

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June will contain important contributions by Canon Driver, Professor Salmond, and the Rev. George Adam Smith.

Were it not an innovation, we should appropriately dedicate this issue to the memory of Franz Delitzsch.

A long and very sympathetic memorial article on Dr. Delitzsch, from the pen of Canon Cheyne, appears in the *Guardian*. A review of the late professor's collected popular essays (*Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers*), contributed to the *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung* for April 5, by Graf Baudissin of Marburg, is also worthy of notice. Referring to the latter, the *Academy* says: Interwoven with the review there is a delicate character-sketch of Professor Delitzsch, to whom Graf Baudissin was closely attached since his student days. Both the German and the English notices refer to the fascinating combination of qualities in the richly-gifted Hebraist and theologian who has passed away. We observe with regret, adds the *Academy*, that the Rev. A. Cusin, the highly-accomplished translator of Delitzsch's *Iris*, has himself been removed by death within the last few weeks.

"Those who have recently entered the ministry of the Church can have but little conception of the risk at which any man, some twenty or thirty years ago, ventured 'to tamper' with our Authorized Version, or the odium to which it often exposed him."

VOL. I.—8.

So says Dr. Samuel Cox in the second volume of his *Expositions*, new editions of which receive notice elsewhere.

"The accuracy of the text of the Old and New Testaments, the age and authorship of the books, open up a vast field of purely literary controversy, and such a question as whether the closing verses of St. Mark's Gospel have the authority of Scripture must be determined by literary evidence as much as the genuineness of the pretended preface to the *Æneid*, or of a particular stanza in Catullus."

So says Mr. Gladstone in the April issue of *Good Words*.

Manifestly we have travelled a long way in these "twenty or thirty years," when a student of Holy Scripture like Mr. Gladstone, so capable, without being a specialist, and so undeniably conservative in theology, can use these words in a popular monthly magazine. And yet the confidence of well-informed earnest Christian men in "the Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" is certainly not less to-day than it was "twenty or thirty years ago."

Mr. Gladstone's attitude in this article—the merits of which we need not enter upon, it has been so fully discussed in the dailies and weeklies—is that of Isaiah: "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." Within the literary sphere he gives full scope to criticism; but he declines to accept all or any of its conclusions till time and counter-criticism have established them on a sure basis. Referring to Canon Driver's recent article in the *Contemporary Review*, he admits that the basis of the historical criticism is

“sound and undeniable;” but referring to Mr. Margoliouth’s Inaugural Lecture as Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, he says that while there is war, waged on critical grounds, in the critical camp, he is determined not to rush prematurely to final conclusions.

Professor Margoliouth’s Inaugural Lecture has itself been the occasion of a somewhat sharp controversy. He chose as his subject the place in Semitic literature of that apocryphal book which usually goes by the name of Ecclesiasticus, but which, from its reputed author, he prefers to call Ben Sira, or the Son of Sirach. There are three versions of the book extant,—one in Greek, one in Syriac, and one in Latin. But it is now generally held that the original language was none of these, but Hebrew. Besides the three versions, there occur quotations from the book in the Talmud, which may be directly from the original Hebrew. Some time ago Mr. Margoliouth, along with the late Dr. Edersheim, set himself to reconstruct the original text; whereupon he made the surprising discovery that the original Hebrew must have been in metre. This at once made the reconstruction easier, and placed the reconstructed text on a much firmer basis. He then perceived that the original must have been neither in ancient Hebrew, like Isaiah, nor in middle Hebrew, like Nehemiah, but in modern Hebrew, like the Talmud itself. It was at this point that Mr. Margoliouth found himself in conflict with the results of the Higher Criticism. Ben Sira wrote, admittedly, about 200 B.C. If *modern* Hebrew was the literary language so early as that, it becomes necessary, in order to allow time for the gradual formation of this modern Hebrew, to push back the more ancient language in which Ecclesiastes, for example, or Daniel, is written to a much earlier period than the Higher Criticism allows.

