

But, as the shadows began to lengthen, and the sand fell low in the glass, the veteran scholar felt more and more disposed to concentrate his remaining time and strength on practical aims (*v.* his remarkable article, "The Deep Gulf between the Old Theology and the New," published in the *Expositor* for January 1889). Most will think that his life had been truly practical; and, if particular evidence were needed, there is the passion with which he laboured that Israel might be saved. His translation of the New Testament into Hebrew for circulation among Jewish readers—a work that meant enormous toil, upon which he grudged no pains, and regarding which he was peculiarly sensitive (he frequently wrote articles to vindicate its accuracy)—will always remain as strong a proof as could well be found of Delitzsch's desire to bring men into the kingdom of Christ. Yet in the later months he felt speculation pure and simple was not for him. His thought rather fixed itself, not on the Church's creed, but on the truth in it, which was indestructible; and his desire was to rivet men's attention on that. For him, he confessed, the indestructible truth, which would outlive the fire, included the antithesis of nature and grace (he would not soften down the contrast); the sinfulness of man—an inheritance from his birth; the substitutionary work and suffering of Christ, opening communion with God; the fact of miracles,

and the possibility of prayer. The holding of these, he said, constituted the difference between the Old Theology and the New; and he was not slow to declare that he at least had not crossed the "deep gulf." Upon these vital questions he stood where he had always stood. Here are his own words written eighteen months or so before his death: "In the Muldenthal I was, as a young man, a witness of soul-struggles and spiritual victories, which rendered distasteful to me for ever the over-estimation of science. Still does my spiritual life find its root in the miraculous soil of that first love which I experienced . . . still to me is the reality of miracles sealed by the miracles of grace which I saw with my own eyes in the congregations of that blessed valley. And the faith which I professed in my first sermons . . . remains mine to-day, undiminished in strength, and immeasurably higher than all earthly knowledge. Even if, in many Biblical questions, I have to oppose the traditional opinion, certainly my opposition remains on this side of the gulf, on the side of the theology of the cross, of grace, of miracles, in harmony with the good confession of our Lutheran Church. By this banner let us stand; folding ourselves in it, let us die."

The last time I saw him will always linger in my memory. It was outside his classroom. On my side "Auf Wiedersehn" had been said; on his, many kind, undeserved words. Half-way down the broad staircase I caught sight of the reverent face looking over the balustrade, and, in his clear sharp voice, heard him say, "In der Ewigkeit." It was a solemn farewell—one of those words with tender edge that go home—a bullet fired at random that found its billet—a word that pledged one to try to be true. *Ewigkeit* is his now. Who can doubt that for Franz Delitzsch it is *Seligkeit*?

Franz Delitzsch—Exegete and Theologian.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A.

ON the 4th of March the great evangelical divine of Leipzig, Franz Delitzsch, passed to his eternal rest. It is difficult for us to realize that the distinguished, ever active Hebraist, whose abounding energies even in old age seemed to know no abatement, will never breathe another syllable to this weary, anxious, throbbing world. But it is even so. "The rest is silence," and we feel forlorn and poverty-stricken under the oppression of that silence.

For the work of Delitzsch is altogether distinct in quality from that of any of his contemporaries. To the very last his intellectual faculties were

busily engaged, enriching with fresh knowledge, correcting and improving what he had wrought in earlier years. With eager eyes he scanned the whole horizon of theological activity, and showed clearly that he was intensely awake to all the intellectual movements of the time. For the infirmities and perils that beset a specialist—the narrowness of aim and one-sidedness of view, that so seriously detract from the value of much sound and scholarly work produced in Germany, were singularly free. I can readily call to mind the emotions of eager, pleasurable anticipation with

which I opened his new Commentary on Genesis immediately after it was published, nearly three years ago. To those who had only studied the previous edition, the contrast between 1872 and 1887 seemed startling enough. But those who had read the contributions made by the *altmeister* to Luthardt's Zeitschrift in 1880-1882 on the critical problems of the Pentateuch, were quite prepared to find that fifteen years had wrought a great change in the attitude of Franz Delitzsch towards Pentateuchal criticism and the growth of Israel's religious institutions. In a modified form Delitzsch showed himself willing to accept the leading critical results established by Kuenen, the author of the *Religion of Israel*, and by Wellhausen, the brilliant exponent of historic and critical method, in the *Composition of the Hexateuch* and the *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. I have already dealt with Delitzsch's views on these matters in the *Expositor* (February 1888). I prefer not to dwell on this side of Delitzsch's activity. For our author shows himself here not a leader but a follower. Critical analysis is hardly his strong point. In fine discrimination he is certainly not the equal of the late Dr. Hupfeld or of the living Berlin Exegete Dillmann; and his grasp of critical and historic method is far inferior to that of Wellhausen or Stade.

