
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

its spirit and in its bountifulness. In its spirit; for God loveth a *hilarious* giver—ἱλαρὸν δότην (2 Cor. ix. 7), that is, one who gives with the God-like gladness of grace. And your charity should be like Christ's in its bounty; for your 'abounding' to your poor brethren should have some resemblance to God's 'abounding' to you. The medallion should be like its mould. Your character should be an impression the yielding heart has received from the grace of the Great Giver. The very genius of grace, in man as in God, is to find joy in giving joy to others.

The same conception lies at the foundation of all missionary appeals. Grace in you is to work after its kind; it is to create generous thought and feeling, a Christlike outgo and outflow towards the unlovely and the ill-deserving; it is to pour itself forth to them in the divine fashion; with a reversed ambition, with real chivalry, you are to side with the down-trodden and find attractions in the least attractive, and have divine joy in conveying to them the best of blessings. A temper and attitude agreeing with grace—that is the perfection of the mission spirit at home or abroad.

Further, the apostolic exhortations about social and civic life have this as their sum, that we are to breathe the spirit of grace into all our relations with our fellows.

The New Testament study of grace makes it plain that one of the most urgent needs of all spiritual teachers is a soul-bath and a life-bath in the grace of God.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Professor Nowack's 'Die Kleinen Propheten.'

Professor Nowack, now of Strassburg, has been known for many years past as a lucid and accomplished writer on subjects relating to the Old Testament. His first work, published in 1875, was an exceedingly interesting and instructive brochure of 55 pp., entitled *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Kritik*, in which he investigated the character of Jerome's translation of the Old Testament, and demonstrated the manner in which it was often dependent upon the older Greek versions, especially that of Symmachus. In 1880 he published a very full commentary on Hosea; and in 1883 rewrote, for the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*, the commentaries on Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, which, in the first edition, had been done by Bertheau and Hitzig respectively. In 1887–88 he laid biblical students under even a greater obligation, by bringing up to date—and also, as was sometimes necessary, by condensing,—Hupfeld's standard commentary on the Psalms. But his masterwork hitherto has been his *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Archäologie* (1894), which by its lucid and comprehensive treatment of both the secular and the religious antiquities of Israel, supplied a widely-felt need, and is invaluable to all serious students of the Old Testament.

The present commentary on the Minor Prophets forms the most recent addition to the *Handkommentar zum alten Testament*, edited by Professor Nowack himself, the same series to which, for instance, Duhm's *Isaiah* and Budde's *Job* also belong. At the top of the page is given the editor's own translation of the Hebrew text; underneath stand the notes, critical and exegetical. The book of each prophet is preceded by an introduction, explaining its historical and theological significance, and discussing critical questions connected with its authorship or date. The Minor Prophets present many problems and many difficulties—some textual, others exegetical, others historical. The reader who uses Professor Nowack's volume will find all these stated and discussed with perfect fairness and moderation of statement, with lucidity and completeness, and never at immoderate length (witness, for example, the treatment of the question of Hosea's marriage, pp. 27–30). The notes especially are models of terse and exact exegesis. The book will be eminently serviceable to students. The last systematic commentary on these prophets, written upon critical lines, was that of Hitzig, published in 1863 (for Steiner's revision of this, published in

1881, did not alter the substance of Hitzig's work)[1]; and since then, the history and literature of the Old Testament have been approached from many new points of view, and much has been written affecting directly or indirectly the interpretation of parts of the Minor Prophets. Whatever new light has been shed during the last thirty years upon their writings, will be found gathered up and estimated by Professor Nowack.[2]

