

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WITH this issue we begin our second volume. Let us greet with hearty thanks the able editors who have welcomed us so generously, and the readers who have approved that welcome. Our circle of friends is now considerable, and it is enlarging month by month: we shall do our endeavour in the months that are before us to make the friendship true and lasting.

For the binding of the first volume the publishers have prepared a cloth case which strikes us as so much better than anything likely to be got otherwise for the money, that we think it right to recommend it here. It is dark green, with clean cut titles, and shield monogram on the back.

There is at present a wide and earnest desire for the means of systematic and scientific biblical study. We have had abundant evidence of it sent us in the past year. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES GUILD was entered upon in consequence. But we knew from the first that we should have to develop that scheme; and now, in an announcement which will be found on another page, we advance a step further. Let every one who is interested in the subject of Bible study send us a post-card; name the book you wish studied; recommend some manual on it if you can; and, especially, name some scholar or scholars whom you judge capable of writing on it.

A copy has been sent us of the *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung* of August 2. It contains a translation of the article on Delitzsch, contributed to
VOL. II.—I.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by the Rev. G. Elmslie Troup, M.A., which appeared in our issue for May. The translation is entitled "Eine englische Stimme über Frz. Delitzsch's theologisches Wirken."

Reviewing Lichtenberger's *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, in a recent number of the *Churchman*, Dr. Plummer of Durham recalls the famous sermon of Dr. Tatham, Rector of Lincoln, preached before the University of Oxford in defence of the spurious passage about the heavenly witnesses in 1 John v. 7. The discourse lasted two hours and a half, and was fatal to at least one Head of House, who never recovered the ill effects of the long sitting. It was in the course of this unfortunate sermon that Dr. Tatham, standing in a University pulpit, enthusiastically wished "all Jarman critics at the bottom of the Jarman Ocean." That is ninety years ago; but there are still, says Dr. Plummer, "a considerable number of people to whom 'German criticism' is a sound which inspires them with suspicion, if not with horror; and there are very many more, who, without sharing these prejudices, are, nevertheless, altogether at sea as to what has been done by German scholars in the sphere of theology during the present century, and to whom nine out of ten leading names are names and nothing more, conveying no meaning as to the tendencies, sympathies, or achievements of the persons who bore them."

Dr. Plummer says that we can well afford to give up both our prejudice and our ignorance, for

the progress of theological learning in England during the last five-and-thirty years has a great deal more than equalled the progress made in Germany during the same period. And now he believes that we can hold our own with the best of them, for "it is true that England at the beginning of this period had much more to learn than Germany; but it is also true that she had much less to unlearn."

In Sedgwick's *Life and Letters*, just issued by the Clarendon Press, one of the best books of the month, there is an amusing illustration of this comparison made by Dr. Plummer between English and German theologians. It is a geologist's book; for Adam Sedgwick, though by nature a theologian, was turned by circumstance into a geologist, and made his fame thereby. The circumstance was the singular one of his appointment to the Woodwardian Professorship of Geology at Cambridge, when he knew nothing about the subject. His own explanation of it is this: "I had but one rival, Gorham of Queen's, and he had not the slightest chance against me, for I knew absolutely nothing of geology, whereas he knew a great deal—but it was all wrong." He did not disgrace the appointment. "Hitherto," he is reported to have said, "I have never turned a stone; henceforth I will leave no stone unturned."

The great topic since our last, in daily, weekly, and monthly, has been John Henry Cardinal Newman. Many strange things have been said, some unexpected disclosures made, and altogether the subject deserves the interest it has created. But it is not over yet. We shall wait a month, and then see what the gain has been. On the whole, *Nil nisi bonum* has prevailed; so that Adam Sedgwick's comment on the secession, though it probably expressed the average Englishman's opinion at the time, appearing just at this time has something incongruous about it. What Darwin remarked as to his attitude towards natural selection—"Poor dear old Sedgwick seems rabid on the question"—may almost be said of his attitude to Newman's secession also. His comment was: "Shame on them that they did not do so long since! Their attempt to remain in the Church of England while they held opinions such as they

have published only proves that fanaticism and vulgar honesty can seldom shake hands and live together. I pity their delusion, I despise their sophistry, and I hate their dishonesty."

Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority* is declared to be a success commercially. Not such a success as it would have been had not the phenomenal run of *Lux Mundi* preceded it. But a greater success than it deserves to be. For, as Dr. Sanday remarked in his review of the book in our last issue, as far as positive results are concerned, there is no comparison between it and the truly great books which went before it, *Types of Ethical Theory* and *A Study of Religion*. Surely something of this success is due to the shoreless ignorance of recent German theology which Dr. Plummer deplotes. No one wondered that *Robert Elsmere* was a success, notwithstanding the weakness of its New Testament criticism. But here is a new *Robert Elsmere*, with the same confidence, and nearly as much romance, which, however, is nothing if it is not scientific criticism, and on that supposition is passing into an extensive circulation. But it offers one advantage; it challenges reply, and will receive it. In a recent number of the *Evangelical Magazine*, Professor Kennedy made out an effective contrast between the position of this new Unitarianism and the old Unitarianism of Dr. Channing. Dr. R. W. Dale, in the *Contemporary Review* for September, passes its critical processes through a searching examination. And we hope we shall soon be able to offer another criticism ourselves from the pen of an accomplished Scotch scholar.

The Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review of August 30, contains a paper by the Rev. R. W. Harden, B.A., on the words, "The Lord is at hand" (ὁ Κύριος ἐγγύς)—Phil. iv. 5. The interpretation of these words, almost universally adopted, is that they refer to the nearness of Christ's Second Coming. Mr. Harden holds that they express the nearness of our Lord now. They are, in fact, St. Paul's translation of "I am with you always." We have not read an exposition which was conducted in a better spirit, or with a more truly scientific method. This is how the New Testament should be studied; such a method, patiently and reverently pursued, will make a man

a New Testament scholar indeed. We believe that, against almost all the expositors, Mr. Harden has made his point; but that is a small matter in comparison with the example he has given us how to prove all things in New Testament interpretation and hold fast that which is good.

Mr. Harden is not absolutely alone in his interpretation. After writing the note, a sudden recollection made us turn to Principal Moule's little book, *Thoughts on the Spiritual Life* (London: Seeley, 1s.), and there it is: "Let your moderation be known unto all men: the Lord is at hand." After speaking of the blessing of being a "moderate" in this sense, he says: "And would we read something, in this same verse, of its heavenly *secret*? It lies before us: 'the Lord is near.' He is near, not here in the sense of coming soon, but in that of standing by; in the sense of His presence, and the 'secret' of it, around His servant. The very words used here by St. Paul occur in this connection in the Septuagint (Greek) translation of the Old Testament, a translation old even in St. Paul's time: 'Thou art near (ἐγγύς), O Lord'—Ps. cxix. 151. The thought is of the calm and overshadowing of His recollected and realized presence; that divine atmosphere in which bitter things, and things narrow with the contractions and distortions of self, must die, and in which all that is sweet and loving lives."

The August issue of the *Homiletic Review* contains an exposition by Dr. Howard Crosby, under the title of "Christ our Passover." He maintains that the word "sacrifice," whether as verb or substantive, always expresses the idea of punishment and destruction, and never the idea of a gift. The verb (θύω) is used of the Passover Lamb three times in the New Testament, Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7. In all other places it is used in the general sense of "sacrifice," or it simply means "to kill," as in Matt. xxii. 4, "My oxen and my fatlings are killed (τεθυμένα)." The substantive (θυσία) occurs twenty-nine times, and is always rendered "sacrifice." In Heb. viii. 3, and elsewhere, it is directly distinguished from "gifts." The idea of "sacrifice" being a gift to God, the expression of the offerer's gratitude is therefore not in the word, but an import from pagan thought.

Of course Dr. Crosby remembers the *bloodless* offering, which was the gift of a worshipper reconciled by the bloody sacrifice, and who thus as a child could offer a gift to his father.

If "killing" rather than "presenting" is the essential element in the word "sacrifice," there are some passages which are popularly misunderstood. One of these is Rom. xii. 1, "That ye present your bodies a living sacrifice." The idea is not that we present our goodness to God in self-consecration, but that our *sins* ("the body of this death"—Rom. vii. 24) are to be presented for destruction. So "the sacrifice and service of faith" on the part of the Philippians, in which Paul would have a part by being poured out as a libation on it (Phil. ii 17), was their faith bringing their sins to be destroyed through the great sacrifice of Christ. And, again, the things sent by these Philippians to Paul through Epaphroditus were "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18), not because they were a gift to God, but because they were an instance of their condemnation of sin and assertion of love, the foundation of which was the great sacrifice of Christ.

