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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE twenty-first number of *Hermathena* has recently appeared. (*Hermathena*: A Series of Papers on Literature, Science, and Philosophy, by Members of Trinity College, Dublin. Dublin: Hodges. London: Longmans. 3s.) Its first article is an unblushing contradiction of the profession made in its title-page; for it is not by a member of Trinity College, but by a German professor. It is a defence by Dr. Blass of Halle, of his theory of the way in which St. Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles. But as that is the subject of another article in the number, by Dr. Salmon, the Provost of Trinity, and much the most important discussion in this issue, the contradiction is easily forgiven.

Dr. Blass's famous theory, which will be touched upon in a moment, was first announced in a Commentary on the Acts, which he published in Göttingen in 1894. The Commentary itself deserves attention. Dr. Blass is not a New Testament scholar. He 'emphatically disclaims all pretensions to be a theologian.' Yet Dr. Salmon, who is a theologian and a distinguished New Testament scholar, has read Blass's Commentary, and having finished it, he says: 'Since the appearance of Lightfoot's Commentaries, I have not met an edition of a New Testament book which kept the attention so well alive, and the study of which was so completely a pleasure.'

This is a great surprise. Discoveries are not made in any science by those who are unfamiliar with the science. It is true that, as Goethe said, 'intelligent amateurs' have occasionally made a hit. The instance of Astruc comes readily to mind. A French physician, he actually discovered that science which is now causing so much searching of heart and which we know by the stupid name of the Higher Criticism. But Dr. Blass has done much more in this Commentary than make a lucky hit. He has, in Dr. Salmon's judgment and in the judgment of other scholars besides, done more for the interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles than any scholar of our time.

But the surprise is lessened when we remember that Dr. Blass has a very high reputation as a classical scholar. For in the Book of the Acts, as he himself observes, 'the questions with which theologians are specially conversant are not prominent, so that in the interpretation the philologist has the primary, the theologian the secondary place.' Besides, the most reliable contributions which Dr. Blass has made to our knowledge of the Acts, turn upon niceties of grammatical construction, and with these it may be affirmed that no living scholar has a better right to intermeddle. Let us follow Dr. Salmon as he picks out two or three of these points, only remarking that as Dr.

Blass writes in Latin, he is often able to express his meaning with a pregnant brevity which we admire but cannot imitate.

There is no feature of our English Revised Version which has received so much condemnation as its rendering of the tenses. And it is not perfect in that respect. Nevertheless, that is the feature for which it probably deserves our sincerest gratitude. For the translators of the Authorized Version were either unconscious of some of the finest distinctions in the Greek language, or indifferent to their expression in English. Dr. Blass has more faith than even the Revisers in St. Luke's ability to write grammatical Greek. And although, says Dr. Salmon, 'I have sometimes thought his explanations over-subtle, and such as would have astonished Luke himself, it must be remembered that a native will often instinctively employ certain shades of expression without having any knowledge of the arguments by which a skilled grammarian would account for them. I generally find myself well able to acquiesce in Blass's explanations.'

The tense most neglected by the Authorized Version is the imperfect. But that is the tense St. Luke uses with the most delightful accuracy of meaning. The Revisers have altered 'their nets brake' (Luke v. 6) into 'their nets were breaking.' But they agree with the Authorized Version in rendering Acts vi. 7, 'a great company of the priests *were obedient* to the faith,' and miss the fact that it was not a simultaneous conversion of priests, but that a succession of priests, one after another, accepted the faith. They also agree in rendering Acts xviii. 8, 'many of the Corinthians believed and were baptized,' though St. Luke uses the imperfect, and thereby tells us of the slow process of their conversion, and the patient persuasion that it demanded.