The two most characteristic features of Professor Nowack's work are the treatment of the text, and what may be termed the 'higher criticism' of the Minor Prophets. Professor Nowack recognizes more fully than has been done by many previous commentators the suspicion, and in many cases indeed the certainty, of corruption under which the Hebrew text frequently labours; in his notes he mentions the more or less plausible emendations which have suggested themselves, either to his predecessors (notably Wellhausen) or to himself; and adopts many in his translation. The emendations thus adopted are indicated by asterisks (though sometimes, as Hos 9^{13a} 10^{14}, Mic 5^{13b} 6^{8}, the asterisks seem to have been accidentally omitted); passages in which the corruption is deemed beyond cure are marked by a series of dots and left untranslated (as parts of Hos 4^{18} 5^{7b} 10^{10a}, Am 4^{3}, Hab 3^{13}, etc.). We doubt indeed whether all the textual corrections suggested are necessary or satisfactory[3]; and certainly it seems to us that Professor Nowack often occupies space needlessly with mentioning, only for the purpose of rejecting, the improbable emendations suggested by others; at the same time, it is stimulating to the student to have the possibility of corruption placed fairly and strongly before him; and there are unquestionably many emendations which are thoroughly justified. In Nah 1^{2}–$2^{1.3}$ (A.V. 1^{2}–1^{15} 2^{2}) Professor Nowack adopts, with some improvements suggested by himself, the view of Gunkel and Bickell that this formed originally an acrostic poem, and emends the text accordingly. Undoubtedly there are traces of an alphabetical arrangement in the successive half-verses; but we own to feeling great doubts whether this was ever intended to be carried systematically through, or whether it is due to anything more than the fact that the author allowed himself here and there, perhaps half accidentally, to follow the alphabetical order; the very extensive alterations, especially the inversions and transpositions, through which, if the restoration be correct, the text must have passed, seem to us to be intrinsically improbable. One might have thought also that the very fact of the poem having been originally an acrostic would have protected it against so much alteration—whether due to accident or design—as it must have suffered, if that was ever actually the case.[4]

In the literary criticism of the prophets, Professor Nowack agrees generally with the conclusions reached by recent critics. Thus he places Joel—as we believe, rightly—in the post-exilic age; and Zec 9–11 (with $13^{7\text{-}9}$) he assigns to the Greek age, though adding judiciously that for fixing the date of this prophecy more precisely we 'cannot get beyond conjectures,' as the necessary data fail us. In addition to this, however, Professor Nowack

[1] I do not, of course, forget Professor G. A. Smith's justly appreciated *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, with its broad historical treatment of the prophets and their work, and its eminently suggestive and helpful exegesis; but this work manifestly makes no claim to contain a detailed and systematic commentary on the text.

[2] With regard to Am 8^{9}, however, it is worth mentioning that Dr. Pusey showed conclusively, in his note on the passage, that the eclipse of B.C. 784 could not have been total in the latitude of Palestine (its line of totality passed through St. Helena, Zanzibar, and Allahabad). The eclipse of B.C. 763, though not total in Palestine, would have been a more considerable one there (see my note).

[3] יתרצו, suggested by both Wellhausen and Nowack for יפרצו in Hos 4^{10}, would surely mean not 'have pleasure (in it),' but 'make oneself favourable' (1 S 29^{4}).

[4] The facts are these:—The alphabetical order is found actually only in 1^{2a} (א), $4a$ (נ), $5a$ (ה), $5b$ (ו), $6b$ (ח), $7a$ (ט), $9a$ (מ); it can be restored by omitting ו in 1^{3b} (ב), $7b$ (י), $12b$ (ע), $14a$ (צ), and כי in 2^{3a} (ש), and by more questionable changes in $1^{4b.6a}$ (ועמו מי יעמד לפניו), and 1^{10} (a ס line produced by omission of עד כי before סידים); but besides this, in order to restore it completely, 1^{2b} (נ) has to be transposed so as to precede the corrected 1^{10}, and 1^{3a} to follow מה תחשבו אל יהוה in 1^{9} (thus producing a מ line); $1^{8a\alpha}$ (with a verb added) has to be attached to 1^{7b} (י), so that כלה יעשה may begin a ב line; in 1^{9} (from כלה) the two clauses are inverted, so as to form a ל line (. . . לא); the פ line is produced out of 1^{12} by omitting כה אמר יהוה, and then reading פְּחֵז מִשֶּׁל מים רבים (משל מים רבים after LXX, but פחז a violent change for א); the ק line by a violent transposition in 1^{14b}; the ר line by a similarly violent one in 2^{1a} (and the omission of all that follows שלום); the ת line by the insertion of תחת before כי in 2^{3b} (the intrusive verse, 2^{2}, being transposed so as to follow the close of the poem and introduce 2^{4}, etc.). All this is exceedingly ingenious; and, of course, it is not denied that these are parts of Nah 1 (as v.[10. 12]) in which the text is desperately corrupt; but the violence necessary to reduce the passage to the acrostic form, seems to us, as it does also to Professor Davidson (*Nahum*, etc., p. 19 f.), to make it highly improbable that it ever really possessed it.

