

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

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

for an autograph letter of Plato or Cicero? And yet here we have the actual letters of a contemporary of Abraham, the letters, too, of a king who marked an epoch in Babylonian history and made Babylon the capital of the kingdom.

They bear witness to an astonishing amount of energy and administrative power. All the business of the state, down to the minutest details, came before the king, and he seems to have found time to attend to it. In one of his letters he summons a money-lender to Babylon for punishment, in another he orders that a loan of corn be repaid with the interest upon it, in a third he gives the sizes of the pieces of wood required by the metal-workers in a neighbouring town. Other letters deal with finance or the arrest of defaulting officials, or with the repair of the canals and the *corvée* called out for the purpose. There was also a conscription for military service, a fact which has been overlooked by Mr. King, who has accordingly been landed in the impossible supposition that the sons of a *patesi*, or chief priest, had been handed over to a 'taskmaster of the public slaves.'

The *ridûti*, however, were simply recruiting sergeants, and Khammurabi merely intends to lay down that the sons of a high official were exempt from the conscription. From one of the letters we learn that Assyria was still part of the Babylonian empire, and had not yet become an independent state.

Mr. King has included in his work a very important document, the chronological annals of the dynasty to which Khammurabi belonged, compiled in the reign of Ammi-zadok, his fourth successor. He has made a revised copy of the cuneiform text and supplemented it by another contemporaneous, but independent, document of the same class. The notes which accompany the translation contain very full references to the dates found in the legal documents of the period, by means of which several of the mutilated passages in the annals can be restored. The second copy of the annals ends with the tenth year of Ammi-zadok, which, according to Professor Rogers's chronology, would be 2192 B.C. The value of these annals can scarcely be over-estimated.

The Apostle of Unity.¹

By THE REV. CANON J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., WESTMINSTER.

AT this solemn moment of our national life, gathered on the spot where our monarchs are crowned, we cannot utter what is in our hearts.² We have lost our great Queen. She was the mother of her people, and we all loved her. In our childhood we were taught to associate her name with tenderness and purity and truth: as we grew to manhood we learned also her strength and her wisdom, and we gave her the unreserved homage of our loyalty and our love.

The occasion which has brought us together will remind us of the Church's debt to a sovereign

'The building of the body of the Christ, till we all come . . . to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Christ.'—Eph. iv. 12, 13.

whose constant devotion has vindicated her historic claim to be the Defender of the Faith. It is a pathetic incident of our service to-day that the mandate which calls for the consecration of the bishop is the mandate of Queen Victoria, while the oath of allegiance has been taken to King Edward the Seventh. We accept the omen of continuity, and we pray in the King's own words that he may 'walk in the footsteps' of his beloved mother. In gratitude and confidence we lift our hearts to God.

But our present duty presses, and I must pass to my appointed task. In the fourth chapter of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, in the twelfth and thirteenth verses, you will find these

¹ Preached at the Consecration of Dr. H. E. Ryle as Bishop of Exeter.

² This sermon was preached three days after the death of Queen Victoria.

words: '*The building of the body of the Christ, till we all come . . . to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Christ.*'

The conversion of St. Paul issued from the testimony and the prayer of the martyred Stephen. St. Stephen had died on behalf of the larger inclusiveness of the Christian message. He could not be content to see the Church remain a guild of Judaism, invigorated by the Messianic hope, but clinging to the temple worship and practically enclosed within the walls of Jerusalem. His proclamation of a wider ideal roused the enmity of the Pharisaic party, which under Gamaliel's leadership had suspended its verdict and waited to know whether the new movement might or might not be welcomed and used. Their hostile decision at length broke down the one barrier to open persecution: Pharisees combined with Sadducees to crush the disciple as they had crushed his Master: Gamaliel's foremost scholar was consenting to St. Stephen's death.

