

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May will contain important papers on the late Dr. Delitzsch, and a valuable critical article by the Rev. Prebendary Whitefoord, Principal of the Theological College, Salisbury.

To the correspondents who have written to us on the subject of Bible Study, and to whom we soon found it impossible to reply by letter, we return our hearty thanks. Without exception, the suggestions made have been carefully considered. There are some of an enticing nature which only want of space prevents us at present from undertaking. Meantime there are two, recommended in some form by almost all, which we have resolved to enter upon.

I. REQUESTS AND REPLIES.—We acknowledge at once the difficulty of conducting such a department well; but we must also acknowledge the great need and demand there is for it. Our plan is this. We shall exercise our judgment, keeping in view the character of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as to the selection of requests to which replies shall be made. Then, such requests as can be answered by a reference to books at our command, we shall reply to at once. Others we shall either invite our readers to answer, or send to scholars who are specialists in the department to which they refer. Professors of Colleges and other Scholars have kindly consented to co-operate with us in this.

II. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES GUILD OF BIBLE STUDY.—Subjects will be named, covering a moderately wide range of study, upon which short papers may be written. The papers will be read

by competent authorities in the department of study to which they belong, and a choice of the best, say two or three each time, will be made. The object is to foster accurate study and the power of expression; and to enable students and the younger men in the Church to increase their stock of books. The publishers offer such volumes as Dorner's *Ethics*, Lichtenberger's *History of German Theology*, Orelli's *Commentaries*, Pünjer's *Christian Philosophy of Religion*. A list of books, from which a selection may be made, will be sent to those whose papers are judged the worthiest, and their names will be announced in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (except in cases where a contrary desire is expressed). The papers must be accurate and readable.

These two departments will be taken up in alternate months for the present. Requests will be received during April to which replies may appear in May. And on another page will be found the first series of subjects proposed for short papers. The papers upon them must be received by the 25th of April, and the report will be given in June.

Towards the end of his life, Dr. John Duncan—the great “Rabbi” Duncan, whose never-to-be-forgotten dictum on the Fathers was this: “I don't think Polycarp could have stood a theological examination by John Owen, but he was a famous man *to burn*”—Dr. Duncan sorrowfully confessed that he had been somewhat too much of a systematizer in theology. “I am very ignorant of the four Gospels,” he said in conversation once. “I

know Paul better; I know about Christ second-hand from Paul." Some of us would be proud if our knowledge of the four Gospels comprehended Rabbi Duncan's "ignorance." But as to the tendency to find Christ only in Paul, it is well that we should always be on our guard.

Professor Bruce believes that the warning is needed at the present day. "It seems to me," he said in his opening lecture at the Free Church College, Glasgow, this session, and now published in the *Theological Review*, "that the Church is only beginning to learn the right use of the Memoirs of the Lord Jesus. The tendency hitherto has been either to neglect these writings as practically superseded by more advanced presentations of Christianity, or to read into them the developed theology of Paul." He then reminds us that the "reading into" process may be practised by others besides the adherents of dogmatic theology; and he points out "a violent example of it" in a recently published work of Pfeiderer, the effect of which is that Paul becomes at last the *author* of Christianity.

If any of our readers will send us an interesting short paper on the best sermon they have heard, we shall gladly accept it at a fair remuneration. Says the Editor of the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*: We are bound to confess that by far the most faithful and home-thrusting, gripping, grappling sermons we have heard during the last quarter of a century were from prelates of the Established Church; sermons addressed directly and expressly to Oxford graduates and undergraduates; the one in the University Church, the other in St. Giles', Oxford. The former was by the late Bishop of London, on: "Ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears" (Heb. xii. 17). And the latter was by Samuel Wilberforce, from: "Fools make a mock at sin" (Prov. xiv. 9). The sermon which came next in fearlessly fear-arousing fidelity was also delivered in Oxford, in the University Church, by Dr. Pusey, from the very text which Wesley had selected for the same pulpit, about a hundred and twenty years before—the confession of poor

