

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

of a united South Africa under the British flag is one of the outstanding dreams of Empire of the last century. Down at the Kimberley Club, as his intimates grouped about him at night, he was wont to take down a great map of Africa, and, placing his hands on the territory beyond Cape Colony up to the central lakes, he would exclaim: 'All that shall be red; that is my dream.' And through long years of fragile health and immense difficulty he held to this dream, which was finally realized.

Jesus' friends had failed to appropriate for themselves His vision; there was no set to their minds to carry them onward in the midst of the gathering storm, and they slumbered and slept, insensitive to the immense significance of that night in the life of Jesus. They did not realize that for the sake of His dream of a new era in human existence Jesus committed His all, and God's all, to a farcical trial and a savage crucifixion as the utmost which love could do in redeeming men. The sheer unthinking dullness and the inability of His friends to use their imagination hurt Jesus more than all else. It was a time for great faith and great friendship, and Jesus received vacillating indifference.

But His disciples did not lose the battle that night; they had lost it long before. Their action on the fatal evening had been prepared for in the previous weeks. What we think to-day we shall do to-morrow; what we are at twenty we are apt to be at forty, only more so. Weeks of spiritual slackness, even if in the presence of Christ, had made easy their action on Jesus' night of agony.

It is difficult to keep a dream undimmed when trouble comes:

To hope till hope creates from its own wreck  
The thing it contemplates.

To believe in a cause when it is under foot and

trampled upon, to cherish an ideal of a world state when it is defeated by the largest majority against any issue in the history of mankind, to follow Christ closely when He is alone in the Garden, sweating great drops of blood and grappling with the issues of life and death. Little did this sleepy group know that later generations would frame the prayer:

By thine agony and bloody sweat,  
Good Lord, deliver us.

The supreme crisis in human history was approaching; the greatest single manifestation of God's outreaching love was about to be set forth, but this insensitive group was unable to keep vividly before them the dream of the Kingdom which Christ had come to establish.

Not only did their wills and their dreams give out, but also their belief. They had lost faith in themselves and left Jesus alone without their presence. Many of us develop a sense of inadequacy, and feel that we are useless to the world and to God. Jesus offers the world a conception of human personality which says to each, 'You are precious, you are valuable, you are loved.' But on this ghastly night these men, who could have meant so much by their mere companionship, had no confidence in themselves. They had lost sight of what they had to offer of friendship in His hour of tribulation.

We must believe in ourselves in order to help God. The Son of God is lonely now as He was in Gethsemane for responsive human hearts. And we must believe in Jesus. He asks men to give their wills, their dreams, their faith, to Him. He promises, in return, not ease or comfort, but, perchance, the promise to Garibaldi's Red Shirts, 'forced marches, battles, and death,' but in the end that spiritual victory which shall overcome the crassness and brutality of the world.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. Stewart, *The Crucifixion in our Street*, 158.

## Christ's Answer to the Question about Divorce.

BY PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, D.LITT., OXFORD.

ACCORDING to the Lewesian Syriac of Mt 19<sup>a</sup> in answer to the question 'Is it permitted to a man to dismiss his wife on any pretext?' Jesus replied:

לא קריחתן דמן דעבד לרברא אף לנקבתה הוו עבד

'Have ye not read the ruling of Him who made

the male, who also made the female? (Gn 2<sup>24</sup>)— "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh." Hence they are not two, but one flesh. That which God hath coupled let not man sunder.' The use of a simple ܓ ('of') for 'the

ruling of ' or ' the opinion of ' pervades the Aramaic of the Talmud, and examples can be found whenever we open it. Three examples cited from as many lines will illustrate not only this idiom, but the stenographic style in which these discussions were conducted. The words which the hearer has to supply are printed in Roman type.<sup>1</sup>

' Now, too, that the opinion of R. Chiya has not authority, we must compel him to swear from the ruling of R. Nachman ; for there is a Mishnah : If A says to B thou hast a mina of mine and B replies I have nothing of thine, he is not compelled to swear. But R. Nachman said, Still we make him take an oath of encouragement. The opinion of R. Nachman is a correction.'