Where, then, is the strong side of Dr. Delitzsch's genius? What is the distinctive quality of his work that makes every earnest Christian student deplore his loss as something personal? I answer that it is the *cultured piety*—the living faith in the Eternal and Unseen that transfigured every page he wrote, and made it gleam with at least some rays of the suffused light that "never shone on land or sea;"—I say it is for this we love Delitzsch. Girt with the heavy panoply of learning—for no living German commentator was so profoundly read in late Hebrew literature, and knew the Talmud better, and as an Arabist few surpassed him,—yet with all this he was greater than his learning. His profound spiritual perceptions rose superior to it all, dominated it all. His personality is never lost amid a weltering chaos of philologic details. Above all the surprising wealth of learning that fills his pages we see Delitzsch ever distinct, vivid, and supreme. It is the same pious God-fearing, Christ-loving, soul-loving commentator who delights to honour the Old Testament as the inspired organ of Divine truth speaking the message of Divine wrath against sin, and Divine redeeming love to man revealed in the incarnate Son Jesus Christ.

No contemporary commentator in Germany possesses this matchless quality in anything like equal degree. It falls to my lot to read many German commentaries—some, though very few, endowed with deeper philologic insight than De-

litzsch's works possess—but none approaching or even attempting to approach the Leipzig Hebraist in this grand element of cultured piety. This is his surpassing charm that draws the Christian reader like a loadstone, and has drawn hundreds to his classroom at Leipzig. Other writers are philological exegetes, but *not theologians*. Delitzsch is *both*.

Open his Commentary on Isaiah at the sixth chapter—the wonderful consecration vision of the prophet, and we seem to feel that the philology which explains the Hebrew word for "train" in verse 1, or "seraphim" in verse 2, is subordinated to the profound awe created in the mind of the exegete by the wondrous scene which the words depict. The moral environment of Israel at this point of time, referred to in the opening words, "In King Uzziah's death-year," is described in a few well-chosen words: "The preceding period was one of peace when Israel was filled to overflowing with the signs of God's love and favour. But this wealth of Divine mercy effected as little as the preceding age of calamity. Then there entered into the relation of Jehovah to Israel the momentous episode of which Isaiah was especially chosen to be the instrument. Isaiah sees,—not asleep or dreaming, but in his waking moments,—receives from God a glimpse into the unseen world. The activity of external sense falls into abeyance while the inner sense is opened and, owing to man's spiritual-corporeal nature and his earthy limitations, clothes the supersensuous in sensuous form. This is the mode of revelation conveyed in ecstatic vision. Isaiah is borne away to heaven. We have, it is true, in other prophetic ecstasies, the earthly temple as the place and object of vision; but here we behold the exalted throne, the heavenly counterpart of the earthly throne in the ark of the covenant. We behold the *hêchal*, properly meaning 'spacious hall,' the temple or palace of God the King. Hence it is not the temple of Jerusalem, but the heavenly temple that is here intended. There the prophet sees the universal Lord in human form. This is clearly intimated by the reference to the train whose trail or flowing ends fill the hall. The versions, LXX., Targum, and Jerome, dissipate the image of the train as being too anthropomorphic. But John in his Gospel (xii. 41) is bold enough to say that it was Jesus whose glory Isaiah beheld, for the incarnation of the Logos is the truth underlying all Biblical anthropomorphisms."

I forbear citing further. I have selected this passage almost at random from the last edition of his Commentary on Isaiah, published in 1889, enriched by the author's latest studies and the researches in Assyriology of his distinguished son, Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch.

