

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

in the one case is the praise given so much greater than in the other, when the actions, at first sight, appear so nearly the same.

St. Luke, who does not record the Bethany incident, does, however, record a word of great significance about Mary of Bethany. When Martha, in her loving anxiety to give our Lord the best possible entertainment, would have Mary join her in elaborating the feast, our Lord says of Mary that she had chosen the good part which should not be taken from her. If St. Luke was aware of the statement about the memorial of the anointing being made throughout the world, then his record of the good part, not to be taken away, is doubly significant.

Again, when we consider other actions which our Lord signals out for special recognition, we find they are associated with special faith or insight. 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' 'Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.' 'O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'

Following this clue we may expect to find in Mary's action an indication of special insight. Our Lord intimates that she had seized a passing opportunity, 'me ye have not always'; and He associates the anointing in some way with His burial.

It has been generally assumed that while others were anticipating a triumph—'Blessed is the kingdom that cometh' was the cry of the multitude, and the Twelve were disputing as to precedence in the kingdom that was to be—Mary foresaw disaster. But would a gloomy foreboding of tragedy to come make that difference in the values we have seen our Lord setting on the two anointings. Thomas's 'Let us also go, that we may die with Him,' wins no special approval.

Let us look again at the words used. St. Mark's account may be phrased, 'What she had, she rendered; she has forestalled my burial, the wrapping of my body in spices, as is the manner of the Jews to bury.' St. Matthew's, 'She has done this against my burial.' Bishop Lightfoot, in his note on Col 2<sup>23</sup>, says that *pros*, like our English *for*, when used after words denoting utility, value, sufficiency, not uncommonly introduces the object to check or prevent or cure which the thing is to be employed. See also Thayer's Grimm under *pros* i. 1 c. Lastly, St. John, reading as in T.R., 'Let her alone, she has kept it up to now for my burial, but now she uses it in a way I welcome,' or, adopting the R.V. text, 'Let her alone; she had

preserved her treasure until now that she might keep it for my burial, but now she uses it with my approval.'

What had led her to change her purpose? She looked from Lazarus to Jesus: 'The Master is the resurrection and the life, can he need spices to preserve him, when my brother came forth untaunted from the grave? Even if he die, as he has said, he will rise again. I salute the Lord of life, I crown him victor.' Here was an insight commensurate with the praise bestowed. Here was an insight which merited the word, 'Blessed is she that hath not seen, and yet hath believed,' St. John's equivalent to the praise in St. Matthew and St. Mark, or to St. Luke's 'good part, not to be taken away.' Here was an insight to justify also St. John's introduction of Mary in chapter 11 as the Mary of the well-known anointing. Here was one who 'while she had the light, believed on the light, that she might become a child of the light.' It is true she was not able to express her faith to others, not able to make it articulate, but pondering these things in her heart she was neither at the Cross nor at the tomb, but her Lord had understood her meaning, and it had greatly refreshed and cheered His heart; the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. Later on the empty tomb led St. John to realize, without seeing Him, that his Master was risen, but knowing Mary's insight surpassed his own he placed her act alongside of the raising of Lazarus in the very heart of his spiritual Gospel. 'These things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, that he must rise again from the dead, and that they had done these things unto him' (Jn 12<sup>16</sup> 20<sup>9</sup>).

To Mary of Nazareth it was given to be the first to welcome the message of the Incarnation, and to Mary of Bethany first to believe the foretelling of the Resurrection. So doing she strengthened the sense of the joy that was set before her Master, and He endured the Cross, despising the shame. 'Whosoever in the world this gospel is preached there also that this woman hath done shall be told as a memorial of her.'

J. A. WOOD.

*Witherley Rectory, Atherstone.*

---

### The Relation of Sin and Death in Romans v.

WHAT is Paul's idea of the relation of sin and death? It is generally answered that death is the

punishment of sin (Ro 6<sup>20</sup>). 'The wages of sin is death' is often given as a proof text, but the chief ground for the answer is generally found in the previous chapter (5<sup>12-21</sup>). This important passage traces the entry of death into the world to Adam's sin; and under the influence of the Augustinian doctrine of Original Sin it used to be interpreted to mean that all his descendants sinned in Adam, and so were guilty of his sin. It is now generally admitted that this interpretation is mistaken. Augustine read '*in quo*' in the Latin as the translation of the ἐφ' ᾧ of v. 12, and translated it to mean 'in whom (Adam) all sinned,' whereas it almost certainly means 'because all sinned.'

But if Paul means 'all died because all sinned,' another difficulty arises. He also says, 'sin is not imputed when there is no law' (5<sup>13b</sup>). If this is so, how can it be said that all have sinned, and how can it be right for them to suffer death, the punishment of sin?

Dr. N. P. Williams in his learned and profound Bampton lectures offers an explanation. He points out that according to Paul's principle, 'no law, no sin,' the pre-Mosaic generations cannot be said to have 'sinned.' Yet Paul seems to suggest that they did sin, and they certainly paid the penalty of sin, 'death.'

'The answer,' he says, 'to the problem which shapes itself in the mind of the Apostle is, that during the pre-Mosaic period the human race, though incapable of committing sin in the strict sense of the term, was nevertheless *penetrated and infected by the miasma of a vague and undefined abstract "sinfulness"* (his italics). It would seem, in other words, that he invokes in his own thoughts the conception of "original sin" in what the sequel will show to have been a somewhat nebulous form, in order to explain the universal domination of death at an epoch when, according to the Jewish view of the Decalogue as the sole embodiment of the moral law, "actual sin" did not and could not exist' (p. 128).

Again, he says, quoting a hypothetical line of thought in Paul's mind, 'though the pre-Mosaic generations could not commit sinful acts, they were hereditarily constituted in a sinful state' (p. 129).

