

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

IT cannot be said that Professor Schmiedel's article on the Resurrection in the new volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* contains any surprise. It cannot be said that it contains anything new. Its importance lies in its being the latest word on the subject. We think that, after all the failures, someone will surely yet come and prove that Jesus did not rise again from the dead. We have so little experience of resurrection from the dead. We have so much difficulty in believing it possible. When faith in the Risen Christ has worked by love and borne fruit in our lives, we no longer expect the Resurrection to be disproved. But before that comes we do. And we turn to Schmiedel, as we have turned to so many before, thinking it quite probable that it has been done at last.

But it has not been done. Schmiedel is further from proving that the Resurrection of Jesus did not take place than any one of the bold unbelievers who went before him. For they have exhausted all the likely hypotheses. He cannot accept any of the hypotheses which they advanced. And he has not found a new one.

Nor can it be said that the article does Professor Schmiedel himself any good. It is hard to understand why he undertook it. He cannot start with the position that miracles are impossible.

He knew that he had no theory to account for the belief in the Resurrection. To whittle away certain parts of the narratives on the ground of inconsistency or the like, must now be an easy, but it can never be an entirely satisfactory operation with him. And for the rest he has left the matter as it was; while his own attitude is incomprehensible and his judgment somewhat discounted.

In the very first paragraph of his article Professor Schmiedel compels us to discount the value of his judgment. He begins by saying that the Resurrection of Jesus is held to be the central fact upon which the Christian Church rests. And then he states the three fundamental thoughts of the Christian faith which rest upon the Resurrection. These are (1) the belief that the death of Jesus was not the death of a malefactor, but a divine appointment for the forgiveness of sins and for the salvation of men (1 Co 15<sup>17</sup>, Ro 4<sup>25</sup> 6<sup>4-7</sup>); (2) a vindication of the supremacy of the exalted Christ over the Church (1 Co 15<sup>25f</sup>, Ro 1<sup>4</sup>, 2 Co 13<sup>4</sup>); and (3) a pledge of the certainty of an ultimate resurrection of all believers to a life of everlasting blessedness (1 Co 15<sup>18-20</sup> 6<sup>14</sup>, Ro 6<sup>8</sup> 8<sup>11</sup>).

Whereupon he endeavours to show that there was no agreement among the early Christians

regarding the first of these three thoughts. As early as the speeches of Peter in Acts, he says, the death of Jesus was looked upon as a calamity (Ac 3<sup>18-15</sup> 5<sup>30</sup>). It could not, therefore, he thinks, have been considered part of God's plan for the salvation of men, which was completed and confirmed by the Resurrection. But he admits that even in these speeches of Peter the death of Christ is spoken of as foreordained of God (Ac 2<sup>23</sup> 4<sup>28</sup>). And Paul was as ready as Peter to call the crucifixion a calamity when looked upon as the act of the Jews and their rulers. From the side of His murderers the death of Jesus was no less a calamity that from the side of God it was intended for the redemption of the world.

---

The story of Joseph is one of the greatest difficulties with which the Egyptologist has to do. And in the difficult story of Joseph there are lesser difficulties. One of these is the meaning of the name Zaphnath-paaneah.

---

The Pharaoh, we are told, made Joseph to ride in the second chariot which he had; and he also called his name Zaphnath-paaneah. The change of name causes us no surprise. From the example of Daniel and his three friends at the court of Nebuchadnezzar we are content to suppose that the changing of the name was an arrogant way which all those eastern tyrants worked with their slaves or favourites from afar. But why did the Pharaoh call Joseph Zaphnath-paaneah? What does that name mean?

---

Dr. Pinches accepts Steindorff's explanation. In his recent book—a book that is like to be smothered under its own interminable title; he calls it *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, and it cannot be curtailed in writing—Dr. Pinches says: 'Many conjectures have been made as to the true Egyptian form and meaning of Zaphnath-paaneah, but that of Steindorff "(God), the living one, has spoken," is un-

doubtedly the best of all.' And he cleverly compares the name of the well near which Hagar *the Egyptian* fell down exhausted when fleeing from Sarai, Abraham's wife: 'The well of *the living one* who seeth me.'

