

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

forget sometimes how absolutely our Lord condemned this kind of thing. A tower, whether in Siloam or London, is not at all more likely to fall because criminals or atheists happen to be walking under it.

Many clergymen and moralists think that they are doing God service by drawing lurid pictures of the punishments with which Nature visits vice. The plain truth is that Nature has no diseases ready for the worst scoundrels. She punishes the drunkard, and in a very random and blind manner the less heinous forms of impurity. The most horrible offences under this head entail no physical danger. It is therefore absolutely indefensible to use the blind cruelty of Nature to reinforce the motives for clean living.

The law of heredity has been shorn of much of its moral force. Acquired tendencies are probably not transmitted, so that except by bad example a father is not liable by his misconduct to taint the character of his son.

Nature has a morality, but her methods are rude and clumsy. She trusts to us to rectify them in dealing with our fellow-men.

But what a false abstraction it is to speak of Nature apart from humanity! Humanity is part of Nature. Our reasoning faculties which enable us to conquer Nature by obeying her, are part of Nature. Our affection for our fellow-men, our sense of justice, our sense of pity, our self-respect, which makes us abhor things which our lower

appetites desire, our belief in a heavenly Father who can hear our prayers—all these things are a part of Nature. They have a right to be there; God made them, as He made the world.

Nature apart from man knows nothing of human justice; but then Nature is not apart from man. God has never promised that the world shall be just to man when men are unjust to each other. This is a good world for us because God has given us the great privilege of making it better. That is why God has implanted in us the sense of justice, the love of fair play, and generous indignation at the sight of wrong. The historical answer to the pious wish, 'God mend all,' was, 'Nay, then, we must help Him to mend it.'

The problem of individual justice doubtless remains on our hands. But let us not have any *meum* and *tuum* account with our Maker. God's justice is done rather by the transformation of ourselves than of our circumstances, and this is what we really desire. If it is His will that we should be admitted to a share in Christ's unmerited sufferings 'for his body's sake,' shall we make that a grievance? 'For even hereunto were we called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps. Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously.' Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? Yea, verily; though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him.

A Lacuna in the Text of the Acts of the Apostles.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

WHEN we read the account of the addresses given by St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost and on days that immediately followed, we are obliged to admit that the reporter, whoever he was, or, it may be, the historian, has employed the method of abbreviation. Something, essential to sequence, seems to be wanting. The text itself tells us as much, by the statement (Ac 2⁴⁰) that 'with many other words he testified and exhorted,' etc. This is conclusive evidence that only a summary of the address is given. The remark of the historian discloses also the method on which the address and

any supplementary matter belonging to it was composed. The address was a testimony, as well as an exhortation, and so it was based on testimonies or quotations from the Old Testament; these forming the only court of appeal available to the advocate. This might have been recognized without the corroboration that comes from the word 'testified,' for even a superficial reader can see that the appeal is to the Old Testament, and the reader who is at all familiar with the quotations from it that are current in early Christian writers will be aware that the passages quoted by Peter are either

conventional or such as rapidly became so. One of the most striking instances is that in Ac 4¹¹, where Christ is affirmed to be the Stone that was rejected of the builders; perhaps the earliest and certainly one of the most widely diffused of early *Testimonies against the Jews*; it has a section to itself in the early collections of prophecies, with the heading that Christ is the λίθος, or *Stone*.

Now if what we suggest be correct, namely, that the speeches at the beginning of the Acts are abbreviated, it almost follows that the text will be subject to lacuna and show signs of discontinuity—as any one will realize who tries to reproduce a long sermon or speech in few words; and if lacuna, in the sermon in question, be conceded either in the middle of the report or at the end, it is highly probable that the missing matter was of the nature of *Testimonies*. We recognize, in fact, the *Heads of Testimonies* in such passages as Ac 3¹⁸, where God is said to have announced beforehand by the mouth of all His prophets that His Messiah must suffer; here the heading is ὅτι παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, for which we may compare Ac 26²³, Lk 24²⁷, as well as Justin, *Dial.* 39, Athanasius and Zacchæus, p. 3, etc. We notice also, in passing, that the manner of introducing the Biblical quotations in these early chapters is conventional, and can be reduced generally to the type, ‘Moses says,’ ‘David says,’ and the like. In primitive quotation Moses means the Pentateuch, David the Psalms.

In the second chapter of the Acts there is a whole section relating to David, running from v. 25 (‘David says’) to v. 35 (‘David himself says’). A contrast is drawn between what David says and what David means: David says (v. 25) εἰς αὐτόν, *i.e.* referring to the Messiah; David did not ascend the heavens (v. 35), which is followed by the proof-text for the Session at the Right Hand of God (Ps 110¹). But here we notice that something is missing; the text proves the Session, but there is no proof-text for the Ascension: the words οὐ γὰρ Δαυεὶδ ἀνέβη (‘it was not David that ascended’) imply a previous passage from the Psalms, or elsewhere, which can be taken to mean that some one (who is to be understood as the Messiah) did ascend. Nor is it difficult for us to find the verse; St. Paul has preserved it for us; it is in Ps 68¹⁸ (cf. Eph 4⁸):

ἀναβάς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν,
ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

Suppose we insert this, with a prefixed ‘David

says’ between v. 32 and v. 33. We have now made continuity, not only with v. 34 (ἀνέβη), but also with v. 33 (ὕψωθεῖς) and with ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο (which the Western text rightly completes by τὸ δῶρον). Now let us look at v. 32, bearing in mind what we have already inferred as to the dependence of the argument upon proof-texts taken from the O.T. Here we are told τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, but there is no proof-text given, and it is natural to infer, from the first study of the passage, that David and his indirect testimonies have been replaced by the Apostles and their direct testimony. It is doubtful, however, if what we call direct testimony had the same weight with the audience as the other. Can we, then, find a statement, in the Psalms or elsewhere, which will fill up the lacuna, and shed light on the argument? The answer is in the affirmative. Origen has preserved what is, we think, the missing text in the Acts, and provides as close a parallel as could be desired, by way of expansion or explanation.

