---

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 EXTRA VOLUME of the *Dictionary of the Bible* is now out of the editor's hands, and will be ready for issue in a very short time. It contains more matter than any of the volumes already published, and it is actually larger in size than any of them, except the fourth. The Articles are almost all of considerable length, and there are thirty-seven of them. Besides the articles, it contains six Indexes and four new Maps.

The longest article in the volume, as has already been mentioned, is that of Professor Kautzsch on the RELIGION OF ISRAEL. It is also the longest article in the *Dictionary*. Professor Sanday's article on JESUS CHRIST, in the second volume, runs to fifty-one pages. There is no article of the same magnitude within the four volumes. But in the Extra Volume, while Professor Ramsay on the RELIGION OF GREECE AND ASIA MINOR covers forty-eight pages, and Professor Morris Jastrow on the RELIGION OF BABYLONIA exactly the same space as Dr. Sanday, the article by Professor Kautzsch on the Religion of Israel is a hundred and twenty-one pages in length.

Yet it is an article. It is an article for a dictionary. It is not a book. If it had been a book we cannot suppose that Professor Kautzsch would have been careful to see that every sentence should be exactly in its place, weighted with as much meaning as perfect clearness would allow it to carry. If it had been a book it would have been a bulky book, and would have cost nearly as much as this whole volume. 'It will indeed,' says a great English scholar, who has read it in proof, 'be a star of the first magnitude in the new volume.'

There is no department of the study of the Bible in which English scholarship has more resolutely refused to follow the lead of German scholarship than in the study of the Fourth Gospel. The time will come when scholars everywhere will recognize that Westcott and Sanday were the means under God of preserving that Gospel for the use of our generation. It is the loss of the Fourth Gospel that is the cause of that thinness of blood which one sees so plainly in the German exegesis of our day. Jülicher, in his second edition, has gone a long way towards an English appreciation of St. John, but he has a long way yet to go. English scholars like Dr. Edwin Abbott, who once adopted the German manner, are ready now to throw it off.

Dr. Edwin Abbott has published a new book. He has found a new name for it. With an ingenuity that would send some publishers into an asylum, he calls his new book by the utterly unattractive title of *Paradosis* (A. & C. Black; 8vo, pp. xxiii, 216, 7s. 6d. net). It is a successor to

*Clue*; it is one of the series of *Diatessarica*. The most welcome thing in Dr. Abbott's new book is the new appreciation of St. John.

Paradosis means delivering up. The book is written to prove that when the Synoptic Gospels speak of the delivering up of Jesus by Judas to the servants of Caiaphas, they make a mistake, what they ought to speak about is the delivering up of the Son by the Father for the redemption of mankind. It is the Synoptists that make the mistake. St. Paul does not make it, nor St. Peter, *nor the Fourth Gospel*. This is all in the preface. And before the preface is closed Dr. Abbott has succeeded in saying that 'the Fourth Gospel brings us closest, not indeed to the words, but to the mind of Christ.' That is a great thing for Dr. Abbott to say.

But about this Paradosis. Dr. Abbott says that even St. Paul never refers to Christ's betrayal by Judas. We at once recall—for are they not very familiar?—the words of the Institution: 'on that night in which He was betrayed.' Dr. Abbott says that that is a mistranslation. The true translation is, 'In the night in which He was delivered up [by the Father as a sacrifice for sinners].' For there is no other place in St. Paul's Epistles in which this Greek word is translated, or can be translated, 'betrayed.' And although our Lord speaks in the Synoptic Gospels of being betrayed (as if by Judas) into the hands of sinners, that is a mistake in the Synoptic Gospels. In all such cases He really spoke of His being delivered up by the Father.

What is the difference? Dr. Abbott says that the difference and the gain are very great. 'We gain an immense help towards the recognition and sincere worship of our Lord as God. There is all the world of difference between the mind's eye of a seer fixed in a kind of second-sight on Judas, and the mind's eye of a Saviour and Son of God fixed on the inscrutable wisdom with which the Father overrules sin and suffering so as to make them subservient to the redemption and perfection of man.' And if Dr. Abbott is right there is a greater difference even than that.