It may be that the Revisers did not reveal these distinctions, not because they did not observe them, but because they found that the English language would not permit it. Who will bring out in English the difference between the imperfect and the aorist, the one signifying a continuous process and the other its termination, as St. Luke is able to express it in Acts xix. 19—'They brought their books together (one after another), and (one after another) burned them in the sight of all; and they counted (a single act concluding the process) the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver'? Or who will tell us by a mere translation that the lame beggar at the Gate Beautiful kept asking an alms until he got his asking? But it would not have been difficult to let us understand that Timothy's father was already dead, when in Acts xvi. 3 St. Luke said 'they all knew that his father was (had been) a Greek.' Blass tells us in a sentence which recalls Bengel at his best: '*ὑπῆρχεν, fuerat*: si vivus pater fuisset *ὑπάρχει* exstaret'—these are his words.

Dr. Blass disclaims all pretension to special New Testament scholarship. And in that very fact Dr. Salmon finds the source of much of his freshness and fertility. For, as he properly says, 'Scriptural commentaries have a tendency to run into grooves, one commentator so utilising what has been said by another, that, wearied by the monotony, we exclaim, "*taedet quotidianarum harum formarum*, we are tired of the same faces every day," for a mere beautiful face is not so attractive as one that possesses the charm of greater originality of expression.' Nevertheless, Dr. Blass has not been wholly unmindful of his predecessors in this field. For in Klostermann he has discovered a taking interpretation of an almost unintelligible passage, and gives it the added strength of his approbation. In Acts viii. 10, we are told that when the people spoke of Simon Magus, they said, 'This man is the great power of God,' or as the Revised Version has it, 'This man is that power of God which is called Great.' Now the last word in the Greek of this sentence is *megalē* (*μεγάλη*). Klostermann believes that it does not mean 'great.' He believes that it is not a Greek word at all, but a transliteration of the

Aramaic word mĕgallē (מְגַלֵּא), which means a revealer or a seer.

Quite original, however, is Dr. Blass's explanation of St. Luke's account of Apollos, which is another of the perplexities of this interesting but difficult book. It is a most attractive explanation, moreover, and would be altogether welcome and conclusive, if it were not for one circumstance which seems to have been overlooked.

In Acts xviii. 24, St. Luke suddenly introduces Apollos, whom he describes as 'an eloquent man (or *a learned man*—R.V.) and mighty in the scriptures.' Then in the next verse, he says, 'This man had been instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in spirit, he spake and taught carefully the things concerning Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John.' Dean Farrar expresses the common view of this passage when he says that Apollos must have been very imperfectly acquainted with the doctrines of Christianity if he did not know any baptism but that of John. And when it is stated a few verses farther on that St. Paul found at Ephesus, after the departure of Apollos, twelve men who were baptized into John's baptism, it has been freely believed that they were converts whom Apollos had made, and that he had actually told them nothing of Jesus, but left them disciples of the Baptist. That belief, however, is contradicted by the narrative itself. For, as Blass points out, these men are called 'disciples,' an expression which, standing by itself, is never used except of Christians. They are also said to have 'believed,' another word which is appropriated to faith in Christ. And then, the way in which St. Luke speaks of Apollos himself, that 'he taught carefully the things concerning Jesus,' is unintelligible if Apollos did not know or did not teach anything beyond the preaching and the baptism of John.

Accordingly, Dr. Blass suggests that Apollos did know accurately the story of our Lord's life, and taught it; but that he was unacquainted with any other *baptism* than John's. Whereupon the interesting inquiry arises, 'How did Apollos acquire the knowledge which he possessed? Was it from a book, or from *viva voce* intercourse with Christians? Surely, if he had been converted by a Christian missionary, he would have been taught by him the necessity for Christian baptism. But if he learned from a written Gospel, it might have been one as full in its account of our Lord's words and deeds as Mark's or Luke's, and yet have said no more than these do about Christian baptism.'

