
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 second volume of the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE is now ready. It contains 870 pages, and runs from FEIGN to KINSMAN. Within that space fall some of the most important subjects that a Dictionary of the Bible has to deal with.

The letters F and G are mainly English. They therefore contain an unusual proportion of the Editor's own articles. These are not old English words alone. The old English words are explained, and illustrated from contemporary writers. And that not only when they are obsolete, but also when they have partly shifted their meaning. For there the danger of misunderstanding is much greater. It is easy to be arrested by the verb to *fray*, and it is easy to explain its meaning. But when we read in Ps 59^{15}: 'Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied,' it is possible that we may not understand that 'grudge' in this sense has now given place to 'grumble.'

But there are words and phrases that demand attention, not because they are obsolete and not because they have shifted their meaning, but because they are not English at all, and never were. They contradict the genius of the English language, and all the popularity of the Authorized Version has failed to introduce them into the literary or current speech. They are to a large extent bold metaphors, like 'go a whoring after.' The unwary reader either misses their force or mistakes their poetry for Western prose. How much of our popular theology has gone astray through their misapprehension. In his valuable companion to the Psalter of the Prayer Book, Dr. Driver has always kept a watchful eye for such expressions, and even added an exhaustive list of them at the end. What wealth of unseen instruction there lies in this field will be seen by any reader of the new volume of the *Dictionary* who turns to the elaborate article on the verb to *go*.

The great letter in this volume is the letter J. The letter J may be said to give character to the volume. For the second volume covers an unusual number of great subjects, and these belong mostly to J. We have only to recall the books James, Jeremiah, Job, Joel, John, Jonah, Joshua, and Judges; the men Jacob, John, Joseph, Judas Iscariot; the places Jerusalem, Jordan, Judæa; and the doctrines of Jealousy, Joy, Judgment, and Justification. But the other letters are rich in this respect also. And it is into this volume that there fall the three great articles on GOD, JESUS CHRIST, and the HOLY SPIRIT.

These subjects have never before been handled in a Dictionary of the Bible with the same fulness. There is also a special character that ought to belong to a Dictionary article, and they seem

to us to approach it very nearly. They not only present the available information in an easily ascertainable form, they not only lead forward to further study, but they gather the data into results, and they suggest principles which are instinct with spirit and with life. The article GOD is written by Professor A. B. Davidson and Professor Sanday. It runs from page 196 to page 215. The article HOLY SPIRIT is written by Professor Swete. It is found between pages 402 and 411. The article JESUS CHRIST is written by Dr. Sanday, and covers 51 pages, from 603 to 653.

The time spent upon this volume is, of course, much more than the year that has elapsed since the issue of Volume I. And it is possible that the rate of issue may seem to some too slow. But they would not think so if they knew what a volume demands. Though there are many large articles, there are many more that are small, and they are usually very successful in hiding the labour which they cost. It is with thankfulness we see the work fully half accomplished, for the third volume is already well advanced. And if the second volume receives as hearty an appreciation as the first, we shall not grudge the time or the toil that have been given to it.

Now that Professor Ramsay has shown us how to understand the Enrolment under Quirinius, the greatest historical difficulty, we suppose, in the New Testament is the reconciliation of the Book of Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians about the early movements of St. Paul. In the Acts St. Luke says (9^{19-22}): 'And he was certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus. And straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that He is the Son of God. And all that heard him were amazed, and said, Is not this he that in Jerusalem made havock of them which called on this Name? and he had come hither for this intent, that he might bring them bound before the chief priests. But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ.' In Galatians (1^{15-17}) St. Paul himself says: 'But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me: but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned unto Damascus.'