---

But Professor Naville will not have Steindorff's meaning. He has been writing on this name in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, and he counts it a fatal objection to Steindorff's meaning that it makes no reference to what Joseph was or what he had done.

---

Dr. Naville prefers to follow Erman. As long ago as 1883 Erman suggested 'Member of the College of Hierogrammatists.' And the only fault Dr. Naville finds with the suggestion is that it is scarcely definite enough and scarcely exalted enough for the honour that was manifestly intended to be conferred on Joseph. There were many Members of the College of Hierogrammatists in Egypt, it was not enough to make Joseph another. But if Joseph was made *Head* of that Sacred College his honours were complete. For then he was made Head of the sacred, as already he had been made Head of the secular, community in Egypt. He was made High Priest as well as Prime Minister. And this meaning Professor Naville gets out of the name by altering a single letter.

---

Now if Professor Naville is right, what effect has this on the determination of the date of the story of Joseph? For that is the question of importance. Dr. Naville himself says it has no effect at all. For the title we have a fixed date. It belongs to the twenty-second year of Osorkon II., the fourth king of the Twenty-Second Dynasty. But the College itself was certainly much older than that, one of the oldest institutions in Egypt. And it is not improbable that the title and dignity of Head of the College was very much older also.

---

With the exception of Professor Sanday, no

theological writer of England is so well known in Scotland as Bishop Gore. There is a certain expectancy about himself, and there is an air of sweet reasonableness about all his writing. If Presbyterianism has been roused to a defence of its Ministry and Sacraments, Bishop Gore has roused it. He represents a position that annihilates Presbyterian pretensions, but he comes to this conclusion so reluctantly and so illogically that reply is irresistible.

Till recently there were three great branches of Presbyterianism in Scotland; in each of the three branches there was a lectureship founded; and last year the lecturers with one consent, though quite independently, resolved to reply to Bishop Gore. That is to say, they all chose either the Ministry or the Sacraments or both; they were moved by Bishop Gore to make their choice; and they quote and confute him most of all. Principal Lindsay chose for the Cunningham Lecture, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*; Dr. Macleod chose for the Baird Lecture, *The Doctrine and Validity of the Ministry and Sacraments of the National Church of Scotland*; Mr. Lambert chose for his Kerr Lecture, *The Sacraments in the New Testament*.

After the surprise that Presbyterians care so deeply for their Orders and their Sacraments—some will take a long time to recover from that surprise—the next wonder will be, the wealth of meaning they find in both. But that is not the matter we mean to touch upon. It is something that stands over against that, as a wonder on the other side. It is the fact, brought out very clearly by Mr. Lambert, that in only one of his Epistles, and there for purely practical purposes, does St. Paul refer to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Is it possible, then, to make too much of the Supper? Ah, if we would make more of it, it would be well with us—if we would find more meaning in it and draw more spiritual nourishment out of it. But it does seem possible to make

the Supper too dominant in the life of worship, and too exclusive as the channel of grace.

Only in one Epistle does St. Paul speak of it. If it had not been for the misdemeanours of the Corinthian Church, he might never have referred to it at all. 'We are half tempted,' says Mr. Lambert, 'to echo the famous *O beata culpa* which fell from Augustine as he thought of that primal human transgression which led to the sending of the Only-begotten Son. But for the faults of the worldly and selfish Christians of Corinth we might never have obtained a single glimpse into the mind of Paul on the subject of the Lord's Supper.'