The lecture has been published by the Clarendon Press under the title of “An Essay on the Place of Ecclesiasticus in Semitic Literature.” It has been criticised by Professor Driver in the *Oxford Magazine*, by Professor Cheyne in the *Academy*, and by Dr. Neubauer in the *Guardian*, and Mr. Margoliouth begins his reply in the *Expositor* for April. He shows no inclination to yield his position.

In the portion of Scripture which forms the International Lesson for May 4, the Raising of Jairus’ Daughter, there occurs an interesting word, which has received scant justice from our translators. It is found in Luke viii. 49, in the midst of a vivid and pathetic narrative. Jairus had fallen down at Jesus’ feet, with his pleading, urgent request “that He would come into his house, for he had one only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a-dying.” Jesus turned at once to go. But perhaps the change of movement caused a temporary confusion in the crowd of people that followed Him. They thronged upon Him and pressed Him; with the result that a woman found herself unexpectedly close to Him. Approaching from behind, she touched the tassel of His outer robe, and in a moment she was healed. “She came *behind Him*. But the Lord Jesus,” says Mark Guy Pearse, “could not suffer her to stay there, unwelcomed, never seeing His face, never hearing His voice, never knowing the great love that filled His heart toward her; knowing only the healing virtue that lay in the fringe of His garment, and taking it like a guilty thing by stealth—He could not let her go away thus. He could not rest Himself—could not let her rest, until He brought her round *before Him*.” But when the words, “Daughter, be of good comfort,” were spoken, and Jesus was ready to proceed, time had elapsed, long time when measured by Jairus’ anxiety, and a messenger from the house had just penetrated the crowd, touched him on the arm, and whispered, “Thy daughter is dead; worry not the Master.”

“Worry not the Master.” The word used by the messenger (σκιῶν) is as unusual as it is forcible. Its literal meaning is “to tear off the skin, to flay.” It never occurs in any other sense in classical Greek. But from that to “annoy, distress,” is no unnatural leap, whoever made it. A distinguished modern exegete has been bold enough to describe it as the occurrence of a “slang” word in the New Testament. Does he mean that the messenger who pierced the crowd with the bitter tidings to Jairus, was or had lately been a street Arab of Capernaum? But after all it will not do, for it is not only used here and in the parallel passage in Mark v. 35, but it occurs

also in this metaphorical sense in Luke vii. 6 and Matt. ix. 36. Moreover, the slang of to-day is the colloquialism of to-morrow and the best literary style of the day after. Let us say that it had reached the colloquial stage at this time. But his suggestion of "worry" as its translation is admirable; for that word has a similar history, and is at the same stage now. It is greatly to be preferred to the tame word "trouble" of both our Versions.

Of the other places where the word occurs, the most instructive is Matt. ix. 36. The received reading (*ἐκλελυμένοι*), "fainted," is undoubtedly wrong. The editors without exception, following all the great MSS., restore the word (*ἐσκυλμένοι*) "worried." We then read: "And seeing the crowds, He was full of pity for them, because they were worried and thrown down, as sheep which have no shepherd." "How forcible and natural," says Mr. Rayner Winterbotham, whom we follow, "is the metaphor here, and how in keeping with so much in Ezekiel and elsewhere! Abandoned by their shepherds, what is the fate of the hapless sheep, but to be worried and chased by wolves or jackals, and at last to throw themselves down, exhausted and hopeless, to die? The priests and scribes and elders were the shepherds whom God had appointed over His flock; but they had fed themselves only,—or at most only stuffed with unwholesome food a small clique of their own at Jerusalem,—while the multitudes of populous Galilee had been left in their ignorance a prey to every impostor and every fanatic that came to make havoc of them."

In the narrative already spoken of, the Raising of Jairus' Daughter (Luke viii. 41, 42, 49-56), great trouble has been felt over the words of Christ in the 52nd verse: "All wept and bewailed her, but He said, Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth." On hearing this, the hired mourners suspended their wailing, and broke into incongruous laughter. "They laughed Him to scorn, knowing she was dead." Since then there have been many who, understanding His words no better, but reverencing Himself more, have doubted if she were really dead. Says Robertson of Brighton, "I cannot class this case with that of Lazarus. Christ says, 'She is not dead, but sleepeth,' hence

this particular case was one of restoration from apparent death. The other case was that of restoration from real death." Now, apart from Christ's words, no one would have dreamt of taking up such a position, which, as Farrar says, is to contradict the letter and spirit of the whole narrative. Is it the case, then, that the words themselves lay this necessity upon us?