God's ways surprise us: the impossible is possible with Him. The young man Saul takes up Stephen's mantle and receives a double portion of his spirit. He lives to overthrow the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and to found churches in which the uncircumcised break bread with the sons of the ancient covenant. He proclaims by revelation the freedom of Gentile Christianity: but he is never the apostle of liberty only, but always and beyond all others the apostle of comprehension and of unity. The great struggle of his life was not to claim permission for Gentiles to form Gentile churches side by side with the Jewish churches, but to preserve the completest inter-communion between Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ. It was the refusal of Jews to eat with Gentiles—a refusal which must have necessitated separate eucharists—which he denounced as fundamentally unchristian, when even St. Peter and St. Barnabas for a moment lent it their sanction.¹ St. Paul's whole career was shaped by his conviction and determination that comprehension and unity were and should be essential notes of the Christian Church. Not for an instant could he allow the position that the city of Antioch might contain two bodies of baptized persons, agreeing in their Christian faith, recipients of the same Holy Ghost, and yet separated from communion with one another

¹ Gal 2¹¹⁻²¹.

in the breaking of bread. Two bodies and one spirit was a thought unthinkable to him. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek,' he cries to the Galatians to whom he has repeated the story of that crisis, 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bondman nor freeman, there is no male and female; for ye are all one'—one man—'in Christ Jesus.'²

Presently at Corinth a like peril of disunion presented itself in an aggravated form. At least four possible denominations were already to be found in germ: 'I am of Paul, I am of Cephas, I of Apollos, and I of Christ.'³ Unholy rivalries had invaded the holiest ministrations, grave moral delinquency had escaped correction in a community preoccupied with internal strifes, and the apostle's heart was torn by the tidings. Divinely taught by the discipline of disappointment following close upon a peculiarly successful mission, he sprang forward with the proclamation of an ideal which we owe under God entirely to him—the conception of the Church as the body of the Christ—a living organism of which individual Christians were but limbs, whose life was but a sharing in the life of the whole: the body of the Christ, in and through which the ascended Lord still lived and worked in the world, finding feet and hands and lips to carry as before His messages of mercy to men. 'For as the body is one and hath many members, but all the members of the body, many though they be, are one body; so also is the Christ: for by one Spirit have we all been baptized into one body.'⁴

Later in his life, after his supreme effort to bring the Jewish churches to a recognition of the loving sense of fellowship with which the Gentile churches regarded them, when he had succeeded in his mission of reconciliation at the cost of his personal freedom, and was in consequence the prisoner of Christ Jesus on behalf of the Gentiles,⁵ he wrote from Rome, the centre and symbol of imperial unity, and proclaimed in yet higher strains than before his great ideal of the true human unity which had been constituted in the Christ. The vision is clearer than ever now; and in this crowning exposition of his gospel he declares at once the goal of human existence, and the path by which it is to be reached—the one

² Gal 3²⁸.

⁴ 1 Co 12¹².

³ 1 Co 1¹².

⁵ Eph 3¹.

body and the one Spirit—the one Church of Jew and Gentile, the two made one new man in Christ,—the one Church through which the divine purpose was being consummated whereby God would ‘gather up in one all things in Christ,’¹—the body which should continually expand by the constant accession of baptized believers, and should, as its several members grew in the ‘sense and service of membership,’ offer an ever more and more complete embodiment of the life of the ascended Lord, till at length the Christ should be wholly fulfilled in His body, and we should all have come to a fully matured and perfect man, ‘to the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Christ.’²

Such was the ideal which inspired that apostolic career whose commencement we commemorate to-day—the embodiment of the Christ in His Church leading at last to the unity of mankind in ‘the Christ that is to be.’ It is not without significance that the first words addressed by the ascended Lord to His future apostle declared the intimate oneness of Christ with His Church—‘Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?’³ From the first he was being prepared for the truth that the Church and Christ are ‘not twain, by one.’ In this respect, as in others, the apostle could truly say, ‘I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision.’⁴

Such, I say, was the ideal. Its progressive realization is the topic of our text—‘the building of the body.’ The phrase involves a second favourite figure by which St. Paul describes the divine purpose of unity. The bodies of individual Christians together form a holy temple in the Lord, which is not yet complete. Progress towards the fulfilment of the Church’s ideal involves the two elements of human activity and divine increase. The temple must be builded: the body must grow. And the apostle delights to combine his metaphors, and to speak at one time of the growth of the temple,⁵ and at another of ‘the building of the body.’ In our text he is declaring that the various

¹ Eph 1¹⁰.

² I gladly take this opportunity of recalling the notable sermon preached from the same pulpit by the late Dr. Hort at the consecration of Dr. Westcott as Bishop of Durham. The sermon is entitled ‘The Sense and Service of Membership the Measure of true Soundness in the Body’; it is reprinted in the volume containing the lectures on *The Christian Ecclesia*.

