
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 Holy Spirit is the great and distinctive thing in Christianity. In this lies its power. For it is in the Holy Spirit that we have access to God and find God with that certainty or assurance which belongs to Christianity alone.

The words are strong—is it a tale of little meaning? We cannot think so. The words are found in that strong and stirring book by the Rev. W. L. Walker, entitled *The Spirit and the Incarnation*. Their meaning is made good by an argument that is in itself irresistible, and has been abundantly tested by experience.

But if the Holy Spirit is the essential thing in Christianity; if it is the presence of the Holy Spirit that makes Christianity differ from paganism, where is there room for Christ?

There are those who answer, There is no room for Christ. The Spirit is the Spirit of God, they say. God is our Father. He is ready to bestow His Spirit on us all. To place Christ between us and the Spirit of the living God is to erect a theological barrier and contradict the simple teaching of Jesus Himself. So they say.

And when we answer that at least as regards the teaching of Jesus they are wrong, since Jesus said, 'No man cometh unto the Father but by Me,' they tell us that they reject the teaching that is found in the Fourth Gospel. It does not matter. They are wrong nevertheless, and can be shown to be wrong. For this is the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels which they do accept; it is the teaching of His apostles in the Epistles which they acknowledge, and it is a necessity even of accurate thought.

The teaching and the necessity are both found in the simple fact that outside of Christ God is *not* our Father. They have denied or overlooked that; and on the false premisses that we are the children of God apart from Jesus Christ, have argued that of Jesus Christ there is no need. Mr. Walker shows that both the person of Christ is needed and His work. His work is needed because by it the world is reconciled to God, and He can accept us as His sons and bestow His Spirit upon us. The person of Christ is needed because no one else could do the work or make it acceptable.

The December number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* contains an account of the recent Congress of Orientalists. The Congress was held at Rome in October, and lasted thirteen days. This account of it is contributed by Mr. F. Legge.

Professor Jastrow of Philadelphia, says Mr. Legge, read a paper on the name of Samuel. He believed that the writer of the Books of Samuel found the root of the name of Samuel in the Hebrew verb *shâ'al*, 'to ask,' whence the play in 1 S 1[20], 'And she called his name Samuel, for from Jahweh I asked him,' as Dr. Jastrow translates the passage. But *shâ'al* means not simply to ask but to ask an oracle, and the substantive formed from it means one who asks oracles, that is, a priest. Whereupon he translates 1 S 1[28], 'Therefore I have devoted him (that is, made him priest) to the Lord.' Professor Jastrow himself, however, believes that the name of Samuel is to be explained from the Assyrian *šumu*, 'son,' found in several Assyrian proper names. It therefore simply means 'son (or offspring) of God.'

Professor Haupt communicated a paper on the sanitary effect of the Mosaic ritual. He held that the Book of Leviticus was written in Babylon about 500 B.C., and that the ritual was Babylonian and not Egyptian. The leprosy of the legislation was not elephantiasis, but a great number of skin diseases, which are not particularly dangerous, and for which the treatment prescribed is a fairly safe cure. The priests, he said, were the medical officers of health. They saw that the community was provided with pure food, pure water, and pure air. They were clothed in linen so as not to carry infection. And he believed that even the feasts were of sanitary value. For the pilgrimages to them provided that change of air and scenery which modern medical science has so much faith in.

Professor Haupt also contributed a paper on Xisuthros, the Babylonian Noah. He read his name *Per-napistim*, and believed the older readings *Nūh-napistim* and *Sit-napistim* to be untenable. He understood *Per-napistim* to mean 'very wise.' And he agreed with Professor Jastrow in thinking that the statement in Gn 6[9], 'Noah walked with God,' was an echo of the Babylonian tradition of Per-napistim's apotheosis.

