

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

'As often,' says Dr. Alexander Whyte of Edinburgh, 'as often as my attentive bookseller sends me, on approval, another new commentary on the Romans, I immediately turn to the seventh chapter; and if the commentator sets up a man of straw in the seventh chapter, I immediately shut the book. I at once send back the book, and say, No, thank you: that is not the man for my hard-earned money.'

---

So here is one man who knows the meaning of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. 'I confess,' said St. Augustine, 'that I am entirely in the dark as to what the apostle meant when he wrote this chapter.' But Dr. Whyte knows. If St. Paul comes back and contradicts him, he will admit that he is mistaken. But if not, 'not all his commentators on the face of the earth' will do it.

---

The question about the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is, Who wrote it? It lies between these two, Saul the Pharisee and Paul the apostle. Now there are very many who say that Paul the apostle could not have written it: it is too bad. Could Paul the apostle have cried out, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' Could Paul the apostle have said, 'I am carnal, sold under sin'? So they say that it must have been written by Saul

the Pharisee. These are not the words of a regenerate man, they say: St. Paul, when he wrote it, must have been describing his unregenerate state.

---

It is because it is so bad that Dr. Whyte is sure Saul the Pharisee did not write it. Dr. Whyte's text is these very words, 'I am carnal, sold under sin.' When did a Pharisee feel that? A Pharisee to cry out, 'O wretched man that I am!' A Pharisee to tell us he is 'sold under sin'! No, the Pharisee is *born* under sin, and does not feel the galling of his chain. It is the man who has tasted liberty who cries, 'Sold under sin, O wretched man that I am!'

---

And just in that, says Dr. Whyte, lies the great comfort of this chapter. 'Don't speak to me,' said Duncan Matheson, the saint of God, to David Elginbrod, on the market square of Huntly, 'Don't speak to me: I am a rotten hypocrite.' And old David Elginbrod laid his hand on his friend's shoulder and said, 'Ah Duncan, man, they never say Fauch! in hell.'

---

We are not yet done with the miracle of the Sun and the Moon standing still. Some have settled that it was no miracle at all, and that it is only our prosaic Western minds that misunderstand its poetry. But others hold by the miracle still. To

their aid, if they will have him, comes the Rev. W. F. Birch, M.A., in the current *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund.

Mr. Birch holds that it was a miracle. But he holds it with a difference from our accustomed belief. Ben Sira, who had no difficulty as to the effects of the sun and the moon standing still, describes the day as 'a day as long as two' (Sir 46<sup>4</sup>). Mr. Birch will have none of that. The distance from Gilgal to Makkedah, going by Gibeon, is not quite 50 miles, with an ascent of 3100 feet, and a descent of 2000 feet. Picked men could easily cover the distance in a single day of four-and-twenty hours. Joshua went up all night to Gibeon, about 20 miles. By early dawn he had swooped upon the unsuspecting Amorites. They made no stand anywhere (Jos 10<sup>8</sup>), but fled towards Beth-horon, 'butchered like sheep by the pursuing Israelites.' The pursuit covered 24 miles. Joshua's hardy warriors were well able to cap their night march of 18 miles by a pursuit of 24, and finish both within a single day.

Moreover, it was not time that Joshua needed: it was light. As the Amorites fled towards Beth-horon, Joshua looked down the famous pass. A black mass of clouds was drifting up from the sea. He saw that under it the fugitives might escape. 'Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,' he cried, 'and thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.' He felt that if the clouds came up and covered the sun it was all one as though the sun went down. To 'stand still' was not to be obscured.

For, in the language of the Bible, the sun goes down when its light is lost, though it might still be noon. 'Her sun is gone down,' says Jeremiah (15<sup>9</sup>), 'while it was yet day.' And Amos (8<sup>9</sup>) says, 'I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day.' So it is poetry still. The sun stands still and the moon is stayed when their light is not obscured by clouds.

And it is a miracle still, for the clouds were kept from hiding the sun in answer to Joshua's prayer.

The religious periodicals of England have been greatly occupied these months past with the question of Prayers for the Dead. The discussion arose out of a form of prayer drawn up or sanctioned by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for our soldiers in South Africa. One sentence in that prayer followed the soldiers who were shot. It recommended prayer for the dead. But the Church of England was not prepared for an official recommendation of prayers for the dead, and a mighty storm arose.

The course of the controversy has not been hard to follow. It is mostly a matter of up-bringing. If you would succeed in the world, said a certain wise man, choose your parents well. It is the choice of parents that chiefly decides one's creed: it is their training that seems to settle it whether we shall pray for the dead or not. And so it is found that in all evangelical and anti-ritualistic circles prayer for the dead is reckoned an offence.

