

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the number of *The Nation* for the 13th of August there is an article on 'The Mind of St. Paul.' The particular aspect in which the mind of St. Paul is to be viewed does not for some time appear. For, like the approach to a great house, this writer's avenue to his subject is both indirect and long, though it is never uninteresting.

The article begins by telling us that the most difficult thing to discover about any man's mind is not what he thinks, but how he thinks. And before we have time to dispute the statement, the writer has passed to the 'daimonion' of Socrates and the 'monitions' of Stephen Grellet; he has recalled the 'grievous blasphemies' of John Bunyan, the thoughts of Luther that 'have hands and feet,' and the 'womb of the soul of Philo,' that was sometimes shut so disappointingly. And in this way we come to the discovery that the writer's purpose is to consider whether St. Paul's thoughts were evolved from his consciousness or came to him unexpectedly from without.

That some men have thoughts which they are scarcely responsible for seems to be undeniable. Of the 'daimonion' of Socrates there is nothing new to be said yet. We believe that some day we shall find the key to that secret chamber, but

the day has not yet come. Nor is there anything new to be said about the 'monitions' of Stephen Grellet. There is simply the fact to be once more recorded, that whereas most men are conscious of no other guidance in their lives than that which is supplied by circumstances and their own judgment, these men were shown their way by authority, an authority that seemed to them to come independently of their own will and that demanded instant obedience. Or they were harassed by suggestions that demanded instant rejection.

The best example is Bunyan. And he is best because he is so explicit and so unconsciously autobiographical. He does not intend to exhibit the mere action of his own mind when he writes of *Grace Abounding*. But he does so, and that with most instructive fulness. Faithfully and steadily he sets forth the story of his conversion and his long wrestle with many strange temptations. The temptations take various forms. 'Satan strongly suggested' this and that. Or, again, certain 'thoughts' did 'roar and bellow within me like masterless hell-hounds.'

Who or what was this Satan? And these 'thoughts' that roared and bellowed, were they Bunyan's own thoughts, or were they not? In the *Pilgrim's Progress*, continues this anonymous

writer in the *Nation*, he gives, after an interval of some twelve years, a further view of them. Bunyan used italics rather freely in the books he saw through the press, but printers have removed them too often with his vagaries of spelling and other things, such as the fact that the lock of the outer gate of Doubting Castle 'went damnably hard.' It is worth while to use an edition like that of the 'Cambridge English Classics' to see how near one can get to Bunyan's mind. Accordingly, in the Valley of the Shadow of Death, we find a whole paragraph italicized, in which Bunyan says that he saw how fiends stepped up behind poor Christian and whispered many grievous blasphemies into his ear, and Christian imagined they were his own thoughts, and 'was more put to it' than in any former trouble; and yet it was not his doing, for he did not see the fiends, and (naturally) did not think of stopping his ears.

It is clear that Bunyan wishes to convey his belief that a man is not responsible for all that comes into his head, and holds that thoughts are in their way independent things. The writer of this article finds a similar view in Luther. Certain words and thoughts, said Luther, have hands and feet. They can lay hold of a man and carry him away in a direction which is theirs and not his.

This fact, for it is a fact, observable and undeniable, was well known to the ancients. And in the simplicity of their psychology they attributed the acts and words of a man who was 'possessed' by such thoughts to a something or somebody not himself, a Spirit or Dæmon that had entered into him. Luther is anxious to avoid the evil consequences to morality of an unchecked belief of this kind, and says that while a man cannot help a bird flying over his head, he can stop it from building its nest in his hair. But Luther does not deny that, in their coming at least, a man's thoughts may be independent of his will.

But, we have said already, this is not the experience of all men. Of what type of man, of what kind of mind, is it the experience? Plato says that poetry comes to a man in this way. A man who 'approaches the gates of the Muses without madness' will not produce great poetry. And Philo, four hundred years after Plato, out of his own experience, recorded the same things of the philosopher. Sometimes he 'saw clearly' what to say, but 'the womb of his soul was closed.' At other times he 'came empty, and suddenly was full, as thoughts were imperceptibly sowed and snowed upon him from above.' And at such times, Philo, the contemporary of St. Paul, wrote as if divinely possessed and 'corybantic,' forgetful of self, place, and even the writing.

