

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

conceit that Saul's successor must have exhibited had he been guilty of holding up himself as the type of Messiah! And conceive, if that be possible, the scorn with which his boundless egoism would have been reprobated by the critics! Like old Moses, for talking about a prophet like unto himself, young David for singing about a Messiah like unto himself would have been impaled upon the sharp stake of pitiless critical raillery! But because the sweet Psalmist avoided the venerable lawgiver's supposed indiscretion, he has incurred the hot displeasure of his friends. For friends of David not a few of his nineteenth century critics claim to be. In denying him the authorship of the 110th Psalm, and in contending that even though he wrote it he could not have dreamt of Messiah, do they not seek to wipe from his fair fame the scandal of subverting the sacred law of evolution? For this is what it comes to, they keep on assuring the unlearned, if once it is allowed that before David's eyes flitted a loftier conception of Messiah than was cherished by the great prophets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It is idle to interpose that the facts of Old Testament Scripture do not establish the modern development theory of Israel's religion, unless by first cutting and carving the documents in accordance with the preconceived theory, or to suggest that it is reasoning in a circle first to demonstrate the evolution law of Israel's conception of Messiah

by denying that David could have written Psalm cx., and then to parade that law as evidence that David could neither have penned the Psalm nor thought about Messiah. Yet pretty much after this fashion does the German professor build up his accusation against Christ. David could not have produced the 110th Psalm, because then he must have foreseen Messiah as his Lord. No Hebrew prophet could have had such a vision of the distant future unless it had been specially revealed to him. Such special revelation is forbidden by the law of prophetic development which criticism has invented. Jesus affirmed that such special revelation had been vouchsafed to David by the Spirit; that David had foreseen Him, the Messiah, in the distant future, and that David had composed the Psalm in question. Therefore, is the Professor's unwritten but implied conclusion, since the critics are unquestionably right, Jesus was undoubtedly wrong. Those who are satisfied with this reasoning must be easily pleased.

In closing this section of his treatise, Professor Schwartzkopff assures his readers that the above instances of so-called error on the part of Jesus belong to the most important that come before one in the New Testament. The remark sets one wondering what the least important might be, and what form the evidence offered in proof of them might assume.

## Point and Illustration.

MESSRS. OLIPHANT ANDERSON & FERRIER have just published an attractive crown octavo volume by an accomplished American preacher. Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis is the preacher; *A Man's Value to Society* is the title of the book. The book is further described as 'Studies in Self-Culture and Character.' In short, it is a volume which the librarian must place in the most elastic of all his shelves, the shelf where the *Essays* stand. But it must not be left standing there. For it is a very able and original book. Do not dream, because the three anecdotes that follow are quoted from it, that it is a gathering of crumbs from the ordinary raconteur's table. The book was being read, and with quite uncommon pleasure, and the anecdotes came in the course of it.

### The Inner Motive and the Outer Fact.

When Coleridge the schoolboy was going along the street thinking of the story of Hero and Leander, and imagining himself to be swimming the Hellespont, he threw wide his arms as though breasting the waves. Unfortunately, his hand struck the pocket of a passer-by, and knocked out a purse. The outer deed was that of a pick-pocket, and could have sent the youth to jail. The inner motive was that of an imaginative youth deeply impressed by the story he was translating from the Greek, and that inner motive made the owner of the purse his friend, and sent young Coleridge to college. Thus, the motive made what was outwardly wrong to be inwardly right.

### Nothing Covered.

The story has been told recently of a burglar who accidentally discharged a magnesium light connected with a kodak on the shelf. The hour was midnight, and everyone

in the house was asleep. But the kodak was awake and at work. Frightened by the sudden light, the thief fled, leaving his spoil behind. But he also left his photograph. The next day, in the court, the kodak convicted him. Thus the new science is causing each man to stand in the centre of an awful photographic and telegraphic system, which makes an indelible record of man's words and deeds. No breath is so faint that it can escape recording itself; no whisper so low, no plan so secret, no deed of evil so dark and silent. Memory may forget, but nature, never. Upon the pages of the physical universe the story of every human life is perpetually before the Judge of all the earth.

