
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

to know for certain that neither need we be the least afraid of *that*.

RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

XXVII. THE CORINTHIAN PHILOSOPHERS.

THE questions put by the Corinthians to St. Paul were suggested to them by the pressing calls and difficulties of their present situation—a scanty, needy group, almost submerged in the surrounding ocean of Paganism, keeping their heads above it only with difficulty, and with a constant tendency to sink again beneath the surface.

The Christians in Corinth had just risen out of the dead level of Paganism. The first effort had carried them clear above the surface; but reaction was inevitable, and with it many of them were in danger of sinking back again—probably some actually did sink.

We all know how difficult it is to sustain one's self permanently above the moral level of society, and with what force surrounding society continually presses us into itself. But if we feel this when we are trained up from infancy amidst influences and exhortations reminding us that it is our duty to try to rise above the level of society, how much more must the Corinthians have felt it when this idea of moral elevation had been presented new to them after they were grown to mature age, and still more after the voice of their first teacher was withdrawn from them and they were left to struggle alone!

Again, we have grown up amid an atmosphere and spirit in society and in education which Christianity has created. Even those who now strenuously resist Christianity cannot, if they would, free themselves from what it has planted

in them and fashioned around them; in fact, they do not wish to free themselves, for they have never realized that they owe to Christianity much of what they most value in themselves, and, especially, that they owe to it the spirit which leads them to regard religion from the moral point of view and to probe and test it as a moral influence.

But those converts from Paganism were suddenly brought into contact with this Christian spirit as a novelty. Nothing in their past experience had prepared them for it. They were beginning to attempt to live a life which had to rest upon a totally new and strange basis of thought and ideas and philosophy. The need for some such basis was forced even on the least thoughtful among them. In the present time many of us contrive to pass through life without thinking much about the philosophy on which our life and conduct rest; but that is due to the fact that, in our early training, and amid the pressure of society and education and home influences, some such philosophic basis has been made part of our nature by so insensible a process that many of us never become conscious that we are practical philosophers: we solve the philosophic problem by walking where we have been taught to walk, and never know that we have been solving it.

But it was different in Corinth, where the incongruity between their old mental equipment and the conduct which they were now aiming at was constantly forced upon the new converts. They must think: they must try to frame some scheme to co-ordinate their life: they must try in a groping, blind, tentative way to make a new philosophy fitted to their new life. Yet their old ideas and ways of thinking could not be easily got rid of, and were constantly liable to cause them perplexity when they tried to reason about life and conduct. In many practical questions—where we will unconsciously and unintelligently choose the right way because we do what our mothers taught us from

infancy—the new converts, if they acted unconsciously and unintelligently, doing what they had learned from infancy, would choose the wrong way; and the only method by which they could enter on the right way was by conscious, deliberate choice. It is always easy to err: it was doubly easy for the Corinthians to err, when they were trying to reason about the right course in many of the situations in which they might daily be placed. Yet they must reason and weigh arguments about matters which afterwards were gradually settled by the experience and errors of generations. They were beginning to put together in practice the first planks of the platform on which Christian society should rest, or rather to try how much of the existing pagan platform could be used and how much must be destroyed before a Christian society became possible.

Slowly a new fabric was built up. Names, forms of politeness, social customs, methods of address, and so on, in time became settled in Christian forms, partly inherited with little or no change from pagan society, partly remade in substitution for rejected parts of the old pagan fabric. The older forms had been leavened deeply with Paganism, and the question was continually forcing itself on every Christian's attention, how far might he use forms that had some pagan association without thereby expressing veneration for pagan deities and ideas?—at what point must he draw the line and cease to use those forms and ideas? The answer was often most perplexing.

For example, take the mere question of names. Was it permissible for Christians to bear names connected with heathen gods? If a Christian answered to the name Demetrios, Dionysodoros, Menophantos, did he thereby profess respect for Demeter, Dionysos, or Men? The answer here was comparatively easy, and yet it was not uniform. It was not necessary to proscribe such names. Yet many of them passed—some quickly, some slowly—out

of Christian use, while some acquired new associations: Dionysios and Demetrios ceased to suggest the pagan gods, and only reminded Christians of the saints so named. Many new and purely Christian names were introduced, *e.g.* Anastasios, Agape, Renatus, Kyriakos, etc.; others, which were rare or not extremely common among the pagans, such as Elpis, Eirene, Sozomenos and Sozomene, became fashionable among the Christians.[1]

But that is one of the simplest questions that were daily presented to the Corinthians for decision. Amid these difficulties they would long for the presence of an authorized teacher; and we can well understand that they mentioned in their letter to Paul how much, after his departure, they appreciated Apollos's work among them, and how they were eager for his return to them (xvi. 12).

Prof. Findlay has well expressed in his restoration of their letter the feeling of the Corinthians on this subject;[2] and he has rightly apprehended the bearing of *Acts* xviii. 27 f. on the situation in Corinth. Apollos's work in Corinth "helped them much which had believed." As usual, Luke's history placards before us, as it were in big letters,[3] the one most critical fact: Apollos came in rather to help

[1] See *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 491 ff. Agape may yet be discovered in a pagan inscription, as Sozomene has been at Blaundos, see Buresch, *Aus Lydien*, p. 120.

[2] "Apollos . . . rendered us welcome and fruitful service after thy departure . . . Happily at thy request he will come again to Corinth and resume his work among us: this we earnestly desire and entreat."—EXPOSITOR, June, p. 403.

[3] As Mr. C. F. Andrews, Pembroke College, Cambridge, points out, *Gal.* iii. 1 and vi. 11 show the same thought burning in Paul's mind and guiding his expression. Formerly he had "placarded" Christ before their eyes. Now he takes the pen, at the end of the letter, to placard before them in "big striking letters" the main thoughts of the preceding chapters. In a sense he was not above "advertising" his Gospel: he chooses that word to express his method: προγράφω is literally to advertise, προγραφή an advertisement, and they are used, *e.g.*, of advertising a sale, a meeting, the business of a public assembly, etc., and in ancient times advertisement by multiplication of small copies was not possible, only by announcements posted in a prominent place where they would be readily seen by many people.

the existing converts in their need than to make new converts.

