

by Professor W. B. Greene, Jr., D. D.

THE INTERNATIONAL LESSONS IN THEIR LITERARY SETTING—III.,

by Professor Willis J. Beecher, D. D.

VOLUME IV. *New Series.* SEPTEMBER, 1901.

NUMBER 3.

The Bible Student

220.05
B 58
C 45

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

Editors:

WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D. D., LL. D.

SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.

GEORGE T. PURVES, D. D., LL. D.

DANIEL J. BRIMM, D. D.

JOHN D. DAVIS, PH.D., D. D.

Contents:

I. EDITORIAL NOTES: The Genesis Narratives—Points of General Agreement. Two Additional Points of Agreement. The Writer's Task and Achievement. The Magnitude of the Task. Magnitude of Achievement—Other Cosmogonies Failures. Rational Presumptions Against Success. Theme One, Treatment One, Readers Change. The Question of a Literary Form. Pitfalls Abounding, But Hidden. An Instance in Point. Another Statement of the Order Conceivable. An Adequate Explanation Demanded. Only One Parallel. These Facts Create a Problem. Mere Evasions. Inspiration No Explanation. Dillmann's Explanation. Revelation or No Explanation. (W. M. McP.) ** Sabbath School Teachers and Radical Criticism. One Method of Dealing with Difficulty. A Less Straight Forward Method. Plausible, But Unsatisfactory. The Same Difficulty Confronts Preachers. Prof. Smith's Suggestions Disappointing. So Is His History of Modern Criticism. What Shall Preachers Do With the O. T.? A Nut for the Conscientious Preacher. Safest to Imitate Christ. (G. T. P.).....	121
II. THE ETHICS OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS. <i>W. B. Greene, Jr.</i>	136
III. THE INTERNATIONAL LESSONS IN THEIR LITERARY SETTING. III. <i>W. J. Beecher</i>	141
IV. THE MORAL RANGE OF THE PROPHET AMOS. <i>I. F. Day</i>	148
V. THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF PROPERTY. No. 1. <i>F. D. Stone</i>	155
VI. ZACCHAEUS—IS HE MISUNDERSTOOD? <i>J. W. Primrose</i>	160
VII. WHY WAS JOHN CONVINCED, BY THE SIGHT OF THE GRAVE CLOTHES, THAT CHRIST HAD RISEN? <i>P. P. Flournoy</i>	165
VIII. THE DATE OF JOEL. No. 3. <i>W. M. McPheeters</i>	168
IX. CURRENT BIBLICAL THOUGHT: Jew vs. Samaritan Again. Jannaris on John iv. 19-22. Usage Makes Against Him. Unnatural Exegesis. Fundamental Misconception. (JAMES OSCAR BOYD.) The True Text of Mark viii. 32. (P. P. FLOURNOY).....	176

The R. L. Bryan Company Press, Columbia, S. C.

ON SALE BY—FLEMING H. REVELL CO., New York, Chicago and Toronto.

JOHN WANAMAKER, New York and Philadelphia.

FRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, Philadelphia.

FRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION, 101 Main St., Richmond, Va.

The Bible Student.

CONTINUING

The Bible Student and Religious Outlook.

Vol. IV., New Series. SEPTEMBER, 1901.

Number 3.

The Genesis Narratives— Points of General Agreement.

That upon many questions raised by the Genesis narratives there is at present great diversity of opinion, cannot be denied. Happily, despite this fact, there are certain points in reference to these narratives upon which there is practical unanimity. This latter fact is one of which we ought by no means to permit ourselves to lose sight. These points of general agreement ought, indeed, to give us our point of departure for all further study. Let us then briefly note them.

1st. It is agreed that *the controlling purpose of the writer of these Genesis narratives was religious*. His aim was not to give us detailed, much less scientific, information in regard to God's works. Just as little was he concerned to write a detailed narrative, and still less what would now be called a scientific history, of the race. His primary interests were strictly religious. He sought to teach men about God, to exhibit God's relations to His works and to His creature man, and to bring man into a right attitude of mind and heart towards God.

Those who lose sight of this fact

will hardly escape doing an injustice to the writer, as well as involving themselves in difficulties.

2d. Another point upon which there is, perhaps, equal unanimity is that *the writer's effort to minister to the religious enlightenment and betterment of his readers has been attended with marked success*. This is a proposition upon which, for lack of space, we cannot cite testimonies *in extenso*. Fortunately, it is not necessary. A single testimony from Dr. W. R. HARPER will answer every purpose. It is the more significant, coming as it does from one occupying Dr. HARPER's well known critical position. While freely questioning the historicity of the matter employed in the Genesis narratives, this distinguished scholar is unstinted in his praise of their moral and spiritual worth. Speaking specifically of the narratives in Genesis i.-ii., he says:

"Either of them has influenced human life more than all the historical records ever penned * * * As to their value as the medium for the conveyance of religious truth, let history speak. The statement made above is not an exaggeration. These stories have directly and indirectly influenced human life more than all the historic records ever penned."*

**The Biblical World*, February, 1894, p. 108.

as John's honest disciple he has received as the Messiah. It had never been his good fortune to meet him. When therefore Jesus so graciously spoke to him, and calling him by name, treated him as one treats an old friend, the heart of Zacchaeus bounded with joy. Joyfully he received the Master under his roof. When the crowd murmured, it was natural that he should stand forth and stoutly rebut the charge of extortion and oppression, for he would not have his distinguished guest to think meanly of His host. "It is my custom Lord to make ample recompense for any wrong of the past, and the half of my income I give to the poor."

And I—Jesus seems plainly to say—make no apology for being this man's guest. Defilement does not come to me, but salvation, in my person comes to this house, for my mission is to seek and save the children of Abraham, and a son of Abraham is he.

Jesus recognized in Zacchaeus an honest disciple, who like the saints of all ages, longed to see his Lord, what manner of man He is.

WHY WAS JOHN* CONVINCED, BY THE SIGHT OF THE GRAVE CLOTHES, THAT CHRIST HAD RISEN?

REV. P. P. FLOURNOY, D. D., BETHESDA, MD.

There was *something* about them which seemed to convince him that Christ had risen from the dead. The common explanation to the effect that Peter and John, on entering the vault, saw them folded and laid by, and from this felt sure that Christ had risen, and with leisurely care had laid the cerements of the grave in order before He left the tomb, has always seemed to me unnatural and wholly inadequate. Why should the well-ordered state of the grave clothes have convinced one, or both, of the disciples of the occurrence there of the most stupendous of miracles? Would the neat folding of the garments in which his body had

*According to the reading of the Syriac Palimpsest, discovered at Mount Sinai, Peter, also, was convinced by the sight of the linen cloths and the napkin. "They saw and believed," is the reading of this version, and it fits in remarkably well with the following sentence: "For as yet they knew not the scripture that He should rise from the dead."

been laid in the tomb by the pious care of Joseph and Nicodemus be an adequate proof that God had raised Christ up, "having loosed the pangs of death; because it was not possible that He should be holden of it?" To ask the question is to answer it.

That there was something about the aspect of the interior of the tomb well calculated to convince those who examined it of the resurrection of Christ, is indicated by the words of the angel to the women, "He is not here; He is risen, as He said. *Come behold the place where the Lord lay.*" That something, as we see from the account which John gives (xx. 3-8), was the position of the grave clothes in the tomb. What was that? A recent note in the *Expository Times* (April, 1901,) gives us light here. In it, attention is drawn to the fact that the napkin was found to be, not folded up and laid aside, as has been generally thought, but still "rolled" (*ἐντετυλιγμένον*) as it had been while around His head. Let us recall the manner of our Lord's burial:

"He [Joseph] took away His body. And there came also Nicodemus, he who at first came to Jesus by night, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight. So they took the body of Jesus and bound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the custom of the Jews is to bury." (R. V.)