Now what does the modern psychologist say to this? 'One feels,' says this anonymous author, 'that it is the vivid thought that startles a man which he thus attributes to another mind without him; and one wonders whether it is not after all very often a better type of human brain that has this belief, or fancy, or whatever it is—that has, at all events, the experience that gives rise to it. It often goes with a certain quickness and sureness of perception, an almost painfully intense realization of the thing in the very colours and movements of life.'

And so we arrive at St. Paul. For, as we read St. Paul's Epistles, we feel that his thinking is done—achieves itself—in some such way as this. There is the extraordinary quickness of it, noticeable in the strange and flashing tangents at which he moves. And there is the intensity with which he thinks and sees.

The writer illustrates this intensity by the use of the Concordance. He discovers a curious trait of St. Paul's mind in the frequent use he makes of the verb to *abound* (*περισσεύω*), of the adverbs and adjectives belonging to it, and of the forms of words heightened with the prepositions *hyper* and *ek*. When he is overburdened it is 'to

hyperbole beyond strength.' When he knows the grace of God it 'abounds' and 'exceedingly abounds.' And God does 'exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.'

What does this mean? St. Paul uses superlatives, some say; he loves a heightened form of expression; and it is a mistake, they add, to exaggerate. But does he? Is he one of our friends who say 'awfully' when they mean 'rather'? It is right for a man to say that he 'rather likes' a thing when that is the extent of his feeling about it. But it is not from 'rather liking' that either poetry or religion comes. Wordsworth says that the sounding cataract did 'haunt him like a passion,' and that is more than to say that he 'rather liked' it. St. Paul exclaims, 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out,' and no commentator yet has had the folly to remark that 'it is a pity to exaggerate.'

Now this man, who saw so far and felt so keenly, has the same idea about his thoughts and their independent ways. He speaks of 'taking captive every thought into obedience of Christ.' And to the man who finds his thoughts hard to master (the 'masterless hell-hounds,' it may be, of Bunyan), he recommends prayer and thanksgiving, with the promise that then 'the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus.'

Accordingly, St. Paul has the sense of guidance, external and authoritative, beyond anything that Socrates attributed to his *daimonion*, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' And the answer comes from without, 'Go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.' And thereafter, throughout his life, 'necessity is laid upon' him, the 'Spirit of Jesus' suffers or suffers him not; he is the 'slave' of Christ Jesus; and when he was solitary and defenceless, 'the Lord (whose

slave he was) stood with me and strengthened me.'

The Journal of Biblical Literature is the organ of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. It appears but twice in the year. And it may be its infrequency that partly accounts for it, but certainly no periodical is more hopefully considered when it comes. In the first part for 1910 there is an article by the President of the Society for the year, Professor Henry Preserved SMITH, on Old Testament Ideals; an article by the Treasurer, Professor J. Dyneley PRINCE, on the Name Hammurabi; a note by the Recording Secretary, Dr. William H. COBB, on a Hebrew Conception of the Universe; an article by the Corresponding Secretary, Professor James A. MONTGOMERY, on the Dedication Feast in the Old Testament. There is, of course, an article by Professor Benjamin W. BACON (what would the magazines do without him?); it is on the Purpose of Mark's Gospel. And there are two geographical and illustrated articles, by Professor Nathaniel SCHMIDT, the one on Kadesh Barnea, the other on Alexandria.

Dr. COBB's note is on a Hebrew Conception of the Universe. The only expression in Hebrew for the Universe is usually supposed to be 'the heavens and the earth.' Dr. COBB believes that there is a terser and better expression than that.

In Psalm 103¹⁹ we read: 'The LORD hath established his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.' Over all what? Is 'men' or 'things' understood to be supplied? Something must be supplied at any rate, for 'all' is an adjective. But the Hebrew word *kol*, which is translated 'all,' is not an adjective. It is a noun. And it has the article. Why then should we not translate, 'His kingdom ruleth over *the whole*'? That is how GESenius would have it translated, for he gives in German *das Universum*.

But first of all, it is worth noticing in other connexions that the word *kol*, usually translated

'all,' is a noun. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with the whole of thy heart'—that is to say, it is not merely an intense love, it is a love that is undivided; no part of the heart is to be given to the love of any other god. 'The whole of us wandered like sheep,' gives us the sense of the solidarity of the race in its sinfulness much better than 'all we like sheep have gone astray.'