We need not therefore wonder that the Corinthians philosophized, and suggested to St. Paul plans for regenerating society. They were bound to do so. Nor need we wonder if they were just a little too well pleased with their own plans. The young philosopher is generally pleased with his new scheme of life; and the young reformer is generally confident that he is on the point of restoring purity, and with it happiness, to mankind. Still less should we sneer at the mistakes that they made, even the backslidings and crimes that they did not succeed in avoiding, as if these showed that their new religion had failed to affect them. The greatest miracle in history is the way in which the lofty simplicity of Christianity entered the heart of such a world as that of Corinth in spite of the deadening power of society and education; those who most study contemporary life in the Græco-Roman world will most wonder at the miracle.

XXVIII. Meat of Sacrificed Animals.

One of the difficulties constantly besetting the new converts in a city like Corinth was whether they ought to eat the flesh of animals that had been offered in sacrifice to a pagan deity. The ordinary sacrifice among the Greeks was not burned: only the uneatable parts of the animal were given to the gods, while the useful meat was eaten. Much of the flesh that was set on the table in private houses, or that was exposed for sale in the market, had been cut from the sacrificial victims. Had it thereby become polluted? Could the person who ate it be considered to be assisting, as a sort of accessory after the fact, in sacrificing to an idol?

The Apostolic Decree, *Acts* xv. 29, had ordered the converts in the province of Syria-Cilicia to abstain from

such meat; and Paul himself had impressed this duty also on his Galatian Churches, *Acts* xvi. 4. Considering how emphatically he speaks in this Epistle of the uniformity of his teaching in all the Churches,[1] one can hardly avoid the conclusion that he had delivered also to the Corinthian Church "the Decrees for to keep."

But when this order came to be carried out, it involved many difficulties. Was the Christian bound to enquire carefully and find out whether every piece of meat offered for sale in a shop was sacrificial? If he omitted to ask, and bought and ate such meat, had he been guilty of sin? If he asked, and received false information, which led him to eat such meat, was he guilty of sin? If he were eating in the house of a non-Christian friend or relative, was he bound to ask about the previous history of every dish on the table, outraging all courtesy thereby, and often putting questions which the host would be really unable to answer? Such practical difficulties would meet the Corinthian Christians frequently, unless they went out of the world, and lived entirely separate from surrounding society, thereby losing all opportunity of influencing their neighbours.

Evidently the Corinthians put these and similar difficulties before Paul, and indicated their answer. They could not accept the Apostolic Decree as right in this point. It was contrary to the knowledge, the discernment of moral truth (γνῶσις), which they felt in their own heart and conscience.[2] They all perceived with inevitable and overpowering certainty that an idol was naught. How

[1] vii. 17.

[2] I regret to see Prof. Findlay, in his new edition of 1 *Corinthians*, rejects the translation of viii. 2, "we know that we all have knowledge," as tautologous, and renders "we know, because we all have knowledge." The tautology lies only in the wrong use of one English term, know and knowledge, to translate two very distinct Greek terms, οἶδα and γνῶσις. The meaning really is, "we know that we all possess the power of discerning truth." See Evans.

could a piece of meat become unclean through the influence of that which was naught. The idol had neither existence nor power, and could not affect the meat. It would therefore be absurd and irrational to act as if the idol could harm the meat. Nay, it would even be wrong so to act, for it would be a practical teaching of the false doctrine, that these false gods possess real existence and power whereas we know that no idol is anything in the world, and that there is no God but one.

In answer Paul, of course, did not quote the Apostolic Decree. They knew it, and their knowledge had only led them to controvert its orders. In fact the Decree formed the text of the present discussion.

Moreover, it would be worse than useless to refer those young philosophers—bent on thinking for themselves and understanding all things, proud of their own capacity for discerning moral truth—to a formal Decree. They must feel the truth spring from their own mind, not have it given to them by external authority.

And so Paul proceeds to expound the philosophic basis on which that prohibition in the Apostolic Decree rested. The Christian society must be built up upon mutual sympathy and courtesy. The brother must not merely be courteous to his pagan host. He must also be courteous to his hesitating, doubtful, scrupulous, not very strong or discerning Christian brother. This true courtesy comes only through sympathy and love. The pure intellectual discernment of truth might only make them self-confident and unsympathetic towards their brethren.

After the preceding remarks were in print I observed how admirably Professor Knowling has expressed the same thought in his recent edition of Acts:[1] "St. Paul's language in 1 *Corinthians* viii. 1–13, x. 14–22, *Romans* xiv., may fairly be said to possess the spirit of the Decree, and to

[1] *Expositor's Greek Testament*, ii. p. 336.

mark the discriminating wisdom of one eager to lead his disciples behind the rule to the principle."

Formerly, the Apostolic Decree seemed to me a compromise;[1] and, from a certain point of view, it may be called a compromise; but that point of view is external and unintelligent. The Decree was really the brief practical expression of the sympathetic fellow-feeling which ought to bind together the two elements in the Christian Church, Gentile and Jew; but it stated only the result, and St. Paul now explains to the Corinthians the moral grounds on which it was based.

I might here reproduce almost entirely the excellent paper of Prof. W. Lock on this chapter (EXPOSITOR, July, 1897, p. 66 ff.); but it is the shorter way to ask the reader to turn to those pages. Only on one serious point might a modification be desired in his exposition. He says that "the reason why St. Paul does not quote the Decree" is that "the circumstances had changed." I think we have seen a more satisfactory reason: the Decree is not quoted, because it is the topic under discussion. It is exactly as in the Epistle to the Galatians. Scholars have argued that, since the Apostolic Council and Decree are not mentioned elsewhere in that Epistle, they must be meant in ii. 1–10. But they are not mentioned, because they are the main topic of controversy: they are burning in the minds of all parties, and hence they are not formally appealed to.