We gladly mention a little book by Dr. Howard Crosby, which has just appeared (*The Seven Churches of Asia; or, Worldliness in the Church*. By Howard Crosby. London: Funk & Wagnalls, 3s.) It is not an exposition pure and simple, and we do not always approve of its interpretations, (notably in regard to the "hidden manna" and the "white stone"), but it is the work of a tried expositor, and its subject is one which demands careful expository work more than most. Dr. Crosby has left something for other reapers; but he has brought home many ripe sheaves.

The first number of the new Literary and Theological Quarterly, under Dr. Salmond's editorship, is to be very strong. It will contain contributions by Principal Fairbairn, Principal Rainy, Professor Driver, Dr. Alfred Plummer, Dr. Hutchison Stirling, Professor A. B. Davidson, Professor Marcus Dods, Professor Candlish, Dr. Stalker, Rev. G. A. Smith, and several others whose names are held in high repute.

The mention of Dr. Hutchison Stirling's name recalls the fact that when he was appointed to the Gifford Lectureship by the University of Edinburgh, men were heard asking, Who is Dr. Hutchison Stirling? They were not specialists in philosophy who put the question; but to hear it put by persons who had any literary knowledge at all was startling. Dr. M'Cosh of Princeton has a paper in the third number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* on "Kant and his Recent Commentators," and when he reaches Dr. Hutchison Stirling's "Introduction," he says: "Dr. Stirling is a stalwart and strong-boned (metaphysically speaking) Scotchman. His style reads as if it were modelled on that of Thomas Carlyle; yet I am not sure that he copies his Scoto-German countryman. The resemblance may arise from both in their youth speaking lowland Scotch, which has more affinities with German than the English tongue has, and from their being led by their admiration of German thinking to adopt the powerful style of Deutschland. I have often wondered how it is that Dr. Stirling has not been called to some chair of Philosophy in Scotland, England, or America. I have an idea that this neglect has been caused by a fear on the part of academic authorities of his leading his pupils into the woods and wilds of Hegelianism. I am glad to find that he has been called to deliver lectures on Natural Religion on the Foundation of a lately deceased Professor in Edinburgh. It is the first recognition of his great abilities by College authorities."

There has been a long run of correspondence of unusual interest in the *Record*, under the heading of "Keswick Teaching," to which Canon Bell, Principal Moule, and Mr. Meyer, among others, have contributed. The discussion has thrown out branches in several directions, as discussions are apt to do; but the real question has been pointedly expressed by the Rev. W. Barry Cole in the issue of July 11. In "A Child of Faith in an age of Doubt," Andrew Bremner uses these words: "On my way, pondering on what I had been hearing, I was enabled to see that I had just to accept the gift of more holiness as I had accepted the gift of salvation." Mr. Cole doubts if that is

sound scriptural teaching; Canon Bell doubts it also. Principal Moule, we think, accepts it as the teaching of Keswick.

In another letter, contributed to the *Record* of August 15, Mr. Cole enumerates five points as the truths, or aspects of truth, which are, he says, specially emphasized at Holiness Conventions. They are these: (1) There is a certain "sphere," "condition of soul," "attitude," or "position," which may be attained instantaneously by faith. (2) So long as this "attitude" is maintained, the tendency to sin, which exists in all, is effectually held in check. (3) Those true Christians who have not by faith attained hereunto are experimentally ignorant of the "liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." (4) In seeking this "blessing" by faith we must not expect any immediate sense of inward joy at its realization, but must hold on to the belief that it is ours, whatever our feelings may be; and eventually, it may be very soon, or it may be after long waiting, the soul will be consciously filled with the Holy Ghost and with power. (5) A definite act of personal consecration—provided there be no reserve, and we be entirely emptied of self—is sure to be followed in due course by this special "blessing."

