---

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

natural activity, and represents the whole dreary length of the night in concrete form. Beside him he feels a dark Presence with folded wings. This "awful image of a nameless dread" is the Second Hour, who cannot fly away until he sleeps. He falls at length into a restless doze, and the night appears to him as a

"Black waste of ridge-walls, hour by hour apart,
Dividing deep ravines; from ridge to ridge,
Sleep's flying hour was an aerial bridge."

But the bridge was not for him to cross, and he had to climb down into the ravine, and then up the further side, torn by brambles and tripping over stones, until, after an interminable period, he reached the second ridge, and felt "a change of Watchers" in the room. And then the whole wearisome struggle began again. These verses show us very clearly what elements combined to produce "The City of Dreadful Night"—the mind of a poet, sensitive and imaginative, a natural disposition to melancholy, strengthened by disease, and the torturing powerlessness to relax consciousness in sleep.'

That is a long quotation, though it does not include the description of the satirical vision, of which Byron and Shelley seem to be the masters or slaves. But that quotation will give some idea of the modern interest of the book, and its author's ability.

# Contributions and Comments.

## Revelation xvi. 19.

I WROTE to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES shortly after the beginning of the war, to point out the likeness between the hailstones in Rev $16^{16}$ and modern bombs. The plague thereof has grown greater since that time, and I fear will grow greater still, when the American aeroplanes come on the scene. I write to-day to point out a coincidence with another verse describing the events that are to accompany the Battle of Armageddon in what we see taking place in Europe, 'The cities of the nations fell.' The word πόλις among the Greeks had more the meaning of an organized society or community than its equivalent has with us. Therefore 'the cities of the nations' probably means the ordered administrations of Governments among the nations; and how many of these have fallen since August 4th, 1914? The lawful Belgian, Servian, and Montenegrin Governments have been driven from home; the Russian, apparently so firmly fixed, has come down with a crash; the Austrian throne is toppling; the Greek one is bereft of power; and the Portuguese preceded this war. I do not pretend to explain v.$^{20}$; nor do I wish to venture on the thorny subject of Babylon, who, being a harlot, must symbolize an apostate Church, as in Ezk 23 Aholah and Aholibah. But surely it is not presumptuous to suggest that as the 'Beast' in the Apocalypse is, by the consent of most modern commentators, the Roman Empire, which was then persecuting the Christians, and which rested on Might being Right, its true successors and representatives are Kaiserism, Czarism, and the Austrian or Holy Roman Empire, in other words, Cæsarism.

I leave to my readers to consider, if this identification be correct, which of the Christian Churches has been continuously sitting on this Beast.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

*Cambridge.*

## Our Lord's Clothing.

THERE are but two occasions on which the clothing of our Lord is referred to, namely, at His birth—and at His death. As to each there is something to consider, and no help can be found in the published commentaries.

1. At our Lord's birth His mother 'wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger' (Lk $2^{7}$); and the angel said to the shepherds, 'This is the sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger' (Lk $2^{12}$).

The shepherds praised God 'for all the things that they had heard and seen, even as it was spoken unto them.' What they had heard may have been the angel's message, but probably was more—spoken by Mary and Joseph. What they

had seen was what they had been told to look for —something that was a sign—therefore not what they would pass by as an ordinary sight of no special character. The sign was a combination of things which was not expected; but apart from the combination the things themselves would not have been significant. Merely to be told that they would find a babe lying in a manger would have led to nothing; there must have been poor people and indifferent characters in those days as well as in ours, and for such to be reduced to using the roughest accommodation for a new-born babe would be nothing to be surprised at. But that was not the sign.

Swaddling clothes may not have been uncommon, but swaddling clothes at hand imply much. Foresight, expectation of the birth and provision for it, self-respect, a mode of life consistent with decency, possibly a code of manners above that of the lowest class—in our words what we call respectable habits, and such as we might expect from one who was mindful that he was of the house and family of David.

