

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

reaction always set in which only intensified the power of the priests.¹

It is, moreover, especially difficult to believe that Nebuchadnezzar should have determined on this extermination of the priests, for his inscriptions reveal him as a man singularly under the influence of religion, and particularly under the influence of the Marduk worship, in whose interests he completely destroyed the rival sanctuary of Bel at Nippur.²

We have, indeed, in the story the indication that we are dealing with a work of art, not of history, in the record that the captain of the guard sought Daniel, who was completely ignorant of all that had passed in the king's court, to begin the execution with him. It may, of course, be assumed that the command had already been carried out in the case of the leaders of the order, who had aroused the king's wrath, and perhaps more widely, but the impression created by the story is that Daniel saved the order, and since immediately afterwards³ we find Daniel being appointed to be 'chief governor over all the wise men of Babylon,' we cannot think of them as exterminated, but must suppose that Daniel was to have been the first one slain, and saved the entire order. This is dramatically effective, but historically improbable.

VI.

We conclude therefore

(1) That there is no evidence that the term 'Chaldæans' was used in any other than an ethnic sense in the sixth century B.C., and that any other use under a Chaldæan dynasty is almost inconceivable.

(2) That there is ample evidence of its use in a non-ethnic sense amongst later writers, to denote the same class of people that Daniel designates

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² *Vide Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria,* p. 646.

³ 2⁴⁹.

by that name, and that this class consisted of priests.

(3) That it is impossible to suppose that a faithful Hebrew should become a heathen priest, but that we have here the mark of a non-contemporary hand.

(4) That we cannot suppose that a close caste, like the Babylonian priesthood, would have admitted Daniel, or that Nebuchadnezzar would have dared to appoint him to the headship of the order.

(5) That our knowledge of the position of the priesthood and of the character of Nebuchadnezzar alike makes it unthinkable that he should contemplate the extermination of the priestly caste.

Against these positions Boutflower presents no defence. He recognizes the lack of contemporary evidence of the use of the term 'Chaldæans,' and proceeds to demonstrate its already well-known non-contemporary use. With the remaining points he does not deal, but builds a theory of a priesthood of exclusively Chaldæan nationality, for which he provides no real evidence, and which is at variance with the Book of Daniel, which he is defending. For his theory, therefore, the 'Chaldæans' must continue to be a source of disturbance, witnessing to the fact that we must not seek in the stories of Daniel for history, but must rather see in them the literary form in which the author clothed his passionate call to the men of his day to be loyal to the faith of their fathers, to believe that the proud oppressor would be humbled, and the despoiler of temples and profaner of sacred treasures cut off, and that the day of deliverance, sudden and sure, abiding and unshakable, was at hand; witnessing, too, to the fact that the author was not a heathen priest or a magician, who dreamt and who interpreted dreams, and who preserved a correctness in his own life, but that he was a man in whom the urge of God's Spirit was felt, whose soul was stirred by the challenge of events, and who sought men with his message—a man who stands in the true succession of the Prophets of Israel.

Contributions and Comments.

Mark ii. 10.

ALL New Testament Greek students are indebted to Professor Hubert Pernot for his illuminating article on 'Greek and the Gospels' in THE EX-

POSITORY TIMES for December (1926). Particularly helpful are the explanations that he offers on the meaning of *ivn*.

There is, however, one passage which he quotes in which, it seems to me, the usage and meaning of

ἵνα can be more easily explained. I refer to Mk 2¹⁰: ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, for which I suggest the translation: 'But know assuredly that the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins on the earth. He says to the paralytic.' I regard ἵνα εἰδῆτε as a virtual Imperative and thus avoid the necessity of treating Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ as an awkward parenthesis. And this use of ἵνα with the Subjunctive finds a close parallel in Mk 5²³: ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, 'Come and lay thy hands on her.' [For this usage reference may be made to Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, pt. iv. p. 305a (3).]

DOUGLAS S. SHARP.

Durham.

St. Mark xvi. 8.

'They said nothing to any one.'

ALL the commentators who accept the usual modern view of the weight of manuscript evidence say, in the words of Mr. Willoughby C. Allen, 'here the Gospel ends,' and naturally are led to speculate as to what may have followed. Assuming that the First Gospel was written with a complete text of St. Mark accessible to the writer, we naturally expect to find in St. Matthew some hint as to the conclusion, if any, originally to be read in St. Mark.

Unfortunately, it would appear that St. Matthew has so condensed and telescoped together St. Mark's more detailed account, that we cannot infer what the verse at the head of this note specially signified. Mr. Allen, like others before him, translates 'they told no one,' etc., and we are left wondering how and when the story came to be told, as apparently the Fourth Gospel describes, or how Mary Magdalene came to return to the Tomb.

It may be suggested that the true translation is what we have placed above: it is at least curious that the very same expression occurs also in Mk 1⁴⁴, where Mr. Allen translates 'say nothing to any one.' The point would seem to be that urgent haste, in both cases alike, forbade the ordinary dilatoriness of courtesy and gossiping, familiar in the East. The command in Lk 10⁴, 'salute no one by the way,' which is paralleled by 2 K 4²³, is relevant to the same habit of Oriental society. The rest of St. Mark's expressions in 1⁴⁴, 'He straightway thrust him out, strictly enjoining him,' confirm this view in the one passage, and, if we may argue from it to the other, the women fled in such haste that they disregarded all passers-by whom they met. In this case the difficulty raised by many critics is due to their own way of translating the words.

T. NICKLIN.

Hulme Hall, Manchester.

Entre Nous.

A Personal Creed.

The Preface to *In Search of a Personal Creed*, by Mr. J. D. M. Rorke (4s. net), says: 'This little book is intended for men and women who want to find out what the central convictions are that make up a Christian view of life, and to discover whether or not those convictions are their own personal convictions. It is not likely to be of much use to any one who is in a state of willingness to be told what to believe.' Mr. Rorke's method is not to start at the top with existing creeds and doctrines, and find out how much of them are accepted and how much must be modified; but rather to start at the bottom with some conviction behind which one can't go. The foundation facts, he says, are 'yourself and the world you live in,' and from

these you pass to God. It is because the realization of the world and life is not sufficiently vivid that the realization of God is not vivid. Men have no mind for God because they haven't got a big enough place to put Him in. 'Supposing, then, we have some small vision of the Throne of the Universe, can we see God upon it? And what sort of God do we believe in?' Can we catch gleams and glimpses if we are responsive? Mr. Rorke finds that we can, and that the first stage is the coming to think of God as a Person. And then the next stage is that the very process which compels us to think of God as 'at least personality' gives that personality the colours that are best summed up in the word Fatherhood, and from here we pass to the thought of the indwelling God, and lastly to Jesus Christ.