Nor even here does St. Paul give that place to the Supper which we should expect him to give. And when he spends his strength upon the exposition of the great truths of salvation, neither here nor elsewhere does he even mention the Eucharist in relation to them. It is not apparently in all his thoughts when he sets forth the two central ideas of his theology—the righteousness of God and justifying faith. It is apparently not once taken into account when he describes the life of progressive sanctification through the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Christian heart. Mr. Lambert quotes Bishop Gore. Bishop Gore speaks of 'the only sort of abiding which the New Testament suggests—the indwelling of Christ in the members of His Body, of which it is the glory of the Sacrament to be the earthly instrument.' But this is Bishop Gore and not St. Paul. St. Paul does not once mention the sacrament as an instrument for securing the indwelling of our Lord in the members of His Body.

A volume of sermons by the Rev. J. A. Stokes Little, M.A., has been published under the title of *Salt and Peace* (Stockwell, 2s. 6d. net). The curious combination is found in Mk 9<sup>40, 50</sup>, which is the text in the first sermon. The words (after the Revised Version) are, 'For every one shall be salted with fire. Salt is good: but if the salt have

lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another.'

What is this salt, and what has peace to do with it? Mr. Stokes Little, like a wise master-builder, goes back to the occasion. The disciples had come upon a man who was casting out devils in the name of Jesus. Like their successors in all time coming they were shocked. Was he casting out devils or only pretending to cast them out? He was casting them out. But 'he followeth not with us.' That was the cause of their displeasure.

Jesus said they should not be displeased. They must not expect everyone to adopt all the forms of their worship. The Spirit works sometimes among those that 'follow not with us.' The essential thing is that the Spirit be at work.

And He calls this presence of the Spirit, this evidence of His presence, *salt*. So salt here is not used for its preserving property. Salt does preserve. But to the disciples it was more familiar as a condiment, as an ingredient in food to make it palatable, just as it is most familiar to us. In the temple service salt was sprinkled on the sacrifice, not to keep it from decay, for it was eaten at once,—and, moreover, it was not flesh, but meal,—but to give it taste or flavour.

So salt is that which gives flavour. And the salt which gives flavour to a man's life is the Holy Spirit, who is here called fire. 'He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,' said the Baptist. Says Jesus similarly, 'Every one shall be salted with fire.'

It is the salt of the Holy Ghost that makes the man, not his following with us. If the salt have lost its saltness, no outward conformity will salt it. And more than that, it is not right for the disciples of the Lord to insist on outward conformity. Salt does not give every article of food the same taste.

The Holy Spirit does not turn all men into a uniformity of life or of worship. Recognize the Spirit under diversities of gifts and operations. 'Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another.'

There is another volume of sermons worth noticing this month. It comes from America. It is the third volume of a series issuing from the Presbyterian Board of Publication in Philadelphia. Its title is *The Power of God unto Salvation*. The author is Professor Benjamin Warfield of Princeton.

The sermon in Professor Warfield's book that arrests us most is the fifth. Its title is 'The Love of the Holy Ghost.' Under such a title we have read innumerable remarks in books on the Holy Spirit, amiable and undeniable, but they have stirred no thought and touched no emotion. Professor Warfield never writes unless he has something to say. He may be somewhat emphatic; he is never vague or commonplace.

His text is a striking one. It is James 5<sup>5</sup>. In the Authorized Version it reads, 'Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?' In the Revised Version, text and margin, various renderings are suggested. The one that Professor Warfield accepts gives a very different meaning from the Authorized translation. It is, 'Or think ye that the Scripture saith in vain, That Spirit which he made to dwell in us yearneth for us even unto jealous envy?'

That text, says Professor Warfield, asserts the Love of the Spirit. 'It is a declaration, on the basis of Old Testament teaching, of the deep yearning which the Holy Spirit, which God has caused to dwell in us, feels for our undivided and unwavering devotion.'

And it is a love of appropriation. Here lies the uniqueness of the passage, the value of the

new translation. The love of God as a jealous love is a familiar thought. Elsewhere, however, it is Jehovah whose jealousy burns unto envy, as He contemplates the unfaithfulness of Israel; or it is the Lamb of God, who cherishes the Church as a husband loves and cherishes his wife. But here it is God the Holy Spirit, dwelling within us, who yearns after us even to jealous envy. 'Surely,' says Dr. Warfield, 'this too is an inexpressibly precious assurance which we would fain, without doubting, embrace with hearty faith.'