The Rev. P. M. Barnard, M.A., in a short paper in the *Expositor* for April, seeks to reconcile that seeming contradiction. His method is very simple. He believes that St. Luke has told us in the shortest space of two distinct visits to Damascus. The first visit he describes as being over within 'certain days' (ἡμέρας τινάς), the second as lasting 'many days' (9^{23}, ἡμέραι ἱκαναί). In the first visit St. Paul knew only that Jesus was the Son of God (observe that the correct reading is not as A.V., 'he preached Christ,' but as R.V., 'he proclaimed *Jesus*'). At the second visit he knows that Jesus is the Messiah,—'proving that this is the Christ.' How do we account for this development in the apostle's preaching? He tells us himself in Galatians. He had spent some time in Arabia, and learned it there in intercourse with God. St. Luke's words, Mr. Barnard thinks, when closely studied, reveal two distinct visits to Damascus, a shorter and a longer. And St. Paul's words in Galatians 'clearly imply that his sojourn in Arabia fell between a short and a long stay at Damascus.'

Canon Winterbotham, whose book on *The Kingdom of Heaven* was noticed last month, is much perplexed with our Lord's saying, 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.' He rejects the explanation that the needle's eye is the little gate at the side of the great one, through which a camel may just pass if it is first unloaded. 'That gate is a product (and a monument) of Western stupidity in

dealing with our Lord's words.' It is simply a very ordinary proverb to express what we should call 'perfectly impossible.' And as such, he is greatly perplexed by it.

For he finds it universally taught that a rich man may be a good Christian and die in the Lord, without devoting more than a small percentage of his wealth to good works. And not only is this taught, but experience shows that rich men do actually enter the kingdom. That is to say, they are indistinguishable to our eye from others whom we believe to enter the kingdom, unless it be by their superior sanctity and self-denial. And so Canon Winterbotham is led to conclude that our Lord did not mean the saying to express a permanent feature of His kingdom. It may have been impossible for a rich man to die a Christian then; it is not impossible now.

But there is one thing that it is impossible for a rich man to do still. It is impossible for him to preach the gospel. To the poor the gospel is still preached, and only by the poor. That is to say, it is to the mass that the gospel comes, to that enormous majority of mankind which is poor, and the poor will listen only to those who share the narrowness and sadness of their lot. Our Lord Himself had to become poor that He might preach to the people. And it is here that Canon Winterbotham finds light on the text that perplexes him. When our Lord said, 'Enter the kingdom of heaven,' He meant more than we vulgarly mean by salvation. He included service. A rich man may be saved in our modern sense, but he cannot turn his gifts and capacities to use in the Master's service, he cannot enter fully into the kingdom of heaven.

Professor Jannaris of St. Andrews is a stimulating writer, and the author of the most authoritative Grammar of Historical Greek in the English language. He has contributed an article to the *Expositor* for April, in which he argues that a long passage in our Lord's intercessory prayer has been hitherto wholly misunderstood.

It is the passage beginning Jn 17^{18} and continuing to the end of the chapter. In these nine verses the particle ἵνα occurs ten times, and each time it is mistranslated in the English versions. Take the first occurrence, 'And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, *that* they themselves also *may* be sanctified in truth.' Such is the rendering of the Revised Version. And expositors have given themselves to the effort of explaining how our Lord's sanctification of Himself could be the means of our sanctification. Professor Jannaris says it is a misinterpretation of the passage. The particle ἵνα with its subjunctive, rendered here 'that . . . may,' is really an imperative. What our Lord spoke was therefore: 'In their behalf I am sanctifying Myself. May they also be sanctified in truth!'

For this particle ἵνα has a history. Originally it was a weak synonym for ὅπως, 'in order that.' Then it took the place of that conjunction in ordinary speech (perhaps, suggests Professor Jannaris, under the influence of the Roman *utinam*, as if *ut-ina-m*), sending ὅπως into mere literary or artificial language. Next it began to elbow the infinitive. For a time the infinitive, pressed on this side, stretched away on another, and took up the ground of the participle, ἐν τῷ λέγειν being largely used in biblical Greek for the classical λέγων, 'while speaking.' But ἵνα still pressed on. In the Greek of the Middle Ages it has dislodged the infinitive entirely.

Now one of the functions of the infinitive in classical Greek was to express a demand or a wish —to do duty, in short, for the imperative. And this usage survived into New Testament times. Thus in Ro 12^{15} we translate, 'Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep,' where the Greek is χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Again, in Lk 9^{3}, the R.V. gives, 'Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor wallet,

nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats,' and the Greek is first an imperative and then an infinitive (*μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, μήτε ῥάβδον, μήτε πήραν, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἀργύριον· μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν*).

