

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

EXODUS 23^b. I should object to עָוַב being used in two different senses (as Keil, Gesenius, etc.) in the first and second members, as a *lusus verborum* (which seems out of place in a legal document); nor is it necessary, if we take עָוַב either (as in text of A.V.) for 'and wouldest forbear,' or (as in margin) for 'wouldest thou forbear?' I prefer the latter, with Gataker, *Adv. Misc.*, p. 183 (*non sine admiratione aliqua: an tam durus et inhumanus existeris*, etc.). Then, adopting the abnormal sense of *vincula laxare* attributed to עָוַב, we might trans-

late: 'wouldest thou forbear to release *it* for him (thine enemy)? *Nay, but* thou shalt surely release *it* with him.' The alternative, 'and wouldest cease to leave *thy business* for him,' etc. (which is Piscator's), might be omitted.

EXODUS 35²². 'Necklaces' is probably the meaning of the A.V. 'tablets,' which is not in Todd's *Johnson*; but in Ebers' *English-German Dictionary*, 1794, I find: 'Tablet—das Halsband, auch Armband.' So the Peschito uses here a word which is interchanged with the Greek words *μανιάκης, κλοιός, ὀρμίσκος*.

Entre Nous.

A TEXT.

Matt. xviii. 15-17.

It seems to be possible for an American to write without making it known that he is an American. Mr. Herbert S. Houston has done it. In a little book which he has called *Blocking New Wars* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net) he writes simply literary English. The book was written some time before the present situation, but very little of it is out of date; for it is a book of principle rather than of practice.

In the middle of the book Mr. Houston suddenly arrests his own hand and offers us a chapter from Dr. Lyman Abbott. It is an article which Dr. Abbott published in the *Outlook*. It is really a sermon on Mt 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷. The words of the text are, 'And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.'

This is the introduction: To treat a man as a heathen man and a publican or Roman tax-gatherer was simply to have no dealings with him. The heathen were not subjected to penalties of any sort in Judea; the Jews simply had no intercourse with them. The meaning, then, of Christ's ultimatum, as it would have been understood by his disciples, would be: If your fellow-member defies the public opinion of the Christian community to which you both belong, have nothing more to do with him.

The great statesmen of the world, horrified by this terrible world war, are endeavouring to find some better method for the settlement of inter-

national difficulties than "wager of battle," and curiously, and as it seems to me very significantly, have hit upon the method which Christ commended to his disciples nineteen centuries ago. If I interpret Christ's counsel correctly, these statesmen are following Christ, whether they know it or not. For, if we apply the spirit of his counsel to international action, it would mean, first, Diplomacy; second, Arbitration; third, Judicial Procedure; fourth, to enforce such procedure, Non-intercourse.

So the divisions are:

1. *Diplomacy*.—If in the community of nations a controversy arises between two or more of them, the first step toward a settlement is diplomacy—that is, personal negotiation between the two nations. The object of this negotiation should be to gain a brother. Its spirit and its purpose should be pacific; its aim, to find some common ground on which the two nations can agree. Austria had a complaint against Serbia. The Austrian Crown Prince had been assassinated, and the Austrian Government believed that the Serbian Government had been accessory to the assassination. If the charge was true, the trespass committed by the Serbian Government was very great. But Austria showed no desire in her negotiations to gain a brother. She treated Serbia as a criminal. She went with a demand in one hand and a threat in the other. And the demand was one to which no nation could accede under threat, without, by that very act, surrendering her independence.

Christ also advises that these negotiations between the complainant and the supposed transgressor be private. "Go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." Recently there has been in certain quarters a great outcry against secret diplomacy. There has been in this country some demand, though not very widespread or influential, for the abolition of the secret sessions of

the Senate. It is said that secret negotiations have led to wars, and that, if all negotiations were conducted in the open, war would be avoided. And it is probably true that some wars have been prepared for, and perhaps promoted, by secret negotiations.

But it is certain that wars have often been prevented by secret negotiations. There are many international questions which cannot be discussed in the open forum without arousing popular prejudices and exciting popular passions. There is a strong popular feeling in this country against unlimited Japanese immigration. There is a strong popular feeling in Japan hostile to American discrimination against Japanese immigrants. Popular discussion in the press of America excites race prejudice against the Japanese. Popular discussion in the press of Japan excites race prejudice against the Americans. There would be little danger of war between the two countries if we could only unite our forces in a successful war against the yellow press of both countries. If the Japanese question could be taken out of the public forum, there is little doubt that, by friendly negotiations between the Japanese mission now in this country and our President representing the Democratic party and Elihu Root representing the Republican party, an agreement could be reached which would calm the excessive self-esteem of the one people and the excessive fears of the other.