But do we realize that the Spirit loves at all? We wonder and say, 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God.' We worship and repeat, 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?' But do we recognize the fact of the love of the Spirit? Do we find comfort in it, and power? We feel the lift of St. John's appeal, 'Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another.' We feel the force of St. Paul's declaration that 'the love of Christ constraineth us.' But what effect has the same apostle's entreaty, when he says, 'Now I beseech you, brethren, by the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God'?

And yet, if it is not improper to say so, the love of the Spirit is more wonderful than the love of the Father or the Son. For the Father and the Son love us from without, but the Spirit loves us from within. Of Francis of Assisi it is told that one day he was riding along in the first joy of his new-found peace, when suddenly 'at a turn in the road he found himself face to face with a leper. The frightful malady had always inspired in him an invincible revulsion. He could not control a movement of horror, and by instinct he turned his horse in another direction.' But the victory came. He sprang from his horse, and kissed the leper's hand. Next he visited the lazaretto itself and brought some brightness from the outer world into that gloomy retreat. At last he made the great renunciation, and went to dwell there.

This is the wonder of the Spirit's love. No leprous sores can be as foul in the eyes of the daintiest bred as sin is foul in the eyes of the Holy Ghost. We cannot conceive of the energy of His shrinking from its polluting touch. Yet he comes into the foul lazaretto of our hearts and dwells there,—permanently lives there, for the word that is used carries all that weight of meaning,—that He may cleanse us and fit us to be the Bride, the Lamb's wife.

If the conflict between Science and Theology is now at an end, what is the result of it? Has Science simply been routed? Has it been driven into some department of its own, and confined there? Or has it affected Religion? Are there things in Religion that are different now since the conflict with Science began?

There is one thing that is different. It is different with Prayer. We do not pray for temporal things as we did. We are slow to change our forms, whether in public worship or in private devotion; but when we think about it we shrink now from asking God to alter the weather for our sakes. Elijah was a man of like passions with us, and he prayed fervently that it might not rain, and it rained not. But Science has been here since Elijah's day. We cannot pray so fervently now that it may not rain.

We take comfort, no doubt, and say that there are many things left to pray for yet. But are there? If we cannot pray for rain, is there anything left to pray for? Our Lord said, 'All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them' (Mk 11<sup>24</sup>). That includes the weather. For there is no list of exceptions. And the moment we begin to make exceptions we turn the promise into ridicule.

Professor Moberly of Oxford has been preaching on Prayer, and he has published his sermons.

He has published them in a volume entitled *Christ our Life*. The volume was noticed on its appearance, but it deserves this additional reference, for the four sermons it contains on Prayer are enough to give it a place in the permanent literature of the pulpit.<sup>1</sup>

The words we have quoted from St. Mark are the text of Dr. Moberly's first sermon. He takes the words as they stand. He refuses to let us draw up a list of exceptions to the sweep of them. He refuses to let us water away their meaning. 'At the first sound,' he admits, 'they surround our imaginations, as with an air of fairyland; they seem to be something out of relation with the severities of the things that are—something out of relation with the necessary stringencies of a moral life.' But when we begin to limit, to qualify, to explain them, he pulls us up. For now, 'it is not merely some childish misunderstanding of the promise, it is the promise itself that is slipping away from us; the solemn declaration of Christ begins to mean nothing very definite or distinguishable; or, worse still, men find ground for pleasant mockery at the hollowness of a religious aspiration so transparently unreal.'

Professor Moberly pulls us up just when we are becoming pleasantly humorous over the absurd disproportion between the promise and what it accomplishes. 'Do the words mean what they say?' he asks, 'or do they not? Or what do they mean? If I ask for health, for wealth, for what not,—shall I receive it? Or what mental conditions are there which would ensure my receiving it?'

