

it we read (p. 346): 'The Son of man in the Book of Enoch must be left out of the game so long as it is not established that the part of the book in question *was* known or *could have been known* to Jesus.'

Both the strength and the weakness of this sentence lie in the evident determination of Wellhausen not to tie up his theory regarding the meaning of *Bar-nasha* on the lips of Jesus with the view that the passages in Enoch are Christian interpolation. But unless he falls back (as he does not) on the view of Lietzmann that the usage, *Son of man = the Messiah*, is not to be found in Enoch, he really cannot afford to admit the possibility of the pre-Christian origin of the Son of man passages in that book. For, as Schmiedel very justly remarks, it is only the latter of the two alternatives (the *could have been known*) mentioned in the last-cited passage which need cause any concern to those who combat Wellhausen's view. If the Book of Enoch (as we have it in chaps. 37-71) existed in the time of Jesus, we do not need to prove that He must have *read* it in order to account for His adoption in a specific sense of a phrase, which this book (and for ought we know, other books) may very well have made to some extent current in that sense among the Jews.

Yet again, even if we agree with Wellhausen, to leave the Book of Enoch 'out of the game,' we can still, according to Schmiedel, put him in a tight place by means of his concession (a concession in itself creditable to Wellhausen's sense of history) that Jesus *did* use the phrase *Bar-nasha* in an emphatic *personal* though not in a

Messianic sense. In reference to this, Wellhausen frankly admits it to be 'extremely peculiar' that instead of saying simply 'I,' Jesus should have said 'The Man,' 'but,' he adds, 'it would be not less remarkable to say "The Messiah" instead of "I"' (*History, loc. cit.*).

Schmiedel's comment on this 'Machtspruch' (the polite German name for *critical impudence*) is worth quoting: 'Really! *Cæsar commanded the attack*. Instead of this the words in the Gallic War might run: *The general commanded the attack*. But could it also be said: *The soldier commanded the attack?* or, *Cæsar exhorted the soldiers*. It might also be said: *The general exhorted the soldiers*; but what of: *The soldier exhorted the soldiers?* To show that the last example is not irrelevant, we need only quote (*à la* Wellhausen) Mk 9³¹: '*The Man will be delivered into the hands of men.*'

To conclude: No one holds that to establish, as I believe it can be established, that the phrase *Son of man* was in the time of Jesus a more or less current Jewish title of the Messiah, necessarily takes us very far in understanding what the Messiahship of Jesus meant to Himself, but I cannot but think that a serious blow is struck at the historicity of the Gospels, if we are left to choose between the alternatives either that Jesus did not apply the phrase to Himself at all, or that the phrase had not to Jewish ears a Messianic reference. I confess it seems to me that the latter alternative is as repugnant to the interests of faith as the former, and for this reason among others I am grateful to Professor Schmiedel for the article herewith in part reproduced.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF GALATIANS.

GALATIANS I. 4.

'Who gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us out of this present evil world, according to the will of our God and Father' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'Who gave Himself.'—St. Paul here touches on the doctrinal, as in v.¹ he touched on the personal, point of controversy with the false teachers. He holds up at once before the Galatians, who were returning to the bondage of

the law, the picture of the dying Saviour, who, by the one sacrifice on the cross, fully and for ever accomplished our redemption, so that we need not resort to any human means of salvation, or go back to a preparatory dispensation.
—SCHAFF.

THIS is the strongest imaginable description of what Christ did to redeem us. The phrase occurs in 1 Mac 6⁴⁴ with reference to the Eleazar who rushed upon certain death to kill the elephant which was carrying the king, Antiochus: 'He gave himself to save his people.' It is applied to Christ also in Tit 2¹⁴, 'Who gave Himself for

us'; and in 1 Ti 2⁶, 'Who gave Himself a ransom for all.' In the next chapter, v. 20, the apostle writes, 'Who loved me, and gave Himself up for me.' Similarly, St. Paul writes in Ro 8³², 'He that spared not [i.e. 'kept not back'] His own Son, but gave Him up for us all.' The addition in Mt 26⁴⁵ of the words, 'into the hands of sinners,' and our Lord's utterance in Lk 22⁵³, 'This is your hour and the power of darkness,' help to illustrate the exceedingly pregnant expression now before us.—HUXTABLE.

