

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE new session of 'The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study' commences next month. We have chosen the Books of Haggai and Malachi for the Old Testament, and the remainder of the Acts of the Apostles (xiii.—xxviii.) for the New. This completes in each case not merely a portion of Scripture, but a period of Sacred History.

The sole condition of membership in 'The Expository Times Guild' is the promise to study one or both of the appointed portions of Scripture between the months of November and June. That promise is made by the sending of the name and address (clearly written, with degrees, etc.) to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, at Kinneff, Bervie, N.B. There is no fee, and the promise does not bind anyone who, through unforeseen circumstances, finds it impossible to carry it out.

The aim of 'The Expository Times Guild' is the study, as distinguished from the mere reading, of Scripture. Some commentary is therefore recommended as a guide, though the dictionary and concordance will serve. Recent commentaries on Haggai and Malachi are not so numerous as on Zechariah. But Orelli's *Minor Prophets* (10s. 6d.) could scarcely be excelled for more advanced study, while Dods' *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi* (2s. 6d.) is more easily mastered and extremely useful. Archdeacon Perowne has a

volume on the same prophets in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* (3s. 6d.), and *Malachi* may be had alone (1s.).

Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, have again kindly agreed to send a copy of Orelli direct to any *Member of The Expository Times Guild* on receipt of six shillings.

For the study of the Acts, nothing new has appeared since last year. We may, therefore, again mention Dr. Lumby's volume in the Cambridge Bible (4s. 6d.), and Professor Lindsay's in the Bible Handbook Series, which is conveniently issued in two parts (Acts i.—xii. and xiii. to end, 1s. 6d. each), and is surprisingly cheap. For those who are ready to work on a Greek text, nothing can surpass Mr. Page's little book (Macmillans, 4s. 6d.).

As the study of these portions of Scripture advances, short expository papers may be sent to the Editor. The best of them will be published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and the writers, seeing them there, may send to the publishers for the work they select out of a list which will be given.

During the past session fewer papers than usual have been published. This is owing, not to any lack of papers or of ability in them, but to their length. Again and again, papers have had to be

rejected which would certainly have appeared had they been half their present length. We must recognise the fact, however, that some subjects cannot be adequately discussed within the limits we have to prescribe. We wish, therefore, this session to offer, in addition to the books sent for published papers, ten volumes for the best papers received during the session which exceed two columns of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in length. And inasmuch as many of the members of the Guild are laymen or ladies, five of the volumes will be reserved for them. The result will be published in the issue for August or September.

The *Guardian* does for the English Church what the *Times* does for the English nation. If the latter is our political, the former is our ecclesiastical thermometer. It is, therefore, a sign of the utmost significance, that the *Guardian* has recently shifted its attitude towards the criticism of the Old Testament. It is only a year or two since the High Church party, finding itself rent in twain over this question, was compelled to follow the leadership either of Canon Gore or else of Canon Liddon. Then the editors of the *Guardian* threw their influence on the side of Canon Liddon. But that is altered now. A few months ago, Mr. F. H. Woods was offered the leading corner in the journal for an exposition of the Code of Holiness (H.); the reviews of critical books are distinctly sympathetic; Canon Driver is regarded with favour; his latest volume has an appreciative and even cordial reception.

The reviews in the *Guardian* are not signed, but it is evident that in this case the reviewer is a scholar of some standing. He knows the subject committed to him. He is also in sympathy with Dr. Driver's attitude, though he preserves the atmosphere of a judge more than of an advocate. And he has taken pains to read the volume carefully. First of all, he points out how ripe we are in this country for such a series as the International Critical and Exegetical Commentary promises to be. 'The volumes of the *Cambridge*

*Bible for Schools and Colleges*, excellent as they are, are too slight and popular. The *Speaker's Commentary* as a whole can scarcely be regarded as a success. Indeed, in many parts of the Old Testament it is already hopelessly out of date.' And then he turns to Driver.