In the *Christian*, also, the teaching at the Keswick Convention has been under discussion, though in much smaller dimensions. Here, however, in the issue of August 22 may be found one of the most fruitful letters of the whole. An anonymous correspondent having expressed his belief that the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peplow was accustomed to draw a distinction between the three words "faith," "trust," and "confidence," Mr. Webb-Peplow promptly replies that he does so, the distinction being scriptural. "Three words are used in the apostolic writings, viz. *pistis*, *pepoithēsis*, and *parrhēsia*, (*πίστις*, *πεποιθήσις*, *παρρησία*), which, as every scholar knows, have totally different meanings; and these words are rendered as I gave them, in, for example, Eph. ii. 8 (*pistis*, "faith"), 2 Cor. iii. 4 (*pepoithēsis*, "trust"), and 1 John ii. 28, and iv. 17 (*parrhēsia*, "confidence" and "boldness"). The distinction is most important, and deserves fuller exposition, which we hope to offer shortly.

The *Contemporary Review* for September has an enthusiastic article by Professor Sayce on Mr. Flinders Petrie's recent excavations in Palestine, to which we referred last month. He believes that Palestine exploration has only just begun. "The explorer," he says, "who will devote himself to the labour, as Sir A. H. Layard devoted himself to Nineveh, and Dr. Schliemann to Troy, will obtain

results as marvellous and far-reaching as those obtained by Layard and Schliemann. The former story of Palestine has not been obliterated from its soil, as has often been imagined; on the contrary, it is indelibly impressed on the stone and clay which that soil still holds in its bosom. We have dug up Homer and Herodotus; we shall yet dig up the Bible."

Ritschl — Lightfoot — Hatch.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL RAINY, D.D.

THE three names which head this paper are connected together by the fact that death took them all from us within a few months. A fourth might have been added,—that of Delitzsch,—as eminent and as attractive as any of the others. But to say a fitting word of the other three is a task more than sufficient for the limits I must observe.

I begin with the most remote, and therefore with Ritschl. Ritschl was best known as an independent thinker in dogmatic theology. As such he made a deep mark, and rallied to himself a school of resolute disciples. His teaching raised great issues; for in addition to technical dogmatics, it involved a specific conception of the idea of the Christian life, and of the forces on which that depends. It was connected also with views of the history of theology, and of the relation of Reformation theology to his own dogmatic, which created lively debate. But he was not confined exclusively even to this wide field. When we go back a little in the history of his life, we find him active in investigations belonging to a somewhat different region.

No doubt the dogmatic questions were in his view from the first. In the preface to the first volume of his large book on the Justification and Atonement, which was published in 1870, Ritschl spoke as follows: "Almost thirty years have passed since, in the third semester of my academical studies, I became clear upon this, that with a view to my theological culture I needed, above all else, to come to an understanding of the doctrine of the atonement. I endeavoured at the time to obtain special guidance towards this goal; I did not find it in the form I needed; and now, after connected investigation of the later German theology, I perceive that I had no ground to expect at that time from any one fruitful guidance towards the solution of the problem. Other objects meanwhile forced themselves upon me as matter of scientific effort. After I had brought these to a close, as far as I was concerned in them, I took up again independently the question of my younger days."

The objects which forced themselves upon him were the questions connected with the earliest history of the Church. Those were the days in which the great debate created by the Tübingen school was in full progress. Ritschl became involved in it, because he felt the necessity of coming to a conclusion regarding questions so nearly touching the life of Christianity. At first the speculations of Baur and his followers acquired a great ascendancy over him, and he published in 1850 a volume, *Die Alt Katholische Kirche*, which bore very plainly the marks of this state of mind. The positions of the Tübingen men were contested in various details, but no clear or thorough-going principle as to the way of conceiving or construing the history was attained or expounded. The book embodied, therefore, rather the Tübingen position, with qualifications, than the defence of any distinct alternative. Further reflection and study led him to adopt new points of view. In 1857 (after seven years) a second edition appeared. The general arrangement was not much altered. But the author could declare that the book, from the foundation upwards, had become a new book. This second edition of the *Alt Katholische Kirche* I have always regarded as a very instructive and useful work. Ritschl's native aptitude for dogmatics is skilfully applied to the early movements of theological opinion in the Church. The book does better service than any I know in the way of making plain the historical mistakes into which Baur fell in his conception of the Church parties of the apostolic and post-apostolic time. It is still an excellent work to read for the purpose of acquiring insight into the earliest Church history, and the relations of the post-apostolic to the apostolic age. I think it is possible to trace to its influence important elements in Lightfoot's historical views; and I could hardly pay any book a higher compliment.

But this, after all, was only an episode. In the year in which the second edition just referred to was published, 1857, Ritschl returned to the sub-