'For our sins.'—In the Greek there are three prepositions, which can only be translated by the single word 'for' in English. The first has for its primary sense 'concerning' or 'relating to'; it merely marks a connexion or relation between two facts. The second has rather the sense 'in behalf of,' 'in the interests of.' The third means strictly 'in place of.' The first, as might be expected, is naturally used in respect of *things*; the second and third of *persons*. The death of Christ was a sacrifice *for sins*, i.e. the sins of mankind stood in a distinct relation to it, which was really that of cause. The sins of mankind it was which set the whole scheme of redemption in motion, and to take away those, sins was its main object. The death of Christ was a sacrifice *for sinners*. It was a sacrifice wrought in their behalf for their benefit. It was also a sacrifice wrought *in their stead*. Christ suffered in order that they might not suffer. He gave His life 'a ransom for (i.e. *in place of*) many.' The first of these meanings is represented in Greek by the preposition *peri*, the second by *huper*, the third by *anti*. The distinction, however, is not quite strictly kept up. We not unfrequently find the death of Christ described as a sacrifice for (*on behalf of*) sins. This would correspond rather to our phrase 'for the sake of.' The object was to do away with sins. They were, as it were, the final cause of the atonement.

It is somewhat doubtful which of the first two prepositions is to be read here. By far the majority of MSS. have *peri*, but the famous Codex Vaticanus, and one of the corrections of the Sinaitic MS. have *huper*. The two prepositions are not unfrequently confused in the MSS., and the probability in this case is that the numerical majority is right. It will then be simply stated in the text that the sins of men and the sacrifice of Christ have a relation to each other. If there had been no sin there would have been no redemption.—SANDAY.

'That He might deliver us.'—*Deliver* strikes the keynote of the Epistle. The gospel is a rescue, an emancipation from a state of bondage. See esp. 4^{9, 31} 5^{1, 13}.—LIGHTFOOT.

RESCUE us from the thralldom of, etc. The same word is used of the deliverance of Joseph (Ac 7¹⁰), and by our Lord Himself in reference to St. Paul (Ac 26¹⁷). Freedom, as the result of emancipation, is the great blessing of the gospel.—PEROWNE.

'Out of this present evil world.'—The reading of the three oldest and best MSS. tends rather to emphasize the word 'evil'—'this present world with all its evils.' A question is raised as to the word translated 'present,' which might probably mean 'impending,' but the Authorized Version is probably right. 'This present world' is strictly *this present age*. The Jews divided the history of the world into two great periods—the times antecedent to the coming

of the Messiah, and the period of the Messianic reign. The end of the first and the beginning of the second were to be especially attended with troubles; and it was just in this transition period—the close of the older dispensation of things—in which the apostles regarded themselves as living. The iniquities of the pagan society around them would naturally give them an intense longing for release; but the release which they seek is moral and spiritual. They do not so much pray that they may be 'taken out of the world' as that they may be 'kept from the evil.' This the Christian scheme, duly accepted and followed, would do. The Atonement frees men from guilt, but its efficacy does not cease there; it sets going a train of motives which hold back the Christian from sin, and constrain him to use his best endeavours after a holy life. The Galatians had lost sight of the power of the Atonement to do this, and had fallen back upon the notion of a legal righteousness, through the vain attempt to keep the commandment of the Law.—SANDAY.

'According to the will of our God and Father.'—St. Paul in this place lays down a great principle, which he unfolds more fully afterwards. Our deliverance is entirely the result of free grace. 'Paul,' says Luther, 'so placeth and ordereth every word, that there is not one of them but fighteth against those false apostles for the article of justification. . . . We be not delivered by our own will or cunning, nor by our own wisdom or policy, but for that our God hath taken mercy upon us and hath loved us.' He so loved the world that He sent His Son to be our Saviour (Jn 3¹⁶). His will is 'that all men should be saved' (1 Ti 2⁴). 'There is also another cause why Paul here maketh mention of the Father's will . . . that in Christ's works and works we should not so much look upon Him as upon the Father. For Christ came . . . that we by fastening our eyes upon Him, might be drawn and carried straight to the Father.'—HOWSON.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Separation and Service.