Turn now to the pages of Diestel's commentary

on this passage. And lo! the whole scene shrinks into nothingness. The temple, the prophet—the Divine presence enthroned, and the train that fills the temple—the seraphim and the sublime trisagion—almost disappear. And alas! we have only a few empty words left as husks and shells for peddling exegeses to manipulate. We turn with weariness and longing to Delitzsch's pages once more, and feel that we are again standing by the side of one who is himself a seer—a theologian as well as a scholar—a steward of the Divine mysteries, well qualified to lead us within the veil, and teach us of those hidden things that the angels love to contemplate.

I might quote many other illustrations of Delitzsch's individuality in exegesis if I had time or space. Let the reader compare for himself the author's Commentary on the Psalms with that of Hupfeld (or Hitzig!). There is only one German commentator whom I would place alongside of Delitzsch for sympathetic imaginative insight, and that is Heinrich Ewald. And yet how profoundly Ewald's self-reliant egoistic temperament differed from that of the modest Leipzig theologian!

It is a great mistake to assert that Delitzsch's strong points are directly deducible from his conservatism. Others—like Bredenkamp—are quite as conservative as Delitzsch in their attitude to the Old Testament, but their treatment of the Old Testament is as dry and technical as that of the most advanced critic, and even more so. Delitzsch's genius is eminently one of intellectual sympathy and insight, and his strong evangelical fervour, his intense tenacious grasp of Christian truth, colour his utterances on every theme, and are never obscured by his learning. He interprets the Old Testament not only as a Hebraist, but as a well-versed ecclesiastic. It is for these transcendent qualities that Christian preachers will thank him for all time; and we can hardly imagine an age when the messenger of Christ will not delight to have Delitzsch's Commentaries on his shelf for constant reference.

I have but small space left to speak of the unique gift of the Leipzig scholar to evangelical Christendom. I refer to his Hebrew New Testament. In the year 1870 appeared the first instalment—a translation of the Epistle to the Romans into Hebrew, with illustrative citations from the Talmud and Midrash. In a useful preface the author reviews the previous attempts that had been made in the same direction. Delitzsch's object was twofold. By a Hebrew translation of the New Testament he desired to attract the intellectual interest of the Jews to a religion that proceeded from the bosom of Judaism, and subsequently overshadowed Europe—a religion

whose early records are of priceless historic value to the student of the history of Judaism. Moreover, Delitzsch endeavoured in this way to realize the cherished dream of earlier years—that lay as a burden upon him as upon the apostle to the Gentiles, viz. that Israel should be won to Christ. The work grew in subsequent years, and the result we see in the splendid monument of scholarship with which Dr. Delitzsch endowed the British and Foreign Bible Society. The book has passed through several editions, each containing the latest improvements from the hand of the accomplished Hebraist. To the Christian student the work is of great value. To understand the thought of St. Paul, it is necessary to know at least something of the new Hebrew literature. Let the student read such a tract as the "Sayings of the Fathers" and the "Day of Atonement," and then carefully study the diction of Paul's epistles in Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, and he will thus be in a far better position to grasp the underlying rabbinic thought and style of the apostle.

Delitzsch occupied a unique position between the Old and the New. While accepting some of the latest critical results in their bearing on the Old Testament, he held tenaciously to the conservative theological presuppositions of his earlier years. In an article published recently in the *Expositor* (January 1889), he described the deep gulf which separates the Old Theology from the New. Of that Old Theology he acknowledged himself a devoted adherent, and uttered his strongest protest against the tendency, now so fashionable, of blending the realms of nature and grace, and thus denying the reality of miracle. Let a few words from this remarkable "last will and testament" close our article, and may they continue to ring in our ears!—"He who in the midst of his estrangement from God and degradation in sin has experienced spiritual transformation, knows that he owes it to the supernatural interference of the rescuing hand of God, and feels himself placed in a new world, in contrast with which his earlier existence appears like the groping of a blind man, the lethargy of one more dead than alive. . . . The condition of the true Christian is a supernatural one, seeing that it has its root in the New Birth which he has experienced. This condition is wanting in the New Theology. Apart from its rejection of the so-called metaphysical element, to which it denies any practical significance, the new school speaks with regard to the actual facts of experience a language of moral shallowness foreign to the Christian and theologian of the old stock. The difference between nature and grace is here toned down and washed out, and that makes the deep gulf which divides us."