2. *Arbitration.*—If diplomacy quietly conducted between the two parties in a spirit of mutual brotherhood fails, arbitration is the next step in Christ's league to enforce peace. It is evident that the two or three witnesses are to hear both sides of the incipient quarrel. Their opinion is to be listened to by both parties to the quarrel. There is, indeed, no suggestion that they possess *authority* to decide. Authoritative decision is reserved for the third stage in this proceeding toward peace. But they are not partisans of the complainant taken by him to overbear the accused. They are witnesses, taken to hear the story, to reach their conclusion upon it, and, if no agreement can be reached by their aid, to report to the constituent assembly their judgment upon the undetermined issue. My readers will remember how urgent were the entreaties of England, France, Italy, and Russia to Germany and Austria to submit the issue between Austria and Serbia either to the Hague Tribunal for decision or to a conference of the Powers for amicable settlement, and how emphatic and almost contemptuous was the refusal.

3. *Judicial Procedure.*—This was as far as Christian civilisation had gone in 1914 in its preparations to avoid war. Reformers had urged the constitution of a supreme court of nations to

which any nation might be summoned to give account of its claims. But no such court had been constituted. The imperfectly organised Hague Tribunal could pass only on such questions as were submitted to it by the consent of both the parties to the controversy. Christ recommended to his disciples a further step—the creation of some sort of body—Parliament, Congress, Supreme Court, Constituent Assembly, Ecclesia—to which either party could report its complaint, a body which would have power to declare an authoritative judgment.

4. *Non-intercourse.*—And if the other party would not accept the judgment, what then?—war to enforce the decision? No! Non-intercourse. If he will not hear the assembly let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Let us imagine that in 1914 the eighteen nations now in alliance against the Central Powers had constituted a community of nations; that they had an international tribunal or assembly with power to hear and decide international questions; and that when Germany and Austria refused to submit the issue between Austria and Serbia to decision by that tribunal, the Powers had instantly and automatically pronounced a decree of non-intercourse. What would have happened? Every foreign ambassador in Germany and Austria would have been called home. Every German and Austrian ambassador would have been sent home. The mails between other countries and Germany and Austria would have been suspended. Telegrams of every description would have ceased. The world's ports would have been hermetically sealed against the offender. No exports could have passed from the Central Powers to other countries, no imports could have passed from other countries into their territories. Germany and Austria would have been as effectually isolated as if they had been transported bodily to Mars. The present blockade, which is threatening to bring Germany to her knees, would be insignificant by the side of such a world blockade. What nation would venture to defy it? What nation defying it once would ever venture to defy it a second time?

It is true that such a league as is here foreshadowed would not absolutely prevent war. Germany might have invaded Holland, Belgium, France in the west, and Russia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Rumania in the east, to get by her arms the supplies which commerce refused to her. It might have been necessary to unite the armies of the world in defence of the right to decree and enforce non-intercourse against a defiant nation. But if such a league had existed in 1914, it would not have required three years of robbery on the land and piracy on the sea to call it into existence.

If any ecclesiastical reader is inclined to think

that the counsels embodied in the passage here interpreted and applied to international affairs were intended by Christ simply as a direction for Church discipline, I must refer him to my Commentary on Matthew for a statement of the reasons why I cannot agree with him; if any reader thinks they were intended only for the settlement of private disputes, I reply that the same principles apply to the settlement of disputes between organisations as between individuals. If any one thinks it extraordinary that the world should not have long since discovered and adopted Christ's league to enforce peace, if it is really suggested by his teaching, I reply that he who believes, as I do, that Jesus Christ is the divine leader of mankind will not think it extraordinary that he should still be in advance of the age and waiting patiently for his disciples to overtake him.

SOME TOPICS.

Don't Worry.

'THERE is but one remedy—never harp on business and dollars after working hours, never go to a theatre and permit the mind to wander off on personal affairs which have nothing to do with recreation, never discuss personal matters when you are playing games, never worry over things that you cannot alter, and, above all, learn to play some musical instrument and engage the mental faculties in something the exact opposite to that which engaged the attention during business hours.'¹

Endor and London.

Professor W. R. Sorley of Cambridge has published three lay sermons on *Reconstruction and the Renewal of Life* (Cambridge: at the University Press). They are, one and all, a plea for the spiritual against the material—for life against organization, for faith against sight, for insight into the present against prediction of the future. In the sermon on Vision he says: 'Perhaps the greatest enemy of true religion has, all along, been the claim to vision which is not based on an understanding of the really vital forces of history. Especially in periods of crisis and calamity, troubled minds have always been eager to see behind the veil; and, from the time of the witch of Endor to the London medium of our own day, they have found instruments willing to pierce it for them—at a price. The test of all these revelations is their result. They picture the world beyond as a pale reflexion of the material conditions of the present. And they show no genuine vision, for they have no real insight into the moral forces

¹ Francis Grierson, *Illusions and Realities of the War*, 75.

which now fight for mastery and in which lies the promise of the future.'