But there are exceptions. And the most unexpected exception is a leading article in the issue for April 5th of the *Christian World*. The writer of that article believes in prayers for the dead. He quotes no Scripture, and he uses no argument. He simply asks, Why not?

His answer seems to come in the *Pilot*. Now the *Pilot*, the new review edited by Mr. Lathbury, late editor of the *Guardian*, can scarcely be described as either evangelical or anti-ritualistic. But in the issue of the *Pilot* for 7th April the real difficulty is faced. Inasmuch as it is the saintly dead we are recommended to pray for, our prayer becomes a judgment. Surely, says this earnest writer, all our beloved soldiers cannot be described as 'saints.' It is just because they are not saints that while they are still with us we pray so

earnestly for them. Why should we not pray for the dead? asks the writer in the *Christian World*. And the writer in the *Pilot* answers, Because we prayed for them while they were here, believing that they were not saints, and we dare not suddenly turn and say they are.

In the *Pilot*, which has just been mentioned, a significant correspondence is in progress between Canon Gore and Dr. Bernard of Dublin. In the second issue there appears a review by Dr. Bernard of the new edition of Canon Gore's *The Church and the Ministry*. Some changes are noted in the new edition, all in the direction of a wider scholarship. But it is observed that still Canon Gore holds that an office of government in the Church was committed by Christ to the apostles, to be by them transmitted to their successors. Dr. Bernard does not repudiate apostolic succession. Only he does not believe, as Canon Gore still does, that it can be carried back to Christ's appointment.

At the close of the 'Evangelistic Campaign' in Glasgow the Rev. J. Anderson Watt preached a sermon on Christian Assurance. Under that title the sermon is now published by Messrs. Kennedy & Christie of the same city. It is a good sermon on a great subject. For it is well that we should all be able to say, as St. John said, 'We *know* that we have passed from death unto life.' But there is a prior and even a better thing than to know. That is to do. And it is possible that the desire to know may be the cause of prolonged and needless pain. Let the doing come first and the knowing will follow.

Let the doing come first. When the ten lepers cried out, 'Jesus, Master, have mercy on us,' He said, 'Go, and shew yourselves unto the priests.' And it came to pass that *as they went* they were cleansed. Then one of them when he knew that he was healed, turned back, glorifying God. So they went before they knew. They took Jesus

at His word. He said, 'Go, show yourselves.' There was no appearance of cleansing. There was no feeling of cleansing. But they went. And it came to pass that as they went they knew that they were cleansed.

So the right order is going, knowing, showing. The going comes first. Of course there must be the two preliminaries of needing and asking. We get nothing which we do not need; and we get nothing which we do not ask. The blind Jericho beggar was brought to Jesus. He stood there, his sightless eyes rolling. 'What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?' What a question to such a man. 'Lord,' in surprise, 'that I may receive my sight!' Just so. Your Father knoweth what you have need of before you ask Him, but yet He will have you ask Him. There are these two preliminaries always, needing and asking.

And then there always follow these three: going, knowing, showing; and the first of these is going. For Jesus will be trusted. You undertake to work for a man, it may be for only a week, before you receive your wages. But even if it is for a week only, you trust him for that week. You go before you know. Jesus will be trusted. The ten took Him at His word, and went. We take Him at His good word of promise. We go, and it comes to pass that as we go we know that we have passed from death unto life.

How far did they go? That we cannot tell. Possibly one went farther than another before he knew. They may have all been going different ways. The Samaritan assuredly was going his own way, to show himself to his own Samaritan priest. We do not know how far they went, but probably the distance was in inverse ratio to their trust. When Jesus said, Go, they looked at one another. Then one turned and went, another followed, and behold the ten have begun to go, the little faith helped by the greater. Their faith varied, and he who had the greatest faith knew first.

We do not know how far they went. Perhaps the Samaritan had not far to go. He returned as soon as he knew, and Jesus was still in the same place. Perhaps it was he, Samaritan though he was, who first said, Let us go. One thing is clear, they did not spend days of agony, 'Lord, let me know before I begin to go.' They went, and it came to pass that as they went they were cleansed, and knew it.

Neither can we tell how they knew. It is not probable that they found the wounds heal suddenly. It is probable that they felt the healing virtue. The warm river of life coursed within their veins. It is probable that as they went their flesh *began* to come again as the flesh of a little child. We cannot tell. But they knew. They all knew.

And when they knew, one of them returned at once to give glory to God. He was a Samaritan. If, as we have dared to suggest, he was the first who said, 'Let us go,' it is as we should expect. For it requires faith to know as well as to go. The rest knew, too, but they were not sure enough to return and give glory to God. They will first go to the priests and get them to confirm their own knowledge. Well, they too were healed. The priests will confirm it. But they will never know so surely as this Samaritan. For to the abundance of assurance faith is needed. It is taking Him at His word that teaches me to go; and it is taking Him at His word that teaches me to know. I feel that I am healed. That is good. That is knowledge. But He promised, and I know that He has kept His promise. That is better.