Finally, Mr. Legge notices a paper by Professor Montet on the origin of the Israelites. Professor Montet denied that the earliest home of the Israelites was Ur of the Chaldees. Arabic traditions are unanimous in finding the common birthplace of all Semitic peoples in Arabia. He showed from Arabian inscriptions that the ancient Aramæan and Arabic languages were originally one and the same. And he claimed that it was from Arabia, and some time before 2000 B.C., that the Israelites began that momentous emigration which the Hebrew writers describe as the Call of Abraham.

There's a fancy some lean to, and others hate—
That, when this life is ended, begins
New work for the soul in another state—
Yet I hardly know. When a soul has seen
By the means of evil that good is best,
And, through earth and its noise, what is heaven's serene—
When our faith in the same has stood the test—
Why, the child grown man, you burn the rod;
The uses of labour are surely done;
There remaineth a rest for the people of God;
And I have had trouble enough for one.

So Browning. It is good poetry. Is it also good theology and exegesis? As exegesis certainly it is all wrong, for the 'rest that remaineth for the people of God' is not a rest in heaven. And as theology—well, it is at anyrate different from the theology of Professor Candlish.

A book has been published consisting of lectures delivered by the late Professor Candlish of Glasgow. It is called *The Christian Salvation*. It is noticed on another page. One of the subjects in that book is Eschatology. And under Eschatology Professor Candlish told his students, and now tells us, that he thought the redeemed would have some work to do in heaven, and what he thought their work would be.

Professor Candlish says that besides their blessed fellowship with God and exercises of adoration and praise, the redeemed in heaven will

receive enlarged powers for exercise and the opportunity of exercising them in the service of God—these powers and opportunities being in proportion to the use they have made of their gifts here. He finds this implied in the two Parables (for he counts them two) of the Pounds (Lk 19^{12}) and of the Talents (Mt 25^{14}). He finds it indicated also in the promise to the Twelve: 'that ye may eat and drink with Me in My kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Lk 22^{30}). That promise is no doubt highly figurative, and *may* refer to privileges enjoyed in this life. But there is no mistake about the promise in Rev 3^{20}: the saints who sit on Christ's throne do so in the future state. It is in the future state also, he thinks, that the saints shall judge the world and even angels, as St. Paul testifies in 1 Co $6^{2.3}$. And where but in the world to come can the Church show to the principalities and powers in the heavenlies the manifold wisdom of God (Eph 2^{7})? Where else can she show 'in the ages to come' the riches of God's grace (Eph 3^{10})?

The New Testament is not explicit on the activities of the life to come. Its horizon is the last Judgment, with a vision of eternal peace and blessedness beyond. Yet those passages give us at least the hint that there *are* activities in the life to come. Can we form any idea of what these activities are?

Professor Candlish believes that we can. He believes that the work of the redeemed in heaven will be to lead other intelligent creatures of God to loyal and loving obedience to Him. For they are to be kings. They are to be kings and priests unto God. And what else is a king for but to help those whom he rules to obey God, the King of kings, and enjoy His blessing?

But if the work of the redeemed in heaven is to minister to other intelligent creatures and lead them to God, where will they find the opportunity? Who are those other intelligent creatures? Are they angels or men? They are neither. If angels or men, they must have lived and sinned and been condemned. But Scripture says nothing of a ministry to these. And what could the redeemed reveal to these that they do not already know, what influence could they bring to bear upon them that they have not already felt? It is neither to angels nor to men.

Professor Candlish takes his stand beside other 'profound thinkers,' and believes that those to whom the redeemed will minister have yet to be brought into existence in the ages that are to come. When at the last judgment the present dispensation has been wound up, he believes that a new universe will begin and millions of new souls will be brought into existence. And the redeemed among men will have their special function among them. They will be their kings. And, as kings ought always to be, they will be ministers unto them, to lead them to holiness and happiness.