In size and appearance Driver's *Deuteronomy* corresponds very closely with the volumes of the International Theological Library, of which Driver's own *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* is the best known work. But in one respect he finds a marked improvement in the *Deuteronomy*. In the *Introduction* it was difficult to distinguish between chapters and verses in the reference to passages of Scripture. There is no difficulty now. Instead of Am. 3, 4. 8. 5, 8. 16. 17. 19. 9, 9., which requires a slight technical education to comprehend, we have Am. 3<sup>4</sup> 8 5<sup>8</sup> 16 17. 19 9<sup>9</sup>, which, even though it is new to us, a child can understand and a fool can scarcely err in. He points out some modifications in Dr. Driver's attitude, particularly in respect of the date of Deuteronomy, of which in the *Introduction* he said 'it is probable that its composition is not later than the reign of Manasseh,' but now it belongs 'most probably either to the reign of Manasseh or to the earlier years of the reign of Josiah.' Then, after referring to the skill with which Dr. Driver has made his book as useful to the learned as to the unlearned reader, he enters into the critical position itself, and discusses it at some length.

Other reviews of Dr. Driver's *Deuteronomy* have been read with interest. For it has no doubt been the book of the season, as the literary papers say. But besides that, there is its unique importance in relation to the question of the composition of the Old Testament, which is not only the greatest question of our day, but the greatest question that has arisen since the Reformation. It is, therefore, of more than passing moment to perceive into whose hands Driver's *Deuteronomy* has been placed by the *Guardian*,

the *Record*, the *Independent*, the *Methodist Recorder*, and the *Methodist Times*, not to mention the *Academy*, the *Times*, and the rest, whose attitude we knew already. Now it is a surprise to find that not one of these responsible religious journals has denounced the book, or even doubted its witness to the truth. The *Record* indeed, in its long and able review, is slightly less sympathetic than the *Guardian*. But the *Independent*, though it swung round somewhat sharply towards a more conservative position as soon as Mr. Herbert Stead left the editorship, has given Principal Chapman space for two long articles which Dr. Driver might have written himself. And, to mention only one more, the review in the *Methodist Times* over the initials J. S. B. (characteristically hiding the personality of one of the finest scholars of our time), while it indulges in no flattery, touches the points of dispute without dissent, and is 'conscious of a glow and warmth of feeling which was wanting in the rest of the author's famous works.'

If Moses would arise, as Samuel arose at Endor, and tell us what he really wrote, it is possible that we all should meet with surprise, while some of us would wish that we had been less positive. But that we dare not say it is the critics alone who would look foolish is proved by an incident which happened to Dr. Chase and is recorded in his newly published volume, *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (Macmillan. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net).

Dr. Chase was writing a book to prove that the text of Codex Bezae owes its peculiarities to translation from the Syriac. One of these peculiarities is found at Luke ii. 4, 5, where the clauses are transposed, and without any obvious reason. The ordinary text is this: 'And Joseph also went up from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth, into Judæa, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family of David; to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child.' But Codex Bezae puts the clause 'because he

was of the house and family of David' at the very end of the sentence.

Now Dr. Chase suspected that in the old Syriac text the clauses of the sentence must have been in the same order as they are in Codex Bezae, and that they were in that order because the Syriac represented Mary as well as Joseph as of the house and family of David. That is to say, he believed that the scribe of Codex Bezae had copied the order of his clauses from an old Syriac text, but not the reading of the text itself, and if ever the old Syriac text were discovered it would be found to say distinctly that both Joseph and Mary were of the house and family of David. Whereupon Mrs. Lewis returned from Mount Sinai with the 'New Syriac Gospels' as we call her find. And as soon as Dr. Chase was able to turn to this passage, he read: 'And also Joseph went from Nazareth, a city of Galilee, to Judæa—to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, he and Mary his wife while great with child, that there they might be enrolled, because that both of them from his house were of David.'