The Father delivers up the Son. But the Son is at one with the Father, and delivers Himself up. And another way of saying that He delivers up Himself is to say with Isaiah that He 'pours out His *soul* unto death.' For the soul is used for the self, including the body. It may even, paradoxically enough, be used for the body alone, or the body may be used for it. What have we then? In the institution of the Eucharist we have our Lord saying, 'This is my body.' He means, 'This is my soul or self.' In the Eucharist He has no thought of the body apart from the self. He simply means that He is pouring out His soul unto death. And when He encourages His disciples, saying, 'This do in remembrance of me,' He means, 'Do as I am doing. As I give my life a ransom for you, so give ye your lives for the heathen. As I lose my life, so lose ye yours, that ye may gain it unto life eternal.' Dr. Abbott does not deny that Christ 'contemplated a continuous celebration of the evening meal of thanksgiving in future generations.' But he holds that its only efficacy is in the spirit of self-sacrifice which it illustrates and expects.

'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you.' So the Revised Version as well as the Authorized, repeating the margin, 'or, among you.' But it was the Pharisees who asked, 'when the kingdom of God cometh.' Was it within *them*? Would our Lord be likely to say so?

Mr. Muirhead, in his *Eschatology of Jesus*, elsewhere noticed, thinks that Christ would not be likely to say so. And yet he is pressed with the thought that our Lord spoke always of His kingdom as spiritual and would not miss the chance of speaking of it as spiritual now. So he thinks there is an ambiguity in the word. Grammatically

either meaning is admissible. Dalman, who argues for 'within you,' as the most likely Aramaic original of the Greek word (ἐντός), is answered by J. Weiss that, on Dalman's own argument, 'among you' is the more likely form in Aramaic. So Mr. Muirhead thinks that our Lord expressly chose an ambiguous expression, not committing Himself to the statement that the kingdom of God was within the Pharisees, and yet not missing the opportunity of suggesting its essential inwardness.

It is the day of freedom of speech. There are still, no doubt, ways of making men feel that by their words they may be condemned. Mr. Beeby has discovered that. But Mr. Beeby protests that the Bishop of Worcester took an unfair advantage of him. He appealed to him *as an honest man* to resign. And now, Mr. Beeby reads articles by Canon Hensley Henson in every other magazine, and every article as 'unfaithful to the ordination vow' as ever his own words were, and no one asks Canon Henson to resign.

It is the day of freedom of speech. But you must be able to resist appeals to your honesty. Canon Hensley Henson is able. He has had appeals enough, for he has many watchful enemies. But his open and undisguised intention is to get the ordination vows altered. He wants the Creeds revised and the Lectionary reconstructed. And he is not weakly going to resign his canonry and so lose the power which 'being set in no obscure place,' as he puts it, gives him for gaining that great end.

So when the Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School deplores in the *Guardian* the extraordinary length Canon Hensley Henson has gone, he does not ask him to resign his canonry. He simply asks him to be more cautious. His own experience as a teacher 'has impressed him deeply with the need of caution in communicating, to relatively uninstructed minds, views of a purely subjective character, which, however unsatisfactory and uncritical in themselves, may possibly be accepted by some on the bare word of those who gave them currency.'

What has Canon Henson been saying? He has been saying two strong things in one month. The one appears in the *Contemporary Review*, the other in the *Hibbert Journal*. In the *Contemporary Review* he demands a revision of the Lectionary. He wants certain things cut out of it, especially 'the incredible, puerile, or demoralizing narratives which the Old Testament contains'; and he wants certain things put into it, in particular 'Christian compositions which have secured the approval of general acceptance, and taken the rank of spiritual classics among religious people.'

