
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.

WHERE is the preacher to go now for freshness and colour for his sermons? Science has been most useful, but scientific illustrations no longer surprise. He may go now to the Papyri and the Inscriptions.

It is to the Papyri and the Inscriptions that Professor Ramsay has gone. And he has brought back more than colour, he has brought the very sermons themselves. Has he not rescued the great apostle from the grasp of grim Dogmatics and made him real, human, heroic? Let us go to the Papyri and the Inscriptions ourselves. They have just been made accessible to us in the translation of Deissmann's *Bibelstudien*.

'Bible Studies' is the simple title. It is chosen for freedom. The things which the Papyri and the Inscriptions furnish are disconnected. So we may enter in at any opening, and we select the very last to begin with. It is a note on the 'White robes and palms' of the Apocalypse.

'After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands' (Rev 7^9). How unfamiliar to Western modern life the imagery is, yet how familiar! 'Few Bible passages,' says Dr. Deissmann, 'have taken such hold of the everyday Christian consciousness, few have been inscribed so hopefully on the impassive tombstone.' Where did the Seer find the image? Its details are clear enough. The robes are washed white in the red blood of the Lamb (for the symbolism is very bold), and the palms are expressive of festal joy. But why are these two figures brought together? Where does the picture as a whole come from?

At Stratonicea, in Caria, there has been found an inscription which dates from the beginning of the period of the emperors. The city wished to do honour to two of its gods. Thirty boys of noble parentage were chosen and set apart to sing a hymn in their honour every day. The boys were 'clothed in white and crowned with a branch, while they held a branch also in their hands' (λευχιμονοῦντας καὶ ἐστεφανωμένους θαλλοῦ ἔχοντας δὲ μετὰ χῖρας). The custom would not be peculiar to Stratonicea. In one or other of the Greek cities of Asia Minor the Seer of the Apocalypse would see such a choir of singing boys, and the image would occur to him inevitably.

Professor Morris Jastrow, jun., of Philadelphia, has contributed an article to the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* on 'The Tearing of Garments as a Symbol of Mourning.' It is a

custom which demands explanation. We can easily understand how an Oriental in a paroxysm of grief should tear his hair. We can understand how others, who felt less, but wished to appear to feel as much, should imitate his example, and the act grow into a custom. But in the tearing of the garments there must be some symbol or sentiment which does not lie so manifestly on the surface.

Now the first thing to notice about the tearing of the garments is that it is frequently associated with the putting on of sackcloth. When Jacob heard that Joseph was dead, he 'rent his garments, and put sackcloth upon his loins.' When Ahab heard Elijah's denunciation, 'he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh.' And often as the two acts are associated together, the tearing of the garments is always named before the putting on of the sackcloth, as if it were preparatory to it.

The next thing to notice is that the verb which is used for tearing the garments (קָרַע) is one that expresses a violent action. In 1 S 15^{28} Samuel announces to Saul, 'The LORD hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day'; Professor Jastrow translates, 'Yahwe has wrenched from thee the rulership over Israel.' So when Elisha saw the ascension of Elijah (2 K 2^{12}), he took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces' (literally, 'in two rents'). The rending of one's garments, therefore, is more than making a rent in them, it is an action that is practically equivalent to tearing them off.

Now there is evidence (Schwally has collected it in his *Das Leben nach dem Tode*) that at one time it was customary in the East, and even in Israel, to strip oneself entirely as a sign of grief. Micah pictures the coming desolation of the northern kingdom of Israel. As the scene rises before his mind, he is profoundly affected with grief, and he cries—

> 'Therefore I will lament and howl,
> Go about barefooted and naked,
> Start a lament like the jackals,
> A mourning like ostriches' (5^{8}).

So also (for the prophets preached by act as much as by word) Isaiah is ordered, in evidence of the depth of his grief, to remove the sackcloth from his loins and the sandals from his feet and go about 'naked and barefooted' (20^{2-4}).

It is not to be supposed that the prophets would appear entirely without clothing in the streets. But it is evident that the rending of the garments meant their removal, and the act bears witness to a custom which had once prevailed of stripping oneself wholly in token of excessive grief. And now the frequent association of the rending of the garments and the putting on of sackcloth becomes intelligible. The sackcloth, it is now agreed, was simply a loin cloth, and usually hung down as far as the knees. When the ruder fashions of early days could no longer be tolerated in Israel, mourners were not allowed to strip themselves naked. The garments were torn off, but the loin cloth was put on. And soon the sackcloth, though a mere concession to civilization, became itself the recognized symbol of mourning.

Why is it, asked a layman recently, that young preachers are so fond of the text, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling'? Our answer was of no value. If Dr. Warfield of Princeton had been asked the question, he would probably have answered, Because they do not understand it.

'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure'—it seems a good-going text of the 'Trust in God and do the right' order, only that the doing of the right comes first. But Dr. Warfield says that that is not the meaning of the text. He says its meaning is the very opposite of that.