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July there appeared some Notes which touched upon the meaning of our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane. The interpretation was not new. As a writer in this issue points out, it was fully expounded long ago by Charles Finney. But it was adopted by writers of the ability and responsibility of Dr. Schauffler of New York and Dr. Clay Trumbull, the Editor of the American *Sunday School Times*. It was even given in that paper as an exposition of the lesson for Sunday school children. It seemed advisable, therefore, to direct attention to it. The Notes appear to have been read with unusual interest, and now it seems necessary to enter a little further into the subject.

But the voice of our Lord's 'strong crying' in Gethsemane was not intended to be heard in the street. We should not have chosen it for discussion even in a magazine of religious thought.

The discussion has come unexpectedly upon us. Let us therefore use the words with which Mr. Andrew Murray opens *his* discussion: 'Let us enter this holy place with hearts bowed under a consciousness of our ignorance, but thirsting to know something more of the great mystery of godliness, the Son of God become flesh for us.'

The interpretation in question may be repeated in a word. Christ prayed that 'this Cup' might pass from Him. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says that He prayed 'unto Him that was able to save Him from death, *and was heard*.' It is impossible, then, says Dr. Schauffler, that His prayer could have been for deliverance from the death on the Cross. Yet it was for deliverance from death. The death from which He prayed to be delivered was death there in Gethsemane. His soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death. He feared that His bodily frame might be unable to go through the agony that lay before Him. He prayed, not that He might be able to escape the Cross, but that He might be strengthened to live until He reached it.

This interpretation is not new, but it is undoubtedly novel. It is not the meaning one naturally takes out of the Gospel narrative, and as a matter of fact scarcely any competent expositor has found it there. It is not the Gospel narrative that has suggested it. If it had not been for the reference to the agony in Gethsemane of the Epistle to the Hebrews, such an interpretation would probably never have been thought of. No necessity for it would ever have been felt.

But the words of Heb. v. 7, 'Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared,' are not easy to explain. Dr. Robson asks why we should stop there. Well, go on to the next verse, 'though He were a son yet learned He obedience by the

things which He suffered,'—the explanation is not much easier. It is easy enough to take a general meaning out of the words. That is what Bishop Westcott advises us to do. 'For what did Christ pray?' he asks. 'Perhaps it is best to answer generally, for the victory over death the fruit of sin.' But it is hard to see why we must be content with a general meaning here when every other verse in the Epistle is clear and definite. Let us once begin to think of it, indeed, and a general meaning is impossible. We must believe that the writer had something quite definite in his mind, and that the words he uses are intended to convey that definite meaning to us.

'He offered up prayers . . . unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard.' He was *heard*. The word, when used in connexion with prayer, has always the one meaning that the prayer was granted. Luke i. 13: 'But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias, for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John.' Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane was heard, His petition was granted. It seems imperative to ask what the petition was. It is evident that the writer intends to tell us.

And he certainly seems to tell us that it was a petition to be saved from death. In spite of Westcott the expositors of the passage are quite unanimous in understanding him so. But what was the death He prayed to be saved from? The answer that must come first is, 'the death of the Cross.' And that answer is made even by one of the latest and best of the expositors of Hebrews. Says Mr. Rendall: 'Since every priest for man must be compassed with infirmity, and make offerings for sin, Christ in the days of His flesh offered passionate prayer, with human shrinking from death, and learned by suffering the obedience that belongs to man.' But that answer lay open to the use which Celsus and Julian were ready to make of it. Then Jesus, they said, is less than the least of His followers, for they go bravely to the death

He shrink from. It led Schleiermacher to doubt the genuineness of the whole scene; it seemed so out of keeping with the ideal that he had of Jesus, and with the farewell discourses in St. John. And it contradicts the narrative. Jesus was not saved from the death of the Cross. If He prayed for that, His prayer was not heard. 'The prayer of Christ,' says Dean Vaughan quite frankly, 'was not granted, if it was a prayer to be saved from dying.' And Dr. Joseph Angus says it is impossible that He could have prayed to be saved from death, for He came to give Himself a ransom for many.