agrees with an increasing number of recent critics in holding that the existing text of the prophets contains many insertions and supplements, added long after the lifetime of the prophets themselves, and dating mostly from the Exile, or the post-exilic age. The passages thus treated by Professor Nowack are printed by him in italic type,—the reasons for the view thus taken of them being stated fully in the notes. The present writer has expressed himself recently upon this subject in different parts of the newly published edition of his *Introduction*, and (so far as regards the passages of Amos, which have been so treated) in his edition of Joel and Amos in the *Cambridge Bible*, pp. 117–124; and he cannot at present add anything substantially to what he has there said. He recognizes fully that there *are* reasons for treating the passages in question as 'secondary'; but he is seldom able to satisfy himself that the reasons are conclusive. He doubts, for instance,—except in extreme cases,—whether imperfect connexion with the context is a sufficient reason for ascribing a passage to a later hand: the prophets are manifestly poets, guided frequently by impulse and emotion rather than by strict logic; the future, moreover, often presents itself to their imagination under ideal aspects,—they do not pause to reflect by what steps the transition is to be effected from the actual present in which they live, to the ideal future which they look forward to as approaching; hence, in the case of their writings, abrupt transitions, and rapid changes of point of view, do not seem to be cogent proof of a change of hand. A passage such as Am 9^{8-15} does not seem to the present writer to contradict or neutralize the threatenings contained in the previous parts of the book: for surely the promises given here by the prophet are addressed not to the corrupt Israel of his own day, but to the *ideal* Israel of the future, which he imagines implicitly as purged of its sins, and worthy of being reinstated in its former home; the threatened judgment runs its course; the corrupt Israelites perish; the faithful few survive the crisis, and form the nucleus of a purified community of the future. The picture is naturally an *ideal* one: the prophet does not ask how all this is to be actually effected; but it is not apparent why the ultimate salvation of the few should be deemed inconsistent with the immediate destruction of the many. In the same way, again, slight difficulties or obscurities of expression or allusion, phrases, or turns of thought, a little different from what might have been expected, small incongruities or inconsistencies of representation, are frequently put forward as grounds for rejecting a passage, which to the present writer seem anything but conclusive: have we the necessary *data* for pronouncing confidently that such things would not occur in the writing of an ancient poet-prophet, of whose surroundings and habits of thought we are, after all, only incompletely informed? In Hos 2^{4-25} (A.V. $^{2-23}$), for instance, Professor Nowack rejects v.^{4} (from *for* to *husband*), $^{6.\ 8-9.\ 12.\ 16-18.\ 20-25}$, all passages of which none (except v.^{18}), five years ago, excited the suspicion of Wellhausen: although, in one or two cases, the omission no doubt makes the sequence of thought a little more direct, can it be said that there are really any sufficient grounds for their rejection? do not, on the contrary, all these passages contain characteristic thoughts of a kind not likely to have occurred to an interpolater? Similar doubts occur to us constantly elsewhere, in the case of passages questioned upon similar grounds. Arguments, again, derived from a difference of beliefs and ideas, seem to us not unfrequently to limit unduly, without adequate ground, both the spiritual capabilities and the imaginative power of the earlier prophets. And it is rarely also that the passages in question are differentiated from their context by noticeable literary or linguistic features: the principal clue, which is so valuable in the historical books for distinguishing separate hands, thus fails us.[1] On the whole, the present writer must own that he agrees largely on this point with Kuenen. It seems to him that there are many possibilities to be weighed, which it may be doubted whether recent writers have fully taken account of, before passages in the prophets can be pronounced 'secondary' upon the extensive scale that is now sometimes done.