By the Rev. A. J. Gordon, D.D.

Here Christ's vicarious sacrifice touches its lowest depths of humiliation. He gave Himself *for our sins*. Consider the end of this condescension.

I. The Divine Separation—'that He might deliver us from this present evil world.' Attachment to Christ is the only secret of detachment from the world. A man never stops sinning till he has begun believing. An unconverted man may fight hard with his evil passions, but the battle will be a drawn one. It is the warfare described in Ro 7; the law in the members wars against

the law of the mind, the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and so the conflict goes on till Christ comes into the soul and brings victory. But is the battle won once for all at conversion? No, it must be fought again and again. We must beware of the dangers of peace, of compromise with the world, of being beguiled through harmless pleasures. In a region in Barbary infested by robbers there is a spring over which is inscribed, 'Drink, and be gone.' So we must not linger over the pleasant things of this life, but taste them and hasten on as pilgrims passing through the world. Men try to popularize Christianity by offering an adulterated religion—a mixture of secularity and spirituality. They think it will be more palatable, but it is not so. Garibaldi recruited his army by calling for such as would accept cold, hunger, nakedness, and death, and Christ gets His true soldiers by proclaiming His Cross. By repentance, faith, and self-denial He separates men from the world to Himself. And here is the test of faith,—not, can it keep a moral man moral, but can it change the immoral and outcast into the sober and respectable?

II. The Divine Standard,—'*according to the will of God.*' God has his own method by which He works, and to this we must conform. Some reformers say the problem for the Church is to adapt Christianity to the age. But why should we do so, if the age is evil? Scripture says, 'Be not conformed to this age, but be ye transformed, by the renewing of your minds, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.' This is what is needed,—the Divine will lived out in human lives. God's will is the measure by which all human conduct must be rectified. If traders have fallen into the sin of measuring with a short yard-stick, and weighing with a false balance, is he the best friend of society who gets the standard of weight and measure changed so as to conform to this dishonest usage? Sin has deranged our moral standards, and the Christian must not adjust himself to the age, but convince the age of sin by exhibiting to it the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. Christians are significantly called 'believers' in the Bible. They accept what God says as final, not resting upon science or the opinions of great thinkers. It may seem stupid not to think with the great thinkers; it is better to believe with the great believers. And it is the Christian's chief distinction to be delivered from the world's ways of thinking,

and to walk by faith, not sight. As another passage says, Christians are those who 'have tasted the powers of the age to come.' It is a strange paradox but true. The pilgrim may feed from his father's table while yet in the wilderness. If you ever grow weary or languid, taste the powers of the world to come and you will be refreshed and invigorated.

III. Separation to What? (1) *To the Lord's ownership.* We speak of losing the soul. Who is the loser? Or of saving the soul. For whom is it saved? 'All souls are Mine,' saith God. To lose the soul is to defraud Him of His redemption-right; to save it is to restore it to Him. Gold cannot be used for currency while it is mixed with quartz and rock. So your soul must be taken out of the sin and earthliness in which it is embedded, separated unto Christ by the Holy Spirit, stamped with His image and superscription, and made into a divine currency to bear His likeness among men. The Christian is the circulating medium of Christ, standing for Him as the currency stands for the gold, representing His good and acceptable will.

(2) *For the Lord's service.*—Christ takes us out of the world in order to send us into the world. He does not require us to seclude ourselves from it. The greatest saints in the world have been those who plunged deepest into its sin and woe to rescue the lost. A worldly man is in the world not to make his neighbours more unworldly, but to make himself more worldly. A heavenly man is in the world to lift men up to God, and can no more be hurt by it than a sunbeam can be defiled by falling into mud. He has his source and being in God as the sunbeam in the sun. Christ has commanded us to go into the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and to keep His command we must rise into constant communion with the Saviour, and come out of the world by separating faith that we may be sent into it bearing the blessing of the gospel of Christ.