Agrippa: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

In some circles in England the discussion of the Higher (or Historical) Criticism of the Old Testament has, since the publication of *Lux Mundi*, and Canon Liddon's St. Paul's sermon on the other side, reached a tolerably acute stage. But in America it is already at fever heat. The battle is being fought in the pages of that scholarly Quarterly, *Hebraica*, and quite in the ancient style. Two champions have appeared, on either side one, and they are punctiliously observing all the knightly rules of courtesy, while at the same time they are dealing some vigorous blows. But there is an inequality in the combat. For Professor W. R. Harper of Yale, who has come forward as the champion of the Higher Criticism, declines to be held responsible for the opinions he presents, and professes merely to offer as good a statement as he can of that side; while Professor W. H. Green of Princeton, his antagonist, equally well equipped, a foeman, indeed, worthy of any man's steel, "writes with all the ardour of deep and strong conviction." This is taken by a writer in the *London Quarterly Review* as an evidence that the Higher Criticism is not generally acceptable among American scholars; and doubtless he is right.

The issue of Canon Driver's new book on the Hebrew text of Samuel reminds us that the Lower (or Textual) Criticism of the Old Testament has its problems also. This, however, is only beginning to be realized. Professor Harper, of whom we have just spoken, has a useful note on this coming subject in the February number of his *Old and New Testament Student*. The problem of Old Testament text-criticism is a peculiar one. There are no Hebrew manuscripts older than the ninth or tenth century A.D., that is to say, than 1500 years after the close of the Old Testament canon. The text of these MSS., called the Massoretic or the traditional text, shows a wonderful agreement in readings. There are few variations of the slightest importance. Now, in less than three centuries, the Greek MSS. of the New Testament showed tens of thousands of various readings. How is it, then, that after some fifteen centuries

there is nothing but agreement in the Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament ?

There are two schools of Old Testament text-criticism, and the answer made by the bolder school of critics is, that about the days of Hadrian one MS. was chosen (or formed) as containing the best text, and, the other varying MSS. having without exception been destroyed, it became the great archetype of which all the existing MSS. are a reproduction. This school of criticism, accordingly, freely uses the Versions to alter the existent text, believing that the Septuagint, the Peshitto, and the Vulgate, as they represent an earlier, represent also a purer text than the traditional or Massoretic. But a more conservative school of criticism looks upon the agreement of the existing MSS. as a proof of the correctness of the Massoretic text, and declines, except for good reasons, to accept alterations upon it on the authority of the Versions. There are some books, however, especially the books of Samuel, which contain unmistakable errors in the present text. And even in Isaiah and Jeremiah, Orelli, a conservative commentator, adopts changes in such passages as Isaiah xvii. 9, xxiii. 13, xlv. 12, liii. 9; and Jeremiah ii. 34, iii. 1, viii. 3, ix. 21, xi. 15, and xv. 13.

In a great sermon on the parable of the Prodigal Son, published in the *British Weekly* (February 28), Dr. Dale points out that this parable might have been more appropriately called "The Parable of the Elder Brother," as the point of it lies in the conduct of the elder brother. "But the early part of the parable," says Dr. Dale, "has so touched the heart and fascinated the imagination of the Church, that the point of the parable has been almost forgotten, and it has received its name, not from the elder brother, of whom our Lord spoke in order to rebuke the Scribes and Pharisees, but from the prodigal son who was received by his father with such generosity and delight." This is most true, and preachers should be on their guard against what is undoubtedly a misapprehension of the purpose for which the parable was spoken. There is something more than

incompleteness in a sermon that ends with the prodigal's return (verse 24). And yet we could name quite a number, preached, published, and praised, that undertake to expound the parable, and end before the point of it is reached. The great illustration of this parable is in the same Gospel, and, like the parable, found nowhere else—Luke vii. 36–50. The woman that was a sinner in the city is the prodigal, Simon the Pharisee is the elder brother, and the point and the purpose of the story are identical.