In the *Hibbert Journal* he demands a revision of the Creed. His chief trouble is over the Resurrection. He himself believes the Resurrection. He has no doubt that Jesus Christ survived death, and that 'not in an impoverished ghostly state, but in the fulness of personal life,' and that He made His presence known to His disciples. But there are good men and true who cannot accept so much as that. Canon Henson would like to retain them. He would therefore not insist on 'the Lord was raised'; he would be content to say 'the Lord lives.' Besides, there are details of the Resurrection narratives which he himself has trouble with. The material nature of Christ's risen body, the empty tomb, and the third day—these are in his opinion both unproved and unnecessary.

It is not easy to see how Canon Hensley Henson can say 'the Lord lives' if he cannot say 'the Lord was raised.' It is not easy to see what good it will do him. But let that pass. Why does he dispute the nature of the Lord's risen body? Because there is not sufficient evidence for it. Its evidence rests with St. Luke. It is he that says Jesus took food, and ate it before the

disciples. St. Paul does not mention such a thing. St. Paul seems even to reject such a conception, when he says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom.

---

Why does he reject the empty tomb? Again, on insufficient evidence. It is true that *all* the evangelists speak of it, but then St. Paul does not. Canon Henson cannot understand St. Paul's silence if he knew of it. Why, finally, does he renounce the third day? On insufficient evidence. For, although in this case the fact is held as firmly by St. Paul as by the evangelists, Canon Henson would require more evidence than that, because he thinks it likely that the idea of rising again the third day was suggested to the disciples by the Old Testament.

---

Canon Hensley Henson does not claim to be a critic. He relies on the criticism of other men. And Mr. Arbuthnot Nairn has little difficulty in showing how great a risk the man runs who goes out seeking such dangerous adventures in other men's armour. His great stand-by is Schmiedel. But he misunderstands Schmiedel, and misrepresents him. And how ridiculous is the attitude of a man who thinks he could believe in the risen body if the Gospels would agree to recommend it; who would accept the empty tomb if St. Paul would confirm it as well as the Gospels; who at last wants something else when all the Gospels and St. Paul testify that Christ rose on the third day. These matters are all the proper subject of criticism. Mr. Arbuthnot Nairn's objection is that this is not criticism.

---

Professor Sanday has written an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April on 'The Injunctions of Silence in the Gospels.' Some two years ago Professor Wrede of Breslau published a book, in which he used these injunctions of silence as evidence that our Lord did not claim to be Messiah. If Jesus had claimed to be Messiah, He would never, says Professor Wrede, have gone about preventing His followers from publishing that claim. If He had wrought miracles in support of His Messianic claims He would never have forbidden those who profited by the miracles to speak about them. Professor Wrede says that Jesus never claimed to be Messiah, and never wrought miracles in support of such a claim. It was after His Resurrection that His disciples, coming to believe that He was God, read back this belief into His life, asserted that He had claimed the Messiahship, and proved His claim by miracle; and when asked why nobody knew this while He was alive, met the difficulty by saying that He had forbidden them to speak of it.

---

Professor Sanday cannot believe that. He finds it easier to believe that Jesus did work miracles, and did claim to be the Messiah, and that He often enjoined silence about these things just as we have it in the Gospels. For he feels the unmistakable touch of sincerity in those narratives. They seem to him not only strictly but beautifully historical. 'There is just that paradoxical touch about them which is the sure guarantee of truth. What writer of fiction,' he asks, 'especially of the naïve fiction current in those days, would ever have thought of introducing such features, with just that kind of seeming self-contradiction?'

---

Why, then, did Jesus enjoin silence on those who confessed His Messiahship? Why did He often charge those whom He had healed to tell no man? Professor Sanday is not sure that he is altogether able to say. There was one prophecy about the Messiah with which these injunctions to silence were in fine accord. It is the prophecy that the Servant of the Lord 'shall not strive nor cry, nor lift up his voice in the streets.' The Jews had forgotten that prophecy. They looked for a political Messiah. Men gathered round Jesus, eager young men, full of courage and enthusiasm, ready to take the sword, ready at any moment to rise against the Romans, waiting only for a leader. Ever since the dethronement of Archelaus and

the annexation of Judæa by Rome in 6 A.D., there had been this temper of sullen acquiescence biding its time. The memory of the Maccabæan rising still lived in men's minds, and of the wonderful feats that had then been wrought against desperate odds. What, then, might not be done with a prophet at the head—nay, one more than a prophet, who was assured of the alliance and succour of Heaven?