One naturally feels great hesitation in differing from Dr. Williams, yet I am bound to say that this explanation does not seem to me possible, for it was not the substantive acts which Paul denied to the pre-Mosaic generations on the basis of his

theory about the Law, it was the adjective 'sinful.' To deny the sinful acts and posit instead a sinful state or a vague, undefined, abstract 'sinfulness,' gets us no nearer to the Apostle's view, and, in fact, is contrary to his explicit statements. There was nothing either vague or abstract or undefined about the evils which Paul recognized as typical of the Gentiles in the world of his own day, who were at least approximately in the same position with regard to law as were the pre-Mosaic generations (see Ro 1). In fact, if we are to make a distinction between state and acts, a contemplation of the facts of their evil deeds on the one hand, and of their being without positive law on the other, would lead us to say that their acts were sinful, *i.e.* contrary to law, but their state, in so far as it was not conscious of law, was innocent.

It is true, on the other hand, that to Paul it was the Law's prohibition which constituted sin. In other words, only after the explicit declaration that anything ought not to be done can a man be blamed for doing it. The Law, that is to say, establishes the guilt of sin. But whether there be a law or no, some lines of conduct lead towards social health, others towards social disease. Till law recognizes this, and so commands men to go in the one direction and warns against the other, any one may without guilt do great evil. According to Paul's view, God does not then regard him as a sinner, but the consequences of his wrong deed still remain evil.

The distinction which underlies the Apostle's thought here, then, is not that between acts and state. It concerns the adjective 'sinful' and implies the denial of guilt to those, who, not knowing the Law, have committed acts contrary to it. So far as I can see, he can only mean by this passage in Ro 5 that though while the Law was not promulgated God did not blame those who did wrong and did not reckon them sinners, yet for all that they died as a consequence of their sin. And this in its turn can only mean that *Paul did not regard death in the strict sense as the Divinely inflicted punishment for sin, but as its natural consequence.* For to think of death as the punishment of sin requires us to suppose that God reckoned up men's sins to them and passed a verdict of condemnation upon them, which is exactly what is denied in the words 'sin was not imputed.'

To think of death as the natural consequences of sin harmonizes well with Paul's words here and elsewhere. It implies that there are two parallel and related but not necessarily coincident sequences: a course of wrong-doing issuing in death, and

conscious breaking of the Divine law issuing in a Divine verdict of guilty. There are emphatic words in Ro 2 in which Paul seems to say exactly this: 'As many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law' (Ro 2<sup>12</sup>).

This position is confirmed by a careful study of Paul's doctrine of the 'wrath of God' given in Ro 1. It is natural to suppose from the phrase 'wrath of God' that a personal, passionate Divine intervention is intended. But the state of things which Paul depicts is simply sin taking its natural course in leading to more sin and consequent spiritual degradation. It is no action of God, but rather His inaction. If Paul had in these verses stressed the suffering of body and mind which men bring upon themselves by sinning, it might perhaps reasonably be supposed that he regarded the process as a Divine intervention in punishment. But throughout no stress whatever is laid on suffering, which is in fact not mentioned; the whole stress is on increased sin. Moreover, the final state of things depicted is summarized in the words *ἀδόκιμος*

*νόος* (R.V. 'reprobate mind'), which may well be translated 'a mind incapable of right judgment.' To have such a mind need not necessarily be particularly painful to its possessor, but it secures that he continues in the course of wrong-doing.

Paul then means in Ro 5 that all wrong-doing has as its end death, not as a Divinely inflicted punishment, but as a natural consequence. When the Law is known and rejected, Divine censure also follows, but where there is no law there is no censure. Only wrong-doing in contravention of known law can be called 'sin' in the full and strict meaning of the term. But in this passage the Apostle by a natural and easy inexactitude also calls wrong-doing apart from law 'sin,' but hastens to explain that it is not properly so-called, and that the sin of Adam's descendants till Moses, being without law, is not like his sin, which was against law.

I submit that this is both a simpler explanation than that of Dr. Williams, and also that it is in accord with the rest of the Apostle's teaching.

W. E. WILSON.

*Selly Oak.*

---

## Entre Nous.

### Mysticism and Religious Education.

'The mystic is not a peculiarly favoured mortal who by a lucky chance has received into his life a windfall from some heavenly Bread-fruit tree, while he lay dreaming of iridescent rainbows. He is, rather, a person who has cultivated, with more strenuous care and discipline than others have done, the native homing passion of the soul for the Beyond, and has creatively developed the outreach of his nature in the God-direction. The result is that he has occasions when the larger Life with which he feels himself kin seems to surround him and answer back to his soul's quest, as a sensitized magnetic needle, if it were conscious, might feel itself enveloped by the currents that sweep back upon it from the electrical storehouse of the sun.'

So Professor Rufus M. Jones in his introduction to *New Studies in Mystical Religion* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). Starting from this account of the mystic, we turn with special interest to the third chapter, in which Professor Jones deals with Mysticism and Religious Education and pleads for

a new emphasis in education. 'The emphasis has been on methods of education that would promote the conquest and control of external nature and that would prepare persons who could *do* things successfully. There is no question about the results. The methods have *worked*. We can fly. We can travel at enormous speed. We can talk around the world. We can see what is happening on the surface of the sun and we are near neighbours with the Pharaohs of Moses' time.

'But unfortunately this conquest of the external world does not make us better men. Our "I.Q." is high, but our hearts are neither trained nor spiritualized. We know a great deal about radium and helium, but we know very little about the deeper processes of the Soul.'

First, he says, education and all that is meant by spiritual culture must be pushed farther back toward the headwaters of the child's life. 'The impulse and urge to correspond with the unseen and the beyond appear very early in life, and they are profoundly, though of course unconsciously,