It is by keeping well in mind the purpose for which Christ spoke this parable—at once to show up and to rebuke the hard unrighteousness of the self-righteous Pharisees—that we shall avoid the numerous misapplications of it that are abroad. Dr. Dale quotes one of these from the report of a recent sermon on "Forgiveness." It is the common and very plausible argument that in this account of the sinner's restoration to the favour of God there is not a word about satisfying divine justice, not even a word about the sinner's faults being laid on another; that, on the contrary, the prodigal bears the fruits of his sins himself, and on simple repentance is frankly forgiven, and restored to his Father's favour. The argument has something in it if Christ's purpose in telling this parable was to describe the means and method of the sinner's restoration to God: nothing at all if His purpose was to contrast the *reception* which the sinner receives from God with that which the Pharisees would give him.

We are arranging for a series of articles on the teaching of theology in various colleges. Meantime we have met with a readable paper in the *Old and New Testament Student*, by a Cambridge graduate, with which we shall open the series this month. Professor Lewis Campbell, of St. Andrews, has contributed two papers to the *Scots Magazine* on the wider subject of the University Curriculum, a subject with which we have not here to do; but we mention it to note the fact that he would give Oriental languages a place amongst Art subjects. "If young men," says he, "were encouraged to begin Hebrew during their Arts course, a much

firmer groundwork would be laid than at present exists for the understanding of questions of Old Testament criticism by the clergy. But the interest of Semitic studies, as now-a-days pursued, is by no means limited to the clerical profession. Hebrew, with its two branches, Aramaic and Arabic, commands a field of investigation which, to the inquirer of to-day, reveals an ever-widening horizon."

The Rev. H. A. Paterson, M.A., of Stonehouse, sends us a most interesting expository note on the important words, "Buried with Christ in baptism" (Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12). We wish we could have given it in full, but we must be content to present the main points of it. Mr. Paterson insists first upon a correct translation. He shows that in an essential particular both our versions are faulty: they give no equivalent for the article (τοῦ) found in the Greek. Now there are many places where the article is translated by the possessive adjective. Thus in Rom. ii. 18, "Thou knowest *His* will," where the word rendered "his" is the simple article (γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα). Mr. Paterson holds that it should be so translated in Rom. vi. 4. He would therefore render, "We were buried together with Him by His baptism unto death" (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον). Thus the baptism of which the Apostle speaks is Christ's "baptism unto death" upon Calvary ("I have a baptism to be baptized with"); and the believer, yielding himself to Christ in faith, becomes so identified with Him, that he is condemned, crucified, and buried together with Him; quickened, raised up, and glorified together with Him.

In Col. ii. 9-12 St. Paul reasons precisely as in Rom. vi. 4. He there tells the Gentile Christians of Colosse (who never underwent circumcision in their own persons), "Ye were circumcised *in the circumcision of Christ*," i.e. His circumcision was yours. In other words, by becoming Christians you have been so identified with Christ, that what is true of Him is true of you. This thought the apostle expands throughout the whole passage, thus: In Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and ye have been filled full in Him; "in whom also (ἐν ᾧ καὶ) ye were circum-

cised in the circumcision of Christ; being buried together with Him in His baptism (literally, as in Rom. vi. 4, 'in the baptism'); in whom also (ἐν ᾧ καὶ) ye were raised together with Him." That is to say, ye were circumcised along with Him on the eighth day of His earthly life, buried along with Him on the last day of His earthly life, raised along with Him on the first "Lord's Day," and are now seated along with Him in the heavenly places.

Besides giving an equivalent for the article in the above passage, Mr. Paterson differs from the Revised Version in another particular. He prefers "in whom also" to "wherein." That is to say, he takes the pronoun to be masculine and to refer to Christ, not neuter and to refer to baptism. He is perfectly entitled to do so. He then adds that if this same expression (ἐν ᾧ καὶ) is so rendered where it occurs in another passage of great perplexity (1 Pet. iii. 19), it makes all plain. It will then read: If ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye . . . for Christ *also* once suffered for sins . . . that He might bring *us* to God . . . in whom also He (that is, God) went and preached *to the men of Noah's day*, now spirits in prison, awaiting the judgment day for disregarding that preaching. The same form of expression St. Paul uses when he tells the Ephesians, "He (Christ) came and preached peace to you who were far off," though in His earthly ministry Christ never visited Ephesus.