³ Ac 9⁴.

⁴ Ac 26¹⁹.

⁵ Eph 2²¹.

gifts of the ascended Lord all make for unity. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers are given to fit the parts of the body for the service of the whole, ‘for the building of the body, till we all come . . . to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Christ.’

The necessity of the Church’s unity is manifest, if we have learned and believed the central message of St. Paul. We cannot base our desire for it on the lower grounds of practical advantage, of economy of resources, or of a better front to be presented to the world. We go deeper and perceive that the very meaning of the Church’s existence is obscured and her primary purpose frustrated, where baptized Christians are not held in fellowship by the breaking of one bread.

In the generation after the apostles the bishop stands for unity. The monarchical episcopate quickly became the symbol and the safeguard of the Church’s fellowship.

The bishop was the centre of unity of the local church. The one bread by means of which its members realized that they were one body was broken to all by the bishop. The eucharist was the bishop’s eucharist. The prayer of the whole church was the intercession offered by the bishop. Besides this, he united the local church over which he presided with the churches of other localities. His eucharist was no isolated thing: it was the same body and blood of Christ which his fellow-bishops were distributing to their several flocks. They were all one bread, one body—however distant from one another—because they all partook of the one bread. To sever himself wilfully from his bishop’s eucharist was for a baptized man to sever himself—so far as an act of his will could effect the severance—from the body of the Christ, that is, from the Christ Himself.

Nor was the bishop only the centre of unity in the present; he was also the symbol of unity with the past and the promise of unity in the future. He was the recognized depositary of the true tradition of the apostolic teaching. This was the primary significance of the episcopal successions, which were first valued as the guarantee of doctrinal truth.

The conception of the bishop which is familiar to ourselves in England to-day differs largely in

detail from the primitive idea. But fundamentally it is the same. The bishop still stands for unity. Whatever the difference in the extent of his diocese may be—and it is density of population that makes the chief difference—he bears rule over a certain geographical area. The Church of Christ within the area is a corporate whole, of which he is the head. His responsibility extends to all baptized persons within that area, and his main function is to preserve them in the completest fellowship of a corporate life, and to fit the whole thus realized for its place in the larger unities of the province, the national Church, and the universal Church throughout the world.

This is the ideal from which our faith and hope may never swerve. But the actual facts that face the English bishop of to-day are such as present a perpetual temptation to take refuge in what I cannot but call a practical sectarianism.

1. Happily, in relation to the clergy of their dioceses, the bishops were never less open to the charge of adopting a party attitude. They have taken their stand for the comprehensiveness of the English Church. And the result of this has been strikingly manifested. What can be more hopeful in the present outlook than the large readiness which has been shown by the clergy of both extremes in our Church to yield to the bishop when he has spoken as bishop, and has asked for obedience as his episcopal right? If there be one thing more hopeful still, it is the appeal of all the bishops to all their clergy to support them in their fixed determination to uphold the principle of episcopal authority. We thank God for the strong leadership which in this presence I may not praise.

2. But the temptation to acquiesce in a practical sectarianism still presses from another side. For a bishop on entering his diocese finds that half the baptized souls within it do not recognize his rule. They do not even claim their membership in the corporate life which it is his function to fashion into unity. Societies of baptized men and women exist to whom the bishop is nought. They contain devout souls, earnestly serving the Lord Christ, but separated from the unity which the bishop represents. One such society, more than a century old, is full of spiritual vigour to-day, and is spreading more widely than ever over our land. It is daily growing in the sense of membership, and at this moment is showing an astonishing power of

providing funds for its common purposes out of the liberality of its adherents—no mean test of a corporate vitality. It quarrels little now with the doctrine of a visible Church. It claims to be a Church, and a branch of the universal Church, taking its stand as such by the side of the mother Church from which it has sprung. It quarrels not at all with liturgical worship; it makes large use of our own Prayer-Book, and its doctrines in general are such as are held by an important section of English Churchmen. It claims that its ministry, though not episcopally ordained, is a true ministry attested by the highest of all evidence, the power of the Spirit of God for the conversion and shepherding of souls. It has no theoretical objection to episcopacy itself: on the contrary, it owns its value, and has recently adopted a quasi-episcopal organization in the appointment of chief pastors to preside over large geographical areas.