XXIX. OFFICIALS IN THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH.

In view of the situation described in § XXVII. the provision of permanent officers and guides among the Corinthians was also urgently necessary. In *Acts* nothing is recorded of any such provision as regards Corinth. But it has been pointed out[2] that when the author of *Acts* mentions the institution of officials by Paul in his first Churches,

[1] *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 172. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 121 f.

and when the existence of officials is elsewhere implied in many of the later Churches, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, though their appointment is not mentioned in *Acts*, all who appreciate the methodical expression of Luke must infer that the first case is intended to be typical of the appointments made in all later cases. Paul directed that officials should be appointed in every Church, and prescribed a method which involved voting of the congregation under the direction and presidence of some apostolic representative, who had considerable powers to instruct the body of voters as to method and probably to reject unsuitable names. See *Titus* i. 5–7, 1 *Tim.* iii.

Some scholars, indeed, consider that the absence of any reference to *Presbyteroi* in this Epistle is a sufficient proof that none were instituted in Corinth. The silence is, perhaps, a sufficient proof that the institution had in Corinth failed in its purpose; and the ill-success may be traced in such passages as xi. 21, xiv. 26 ff.; but it cannot prove that no officers had been appointed, in view of two passages.

(1) In ix. 28 "helpings, governings," must be taken as an expression equivalent to "officers to help the poor, and direct the business of the congregation," and it is clear that all the kinds of personages there enumerated, from "Apostles" to "tongues," were known in the Corinthian Church. There were therefore in that Church officers charged with certain administrative duties.

(2) In ix. 12 it is clearly implied that there were persons receiving salaries or maintenance from the Church in Corinth;[1] and Paul claims an equal right to receive maintenance: "if others partake of this right over you, do not we yet more?" It seems impossible to suppose

[1] This is fully conceded by Prof. Findlay, in his recent edition of 1 *Corinthians* in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, ii. p. 849; and he is one of the scholars who maintain most positively that Paul had refrained from appointing any officers at Corinth (pp. 732, 950).

that the right was conceded to unauthorized and merely volunteer teachers and speakers. The right of maintenance by the Church involves formal recognition and appointment of those persons by the Church.

The inference from those passages is plain. There were in the Corinthian Church paid officials charged with administrative duties. These can hardly have been chosen except from among the seniors and men of experience; but the name *Presbyteroi*, "elders," does not seem to have been applied to them in Corinth. Titles were, at first, determined in the Church more by local usage and language than by a formal and universal rule. Now the word *presbyteroi*, as a title, was not much used in Greece, but it was common in Asia Minor.

The inscriptions are clear on that point. *Presbyteroi* are mentioned in many parts of Asia Minor as members of a body possessed of a high social standing and something of an official character. That body was commonly called the *Gerousia*, but its members were spoken of at Chios, Cos, Iasos, Ephesus, Smyrna, Philadelphia, Magnesia *ad Mœandrum*, and many other places, as the *Presbyteroi*; in Eumeneia and Hieropolis as the *Geraioi*,[1] and the entire body was occasionally mentioned as the *Synedrion* or *Systema* of the *Presbyteroi*. Thus the Christians of that country were accustomed to regard the name *Presbyteros* as a noun, implying something of rank, standing, age, and even official position; and it was readily applied to the body of persons selected as *Elders*, experienced and trusty, to manage the business of the congregation. But in Greece proper and in Macedonia the word *presbyteros* was hardly

[1] See the following note. There has been much dispute as to the character of the Gerousia in cities of Asia Minor; it varied to some extent, in some places having more of an official character, in others being more purely social; see Lévy, in *Revue des Ét. Gr.*, 1895, p. 231 ff.; Kühn, *Stadtverw. im röm. Kaiserr.*, 565; Hogarth in *Journal of Philology*, xix. 70 ff.; Ramsay, *Cities and Bish. of Phr.*, i. p. 111.

used except as an adjective, "older," and conveyed none of the meaning that people in Asia Minor associated with it as a noun.[1]

A parallel variation is seen in early Christian usage. Clement *ad Cor.* 1 and 21 distinguishes *Presbyteroi* as "elderly men" from the officials *Hegoumenoi*, in Corinth, and from *Proëgoumenoi* in Rome. In Thessalonica Paul mentions the *Proïstamenoi*, in Philippi the *Episkopoi*. In the cities of Lycaonia and Eastern Phrygia (*i.e.* South Galatia), Luke mentions *Presbyteroi*, as he does also in Jerusalem. In Ephesus the names *Episkopoi* and *Presbyteroi* are both used.[2] *Prostamenos* is used in a Phrygian early Christian inscription (of the fourth century, probably); and the term *Geraioi* was perhaps used in Eumeneia, *Proëdroi* in Hierapolis.[3] Thus even in districts where the term *Presbyteros* was known it was not uncommon for persons who paid some attention to style and accuracy of Greek to use a more correct Greek word. *Presbyteros* as a title was felt to be a little slangy, and was tabooed by purists.

The most correct Greek usage evidently was a participle, such as *Hegoumenoi* or *Proïstamenoi*, "the leading men,"

[1] The relation of the Christian usage of *presbyteros* to local expression has not escaped Prof. Deissmann, who treats it at some length in his *Bibelstudien*, p. 153 f., and *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 61 f. He points out that official *Presbyteroi* are often mentioned in Egypt and in Asia Minor. One desiderates in his remarks (as often throughout his admirable and suggestive studies) a livelier sense of the quality of Greek expression, and a perception of the fact that persons who wrote and spoke Greek of a higher and more cultured style would avoid the term. He also points out, what I have omitted above, that the term *proëgoumenos* was applied to the president of the *presbyteroi* or geraioi in some parts of Asia Minor.

