

or statesman of to-day? And can we really speak so certainly of what was held and what was not held in Israel at certain times, as do Cobb and Briggs?¹ The same age, and even the same man, may have spoken the language of quite different 'universes' of thought. To urge this is not to appeal to obscurantism; it is simply to caution against the exaggerated method which produces different results in different hands, and so conceals and even belies the agreement hitherto attained. The Old Testament scholar has to study the work of living and active minds; least of all men can he afford to dispense with the lessons of psychology. Let him study other leaders of religious thought, such as Dante or Wesley, and see how they could change their point of view, and even speak the language of two different points of view at the same time; and he will be less ready to challenge the hostility of friend and foe alike by ignoring the venerable law of parsimony, and by attributing to hypothetical redactors expressions of which his authors were quite capable themselves.

It would seem that little more is to be expected, at present, from the purely literary analysis of

¹ See, for example, the comments of the former on Ps 74, and the textual alterations of the latter on Ps 68.

documents. When the fifth edition of Cornill's *Introduction to the Old Testament* appeared two years ago, it was a matter of remark that no important changes of view on large points had been introduced by the last ten or even fifteen years. It is reasonable to hope that we have more to gain at present from an eagerly prosecuted study of archaeology and history. It is only as the ancient world gradually arises before our eyes, as it has been doing at Gezer and Lachish and Taanach, that we can understand the conflict and welter of ideas both of religion and of civilization into which the monotheism of the early Hebrews was introduced, from which it emerged safe at the last, and in the midst of which was produced a body of writings, tentative and incomplete, but unchallenged by the proudest literatures of antiquity. When this is done, and the scattered hints in the Bible have been far more fully compared with the records which the earth's surface is still hiding for us, we shall hardly be disappointed if we have to conclude, in words which Wolf used more than a century since with regard to Homer, 'perhaps it will never be possible to show, even with probability, the precise points at which new filaments or dependencies of the texture begin.'

'Things New and Old.'

BY THE REV. DAVID SMITH, M.A., TULLIALLAN.

Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὁμοίως ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδοσῶντι ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά.— Mt 13⁵².

It will clear the way toward an understanding of this remarkable saying of our Lord, if we seek first of all to define certain terms which He employs.

1. The Scribes were a learned order of the Pharisees. Their business was the study and exposition of the sacred Law, and they prosecuted it with amazing assiduity. They were called in Hebrew הסופרים, which means properly 'the Counters'; and they got this title because they actually counted the words and letters of the Law. The middle letter, they found, was the י of סופרים in Lv 11^{42,1}

¹ Lightfoot on Lk 10²⁵.

2. The A.V., following the reading of T.R. μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν,² renders: 'instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven.' The true reading is μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασ., and it means 'made a disciple to the Kingdom of Heaven.' Cf. Mt 27⁵⁷: Joseph of Arimathea ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ, 'was Jesus' disciple.' The Kingdom of Heaven is here personified. It is viewed as the teacher, and, just as young men who desired to be Scribes resorted to the Scribal College, the *House of Midrash*, and sate at the feet of the Rabbis (cf. Ac 22³), so the Christian Scribe must go to

² NBC ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ. Jer. : *doctus in regno caelorum*.

school with the Kingdom of Heaven and receive its instruction. And, since Jesus is the Lord of the Kingdom of Heaven, this means that he must sit at Jesus' feet (cf. Lk 10³⁹).¹ Jesus is the teacher. Thus, 'a Scribe that hath been made the Kingdom of Heaven's disciple,' signifies a religious teacher who has sate at Jesus' feet, learned His method, and caught His spirit.

3. Such a teacher the Lord likens to 'a householder who flingeth forth² from his store things new and things old.' These words recall Horace's 'exilis domus est ubi non et multa supersunt.'³ They are a description of a well-furnished house—a house where they do not live from hand to mouth but have good store laid by, ample for any sudden demand. Should a visitor arrive after nightfall, the householder does not need, like the man in our Lord's parable (Lk 11⁵⁻⁸), to knock up a neighbour and borrow a loaf. He has abundance in his store—relics of the last meal, a spare garment, whatever a weary wayfarer may require; and he produces it with lavish hand and lusty joviality: he '*flingeth it forth.*'

The occasion of this saying was a fresh departure which Jesus had made. He had begun to teach by parables. It was a new method with Jesus, but it was by no means original. It had been much employed by the ancient prophets (cf. 2 S 12¹⁻⁶, Is 5¹⁻⁶, Ezk 17³⁻¹⁰ 24³⁻⁵), and the Rabbis were very fond of it.⁴ This would rather commend it to Jesus, who was ever wont, if haply He might reach the hearts of His contemporaries, to adapt Himself to their ways, linking new things to the old and making the old stepping-stones to the new; but it would surprise His disciples. His teaching had hitherto been absolutely unique, amazing all who heard it and impressing them with a sense of its 'authority' (cf. Mt 7²⁸⁻²⁹). It was 'a new teaching' (Mk 1²⁷), utterly unlike that of the Scribes; and, when He adopted the common method, it would seem to the disciples that He was descending to the level of the Scribes and becoming a teacher of the common order. And there was this danger in the new departure, that the familiarity of the method might conceal the originality of the message. Jesus knew what His disciples were

thinking, and He inquired: 'Have ye taken in all these things?' 'Yes,' they replied, their glibness betraying how imperfectly they had comprehended what they had heard. 'On this account,' He said, 'every Scribe that hath been made a disciple of the Kingdom of Heaven is like a householder who flingeth forth from his store things new and things old.'