The extent covered by 'the whole' depends upon the object in view at the moment. That object may be as small as a single animal. In Lv 1⁹ the law of the burnt-offering enumerates the various parts of the bullock, and then gives the ordinance, 'The priest shall burn the whole on the altar.' Or the object may be as large as all humanity. The hand of Ishmael (Gn 16¹²) is 'against the whole,' that is, the whole race; just as the hand of the whole race is against him. Koheleth made great works, builded houses, planted vineyards, and so on through a long list; and then he looked on all his works, 'and behold, the whole—vapour!' And when David pursued the Amalekites, who had carried away his own and his followers' wives, their sons and daughters, their flocks and herds, and all manner of spoil, he defeated them and brought back *the whole*.

Now return to 'the whole' signifying the Universe. And look at a puzzling passage in Isaiah. 'We moderns,' says Dr. COBB, 'bandy about very glibly those abstract terms which the Hebrews used but sparingly. If you do anything that attracts public notice, the reporters are likely to beset you with requests to give the newspapers your philosophy of life, or your outlook on things in general. The Hebrew prophets did not deal in philosophy, but they had an outlook on the world. They called it *vision*. It was the gift of God.' And it was sometimes claimed when it had not been bestowed. Isaiah says that the false prophets are as helpless to interpret the will of God as a man with a sealed book in his hand. And what does he place in contrast to the sealed book? It is 'the vision of the whole' (Is 29¹¹). Our

translators render: 'The vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed'—which is at least ambiguous, says Dr. COBB, if not unintelligible. And then he severely reproaches the English and American Revisers for making bad worse, and producing what he calls the outrageous translation, 'all vision.' What Isaiah contrasts with the sealed book of the false prophet is the vision of the Universe. It is the vision of the working of God's hand in all time and in all space.

In the month of April 1909, an article appeared in *The Open Court*, entitled 'The Aryan Ancestry of Jesus.' It was written by Professor Paul HAUPT of Baltimore, the editor of the *Polychrome Bible*, and a highly accomplished Semitic scholar. The object of the article (some account of which was given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September) was to show that Jesus of Nazareth was not a Jew. He was born, not in Bethlehem but in Nazareth of Galilee, at a time when the inhabitants of Galilee were preponderatingly Medians. The probability is that He Himself was a Median and belonged to the Aryan race of men.

Now there are those to whom it is a matter of no concern whether Jesus was a Semite or an Aryan, a Jew or a Gentile. WEILHAUSEN has expressed his contempt for the whole discussion. But the subject has been taken up, dependently or independently, by other writers of eminence, like Professor Emile BURNOUF, Professor Rudolf von JHERING, and Professor WIRTH, and it has been the occasion of a very lively controversy which has been carried on in the pages of *The Open Court* for more than a year. Other things have entered into the discussion besides the original question of the ancestry of Jesus. And some of these things are instructive. But the most instructive thing about the whole controversy is the illustration it affords of the way in which some very rationalistic writers reach their conclusions.

And, first of all, these writers are unanimous in

holding that Jesus was not born in Bethlehem. On that the editor of *The Open Court* is as emphatic as any of his contributors. 'In our opinion,' he says, 'there can be no question but Jesus was a Galileean by birth. The story of His birth in Bethlehem is conceded by Higher Critics to be a later invention.' 'The tradition of Davidic descent and Bethlehem birth,' says Professor William Benjamin SMITH, 'is not original. The Lucan historical framework (so valiantly championed by RAMSAY) hangs together like so much sand.'

Why was He not born in Bethlehem? Because He was brought up in Nazareth. That is one reason. Another reason is because the date of His birth does not correspond with the date of the enrolment under Quirinius. And the third reason is because it is absurd to suppose that people would be sent for enrolment to the place of their nativity. 'As if Missourians,' says Professor W. B. SMITH, 'should go back to Kentucky or Virginia every census-year!'

How was it ever supposed that Jesus was born in Bethlehem? These writers are not so sure about that as they are about some things. They might have suggested that it was done in order to connect Jesus as the Messiah with the house and lineage of David. But then they are not agreed that David was born in Bethlehem. Professor HAUPT will not allow that David had anything to do with Bethlehem. In an ingenious article in Peiser's *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* for February 1909, he declares the traditional connexion of David with Bethlehem to be made up of misconceptions: David belonged to Hebron. WINCKLER, on the other hand, transfers him to the Negeb. But, to use the free speech of Professor W. B. SMITH, 'WINCKLER despairs of separating actuality from genealogic-mythologic constructions; and footing on Stucken's Astralmythen, he translates so much of the Davidic legend to the skies that it becomes almost indifferent where the minstrel king was born, or whether he was born at all.' And that, we may add, is very nearly

how it is with 'great David's greater Son,' as we shall see.

