
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.

In the *Expositor* for April and May Professor Ramsay expounds the Pauline teaching on marriage. He believes that the teaching, and the apostle who taught it, have both been much misunderstood. It has been counted certain that St. Paul recommended celibacy; it has been held that he was himself a celibate. Professor Ramsay finds that St. Paul recommended marriage as the better state, and pointed to his own example as that of a married man.

The letter in which the question is discussed is the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Now the First Epistle to the Corinthians is a reply to a letter, sent by the Corinthians themselves to St. Paul. We cannot quite understand the apostle until we understand the letter he replies to. Professor Ramsay has mentally reconstructed that letter. It was, he says, no mere string of questions sent by humble and inquiring disciples. It was 'a decidedly ambitious performance. The Corinthians discussed, with much philosophic acumen, and with strong reforming zeal, the nature of society, the character of man, the relation of man to God, and other similar topics, and they were well satisfied with the letter which embodied their opinions. It was (as they felt) able, religious, and on a lofty plane of morality. They were eager to regenerate and reform society, and they were satisfied that they knew how to do so.'

Well, then, they did not put to St. Paul a simple, colourless question about marriage. They had their own ideas on that as on other subjects, and their question suggested what they considered the only possible reply. The only reply which they considered possible was that it was the duty of every person to marry. For at that time the most vicious part of society was the one where celibacy was commonest. Marriage was the only cure. Make marriage universal and vice will disappear.

But the apostle refuses to make marriage universal. That is to say, he refuses to bind any Christian conscience by any external regulation whatever. He will at all costs preserve the liberty which they have won in Christ. Nevertheless he thinks marriage better than celibacy, and that for two reasons. It is a noble relation, comparable to the union between Christ and His Church; and it is a great moral safeguard. The first reason he discusses elsewhere, the second is the one he has to enforce here.

But does he not say that it is good for man not to come into connexion with woman? He does,

and that in the opening sentence of his discussion (7^1). But 'good' is not 'best,' it is not even 'better.' Let us think what the Corinthians asked. They asked if it was not imperative on every one to marry in order to avoid impurity. The apostle's answer is, No; neither marriage nor celibacy is imperative, for impurity may be avoided in either case, and Christian liberty must be maintained. It is good, he says, it is permissible, it is not wrong, for man to remain unmarried. He does not say it is better. He has no occasion and no temptation to say that.

And then he quotes his own example. Is it the example of a celibate? That is impossible, thinks Professor Ramsay. For if St. Paul had never been married, how could the Corinthians expect him to say that every one should be married? Their question would have been answered before they asked it. Still, it is neither as celibate nor as married that St. Paul introduced his own example. It is because of the liberty which he enjoys in Christ. He has that liberty, and turns it to no impure account, why should not others?

What did Lamech mean when he named his son Noah, and said, 'This same shall comfort us concerning our work and the toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed'? He meant, says Dr. B. Jacob of Göttingen, writing in the *Jewish Quarterly* for April, that the curse had been taken off the ground, since Adam was now dead. For only for the lifetime of Adam had the ground been cursed: 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it *all the days of thy life*.' And Noah was the first that was born after the death of Adam.

Dr. Jacob says that we entirely misunderstand the punishments promised in Gn 3^{14} if we believe that they refer to succeeding generations. God addressed the persons present. Only the serpent in the Garden of Eden was doomed to eat dust all the days of its life; other serpents will have none of it. Only Eve was compelled to suffer many and painful pregnancies and be possessed by a morbid desire for her husband. Only Adam was allowed to rule over his wife. There is a unity in marriage. The two become 'one flesh.' Husband and wife have equal rights before God. It is idle to speak of 'the inferior position of woman in the East.' God did not make her position inferior. The Bible does not make her inferior. It is godless custom and bad habit that have done it. Eve was punished in her position towards Adam, because Eve led Adam into transgression. But with the death of Eve the 'inferiority of woman' ended.

In the exposition of the Old Testament there remains yet very much land to be possessed, and we dare not scoff at Dr. Jacob. But if he is right, there are some systems of theology that stand in need of revision. For Dr. Jacob can find no evidence that on account of the sin of the first man God has 'doomed all unborn generations by an everlasting curse.' Even the classical passage, Gn 8^{21}, has no such meaning. God is there made to say in His heart, 'I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.' Professor Schultz says that 'sin is here undoubtedly not confined within the limits of the single determinations of the will, but looked upon as an inclination which has been given to everybody with human nature, as we know it from experience, as his hereditary portion, that is as *original sin*.' But Dr. Jacob holds that such an interpretation is impossible. For if another Deluge is to be withheld because man is radically bad, why was the first Deluge sent? Moreover, God was well pleased with Noah and his family, finding them upright. No; the words are, 'I will not again curse the ground any more for *Adam's* sake, for the imagination of the heart of *Adam* was evil from his awakening (that is, from his

maturity).' Adam is now dead, and his curse has died with him. With Noah begins the age of blessing.