A Begging Letter.

In the biography of Joel Chandler Harris we are told that a rumour got out after the success of Uncle Remus that the author had become wealthy. The result was a steady flow of begging letters. Here is one of them: 'It came from a man living in a small Georgia town, and he wrote: "Le' 's be up and doing! I'll head the list with \$5.00 for my father's tombstone. A little tombstone is all that is needed. What will you give?"'

NEW POETRY.

Cornelia Steketee Hulst.

The Story of Balder's Death and Loke's Punishment has attracted many a gifted author and some whose gift was genius. Nevertheless we do not know that any one has ever rendered it into more saga-like English verse than Cornelia Steketee Hulst, whose book has been published by the Open Court Publishing Co. (3s. net). It is enriched by a selection of illustrations from the rare series with which Frölich illustrated the Eddas. Take this short portion from Odin's last submissive speech:

'Lo, a Vision is rising before me—
Humbly I thank thee, thou Weird One!—
I see Him, with sight that is certain . . .
And not Death, but Life Everlasting,
For His palace has sheltered no Evil!
That Mead that Hel brewed, mingling floods
Of all Fountains of Life, He will drink,
And all Wisdom, all Good will be His.
And the Dead that in love drink those waters
Are His, the Redeemèd and Blessèd,
For that Mead when they drink will transfigure
Their ghosts, and new bodies will clothe them
With Strength and with Beauty immortal.'

E. R. Jaquet.

Mr. E. R. Jaquet is the editor of a volume of poems relating to the War. The title is *These Were the Men* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net). He has gathered the poems, not from the obvious sources only but from all sources, including *Punch*, the *Spectator*, and the daily newspapers. And in every case he has named the author and the place where the poem has been found. Quotation is difficult where all are exceptionally good; for this editor knows a poem when he sees it. But we

cannot be wrong with Katharine Tynan. The title is

PEACE.

Some day of days the peace will come,
The houses break to banners gay;
With trumpet and the sound of drum
The people make high holiday.
Go quietly, oh, people dear,
Because—a broken heart may hear.

From Land's End unto John o' Groats
With bonfires shall light up the skies!
The shouting of a myriad throats
Shall to the startled heavens arise.
But Rachel weeping for her dead,
Weeps on, and is not comforted.

The men will march a-down the street,
The broken boys that were so bright:
What of the unreturning feet
That will not come by day or night?
The darling heads that lie alone,
This one and that one's little son.

Red Armageddon shall be past,
The Thousand Years of Peace begin.
No roll of drum or bugle blast
Shall wake the sleepers with their din,
Or lift the broken heart again
Behind the shuttered window-pane.

German or French?

Mr. Harvey Carson Grumbine has given himself to a thorough study of German and of French war poetry. He is, moreover, an accomplished translator. In a volume entitled *Humanity or Hate: Which?* published by the Cornhill Company of Boston (\$1.25), he has given translations into English verse of thirty-two German war songs and thirty-two French. His purpose is to compare one set of songs with another and so arrive at the difference in mentality between the German and the Frenchman. The German songs are by Sudermann, Lissauer, Herzog, and others; the French by Botrel, a former Laureate, Arcard, a Member of the Academy, and others. We need not repeat his conclusion. Let us quote a fair example of the German and a fair example of the French songs. This is by Will Vesper:

LOVE OR HATE—WHICH?

The Father of all Love, who died,
Jesus the Saviour crucified,—

Once in a dream I saw Him give
His love to men that they might live.

He spake to me as from above:
'Sing not in hate, but sing in *love!*'

Feigning I did not understand,
I quickly took my pen in hand,

And wrote: O Lord of Love, my hate
Is deep as love and high and great!

I tell Thee truly, eye to eye,
My hate does all Thy love defy!

And this because, O Holy Dove,
My hate is born of purest love.

My Fatherland is nigh to death;
I hate all foes to my dying breath!

That is the German song. The French is by Maurice Allou.

A LETTER FROM A GERMAN MOTHER.

'Each day brings here, my son, a train of
Russian brutes.
They bend their lumpish forms with low and
sullen groans,
As, in the villages they go as raw recruits,
Bearing burdens heavy enough to crush their
bones.

'Their sombre visages peer out from prison-
bars.
I hate them; for they are the authors of our
woes.
So, spare them not, but slay; the bloodiest of
wars
Must mow them down in droves! What men!
What beasts! What Foes!'

The letter ended with maternal tenderness.
A Russian found it folded in a dead man's
vest.
He sent the spiteful missive back to her
address.

But, as a glow of pity warmed his savage
breast,
He quick bethought himself and added this in
Prussian:
'Mother, your son is dead. I pity you.
'—A RUSSIAN.'