

## The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

### REPORT.

THE greater number of papers received this time are expository. Only two theological and two literary are to hand. This is not unexpected, and we take it as a guide for the future. No doubt the most pressing as well as the most profitable work is direct exposition. We have put the theological and the literary papers together into one report, but have separated the papers of New Testament exposition into two. Several correspondents have written to say that the difficulty and magnitude of the subjects proposed have prevented them from sharing in the benefits of the Guild. We have therefore made our new scheme (which will be found on p. 70) more comprehensive.

#### OLD TESTAMENT EXPOSITION.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, M.A.

I have marked the papers on Psalm viii., I, II, III, IV, V. Of these No. I. (the Rev. D. Burns, Nithsdale U.P. Church, Glasgow) is clearly the best. The style shows literary ability, but is a little too florid, and would be improved by self-restraint. The paper would be more of an exposition if the writer had shown how he gets his exposition from the text. II. (S. J. B.) and III. (J. S.) are also florid in style, especially II.; and their tendency is rather to express the ideas suggested by the Psalm to the writers than to explain and set forth the meaning of the Psalm—hence a measure of irrelevance.

IV. (J. T.) and V. (J. M. S.) err in the opposite direction. V., though good as far as it goes, is much too slight, and neither explains details nor brings out fully the general meaning. IV. shows careful thought and work, but is only a series of disconnected notes on separate phrases.

There is good material in all the papers, and with study and practice the writers may make it much more difficult in future for examiners to decide between the various competitors.

#### NEW TESTAMENT EXPOSITION.

##### I.

#### HISTORY AND VALUE OF THE TITLE, "SON OF MAN."

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR MARSHALL RANGLES.

I. "Ὁμιον" grasps the kernel of the question, and handles it well, leaning rather heavily on quotations from Bruce, M'Laren, Neander, and others. He presents clearly, as do the two others, the oneness of Christ with all humanity—the Man, the ideal Man, the Representative Man, gathering up in Himself the whole of humanity. "The religion of the New Testament, having the Son of Man for its centre, has also all the sons of men for its circumference" is a figure of speech not to be too closely criticised. The hortative element in this paper is of high tone, but possibly more than the question called for.

2. R. G. writes a lucid, pertinent, and effective paper. Beza's notion that the title is but a periphrasis of the pronoun "I" is conclusively refuted. Equally well does he dispose of Hitzig's contention that in Dan. viii. the title only refers to "the holy people of God collectively," or "the elect of the people of Israel who realise the true ideal of the kingdom of God." The writer thinks the title was an *incognito*. It may at least be said its meaning was not at first apprehended by the people, but unfolded itself as the work of the Divine-human Person proceeded.

3. J. S. C. spends some time on the Hebrew idiom "son of." He puts the thought admirably that Psalm viii. may be in some sense Messianic, but that the phrase "Son of Man" is not certainly intended as a title of the Messiah, Hebrews ii. notwithstanding. In Dan. vii. 13 he sees, I think rightly, "not, indeed, any indication of a recognised name of the Messiah as yet, but an interesting and important step towards the specialisation of the term 'Son of Man' as a title of Christ." This paper is the most, as ὀμιον is the least, original of the three. This, in point of general excellence, must be their comparative rank, R. G. being a very good second. J. S. C. does not weave his paper out of the concordances and extracts from the best known exegeses; but reasons and judges for himself, though not differing widely in his conclusions, reminding one of an old tutor who, after hearing a sermon made up of the various opinions of commentators, advised the preacher to have an opinion of his own. J. S. C. is the Rev. J. S. Clemens, B.A., Mirfield.

##### II.

#### EXPOSITIONS OF HEBREWS XII. 1, 2.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR R. WADDY MOSS.

1. Exposition by J. R. (The Rev. John Rutherford, M.A., 6 Crichton Road, Rothesay).—The exposition is, especially in the case of the earlier clauses, very minute and thorough; and a careful study has been made of most of the words, and of many of the suggested interpretations. In regard to the latter clauses, such matters as the significant change of tense and the omission of the article before *σραυόν* called for comment, though it is evident from the amended rendering that they had not escaped the writer's notice. The application which is intermingled with the exposition is both appropriate and forcible, as are also the supplementary lessons drawn from the passage, with the exception, perhaps, of the first. On all grounds—of accuracy, fulness, and practical use—this paper must stand at the head of the three.