[2] See *Acts* xx. 17, 28, confirmed by 1 *Tim.* iii. 17. There can be no reasonable doubt that Timothy was addressed as being in a kind of charge over the Asian Churches.

[3] See *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. pp. 520, 548. *Geraios* in Eumeneia has as yet been found only in Christian inscriptions, but may possibly denote only the members of the city Gerousia. The inscription of Hierapolis mentioning the *Proëdria* still seems to me Jewish-Christian; but I was wrong in making the Porphyrabaphoi a Christian guild. They were a Jewish society, and hence Christianity had a strong footing among them.

"the prominent ones." Luke never uses these words, but only *Presbyteroi*,[1] for he employed the popular language of Asia Minor and the Ægean coasts, and elsewhere his tendency to a less polished tone in matters of name and title than Paul has been pointed out.[2]

Thus we find everywhere in the Pauline Churches officials of the same general type, but not always called by the same title. They were chosen and paid by the Church.

It is therefore highly probable that there were in Corinth such officials, called afterwards, apparently, *Hegoumenoi*.[3] Paul himself mentions them only under the very general and abstract title "governings," probably because the title was not as yet fixed, and usage varied so widely.

Yet there is nowhere even the faintest sign in Paul's reply that the Corinthians had referred to them in their letter. This is all the more remarkable inasmuch as a different class of persons were prominently mentioned in that letter, viz., the volunteer speakers in the assembly, the prophets and speakers with tongues, who rose as the Spirit prompted them.

In his reconstruction Prof. Findlay brings out well that the Corinthians laid much stress on the services and the work of those volunteers in their Church, and that they congratulated themselves much on the forwardness and zeal shown by so many of their members in guiding and instructing the congregation, so that the "difficulty is to

[1] In *Acts* xv. 22 *Hegoumenoi* occurs, but it is evidently merely quoted.

[2] *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 267 f.

[3] Clement, *Ep. ad Cor.* 1 uses the term about the Corinthian officers (while he mentions *Presbyteroi* only as elderly and reverend men), and the name was also used at Jerusalem, *Acts* xv. 22. The term used in the Roman Church was *Proëgoumenoi* (Clement 21, and Hermas, *Vis.* 2, 2; 3, 9: for *Hegoumenoi* in Clement 37 refers to imperial government officials). It is therefore quite marvellous that the occurrence of Hegoumenoi in *Hebrews* should be appealed to by Harnack and others as a proof that that Epistle was addressed, not to Jerusalem, but to Rome. So far as it proves anything, it proves the very opposite.

find a hearing for all whom the Spirit prompts (xiv. 26 ff.)" It is all very naïve, very interesting, so characteristic of a young community, and, above all, of a community consisting mainly of Greeks, who are never eager to obey the constituted authority, but always forward to govern themselves and to direct their neighbours.

But, certainly, the silence of Paul about the influence of those officials in Corinth is noteworthy. He nowhere bids the Corinthians obey them; yet it is plain that one of the most serious faults which Paul saw among the Corinthians was insubordination, and that there was hardly any advice which they stood more in need of than "obey them that are in authority among you." Must we not infer that the existing officials in Corinth had been unsuccessful, that they had given way to the same faults as the congregation generally, that they were in some degree responsible for fomenting the spirit of argument and criticism and partisanship, which was such a dangerous factor in Corinthian life, that it was they who had condoned the conduct of the worst offender? It was hardly possible simply to advise the Corinthians to obey their *Hegoumenoi*. But a guarded counsel is given in the concluding paragraph, when Paul gathers up in brief the most urgent teaching of the Epistle, and beseeches the Corinthians to "be in subjection unto such" as Stephanas and his household, who "have set themselves to minister to the saints"; and further, to be in subjection "to every one that helpeth in the work and laboureth." Those who do the work should have the obedience of the congregation: which, doubtless, implies that there are some who have failed to do the work.

The question which has sometimes been put, if *Presbyteroi* were purely administrative officials, or if they took part in teaching and preaching, would have seemed meaningless and absurd to the Christians of that time. The idea that there could be persons eminent in the congregation who

did not teach was inconceivable then. Stephen and Philip were among the seven appointed "to serve tables"; but their conspicuous position gave them only greater advantage to "help in the work and labour."

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE PERIL AND THE COMFORT OF EXPOSURE.

(MARK 4^{22}=LUKE 8^{17}; MATTHEW 10^{26}; LUKE 12^{2}.)

THE difference between the two forms of this sententious aphorism points to a difference in the channels by which it has reached the synoptic narratives. One form is obviously briefer, even abrupt in its pregnant statement:

οὐ γὰρ ἐστί κρυπτὸν
ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ·
οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον
ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν (Mark 4^{22}).

Here we have probably the closest reproduction of the original Logion as it existed in the Petrine memoirs which underlie Mark's gospel and, in that or another shape, are one source for the first three gospels. Luke also has preserved the saying in this, its original connection,[1] as one of a series of counsels which he represents as having been addressed to the disciples by Jesus after the parable of the sower and the seeds. But he has omitted the *ἵνα* of purpose, introduced his favourite periphrasis with *γίνομαι*, and slightly expanded, in his usual manner, the closing words of the primitive sentence:

οὐ γάρ ἐστι κρυπτόν
ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται·
οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον
ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ.
(Luke 8^{17}).

The same idea has been embodied in a slightly different

[1] Luke omits Mark 4^{23}, and generally preserves a smoother argument. Cf. J. Weiss, in *Studien und Kritiken* (1891), pp. 310 f.

form, which is in all likelihood due to the Logia. In Matthew and Luke this form is practically identical from the linguistic point of view: the main difference lies in the setting assigned to it in the course of the narrative.

