

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE greatest mistake that the Christian Church ever made, said Professor Bigg, was to saddle herself with the Old Testament. Her greatest mistake, says the Rev. David JENKS, is that she has been so little concerned about the Old Testament.

---

Mr. JENKS, who belongs to the Society of the Sacred Mission, has written a book on *The Fulfilment of the Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Formally it is an exposition of certain passages in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Actually it is a definition of the Church and of the inheritance that she has still to enter into. And the basis of the definition is the fact that between the Jewish and the Christian Church there is no break or cleavage. The one simply passed into the other.

---

'The cleavage popularly made between the Old and the New Testament is arbitrary. The tendency is to substitute the latter for the former, instead of building on the foundation laid by God.' That tendency Mr. JENKS writes his book to arrest. For it has had serious consequences, the full force of which we are feeling only now.

---

The most serious consequence is that we think of God as a God of love and not as a God of holy love. Another consequence, less serious but sufficiently disastrous, is that we bring God and the

individual together without realizing the fact that the individual is inseparable from the community. If we had taken the Old Testament with us more than we have done, we should have known that the God who can lightly look over our transgressions is not our God. And we should have known that no man has ever anything to do with God without at the same moment having something to do with his neighbour.

---

'The people of the earlier stage of revelation had gone through a long disciplinary course before they were trusted with the knowledge of God's love as it is now made known to us through Jesus Christ. Semitic hordes had been raised slowly out of nature-worship, through the medium of sacrifice and ceremony, which only gradually shed their crude notions under an unfolding course of revelation. The national education was developed in the covenant to Israel, wherein the people came to realise that God was their Father, and that His relation to them was such that because He had known them alone of all the nations of the world, therefore "I will punish you for your iniquities. Can two walk together except they be agreed?" And the two were not God and the individual, but God and His son Israel.'

---

'It is not true that the Jews did not know the love of God. What other nation could have

written Psalm ciii., or "I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins; return to me, for I have redeemed thee"? The difference between the Jews and ourselves is more nearly expressed by saying that they referred the love of God more often to the nation than to the individual, and that they could not conceive of the love of God apart from His holiness. We have discarded the thought of the nation in relation to God's revealed will, and often show ourselves to be unprepared for the revelation of His love to the individual, because we have lost the clear vision of His inviolate righteousness.'

It is because we have let go the thought of holiness in the love of God and of our nationality in His sight that we have lost our interest in the Atonement. And no loss to theology or life can be greater than that. The nation is now the race; and the fear of God's holiness is now in Christ Jesus the joyful acceptance of reconciliation and rest. But we must recognize the need of reconciliation, and we must emphasize the solidarity of the race, otherwise the Atonement is either an incredible dogma or a worthless sentiment.

Of all the changes found to be made in the Revised Version of the New Testament when it was published in 1881 none seemed more certainly right than that which was made in the twelfth verse of the second chapter of St. Luke, and none more certainly wrong than that which was made in the fourteenth verse of the same chapter.

In the twelfth verse the Authorized Version was, 'And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.' The Revised Version is, 'And this is the sign unto you: Ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger.' With the exception of 'the' before 'manger' (which they ignored), the Authorized translators had the same Greek text before them as the Revised: the difference is that they translated it carelessly.

We may pass the 'shall be.' There is no verb in the Greek text. The Revisers therefore correctly use 'is,' the mere copula, here as elsewhere; though here as elsewhere it was unnecessary to tell us so by printing the *is* in italics. The changes to notice are in the articles—'the sign,' for 'a sign,' and 'a babe' for 'the babe.'

Zacharias asked for a sign. It is a way the Jews had. 'The Jews ask for signs,' said St. Paul, just as naturally as the Greeks 'seek after wisdom.' And sometimes they received them. Zacharias was sent home groping his way in darkness. For they who are so anxious to see must often be made blind. The highest blessing is to them that see not and yet believe.

And sometimes they have the sign offered them and are sent on then to verify it. So it was with Thomas: 'Reach hither thy finger.' And so it was with the shepherds: 'This is the sign unto you, Ye shall find a babe.'