That a child so carefully clothed and tended should be laid in a cattle manger was evidently not to be expected, and this was the sign which shepherds looked for and found. The popular hymn:

> All meanly wrapped in swathing bands,
> And in a manger laid,

appears to misinterpret the meaning of the angel's message. There is nothing squalid associated with our Lord, and it is possible that 'swaddling clothes' were an indication of greater refinement or higher rank than we are accustomed to imagine.

2. The only other mention of our Lord's clothing is at His death. After the mocking by the soldiers, 'they took off from him the robe, and put on him his garments' (Mt $27^{31}$), and 'when they had crucified him, they parted his garments among them.' Joseph of Arimathea, when he received the body, 'wrapped it in a clean linen cloth' (Mt $27^{59}$), or, as St. John says, 'bound it in linen cloths.' After the resurrection, Peter 'beholdeth the linen cloths lying' (Jn $20^{7}$). We see how carefully all connexion of our Lord's risen glorified body with His earthly clothing is definitely severed.

Then follow our Lord's several manifestations of Himself. To Mary Magdalene He seems a gardener—to the disciples at Emmaus a traveller; to the disciples in the place where the doors were shut, He may have appeared in His ordinary clothing; but when He directed Thomas to 'reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side,' His garments were evidently no obstacle. In Galilee, if He had had His habitual appearance, St. Peter would have known Him at once, and none would have doubted. Does not all this show that the outward manifestation of our Lord was according to His will? If He willed to be visible by human eyes, He willed also in what character and with what accessories He would be seen before He assumed the splendour which St. John saw only when he was 'in the Spirit' and of which he tried to give some idea by recalling such images from terrestrial things as would best convey to others the overwhelming impression made upon him.

Compare the irradiation of our Lord's raiment at the Transfiguration.

HENRY H. BOTHAMLEY.

*The Crossways, Bromley.*

## Luke xv. 16.

'No man gave unto him.' Gave what? The common answer is, 'Husks': 'he longed for the food the swine ate, and no one gave him any of it.' This has always seemed to me an unintelligent reading of the parable. I understand it means: 'No one gave him food in adequate quantity—suitable food.' The reference to the husks seems to imply simply that at times he was so hungry that he envied the animals that had enough to eat, and that no one took pity on him and relieved his hunger with proper food and a reasonably ample supply of it. It seems a somewhat stupid kind of exaggeration of the description of his misery to say, 'he desired to eat the swine's food, and could not get enough even of *it*.' It also seems to suggest that if he had got it, it would possibly have staved off the hunger which led him to return to his father. If he had actually wished for the husks, he could surely have supplied himself with them even if the swine got a diminished portion—a matter of which they could not complain articulately.

JOHN WILLCOCK.

*Lerwick.*

## Apocalypse and Genealogy.

THE genealogies of Jesus Christ, as given in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke, admittedly present many difficulties, and with the knowledge now at our command are incapable of mutual reconciliation. That of Matthew bears the stamp of artificiality on the face of it, for the writer seems to have had special reasons for commencing his list of names with Abraham, for dividing his list into three equal sections, and for allotting to each section fourteen generations. The value of this plan for our author is emphasized by the fact that he boldly asserts it although his last section has only thirteen names, and is made obvious in the second section, which is derived from 1 Ch 3. Here there are more names than Matthew needs, but rather than abandon his scheme he cuts down the list in Chronicles to the required fourteen. The question naturally arises, Why the importance of this ground plan, and whence its origin? The answer seems to be given in the Book of Enoch.

It is well known that serious attempts were made to fix the time of the expected Messianic kingdom, the 70 weeks of Dn $9^{24}$ being the most familiar example. In the Book of Enoch $93^{1-10}$ and $91^{12-17}$ there is a short Apocalypse which divides the whole period of historic time into ten weeks of seven generations each. Seven of these weeks had already passed when the author wrote his book, three were still in the future. In the eighth week the righteous are to subdue their opponents by the sword, in the ninth week a solemn judgment ushers the divine age into this world, only in the tenth week do we see a similar judgment in the upper world and the final overthrow of sin. It is true no Messiah is mentioned in this Apocalypse, but that does not affect the purpose we have in view.