A correspondent of the *Methodist Recorder* complains that his minister does not look to see how his text goes in the Revised Version before making use of it. Only on Sunday morning, he says, a preacher, well known throughout the Connexion, took for his text 2 Pet. i. 3, which, in the Old Version, reads: "Through the knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue," and proceeded to discourse eloquently of the destiny and privileges of Christians. But the Revised Version reads: "Through the knowledge of Him that called us *by His own* glory and virtue," which is a totally different idea. We certainly hold with the correspondent that a preacher should know

what his text is about before he preaches from it, and, if he cannot do more, ought at least to consult the Revised Version, that in the mouth of two witnesses which every man can use the words may be established. But is he sure that the preacher would have changed his sermon even when he found that he was using a mistranslation? He admits that the sermon was "very good in itself," and it is true that we *are* called to virtue and glory; if it is not in this text, it *might* be, and the text may still stand as at least a motto for a "very good" sermon—may not the preacher have argued so? Preachers do argue so every Sunday, or act

so without argument, but we do not think they are justified. If the truth of the sermon is in Scripture, we think they ought to find the Scripture and make that their text. If it is not in Scripture—well, we do not believe there is time to preach it. On this very text we had the curiosity to turn to a sermon which we remembered by Dr. Maclaren, and we found that, though preached in Shoreditch Tabernacle to a large congregation of such as would gather there, he not only used his text correctly, but took pains to explain what the proper translation of it was, and the "deeper thought still" that lay in the new version.

The Study of Theology at Cambridge.

BY A CAMBRIDGE GRADUATE.

It is the aim of this article to give some account of the work done in theology at Cambridge under the guidance of the various teachers appointed by the University and the different Colleges.

A glance at the syllabus adopted by the special Board of Divinity for the present year is sufficient to show that theology is by no means a neglected study. In addition to the six University professors, no fewer than eighteen college lecturers are offering their services in the different departments of theological work. The courses arranged for are about sixty in number, the average attendance at which will vary from three or four hundred down to the twos and threes occasionally to be found, who are proof against the dulness of a third or fourth-rate lecturer. And besides these, there is that very important factor in Cambridge University life, the "Coach." Often the ablest men devote themselves to this kind of work, and the average undergraduate, provided his means allow, could not generally do better than place himself as soon as possible under the guidance of a competent "Coach." Otherwise he may lose much of his time in aimless and desultory reading. This is a serious danger. There is too much choice left to the ardent but uninformed freshman, and often the first two or three terms are thrown away.

The number of men who study theology is considerable. The Theological Tripos cannot indeed yet vie in numerical importance with the Classical or Mathematical or Natural Science Triposes, but a very fair number enter for it, and a still larger number attend some of the theological lectures. Many make it their special subject for the final examination for the ordinary degree; and others who intend to take orders in the Church

of England find it to their advantage to take up some of the courses, as by so doing they are excused parts of their "Bishop's examination."

Most of the lectures are framed with a view to the requirements of the Tripos, and it will therefore be best to state briefly the range of subjects included therein, at the same time endeavouring to estimate the relative value of the work done in the different sections. These may be described as Old Testament, New Testament, Church History and Doctrine.

1. *Old Testament*: which includes the history of the chosen people to the time of Christ, their literature, politics, and theology with special reference to a given period; translation from the historical books, of which two are generally selected for more careful study; Hebrew grammar and composition; history of the Text and Canon.

The papers set are mainly grammatical and historical in character. The questions raised by recent criticism are barely touched upon, and very good papers might be done by those ignorant even of the existence of the Wellhausen school. This conservatism is characteristic of all the work done in the Old Testament. It is careful and scholarly, and presents a striking contrast to the bolder critical methods represented at Oxford. The Hebrew scholars at Cambridge have nearly all been made by the Rev. P. H. Mason, President and Hebrew lecturer of St. John's College. No one who has come into contact with Mr. Mason can doubt the accuracy and thoroughness of his scholarship. There is no greater Hebraist in this country. And yet we cannot help wishing that he was something more than merely erudite. It may not indeed be well for the student of the Hebrew language to