---

Our Lord could not wholly disappoint, and yet He could not encourage this enthusiasm. As enthusiasm it was good, but it was enthusiasm of the wrong sort. It needed to be enlightened, disciplined, purified; so the record of the Gospels is of seeming paradox, seeming cross-purpose. Now He seems to stimulate, again He seems to restrain. Dr. Sanday believes that the cross-purpose is only in our imperfect knowledge. If we knew all, we should know that He adapted His treatment to each case as it arose, diagnosing with perfect insight the temper of those with whom He had to deal and adjusting His own attitude accordingly.

---

But Professor Sanday believes that there is more in the injunctions to silence than that. He sees that when Jesus enjoins silence His language is constantly emphatic: 'Jesus rebuked (ἐπετίμησεν) the unclean spirit, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him' (Mk $1^{25}$); 'And He chargeth them much (πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς) that they should not make Him known' (Mk $3^{12}$, cf. $8^{39}$); 'And He chargeth them much (διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλά) that no man should know this' (Mk $5^{43}$, cf. $7^{36}$ $9^{9}$).

---

What sort of language is this? It is the language of emotion, says Dr. Sanday, the language of strong emotion. Now there was one occasion on which our Lord used stronger language even than this. It was after St. Peter's confession. Immediately after that confession came the first prediction of the Passion and the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. St. Peter was taken by surprise. He was sincerely shocked. He took Jesus and began to rebuke Him. 'Then Jesus, turning about, and seeing His disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind Me, Satan: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.'

---

Professor Sanday believes that the reason of the strong language in all these places is the same. It is personal. It has to do with the Lord Himself. Words like these are not the calm enunciation of a policy, or the didactic outpouring of a lesson. They come up from the depths. They are spoken with heat. It is the reaction against temptation. And the temptation is keenly felt, felt as temptation.

---

Dr. Sanday has none of that ease with which some writers seem to move in the region of our Lord's human consciousness. He does not profess to be well acquainted with it. He cannot handle it freely. He has no skill in eking out the limited data supplied by the Gospels. But here he is within the Gospels themselves. He remembers that in one of the scenes of the Temptation in the Wilderness Jesus was taken up into an exceeding high mountain and shown the kingdoms of the world. The story is symbolical. It gathers up the significance of more than one actual incident in our Lord's life. Jesus is conscious of supernatural power. If He would He could make these kingdoms His. But only by giving up His Messianic mission. He came to serve. He came to be obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. The prospect of the Cross was now before Him. It carried a real temptation. 'Father,' He said, even after this, 'Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from Me.' When Peter made his unhappy impulsive speech, he was doing, without knowing it, the devil's work. Jesus felt the temptation. 'Get thee behind Me, Satan.'

---

'Among the uses of the Old Testament,' said Professor A. B. Davidson once in an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 'there is one that

deserves special emphasis—the firmness of voice with which the Old Testament says "God." It utters little but one word to men, but this is the word.'

---

It is the utterance of this word that determines everything which the Old Testament contains. It determines the Old Testament view of the Future State. Why is it that men have been so slow to understand the Old Testament teaching upon the Future State? It is because they have not seen that the Old Testament conception of the Future follows the Old Testament conception of God. Now the Old Testament conception of God is progressive, and the conception of the Future makes progress with it. The difficulty of arriving at an understanding of the Old Testament doctrine of the Future State is due to the fact that that doctrine is not always the same.