But we must not stop there. They might have found many a babe in Bethlehem. Were there not quite a number of 'two years old and under' when Herod sent his murderers into the little town? Nor must we stop at 'wrapped in swaddling clothes.' All the babes they found would be wrapped in swaddling clothes. We must go on to 'manger.' Ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger—that was the sign. Only one babe in Bethlehem was to be found so lowly, so utterly unwelcome, so evidently undesired.

We make too much of the babe. We have made too much of the babe all through the history of Christianity. We are in some danger of making too much of the babe still. And when we make too much of the babe, we make too much of the mother. That danger also is in front of us, strangely, to-day. The sign to the shepherds was not that they would find a babe in Bethlehem, it was that they would find a babe lying in a manger.

We make too much of the babe and too little of the manger.

---

But the other verse.

---

The other verse is the Gloria in Excelsis, the Song of the Heavenly Host. It is the worst translated verse in all the Revised Version. The defenders of the Revised Version tell us that the Revisers could not help themselves. It is the fault of the English language. They had to render the single Greek word *eudokias* by the phrase 'in whom he is well pleased,' because there was no other way of conveying the sense.

---

But that is not all. They turned three clauses in the Authorized Version into two—three simple clauses, and, as it seemed, so evenly balanced, into two that were most unevenly balanced, and were far from simple either in sense or in theology. They turned 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men' into

Glory to God in the highest,

And on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.

---

Was it all necessary? That depends upon the Greek text. For here there is a disputed reading. The Authorized Version used a text with the word *eudokia*, in the nominative; the Revisers followed the manuscripts in which they had most faith, and read *eudokias*, the same word in the possessive. Out of the addition or omission of a single final letter came all the difference between the two translations.

---

Have we to accept it? Some recent scholars think not. One day during the war Harnack published an article in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy—the date is December 9, 1915—in which he discussed afresh the text and meaning of the Angels' Song. He accepted the Revisers' text—*eudokias* not *eudokia*. But he translated it differently. This is his translation:

Glory to God in the highest and on earth,  
Peace to men of (His) gracious will.

---

And that translation differs from the Revised Version more than it seems to do. For not only did Harnack make 'in the highest' and 'on earth' go both with 'glory to God,' he made '(His) gracious will' go with 'peace,' and not with 'men.' He read, not 'peace to men of His gracious will' (which would be very like the Revised translation), but 'peace of His gracious will to men.'

---

It is clear, then, that if you read *eudokias* for *eudokia* two results follow. First, the song is in two lines, not three. And next, the word *eudokias* is in such an unusual place that it is scarcely possible to translate it. The Revisers translated it 'in whom he is well pleased.' But that is not the word's meaning. It does not mean, it never means, God's pleasure in men; it means His will towards them. As Professor Hardy ROPES of Harvard, who discusses the text in *The Harvard Theological Review*, says: 'It refers to His purpose, His choice, not to His approval or satisfaction with man's performance; and it looks to the future, to grace, to the hope of a needy world, not to the past, to man's merit, or even to the inherent worth of human nature.' Harnack translates it correctly: 'His gracious will'; but then Harnack is compelled to take the Greek words in an order which is pretty nearly impossible.

---

So the question is, Are we compelled to read *eudokias*? Professor ROPES thinks not. The textual evidence has somewhat altered since Hort wrote his persuasive note in the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament. This is how it stands now: First, '*eudokias* is the reading of B\*N\*AD (C is lacking), Origen, and possibly Irenaeus, together with the whole body of Latin witnesses, and the Sahidic and Gothic.' Next, '*eudokia* is the reading of all other certain Greek witnesses, including apparently Theodotus as cited by Clement of Alexandria (*Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 31. 1; cf. 74. 1f.). It is further supported by all Syriac

witnesses, including Tatian's Diatessaron (as quoted in the Armenian Ephraim), Syr. Sin. (Syr. Cur. is lacking), Aphraates, and Ephraim, and by the Bohairic with some other versions.'

'It seems unquestionable,' says Professor ROPES, 'that both readings were in existence in the second century. Other things being equal, the agreement of B, other Alexandrian witnesses, D, and the whole Latin text, might on general principles be held to outweigh in favour of *eudokias* the combined testimony to the Syriac, older and later, and of the younger Greek text, which doubtless had its earlier history in the same locality as the Syriac translations. But are other things equal? Are we left to external evidence?'