Turning again to Matthew, it is significant that he commences his genealogical table exactly at the close of pseudo-Enoch's third week, the first having extended from Adam to Enoch, the second from Enoch to Noah, and the third from Noah to Abraham. In Mt $1^{17}$ we are told that from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, *i.e.* two weeks of seven generations each as in pseudo-Enoch; two more such weeks divide David from the beginning of the Exile, and two more carry us from the Exile to Christ. At the end of the ninth week the Saviour is born, for Jesus shall save His people from their sins (v.$^{20}$). Thus for Matthew, as for Enoch, salvation comes at the end of nine weeks. Canon Charles says: 'The Book of Enoch was well known to the writers of the N.T., and to some extent influenced alike their thought and diction.' Have we not an instance of its influence here? We have only to suppose that Enoch's scheme of time was well known to see how important an argument for the Messiahship of Jesus the genealogy presented in this form would be. And if, as we believe, we have here the key to Matthew's genealogical list, there is another proof, if such were needed, of Matthew's desire to reveal Jesus to the Jews as the consummation of all their hopes.

J. T. NEWTON.

*North Shields.*

## Esau.

IN a recent issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Professor Paterson is quoted as saying that 'Esau, who to begin with was nothing worse than a fool, has come to be described, by the time the story reaches the age of the Apostles, as a profane person and fornicator.'

Is this quite fair to Esau? He does not appear to be described as a fornicator in the passage to which the Professor obviously alludes. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes, 'lest there be any fornicator, *or* profane person, as Esau,' etc. If the writer had meant to describe Esau as profane and impure, surely he would have written, 'lest there be any fornicator *and* profane person, as Esau.' Esau appears in He $12^{15}$ not as a fornicator at all, but as a type of the 'profane' (*βέβηλος*), a description which suits him exactly.

'The N.T. calls Esau "profane," thus revealing the secret of his character: the word (Gr. *bebēlos*) suggests the quality of a man to whom nothing is sacred, whose heart and thought range over only what is materially and sensibly present' (Dr. R. Waddy Moss in Hastings' one-vol. *B.D.*)—an idea finely worked out in George Adam Smith's well-known sermon on Esau in *The Forgiveness of Sins*, pp. 174–191.

Dr. W. F. Moulton's exegesis of this passage leads to the same conclusion:

'Though Jewish tradition (see, for example, the Targum of Palestine on Gn $25^{29}$) affirms that Esau was a man of impure life, it is not probable

that he is so represented in this verse. Here he is mentioned as a type of the "profane" who care not for divine things, but only for the gains and pleasures of this world' (Ellicott's *N.T. Commentary for English Readers*).

So that in spite of Farrar (Cambridge Bible, *in loc.*), who maintains that πόρνος applies to Esau, and 'must be taken literally,' the writer of the Epistle probably alluding to the Jewish Hagadah, where Esau is painted in the darkest colours, perhaps Westcott (Comm. *in loc.*) has said the final word on the point:

'A question has been raised whether both πόρνος and βέβηλος are connected with Ἠσαῦ, or the latter only. The second view seems unquestionably to be right. Esau is represented in Scripture as the type of a "profane" man, but he does not appear as πόρνος either literally or metaphorically. The later Jewish traditions can hardly have a place here. And, yet again, the words of explanation which follow justify the epithet βέβηλος, but they do not extend further. They imply therefore that πόρνος does not refer to him.'

ERNEST ELLIOT.

*Manchester.*

## Note on Proverbs xx. 27.

נֵר יְהוָה נִשְׁמַת אָדָם חֹפֵשׂ כָּל־חַדְרֵי־בָטֶן׃

A.V., 'The spirit of man is the candle of the LORD, searching all the inward parts of the belly.'

R.V., '. . . the lamp . . . innermost.'

But the meaning of the Hebrew is infinitely greater and deeper. Keeping the Heb. order, and giving the established meaning of all the words:

'A lamp of the LORD is the breath of man, searching through all the store-rooms of *his* being'; cf. Jn 1[9].