---

In the end of last year a course of lectures on the Psalms was given in St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin. The lectures have now been published by Messrs. S. C. Brown, Langham, & Company, under the title of *The Psalms of Israel* (crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.). One of the lectures, by the Rev. Prebendary L. A. Pooler, B.D., deals with the Eschatology of the Psalms. In that lecture Prebendary Pooler shows that the conception of the Future State held by the Psalmists is inconsistent. It is inconsistent because it is progressive.

---

Prebendary Pooler begins his lecture by making two quotations from the Psalms. The first is Ps $88^{5}$—

> Like the slain that lie in the grave,
> Whom Thou rememberest no more;
> And they are cut off from Thy hand.

The other is Ps $139^{7.8}$—

> Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
> Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
> If I ascend unto Heaven, Thou art there:
> If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there.

Do the writers of those two passages agree in their thought of the Future State? Prebendary Pooler says they do not agree. And he says that the reason of their disagreement lies in the difference of their date. The one had a conception of God and therefore of the Future State which the other had grown out of.

---

Prebendary Pooler finds three distinct moments in the knowledge of God and of the Future Life in Israel. In the first stage of their existence he believes that the Israelites were simply Semites. They were Semites with possibilities, perhaps with actual powers, within them which would one day lead them up to great things. But as yet they believed as the other Semitic nations believed, and for that matter, as all the nations of the earth seem to have believed at the beginning.

---

They did not believe in God. They scarcely believed in gods. They believed in demons or spirits. These demons or spirits were of good or ill intent, mostly of ill. And the object of all worship was to attract the good or drive away the evil. Images were made of them, and called *teraphim*; and the early Israelites carried these images with them wherever they went. Rachel felt so much safer and better when she stole the household *teraphim* of her uncle Laban and hoped to have them beside her in her new home. Michal found an unexpected use for them when the hour of danger to her husband David came. She placed the image in the bed that the murderers might mistake it for her husband himself.

---

Prebendary Pooler believes that these spirits were the ghosts or souls of dead ancestors. He believes that the early Israelites were not only Animists, but Ancestor-worshippers. Sheol was peopled with the souls of the dead. They were not dead. They were not confined to Sheol. They took a keen interest in the affairs of the world above them. They knew what was going on and even what the future would bring forth, and they were sometimes called the 'knowing ones' (Lev $20^{27}$). They could be consulted. They could be summoned out of Sheol for con-

sultation with those who were still alive. At Endor, even in the days of Saul, there lived a wise woman who could bring up the soul of the dead into the land of the living to tell what the future was to bring forth in a great crisis of a great man's history.

Then Jehovah came. The years and the agonies through which the Israelites passed before He came we need not dwell upon. From the worship of demons they had passed, we may be sure, to the worship of proper gods. The demons were not extinguished. But they were gradually more and more confined to the place where they did *not* delight to dwell, the abode of the departed. The gods reigned in heaven and on earth and under the earth.

When Jehovah came, He came at first as one of the gods. Prebendary Pooler is bold enough to believe, with Wellhausen, that He came from Mount Sinai. He believes that He was the God of the tribes that used to pasture their flocks around that mountain, and that even in the days of Deborah He is still conceived of as coming all the way from Sinai to help the Israelites against their enemies in the north. But wherever He came from He came as one of the gods. His jurisdiction was limited. At first the grassy plains and black rocks of Mount Sinai if you will. Certainly afterwards 'in Salem was His tabernacle and His dwelling-place in Sion.' He was the God of the land of Canaan.

Beyond the borders of the Promised Land Jehovah had as yet no proper jurisdiction. David complained that in being driven out of Canaan he was driven to the worship of strange gods. And if Philistia, how much more was Sheol beyond His jurisdiction. The under-world had its own gods. They needed no help in their government from the gods of the world above, they would brook no interference. The living were under the control of Merodach or Sin if they dwelt in Babylonia, of Ra or Isis if they dwelt in the land of Egypt, of Chemosh if they dwelt in the cities of Moab, of Jehovah if they dwelt in Canaan. But the moment that they died, they passed into the realm of the dead and under the control of the gods of the under-world. When the Israelite died, he did not cease to be, but he ceased to have Jehovah for his God. This was the bitterness of it. He became—not extinct, that would have been easier—but one of those

> Whom Thou rememberest no more;
> And they are cut off from Thy hand.