We are not. The song occurs in the second chapter of St. Luke. Now we know that the first two chapters of that Gospel are quite unlike the rest of it. The remaining chapters are written in literary Greek; these are written in what might be called Semitic Greek. Twenty years ago (Professor ROPES does not remember this) Professor NESTLE discussed the passage in his *Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, and said: 'One thing seems to me decisive in favour of the nominative. Scarcely any part of the New Testament is so steeped in the Hebrew spirit as the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel.' He then decided for the translation of the Authorized Version. So does Professor ROPES. For 'with *eudokia*, he says, the verse is a tristich, and is easily translatable into three lines of formal poetry in either Hebrew or Aramaic. With *eudokias* it has become an irregular distich, far less adapted for retranslation into a Semitic tongue.' He concludes: 'Internal evidence speaks decidedly for—

Glory in the highest to God,  
And on earth peace.  
Among men goodwill.'

'The absence of "And" with the last line is no blemish; for the first two lines are parallel and require to be connected, while the third bears its

own distinct relation to the pair. It gives indeed the glad reason on which rests the preceding exultant pæan: God's gracious will has at last been given effect for mankind; *therefore* ampler Glory is now ascribed to God in heaven, and Salvation is the happy lot of the earth.'

The interest of modern Jews in the Trial of Jesus is one of the most hopeful signs of the time. Not necessarily in the sense that it signifies that turning to Christ, which St. Paul prayed for, as near at hand. But that it certainly signifies the arrival of a new spirit of reasonable consideration.

The Professor of the Classical Languages in Dartmouth College, U.S.A., recently published a book on *The Prosecution of Jesus* (Princeton: at the University Press). Professor R. W. HUSBAND is not a Jew. But the book is fully, and even elaborately, reviewed in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* (new series, vol. xi. p. 89 ff.) by a learned Jew, Dr. M. HYAMSON.

'The main problem,' says Dr. HYAMSON, 'is, Who was responsible for Jesus' trial, condemnation, and execution? The current popular view, as Professor HUSBAND correctly states, is that Jesus was tried by the supreme Jewish court, the great Sanhedrin, on the charge of blasphemy, and that he was condemned to death by that court; but in order that the sentence should be carried into execution, the consent of the Roman authorities was requisite. This was reluctantly extorted from Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator at Jerusalem.'

From that view Professor HUSBAND in his book does not greatly differ. And Dr. HYAMSON is dissatisfied because he does not. 'The weakness of the author is that he tries to be fair all round; fair to Pilate, fair to the Jews who brought Jesus before Pilate, fair to the writers of the Gospels. He aims at avoiding the necessity for assuming

falsity on the part of the writers of the New Testament, malice or illegality on the part of prosecutor or judge. "There are three possibilities," he says. "First, that Jesus was under the legal control of the Roman authorities from the time of the arrest till the crucifixion. Second, that he was tried for blasphemy or for false prophecy under Jewish law and procedure, and was convicted and then either (a) sent to Pilate for rejection or ratification of the conviction, or (b) re-tried by Pilate on the same charge according to Roman procedure, or (c) that he was tried on a charge of treason advanced by the Sanhedrin. Third, that the proceedings before the Sanhedrin were merely preliminary hearings, conducted in order to present a charge before the Roman court, and that the Sanhedrin presented the charge and the evidence to Pilate who conducted the trial according to Roman procedure. Jesus would then have been under the legal control of the Jewish authorities until the time of his transfer to Pilate, after which time he was in the legal control of the Romans." This third view it is that Professor HUSBAND favours.

But Dr. HYAMSON will not have it. 'That the Sanhedrin took any part whatsoever in the trial of Jesus—*pate* the Gospel accounts—is highly questionable. All the probabilities are against this view. The institution of grand jury proceedings was unknown to Jewish jurisprudence. To act as a *delator* or informer was, and is at the present day, most repugnant to the Jewish conscience. For the members of the Sanhedrin, of their own motion, to have arrested a Jew, surrendered him to the hated Roman authorities, preferred a charge against him, and pressed that charge, is unthinkable and without parallel.'