But the answer is at once made: It was not the mere death of the body He dreaded. It was death on the Cross, certainly, but not such a death as any of His followers might have died there. Things were added to this death which never had been found in death before. Jesus had to endure not merely death, but a special death, death with a special and terrible penalty attached to it. He had to endure death with the burden of sin lying upon it, and giving it its sting. Not His own sin, for He had none. But worse far than that, the sin of the whole world. And when it is asked in what sense He could have endured the sin of the world, how He felt it, the answer is made, in the hiding of His Father's face. 'He knew,' says Dr. Saphir, and he admirably represents the current conception of this mystery,—'He knew that on the Cross as our Substitute He would be left to suffer in connexion with the judgment of sin; that His soul would be left without the light of the Father's countenance, and that which was His sole joy and strength, the very life of His life, would be taken from Him. He tasted that death of which sin is the sting and the law the strength. When He saw what was before Him—*death in its organic connexion with divine wrath*—He trembled and was in agony.' The italics are Saphir's own.

But the difficulty is not removed. Though it was death with all these burdens of terror, burdens too terrible for eternity to comprehend, still it was

death. He prayed to be delivered from death, and He was not delivered, His prayer was not heard.

So other explanations have been sought. One of the most unexpected is actually one of the earliest. The Fathers of the Church are almost unanimous in believing that the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane was not for Himself at all. The prayers of Jesus, they say, were intercessory always. This was intercessory also. But who He interceded for, they do not agree to say. Some will have it the Jews, some the disciples, and some the traitor Judas. It is not surprising to find that this interpretation is favoured by one of the most modern writers on the life of Christ. For Father Didon is a Catholic and cannot free himself from the past. But it is quite surprising that the Bishop of Durham should touch it with sympathy. For it surely is altogether incredible and untrue.

Is it possible, then, that His prayer was for resurrection from the dead? Yes, it is possible, says Dr. A. B. Davidson. And he even seems to think it most probable. He is not certain that Jesus *prayed* for a resurrection from the dead. 'The prayer being addressed to Him that was able to save Him from death, referred to death and salvation from it. And when it is said that He was *heard*, that must mean that His prayer was in effect answered. But it might be answered truly, though not quite as offered; that is, the answer might be given in His being raised from the dead, though the prayer was that He might not die.'

We rarely differ from Dr. Davidson, and we nearly always repent if we do. But even though Dr. Moulton of Cambridge is with him here, it seems impossible to agree. There is nothing we can think of that was clearer to the mind of Jesus than the resurrection from the dead. 'Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.' 'As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of man be

three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.' And the plain intimations to His disciples, which always ended with the words, 'And the third day rise again.' It does not leave any *reason* for the agony. He knew that He would rise again from the dead, and that on the third day. It was the latest of His promises to the disciples, 'Yet a little while and ye shall not see Me, and again a little while and ye shall see Me.' Is it possible that some sudden dread should have overtaken Him that He might not be able to fulfil that promise? It is not possible. For He chides the disciples with being slow of heart when they did not believe that it behoved the Christ to suffer these things, *and to enter into His glory.*

There is no man we know of who has handled this great subject so exhaustively as Steinmeyer. His *Passion and Resurrection History* is our classic upon it. Steinmeyer has an interpretation of his own, and he explains it very fully. Put into a word, it is this: Christ was made a curse for us. When that took place the apostle plainly tells us. It was when He was crucified; 'for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' But Christ was also made sin for us. It is the same apostle that uses the word. But he does not refer to the same occasion for its fulfilment. When and how He became a curse for us we are expressly told, but when He became sin for us 'is a question to which we have no answer to give, except to point to Gethsemane.' And he goes on to say, 'When the Father presented the Cup to Him, He intended Him to become sin for behoof of men; and when the Son said, Thy will be done, He had taken the sin of the world upon Himself in order to bear it, and by making expiation, to bear it away.'