Matt. 10 [26].	Luke 12 [2].
οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται· καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.	οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται· καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

These minor variations do not affect the common thought of all the four passages. The point which Jesus is pressing in these instructions to his adherents is the law of Exposure. His principle is that concealment in religion is provisional, not final; that any sort of reserve, however necessary it may be, must prove temporary; that self-expression is the ultimate phase of life. There is no hope, and there need be no fear, that things will be entirely hushed away and covered up. People either dread this law of utterance in the life they see lived around them and within themselves, or else they despair of it ever prevailing. According to their mood, exposure seems a doom or a reward. But in either aspect, according to this synoptic Logion, it is sure. Character comes to show itself. Truth is meant for exhibition, as light for illumination. "The universe," as Emerson once put it, "protects itself by pitiless publicity . . . the whole economy of nature is bent on expression." In fact, it is an ethical conviction which has always been thought worthy of repeated emphasis, that the tendency, conscious or unconscious, voluntary or involuntary, of men and things is for them to come to the surface. Motives may be misunderstood or concealed for a time, and aims dissembled or obscure; but exposure prevails in the long run, whether exposure is a matter for congratulation or for dread. In the older phrase of Menander, *ἄγει πρὸς φῶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν χρονος.*

The law of self-disclosure, then, applied as a threat or as an encouragement, seems to have been rather a favourite topic in the teaching of Jesus. On three separate occasions he is reported to have used it, once in private to his disciples (Mark 4^{22} = Luke 8^{17}), once at a later period in his charge and commission to the twelve (Matt. 10^{26}), and, finally, in a speech to his disciples before a vast crowd (Luke 12^{2}). In each case the saying has a special *nuance*. It is an apt word for the situation, semi-proverbial and intelligible; and there is no reason *à priori* why Jesus should not have repeated a sentence like this more than once, presenting the idea in one aspect after another. He must have frequently had occasion, as he travelled and taught, to reiterate such a maxim in various localities and under different circumstances. It was not a case of once said, said for ever. The more characteristic and luminous, indeed, the idea, the greater would be the likelihood of its recurrence. It would be employed for different purposes, and modified more or less, as it came to be adapted to varied audiences. Such a procedure [1] would be entirely natural, and in keeping with the character of Jesus' ministry and situation; nor is there any reason to dispute its reality. But even when this is granted, the question remains, How far do the reduplicated sayings in the gospels reflect this procedure? In the present instance, at any rate, they seem to give only a partial reflection. Certainly in the third occurrence (Luke 12^{2}), and probably in the second (Matt. 10^{26}), one can feel the editorial faculty of the evangelists, who freely transpose and rearrange their materials, placing old sayings in new connections and exhibiting a given idea or narrative of Jesus in fresh applications. The general comparative criticism of the synoptic tradition vindicates literary manipulation as quite a legitimate hypothesis in the attempt to

[1] Mr. T. G. Selby has some sensible remarks on this point in *The Ministry of the Lord Jesus* (1896), pp. 14–17.

account for the second and third instances of this saying. The setting and circumstances of Mark 4 [22] (= Luke 8 [17]) are intrinsically probable. They bear the stamp of an original situation. Time, place, and purpose are all homogeneous. The later (Matt. 10 [26], Luke 12 [2]) occurrences, however, do not afford anything like the same measure of historical certainty. Yet even they possess admirable appropriateness, when viewed from the standpoint of the conception which the authors held of Jesus and his life. Each has a definite place and right of its own, and all three together can be woven into a consistent description of the mind and methods of Jesus, as these were present to the later consciousness of the apostolic age.

(*a*) In its earliest occurrence, chronologically, the saying is a pendant to the word upon the lamp and the lampstand: "Is the lamp brought" (*μήτι*, expecting a negative answer) "to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, and not to be put upon the stand? For"—Jesus proceeds, passing from illustration to principle—

> There is nothing hid,
> Except to be manifested;
> Nor was anything made secret,
> But that it should come to light.
>
> (Mark 4 [21 22]).

Luke (8 [16-17]) preserves the same order of the sayings, though in his version they become slightly flattened and expanded. In both gospels the inner connection of the words may be either "the lamp is meant to take its proper and conspicuous place: so faith has to avow itself in order to discharge its real functions"; or, "the lamp is intended to illuminate everything within the range of its light: similarly faith serves to expose and elucidate matters hitherto concealed." Luke's version points to the former interpretation, if the phrase *ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς* is to be pressed. But in either case the sense remains pretty

much the same. Christ's point is the divine necessity of frankness. His appeal and encouragement make for openness. In this early address during the Galilean ministry Jesus was evidently trying to stir among his companions and adherents (Mark 4^{10}, *οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα*: Luke has merely an audience of *μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, 8^{9}) the spirit and habit of confession. His need was for men who should take their place modestly but firmly, not afraid to show what they were and where they stood in relation to God and the kingdom. Manifestation of this kind, Christ urged, is a rôle of faith. For religion comes under the common government of life; there, as in the ordinary world, openness is a condition of effectiveness. To diffuse itself, to make its influence felt, to expand from its own life, to assume a public, practical attitude—all this constitutes from the outset a natural law for the Christian spirit. Truth, like light, is given for ends beyond itself. Through experience, and through a tangible, legible experience, faith is to be spread in widest commonalty; so that it is not merely permissible, but healthy, to desire utterance for one's convictions, or some channel of expression for one's ideas. "It is necessary to me," George Eliot once wrote to Mr. Sibree, "not simply to *be*, but to *utter*, and I require utterance of my friends."