If this suggestion could be accepted, it would certainly, as Dr. Salmon says, have an interesting bearing on the date of the publication of the Gospels. To know that a written Gospel had found its way to Alexandria at so early a date as the conversion of Apollos is with one stroke to settle some of the keenest controversies of our day. But it is a surprising thing that neither Dr. Blass nor Dr. Salmon has observed the special word which St. Luke employs when he speaks of the instruction in the way of the Lord which Apollos had already received. That word is the very last which we should have expected the evangelist to use if he wished to say that it was from a written Gospel that Apollos had learned his Christianity. For it is the word that is specially employed of oral instruction. Almost unknown outside the New Testament (till the early Church seized it to signify that course of instruction which converts underwent before they were admitted to baptism—the word 'catechumen' is simply its present participle), it is used there for a report that is carried from mouth to mouth, or for teaching that is derived 'from *viva voce* intercourse with Christians.' And the Revised Version actually reminds us of this, by explaining in the margin that the Greek for 'instructed' is 'taught by word of mouth.'

But even if we must let that attractive suggestion go, there is enough remaining to make Dr. Blass's Commentary a notable book. And yet it is

probable that it would scarce have been heard of in this country if it had not contained the surprising theory of the way in which the Book of the Acts was written.

The theory is proposed really to account for the peculiarities of that manuscript which is known as D or Codex Bezæ, and which lies, a priceless possession, in the University Library at Cambridge. There was a time when the strange additions and stranger omissions of that manuscript were accounted for by groaning over the carelessness of its scribe. But when it was found that the scribes of other manuscripts had been as careless, and in precisely the same way, that they had made the same additions, omissions, and transpositions, that theory was hastily abandoned. Now the question is not to account for the ways in which D diverges from the common text, but for the origin of a whole family of manuscripts which exhibit the same peculiarities. The family in question is often called the 'Western' Group of Manuscripts, since its cradle was supposed to be in that quarter of the Roman world. But now it is coming to be designated the Syro-Latin group, from the circumstance that the MSS. which agree with 'that singular Codex' D are mostly Syriac or Latin.

Well, 'the origin of the "Western" text,' as Dr. Chase said recently in the *Critical Review*, 'is the question of all questions, which must be grappled with before further advance in the textual criticism of the New Testament can be made.' Three distinct theories have been quite recently proposed. Professor Rendel Harris, in *A Study of Codex Bezæ*, which he issued as one of the Cambridge *Texts and Studies* in 1891, traced the strange readings of the Greek of Codex Bezæ to the influence of the Latin on the opposite page. For the manuscript is a bilingual; each page of Greek has a corresponding page of Latin opposite. And Professor Rendel Harris showed that at Luke xxiii. 53, for example, a Latin hexameter had been inserted which the Greek scribe had then translated. Thus arose the singular addition to that verse which is found in Codex Bezæ, and which may be here placed within parentheses: 'And he took it down and wrapped it in a linen cloth, and laid Him in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain (and having laid Him, he laid against the tomb a stone, which twenty hardly moved).'

Professor Rendel Harris did not claim absolute originality for his suggestion; he knew that Mill had made it already. And he did not claim that it settled all the difficulties. So there was room and encouragement for another. It came from Cambridge also, as it had the very best right to do. In 1893, Dr. F. H. Chase, Principal of the Clergy School there, published a volume under the title of *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezæ*. The title describes the theory. Dr. Chase believes that the peculiarities of Codex Bezæ are due to the fact that its Greek has not been transcribed from some earlier Greek manuscript, but that it has been translated from the Syriac. That is to say, the Gospels and the Acts, which is all that Codex Bezæ contains, having been originally written in Greek, were first translated into Syriac, and then that Syriac was translated into Greek again, and that is the 'Western' text as it is found in Codex Bezæ.

The third theory and the last is the theory of Dr. Blass. The others are tame beside it. Dr. Blass believes that the text of Codex Bezae is as original as the text of any manuscript in existence. Nay, with all its peculiarities, it is the oldest, the most original text in our possession. For he believes that St. Luke wrote two copies of the Book of Acts. First he wrote what may be called a rough draft; and then he wrote a fairer copy to send to his friend Theophilus. Both copies have been preserved. The first is found in Codex Bezæ; the second and fairer is the text of the other great manuscripts, the text of all our ordinary editions of the Greek New Testament.