So construed, the question in the Gospel receives an appropriate reply. Jesus cites the ruling not of Hillel or Shammai, but of ' Him who made both male and female.' By mistaking this *of* for *that* the Greek translator became involved in a series of interpolations, which in the main have been well enucleated by Merx. The text seemed to mean, *Have ye not read that He who made the male, made also the female.* Reference to the LXX furnished the text Gn 1<sup>27</sup>, *male and female made He them*, which is introduced, though it has no bearing on the question. After the first *made* of the Syriac, originally was introduced to avoid tautology ; and the words *and said* were inserted before the quotation of Gn 2<sup>24</sup>, because this text does not follow 1<sup>27</sup> in the original. *For this cause* in 2<sup>24</sup>, the only text really cited, does not of course refer to what is said in 1<sup>27</sup>, but to the narrative of Gn 2, where Eve is shown to have been originally part of Adam.

The Pharisees asked this question *tempting Him*, or rather *trying Him*, probing His Rabbinical lore and legal acumen. The question was well suited for that purpose, and the discussion in the last pages of B. *Gittin* indicates the mode wherein a Rabbi might be expected to deal with it. It is there shown that the verse Dt 24<sup>1</sup> is ambiguous both in syntax and expression. The phrase *because* (or *if*) *he has found in her impropriety of a sort* may be interpreted in several ways. It might mean that *any* pretext would justify a bill of divorce ; it might mean that some serious reason would be required. It is incredible that any school supposed there could be a reference to actual misconduct either pre-marital or post-marital : the Law punished these offences with death (Dt 22, etc.), and the Gospels imply that this Law was by no means a dead letter.

The order of the dialogue in Matthew is natural. The Pharisees ask a question which they expect will

<sup>1</sup> *Baba Metsia*, 5a, near the end.

be answered, if at all, by a reference to Dt 24<sup>1</sup> ; Christ surprises them by citing Gn 2<sup>24</sup> as settling the matter. What then, they ask, does He make of Dt 24<sup>1</sup> ? He replies that it was a concession to 'hard-heartedness.' His own ruling (speaking like one with authority and not as the Scribes) is that dismissal of a wife followed by remarriage (except in the case of the wife's misconduct) involved the perpetrator in the sin of adultery.

The Pharisees say no more, but the disciples make an objection. In the Greek this reads : *εἰ οὖτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναίκος, ἡ ἐστὶν ἐκπεδῖον ἐμμεναι.* The R.V. renders the Greek words : *If the case of the man is so with his wife.* Schleusner and Grimm confess that they can produce no case of *αἰτία* used in this sense ; Moulton and Milligan quote a papyrus, where, however, the word has its ordinary sense of *cause, reason for conduct.* The Syriac is also difficult : *אן הכנה אית ערליא בית נכרא לאנתתא* *Wenn so das Rechtsverhältniss zwischen dem Manne und dem Weibe ist*, which is doubly incorrect ; the word rendered *Rechtsverhältniss* means 'blame,' 'reproach,' or the like, and the syntax violates the rule given by Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.* § 303. The rendering offered by the Armenian Version seems the only possible one : *If thus there is guilt with the man and with the woman*, i.e. if divorce involves the parties in guilt, which in the Syriac is meant by *If thus there is blame between the man and the woman.* The Greek translator wrongly inserted a definite article.

If we turn to the account in the Second Gospel (10<sup>21</sup>), we find the errors due to mistranslation of Matthew's Syriac reproduced, with various alterations. The question asked by the Pharisees is not that whereon Rabbinical subtlety had been expended, viz. the limitations of the licence granted in Dt 24<sup>1</sup>, but simply whether divorce was permissible. Instead of replying, Christ asks them what the Law of Moses on this subject was. They cite the substance of Dt 24<sup>1</sup>. Christ declares that this was a concession to 'hard-heartedness,' but *from the beginning of creation He made them male and female ; for this cause shall a man leave his father, etc. What then God hath coupled let not man sunder.*