What has led Dr. Jacob out on this quest? It is the presence of a curious little phrase in the statement of Adam's death. That phrase (אֲשֶׁר־חַי) occurs in Gn 5^5 and Gn 25^{27}, and nowhere else in the Bible. In the one case it refers to Adam, in the other to Abraham. It means 'that he lived.' But as there is Hebrew enough without it to express 'And all the days of Adam were' so and so, it is evident that to add 'that he lived' is to repeat what is already stated. So on the ordinary translation 'that he lived' is quite superfluous. Dr. Jacob believes that it is used for the purpose of drawing attention in a special way to Adam's death, because Adam's death was the end of an epoch, the end of the great curse-era.

Dr. Jacob translates the phrase in question, 'namely those that he had lived *up till then*,' and the whole verse reads, 'The days of Adam, namely, those that he had lived *up till then*, were nine hundred and thirty years.' Now as 930 years is the end of Adam's life, 'up till then' can mean nothing else than up to his death. But why say 'up till then'? Because to the writer's mind Adam's death was *the* event of that early time. It had an outstanding objective existence; it was *then*: 'up till *then*,' he says, up till the time we know of, up to the end of the curse-era, up till Adam's death, was 930 years.

As we have said, the phrase occurs but once again. It occurs in Gn 25^{27}, of the death of Abraham. For the death of Abraham also was an event for the writer. It did not mark the close of an epoch like the death of Adam, but it recalled to the writer's mind a significant occurrence that accompanied or shortly preceded it. And again he says that 'up till then'—up till the time so memorable and the occurrence so significant—'the days of the years of Abraham's life were 175 years.'

What was the memorable occurrence? Dr. Jacob believes it was the birth of Jacob and Esau. For Abraham was yet alive when Jacob and Esau were born. He lived some fifteen years after their birth indeed. But the event was so momentous and so near the close of Abraham's life that the two were associated together. Now it is stated that when Rebekah knew that twins struggled within her, she went to inquire of the Lord (Gn 25^{22}). How did she inquire? Dillmann supposes that there were already places for oracles or prophets and priests of the true God. Dr. Jacob considers that far-fetched. He believes that she went to inquire of Abraham. It was to him that the promise was made of an heir—of one heir—through Isaac. It was he that had sent to Paddan-aram for her to be the mother of this heir. But now there were *two*. To whom should she go to inquire but to him to whom the promise was made, and who stood to her in the room of God? She goes to Abraham, and in his assurance that the elder shall serve the younger, Rebekah receives her answer, and henceforth dotes on Jacob as the heir to the promised inheritance.

In the *Pilot* for 21st April Professor Sanday begins a series of articles on the Fourth Gospel. They are to be intermittent in their appearance, and they propose to cover the last eight years of research.

In the first article Dr. Sanday deals with the literature of the subject in a general way. The English work is small in bulk. 'A single monograph of value on a portion of the controversy that has been for some time receding into the background, and two noticeable articles in a Dictionary of the Bible, are the most conspicuous contributions that we have to show.' The monograph is Dr. Drummond's on 'The Fourth Gospel and the Quartodecimans' in the *American Journal of Theology* (1897, pp. 601–657). The articles are those in the new *Dictionary* by Mr. T. B. Strong and Principal Reynolds.

Of Mr. Strong's article on St. John's Life and Theology, Dr. Sanday says that though brightly and competently written, it is rather an intelligent summary of what is known than exactly what we understand by research. 'The article on the Gospel by the veteran Dr. H. R. Reynolds (who died before it was published) is the fruit of prolonged and profound study, of which it everywhere bears traces. It was not only that Dr. Reynolds brought to bear upon his subject a mass of digested learning, but he had a natural affinity of mind for the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, which gives to his treatment of it sympathetic and weighty expression.'

To pass from England to Germany, says Dr. Sanday, 'is like passing from the edge of the moor visited by an occasional bee to the hive itself, with its winged occupants busily circling around it, and with the hum of their ceaseless activity. It may, perhaps,' he adds, 'be more open to question how far the honey actually deposited in the cells is in proportion to this activity.'