The original situation made the counsel specially apposite. Christ's hearers at the moment formed an inner circle.[1] They stood by themselves apart from the larger crowd. But, as the saying implies, it was not to be imagined that

[1] *i.e.* if the whole passage 4^{10} f. hangs together. Certainly *vv.* 21–22 cohere (cf. Luke 8^{16-17}, where the same sayings are grouped), and the connection of the saying with the preceding parable and its explanation is probably intended to be significant. (i.) The explanation given to them is not meant entirely for themselves: it must be passed on to others. (ii.) The inner working of God in life is hidden, but man's duty is to express it in outer results of helpfulness: seed must come to grain, light to illumination. (iii.) Christ's method of making his parable widely intelligible by means of an explanation is an object-lesson: so ought his disciples to make their faith and knowledge clear to all.

such private and privileged intercourse with himself formed the be-all and end-all of life. The exclusiveness, secrecy, and enigmatic character which apparently were bound up in his present method of teaching, no less than the limited extent of his activities during the provincial and obscure Galilean mission (preaching "great verse unto a little clan"), were necessary indeed, but only for a time. This element of privacy merely constituted one stage in his method; its end was a wide and open disclosure. The Law of Exposure forbade any parochial and indolent interpretation of the Christian spirit, or any attempt to rest content with it as the luxury of a coterie.

It also encouraged men who were practically beginners, tempted to distrust their new powers, requiring to be made conscious of their capacities and to be warned against the neglect of them. Exposure in the outside world, as Christ indicated, answers to the frank assumption of one's place and responsibilities in the moral sphere. Why shrink from coming forward? It is absolutely natural, a thing to be expected, and you can rely upon its practicability. Such a conviction is the best help in rallying from the false modesty, the hesitancy of inexperience and the subtler forms of cowardice which beset the threshold of all enterprise. Christ's word is wise and apt: manifestation, self-expression, is reasonable and inevitable. Grasp that natural law, and you understand how modesty and courage can be leagued to win success.

The saying is strongly put.[1] The ἵνα of purpose and the

[1] The brevity of the genuine text corresponds to the abruptness and difficulty which occasionally characterize the sayings in Mark as compared with their form in the later gospels. A list of similarly obscure or harsh expressions is given in Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 106 f. From the standpoint of grammar, the context alone can decide whether the future tense is aoristic or progressive; in this case even the data afforded by the context fail to establish either interpretation as unquestionably right. But the tense might conceivably be regarded as an instance of the gnomic future, denoting a matter that will take place from time to time (Burton: *Moods and Tenses*, p. 36).

aphoristic parallelism, possibly with a double reference to sight (*ἀποκαλυφθήσεται*) and hearing (*ἀπόκρυφον*), contribute to the emphasis; as Calvin pointed out, the words even have some appearance of being a proverb. *Ἀπόκρυφον* ("secret") is the technical term for esoteric teaching among the Essenes and the later Gnostics. Here, however, it might be taken quite as probably in its companion and informal sense of "precious," after the metaphor of hidden treasure (Isa. 45 [3] LXX. = Matt. 13 [44]) which is concealed on account of its value. At any rate, the bearing of the Logion upon practical Christianity remains unaffected; the outcome of a religious faith is to be neither concealed nor ambiguous in the Christian sphere. The main point nowadays, as Rothe wittily remarked, is to be pious in the open air; and that applies to the avowal as well as to the naturalness of religion, to those who are tempted to be backward as well as to those whose danger is artificiality.

(*b*) Some months later, probably during a journey through the villages in the district of Nazareth, the saying is repeated (according to Matthew's version),[1] followed by the word upon "the housetop."

For there is nothing covered,
That shall not be revealed;
And hid,
That shall not be known.
What I tell you in the darkness,
Speak in the light:
And what you hear in the ear,
Proclaim upon the housetops.

(10 [26-27], *κηρύξατε*: a word of authority and frank avowal.)

The situation is reflected in the preceding and the following words, "Fear them (the unnamed opponents of *v.* 25) not therefore . . . and be not afraid of them," etc. In directing the twelve for their mission, Jesus met by anticipation what would in all likelihood prove their chief

[1] Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, i. pp. 113 f.

cause of hesitation, viz., the dread of outside opposition. Hard resistance would be encountered, probably persecution. But, he is represented to have argued, it is against nature to suppose that these will avail to finally stifle the new Spirit of God, or to crush into silence his messengers. Gradually, by the sheer power of self-disclosure, the gospel would unfold itself in and through their labours. They need not have the slightest fear or scruple about engaging in the active proclamation of the truth, for the private teaching of Christ was meant to secure, as its issue and final expression, public and free avowal ("on the housetop").

The saying in this form is very naturally interpreted as a programme of the evangelists' experience within the apostolic church. It is tempting to regard the whole passage with most critics as in the main a reflection of the oldest Palestinian mission, when the good news of Jesus was carried from house to house with vigour and independence, and the enterprise spread gradually into prominence (*e.g.* Acts 8 $^{1-4}$ f.). Many details in the commission suit this period, as do several of the directions in their extant form.[1] In this event the saying is a direction adopted by the evangelist from the contemporary activities of the apostolic age. If, on the other hand, the maxim is considered as a fit counsel for the disciples within the actual lifetime of

[1] This is rightly urged by Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, E. Tr., i. pp. 28 f., ii. pp. 48 f.), who traces in Matt. 10, and even in Mark 6 and Luke 9, instructions which could only have been understood by the disciples in reference to their independent vocation, as that existed for them subsequently to the death of Jesus. But it is impossible to detect any such change as he imagines in the conception of this Logion upon exposure, under the influence of success and publicity. The earliest application of the Logion, so far as the records show, does not mean that the disciples were to work on contentedly in the darkness, confident that their message would become conspicuous despite the limitations and narrowness of their career. The original point of the saying is preserved throughout all its extant uses in the tradition, viz., that secrecy was always to be regarded as a provisional expedient, and that the disciples were deliberately to work out of it, sure that in doing so they had the Law of Exposure on their side.