It would have been easier for the Israelite if he had ceased to be. That was the next step that was taken. The Israelite at death ceased to be.

To Prebendary Pooler there is no question that at a certain period in their history the Israelites came to believe that death was practical extinction. 'O spare me,' cries one Psalmist piteously, 'that I may recover strength, before I go hence and be no more.' 'For there is hope of a tree,' says Job, 'if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease; but man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?'

They came to believe this. It was not their earliest belief. It was a rescue from their earliest and most dreadful belief. For to the pious follower of Jehovah it was less terrible to 'be no more' than to be under other gods. It was a step forward in their knowledge of God. They conceived that all life was the gift of Jehovah their God. 'Jehovah God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a *living soul*.' So the existence of the very soul of man depends henceforth upon the possession of this 'breath of life.' Hitherto it has been understood that the body perished at death, but the soul lived on in Sheol. Now the soul perishes also, becomes, in the striking words of Numbers $6^6$, 'a dead soul' the moment the breath of life is withdrawn. Now 'the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the

spirit returns to God who gave it.' The Israelite ceased to be.

This did not enlarge the boundaries of the realm of Jehovah, but it extinguished the gods of the under-world. It extinguished also all approaches to ancestor-worship, and much of the degrading dread of demons. It was a step in advance. It prepared the way for the recognition of Jehovah as the only living and true God. Soon Jehovah will be the God of the living in the hereafter as well as here.

The Sadducees never took another step. They never came to believe in the life to come. They arrested revelation at this stage in its progress. They cut off a portion of the past and called it tradition, and were content with it. They counted Sheol a synonym for Abaddon or Destruction. They quoted the 88th Psalm, 'Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in Abaddon.' They said, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'

This next great moment in the progress of Israel's belief in the Future came in with Amos. It came with a new revelation of Jehovah. According to Amos, Jehovah not only brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, He also brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir. He is the God of the nations over all the earth. He is the Creator of heaven and earth. Sheol also comes under His authority. Now there is no passing beyond the skirts of His white raiment.

> Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
> Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
> If I ascend unto Heaven, Thou art there;
> If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there.

This is the 139th Psalm. Prebendary Pooler holds that it is the high-water mark of the Psalter.

# Can We still Defend a Vicariously Penal Element in the Atonement?[1]

By the Rev. W. D. Maclaren, M.A.

In the discussion of this question we must assume the Being of God, man's present alienation from Him, and His constantly reconciling action on the souls of men. It will also be allowed that all professedly Christian teachers, whatever their view of Christ's person, regard His mission as specially concerned in bringing about this reconciliation. Behind these assumptions we cannot at present go. Our question further implies the existence and quondam popularity of an opinion that this reconciliation of man with God has taken place in virtue of a penalty incurred but not endured by the wrong-doer, endured but not incurred by Christ, in the name of those thus redeemed. With this theory there has always been presented a corresponding conception of the whole Christian economy.

It is equally notorious that this opinion can to-day hardly get a hearing, and that it is chiefly defended, even by those in whose Christian experience it is most deeply intertwined, by arguments and formulæ of a traditional character, which seldom venture to deal with the ultimate realities of the question. The extreme individualism of the greater part of the nineteenth century was hostile to the admission of any vicarious element in the divine treatment of sinful men. A purely humanitarian view of Christ's person naturally associates itself with individualism as to the nature and effect of this mission. Not a few, however, who most strongly affirm the trinitarian view of Christ's person, and who admit therefore the entrance into the human race of an extraordinary type, deny that His mission, while

[1] This paper was first prepared for the Manchester Ministers' Association a few years ago, and has since been discussed at a number of other ministerial gatherings in different parts of England.