II.

Our Father's Redemptive Purpose.

By the Rev. Robert Tuck, B.A.

I. *The will of our Father-God concerning us.* It is that we may be delivered from this present evil

world. It is a Father-like thought, not what we expect of a great King, an Almighty God, but just what we expect of a father. A king wishes to put down rebellion and will grant forgiveness that right relations may be restored; a father grieves for the wrong state of heart in his children, and longs for their regeneration. In this view of God He can seek nothing less for us than deliverance from the world, for He alone knows our bondage. His free children have become the slaves of sin. More even than the multitude of our positive transgressions we feel our *bondage*,—our sinfulness more than our sins. We are by right the children of God; we are in fact slaves to self and the world. And from this evil world it is our Father's purpose to deliver us, and set us free to love and serve Him.

II. *The gracious way in which our Father works out His will.* He sends Jesus Christ to liberate the slaves. He gave Himself for us—not in His death only, but in His whole life as well, meeting all claims, honouring all laws, working out all righteousness, and all this *for our sins*. But how does he deliver us? He becomes a delivering power by winning our love to Himself, and if He holds our love He delivers us from the love of all lower things. Take for example the Apostle Paul, who was so free from the world, so absorbed in the love of Christ, that men thought him beside himself. Christ has gained our love by giving Himself for us, and so has gained the power to deliver us. By love He gains the entrance to our hearts, and He enters to cleanse and sanctify.

The Father's purpose is not yet accomplished in our hearts. We are not quite free. But our Saviour waits to finish His work, and, if we will let Him, to enter into every part of our life and there deliver us from this present evil world.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

A STORY by an American writer describes the perplexing experiences of a little girl whose parents had been divorced, and who, by the decision of the judge, was to spend six months of the year in the care of one parent, and six months with the other, turn and turn about. It is needless to say the child was the victim of wretched mystifications, and did not conceive much love for either one or the other. Whilst in the company of her father she had to listen to daily abuse of her absent mother, who, in veiled hints suited to a child's capacity, was described as a monster of iniquity. And when the child passed for the next six

months into the care of her mother she had to listen to similar depreciations of her father. It was obviously impossible for a child under such conditions to have a share of gladness suited to a child, and to grow up into faith and contentment and love. By their own choice some people put themselves into a similar position between God and the world; they can never therefore trust and entirely love either the one or the other, whilst flitting at intervals between the two. There is an irrevocable divorce, and he that would be the friend of the unregenerate world is the enemy of God.—T. G. SELBY.

A TRUE Christian living in the world is like a ship sailing on the ocean. It is not the ship being in the water that will sink it, but the water getting into the ship. So, in like manner, the Christian is not ruined by being in the world, which he must needs be while he remains in the body, but by the world being in him.—J. MITCHELL.

'OPERATING in futures' is an art practised just as much in the churches as on the exchanges where men buy and sell unground corn and cotton. With not a few people religion is a speculative transaction for distant dates, and the man who gives himself up to God's service is going in for a lock-up investment, sound of course, but the wisdom of which will be proved fifty years hence. Such tentative pietists anticipate, rather than experience, their spiritual life resolving itself into a hope rather than a faith saving from present evil.—T. G. SELBY.

THE tall cedars can be easily sawed and planed and polished, and fitted into their places in the temple of God; but the great problem in my boyhood was how to pull the stumps, whose strong, deep, gnarly roots have struck down into the earth, and grasped it with giant fingers. Only by a tremendous convulsion can these be uprooted. The world is full of such stumps of humanity, all beauty and grace gone; and they only a mass of deep-rooted and inveterate evil habits. 'To deliver men from this present evil world'—this is the problem of humanity which the gospel solves.—A. J. GORDON.