In the first book of his commentary on *John* (Bk. i. c. 23) he discusses the various names given to Christ in the O.T. (as that He is called Jacob, Israel, Judah, Branch, Flower, etc., most of which can be paralleled in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*), and, in addition to these Messianic titles, he says ‘that the Messiah is also called David, as when Ezekiel prophesied, speaking in the person of God, “I will raise up (ἀναστήσω) David my servant, who shall shepherd or rule them” (Ezk 34²³). For it is not David the patriarch who is to be raised (ἀναστήσεται) and rule the saints, but Christ.’ If we compare the language of Origen with that of St. Luke, we are struck with the similarity of the terms used; there is the reference ‘to the patriarch David’ as in Ac 2²⁹ (‘I may speak freely to you concerning the patriarch David’); then there is the expression ‘David my servant,’ which we shall meet with presently in Ac 4²⁵, and there is the parallel between οὐ γὰρ Δαυεὶδ ὁ πατριάρχης ἀναστήσεται and οὐ γὰρ Δαυεὶδ ἀνέβη, in Ac 2³⁴; and last of all there is the continuity that is established with Ac 2³², ἀναστήσω Δαυεὶδ τὸν παῖδά μου, and τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός.

It appears, then, that we ought to insert Ezk 34²³ at the beginning of v. 32, very nearly in the setting given to it by Origen, as follows:

Ἰεζεκιήλ δὲ ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ·
ἔλεγε γὰρ ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ· Ἀναστήσω Δαυεὶδ

τὸν παῖδά μου· οὐ γὰρ Δαυεὶδ ὁ πατριάρχης ἀναστήσεται, ἀλλὰ τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός.

It will, I think, be conceded that the foregoing treatment of the first reported Apostolic sermon would supply a unity and a continuity to the discourse which it does not possess in the ordinary text. The principal objection to the amended text will come from those who do not like to think that the words of Ezekiel could be quoted with an unnatural sense given to the expression 'I will raise up,' but such an objection will not greatly impress those who know how readily the early Christians attached fresh *nuances* to ordinary terms: such a case as that of the Psalm might be taken as a parallel, where David says:

"I [*i.e.* David] fell asleep and I slumbered; I was raised up because the Lord helped me."
(Ps 3⁷); cf. Justin, *Dial.* 95.

This is one of the early proof-texts for the Resurrection. That we are on the right track appears from another consideration; from the new point of view, as we said above, we can shed light on the other Pentecostal discourses. For instance, the last verse of the third chapter of Acts has the conclusion of a Petrine discourse in the words, 'God has raised up his servant, and sent him to bless you, in turning away every one from his iniquities.' Here the received text has 'raised up his servant *Jesus*,' and no doubt this is the

ultimate intention of the speaker, but the shorter text is more correct, which can carry either the meaning 'David' or 'Jesus' as object. The servant that is raised is, in the first instance, called David, as in Ezekiel's prophecy, but it is really Jesus, because David is Jesus and speaks for Jesus. Thus the *παῖς* in the first chapters of the Acts is David-Jesus. We can see the same equivalence in Ac 4^{25, 26} where the Lord speaks through His servant David in the second Psalm, and says, 'Wherefore did the heathen rage, etc.?' for of a truth it was against 'thy holy servant Jesus' that the rulers were gathered together.

It appears, then, that in an undue zeal for finding the Servant in Isaiah, we have missed him in Ezekiel and in the Psalms. The early Church was better instructed; in the first eucharistic prayers of the Church in apostolic times we have the expression of thanks for 'the holy vine of *David thy servant* . . . which thou hast made known to us through *Jesus thy Servant*.' Here, again our David-Jesus parallel is justified. The one is, according to St. Peter, 'dead and buried,' and is in the Creed with Jesus up to that point, but then 'his tomb is with us,' and that takes Him out of the Creed and into the Guide-book. The parallel has been exhausted. The observation of the antithesis between David and Jesus is essential to a right understanding of the first chapters of the Acts.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Was Moses Martyred?

PROFESSOR ERNST SELLIN is one of the most accomplished, and, in some directions, decidedly the most stimulating of all the scholars working to-day upon the Old Testament; and a brief account of his recent discussion of the significance of Moses,¹ which reveals alike his minute command of the Old Testament text and his gift of ingenious combination, may be not unwelcome to readers

¹ Dr. Ernst Sellin, *Mose und seine Bedeutung für die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte* (Leipzig, Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung [Dr. Werner Scholl]; Mk. 4).

who have found it difficult to keep track of recent German criticism.

He begins by remarking that the greatest problem of the religious history of Israel is, Who was Moses? It is not enough to say with Wellhausen that he inspired his fellows with the faith, 'Jahweh the God of Israel, Israel the people of Jahweh.' In 1906 Meyer had maintained the thesis that our knowledge of Moses rests on the tradition preserved by the Levitical priests of Kadesh, a tradition which ultimately influenced the great prophetic reform movement. But as a matter of fact, Sellin argues, from the tenth century onward these Levitical priests were regarded by the prophets