Christ said two things: (1) "She is not dead," and (2) "She sleepeth." Take the latter first. Sleep is never used to describe a swoon, or the anxious suspense of apparent death. To do so would be to contradict all its associations. "If he sleep, he shall do well." But it is a very common metaphor in the New Testament for actual death—the death of the body. "She sleepeth,"—no one familiar with New Testament language would hesitate to accept that as equivalent to "She is dead." That the hired mourners, and even the disciples, did not so understand it, proves nothing. The disciples were but learning the meaning of Jesus' words. Later than this they still misunderstood when He said, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth." And though it is true that the word employed in the case of Jairus' daughter (*καθεύδω*) is much rarer in this metaphorical sense than another (*κοιμάομαι*), yet it is found in the Septuagint (Dan. xii. 2), and 1 Thess. v. 10 shows that its employment in this sense is quite legitimate.

What, then, did Christ mean when He said, "She is not dead"? In the New Testament death is spoken of in three different senses. For it is regarded as simply a separation from some form of life; which modern science acknowledges to be a strictly accurate view to take of death. In scientific language, it is the cessation of a correspondence with some special environment. There is, first, physical or temporal death, which is simply separation from this present outward world, the end of our correspondence with our physical environment. There is, next, spiritual death. Here the environment is God, and death means separation from the light of His love. "To be carnally minded is death" (Rom. viii. 6); "You, who were dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1). And, lastly, there is the death to sin, the exact converse of the latter, separation from the Devil

and his works, through the life that is in Christ Jesus. "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vi. 11); "He that is dead is freed from sin" (Rom. vi. 7).

Now this is one of the ways in which the gospel has enriched our daily thought; for in the days when Jesus came unto His own, the Jews knew nothing of any death but one, the temporal death. But if they knew only one, they made enough of that. No grief could be great enough to express their sense of its calamity. The resources of the household in which the death occurred were quite inadequate to give it due expression. Hired mourners were called in. For there existed a numerous body of women who made their bread by tearing their hair and beating their breasts; who studied the art of uttering the most heart-rending wails and cries till "they became exceedingly skilful in the business." St. Mark, with his graphic pen, draws a most vivid picture of the scene at the house of Jairus when Jesus reached it. "He beholdeth a tumult (it is *θόρυβος*, the noise of an excited public assembly, like that of Ephesus in the days of St. Paul), and many weeping and wailing greatly."

How utterly wide of the mark was all this tumult we do not know, for we have not learned to know it yet. But Jesus knew. We have said that there are three kinds of death in the New Testament. Leaving out of account at present the third, which, being the death to sin, is simply the converse of the death *in* sin, there remain these two—temporal death and spiritual death. If the Jews recognised only the former of these, it may be truly said that Jesus recognised as death only the latter. If by any chance a Jew, learning something of a death in trespasses and sins, should come to speak of it, he would be careful to explain that it was this he meant, and not the familiar death of the body; he would point out that he was using a kind of metaphor, talking, so to speak, of a shadow, of which the reality was temporal death. But to Jesus death in sin was the substance, and temporal death the shadow. "She that liveth in sin"—it is she that is dead. But

this maiden has but passed the portal of the life elysian; "she is not dead, but sleepeth."

"She is not dead!" How shall He teach the great reality He knows, and must make *them* know, that it may be well with them, except by some startling form of speech such as this? They laughed Him to scorn, these hired mourners. They would have laughed still more bitterly if they had understood. They would then have raised an Ephesian tumult indeed, for would not this their craft have been in peril? But there were three men there who heard the words and treasured them in their hearts.

