

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

In the Footsteps of John Lightfoot.

BY PROFESSOR GUSTAF DALMAN, D.THEOL., GREIFSWALD.

WHEN John Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* were edited (1684) in Germany by J. B. Carpzov, this was done, firstly, in the conviction that Jesus in His intercourse with the Jews made use of the language of the Talmud, and that, therefore, this language could help to a better understanding of His words; secondly, because the righteousness of the opponents of Jesus had to be illustrated from their own sentences; and thirdly, because many geographical, historical, and ritual points in the Gospels could be explained only by the aid of Rabbinical literature. Carpzov, as one of the defenders of Lutheran orthodoxy, meant to give faith a sound basis in philological and historical accuracy by making the work of the admired scholar of Canterbury accessible to German students. That his effort was not in vain is shown by the eagerness of German science to follow in the footsteps of Lightfoot. Meuschen, Scheid, Danz, Schöttgen, and others hastened to use Rabbinical wisdom for the explanation of the New Testament; and Schöttgen, who dedicated his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* to God and the Church, confessed in his Preface: 'Nisi Lightfootus lyrasset, multi non saltassent.' The arguments used for such studies at that time have not lost their power even to-day, though the question of the language of Jesus can no longer be solved by general hints at Talmudical language or simple 'parallels' between the words of Jesus and the sentences of the Rabbis, but has to go into the details of different dialects whose grammar, vocabulary, and phraseology are still imperfectly known.

But the most important problem, not yet touched by Lightfoot and his successors, is the personality of Jesus Himself—the question how far He was a Jew, where we see God revealed in Him to mankind, at a certain definite stage of history, but with a view to all coming ages, and how He became what He desired to be and finally was to Jews and non-Jews. *From Letter to Spirit* has to become the watchword, as Edwin A. Abbott rightly demanded in his 'Attempt to reach through varying voices the Abiding Word' (1903). How is this high aim to be reached? Certainly not without the most unsparing labour. It is a matter of regret

and difficult to understand that at no theological school in the world is there any Foundation entrusted with the special duty of such scientific work from a Christian point of view. We have some more or less able amateurs in Jewish science, but where are the authorities acknowledged by Jewish scholars as their equals? Any one who imagines that knowledge of Judaism can be acquired by the way does not know the complex nature of its sources and the imperfection of the existing apparatus. The syntax and the vocabulary of the dialects in question have to a great extent still to be written. The text of the Talmuds and the Midrashim is still in disorder and not even divided into small portions adapted for citation. For the Law the Jews have created compendia and indexes; for theology this has still to be done. One who is not thoroughly at home in this literature and its language makes constant blunders, as even Jews know, since real Talmudical scholars of their own have become rare, and their studies can no longer be concentrated on Rabbinical literature. Thus preliminary work on texts and languages cannot be spared. My own Grammar and Dictionary were attempts, I hope, in the right direction. But such work must be continued and completed.

A second kind of preliminary work concerns the investigation of Rabbinical literature and theology as a science in itself, without the one-sidedness of a selection from a special point of view; and, I think, scientific work, even with a Christian aim, cannot be done otherwise. When such work has been done, coincidences and differences between Judaism and Christianity, between the Rabbis and Jesus, have to be made clear. And here collections of parallels from both sides, like Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, will be a good help, saving the time of the professional scholar and providing materials otherwise inaccessible to others. If these parallels are well selected and reliable as regards translation and exegesis, they mean valuable work, and should be widely used, not as an ass's bridge, but as helps to the acquirement of deeper knowledge. Just now, to the humiliation of professional scholars, the admirable work of a simple country clergyman, Paul Billerbeck, now

D.D. of Greifswald, edited by the late Professor Strack, surpasses in extent and intrinsic value all that has been done before in this direction. I mean the *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, von Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung). Only the first volume (Matthew, 1055 pages, in quarto) has appeared. The second volume is in print; the completion of the remaining two volumes, already prepared by the author, will depend upon the interest shown in the work by the purchase of the early volumes. We are glad to say that the assistance of friends, including some in Scotland and England, has facilitated the printing of those first two volumes. It is hoped that the completion of the work will be possible before its venerable author, now seventy years old, is taken away.

When the materials are collected, the real work in question can begin. Even here it will be profitable to do this work in different stages. There is the linguistic department, to which C. F. Burney's useful book on *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922), together with A. Schlatter's *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten* (1902), belong. Another department is the comparison of particular theological notions on both sides. My *Words of Jesus*, vol. i., belongs to this category.

A third department concerns the investigation of the words of Jesus as they are found in the Gospels, to find out how they may have been expressed in their original language and what they would then have meant to a Jewish hearer. My own *Jesus-Jeschua* (1922) is a small contribution in this direction, wrongly understood by those who expect final and definite results from this kind of work and naturally feel disappointed when such do not appear. Conclusions are possible only when, after the literary work is ended, the historical task begins; and the work of all departments (the comparison of Jewish Theology is only one of them, side by side with the investigation of the Greek Gospels and their notions as understood by Hellenists) has to be concentrated on one final effort.