But, even in classical Greek, *ἵνα* sometimes takes the place of this infinitive. And in the New Testament that is common. In Col 4^{16} St. Paul is made to say, 'And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.' But Professor Jannaris believes that the apostle wrote better grammar than that. The usual infinitive expressive of a wish has been displaced by *ἵνα* with the subjunctive. Then the translation is, 'And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans. Moreover, do ye also read the epistle from Laodicea.'

Again, in Mk 5^{23} the English translators have had recourse to an insertion in order to express the grammar accurately. All that the Greek gives is, 'My little daughter is at the point of death, that Thou come and lay Thy hands on her, that she may be made whole, and live.' The English versions insert 'I pray thee' before 'that Thou come.' But Professor Jannaris translates, '*do come* and lay Thy hands on her, so that she may be saved, and live.' This, then, is the way he would render the ten instances of *ἵνα* with the subjunctive in Jn $17^{18\text{-}26}$. To take the last verse as example: 'I have both declared unto them Thy name, and will be declaring it. May the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me be among them! I also among them!'

Under the heading of 'Episcopacy and Sacerdotalism,' Professor Sanday has contributed an article to the *Guardian* of 29th March. It is in the form of a reply to the review of his recent book by Dr. Moberly. Not that Dr. Sanday takes exception to that review. That was scarcely possible, notwithstanding that we believe the author of the book and his reviewer are fundamentally at variance. For Dr. Moberly recognized that the purpose of the book was to bring together the two sides in the controversy that is at present rending the Church of England, and he passed over the fundamental differences in acknowledging the Christian spirit of the effort at reconciliation. Dr. Sanday's reply is therefore an acknowledgment of the courtesy of the reviewer, and a disclosure of his own spiritual atmosphere of the most candid and impressive kind.

Professor Sanday fears that his position may be misunderstood. He has not received any 'redding stroke.' And on that account he thinks it possible that he may be considered the advocate of compromises. He does not in the least believe that truth lies in compromises, or that real differences can be glossed over by ambiguities of language. But, for all that, he admits the existence in his mind of things that are opposite, and even of some—perhaps not a few—that are incompatible. For the seeker after truth is constantly discovering that his denials have been too sweeping, and that the adversary has positions and arguments as good as his own. His very purpose therefore was to prevent principles that seem different from being recognized as incompatible before they have been fully tested. He does not think that the wolf and the lamb are ready to lie down together, but he would remind us that all the occupants of our fields are not either wolves or lambs.

Then Dr. Sanday seems ready to make concessions. He goes as far as it is safe to go. We must not allow him to go too far. Of the two methods of reaching truth, the inductive and the deductive, Dr. Moberly had complained that he made too little of the second. Dr. Sanday admits that he has had a prejudice against the deductive method, or, perhaps, rather a prejudice in favour of the inductive; and he says, 'This is just one of the instances in which I have dis-

covered, late in the day, that an old prejudice was not as well founded as I thought. As far back as I can remember, even before I came up to Oxford, a deep impression was made upon me by Butler's *Analogy*. One fixed conclusion that I carried away with me from that work was that deductive arguments in the sphere of theology were highly precarious; that our real concern was not with what *ought* to be, or what *must* be in the Divine economy, but rather with what *is*, or in the historical sense, what *has been*. This naturally led up to the use of the so-called historical method, which in these days enjoys much favour; and, to the extent of my ability, I have spent most of my life in trying to apply it.'

But in the last year or two, 'since I came to know Dr. Moberly,' Dr. Sanday confesses that he has become aware that the deductive method has a larger and more legitimate function than he had supposed. As wielded by Dr. Moberly, he sees that it is an engine of great power, and he has no wish to question it. He still thinks that it is like the bow of Ulysses. Ulysses himself can bend and use it. He is not so sure of the other inhabitants of Ithaca. He will not prejudge them, but he would like to see them trying their skill before he expresses an opinion.