We have mentioned the raising of Lazarus: is not Christ's view of death the key to that narrative? If we do not understand that the temporal death was in itself no calamity in Christ's eyes, that the only death worthy of the name was spiritual death, the eleventh chapter of St. John will bristle with perplexities of the most distressing kind. "This sickness is not unto death" (ver. 4) are words exactly parallel to "The maid is not dead." Again, "Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus; when *therefore* He heard that he was sick, He abode two days still in the same place where He was." And meantime Lazarus died. It was a strange way of proving His love, if death were the calamity we still consider it. Again, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep;" and when they could not understand, "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead; and I am *glad* for your sakes that I was not there." And then, above all, there is that magnificent claim and glorious promise in the 25th verse, of which we believe the translation ought to run thus: "I am the Resurrection and the Life: he that believeth in Me, even though he have died (as Lazarus), yet shall he be alive; and whosoever is alive (like yourself, Martha), and believeth in Me, shall never die."

But it is when we come to the 33rd verse, and reach that evilly entreated word (*ἐμβριμάομαι*), which still, even in the Revised Version, receives the impossible translation of "He groaned," that we find how important it is to bear in mind Christ's view of death. That this word gave trouble to the

Revisers of 1881 is manifest, for both here and in verse 38, where it occurs again, the margin gives a totally different rendering from the text. But it has given trouble to many a one besides the Revisers. Witness the laborious notes to be found in all the Commentaries, and the lengthened monographs that have been written upon it both in German and in English.

The trouble, however, is not with the meaning of the word. Coming from a simpler word which signifies to snort, or roar, it is always used as an expression of *strong anger* or *indignation*. In Grimm's Lexicon of the New Testament the meaning is given as *vehementer irascor vel indignor*. Says Meyer, "The word is never used otherwise than of *hot anger* in the Classics, the Septuagint, and the New Testament, save where it denotes snorting or growling proper." The Vulgate's rendering of the expression here (John xi. 33) is *infremuit spiritu*, and Luther's *Er ergrimmete im Geiste*. "So much is clear," says Westcott, "that the general notion of antagonism, or indignation, or anger, must be taken."

The difficulty appears when we seek to apply its proper meaning to the word in the verses before us. "When Jesus therefore saw her wailing, and the Jews also wailing which came with her, He was moved with indignation in the spirit, and troubled Himself." Such is the marginal rendering of the Revised Version, and it is undoubtedly the correct rendering. But why was Jesus moved with indignation?

We do not know any point in New Testament exegesis upon which there is less harmony among experts. We have taken pains to examine a large number of modern Commentaries, and the result is that no two are in complete accord. It is possible to divide them into classes, and we shall do so, but it must be remembered that each class contains just as many different *shades* of opinion as individuals.

1. There are a few, and among them some honoured names, who, in spite of the demands of language, believe that the word expresses deep grief on the part of our Lord. Thus Lücke: He was seized with grief; Ewald: He sighed deeply.

So De Wette, Tholuck, Brown, and M'Clellan. We have seen that that will not do. All the rest admit that Jesus was greatly angry.

2. Some think that there was a conflict between the divine and the human nature. His divine nature was indignant, says Hilgenfeld, that He could not control the human emotions which He felt at the sight of the sisters' grief. Similarly Bengel. Webster and Wilkinson ascribe the action to a "repression of natural emotion;" Alford to "a physical self-restraint;" Lange to "a mixture of emotions."

3. Others see the occasion of anger in the hypocritical conduct of the Jews who came out of Jerusalem to weep with Mary. It was their pretence of a sorrow which they did not feel that caused His indignation. So Meyer, Abbott, Watkins, Geikie, and Plummer.

4. A larger number, among whom are some of our best commentators on St. John, believe that Christ's indignation was due to the thought of the ravages which sin had wrought in the world, of which the death of Lazarus and the grief of his sisters was an evidence. To which some add the near prospect of His own death, due to the same evil cause. Here we have Hengstenberg, Olshausen, Luthardt, Ebrard, Trench, Maurice, Hutchison, Westcott, Reith. And Godet also, who, however, adds the thought that this resurrection of Lazarus would be the excuse for His own death.

5. Lastly, there are those who attribute the anger to want of belief in Himself as the Resurrection and the Life on the part either of the Jews (Erasmus, Scholten), or the Jews and the sisters also (Lampe, Kuinoel, Strauss, Keim, Kling, Wordsworth).