At all stages of the work we should not neglect the study of what Jews have done, and are still doing, it may be, to confirm their own religious position. Adolph Büchler's *Types of Jewish Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.* (1922) is important in this direction. But the character of a

Jewish standard work on Jesus must be attributed to Josef Klausner's Hebrew book, *Jēshū han-nōšrī, zemānō, hayyāw welōrālō* ('Jesus the Nazarene, His Time, His Life, and His Doctrine'). This work of 468 pages (royal 8vo) appeared in Jerusalem in 1922, and may be procured by applying to the author, Dr. J. Klausner, Jerusalem, Bucharijah. Dr. Klausner was, without doubt, well equipped for his work, having written in German on *Die jüdische Messianologie im Zeitalter der Propheten* (Krakau, 1908), and—with Hebrew title—on 'The Messianology in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha' (Jerusalem, 1921). To give an impression of the contents and tendency of his new book, I may report what it says on the Crucifixion of Christ. This most cruel, and to our author detestable, method of execution was originally Roman, not Jewish; and there is no doubt, he says, that Jesus did not deserve it, as He was no rebel against Roman power and no blasphemer or seducer to idolatry according to Rabbinical definition of these crimes. But political calculations and superficiality on the part of the Sadducean and Roman judges made His condemnation and execution possible. Flagellation was part of the Roman process of execution. The crowning with thorns would be an invention of the executioners to mock the Jews and their king, but is perhaps not historical. [Here the author defines the thorns which may have been used, as *Gundelia Tournefortii*, referring to my *Orte und Wege Jesu*, p. 210. But there that kind of thorn is mentioned as unfit for the purpose, while the claim of *Carthamus glaucus* (Heb. *ḵōs*) might be considered.] As to the site of Golgotha, Dr. Klausner prefers that contended for by General Gordon (to whom he ascribes a motive which was not his) to my vindication of the traditional site ('naturally on account of pure traditionalism'), without making clear where the walls of Jerusalem were at that time. The words of Jesus to the women of Jerusalem and His prayer for the executioners do not suit, we are told, the dreadful situation, and are reported only by Luke. The distribution of clothes, the abuse of the Crucified, His words to the dying robber, were invented to supply a fulfilment of the words of Ps 22 and Is 53. The *titulus crucis* proves that Jesus really was crucified as a Jewish Messiah, not as an apocalyptic prophet as some would have it. That Jesus died on the Cross in shorter time than usual is explicable by His bodily and mental sufferings. That the Father did not come to rescue His Son, He could

not understand. Jesus' prayer from Ps 22 is quite natural, and would not have been invented. Luke substituted for this another utterance, which could not be used in opposition to Christian beliefs. John suppressed the words because they did not suit the Logos. For the disciples of Jesus their dream of the Messianic kingdom was at an end. There is nothing to be said against the story of the interment by Joseph in his own sepulchre, as time was short on the eve of the Sabbath, and Jesus could not be regarded as executed by a Jewish tribunal. 'Here at the locked-up tomb'—with these words the author closes this chapter—'the

story of Jesus ends, and the story of Nazarenism begins.'

There is nothing in the above representation of the Crucifixion of Jesus which strikes one as new. But it shows how necessary and how important is the work at whose service Jewish literature should be placed. That Jesus is the Messiah of God not only for Israel, but for all men, and in what way He is so, is what we shall have to show. Even tedious labour, if any earnest labour can be tedious, is a privilege, if undertaken for this end. May John Lightfoot find many followers until the aim is realized.

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

At last we have what was badly needed—a scholarly report on the present position of investigation into Calvin's theology.¹ Works on that subject having become too numerous for all but specialists, Bauke has worked over the literature and explains in detail what has been done, and by whom, and what yet remains to do. The result is excellent. The author rightly decides that Calvin's theology is not explicable from a single principle. Some reason there must be for the wholly antagonistic verdicts passed on it by Reformed and Lutheran thinkers, and Bauke inclines to suppose that a German, being a monist, can never quite get inside Calvin, who was French and a pluralist; and contradictions which Germans find in his thought were to him no contradictions at all. Bauke turns for explanation to three essential points: (1) the exceptional importance for Calvin of theological form and method; formally, though not in content, he was a rationalist dialectician rather than a metaphysician proper. That is, he did not so much construct a view of the universe as weave together dialectically what he took to be religious certainties. (2) His system is a *complexio oppositorum*, i.e. there is no attempt to base everything on a fundamental idea, but the great doctrines of

the past, even those which logically contradict each other, are bound up in one connected whole. (3) The formal law of theology is for him Biblicism. Bauke holds, correctly I should say, that previous attempts to mark out *material* principles, whether one or more, have failed. Calvin, moreover, was not dependent on any philosophy for actual results.

Bauke at various points opens up a wide vista of inquiry still awaiting the chosen scholar. There is much to do, for instance, in elucidating Calvin's relation to Humanism, as well as Humanism's relation to the Bible and to other sources of a historical and doctrinal kind. Again, is Calvin's idea of God Scotist or not? By what channels did the orthodoxy of the Middle Ages reach the Reformer? The whole background of Calvin's thinking has to be lighted up and made real to the modern mind.

Summing up, Bauke declares that what Calvin really does is to translate the religion of Luther into a foreign tongue and a rather alien kind of human life. But it *is* the same religion. As theology, Calvin's thought forms an original type by itself. He wrought into one whole the Gospel and a conception of life *in* the world, so that for him Christian redemption and Christian politics are one. The doctrine of Predestination, as all scholars with one possible exception agree, is not the central doctrine of Calvin, nor is it speculative. It is simply the dialectic and rationalistic affirmation of what is taken to be religious fact, without

¹ *Die Probleme der Theologie Calvins*, by Hermann Bauke (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1922; pp. viii, 108; 2s. 5d.).