In any case German work has, from our English point of view, several drawbacks. It is too much a matter of the study or the lecture-room; it is too 'critical,' confident, even (to our thinking) reckless, it is too unconscious of any difference between sacred and profane. But, more than these, it breaks too freely with the past. 'It is not uncommon for a German writer to sit down to his task as though he were called upon to construct a complete view of Christianity for himself, with no ties to the past beyond the similar arguments and views that his immediate predecessors have handed down to him.' But Dr. Sanday is in haste to except 'far-sighted theologians like Harnack and Loofs.'

To all these drawbacks there is some compensating advantage, and at any rate Dr. Sanday is sure of this, that German criticism is an element in modern life that has to be reckoned with, and that the sounder portions of it will have sooner or later to be assimilated.

Now, eight years ago, Dr. Sanday was able to say that the two sides in the controversy over the authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel were drawing closer together. 'It seemed as though by mutual concessions a middle ground was being reached across which it would be almost possible for the opponents to join hands.' Very much at that point the controversy still remains. On the whole 'liberal' opinion has been drawing nearer such a compromise as would neither completely accept nor completely deny the apostolic authorship. The controversy has become hottest over the question of the two Johns. For the most part German critics accept the existence of two Johns, and attribute the writings that have come down to us under that name rather to the Presbyter than to the Apostle. So Weizsäcker and Harnack, and 'that free-lance, Hugo Delff, now deceased,' and the two most recent theological journals, Bousset's *Theologische Rundschau* and Preuschen's *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

Dr. Zahn, however, has thrown the weight of his massive learning on the side of the unqualified apostolic genuineness of the Gospel. So also Bernhard Weiss, and Beyschlag (though with rather more concessions to the other side); Loofs also, of Halle, from a yet more critical standpoint; and the Conservatives,—Luthardt, Zöckler, Resch, Haussleiter, and several others.

And, then, last of all, on the far left, besides Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer, who retain their old opinions, and besides the Dutch Professors, Brandt and van Manen, there are H. J. Holtzmann of Strassburg, Jülicher of Marburg, and Wrede of Breslau. From Jülicher Dr. Sanday quotes: 'We shall only do justice to the Fourth Gospel if we regard it as a philosophical poem with a religious tendency of the third Christian generation.' And from Wrede ('even more than Jülicher, a writer of marked ability'), he quotes: 'I find it most

appropriate to call the Fourth Gospel a didactic work in the form of a Gospel, and indeed a didactic work that is at once polemical and apologetic. The author, in my opinion, we do not know, though he was, without doubt, an important person.'

St. Paul called his fellow-Christians saints. Why do we not call one another saints? Dr. James Drummond has a note on the meaning of the word in his new commentary on the Pauline Epistles (elsewhere noticed), and he says that St. Paul called his fellow-Christians saints because they were saints; we do not call one another so, because we know that we are not.

So that Dr. Drummond holds the word 'saint' to mean morally good. The average commentator does not agree with him. Fritzsche, for example, says that the saints of the New Testament are so called, not because they are good but because they are pardoned. It is their standing, he says, that gives them the right to that title, not their character.

In the Old Testament, says Fritzsche, holiness means dedication to the service of God. It is applied to things as well as persons, and therefore character is not concerned. Dr. Drummond denies that. Even in the Old Testament, he says, the holy, or the saints (ἅγιοι), are so called with an ethical consideration. The command is, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy.' No doubt purity was to some extent ceremonial. But even a ceremonial sanctity involves personal qualities in men, and not merely a judicial relation between man and God.

In the New Testament there are expressions which carry an ethical content unmistakably. The Holy Spirit does not surely mean 'the dedicated spirit.' When John the Baptist is spoken of as a 'just and holy man' (Mk 6^{20}), the ethical adjective 'just' claims an ethical meaning for 'holy' also. Christ Himself is 'the Holy One of God' (Mk 1^{24}, Lk 4^{34}), and as this is 'the terrified confession of a man with an unclean spirit, we immediately think of the serene unclouded purity with which the uncleanness was confronted.'

In these places the word is used with a moral intention. In the Pauline Epistles, where it occurs seventy-nine times, its meaning is the same. Thus in 1 Co 7^{1} the 'saints' are contrasted with the 'unrighteous,' and then the 'unrighteous' are resolved into fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, thieves, drunkards, and so forth. If the word 'saints' contained no idea of moral excellence, it would be no true antithesis to 'unrighteous' here.

Dr. Drummond admits that when applied to things the meaning of the word is modified. But even then, he does not think that mere dedication, apart from any quality attaching to them, is all that is meant. The Scriptures are holy because intrinsically good and the expression of God's holy will. St. Paul asks, 'Is the law sin?' And answers, 'No, the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good' (Ro 7^{12}). The 'holy kiss' of Ro 16^{16} and other passages must represent the temper with which the kiss was to be given. And even in the Old Testament the Sabbath, the temple, and the priesthood are holy, because God has chosen them to represent as it were His own holiness, so that they ought to awaken in men's minds the reverential awe which is due to Him.

