

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

but it suffices to indicate the basis of the difference between us. Mr. Braithwaite's outlook is chiefly on the subjective aspect of the Transfiguration, mine on the objective. The two are not opposed, but complementary, and taken together should tend to establish the essential relation of the Transfiguration to the Passion and all that depends upon the propitiatory work of the Redeemer.

In saying that 'the remainder of the story' (*i.e.* the scene on the Mount) 'transcends human experience,' some allusion might have been made to Ac 23¹¹, where the Apostle was the subject of a strengthening vision. Was St. Paul's experience entirely subjective?

But the chief reason for my present comment is to correct the statement that 'from them our Lord might assume . . . the double office.' What I said was: 'St. Peter saw in the Transfiguration nothing less than the assumption before selected witnesses of both offices, priest and prophet, by the Son of Man. Assumed . . . but at the voice of the source of all authority and power, the Father Himself.' He could not 'assume' the two offices 'from' Moses and Elijah, since they had no power to confer them upon Him, nor, as I have been reminded by an astute critic, could He assume, as if then for the first time, offices which were inherent in His Personality and Being; but He could and did manifest before the limited public of five chosen witnesses the beginning of the final stage on earth of the priestly-prophetic work for which He had been sent, and had come into the world. Of the priesthood of Moses, and the prophetic office of which Elijah was the typical exponent (Mal 4⁴⁻⁶), He Himself was the real founder, whatever efficiency or power accompanied their exercise derived from Him and were fulfilled in Him; and it seems to me that His vital relationship to all that Moses and Elijah did almost necessitated their presence in person at the moment when their delegated

functions were to cease and to be taken up into active operation in the person of their true Founder and Author.

In pleading for belief in the reality of the presence of Moses and Elijah on the Mount, as against the view of a phantomatic appearance, or collective hallucination, caused by mental transference from the vivid thought of the two in the mind of Christ, I am not forgetful of the fact that neither St. Peter nor St. John based their teaching of the Resurrection on their vision of the two departed saints whom they saw with Christ. Had the disciples been convinced by some token at the time, or by some subsequent unreported declaration of their Master, that Moses and Elijah had passed through the resurrection of the dead, the fact would assuredly have found expression in their teaching. That nothing of the sort can be found suffices for us to dismiss the appearances as of spiritual reality in the body that 'shall be' (1 Co 15). On the other hand, we have evidence of conversation between Christ and the O.T. witnesses of His glory (Lk 9⁸¹). In this respect the experience was unique, and, I think, it tends to prove the actuality of their personal presence. To be 'heavy with sleep' is by no means a necessary preliminary to a vision of any sort (there are numberless instances of visions, due to simple thought transference, when all the faculties are awake), and the reference to St. Matthew's word *ὄραμα* proves nothing as to the character of the thing 'seen.' And, lastly, Mr. Braithwaite might well strengthen his thought of the 'organic relation' of the Transfiguration to the sacrifice on the cross by the clear teaching of the N.T., especially in Hebrews, as to the truth of our Lord's priesthood. The Mount showed Him to the disciples, as nothing else had done, as the High Priest of God for men, the Prophet whose words they must hear. ALFRED T. FRYER.

Cardiff.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.—The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. G. E. Ffrench, B.D., West Hatch Vicarage, Taunton.

Illustrations of the Great Text for July must be received by the 6th of June. The text is Lk 1²⁵.

The Great Text for August is Lk 1⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹—

'Yea and thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High:
For thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to make ready his ways;
To give knowledge of salvation unto his people
In the remission of their sins,
Because of the tender mercy of our God,
Whereby the dayspring from on high shall visit us,

To shine upon them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death;

To guide our feet into the way of peace.'

A copy of Dr. Forrest's *The Authority of Christ* or Dr. Patrick's *James, the Lord's Brother*, will be given for the best illustration received, and a copy of Bain's *New Reformation* or Gwatkin's *The Eye for Spiritual Things* for the next best.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.