Says Alford, "Any contribution to the solution of this difficult word is not to be summarily rejected." Let us therefore apply our principle. If Christ's aim was to teach men that the only great calamity was death in sin, He must have been utterly opposed to the extravagant demonstrations of grief which accompanied the death of the body. As a case in point, we may refer to His action at the bedside of Jairus' daughter: His strong words of disapprobation—"Why make ye this ado, and weep?"—His summary ejection of the whole crowd of hired mourners. Need we be surprised,

then, if He manifested strong indignation when He came upon the same tumultuous outcries at the grave of His dear friend Lazarus? Mark the words of the 33rd verse: "When Jesus therefore (after all that He had said and done to show that Lazarus' death was *not* a calamity) saw Mary wailing (not weeping, but *wailing*), and the Jews also wailing which came with her, He was moved with indignation in the spirit." It was no wonder. Their wild cries and bitter grief over this temporal loss made it impossible for them to realize that the only real loss is a lost soul. But that was not all. By making the death of Lazarus to be so great a calamity, they brought against both Himself and His heavenly Father the charge of neglect and cruelty. Why did God strike him dead? they seemed to say, and why did Jesus loiter on the way? In a little the Jews laid this charge of cruel neglect openly and directly upon Himself. "Could not this man, which opened the eyes of him that was blind, have caused that this man also should not have died?" And again He was moved with indignation in Himself. For he that dishonoureth the Son dishonoureth the Father also. Surely we need not go further afield to find a sufficient reason for our Lord's hot indignation.

Principal Brown sends the following Expository Note in reference to the date of the Apocalypse, received from one who is at once an accomplished student and successful teacher. "It is a curious confirmation," says Dr. Brown, "of the later date, if the article referred to is that newly-discovered thing, 'clear glass'":—

"In reading the Apocalypse lately, I met with a statement which would confirm the argument for the post-Neronic date of the book. It has been probably noticed before, but as I have not seen it mentioned anywhere, not even by you in your late paper in the *Expositor*, I send it to you for consideration.

"John mentions 'clear glass,' like 'crystal,' four times. He is the only New Testament writer who speaks of it. Now, though *coloured* glass and *opaque* glass were known as far back as the early Egyptian era, it was only in the reign of Nero that clear transparent glass came into fashion. A great demand sprang up at once for it. Hence John, in speaking of it, uses it as we would the railway or telegraph, etc., and by so doing shows that his book was written *after* Nero's reign. Possibly some other allusions of the same kind may exist."

Franz Delitzsch.

BY THE REV. G. ELSLIE TROUP, M.A.

ON the morning of Friday, 7th March, the post carried to his friends in this country the sad and somewhat unexpected announcement that early on the Tuesday previous, after a pilgrimage of seventy-eight years and suffering long endured, there fell asleep in the Lord, Franz Delitzsch, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig. Few of our newspapers recorded the fact. They were concerned with other things, properly supposed to be of more interest to the world at large than the death of one of the most profound Biblical scholars of this century. But the shock fell hard upon many true hearts; for they learned then that beyond dispute a great prophet had fallen in Israel. Franz Delitzsch dead! It means that another bright light is quenched; nay, that it shines more brightly elsewhere, but—not here.

He died in his native town, surrounded with all the honours (and emoluments too) the university

he served for two-and-twenty years—and so well—could bestow upon him. Rostock and Erlangen claimed him, the latter for sixteen years. Curious that he, in whom the orthodox interpretation of the Old Testament sought refuge and a vindication, found himself out of season in Rostock, the home of German orthodoxy. Somehow, too, rightly or wrongly, Delitzsch's name will be associated rather with the busy northern city, uniting, as it does, commerce with literature and the arts, with its great fairs and 3000 students, than with the little Bavarian town, long ago the asylum of French refugees, that supplies the German world with some of its few domestic needs, such as mirrors and combs, stockings and gloves, and not least, tobacco, and rejoices in 500 students. For Leipzig received the maturer thought of its good professor, and witnessed some of the best developments of his intellectual activity and searching spiritual insight.