Now, however childlike a thing Prayer may be, it is not quite the childish thing we have sometimes considered it to be. Alongside the text from St. Mark, Dr. Moberly places one from St. James: 'Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss' (4<sup>8</sup>). So something depends upon the ask-

<sup>1</sup> These notes were written on the very day of Canon Moberly's early death. We did not know of it till the day after.

ing. There is a right and a wrong way of asking. There is asking aright, says St. James, and there is asking amiss. When our Lord said, 'Whatsoever ye pray and ask for,' He meant no doubt that we should pray and ask aright.

Professor Moberly takes an illustration. Here is a man, under pressure (it may be) of great anxieties, moved (it may be) by a great desire, who kneels down and prays urgently to God for certain special gifts or special deliverances. So far well. But what is his real attitude towards God? He thinks of himself as one person, with a mind and will of his own; he thinks of God as another. There are some things he can do for himself, but there are some things he cannot. God can do them for him. He kneels down and prays. He hopes that by His praying he may persuade God to grant him certain things which he cannot obtain for himself.

Is that Prayer? Dr. Moberly is lenient with such a man. He will not deny that even such a prayer as that has its place 'among rudimentary efforts of prayer.' But is it praying aright? The man has a will of his own. He knows what he wants. All he asks of God is to give him what he wants. The wisdom and the will of God may be otherwise. He has not considered or concerned himself with that. He does not seek to enter into the will of God. He does not endeavour to conform himself to God's will. He makes no appeal to the higher wisdom of God. He simply asks God to give him what he wants.

It is the appeal of a child to a father? Perhaps, but of a spoilt child to an indulgent father. It is an appeal to the love of God? Perhaps, but it is an appeal to His love against His wisdom. In reality it is an appeal, neither to the wisdom nor to the love of God, but simply to His power. The man has the will; God has the power: the prayer means, 'O God, may *my* will be done.'

Dr. Moberly fears we may call that a caricature.

He need not fear. Even our most intensely earnest prayer is often that and no more than that—an intensely earnest desire to bend the will of God and win it over to our own.

Now what would it mean to succeed in such a prayer? It would mean that the will of God would be overruled, that the will of God would fail, that the will of God would not be done in the earth as it is in heaven—if it happened not to agree with our will. Therefore the first necessity of prevailing prayer is that it be in accordance with the will of God. ‘Make Thy will my will, and my will into Thy will,’—that is its central petition. And with that Canon Moberly’s first sermon ends.

The second enforces what the first has proved. It shows us Christ at prayer. For the thought at once arises in our mind, If this is prayer and the only prayer, how can we pray at all? If we may not ask for things that we want, what is the use of praying?

Canon Moberly does not say that we may not ask for things that we want. He only says that we may not ask God to give us things that we want which He does not want to give us. He shows us Christ praying. When Jesus spent the long night through in prayer with God, are we to suppose that He was striving against God? In the garden of Gethsemane He prayed, ‘O my Father, if it be possible let this cup pass away from me’; and He added, ‘nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt.’ Are we to understand that first He prayed the Father to bend His will to something that was not His will, and that then, when He saw that could not be, He added, ‘nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt’? Was this prayer—the example and encouragement of all prayer—really two different prayers? Was it first an effort to change God’s will, and then, when that failed, an effort to be resigned to the failure?

‘Surely,’ says Dr. Moberly, ‘it was far other-

wise. Rather, the effort of His soul in that awful moment,—across all the inevitable shrinking of the flesh, across the deep horror and distraction of impulse which must form part of the undimmed consciousness of human life before the unnatural outrage of the knife of the murderer,—the real effort of His soul was one effort, single, consistent, and triumphant together. It was the final surrender and consecration of every impulse of necessary human shrinking, even from that death of inconceivable sacrifice. It meant, it was, not the defeat, indeed, or crushing, of human will, but its crowning simplicity, in perfect identification, perfect oneness, with the Divine. Was not this the real issue of that most victorious prayer—namely, that, in it, the will, even of human flesh, willed and chose for itself every unnatural detail of the agony, as voluntarily, as entirely, as did the will of God?’