But though the writer is thus unable frequently to follow Professor Nowack in the details of his textual and literary criticism, he has no hesitation in commending warmly his volume on the Minor Prophets as the best work of its kind which exists, as eminently well-timed, and as one in which the student will find all the information and assistance

[1] Such differentiating features are present, however, sometimes, *e.g.* in Is 12; there is also *some* weight in those which have been noticed in Am 9^{8-15} (*Joel and Amos*, p. 122).

which he can reasonably expect from a commentary of such a kind.

S. R. DRIVER.

Oxford.

Among the Periodicals.

Codex Bezae and Luke's Gospel.

THE readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES have frequently of late been kept alive to the importance of Codex D by the interesting and valuable communications of Professor Nestle. In the current number of *Studien u. Kritiken* the same subject is handled by Dr. GRAEFE. To illustrate the interest which this MS. has assumed of recent years as compared with the place it used to occupy, Graefe mentions that in 1888 he found that the copy of Scrivener's edition of Codex D in the Royal Library at Berlin was *cut in only a few places*, whereas the same book is now *very much worn through constant handling*. At the former date Graefe himself had not thought of the possibility that both texts of Luke might be due to the evangelist's own pen. Westcott and Hort dismiss this theory as improbable. Gregory, in his edition of Tischendorf (1884), does not even mention it. In passing, Graefe enters his protest against de Lagarde's contemptuous references to Tischendorf's 8th edition and his censure of the latter scholar for changing his mind so often in the course of forty years. On the contrary, one who corrects himself deserves, in Graefe's opinion, our esteem. Without Lachmann we should have had no Tischendorf, and without Tischendorf no Westcott and Hort. And it is through the previous labours of these men that Resch, Nestle, and Blass, along with Schürer, B. and J. Weiss, and Belsheim have been enabled to render such illustrious services in investigating and characterizing the Western text. The pity is that the two pioneers, Resch and Blass, should have reached such contradictory results, while Nestle, occupying an impartial middle position, is able to trace duplicate traditions to the Semitic idiom of the sources in a manner that commands assent from both sides. Resch's four stages in the development of Codex D are fully described by Graefe, as well as the important principle for which he contends that '*Agreement between Codex D, the old Latin VSS, and the Curetonian Syriac gives us with certainty the text of the archetype, even if the latter should be represented by only a single Latin copy.*' For the details of Resch's work we must refer the reader to Graefe's article, which, at the present stage of the controversy, is of extreme importance. In spite of the learning and the skill of Resch, his solution of the problem fails in many points to satisfy Graefe, who turns next to the work in the same field of Blass. The latter very properly took as his starting-point not the Third Gospel but the Acts. Here the principal differences between the Alexandrian and the Western text appear much more distinctly, because the disturbing element caused by the mixing of text from the four Gospels is absent. Blass has proved to Graefe's satisfaction that both texts, the Alexandrian and the Roman, are most naturally to be ascribed to the pen of Luke himself. This was the old hypothesis of Clericus '*Lucam bis sua edidisse*,' and many are ready now to pronounce it the egg of Columbus. Probably the opinion will also prevail that the Roman edition of the Acts is the older, containing, as it does, details that would interest Luke and Theophilus, but might be spared in the later edition destined for the Christian public. Blass himself is disposed (we write this without having seen his recently published text of Luke, which had not appeared when Graefe's article was written) to reverse this hypothesis in dealing with the priority of the two editions of the *Gospel*. The Alexandrian text he supposes to have been written by Luke at Cæsarea during Paul's imprisonment there, and the Western text to have been afterwards produced at Rome, and destined for the Christian public. To this Nestle (*Philologica Sacra*, p. 42 f.) gives a qualified assent. Graefe himself believes that in the Gospel as well as in Acts the priority should be ascribed to the Western text. His arguments we cannot of course go into, but must again refer the reader to the pages of the *SK*, where our author discusses most elaborately the data supplied by the genealogy of Jesus, the Heavenly Voice at the Baptism, the Words of Institution at the Lord's Supper, the Narrative of the Ascension, and some other passages on which Blass founds for the priority of the