As has been seen, *for this cause* in the text quoted refers to something so different that it is customary now to regard the two texts as belonging to inconsistent accounts belonging to different authors and ages. The charge of seriously misquoting Scripture, which the translator of Matthew avoided by inserting the words *and said* after he had erroneously introduced Gn 1<sup>27</sup>, has now materialized ; the quota-

tion of Gn 1<sup>27</sup>, which is merely off the point in Matthew, in Mark's account involves the Speaker in error. Some other difficulties are introduced. Possibly the stenographic style might excuse the introduction of *He made them* without any word having preceded to which the implied pronoun can refer; in the Greek of Matthew it is preceded by *He who made originally*. In Matthew, *let no man sunder* is appropriate *before* the mention of Moses; in Mark, where Moses is the person who sunders, *man or a man* is surprising, since the great Lawgiver was no ordinary man.

In Mark, the Pharisees get no further reply. The disciples 'when they are back in the house,' and so free from the presence of the Pharisees, do not bring the objection recorded by Matthew, but repeat the Pharisees' question. The reply is: *Whosoever dismisses his wife and marries another woman committeth adultery against her, and if she herself shall put away her husband and marry another man, she committeth adultery*. The exception admitted in Matthew's account is omitted; on the other hand, a clause is introduced which takes us out of the region of Jewish law to that of Roman. By the latter the

wife could initiate proceedings for divorce<sup>1</sup>; by the former she could not. Josephus, a good authority on such a matter, as he himself divorced a wife, is emphatic on this point: Salome sent her husband 'a bill of divorce, not according to the Jewish laws; for among us a man may do this, but a woman, even if separated, may not marry of her own right without permission of her former husband.'<sup>2</sup> The author of this addition was then more familiar with Roman law than with Jewish.

In 1 Co 7<sup>10</sup> St. Paul ascribes this precept to 'the Lord,' whereas the following are, he confesses, his own. Perhaps this is the source of the addition.

The omission of the exception (the case of the wife's misconduct) may be connected with the *Lex Julia de Adulteriis*, which enforced separation in such cases; at some time before Christianity became the religion of the Empire the death penalty was introduced in lieu of banishment, which appears to have been the punishment of the *Lex Julia*. Since the ordinary law dealt with this particular case, it could be omitted.

<sup>1</sup> Walter, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, § 522.

<sup>2</sup> *Antiquities*, xv. vii. § 10.

---

## Implications of the Fatherhood of God.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN DOUGLAS, M.A., EDINBURGH.

### I. FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CHRISTIAN.

THE call of God to men is expressed by many of His servants in these days in terms of problems to be faced and solved, of a challenge to be taken up, of service to be rendered. It would sometimes seem as if the Kingdom of God in the earth were set forth as the proper object of the soul's faith and devotion, and the Christian life seems to be conceived largely as a kind of 'doing one's bit' in the Divine war that is 'on' in the world. Jesus is the great and splendid Captain in the fight, and our generation is summoned to battle by the call, 'The royal banners forward go': 'who follows in His train?'

That a vexatious individualism in the type of Christian salvation preached and held as normally satisfactory for generations, produced or provoked this reaction of emphasis is no doubt the case. 'What must I do to be saved?' found a well-worn answer which drove men in upon their own souls

and there propounded for them their whole lifetime's problem, so that they rarely got outside that. Something like this, at any rate, is freely said. Incidentally, it is a bold assertion in the face of a great century of missionary expansion such as the nineteenth was, not to speak of the many kinds of reforming and philanthropic activity which sprang out of its warm evangelicalism. It was surely a wise voice which reminded a great modern audience that there was perhaps something more to be desired in a faith which achieves than in a 'faith that inquires.' This was said in suggesting a comparison between the Victorian period—to name the spectral name—and our own; and if we work back from great things done, and greatly done, to the things which brought them forth, may we not find factors which are being neglected or set aside but which we need to magnify to-day? Some years ago a speaker to theological students said: 'There are three great factors in life, God and the world and the individual'—the