But if this is Prayer, and only this, then, after all, Prayer has surely only a reflex influence on ourselves. Surely it is simply the means of bending our will into conformity with the will of God. What influence has it on the things around us? It may make us more submissive under our disappointment at the continuance of rain or the lack of it; but does it bring rain when we need it, or stop it when we have enough?

If it is not in accordance with the will of God, we shall not by Prayer compel Him either to give rain or to withhold it. But the prayer for rain or for dry weather is not in vain. For the will of God is not always done on earth. There are innumerable ways in which it is not done. In this human life of ours, with its endless catalogue of failure and sin, of intemperance and lust, of neglect, cruelty, or malice,—and their terrible entail of wasting and suffering, of disaster and death,—who can say that the will of God is always done?

And why is it not done? Because the will of man prevents it. For the will of man has power

to arrest the will of God. How otherwise could man be man? If God imposed His will on an unwilling subject, could that subject be a friend of God and love Him? If God insisted that His will be done whether man agreed or not, how could God and man come within sight of one another? How could man be man?

But when the will of God is thwarted in the earth by the opposition of the will of man, Prayer may remove the opposition. And then, if the will of God is that the blind see and the lame walk, the blind will see and the lame will walk. For the will of God is strong to heal. It only needs the consent of the will of man, that prevailing consent which carries power to heal not only on the person consenting, but upon others also. For it stems the powers of evil all around; it opens the

way to the power of God; and, in proportion to the fulness of its surrender to the will of God, distributes healing and blessing.

Prayer may not bring rain just when we ask it. That may not be the will of God. For the will of God is the wisdom of God, and rain may be no blessing just when we ask it. But if the rain is withheld through the obstruction to the will of God which the will of man can make, then Prayer will bring it. And so, as St. James has it, the fervent prayer of a righteous man—a man who bends his will to the will of God—availeth much in its working; it brings rain not on his own garden only, but as far beyond his own garden-gate as his entrance into the will of God arrests the powers of evil and lets the will of God be done.

## Hermann Schultz.

BY THE REV. J. A. PATERSON, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

By the death of Professor Schultz on 15th May the Theological Faculty of Göttingen University has lost one who served it long and well, and whose fame in English-speaking lands was second only to that of his former colleague, Albrecht Ritschl.

Hermann Schultz was born in 1836, and studied theology both in Erlangen and Göttingen. He had a distinguished career as a student; and, on finishing his theological curriculum, spent a year or two as a teacher in Hamburg. His natural aptitude for such work was so marked that in 1859 he was encouraged to return to Göttingen, where he became a *privat-docent*. While in that position he published, in 1861, an elaborate treatise on *The Presuppositions of the Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, which is still considered a work of importance, and is certainly a noteworthy production for so young an author. The promise it gave of future eminence in the theological world has been amply fulfilled.

It is a striking and convincing proof of his popularity as a professor that Dr. Schultz during

his professorial career was called to serve in no fewer than four universities. In 1864 he was elected to a professorship in Basle; and in the following year his own University of Göttingen conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Although his special department was that of Old Testament Literature the youthful professor did not confine his energies exclusively to that department, but also lectured for several sessions on New Testament subjects. So successful, as well as versatile, did he prove as a professor in the old Swiss town, that in 1872 he was called to the newly organized University of Strassburg, once more a German city. There, however, he remained only two years, when he was appointed to the famous University of Heidelberg. His stay in this most picturesque little town was equally brief, for in 1876 his own *Alma Mater* invited her brilliant *alumnus* to fill the Chair of Theology, an invitation naturally accepted with the utmost satisfaction.

For twenty-seven years Professor Schultz taught and preached in Göttingen with unflagging zeal,