Alexandrian text. Graefe lays much stress on the point that in any case both texts *are original* as much as two editions of the Augsburg Confession or of an Introduction to the New Testament [is the latter a happy illustration?]. If it should prove in the end that all the attempts to explain Codex D must be thrown aside like old iron, yet the main result abides, that the contents of the Gospel are 'realities,' and not merely literary *Tendenzprodukte*.

The Popular Style of the Scriptures.

Under this title a very interesting paper by the late Professor JALAGUIER appears in the October issue of the *Revue Chrétienne*. The style of the Bible, a style due at once to the social position and acquirements of most of the writers and to the character of the readers addressed, has been, our author thinks, too much neglected hitherto, especially in its bearing upon the interpretation of Scripture. In the paper before us he sets himself, first, to state precisely the characteristics of this style, and then to examine the practical consequences of these.

1. In general, the language of Scripture is that of common life, it is *spoken* rather than *written* language. It is characterized by *simplicity*, *energy*, and *figure*. How concise such sayings as 'It is more blessed to give than to receive,' or 'Children, obey . . . in all things,' where it is easy for the candid soul enlightened by the Spirit to supply the necessary limitations and exceptions. The language of common life is, moreover, largely untrammelled by grammar and logic. It delights in metaphor, hyperbole, and proverb. Our author adduces three illustrations of the characteristics he claims for scriptural language. (*a*) On the one hand, it teaches that God is Spirit, omnipresent, omniscient, invisible; on the other hand, it represents Him as looking down from heaven, nay, as coming down to see what is passing on earth, as deliberating, repenting, etc. Anthropomorphism and anthropopathy reign from one end of the Bible to the other. (*b*) The prophetic descriptions of the Messianic kingdom or of the establishment and progress of the Church almost always contain features borrowed from earthly empires or from the Jewish theocracy. (*c*) So with the pleasures and pains of the world to come, everything in this world that is fitted to stimulate strongly hope or fear, or to suggest happiness or misery, is transferred to the description of heaven and hell.

Such characteristics mark, above all, the language of the Sermon on the Mount. A few words as simple as profound, a few gnomes, one might almost say a few paradoxes, suffice to describe the conditions of admittance into the kingdom of heaven. Jalaguier thinks that in His preaching Jesus has left an example which has been too little remarked and too little followed by preachers of the gospel. How little anxiety, again, does Paul show to harmonize his teaching on one occasion with that on another. On the one hand, he conveys the impression that he denies both the merit of good works and their necessity for salvation; and on the other, he insists on the absolute necessity of these. It is the same with the doctrines of the Divine predestination and human responsibility.

2. From the characteristics above described, it results, in general, that the Bible is the book of humanity: it comes within the range of every intelligence. But, above all, the bearing of all this upon the science of hermeneutics concerns us. (*a*) As a rule, the first or obvious sense is the one to be accepted. The simple natural interpretation put upon the words of the Bible by unsophisticated piety will usually be right. Jalaguier points out, of course, that critical and historical difficulties are beyond the range of simple unlettered faith. That is the sphere of science. (*b*) The popular character of the language as above described warns us against attaching too much weight to the mere letter, or rearing a dogma upon the foundation of isolated expressions. It is unchecked literalism that accounts for the false Messianic expectations of the Jews in our Lord's day, for ancient and modern chiliastic notions, for some of the singularities of Quakerism, etc. Protestants wonder at Roman Catholics for pressing Jn $21^{15\text{-}17}$ to the issue of papal supremacy and infallibility, for finding purgatory in Mt 5^{26}, or transubstantiation in the words, 'This is My body.' But, as Jalaguier remarks, the same disposition is found in all the Churches or sects. Each is found pressing unduly what favours and attenuating or explaining away what does not support its own pretensions. (*c*) The opposite extreme, that of undue spiritualizing, has equally to be avoided. From the time of Philo and Origen downwards, the supposed secret sense of Scripture has wielded

a powerful fascination over many minds. It is this disposition which, in the name of Hegelianism, has done such violence to the New Testament in its effort to strip off the material envelope from the underlying idea. Jalaguier considers that the dangers of literalism, serious as these are, are less to be feared than those of this professed spiritualism which volatilizes Scripture at its pleasure. If literalism materializes, at least it conserves; whereas, under pretext of purifying or rationalizing, this philosophico-theologic spiritualism annihilates.