#### Where Ignorance is Laziness.

Ignorance is want of mental animation. The scientist tells us the Patagonians sleep eighteen hours each day, with a tendency to doze through the other six. Their minds are unable to make any kind of movement, and the Chief once told Sir John Lubbock that he would love to talk were it not that large ideas made him very sleepy.

Here is a paragraph from a book of *Ministerial Table-Talk*, lately published by Mr. R. D. Dickinson. The Rev. John J. Pool, B.D., is its author.

#### Peter M'Kenzie.

The late Peter Mackenzie was full of homely illustrations. Addressing some farmers in East Anglia he said: 'Some men are like pigs, they can never look up until laid on their backs.' This peculiarity of the pig's eye many of the farmers had not noticed, but on their return home they sought to verify Peter's statement, and found it was correct. Said the preacher, applying his quaint illustration: 'Some men are so sordid, their eyes are always down upon earthly things, that they cannot be induced to look up or think of heavenly things until the Lord, by affliction, lays them on their backs.'

Rebuking selfish Christians, Peter asserted that 'there are some people so selfish that they would monopolise God if they could, and gather up all His light. But look at the matter fairly, and see what a blunder they make. What would happen if a man could monopolise the sun? Try and focus all the sun's rays upon your little self. Do you feel warm and comfortable? Why, man, it would melt you! *There would be nothing left of you but a grease spot.*'

The first volume of a very popular German book in answer to Darwinism was lately translated and issued in this country by Messrs. Burns & Oates, under the title of *Foundations of Faith*. The style of its criticism may be gathered from the following page:—

While the bee is constructing its comb after the laws of stereometry, the funnel-roller (*Rhynchites betulae*), a beetle not quite so large as the house-fly, is engaged in differential and integral calculus. Nature has intrusted to it a task of some difficulty, for it must provide for a sufficient progeny, under conditions by no means favourable to it. To begin with, it can lay but few eggs, and these are exceedingly sensitive to the influence of the weather, especially to sunshine and moisture. Further, they must be well concealed from robbers of all kinds; and finally, as the maggots of the funnel-roller are blind, they must have their proper food at hand as soon as they are hatched. This food consists of the dried leaves of the birch and other trees. Now, how shall the poor little beetle fulfil all these requirements at once, and in the first generation? For had it not fulfilled them, it must have been the last as well as the first of its race. Let us imagine that, like man, it was capable of thought and calculation. What must have been its reflections? Something of this sort, one may fancy.

First, thinks the tiny *Rhynchites*, I ought to know what my maggot eats. This I do not know by experience, because I am the first *Rhynchites betulae*, my ancestors having belonged, according to the *Origin of Species*, to another order of living things, or even to inanimate matter. I will try birch leaves, and lay my eggs in those—but no, I dare not do that, some sparrow will devour them, or the sunshine and rain will kill them. I have it! I will make a roll or funnel of a birch leaf, and lay my eggs in that. Now, let me see, the simplest way will be to roll the leaf from the point towards the stalk—but no, for then I shall have to roll the hard mid-vein, and I have not strength enough for that. Shall I begin with the side of the leaf?—that, again, is too heavy for me, for it will give me the whole broad surface to roll; besides, the leaf would remain fresh, and my maggots cannot eat fresh leaves. Would it not be best to cut the leaf through diagonally?—only I must leave the mid-vein, or the leaf will fall to the ground and rot. How shall I make the cut so that when I roll the leaf it shall form a proper funnel? If I had ever seen how a female of the *Rhynchites betulae* constructs her funnel! But my mother belonged to a lower order, according to Darwin, and even had she been a funnel-roller, I was not in existence at that time to mark how she made ready for my arrival. I will therefore see how I can best make my incision under the given conditions. Having made my calculation, I find a straight line to be impracticable, likewise a circle or an ellipse. I can obtain the most suitable line if I consider the edge of the leaf as the evolute, and by means of differential and integral calculus, cut the resulting involutes into the leaf, so that my rolling lines shall be perpendicular to the given leaf-edge, and shall, at the same time, form a tangent each time to the evolute. Following this rule, I must make a cut in the right side of the leaf from the edge to the mid-rib, somewhat in the shape of an upright S, and in the left in the shape of a recumbent S. I then roll the right side from the edge to the mid-rib, fold the left over it, and use the point of the leaf as the cover of the funnel. In this way my young are provided with a secure shelter.