'Lamp' is the same word as in the Samuel story; also in Zeph 1[12], 'I will search Jerusalem with candles' (intensive form of same verb = 'busily search,' 'go about searching').

'Breath' is the same word as in Gn 2[7]; also Job 34[14] side by side with 'spirit' (רוּח); and 32[8], R.V., 'the breath (A.V., 'the inspiration') of the Almighty giveth them understanding' ('teacheth them') a parallel thought to our Proverbs verse.

'Of man,' or 'of mankind.'

'Searching through'—the same verb occurs in Pr 2[4], A.V., 'searchest for.' In Palestinian Syriac the verb means 'to dig' (*B.D.B.*).

'The store-rooms' or 'the presence-chambers'; cf. Pr 24[4], Ps 105[30], Job 9[9]. The word always means precious and private rooms.

'Of *his* being.' The English versions' ugly word, although right for our word often, is utterly wrong here, and, in same phrase, Pr 18[8] 20[30] 26[22]. See 22[18], E.V., 'within thee,' but lit. as in A.V. margin; and the sense is, 'Surely delightful is it if thou guard them in thy being, ready one and all of them upon thy lips'—'them' = 'the words of the wise men,' and 'my knowledge.' See also Job 15[2. 35]; and specially 32[18. 19], which I would render, 'For full am I of words—the breath of my being constraineth me: yea, my being is like wine unopened, like *wine in* new skins, which would out.' Also Hab 3[16], 'I heard, and my being trembled.'

The Hebrew usage is *something* like English poetical 'breast' or 'bosom,' but it has a deeper meaning than these. The Heb. subst. in these connexions means 'the whole, visible, tangible frame of man,' the covering encasement of his individuality, of his secret 'ego.'

A paraphrase of the inner thought of Pr 20[27], in modern phrase, and for our present occasions, would be, 'A searchlight from God is man's conscience, exploring the cloisters of the soul.'

H. W. SHEPPARD.

*Lee-on-Solent.*

## 'Fulfilled in your Ears.'

THE popular interpretation of this passage (Lk 4[21]) is that in it Jesus frankly announced 'that he was the Messiah in whom the words of the prophets found their fulfilment' (Farrar, in *Cambridge Bible for Schools*). I do not know what English commentator takes an essentially different view. But this interpretation is beset with improbabilities. First, it runs counter to the consistent representation of the Synoptic Gospels that, at least until a late period in His ministry, Jesus made no claim to the Messiahship; and that when Peter suggested the idea, Jesus told him to keep it a profound secret, as Luke himself mentions (9[21]). That Jesus should open His discourse with the startling announcement, and that His hearers, already doubtful of Him, should have greeted the statement as 'gracious words,' are suppositions in the highest degree improbable. Second, the mere *claim* to be

the Messiah, unaccompanied, as the context (v.[28]) implies, by any confirmatory miracles, could carry no conviction, and would be quite unlike the wisdom and modesty of Jesus (Mt 12[19]). These considerations seem to call for a fresh study of the terms employed.

1. The phrase *fulfilled in your ears*, which is uncommon, would not be a natural way of expressing the claim, even if such a claim were intended to be made. If the meaning were 'This prophecy is fulfilled in me, the preacher,' appeal would more naturally be made to the sense of sight than to that of hearing, and the mode of expression would be 'in me whom you see standing before you.' One can imagine a demonstrator in Chemistry describing the result of a chemical experiment he was about to make, and then when the result followed (*e.g.* the electrolysis of water), saying, 'My words have been fulfilled *before your eyes*'—that is, as *you have seen*. If, however, the lecturer were a politician and had been foretelling the result of an election, and at the close of his lecture a telegram were read out confirming his forecast, he might appropriately say, 'My words have been fulfilled in *your ears*'—*i.e.* as *you have heard*. The phrase is only appropriate when it refers to something like tidings, which appeal to the sense of hearing. Now the next verse but one expressly refers to tidings which His hearers had received about the doings of Jesus in Capernaum.

2. The expression *this day* must be understood in the common Hebrew sense of 'nowadays,' 'at the present time,' 'in these days.' See, *e.g.*, Neh 9[36], Dn 9[7], He 13[8].