The one safeguard against these opposing errors is a sound principle of interpretation, which consists, in general, in treating the Bible as one treats other books, and letting it say what it really says. We are not to ask, What sense can I put upon this word? but What must it have meant to him who spoke and to him who heard it? And, as a rule, this last question will not be difficult to answer.

Current Theological Literature.

Since our last notice, other two parts of the invaluable and indispensable *Theol. Jahresbericht* (Schwetzschke & Sohn, Braunschweig) have appeared. The first, prepared by Drs. Meyer, Troeltzsch, Sulze, and Dreyer, catalogues and reviews (frequently with considerable fulness) the works in Systematic Theology published during the year 1896. The other is devoted to Practical Theology and Church Art (*Kunst*, a pretty wide term, including painting, sculpture, music, etc.). The catalogue and review of the Literature for 1896 is by Drs. Marbach, Ehlers, Woltersdorf, Kind, Everling, Hasenclever, and Spitta.

Moral Philosophy and the Gospel.

In the *Revue de Théologie* of last July, M. J. A. PORRET discusses the relation between the Moral Philosophy of the present time and the Gospel of Jesus Christ. At the outset he complains of the difficulty of stating clearly the point at issue. There may have been periods in different countries where a system of philosophy carried all before it and effaced for a time every rival system. So was it with Hegelianism in Germany from 1820 to 1825, so was it in France in the palmy days of Cousinism. But the prevailing appearance at present is multiplicity of systems. Equally difficult is it to define the gospel of Jesus Christ. In view of all this our author finds it advisable to formulate five questions with a view to clearing up the subject:—

1. What are the different tendencies actually at work in the field of moral philosophy?
2. Is it possible to find a unity in them, or, at least, points of contact between them?
3. What is at bottom the gospel of Jesus Christ?
4. What are its points of contact, if any, with the prevailing currents of moral philosophy?
5. What conclusion may be drawn from the facts established?

1. All the systems of moral philosophy in vogue at present may be classed under the three categories: Egoism, Altruism, and Love. The first is not, at least avowedly, much in favour at present. Side by side with self-love, the instinct of sympathy is fully recognized. The individual is expected to find his own well-being in the well-being of others: their happiness is to be his. But our author has no great faith in the optimist theory that 'the individual and society will become perfectly adapted to one another.' He finds that these altruistic systems fail to make sufficient allowance for the strength of human passions, or to supply sufficiently strong motives for action. The systems that belong to the third category, that of Love, differ from Altruism in that the latter says, It is for my good to do good to others, while the former sees here an act of *duty* without regard, in the first instance, to results.

2. Leaving out of view egoistic systems, there appears in all the others a tendency to consider humanity as one body, of which individuals form different members, and the inference is drawn that none of us should live solely for himself.

3. The essence of the gospel is Love. It starts with God's love to man, and concludes that man, the object of that love, ought to love God in return. Confucius and Sakya-Mouni may have given the precept to love one's neighbour as one's self, but the gospel alone has supplied the motive. Before saying 'Love,' it says, 'Thou hast been loved.'

4. The altruism so prevalent to-day is partly due to infiltration more or less direct and pure from the gospel. Amongst the pagan systems the golden age is nearly always found in the past, whereas the popular notion at present is that of Progress.

5. What the gospel offers to the world is something better than, and different from, philosophy. It is, properly speaking, neither a code of morals nor a philosophy. The Living God is Love. Love is life. The gospel of the Living God bestows life in creating love. J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter