

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 15.—July, 1883.

I.

MODERN MIRACLES.

WE have not to argue in this paper the abstract possibility of miracles, nor to defend the historic verity of the Gospel and apostolic miracles. Our question lies within the circle of the miraculous. The principal form in which it arises in our day, is the claim to the power of healing the sick by the prayer of faith. This claim is preferred upon scriptural, rational, and historical grounds.

The main positions assumed in its defence are the following :

1. There is no evidence that miraculous gifts were ever withdrawn by God from the Church.
2. The promises of miraculous power given to the first disciples and apostles were for the *whole* Church of *every* age.
3. God is clearly revealed by His word as the Healer of the body no less than as the Saviour of the soul.
4. The reason why the Church does not now enjoy these miraculous powers in greater measure is her weakness of faith.
5. The Church everywhere needs to be reshaped to the apostolic model, and reinvested with her apostolic powers.*

The most thorough consecutive discussion from this point of view is the book of the Reverend A. J. Gordon, of Boston, entitled "The Ministry of Healing," which is written in an excellent spirit, and is plausible and ingenious. A large part of this paper will be devoted to the discussion of the positions of this volume.

* Rev. A. J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Healing," pp. 2, 3, 7; Rev. W. E. Boardman, "The Great Physician," pp. 28, 117; Theodore Christlieb, D.D., "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," p. 336.

substance be revealed. It is indissolubly connected with the temple and the altar and the sacred vessels and the ritual and the priesthood. These all stand or fall together. And there is not the slightest reason for singling out the land of Canaan and insisting that this alone is to be literally understood, while all the rest is figurative. And surely they who do this should not plume themselves on being literal interpreters of prophecy.

W. H. GREEN.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE: A Proof from Internal Evidence that "the Gospel according to St. Luke," and "the Acts of the Apostles," were written by the Same Person, and that the writer was a Medical Man. By the Rev. W. K. HOBART, LL.D. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co. 1882.

The object of this volume is fully stated on the title-page, and it is faithfully carried out. Every page bristles with quotations from Hippocrates, Aretaeus, Galen, and Dioscorides, and a parallel is found for almost all the words used by the sacred writer. This, indeed, is the fault of the book. So long as the comparison is confined to medical terms and the language either of disease or its cure, the author's point is well sustained. But he presses the matter beyond reason, as, for example, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (pp. 31-34), and in the first chapter of the Gospel (pp. 86-98), where even common words which any man writing on the themes in question would naturally use, are gravely set forth as evidences of Luke's medical character and training, just because these words happen to be employed in a different connection by the old writers on medicine. A single instance may be cited. The evangelist says (xix. 19), "And another said, I have bought five yoke (*ζεύγη πέντε*) of oxen, and I go to prove them," whereupon Dr. Hobart remarks, "*ζεύγος* is peculiar to St. Luke, and is the word used in medical language for a pair of nerves, arteries, veins, muscles," and proceeds to prove the statement by ten quotations. But what does it all amount to? The Greek word answers precisely to the English *yoke*, and would be used by any one who had never even seen a medical work, if he wished to speak of pairs of oxen. There are multitudes of such cases, and they seriously detract from the value of the book, just as an obviously weak argument impairs the effect of the better reasonings with which it is associated. The labor bestowed upon the volume must have been immense, but one cannot but wish it had been better directed.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. By JOSEPH AGAR BEET. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1882. Small 8vo, pp. 542.

This volume forms the second issue in a series meant to treat the writings and teaching of St. Paul for English readers. The first issue—a Commentary on Romans—fell flat from the press in 1877. It was fortunately discovered, however, by Drs. Cox and Sanday in 1879 and highly commended by them in the *Expositor* for May of that year. This secured for it, at last, a fair hearing; and its own high character immediately won for it an enviable place among English commentaries. The volume on Corinthians was announced in it as already in preparation, but did not appear from the press until late in 1882.

To those familiar with the Commentary on Romans it will only be necessary to say that this volume follows that in plan, method, and execution. It is intended for English readers, and, therefore (with the rarest possible exceptions, as, *e. g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 21, xv. 29), is innocent of Greek from beginning to end; it is none the less, however, based on the most careful exegesis of the Greek text. It is a continuous exposition, meant to simply elucidate the words of the Apostle, and, therefore, refuses to busy itself with the discussion of differing views; it is none the less, however, the result of much weighing of others' opinions. Its method is to analyze the epistles carefully, give appropriate headings to the resulting sections and thus divide the epistles into chapters, each of which is then literally translated and commented on clause by clause, with frequent halts for the discussion of doctrinal, apologetical,

and ethical points, and a constant endeavor, by a lucid arrangement and constant recapitulations, to make plain the logical flow of thought. It claims to be not only a commentary, but a contribution as well to Systematic Theology, the Biography of Paul, the History of the Early Church, and the Evidences of Christianity. No wonder the volume is a thick one.

Very different degrees of success attend these various aims. No commentary on these epistles succeeds better in combining an exceedingly clear exposition of the Apostle's line of thought with clear, compact, and linguistically sound, detailed exegesis. Dr. Hodge's Commentary is its peer in the one sphere, and Canon Evans' rather more than its peer in the other; but no English commentary equals it in the combination. In its apologetics, also, although they are hardly as fully developed as in the volume on Romans, it is admirable; and no one, in the face of the attacks of such writers as Dr. A. Loman, can doubt the vast importance of revealing the unimpeachable strength of the proof of the Pauline origin of each of the four great epistles. We cannot, however, praise so highly the contribution to systematic theology. Here the author appears to be weighed down by an armor not his own, and to be overeager to uphold a system. His stand-point is a mild Arminianism; and he manages to defend out of these epistles the doctrine of falling from grace, the distinction between salvation and full salvation, etc., to say nothing of tendencies which are exhibited to lower the doctrine of inspiration and to adopt a trichotomistic anthropology. It is curious to note also that here the work becomes polemic and loses the calm so admirably preserved in the exposition. If there, what is held to be truth is stated without reference to others' opinions; here, occasion is even made to attack and controvert individual writers—whereof a very striking example occurs on page 33, where wholly without call or necessity an easy victory is won, by the aid of a series of exclamation points, over a rash statement of Dr. Whedon's. On points of Ethics a purer note is struck; a basis for abstinence from intoxicants is correctly found in 1 Cor. vii. 13, and no uncertain sound is given on the woman-question in ch. xi., in the course of which the note on the general bearing of xi. 3 is worth attention. On the other hand, vii. 15 is wrongly thought to give a permission which "doubtless includes divorce."

The literal translation which precedes the exegesis of each section is exceedingly helpful, although hard, dry, and involved far beyond what was required. Such a translation as "*for*" for *εἰς τινα* after *βαπτίζω*, for instance ("for the name of Paul," 1 Cor. i. 13; "for Moses," x. 2), simply carries no meaning to the English ear. A fair example at once of the merits and the failure of the translation is furnished by the rendering of *ψυχικός*, *πνευματικός*, *σαρκικός* and *σάρκινος* in 1 Cor. ii. 14 sq. An advance is made in the Revised Version in that an attempt is made to distinguish between the last two; but a retrogression is made in the destruction of the contrast between the first two. The "natural and spiritual" of the Revision, if only the spiritual were spelt with a capital S, would suggest the contrast intended by St. Paul; but "soul-governed and spiritual" simply buries it out of sight. Even in the attempt to distinguish *σάρκινος* and *σαρκικός*, nothing is gained, through the clumsiness of the translation; "men of flesh and fleshly" suggests little or nothing by the juxtaposition, while such a rendering as, say, "flesh-made and flesh-led" would bring out the climax which Paul intended. On the other hand, he catches and brings out the relation of iii. 1 to ii. 6 by rendering "full grown" and "babes."