Exposition by M. J. B.—This is a good specimen, somewhat too rhetorical, of the expository sermon. One or two of the collocations of words or phrases are unusual, but the style is on the whole clear and not without force. The application is natural, and generally kept within the sphere of the actual suggestiveness of the passage. But it cannot be said that all the particulars are noted which would find place in a careful and exact study. To the last phrase, for

instance, but a single sentence is devoted; and that, if sufficient for a discourse, is hardly so for an exposition.

3. Exposition by B. N. G.—This is a discourse in which the application abounds almost to the exclusion of exposition. With a little more care in the use of figures and figurative speech it would be effective in many pulpits. The tone is earnest, and the appeals to experience are direct and close.

#### THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY.

A paper is received on "Clement of Rome" (A. S.), and one on "The Work of the Holy Spirit on Christ" (M. J. B.). The former is full and interesting, and in scholarship quite up to date. But it is hurriedly written, and would require a good deal of overhauling to prepare it for the press. The latter is most carefully written, in a fine spirit and with true insight. Its defect is the rush at the close, not due to carelessness, but to want of space.

The two literary papers are reviews of "Lux Mundi," the one (W. D. R.) of the whole book, the other (T. N.) a more

elaborate criticism of Mr. Gore's essay alone. In the latter there is evidence of careful reading and capacity to handle the subject chosen, but the style is somewhat slow and pointless. The best paper of the four is by W. D. R.—the Rev. W. Douglass Reid, M.A., Clapton Presbyterian Church, London.

Will Mr. Burns, Mr. Clemens, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Reid kindly let the publishers know which of the following volumes they wish sent to them:—

Dorner's System of Christian Ethics, 14s.

Lichtenberger's History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 14s.

Orelli's Prophecies of Isaiah, 10s. 6d.

Orelli's Prophecies of Jeremiah, 10s. 6d.

Stählin's Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl, 9s.

Workman's Text of Jeremiah, 9s.

Cassel's Commentary on Esther, 10s. 6d.

Frank's Christian Certainty, 10s. 6d.

Sartorius's Doctrine of Divine Love, 10s. 6d.

## Note on ψυχή and ζωή

### AND THEIR ENGLISH RENDERINGS IN AUTHORISED VERSION AND REVISED VERSION.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL J. B. M'CLELLAN, M.A., CIRENCESTER.

THE "Notes of Recent Exposition" are, I have no doubt, of great interest and convenience to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In the September issue, on p. 268, there is a reference to an article by the Rev. C. W. Darling in the *Clergyman's Magazine* for August on the difference between the two Greek words ψυχή and ζωή, and their renderings in the A.V. and R.V. Mr. Darling's statements and arguments are briefly reproduced, with the cautious and suggestive addition, "There are five passages which create a little difficulty. . . . We do not think that Mr. Darling has successfully disposed of them all." Mr. Darling's view being, to quote THE EXPOSITORY TIMES' *resumé*, that "the two words are not only distinct, but in their distinction lies a whole theology: ψυχή means our *present temporal life*, ζωή the *eternal life*;" and that while "the A.V. sometimes offers *soul* as a translation of ψυχή, but with no gain and some loss, the Revisers uniformly render both by *life*."

Now, assuming that THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has correctly reproduced Mr. Darling's view, it is desirable to utter a warning against its acceptance. With the exception of the statement that "the two words are distinct," the representations and assertions are not only not correct, but are entirely erroneous. It is not even true that "the Revisers uniformly render both words by *life*," as will be

seen by referring to Luke xii. 19, 20 (R.V.), "*Soul thou hast much goods,*" etc. . . . "this night is thy *soul* required of thee" (ψυχή in both cases). But the main and fundamental error is the utter misconception of the distinction between ψυχή and ζωή, as one between *life temporal* and *life eternal*. If ζωή itself were *life eternal*, then the constantly recurring phrase ζωή αἰώνιος would be needless. There is, certainly, a real and great distinction between the two words; but neither in one nor the other is the idea of *temporal* or *eternal* involved. Whether the one or the other refers to *eternal life* in any particular passage, or otherwise, must be judged by the context and by the phraseology employed. That, contrary to Mr. Darling, ζωή undoubtedly *is* used at times of *life temporal*, is clear from James iv. 14 ("What is your ζωή, a vapour," etc.); and that ψυχή may at times *seem* to be rendered correctly by *life*, is no more a proof that the word means *life temporal*, or *life* at all, than that *caput* means *death* because *damnari capitis* is rightly rendered in English by "*condemned to death*." It is purely an accident of *phrase* and *idiom*; and translators, whether in A.V. or R.V., are right or wrong according as they pay the proper attention to the *context* and the *idiom*, and render accordingly. That the R.V. generally falls far below our venerable A.V. in its renderings, I, for one, believe to be capable of demonstration