How long are we of the Church of England to content ourselves with shutting our eyes so far as we possibly can to facts like these? In our controversy with other branches of the Catholic Church we have appealed again and again to the vitality of the English Church as an unanswerable argument on our own behalf. Are we to be deaf to that argument when it is urged to prove that others who are separated from us at home are not without the grace of God in their corporate life, that their ministry, though we count it irregular, is a Christian ministry, that their sacraments are sacraments of Christ?

In the case of that great society of which I have spoken, the chief barrier to reconciliation with the old Church, for which many of them have a deep reverence and a sincere love, is the thought that such reconciliation could only be possible on terms which to them would be a denial of the grace of the ministry to which they owe their souls. Fathers and brethren, I take this solemn occasion to ask you, for the sake of the unity of Christ's Church, to consider afresh whether this must needs be so.

We have reached a stage at which we are beginning to show a cautious friendliness to those whose earnest labours in the cause of Christ are a noble challenge to our zeal. The bishop whose recent loss we deeply mourn will not only be remembered as one who laboured for peace within our own borders. His visit to the Russian Church

made to my knowledge an impression that will not be quickly lost. Was he less truly a wise and faithful father in God of the English Church, when he sent a message of welcome to a Nonconformist Conference gathered in his earlier diocese of Peterborough? Tributes to his memory have shown how much his sympathetic attitude on that and other occasions was welcomed and reciprocated.

It may be that this century will still be young when measures of practical reunion will claim the attention of our leaders. The thoughts of men are everywhere turning to unity. One of the gravest and most honoured of Methodist divines said to me a few days ago, that if our Church could get powers of internal reform many difficulties might disappear from the path of reunion. The words may help to brace us for one of our immediate tasks. For indeed until we have got such powers we can hardly think that communities accustomed to self-government will readily renounce altogether the liberty in which they rejoice.

I have ventured to say these things to-day, because the Festival of St. Paul reminds us at how great cost the unity of the Church was sought and secured in the earliest age. 'The care of all the churches' meant to the apostle their building up into the central unity in which Jew and Gentile were one in Christ. If he were among us now he would surely be leading the way to the restoration of our broken unity, crying to us in amazement,

'Is Christ divided?'—beseeching us 'if there be any fellowship of the Spirit,' to make it our first duty to bring all Christians back into it.

I am further emboldened so to speak by the knowledge that you, my brother, will gladly make it your aim to 'maintain and set forward (as much as shall lie in you) quietness, peace, and love among all men.' Twenty years of Cambridge friendship, including six years of common professorial work, justify me in declaring that you will not narrow your sympathies either to espouse a party within the Church or to ignore that wider work of God which goes forward beyond the limits of those who will readily own your control. You are given to us this day 'for the building of the body of the Christ.' You will go forward in humble faith and unconquerable hope to your great task. The vision of unity will not fade from your soul. It will inspire you in the exercise of your highest functions, it will support you in the weariness of harassing details. You will not be disobedient to the heavenly vision. You will perpetually proclaim with your lips and your life. You will find the promise of it everywhere: you will interpret every movement in the prophetic light which it casts. When the strife rages fiercest and men's hearts fail for fear, you will still be strong and full of hope. The music of the promise will ever be in your ears: 'Though the vision tarry, wait for it; for it will surely come, it will not tarry.'

Contributions and Comments.

The Old Testament Quotations in St. Matthew and St. Mark.

II. St. Matthew.

A. QUOTATIONS ALREADY IN ST. MARK.

a. Quotations ascribed to Christ.

(1) Mk 4¹² = Mt 13¹⁸⁻¹⁵. Matthew, who changes Mark's *ἵνα*, into *ὅτι*, is obliged to alter the mood of the following clauses. He stops short at

Mark's *συνιδῶσιν*, and then in vv. 14-15 introduces a formal quotation of the Isaiah passage. This is given in the language of the LXX without variation, with the result that *καὶ ἀφεθῆ ἀποὺς* of the omitted clause in Mark is assimilated to the *καὶ ἰάσονται αὐτοὺς* of the LXX.

(2) Mk 7^{6,7} = Mt 15^{8,9}. Matthew copies Mark's abridged quotation with the single exception that in *ὁ λαὸς οὗτος* for *οὗτος ὁ λαὸς* he makes a further assimilation to the LXX text.

(3) Mk 7^{10a} = Mt 15^{4a}. Matthew omits *σου* twice.