There is just one passage that seems to be all in Fritzsche's favour. It is 1 Co 7^{14}. St. Paul is discussing what should be done when a believer is married to an unbeliever. He decides that the Christian should not take the initiative in separating, because the unbelieving husband or wife is 'sanctified' by the believer. Dr. Drummond gives that passage away. But he observes that it contains the verb to sanctify, not the adjective rendered 'holy' or 'saint.' The verb, he admits, is used in the mere sense of consecration or the imputation of holiness, but not the adjective.

Once only is the adjective so used. It is the same passage. 'Else,' says the apostle, 'were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' Dr. Drummond believes that the reference is to the custom of reckoning the children of mixed marriages as Christians. They are not really 'holy' no doubt. But it is no true exception. For the less is covered by the greater. The Christian community as a whole is holy in fact, the children are reckoned so as forming part of it. A single soldier may not be brave, but the army is, and he gets the shelter of its good name.

So St. Paul called his fellow-Christians 'saints' because they were saints. We, whom it costs nothing to be Christians, are not saints; at least there are not enough of us saints. We have lost our right to this desirable name.

The Contest for the Body of Moses.

By the Rev. J. T. Marshall, M.A., Principal of the Baptist College, Manchester.

Michael (the name means, 'Who is like God?') was one of the princes of the angelic host. He is called 'the great prince' in Dn 12^1, 'one of the chief princes' in Dn 10^{13}, and 'the archangel' in Jude v.^{9}. The mention of 'principalities and powers in the heavenly places' (Eph 3^{10}, cf. 1^{21}, Col 2^{10}) shows that the primitive Christian Church adopted the Jewish conception of gradations in the heavenly hierarchy, a conception according to which there were four archangels: Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel (*Enoch* 9). Another tradition adds three others, but their names are not constant. Michael the merciful (*Enoch* 40^9 68^2) was believed to stand at the right hand of the throne of God, and Gabriel at the left.

There are three principal functions which the Jews believed Michael to fulfil. (1) He is the *guardian angel of Israel* (Dn 10^{21}). In Dn 10 we read also of the angelic 'Prince of Persia' and 'Prince of Greece.' Indeed, it was an article of the Jewish faith, that 'for every nation God has appointed a governor' from among the angels (Sir 17^7). In Dt 32^8, the LXX reads, 'He fixed the boundaries of the nations (cf. Ac 17^{26}) according to the number of the angels of God.' The Palest. Targum on Dt 32^8 speaks of seventy nations 'according to the seventy angels'; and also 'according to the seventy souls which went with Jacob into Egypt'; thus interpreting the Massoretic text, 'according to the number of the children of Israel.' The Targum on Ps $137^{7.8}$ calls Michael 'the prince of Jerusalem' and 'the prince of Zion.'

(2) The Jews conceived of Michael as the *Custodian of Heaven*. In the Jewish-Christian hymn of Jeremiah, 3 Bar. 9, he is designated 'the one who opens the gates to the righteous'; and in 4 Bar 11 he is 'the key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven' (*Texts and Studies*, v. 1, lv.). And as, without his leave, no one may enter the heavenly gates, we are not surprised to find that it is Michael and his angels who are commissioned to *expel* Satan and his angels from heaven (Rev 12^9) when they cause discord there; as in *Enoch* 10^{11} it is Michael who is instructed to bind Semyaza and his associates who have defiled themselves with women, and to bind them fast under the hills of the earth for seventy generations.

(3) The chief function which Michael fulfilled was that of *Conductor of pious souls to Paradise*. When we read in Lk 16^{22} that the soul of Lazarus 'was carried away *by the angels* into Abraham's bosom,' the following references from Jewish and early Christian literature render it all but certain that it was Michael and his angels who were intended. In the *Testament of Abraham* we find that Michael was bidden by God to warn Abraham of his impending death; but he found himself unable to introduce even the mention of death into so happy a home, and he wept in Abraham's tent. Eventually he caused Isaac to dream (cf. Hermas, *Sim.* 8^3) of his father's death, and Isaac recited his dream to his father. Then Michael took Abraham upon a chariot of cherubim, and led him upon the cloud with sixty angels (*Texts and Studies*, ii. 2; *Ante-Nicene Library*, Addl. Vol. 183 ff.). In Midrash Rabba it is said that Michael demurred