Is the idea bold? It has fruitful applications. It gives us to understand the cosmical importance of Christ. One of the most pressing difficulties in our day is the littleness of the scene of man's redemption. How could the Almighty God choose the speck of matter which we call the Earth for a great theophany, be born into it, dwell on it, be put to death in it, and all to redeem the little creature man? It is His way always, if we understand His way at all. He chose the least of all lands upon the earth, why should he not choose the least of all worlds? But more than that. He chose one man's seed to be a blessing to all the rest. Is it not probable that He should choose the seed of men to be a blessing to innumerable intelligent creatures of His hand, though they are yet to be born when time with us shall be no more?

Do Ritschlians deny the miraculous? Professor Denney says they do. In his *Studies in Theology* he says: 'It is doing no injustice to the whole school of writers to say that in point of fact they reject miracle altogether, in any sense which gives it a hold on man's intelligence or a place in his creed.'

But Mr. Garvie denies that in his new book, *The Ritschlian Theology* (T. & T. Clark, 8vo, 9s.). He says that Ritschl himself accepts not only the Resurrection of Jesus, but also the miracles wrought by Him. And in answer to the quotation which Professor Denney makes, and which he says will not bear the far-reaching conclusions drawn from it, he quotes what Ritschl has written on the Resurrection in his *Unterricht.* He quotes and translates these words: 'It (the resurrection of Jesus) is the completion of the revelation made in Him, which not only absolutely corresponds with, but necessarily results from, the worth of His person.'

And he is not content with that. For he says, 'It seems to be a rule in the interpretation of Ritschl by some of his critics that he can never mean what he appears to say.' He therefore quotes from Ritschl's *Lectures on Dogmatics* these definite statements: 'It is to be noted that our whole view of Christianity assumes the recognition of the resurrection of Christ as a fact, in which is most directly proved the prerogative of God to create, and to create life out of death. We would surrender the whole Christian view if we were to surrender this key to our whole mental attitude with the argument that the restoration of a dead man to life contradicts natural law.' And that Ritschl means just what we mean by the resurrection of Christ is made yet more evident, says Mr. Garvie, when he adds: 'It is self evident, according to analogy with what Paul expresses in 1 Co 15, that Christ made Himself known to His disciples in the body.'

The evidence for the Ritschlian belief in other miracles is not so cogent. But Mr. Garvie fortifies his position by saying that Ecke, 'who is by no means a partisan of the Ritschlian school,' sums up the matter convincingly, and declares that 'all the representatives of the Ritschlian school are of one mind with their master in their acceptance in principle of the belief in miracle, whether they assume a more positive or more critical attitude to the single miracles recorded in the Holy Scriptures.'

'From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus.'

These are the closing words of St. Paul's letter to his 'foolish Galatians.' There is an independent, almost a defiant, ring in them. They *are* defiant. The apostle defies his enemies to do their worst, for their worst will not trouble him more.

There was one way in which his enemies could trouble him once. It was by denying that he was a slave—by denying that he was the slave of Jesus. They called him a mere hired servant. Now, as Professor Ramsay reminds us in his *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, 'the slave in ancient times was far more closely bound by feeling and affection to his master than the hired servant.' The slave could be proud of his master. He could be proud to be his master's slave. St. Paul was proud of his Master. St. Paul was proud to be his Master's slave. And now he was glad that no man could deny it. For he bore branded on his body the marks that proclaimed him a slave—that proclaimed him the slave of Jesus.

It was once the custom to brand slaves so. It is the custom still, where slaves still exist. Slaves do not now exist in the lands through which St. Paul travelled. But they existed not so long ago. And this custom, says Professor Ramsay, to mark slaves by scars,—produced by cuts, which are prevented from closing as they healed, so as to leave broad wounds,—is familiar even yet to the observant traveller in Turkey. The scars in the apostle's flesh were not made by the dear Master whom he served. They were made by his Master's enemies. Nevertheless he gloried in them. They were the marks of ownership, the brands of the slave. From henceforth no one could trouble him by calling him hireling; he bore branded on his body the marks of Jesus.