More than that, the Jews had no quarrel with Jesus—why should *they* wish to put Him to death? 'The ethics of the New Testament is Jewish. The Sermon on the Mount, with its stress on purity, meekness, and mercy, reflects the spirit of Judaism. The sayings of Jesus have their parallels

in the Old Testament, Apocryphal literature and Rabbinic traditions. In insisting on the indissolubility of marriage, Jesus was following the school of Shammai. The teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees he holds in respect. "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do" (Matt. 23. 2-3). He declares that he did not come to destroy the law but to confirm it (*ibid.* 5. 17, 18). He heals on the Sabbath. Where there is no actual work this involves no violation of the fourth commandment, and where life is in danger such violation is, according to the conception of Judaism, a positive duty. He consorts with the common people and is influenced by this association to make light of the laws of ritual cleanliness. But such laws were observed rigorously only by the *Chaberim*. He is conscious of a mission to his people alone. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel" (*ibid.* 15. 24). He fully accepts the doctrine of the Resurrection in which he is at one with the Pharisees and against the Sadducees (*ibid.* 22. 23-33).'

But watch the last word. Sadducees. After all, Dr. HYAMSON does not exonerate the Jews. He simply transfers the guilt from the Pharisees to the Sadducees. 'Who denounced him to Pilate?' he asks. His answer is: 'Those whom he had denounced to the people. The ignorant and venal priests, creatures of Pontius Pilate whom Jesus had angered, ordered his arrest. The captain of the Temple guard, possibly assisted by Roman soldiers, carried out the order. What exasperated the priests was Jesus' disapproval of the Temple service as conducted by them. His statement that he would pull down the Temple and rebuild it in three days was blasphemy in the eyes of the chief priests, and induced them to surrender him to the Romans.'

And this is just what the Christian reader of the Gospels finds. The evangelists do not lay the blame of Christ's betrayal and death on the

Pharisees, they lay it on Caiaphas and the chief priests.

It seems now to be fairly certain that it was in Egypt, and not in Palestine, that God was first worshipped as one God. Akhenaton was a monotheist.

In the year 1375 B.C. Amenophis III. died, the last of the great warrior kings of the XVIIIth dynasty. He was succeeded by his son Amenophis IV. Amenophis IV. was thirteen years of age when he came to the throne. Within five years he completely overthrew the official religion, transferred the capital of the country from Thebes to El Amarna, and established the worship of one god.

When Amenophis IV. changed his religion he changed his name. Amenophis means 'Amun is satisfied.' The revolt which he headed was against the tyranny of Amun and his priests. He called himself Akhenaton, which means 'the Disk is pleased.' For now he worshipped the Aton or disk of the sun.

What led this lad of nineteen to make such a change in the religious life of Egypt? No one can tell. It was a revolt against the priesthood of Amun. That much is clear enough. But little else is clear. Once it was believed that the hand of his mother Ty was in it. And Ty was understood to have been a Syrian princess. Hence the

conclusion that we had a parallel in Egypt to the influence of Jezebel in Israel. But the tomb and the bodies of Yuia and Tuia, the parents of Ty, have been discovered, and it is sure enough that both were of Egyptian blood. So 'the theory of a Syrian origin for Akhenaton's reform has had its day and will not return.'

This is the opinion of Mr. T. Eric PEET, writing in *The Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. IX. (Longmans; 5s. net). Mr. PEET attributes the revolution to Akhenaton himself. In Egypt boys develop early. Akhenaton had an exceptionally early development. Perhaps he had what is called a genius for religion. In any case he made the mighty change before he was nineteen, the most momentous change that up till then religion had ever undergone.

For Mr. PEET has no doubt that Akhenaton was a monotheist. It has been doubted quite recently in *The Journal of Oriental Research* by Dr. Samuel MERCER, on the ground that a true monotheism 'involves the suppression of all gods but the one, and that such a complete suppression cannot be proved in the case of Akhenaton.' Mr. PEET concedes that at first, it may be, only the name of Amun was expunged from the monuments. But the rigorous erasure of the plural word 'gods' distinctly points to monotheism, and Mr. PEET is convinced that, if all the evidence is taken into account, the religion of Akhenaton was a truly monotheistic religion.

## Jesus and the Four Men.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

JESUS was sentenced and perhaps even crucified by nine o'clock in the morning; He died six hours later. Between the morning and the afternoon of this, His last day on earth, He met four men for the first time. Probably there were hundreds who had

never seen the famous Prophet from Galilee until He hung before their eyes upon the cross, but in less than twelve hours He had come into special touch with these four men, along different paths and with very different results.