The opening passage in our Lord's discourse may therefore be paraphrased as follows: 'As you have heard in the recent tidings from Capernaum, these words of the prophet are in our days receiving fulfilment. Good tidings are being preached of the Kingdom of Heaven at hand; the blind are receiving their sight; devils are being cast out, and Satan's captives released from thraldom. These are works which betoken the expected Christ (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Mt 11[2]). We are living therefore in Messianic days. Your ears hear things that kings and prophets of many generations have wished to hear.' Such statements would indeed be received by the hearers as 'pleasing words'; and would be wholly in accord with what we read in all the Synoptics that Jesus began His ministry, not by announcing Himself to be the Messiah, but by preaching the good news of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.'

The revulsion of feeling which shortly followed was due to the fact that Jesus insisted, like John the Baptist, that the privileges of the Messianic kingdom were not to be obtained by accident of birth, but by moral fitness;—that therefore they were not the peculiar possession of the Israelite, but were open equally to people of every nation, and that the Jew, if not morally qualified, might even miss them altogether. That this was part of the teaching of Jesus we have evidence elsewhere; *e.g.* in His words about the centurion of Capernaum (Mt 8[11. 12]; cf. Mk 11[17]). This was so opposed to Jewish conceptions, and was judged so unpatriotic, revolutionary, and heretical, that His hearers on the present occasion could not abide it. It outweighed the effect of the pleasing words which had preceded.

EDWARD P. RICE.

*Hassocks.*

# Entre Nous.

**Russian Poetry.**

Dr. Jane Harrison has written a Preface to *Russian Poets and Poems* by Madame M. Jarintzov (Oxford: Blackwell; 10s. 6d. net). It is a Preface of two pages, but it says enough to give the reader of it an appetite for the book. For it tells us that the book is the successful result of the application of a new conception of translation to the most famous Russian poetry. 'Hitherto among translators a kind of orthodoxy has become traditional. The translator translates from an alien idiom. He, it is assumed, is past-master of his own tongue, and must guard its sanctities; if violence be done, it is the alien idiom that must suffer. Madame Jarintzov frankly turns the tables on tradition. If Russian is to be translated, the translator must be a Russian. He and he only can really feel his mother-tongue, its rhymes and rhythms, its com-

plex music, its rather stark stateliness. The translator's object is, not to create English, but to carry over Russian.' As a good example of the good results following, Miss Harrison bids the reader 'read Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman." He will feel the broad swell of the Neva and see the splendid spectral vision of Peter's great new city shining in the northern night. Above all, let him read "The Demon" of L'èrmontov. A line like

"By swords of passionless Archangels"

may well live on in English literature. "The Demon" is a masterpiece of translation, charged with the unearthly beauty of the original—yes, and with something of its timeless terror.'

Madame Jarintzov believes in her own method heartily. 'Mr. Wilfrid Blair,' she says, 'believes in a word-for-word translation, and thinks that it only "needs time" and can be achieved in every case within the laws of perfect English, and yet combined with the original metre, original rhyming scheme, *and* original atmosphere of speech. *I don't!* The impossibility of this has become particularly clear to me since the great debate between Mr. Wilfrid Blair and myself over L'èrmontov's "Demon." On being given the word-for-word English for that poem, Mr. Wilfrid Blair said that he "could not possibly pass" my translation, as it "needed several months of work to correct it." I, on the other hand, could not possibly pass the line or two which he suggested as his own version, so we left this poem alone. Thus, all the "Demon's" sins are now *my sins; but so is the "Demon's" Russian swing!* The fact is that *the knowledge of the exact meaning of each separate word does not give a foreign translator, who knows no Russian, the feeling of the original musical lilt*—not in the least. The "Demon" is one of those classical creations which are permeated with the typical, essential beauty of classical Russian poetry—*namely, the stateliness of simplicity, the naturalness of speech which could not be beaten by the most perfect prose.* The moment the English poetic language steps in with its very own licences, out flies the great spirit of that stately naturalness! . . .'