Such was the primary application of the saying, but, of course, this by no means exhausts its significance. It expresses a deep and far-reaching truth—the *continuity of old and new, past and present, and the insufficiency of either by itself.* By 'things old' the Fathers understood the Old Testament, and by 'things new' the New Testament. 'We must in every wise try,' says Origen,⁵ 'to bring together in our heart, by attention to the reading, the exhortation, the teaching, and by meditation in the Law of the Lord day and night, not only the new sayings (λόγια) of the Gospels and the apostles and their revelation, but also the old ones of the Law which had a shadow of the good things to come, and of the prophets who prophesied in sequence with them.' And St. Chrysostom in his discourse on the passage makes a significant remark. 'Heretics,' he says with evident reference to the Marcionites, 'are outside of this benediction.' The Marcionites rejected the Old Testament and accepted the New, at least in part, holding that there were two Gods—the evil God of the Jewish Scriptures, the δημιουργός, the creator of sinful matter, and the good God, the Heavenly Father of Jesus. They rejected 'things old' and accepted only 'things new.'

Marcion did not appear until the middle of the second century, but the spirit which animated him is ever operative. He represented an intellectual tendency which manifests itself in every generation and which in our Lord's day found its exponent in John the Baptist. John had broken with the old order. He had forsaken Temple and Synagogue. He assailed the Pharisees and Sadducees with fierce denunciation, and pictured the Messiah as a stern reformer who would come with axe and winnowing-fan to demolish and sweep away the old order and inaugurate a new and better era. Over against John, representing the opposite tendency, stood the Rabbis, those conservers of the past, those blind sticklers for orthodoxy, who

¹ Euth. Zig.: μαθητευθείς τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός.

² Orig.: προφέρει.

³ Eph. 1. 6, 45.

⁴ Cf. Lightfoot on Mt 13³.

⁵ In Ev. Matth. x. § 15.

counted no doctrine authoritative unless it were prefaced with 'R. So-and-so saith.' It is related in the Talmud that Hillet once propounded a doctrine and, though he discoursed for a whole day in demonstration of its truth, his hearers would not accept it until at last he said, 'So I heard from Shemaiah and Abtalion.'¹ John the Baptist had in his store only 'things new,' the Rabbis had in theirs only 'things old.'

Jesus stood midway between those antagonistic tendencies, at once condemning and combining both. At the very outset of His ministry He defined His attitude. Apprehensive lest He should be identified with His iconoclastic Forerunner, He protested that He had not come to 'pull down' the ancient Faith (Mt 5¹⁷). And all through His ministry He vindicated His loyalty to the Law and its institutions. It was His custom (Lk 4¹⁶), wherever He might be, to repair

¹ Lightfoot on Mt 7²⁹.

to the Synagogue and take part in its worship; and year by year He went up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast. He might have claimed exemption from the Temple-tax, since the Temple was His Father's House (Lk 2⁴⁹, Jn 2¹⁶) and not on Him should rest the burden of its maintenance; but, had He claimed exemption, it would have seemed to such as knew not who He was a mere violation of the Law, and therefore He paid the half-shekel, 'lest we make them stumble' (Mt 17²⁴⁻²⁷). This was His constant manner. He neither with the Rabbis idolized the past nor with the Baptist contemned it. He bade His disciples cherish the old and welcome the new, recognizing their continuity and the insufficiency of either by itself. The Law, He told them, was the word but not the final word of God, and He had come to complete it, enlarging its content, filling in its outline, and reinforcing it with fresh sanctions.

Jesus Christ and Missions to the World according to the Gospels.

BY THE REV. H. U. WEITBRECHT, PH.D., D.D., LAHORE, INDIA.

II.

THE apparent discrepancy of the statement in Mt 10²³, 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come,' with the prophecy of the universal diffusion of the gospel before the end lies on the surface, and the difficulty of explaining it is a real one. But we may note two facts—first, that these words form part of the same discourse, in which occur later the sayings already referred to (v. 17, 18), which, indeed, precede this saying and indicate an eventual mission to the Gentiles following upon that to the Jews. 'They shall deliver you up to councils (*συνέδρια*), and in their synagogues they shall scourge you; yea, and (*καὶ δὲ*, indicating something further than the first) before governors and kings shall ye be brought,' etc. A careful and pragmatic writer like St. Matthew does not easily introduce a plain *contradictio in adjectis*. Second, when, as a matter of history, did the visitation of the cities of Israel by Christian evangelists come to a stop, while their

task remained unfinished? Clearly, at the destruction of Jerusalem, which brought the connexion of the Jewish Christians with the non-Christian Jews to an abrupt conclusion. This leads naturally to the interpretation followed by innumerable Christian divines, that in speaking of the 'coming of the Son of man' Christ is here referring to the destruction of Jerusalem as the first act in the drama of judgment on those who reject Him. Do the results of modern exegesis preclude us from still taking this view? In other words, is it inconceivable that Jesus should have used the same phrase, with different, though parallel meanings? We have an analogy in Lk 17. 'Ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man' (v. 22) refers, doubtless, to the days of His bodily presence among them, while the 'days of the Son of man' (v. 26) still more plainly indicates the time of His second advent. And again, in v. 20, the Saviour, in answer to the question when the kingdom of God