Now it has seemed to some of us that it is just here that the essential weakness and vice (we use the word in its technical sense) of Dr. Moberly's position comes in. And it is the boldness with which he takes up the bow of Ulysses that makes him dangerous. Dr. Moberly writes a large book on the meaning of Christian Priesthood. He disclaims special knowledge of the subject. He does not think that special knowledge is necessary in order to the writing of the best, that is, the most scientific, book. What he lacks in knowledge he supplies in reasoning. In other words, Dr. Moberly displaces the inductive gathering and interpretation of facts for the deductions of an acute ecclesiastical mind. He does not count it necessary to discover all that *has been*; to supplement the deficiency, he calls in the aid of what *must* or *ought* to be.

All this is boldly stated in Dr. Moberly's preface. And it is there we find the following illustration of his method. 'It would be hard,' says Dr. Moberly, 'to find a scholar of graver or more solid judgment than Dr. Hort.' But Dr. Hort was an inductive scholar. He gathered facts, and when he had gathered all that he could find, he drew conclusions from them. Sometimes these conclusions were negative. Thus he concluded that the apostles received from our Lord no authority to govern in the Church; he concluded that there were no *ecclesiae* as a result of St. Paul's first missionary journey in Europe; he concluded that the *deacon* had nothing to do with teaching; and that the connexion between laying on of hands and ordination to ministry was rather accidental than important.

Now it is possible that Dr. Hort had not sufficient data to draw these negative conclusions from. When Mr. Cooke wrote his appreciation of Professor Driver in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of last September, one was struck with his picture of the lectures that were 'an education in scientific method. There is the searching examination of the grammar of the text, the masterly grouping of illustrative material, and then the carefully worded, exact induction.' But especially was one struck with this: 'When his result is reached, it is stated with clear and resolute precision; when it is impossible to be certain, he says so frankly. How familiar to his pupils is such a remark as "The data are not sufficient to warrant us in forming any certain conclusion."'

It is possible, we say, that sometimes Dr. Hort drew negative conclusions when the data were not sufficient to warrant him in forming any certain conclusion. But that is not the ground on which Dr. Moberly condemns him. He condemns him for not adding to his data such theological prepossessions as would have made a negative con-

clusion on these subjects impossible. Dr. Sanday has done more than any living man to teach us the value and use of the inductive method of historical investigation. It is by the use of that method that the great advances have been made in New Testament study within the last quarter of a century. Surely he is not going to destroy or dilute its force by the introduction now of every man's theological presuppositions. Certainly there is a function for deduction in New Testament investigation, as in every other branch of inquiry, but that function is not to fill up the gaps that are left by the available historical data.

Dr. Moberly, we are aware, says that men have their presuppositions in any case, and all that he argues for is that, instead of being covered up and ignored, these should be carefully taken account of. And certainly we agree with him in thinking that a man who swept the heavens with his telescope and said he had not found God, is not to be accepted as an infallible guide in theology. But we say to such a man, Make your induction larger. We do not say to him, First believe in a God and then add Him to the discoveries of your telescope.

There is an excellent example of Dr. Moberly's method in the very next subject which Dr. Sanday deals with. And it is a relief to find that, though Dr. Sanday gives in on the general principle, he differs on its application. The subject is Schism. Dr. Moberly holds 'that wilful breach of organized unity is to the conscience of an instructed Christian "schism," and that "schism" is not only a mistake but a sin.' Well, the Reformers were guilty of 'breach of organised unity.' The only point where induction comes into play is in determining whether it was wilful. Dr. Sanday shows that it was not. Dr. Moberly holds that it was. His theological presupposition is a trained disbelief in the wisdom of the Reformation. It is enough in this instance to turn the scale. The consequence, for the Church of Scotland, for example, is somewhat serious.

But, after all, we do Professor Sanday injustice. It is not possible for him to fall back upon *à priori* methods and accept Dr. Moberly's conclusions. He sees with innate clearness that the time for that is past. In the matter of 'apostolic succession' it is the evidence that he relies upon. He is not concerned to deny that from the end of the second century a certain mode of conveyance—conveyance of authorization for ministry—has been practised. He does not doubt that even before that date a similar mode had been practised—'but with what degree of regularity and how far back that regularity extended, the evidence does not permit us to determine.' Wherefore he is not prepared so to erect it into a law of the Divine action as to say that there is no blessing conveyed by any other.