Now if Peter and John, on coming into the vault, saw the rolls of linen cloth in which the body of our Lord, together with the hundred weight of aromatic herbs, had been bound by winding it around them, lying just in the position in which they had been while encompassing the body, still distended by the hundred weight of herbs, while, a little apart, where the head had lain, there was the napkin in which His head had been turbaned, lying still "rolled," as it had been when about the head, could they fail to believe that the body had been removed miraculously, i. e. by a resurrection by divine power? What other explanation could there be of the "linen cloths *lying*," as they did, and of the napkin still rolled (*ἐντετυλιγμένον*) and apart from the cloths, where the head had been? Would it be strange, if on seeing this sight, "they *believed*."

We are to remember that our Saviour had told them that He would rise from the dead, and that in this early morning of the third day of their gloomy and almost despairing doubts, Mary Magdalene had run in with the startling announcement, "They

have taken away the Lord out of the Sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him!" They had run breathlessly, with a torrent of thoughts surging through their minds, but not yet remembering that Christ had told them repeatedly—"fools and slow of heart" as they were—that He would rise from the dead, and that, on the third day. But, in the open tomb, what do they now see? They saw "the linen cloths lie," and the napkin that was on His head not lying with the linen cloths, but *rolled up* (ἐντετυλιγμένον) in a place by itself. (R. V.)

What he had told them, now flashed with the suddenness of lightning and the clearness of noon-day, on their dark minds. "He hath risen as He said" was the language of reason and of faith, as it had already been the announcement of the angel to the women.

I think we can now clearly see why so much stress is laid on the position of the grave clothes, and why, on seeing them, John (and Peter too) "*believed*."

It was the last drop into the turbid solution of their thoughts which wrought the brilliant and beautiful crystalization out of the chaos of ignorance and doubt, and there instantly came, in beautiful order, the promise and its fulfillment, all clear and consistent, before the newly opened eyes of their faith.

But this explanation is by no means so new as the writer in the *Expository Times* seems to have thought it. Looking into an old musty volume of *Horne's Introduction*, to see what he has to say of the peculiar customs of the Jews in burying their dead, I find this:

"And when our Lord was risen, Peter, who went into the sepulchre, saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that had been folded round His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wreathed together in a place by itself, lying at some distance from the rolls in which his body had been swathed, and folded up, *exactly in the state it was when first wrapped round His head* (John xx. 7)."

In a note, he adds:

"He went into the sepulchre, and then he plainly saw the linen clothes, *μόνα*, alone, or without the body, and *κείμενα*, lying, that is, undisturbed, and at full length, as when the body was in them. The cap, or napkin, also, which had been upon our Lord's head,

he found separate, or at a little distance; but *ἐντετυλιγμένον*, folded up in wreaths, in the form of a cap, as it had been upon our Lord's head."

THE DATE OF JOEL.

No. 3. Argument for Post-Exilic Date Further Examined.

PROFESSOR W. M. M'PHEETERS, D. D., COLUMBIA, S. C.

Besides the literary data, examined in a previous paper, there are certain historical data which are supposed to establish the late date of Joel. These, together with the arguments based upon what has been termed "the content of thought," will now engage our attention.

We will begin with the arguments based upon historical data. Such data, it will be remembered, may be either positive or negative. In other words, from the presence of allusions to certain persons, places, events, usages we may argue that the writing was contemporaneous with or subsequent to the appearance of such persons or the rise of such usages. On the other hand, the absence of allusion to well known persons, events, or usages may create the presumption that the writing was produced, either prior to the rise of such persons and usages or at a time when such conditions no longer obtained or when such offices and usages had fallen into desuetude. It is further evident that historical data may either be general or specific; that is, they may have to do either with a situation as a whole or with particular persons, places, events and the like. But the essential thing in every instance is that we should have something *distinct* in the writing; corresponding or failing correspond to something not only distinct but *distinctive* of the period to which the writing is assigned or denied. No results of value can be expected when *indefiniteness* or *uncertainty* attaches to the allusion or lack of allusion relied upon to locate the writing. Neither can any be expected where the thing alluded to or ignored is itself *not distinctive* of the period to which the writing is assigned or denied. But all of this, and some other things will, perhaps, become clearer