This was an act of the Father, says Dr. Steinmeyer, and it came suddenly upon the Son in Gethsemane. Having no 'desire' Himself, no wish or will to transgress the commandment, suddenly there fell upon Him the pressure of a burden, the result of such a desire. It was the

burden of *our* lust and *our* transgression. And when He felt it He knew that it was the Father's sovereign act, He became 'amazed.' His soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. He prayed that this Cup might pass from Him.

Steinmeyer claims that this gives the agony in the garden an independent value which on the ordinary interpretation it does not possess. On the ordinary interpretation, he says, the agony is a mere reflexion thrown forward from the Cross. And either the agony or the Cross loses its independent value, or else Christ suffered the same torture twice. He claims also that it meets the difficulty of our Lord's obedience to the Father's will. He always did the will of Him that sent Him. But this is a special and sovereign act of will. It is suddenly and unexpectedly revealed to Him. He was always ready to do the Father's will, and even came for that end. Now He is ready to do it also. But it needs a special prayer; it needs strong crying and tears.

But Steinmeyer will not do. There is no excuse for separating these two phrases, 'He was made sin for us' and 'He was made a curse for us,' and giving them a different fulfilment. Again, if they refer to two different moments in Christ's passion, then He did suffer twice. He suffered the sin in Gethsemane, He suffered the curse on Calvary. And yet the sufferings were both on the same account. Then there is no explanation offered to us of the entering into the garden: He was driven by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. We have been accustomed to think that the same spiritual necessity found Him in the garden of Gethsemane. But if Steinmeyer's interpretation is right, He must have simply gone there, not *as* He was wont to do, but *because* He was wont to do it. He must have gone unintentionally to that place and then felt the agony come suddenly down upon Him. But the narratives are all against it. Further, Steinmeyer does not get over the difficulty about the answer to the prayer. He feels it. He rejects with scorn the

airy suggestion of Strauss that the narratives have 'an appearance of poetry rather than of history.' He says Christ prayed to be delivered from death. He says His prayer must have had an answer. But he fails in the end to show us the answer that it had.

So it is not an easy subject, and these answers will not do. Is there no answer then to be found? Assuredly there is. One original and reverent suggestion is made by a writer in this issue. Another may be offered after.

The present issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES commences the seventh yearly volume. The six volumes that are finished contain some conscientious writing. But what is done is as nothing to that which yet remains. Our subject is the Word of God as it is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. It is the greatest subject of human study (Alexander Pope notwithstanding). There never was so much interest felt in its study; there never were so many persons studying it. The aim of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES is to record the results of the study of the Word of God as they arrive, and to indicate, as far as may be, the direction in which they are leading us.

The regular features will remain. The 'Great Text Commentary' has now covered St. Matthew's Gospel, the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, and the First Epistle of St. John. With this issue it enters upon St. John's Gospel. The 'Guild' is already mentioned. The 'Index to Modern Sermons' is slowly working its way through St. Matthew, having long ago finished the Book of Genesis. Some of the leading specialists in various departments of biblical study have answered questions submitted to them, and their answers have appeared under the title of 'Requests and Replies.' That feature will receive yet fuller attention in the issues that are to come.

There is no other magazine we know of which gives so complete and prompt a record of our

contemporary theological literature. The notices are necessarily brief, but brevity is not a loss either to the author or to the reader if it enables the possible buyer to decide at once whether he ought to buy or not. And just that is the aim of the 'Literary Table' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. To the 'Books of the Month' we shall add an occasional Survey of Special Departments of Theological Literature — Recent Literature on Preaching; Recent Literature on St. Paul; Recent Literature on the Hexateuch, and the like.

Certain subjects of pressing importance will receive discussion by those who have made a special study of them. The earliest, as it happens, is perhaps the deepest we may touch—the Agony in the Garden. To this will follow Our Lord's Temptation in the Wilderness, upon which papers will be contributed by Professor Bernard of Dublin, Mr. A. E. Garvie, B.D., M.A. (Oxon.), and others.