Thus Dr. Blass is bold enough to carry us back to St. Luke himself. He introduces us to his

study. We see him with his pen in hand. He has finished the first copy of his immortal work. It is well done and workmanlike. But it is not fair enough for the eye of his illustrious friend to see. He sits and writes another. And as he writes he alters here and there. Words are suppressed or inserted, phrases are exchanged for others, sentences are rearranged. He finishes the new copy and sends it off. But the rough draft is preserved as well as the cleaner copy. They both get into circulation, and puzzle the critics exceedingly. And in the end of the nineteenth century, just as the controversy over the origin of the Western text has become acute, a 'mere classical scholar' steps in and dramatically settles it for them.

At least, Professor Nestle believes that it is settled, calling it 'a new biblical discovery.' And the Provost of Trinity College also believes that it is settled. And both these men are competent to judge, and slow to pronounce a judgment.

Where is Mount Sinai? Till Professor Sayce came to disturb our comfortable belief, we all had unhesitatingly answered, 'In the Sinaitic Peninsula.' But the answer cannot be offhand now. For Professor Sayce has argued that it is not in the Sinaitic Peninsula, where the Israelites never could have wandered in the days when Egypt held possession of the Peninsula and worked its profitable copper mines. Ask Professor Sayce, Where is Mount Sinai? and he answers, 'I know not; somewhere perhaps among the ranges of Mount Seir, on the borders of Edom and Moab, but certainly not in the peninsula which ignorant monks have called "Sinaitic."'

Thus the question has to be carefully considered now, and experts' left to answer it. Professor Edward Hull is such an expert. At the meeting of the Victoria Institute in London on the 3rd of February, Professor Hull read a paper of which this question was the title, Where is Mount Sinai? He does not follow Professor Sayce, and say it cannot be in the Sinaitic Peninsula. He follows the belief of all the centuries, and says it cannot be anywhere else. And he has the advantage over Professor Sayce that, in 1883, he went over the ground. Perhaps he has the further advantage that he is a trained geologist and official surveyor. So he concluded then, and he stands to it now, that Mount Sinai is the traditional Jebel Musâ.

In the *Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund for the current quarter, there is reproduced from a recent issue of *The Jewish Chronicle* a note on the site of Ophir, where the ships of Tarshish were wont to go for gold.

Where Ophir was, has been the occasion of much dispute. Once confidently held to be a city or site in India, the writer of the article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* argued so earnestly in favour of Arabia that the popular verdict has gone that way ever since. But Dr. Carl Peters, the well-known geographer, has recently made a discovery which, in his opinion, upsets that judgment. He has discovered an historical atlas which was printed at Amsterdam in the first decade of the eighteenth century. This old atlas proves that nearly two hundred years ago the Portuguese had a knowledge of Africa which, had we but been aware of it, might have saved innumerable exploring expeditions and deplorable loss of life. But with the decline of the Portuguese power there, this knowledge went out of sight. Now the accidental discovery of an old Dutch atlas reveals an early and accurate knowledge of the east and south-west coasts of Africa, of the courses of the rivers Congo and Zambesi, of the dwarf tribes Akka, and of the great forest in the north-western bend of the Congo.

Well, this atlas speaks particularly of the great treasures to be found in the Zambesi country. Gold, jewels, and fine animals are there; and it even knows and names the sites of the best of the gold mines. Dr. Peters is convinced that these mines are old as the days of the Phœnician and Sabaian traders, and that here on the south-east

coast of Africa was situated the Ophir of the Old Testament. He even goes further. He is bold enough to argue that the word Africa is itself of Shemite origin, and came from the fame of this very city of Ophir. For what is *Afr* but the three consonants (אפר) which in Hebrew stand for Ophir? And to *Afr* you have only to add the Latin ending *ica*, when the name of Africa is complete.