So the nine were healed also. But their healing did not bring them so much joy. They were content to receive. But it is more blessed to give than to receive. And as this Samaritan returned to give glory to God he was blessed beyond the nine.

The nine were healed as well as he. But they never were so sure. We need not suppose that till their dying day the ugly inroads of that terrible disease were utterly gone. When they went to show themselves to the priests, they held up stumps for fingers. The priests could call them clean, for it was their business to look behind scars and find the presence of the flowing life. But others would not be so careful as the priests. And as some inconsiderate persons, seeing the unobliterated scars, started away from them, they were plunged in misery. They had not the joy of the Samaritan, because they had not his faith. They depended on the word of others to confirm their own opinion. He trusted to the word of Christ, and knew.

The articles of most interest in the new number (March) of the *Critical Review* are those by the Editor on Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica* and Charles's *Doctrine of a Future Life*.

Dr. Salmond is disappointed with the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. 'What one wishes to get in a Bible dictionary,' he says, 'is a complete, however compressed, statement of the data that go to the making of a question as well as of the answers given to it, so that the reader, having both sides before him, may be in a position to form his own judgment and understand the reasonableness of the position affirmed in the article. But in the case of many of the articles of this *Encyclopædia*, the reader might have difficulty in discovering that there is another side at all. In the second place, too much is made of speculations, which belong to the individual writer. Many of these, no doubt, are of interest, and have some reason behind them. Others are of the kind that should find a place in a journal rather than in an encyclopædia—speculations and hypotheses from which the author himself may fall away to-morrow.'

Nor is Dr. Salmond quite satisfied with Professor Charles's new book. On the doctrine of a future state Dr. Salmond speaks with the authority of special and prolonged study. Professor Charles, he thinks, has not yet studied the subject long enough. His special subject is the pseudo-epigraphic literature of Judaism. 'In the present volume he ventures far beyond the province which is most familiar to him.' He has produced not a little that is enlightening and suggestive, especially has he placed a number of things in new relations. But—'the critical faculty would be all the better of a little more restraint. Conclusions drawn from critical positions of so hypothetical a kind, and so provisional a value with regard to the rise, order, and development of religious ideas, have to be taken with a very strong *caveat*.'

Dr. Salmond blames Professor Charles for not knowing that other scholars have followed the historical method in studying the doctrines of the Old Testament and the New. 'He speaks as if "very few" scholars have seen it to be necessary to study a passage in anything but its "textual context," and as if he were himself the opener of new paths in the respect he pays to the historical context. This sounds strange; no recognised scholar thinks of adopting any other methods

surely than those of historical exegesis and historical criticism.'

And especially he blames him that, when he does follow the new paths which he believes he has opened, he follows them to disastrous exegetical and critical results. Passages, especially in the New Testament, that do not fit into the right order of doctrinal development, must go. Christ did not teach a resurrection of the unrighteous as well as the righteous. If Luke 20<sup>27-40</sup> says He did, that passage is an interpolation. St. John taught only a 'spiritual' doctrine of the resurrection. If Jn 5<sup>28, 29</sup> speak against that, Jn 5<sup>28, 29</sup> must go, along with all the passages which use the words 'at the last day' in this sense. 'There remains St. Paul, and there is much in his epistles that is difficult to fit in with all this. But his doctrine is inconsistent. His eschatology passed through no less than four stages, and in the last of these it was very different from what it was when he began to write. His ideas were at first rude and Judaic, but at last they became spiritual. He thought, no doubt, that when he was writing his Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians he was rightly interpreting Christ's mind. But in this he was mistaken. There are modern theologians by the round dozen who know far better than he.'

## The Apocalyptic Origin of the Expression 'Son of Man.'

BY PROFESSOR FRITZ HOMMEL, PH.D., D.D., MUNICH.

In a very noteworthy article in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (Jahrg. xlii. = Neue Folge, Jahrg. vii. pp. 581-611), October 1899, under the title 'Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen,' Professor Hermann Gunkel of Berlin, the well-known author of *Weltschöpfung und Chaos*, has, *inter alia*, a detailed discussion of the Messianic title *bar-*

*nāshā* (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 'Son of Man,' or rather, more correctly, 'the Man' κατ. ἐξ.). Gunkel rightly insists, against Wellhausen, that this expression is not meant to designate Jesus as the ideal man (say in opposition to the other expression 'Son of God'), but that it is one of the technical apocalyptic terms, which are still in many ways obscure to us, and that *it uniformly*