Mr. Headlam has completed his study of the 'Theology of the Epistle to the Romans.' Now Professor Marshall gives us the 'Theology of Malachi' in two papers. He will be followed by Professor W. T. Davison dealing with the 'Theology of the Psalms.' And Dr. A. B. Davidson will then continue his articles on the 'Theology of Isaiah,' of which he has completed the first part, Isaiah i.—xxxix. Of 'Leading Theologians, their Personality and Influence, with a Bibliography of their published Works,' the next two will probably be Adolf Harnack by Mr. Macfadyen, and William Sanday by Mr. Vernon Bartlet.

Three articles will shortly appear by Professor Buhl of Leipzig, Delitzsch's successor, on 'The Abiding Value of the Old Testament'; and three by Mr. George Milligan of Caputh on 'The Doctrinal Gains of the Revised Version,'—an obvious but actually unworked mine. Mr. Macfadyen will indicate in two papers the present position of Christian Socialism; while Mr. Charles will go back to the Apocrypha, and with an unsur-

passed knowledge of the subject describe the doctrine of 'The Seven Heavens.' And there are single papers of much interest besides these.

But the two most promising features of our coming volume yet remain. They are a Poetical Translation of the Song of Songs, by Canon Fox

of Waiapu, New Zealand, and a series of articles by Professor Sayce on the Monuments as they illustrate the Old Testament. Professor Sayce will commence with the first chapter of Genesis and work his way onward, giving us an article every month. The first article will appear in December or in January.

## Adolf Harnack.

BY THE REV. D. MACFADYEN, M.A., ST. IVES.

THERE is no more interesting figure in the ranks of living theologians than that of Professor Harnack. Those who have sat in his crowded lecture-room at Berlin, or visited him in his book-lined study at Wilmersdorf, remember with a pleasure which is also an inspiration his vigorous face, knitted brows, and strong, unhesitating voice. Those who know him only from his books know him as a writer who never leaves his readers in doubt as to what he means, although a German. His reputation is that of a scholar who has not hesitated to deal with the great questions of Christian history with singular boldness and success.

There is not much personal history to tell in the lives of such men. Their biography is their bibliography, and this is very much the case with Professor Harnack. The bibliography which is appended to this article marks the course of his work; the dates and places of publication indicate the years of his migration from one professorship to another. There will be an interesting story to be written some day when the history of the controversy concerning the Apostles' Creed is told. In that controversy Professor Harnack has been forced into the position of protagonist against his will. He holds a position in German Church life not unlike that which Professor Robertson Smith was compelled to take in Scotland before sentence was pronounced against him. But the last blow has not yet been struck in this war of words and pamphlets, and the story of the conflict is already too long to be told fairly in a few words. Those who wish to know the details will find one side of the question fully dealt with in the three pamphlets on the

Apostles' Creed mentioned in the bibliography<sup>1</sup> (Nos. 31, 32, 33).

Professor Adolf Harnack is the son of Theodosius Harnack, Professor of Practical Theology in the University of Dorpat. His interest in Church history is a clear case of heredity. The father was the author of several pamphlets which deal with subjects since handled by his better known son. The son must have found his way very early into the theological atmosphere, which seems now to be the one entirely natural to him. He is still under forty-five, but has already been Professor of Church History at Giessen and Marburg, and is now at Berlin. His chair is the one made famous by Neander; and he is generally acknowledged to be, as Dr. Schaff calls him, 'the ablest of Neander's successors.'

As a lecturer he is singularly successful in carrying his audience with him. When the present writer first heard him he was lecturing twice daily, but he scarcely used a note. He was lecturing on early Christian institutions and on the history of dogma,—in one lecture dealing with a mass of details and patristic quotations, and in the next dealing with the abstruse questions of the theology of the Incarnation. It was difficult to say which set of lectures was most full of interest. In one there was an orderly marshalling of facts, and in the other a clearness of exposition which made him easy to follow, even in an unfamiliar tongue. The lecturer was never monotonous in voice, and

<sup>1</sup> A translation of Professor Harnack's pamphlet, *Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis*, by Mrs Humphry Ward, was printed in the *Nineteenth Century* in the autumn of 1893.