Well, if Jesus was not born in Bethlehem, where was He born? He was born somewhere in Galilee—that is to say, if He was born at all. Now, Galilee being preponderatingly Aryan, Jesus must have been an Aryan. One of those who come to this conclusion along with Professor HAUPT is Dr. H. S. CHAMBERLAIN. Perhaps Dr. CHAMBERLAIN is not so sure as Professor HAUPT is that Jesus was an Aryan, but he is very sure that He was not a Jew. And the way in which he becomes so sure about it is worth considering. It is an exercise in progressive assertion.

His first statement is comparatively mild: 'In religion and education Jesus was undoubtedly a Jew; in race He was most probably not.' Three pages further, 'there is not the slightest occasion' to assume that His parents were Jews. Pass other four pages; then he who makes the assertion that Jesus was a Jew is 'either ignorant or untruthful,' and 'the probability that Christ was no Jew, that He had not a drop of pure Jewish blood in His veins, is so great that it almost amounts to a certainty.' And when we turn another page we read, 'That Jesus Christ did *not* belong to the Jewish race may be considered as certain. Every other assertion is hypothetical.' Now Dr. CHAMBERLAIN knew on page 211 what he knew on page 219. As Professor SMITH points out, 'No scintilla of fresh evidence has been forthcoming.'

But, as we have already hinted, there is a rift here. These writers all agree that Jesus was born in Galilee. They do not all agree that therefore He was an Aryan. For there were many different races represented in 'Galilee of the Nations.' Says Dr. SMITH: 'The race-Babel of the Assyrian monarchy, on which WINCKLER lays so much stress, was even intensified in Galilee, which was a veritable witches' caldron, bubbling over with varied and violent contents.' And all that Dr. CARUS himself, the judicious editor of *The*

Open Court, will assert is that 'Jesus was a Galilæan, and the Galilæans were a people of mixed blood.'

But now, supposing Jesus was born in Galilee, where in Galilee was He born? We must not hastily answer 'Nazareth.' For there is a difficulty.

The difficulty is that there was no such place. 'We search in vain,' says Dr. CARUS, 'for a town or village of Nazareth in the time of Jesus.' Again he says, 'Nazareth, nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament and absolutely unknown to geographers and historians at the time of Christ, was an insignificant place even in the Christian era.' In the same way, Professor SMITH speaks of 'the queer riddle of the "city called Nazareth," which suddenly appears on the map as if it had fallen from the sky.' And in another place he says, 'Neither Josephus, nor the Old Testament, nor the Talmud (for nearly a thousand years after Christ) knows anything of such a town.'

But here also there is a little rift. Professor A. KAMPMEIER takes Professor SMITH to task for saying that the Talmud for nearly a thousand years knows nothing about Nazareth. 'I would call his attention to the fact that Nazareth is mentioned in a Jewish elegy by Eleazar ha Kalir, 900 A.D., a notice which goes back to an older Midrash. According to that notice, there was a "station for priests in Nazareth," who went to Jerusalem to do service in the Temple.'

Professor KAMPMEIER goes on to say that no such town as Dalmanutha occurs in Josephus, the Old Testament, or the Talmud; nor do Josephus or the Old Testament mention Magdala or Chorazin. And he wishes to know if on that account these places are to be wiped out of the atlases. But we are afraid that Professor KAMPMEIER does not understand. Who wants to deny the existence of Dalmanutha? If any one ever does, he has the argument from silence at his

hand. But meantime, it is the existence of Jesus that is the question. Jesus is said to have been born or brought up in Nazareth. And as Nazareth is not mentioned—therefore Nazareth did not exist. And Jesus could not have been born there.

But if Nazareth did not exist, why were the followers of Jesus called Nazarenes? That is the very question our critics want us to come to. The followers of Jesus were certainly called Nazarenes. But they were not called Nazarenes because Jesus came from Nazareth. It was the other way. A place called Nazareth was invented by the fertile minds of those Jewish evangelists who wrote the Gospels, because in their day the followers of Jesus had somehow come to be called Nazarenes.