On turning from the translation to the exposition of this passage, it is curious and not unhelpful toward an estimation of Mr. Beet as a commentator to note how the proper sense of *ψυχικός* has been missed. Coming to the word with his mind on a distinction between *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, he translates it "soul-governed," and defines it: "One whose inward and outward life is directed by the soul, the lower side of his immaterial being, by the side nearest the body and the visible world," etc. Yet his exegetical insight is too acute to permit him to overlook two important facts:

(1) That πνευματικός refers to the Holy Ghost and not to the human spirit, and hence does not suggest just this contrast. Thus he defines "spiritual things" (i. 13) by: "'the things of the Spirit of God' (v. 14), *i. e.*, the truths taught by the Spirit"; and adds to the definition of "soul-governed men" the words: "he thinks probably of men altogether without the Spirit." (2) That SELF is the ground thought of ψυχικός, writing: "Of this character, selfishness is a constant mark. For all unselfish instincts are from above." When he has gone so far, we ask, in amazement, how could he fail to go farther? what deterred him from following the contrast indicated by Paul (and always either expressed or implied) and seeing that the standing sense of ψυχικός in the New Testament is *self-led* (or determined) as distinguished from *Holy-Spirit-led* (or determined), and thus was the fit word to express the contrast between the regenerate and unregenerate man. The same error follows him, of course, into 1 Cor. xv. 44 sq., and produces some curious exegesis, culminating in the denial of the parallel between "it is sown in corruption, dishonor, weakness," and "it is sown a self-led body," and the application of the latter, translated "soul-governed body," not to the sin-smitten body of the latter part of Romans vii., but to man as "he sprang from the Creator's hands"; while the "spiritual body" by the contrast is made to be not the fully sanctified body of Romans viii. 23 which we shall receive at our resurrection, but the body fully controlled by *our* spirit!

We think too highly of Mr. Beet's commentary to leave this as the only sample of his exegesis, and so, at the expense of a little space, shall add his opinion on a few disputed passages of 1 Cor. In i. 2 he connects "with all that call" with "the church, etc.," balances this by connecting "both theirs and ours" with "place," and appeals to 2 Cor. i. 1 as parallel. He punctuates i. 13*a* as a declaration and not a question, but does not adopt Canon Evans' striking explanation. He finds correctly four parties in i. 12 sq., holds them to be all blameworthy, and thinks the order describes the order of their origination. The Aramaic name Cephas seems to imply that this party was Judaic in composition; but the fact of the existence of a Cephas party in Corinth no more proves that Peter had visited that city than the existence of a Christ party there proves that Christ had visited it. In ii. 9 the quotation is held (rightly) to be taken from Isaiah lxiv. 4. The command in iv. 6 is explained to be, "not to exceed in their estimate of themselves and others the descriptions of human nature given in the Old Testament." In vii. 21 the exposition is (rightly) preferred which finds the complement of χρίσαι in the previous clause, and hence advises the slave, in case opportunity offers, to become free, just as verse 23 forbids the freeman to become a slave. No reference to Jewish fable is allowed in x. 4 (rightly): God followed them with His gift from the rock. In xi. 10, "*because of the angels*," is an appeal to their well-known presence in Christian assemblies as a deterring motive against unwomanly conduct in the presence of superiors. The custom referred to in xv. 29 is modestly explained as the innocent one of a friend appearing in the public assembly to confess Christ publicly in the name of and for one converted on his death-bed—acting, in a word, as bearer of his public confession to the Church.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

The following works in Exegetical Theology deserve brief mention:

Current Discussions in Theology. By Profs. Boardman, Curtiss, and Scott, of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. I. Introductory. Chicago: F. H. Revell. 8vo, pp. 218. The greater portion of the volume is taken up with Exegetical Theology. Prof. Curtiss calls attention to the fact that "We are most indebted to Germany for helps in the critical study of the Old Testament. Aside from the works of Robinson and Lynch we have done very little original scientific work in this department which is of value" (pp. 1-2). Prof. Curtiss is, in the main, correct. He ought not, however, to have overlooked Moses Stuart and Nordheimer. A few others might with propriety have been added to the American list. Prof. Curtiss, in his