Well, let us turn to the 'Demon,' and let us quote for example this evidence of the power of love:

The evening mist had thrown its veiling
Of white on Grùzian hill and dale.
Obedient to his wont, the Demon
Had sought the convent's holy pale.
But, filled with fear of sanctity,
He dared not boldly force an entrance
And violate the sanctuary.
Then for a moment was he fain
To give up his hell-dark device.
Absorbed in thought, he slowly paced
'Neath towering wall; shudder would rise
And run, scarce heard, in windless night
Through sleeping leaves at his approach.
Still hesitating to encroach,
He glancèd up: there was a glimmer
Of lamplight in Tamàra's window;
She seemed to wait for someone there. . . .
Then, through the drowsy, silent air,
There came a distant sound of singing,
With it chingàra's strings a-ringing,
Subdued and gentle sounds, which flowed
In even streams, like tears of rare
Angelic tenderness: a song
For earth in Heaven born and nourished. . . .
Had, then, an angel flown in secret
To meet him as his friend of yore,
To sing the bygone joys they cherished,
And soothe the sufferings he bore?
Then first the Demon knew he loved;
Knew how he yearned and longed for love.
In sudden fear, he thought to fly. . . .
But in that first heart-rending anguish
His wing was stayed—he had no power!
And, marvel! from his veilèd eye
There dropped a tear. . . . This very hour.
There lieth by Tamàra's tower
A stone burnt through by flame-like tear—
Inhuman tear: a sign for aye! . . .

It is a great book, a real reflexion and interpretation of the greatness of Russian poetry.

---

**Helen Hamilton.**

Miss Hamilton has written (in blank verse and very irregular metre) the biography of the woman who becomes Head Mistress, and that from the cradle to the grave. It is (as we shall show) an

amazingly graphic biography. But—who would be a teacher after reading it? The title is *The Compleat Schoolmarm* (Blackwell; 2s. net). This is the beginning of the chapter entitled

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES

The Day of days,
A *Molto agitato* day.
Dreaded, desired,
And worked for,
Consumedly!
O the turmoil,
The prostrating, happy turmoil of the morning!
You spare yourself no effort,
For one thing only matters
In all the world:
That It,
The Great event,
Should go off well,
Else will you die,
Of bitter disappointment.
Furiously active,
Caught in a whirlwind,
Hither and thither you whisk,
Doing, directing,
Exhorting, rebuking,
Confounding other zealots
By conflicting orders.
The girls are like leaves,
Scattering leaves,
In an autumn gale.
But how they enjoy it!
So frightfully important!
She of the awful silence
And wrathful eyes,
When things go wrong,
Your Head, adored and dreaded,
Hovers majestically
Over her hive,
Controlling its workers.
How searching her glances,
Swift her decisions,
Sudden her appearances,
Sudden, unnerving!
The Great, the Good, the Always-wise!
Wondering, mazed, and awestruck
You rush to do her bidding,
With instant, proud humility!

**M. St. Clare Byrne.**

*Aldebaran* is the title of the new volume of Mr. Blackwell's 'Adventurers All' (2s. net). The author is Miss M. St. Clare Byrne. Take these two poems; they are in no way better than those that are not taken, for all are true and touching:

THE COMMON THINGS.

I never knew how sorrel looks
When the sun is getting low,
Till I watched you gathering it,
Three weeks ago;

I'd never gathered trefoil
Since I was six years old,
Till I saw it in your hands—
Pure fairy gold.

Clover and trefoil
All in an earthern bowl—
How these little things
Master the soul!

NOS IDEM MORTALES.

When they shall come to tell me you are dead
I will be very quiet: I shall know
Instantly, then, the place where I must go,
The thing that I must do. The words you said
I must ponder on in the very deepest heart:
I must remember all you ever did
Of loveliness, and the deep honour hid
In your whole life, and all the little part
We shared together, both of sorrow, laughter,
And age-old foolishness, all unforgotten.
I will tell over to myself all day
Your wonder and your beauty . . . and then after,
With peace of you from my long day begotten,
Quietly, strong with you, go on my way.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.