Jesus,[1] its place might be justified by a sense of his originality and searching insight, as well as by the admirably fit setting of the word in question. The best comment, at any rate, upon the words is the apostolic confession: *οὐ δύναμεθα ἡμεῖς ἃ εἴδαμεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν μὴ λαλεῖν* (Acts 4 [20]). And behind this courage lies the sense of urgency and inevitableness in the proclamation. "It is a great encouragement," says Matthew Henry, "to those who are doing Christ's work, that it is a work which shall certainly be done . . . Whatever hazards you run, go on with your work, publishing and proclaiming the everlasting gospel to all the world; that is your business, mind that." In stating the Christian facts there is no need for men to employ reserve or ambiguity in order to advance the interests of their mission. To be open is their destiny: to be unflinching, their true safety. If there is historical evidence to show that the early disciples undertook independent missions during the lifetime of their Master upon so extended and elaborate a scale as is implied in Matthew 10, then the background of a saying like this upon the duty and success of frank confession is furnished without further ado.

With Chrysostom, one might also read into the words here the companion and darker side of the law, exposure being threatened as well as promised. In this case the

[1] "Darkness," then, is simply a strong expression for the comparative privacy and limited range of Christ's teaching (*ἐπειδὴ μόνοις αὐτοῖς διελέγετο καὶ ἐν μικρᾷ γωνίᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης, διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν, "ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ"*: Chrysostom). A. Réville (*Jésus de Nazareth*, ii. pp. 128–130) strangely takes the similar passage in Matt. 5 [13–16] as addressed by Jesus to the Jewish people represented by the surrounding crowd, a call issued by him to his fellow-countrymen to be worthy of their religious superiority and faithful to their high vocation in the world. He thinks the original followers of Jesus lacked any such notoriety. But surely the adherents of Jesus, even during his earthly career, possessed enough distinctiveness through their belief in him as the agent of the Divine kingdom and through their own position as heralds of that kingdom. Such a rôle must have marked them off, if it was prosecuted with any seriousness; and the primitive synoptic tradition shows that words like these were really applicable to the disciples. (Holtzmann: *Neutest. Theologie*, I. p. 209 f.)

sense of the passage would be: "Fear not your opponents; they have their day indeed, but evil will be shown up before long. Hypocrisy is futile." This would be quite in the manner, *e.g.*, of Paul, who refers the exposure of evil to the actual coming and judgment of the Lord (1 Cor. 4 [5]), and Bengel finds this application even in the Mark-passage with its twofold structure. *Prior sententia potest de malo, altera de bono accipi. Id axioma valet de rebus naturæ; de sensibus et actionibus hominum malis et bonis.* But this interpretation introduces too subtle an idea, certainly in Mark 4 [16] f., and probably here; although it must be admitted that the thought of *v.* 26 connects itself with the preceding no less than with the following verse. This under side of exposure, however, is definitely preserved in

(*c*) the narrative of a much later experience during the Peræa circuit (Luke 12 [1-3]). Here the saying is used at once to reassure and to warn the disciples. As the crowds thronged round him, Jesus "began to tell his disciples first of all," [1] "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees [leaven, a symbol for insidiousness and masked activity], which is hypocrisy.

> "Nothing is covered up, that shall not be revealed:
> And hid, that shall not be known."

Then follows, as in Matthew 10, the saying upon the "housetop" (slightly altered); this time, however, put not as a direct imperative, but as the statement of a law. The principle of exposure, by means of which hypocrisy is to be

[1] Primarily, the speech taking a wider range at *v.* 15 (13). Such, at any rate, is the idea upon which the author of the third gospel has compiled the narrative. But 1*b*–12 probably represent an insertion, taken from the Logia and introduced in the story of the popular movement (1*a*, 13–21) round Jesus (so J. Weiss in Meyer *ad loc.*). It is characteristic of Luke that in editing the sayings of Jesus which reached him in the Logia, he usually tried to furnish them with historical introductions, or to set them in a more living context than they secure in Matthew. Instances in Wernle's *Synoptische Frage*, pp. 82–83. 8 [17] and 12 [2] form one of about a dozen doublets in the third gospel: there are twice the number in Matthew.

detected, is the very principle by which the gospel is openly declared.

It is needless to regard this rigorously, with Keim, as "a Pauline and anti-Jewish application" of the Logion. The use of it by Jesus at the close of the Galilean mission is not impossible; for, by this time, the conflict between the Pharisees and himself had passed into quite an acute and well-defined form. Antagonism, in fact, is the background against which the whole passage becomes intelligible, and the words of the Logion are a warning against the insidious influence of the Jewish authorities, by which the disciples might naturally be affected. So read, the terms of *v.* 3 are an indirect threat. Anything in the nature of concealment is doomed, Jesus argues. It is unnatural; its term of power is very limited. Keep clear of ὑπόκρισις: for as time goes on it will become more difficult than ever to avert exposure. *V.* 2 thus states the principle upon which the previous warning depends for its reasonableness. Even if the δὲ be genuine (and it is omitted by ℵ L 81), it is not adversative but metabatic. It merely connects the following statement with the preceding imperative, and thus serves to deepen the emphasis.