One export from Ophir Dr. Peters does not seem to mention. The Chronicler tells us (2 Chron. ix. 10) that when the ships of Solomon and Hiram brought gold from Ophir, they also brought algum trees and precious stones. What were these algum trees? It is more difficult to determine than the site of Ophir. In 1 Kings x. 11 they are called almug trees, as if either scribe was not quite sure of the spelling. We are not sure now, nor what they were, nor where they came from. They also *seem* to have come from Lebanon (2 Chron. ii. 8). But whether these were trees that had first came from Ophir, or a different species of tree, or the same species capable of growing in such widely distant latitudes, Professor Post, the greatest living authority on the plants of the Bible, is quite unable to determine.

A recent issue of *The Journal of Biblical Literature* contains an article by Professor Thayer on 'The Historical Element in the New Testament.' We have for some time been familiar with what is called the historical reference of Prophecy. We admit—almost every serious student of prophecy now admits—that the prophets of Israel spoke first, and in a sense spoke only, to the men of their own time. But Professor Thayer's field is not the prophets of the Old Testament; it is the prophets and apostles of the New. And he finds that they also addressed themselves to their contemporaries, and used language which should first of all be understood by them.

If this is true, and following Professor Thayer we shall proceed to prove it true, the necessity lies upon us to do with the New Testament as we do with the prophecies of the Old; that is to say, place ourselves as far as possible by the side of the men to whom Christ spoke and the apostles wrote; in order that, whatever further and fuller meaning we may discover in the words of the New Testament, we may first of all see clearly the meaning they carried to the men who heard or read them first. It is not a mere pastime, it is a necessity. For otherwise there are passages of the New Testament which we shall scarcely understand, there are passages which we shall seriously misunderstand, and there are passages which we shall wrest to our own and others' confusion.

There are passages which we shall scarcely understand. One is found in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians, vers. 8 to 23. Too long to quote in full, this is the beginning: 'Take heed lest there be any one that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in Him ye are made full, who is the head of all principality and power; in whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.' And this is the end of it: 'If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, Handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using), after the precepts and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh.'

Now the men to whom these words were written, read them and understood them at once. We cannot understand them at once. Without some

careful search or exposition we can scarcely understand them at all. Without comment, says Professor Thayer, the passage is almost ineligible for public reading to a miscellaneous audience.

Again, there are passages which we shall seriously misunderstand. Professor Thayer does not recall it, but it may be well for us here to recall a little book published some years ago by an Oriental scholar, the Rev. James Neil, M.A., under the title of *Figurative Language in the Bible.* The book was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES when it appeared. (Possessors of the third volume may be referred to pp. 97 f.) Among the examples of 'figurative language,' which Mr. Neil mentions is John iii. 5, 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' We pointed out that just at that time a controversy was in progress in the pages of the *Record* over this passage, the meaning of it, and why Christ seemed to make baptism essential to regeneration. And we quoted one of the writers in the *Record* who said, 'Had we been present, we should have heard the most inconceivably impressive tone of emphasis laid upon the words "and of the Spirit."' That is to say, the reference to baptism in the 'water' was admitted, the seeming necessity of baptism was admitted, and this was the way this writer sought to reduce its significance. Even he was attempting to stand beside the men who heard our Lord speak. But Mr. Neil stands there, if less literally, far more really, when he suggests that the phrase being simply 'of water and spirit,' our Lord made use of a familiar Oriental mode of speech. It is the figure of speech we call hendiadys, or 'one by means of two,' the figure which enables a qualified subject to be expressed as if it were two separate subjects. 'We pour out a libation from bowls and gold,' says Virgil, when our prosaic English tongue would put it 'golden bowls.' St. Paul rejoices that 'our Saviour Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel' (2 Tim. i. 10), where Mr. Neil doubts if he means more than immortal or incorruptible life, though he puts it more emphatically. In like manner, 'Except a man be born of water and spirit,' is simply our Lord's employment of the familiar Eastern figure of hendiadys, and means, 'Except a man be born of *spiritual* water,' with a very strong emphasis on the 'spiritual.'