THE pain that comes with reiterated and lifelong wrongdoing mounts to appalling fierceness. We cannot gauge the degrees it may reach with the process of the guilty years; yet at the same time future pain will be an intensified stage of the present. Many men carry their hells about in sections, just as steam launches and light railways are carried on the backs of porters across the desert and put together in a far-off territory. Wherever they go pride, worldly lust, vindictiveness, remorse, vexation, make them only one whit less miserable than lost souls. The last judgment is simply the putting together into an appalling whole of the pains men now feel in parts. Can it be that Christ wishes to save men from a completed hell at last, and not from its constituent terrors now?—T. G. SELBY.

HE that doth love, and love amiss,
 This World's delights before true Christian joy,
 Hath made a Jewish choice :
 The World an ancient murderer is !
 Thousands of souls it hath and doth destroy
 With her enchanting voice,
 He that hath made a sorry wedding
 Between his soul and gold and hath preferred
 False gain before the true,
 Hath done what he condemns in reading ;
 For he hath sold for money his dear Lord.

HERBERT,

Sermons for Reference.

Bickersteth (E.), Condensed Notes on Scripture, 553.
 Davies (T.), Philippians, 289.
 Gordon (A. J.), Yet Speaking, 66.
 Maurice (F. W.), Lincoln's Inn Sermons, i. 246.
 Sallmon (W. H.), Culture of Christian Manhood, 200.
 Selby (T. G.), Unheeding God, 182.
American Pulpit of To-day, ii. 571.
Christian World Pulpit, xiv. 213.

Professor Margoliouth and the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus.

BY PROFESSOR ED. KÖNIG, PH.D., D.D., ROSTOCK.

IV.

NONE of the points emphasized by Margoliouth appear to me to furnish any sure evidence that H is a retranslation 'out of a Syriac and a Persian translation' (p. 19), and that this last was made from G (p. 20). But perhaps there are circumstances which indicate positively that it is neither probable nor possible that H is a retranslation made from S and G. The following appear to me to be such circumstances.

(a) Is it very likely that soon after the time at which the last certain traces of the Hebrew *Ecclus.* are found (*i.e.* in the tenth century, cf. Cowley-Neubauer, p. xi) a retranslation of its sayings into Hebrew should have been undertaken? Was the Jewish scholar who interested himself in favour of a Hebrew form of Ben-Sira's words quite unaware that not a few traces of the Hebrew text of the book were still extant in Jewish literature? Could he fail to cherish the hope that a copy of the Hebrew *Ecclus.* would be discovered in some land of the Jewish Diaspora? Is it likely that he would have sought so early to restore the Hebrew form of the sayings by retranslation? This is not rendered probable by the circumstance that after the year 1516 Hebrew forms of the Book of Tobit began to be issued. For, to begin with, we have no guarantee that there was a Hebrew original of Tobit. On the contrary, Origen wrote to Sextus Julius Africanus

(cap. 13): 'Απὸ τοῦ Τωβία, περὶ οὗ ἡμᾶς ἐχρῆν ἐγνωκέναι, ὅτι Ἑβραῖοι τῷ Τωβία οὐ χρώνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν ἀποκρύφους Ἑβραϊστί. In the second place, we do not at all events meet with such late traces in the Jewish literature of a Hebrew original of the Book of Tobit as we do in the case of Ben-Sira. Consequently a Jew might more readily conceive the plan of reconstructing the Hebrew form of Tobit. Thirdly, it is not certain (see Neubauer, *Book of Tobit*, p. xiii) that the two Hebrew forms of the Book of Tobit which are now extant took their rise as early as the supposed retranslation of *Ecclus.* must be dated.

(b) Is it probable or possible that S and G were the sources of H?

In 40^{16b} both G (πρὸ παντὸς χόρτου) and S read, 'before every plant.' Is this the source of 'on account of' (see above, 2a) or 'before all rain'? Further, 42^{11f.} is not found in G, while in S it reads, 'and amongst houses shall she (a young maiden) not wander about.' How could this give rise to 'neither let it (the dwelling-place of a young maiden) be a house (or room) looking upon the entrances round about'? The same impossibility attaches to 42^{15cd}, where H conveys the sentiment, 'Through the word of God (Gn 1³, etc.) arose only that which He pleased (Gn 1³¹), and him that does His pleasure He accepted,' as, *e.g.*,