And how had the followers of Jesus come to be called Nazarenes? The easiest answer to that is given by Dr. CARUS. Nazarene is Nazirite. 'In former publications of mine I have identified the Nazarenes with the Nazirites (the A.V. spelling), and I have not yet retracted that view.' The followers of Jesus, sometimes called Christians, were called Nazarenes (a mistake for Nazirites) because, like the Nazirites of the Old Testament, they were given to the practice of asceticism.

But if there was no Nazareth, where was Jesus born? Again the readiest answer is made by Dr. CARUS. 'Jesus was probably born and raised in Capernaum, for the Gospels contain indications that He lived there, and that there dwelt His parents and His kin.' Whereupon he remarks with some emotion: 'The visitor to Palestine finds churches built in commemoration of Jesus in Bethlehem and in Nazareth, but not in Capernaum. What a strange irony of fate!'

What progress have we now made? There was no birth in Bethlehem, Jesus was born in Galilee. Therefore He was certainly not a Jew. But He was not born in Nazareth. There was no such place. He was born (and raised) in Capernaum.

The last conclusion is that He was not born at all. To prove this, which sets many of the foregoing questions to rest, Professor W. B. SMITH has written a great book which has had the rare honour, Dr. CARUS tells us, of being translated into German before it has appeared in English, and of which he has sent a summary to THE OPEN COURT for January 1910.

Jesus never was born. That is to say, there never was any such person in the world. Jesus means 'Saviour.' The name was applied, just as Christ was, to that fictitious person who had come to be worshipped as a God by the Nazarenes. But it is not a personal name. It is a title. And Dr. SMITH does not speak of 'Jesus,' but of 'the Jesus.' He speaks somewhat slightly of 'this cult of the Jesus, which Paul taught'; and he says, 'In fact, the notion of the Jesus is only an Hebraization of the Greek *Soter*, whom without any specification, though the reference is to Zeus, Socrates invokes in the *Philebus*. "Zeus, Soter, and Victory!" shouted the Greeks at Cunaxa, as their eager front rank billowed forward against the Persians.'

Thus our Lord is after all not a Jew, but a Greek. He is a creature of that fertile, but not very religious, Greek imagination, which produced the Father of Gods and men, the Zeus of many titles,

of many places, and of many strange experiences. He is the Greek Zeus himself, under another title, associated with another place, and undergoing very new and very unusual experiences. Have the Jews had nothing to do with Him? Yes, says Dr. SMITH. 'Precisely what by its racial nature it was bound to do, Judaism *historized the Doctrine* (the italics being Dr. SMITH's own), just as the Jew has always historized whatever he touched.' That is to say, some Jew or Jews—say Mark or John, or any other you please—finding the cult of 'the Jesus' in existence, gave Jesus Himself a history—had Him born at Bethlehem, brought up at Nazareth, crucified at Jerusalem.

Is that the end? No, there are others who have still another opinion about the origin of Jesus. Dr. S. N. DEINARD will not let Dr. SMITH off easily with a Greek Jesus. He also believes that Jesus as a person 'is altogether a myth, a fiction.' But he does not believe that He was 'historized' out of a Greek cult. 'I believe,' he says, 'that a vast number of facts can be marshalled in support of the theory that Christianity in its origin was nothing else than Buddhism passed through the alembic of the Judæo-Essenic mind, and adapted to the Jewish expectations of that day. Jesus would then be no other than Buddha himself, clothed in Jewish Messianic apparel.'

The Newly Discovered Odes of Solomon, and their Bearing on the Problem of the Fourth Gospel.

BY THE REV. R. H. STRACHAN, M.A., CAMBRIDGE.

'THE Odes of Solomon' is the title that has been given by Dr. Rendel Harris to a collection of Christian mystical compositions which he has recently discovered. Attached to them is a new Syriac MS. version of the Psalms of Solomon. He tells us that the collection had been lying on his shelves for some time, 'perhaps for as long as

two years, along with a heap of leaves from various Syriac MSS written on paper, which came from the neighbourhood of the Tigris.' The place of origin is not more definitely mentioned. The Odes are 42 in number, but three leaves are missing, containing the first and second Odes, and the beginning of the third Ode. Odes 5, 6, 22, 25