But if he does not do that, then, on Dr. Moberly's principles and practices, he might as well, theologically speaking, never have been born. And there are deeper things than that. Dr. Sanday is unable to accept a mechanical theory of the laying on of hands. It is no doubt, he says, a widespread idea that the laying on of hands denotes *transmission*—the transmission of a property possessed by one person to another. But it cannot mean that. It is a common accompaniment of 'blessing'; but 'blessing' means the invoking of blessing. For it is God who blesses or bestows the gift. It is not implied that the gift should be even previously possessed by him who invokes it.

The passage that has touched us most, however, is one of such intimate autobiography as only the strong can use. In his book Dr. Sanday had said that the Christian dies to sin in the strength of Christ, 'on whom his affections are so concentrated that it is as if Christ and he were actually one.' Dr. Moberly took exception to the words 'as if.' He called it an unscriptural touch. He said that no 'as if' in such a context was needed to make Scripture language intelligible or real. And he added that when the 'as if' was taken away, the difference was removed between sacrificing and pleading or presenting a sacrifice.

By that we suppose Dr. Moberly means that if Christ and we are actually one, then when we present our bodies a living sacrifice to God we present Christ, and so become sacrificing priests. But it is Dr. Sanday we are following at present. 'To me,' says Dr. Sanday, 'this paragraph is deeply interesting, and I suspect that it will be to not a few besides. I greatly hope that it may not be long before Dr. Moberly finds an opportunity to explain his meaning more fully.' We greatly hope so also. But we are following Dr. Sanday, and now must quote him word for word.

'I look back upon a time when the words "as if" came to me as the solution of a problem by which I had been much perplexed. I had asked myself, What is the meaning of the strong language about union with Christ which we find in St. Paul's Epistles, and notably in Romans vi.? How are we to translate it into terms of our own experience? I argued thus: Actual union it cannot mean, because that would imply a fusion of personalities, and fusion of personalities is impossible. If there is one thing that personality means, it is distinctness. I am myself and no one else. But what is the nearest thing in human experience to the fusion of personalities? I answered—and here I thought that I had found the key to St. Paul's language—Surely it must be in the line of affection, when—

> Heart with heart in concord beat,
> And the lover is beloved.

The most effective way of getting rid of selfishness and self-will is through some overpowering attachment. There, at last, you may have two wills really acting as one. On that analogy I could explain and make real to myself the seemingly mystical language of St. Paul. His great moral leverage is the attachment of the Christian to Christ. That is at bottom what he means by *faith*.'

There is a frankness about such a statement that is both refreshing and encouraging. And surely it is right. No doubt Dr. Sanday could have brought the Holy Spirit in. But it is not the operation he is seeking to describe, it is the experience. And as an experience, he is certainly right when he says that his view is at least real so far as it goes. He thinks it may be possible to go farther. He thinks the thought of our time is preparing itself for a farther advance on this subject. It may be so. But we doubt very much if it is on Dr. Moberly's lines that the advance is likely to be made.

The foregoing Notes had just been written when Harnack's new book arrived fresh from the publishers. It is described as *Thoughts on Protestantism* (A. & C. Black, 1s. 6d. net). It is from first to last a protest against the introduction of theological prepossession into our study of the Old and New Testaments or of Christianity. Once, says Harnack, there was no such study; *all* was theological prepossession. Then there arose the historical sense. A revolution followed in the history of mankind no less great than has been produced by the discoveries of natural science. 'We are all aware now that to dictate to knowledge the result at which it is to arrive is to make knowledge impossible.'

That the return to mediævalism—by which is conveniently designated the principles and practices of Christianity in the Roman Church before the Reformation—that the return to mediævalism is impossible on the lines of pure historical scholarship Harnack makes very plain. We should first have to return to the method of research that made mediævalism. And although Harnack's interference will not stay the movement in that direction, for there is no man living whom the advocate of theological prepossession more heartily distrusts, yet his little book is timely enough. For to all others it makes it clear that to follow Dr. Moberly in this is to separate oneself both from all our recent gains in knowledge and from all our present historical and scientific methods.