Still more striking, perhaps, is Mr. Neil's suggestion that when Jesus answered and said, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life,' He said no other than 'I am the true and living way.' In referring to this passage formerly, we added that men will not be expected to accept this meaning readily, 'for many noble and edifying sermons have been preached on these words in their literal, prosaic, Western acceptation.' Since then the noblest sermon of all has been both preached and published—Professor Hort's masterly volume, *The Way, and the Truth, and the Life.* Nevertheless, we make bold to repeat the words with which we then concluded: 'It is certain that it is the "way," and neither the truth nor the life that is the topic of conversation, for the words are a direct reply to Thomas's question, "How can we know the way?" and this view of it does seem to "make the whole passage more forceful and consistent."'

Professor Thayer's examples are not less apposite than these, and they carry fuller consequences with them. 'One does not have to look far,' he says, 'among the popular commentaries on the Fourth Gospel to find our Lord's words to Nathanael, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man" (John i. 51), spoken of as referring to the scanty hints of angelic appearances at the Transfiguration, in Gethsemane, at the Ascension, or even on some otherwise unrecorded occasion, so completely do these interpreters stick in the bark.' Professor Thayer would first understand what the bark is. That is to say, he would catch the local colouring, he would trace the national costume this language wears, and then stripping that off, he would find that what our Lord offers is the restitution in the

Son of Man of free intercourse between heaven and earth, the old exceptional privilege of him who strove with God and prevailed, now become the common and constant prerogative of all believers.

Lastly, there are passages which, if we do not understand the historical (by which Professor Thayer means the national and local) character of their imagery, we shall wrest to our own and others' confusion. Take the whole series of passages which describe the Second Coming. 'This is a topic,' says Professor Thayer, 'which stirs a hopeless feeling in many minds; a topic on which sober and reserved exegetes have now and then gone so far as to admit that the apostles are chargeable with inextricable confusion—an admission from which they have not allowed themselves to be deterred by the remorseless logic of Strauss, who says (for substance): "The only trouble in the case is that the event did not agree with the prophecy. Now, Jesus either made these predictions or He did not; if He did, He is thereby proved to have at times lost His mental balance, and hence must be taken with reserve as a teacher and religious guide; if He did not, His disciples, who put such things into His mouth, are not to be trusted in their reports of His teaching' (*Der alte und der neue Glaube*, Sechste Aufl., p. 80).

Now it did not lie in the way of Strauss to suppose so, but it is open to us to suppose that the modern interpreter is as likely to be under a misapprehension as the original writer. For the original writer stood so near the primal source of these statements as to make it probable that he gave a correct report of them; and, further, *they were put in circulation at a time when every reader could bring them to the actual test of history.*

What are these statements? Among others, the following: 'From this time forward ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven' (Matt. xxvi. 64). 'For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then shall He render to every man according to his deeds. Verily, I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom' (Matt. xvi. 27, 28). Watch the words *from this time forward*, the words *them that stand here*, the words *in no wise taste of death*, the word *see*. If the evangelists who wrote them, if the early Christians who read them, understood these words as our modern interpreters do, with what room for faith in Christ as a prophet did they write them down and read them?

But they did not understand them so. They understood them, and they could not help understanding them, in the symbolic sense which current usage gave them. Have we not an excellent and overwhelming example in the prophecy from Joel which St. Peter quoted on the day of Pentecost?

> And I will show wonders in the heaven above,
> And signs on the earth beneath;
> Blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke:
> The sun shall be turned into darkness,
> And the moon into blood,
> Before the day of the Lord come,
> That great and notable day:
> And it shall be, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.

These are the prophet's words: where does St. Peter find their fulfilment? In the event that has just taken place. '*This* is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel.' For St. Peter knew the sense in which his countrymen understood that prophecy, and that they would not demand the literal accomplishment of all its physical marvels.

Now we do not understand Professor Thayer to mean that before you can interpret a prophecy you must empty it of all its historical reality. On the contrary, he insists on your recognising that very thing, and giving it its due and contemporary weight. He only asks that you do not demand its fulfilment according to *your* idea of historical reality, which is so very different from that of an Oriental.