At the same time the words are undoubtedly thrown into sharper relief when they are regarded, as the editor possibly felt they would be regarded by some of his readers, against the background of the apostolic age[1] with its conflicts and perils—especially in view of an incident like the famous dispute at Antioch, where the Jewish Christians, with Peter and even Barnabas, had been carried away by ὑπόκρισις (Gal. 2[13]). The moral danger of ὑπόκρισις is that convictions may be suppressed, or a course of action altered out of deference to some powerful interest—in this case the Pharisaic prejudices of the nationalist party in the church. Conceal-

[1] The change of "What I said to you" (Matt.) into "What you have said" (Luke) inplies a further stage of activity upon the part of the disciples among Jewish circles.

ment of some kind or another is the result. People are deterred from being straightforward and open by the regard they are led to pay to the authority and influence of others. Their better judgment is warped, their own convictions are rendered ineffective. Hence Jesus is represented in the third gospel as insisting, not merely on the futility of such dissimulation, but on the corresponding duty and law of bold confession. It is practically immaterial whether *ἀνθ' ὧν* be rendered "wherefore" (so Holtzmann and Blass), or, as is more probable, "because" (cf. 1 [20], 19 [44], Acts 12 [23]). The point of the passage is that while activity in the dark, or in the inner chambers of the house, is necessary, it is merely a preliminary stage. It leads to open and unchecked proclamation. Persecution at the hands of the Jews may drive Christian preaching into house-to-house propaganda for a while, or into methods of private intercourse (see Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, chap. xviii.). But these are not final: a law of exposure is at work on your behalf, therefore do not lose heart or hope. You may be tempted to dissemble or conceal your convictions, to use compromise or to stoop to false opportunism, under stress of circumstances and the fear of man; but that device, again, merely avails for a time. The Law of Exposure is working against it. *Your* message is to be widely and bravely uttered; so to utter it is your duty, so to be uttered is its nature. Such is the double course of Jesus' thought. "Never suppose about anything," his great contemporary Hillel is reported to have said, "that it will not readily be heard; in the end it must be heard."[1]

[1] Compare this passage from a modern mystic. "Already, it would seem, the soul is enwrapped in fewer veils. Is it quite clear to you (this is a strange and disquieting truth), is it quite clear to you that if you are not good, your mere presence will probably proclaim that fact to-day a hundred times more clearly than would have been the case two or three centuries ago? Look like a saint, a martyr, a hero; but the eye of a child that meets you will not greet you with the same glance, if you bear an evil thought within your heart, an injustice or a brother's tears. A hundred years ago its soul might perhaps have passed by yours unobservant." (From M. Maeterlinck's *Le Trésor des Humbles*, pp. 42–43: "Le réveil de l'âme."

The idea of a general disclosure of things good and evil appears to have formed a characteristic note of Messianic expectation, both Jewish and Christian.[1] But the method of Jesus in employing this saying upon the peril and comfort of exposure stands by itself. For one thing, it is remarkable that he does not here associate the unveiling with his own person or work. At a later stage in the Christian teaching the fuller idea does occur, viz., that the real nature of men is detected by the critical and searching influence of his personality; but it is a mark of genuineness in this synoptic Logion that it does not present the more developed conception. Here Jesus states a common law, and uses what is a general principle of existence. He is also silent upon the collateral expectations of the Messiah and his mission, a silence which may be fairly taken as a tacit repudiation of the fantastic and crude hopes that gathered round the idea among many of his contemporaries. His thought upon this subject is natural and simple. The sphere of the unveiling is the character of man (cf. John 4 [25] with 4 [29] and Luke 2 [35]), and his object in mentioning it is to advance the interests of truth and courage, not to gratify an idle curiosity. It is not quite clear how far Jesus held the belief that this exposure would occur once

[1] For the Jewish cf. 4 Esdras 14 [35], 1 Co. 3 [13] f., Luke 2 [35] ("that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed," ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν); for the Samaritan, John 4 [25] ("I know that when Messiah cometh, he will declare all things to us"). According to the genuine Samaritan doctrine, as Mr. Cowley has pointed out (EXPOSITOR, fifth series, vol. i. pp. 161 f.), when the Taheb does come, there shall be nothing hid any longer, above or below, *i.e.*, "primarily things connected with worship and the true religion."

The under side of exposure forms the dominating idea in Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter*, where it is analyzed and elaborated with a gloomy care. But it is interesting to notice how he makes the idea cover more than the ordinary passage of guilty secrets into the daylight, or the inability of hypocrisy and crime to elude the probing search of investigation. In chap. x. he puts an argument into the mouth of Mr. Dimmesdale to the effect that the final disclosure of human thoughts and deeds is not intended as retribution. It is an intellectual necessity. The dark problem of life cannot be understood apart from an intimate knowledge of men's hearts, and therefore this knowledge will be yielded up to all intelligent beings who will stand waiting to be satisfied on that day by a solution of life's strange mystery.

and for all at the final judgment. Historical evidence upon this point is rather conflicting and ambiguous. But certainly the impression left upon the mind by the Exposure sayings, applied either to the secrets of an individual life, or to the processes by which truth is to be manifested and propagated, is that the disclosure was to be a process, not a shock; the gradual result of action and experience rather than a paroxysm of unmasking. Even in the Matthæan form (10^{26} f.), where *v.* 28 has an apocalyptic ring, the saying on "the housetop" implies not so much a crisis as a career. And to interpret the Logion in this light is neither to read back a fine modern idea into the gospel, nor to attribute proleptically to Jesus a phase of thought which was entirely alien to his experience and outlook.

JAMES MOFFATT.

TWO IMPORTANT GLOSSES IN THE CODEX BEZÆ.

I HAVE recently been reviewing with some care the text of the Codex Bezæ and its allies (which pass comprehensively under the name of the Western Text of the New Testament), as well as a part of the multitudinous books and pamphlets which have essayed to explain the peculiarities of that text with a view either to justify or to condemn it. Amongst these peculiar variations from received or authorized forms, it is well known that the most conspicuous are to be found in the text of the Acts of the Apostles; so that the critic who meddles with the difficult problem of New Testament origins is sure to find himself, sooner or later, in the Slough of Despond which these readings furnish, where there is no sure foothold for the investigator, and which, like the original swamp in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, does not appear to have been made much better by the multitude of attempts that have been made to construct a causeway over it. Or, to use a more classical figure, the