Dr. Warfield writes an occasional exegetical note in the *Bible Student*. The note on Ph $2^{12.\ 13}$ is found in the number for March 1901. It seems

to have been suggested by Schaeder's study of the passage in the *Greifswalder Studien*, presented to H. Cremer in 1895. But Dr. Warfield is an observant exegete himself, and makes his points independently.

The first thing he observes is that the words of the text are addressed to saints and not to sinners. The Epistle is written to 'the saints in Christ Jesus' (1^1). The exhortation therefore is not to those who have not begun the Christian life. It is addressed, in fact, to those who have got well on in it, or ought to have got well on in it. For the apostle does not say 'work your own salvation,' but 'work *out* your own salvation,' and the compound verb (κατεργάζεσθε) translated 'work out,' means 'bring your salvation to its completion.' A good work had been at least begun in them; let them co-operate with God in working it completely out; let them advance it to its accomplishment; let them bring it to its capstone and crown it with its pinnacles.

Now in the beginning of their salvation they had been dependent on the word of the apostle. For how can anyone hear without a preacher? Perhaps they had continued dependent too long, holding his hand when they should have been walking alone. He was now far away and in prison. That had happened unto the furtherance of the gospel in many ways. And this was perhaps one of the ways, that now the Philippians had to work out *their own* salvation. There may be, Dr. Warfield thinks, a reference to the fact that, 'after all, each man must busy himself with his own salvation, the help he can obtain from others being insignificant.' But the emphatic pronoun is chosen chiefly to emphasize the fact that as a Church the saints in Philippi must recognize that the planting and the watering are past, and now turn directly to God to give the increase.

But, after all, the personal pronoun is not the most emphatic part of the sentence. At the beginning of it, in a place of quite unusual emphasis, stands the phrase 'with fear and trembling.' To bring out the emphasis properly we should have to translate, 'Let it be with fear and trembling that you work out your own salvation.'

Now if St. Paul were writing to sinners, there would be much appropriateness in this exhortation. For when a sinner sets himself to work out his own salvation, it is so tremendous an undertaking, and there is so little prospect of success, that 'fear and trembling' are mild words to express his appropriate state of mind. But he is writing to saints. God Himself has begun the good work in them, and God will see it accomplished. There is really no occasion for fear or trembling. The occasion is all for confidence and rejoicing, and in this very Epistle he uses to these very saints the triumphant exhortation, 'Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice.' To tell them now to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, and to give as a reason, 'for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure,' is surely to fall into the flattest self-contradiction.

The contradiction is removed by an examination of St. Paul's use of the phrase 'fear and trembling' elsewhere. It is a set formula with the apostle. The words are not given their separate meaning. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (6^5) he exhorts servants to be obedient to their masters 'with fear and trembling.' He would never encourage a spirit of craven fear before their masters' face. In 2 Co 7^{15} he says that the Corinthians received Titus 'with fear and trembling.' He does not insult them by recalling their vivid dread of punishment or fear of missing his favour. It is evident that in the phrase 'with fear and trembling' we have a set formula. In the mind of the apostle it expressed the single idea of submission. The servants were to be in due submission to their masters and alert to execute their commands. The Corinthians received Titus with a proper sense of his authority.

St. Paul himself accomplished his work at Corinth 'with fear and trembling' (1 Co 2^3), for he had due respect to the operation of the Holy Spirit. And now he exhorts the Philippians to work out their own salvation in absolute but exultant submission to the will and the work of God in them, fully persuaded that it was His good pleasure to make them perfect, and that He was able to do exceeding abundantly beyond all they could ask or think.

'Why not to the World?' Those are the words which Canon Armitage Robinson places at the top of one of his sermons as title. When Professor Armitage Robinson was transferred from the secluded scholarship of Cambridge to follow Canon Farrar in the pulpit of St. Margaret's, Westminster, it was a surprise to most, a doubtful experiment to many. The experiment succeeded. Canon Armitage Robinson did not stay long in his pulpit, but he preached popular sermons while he stayed. A volume of them has just been published by Messrs. Macmillan, and the title at the top of one of them is 'Why not to the World?'

'Why not to the World?' When Jesus rose from the dead He appeared to Mary and to Simon and to James, but they were all followers; and He appeared to five hundred at once, but they were 'brethren' all. Why did He not appear to the world?

In the first systematic attack ever made against Christianity, Celsus asked this question. If Christ really rose from the dead, he said, why did He not appear to His persecutors and to the judge who condemned Him in Jerusalem, and establish the fact beyond a doubt, by calling them, in spite of themselves, to be witnesses of His resurrection? And he concluded, anticipating Renan, that it was because He never did rise, because the whole story of the resurrection was due to the heated imagination of a mad woman called Mary of Magdala.

Why did He not appear to the world? Canon Armitage Robinson reminds us that the objection has been made all through the history of Christianity, and yet Christianity has survived it. That fact should make us feel that it can only be a superficial objection, and that deep down in the heart of things there lies a true and satisfying answer. The objection is still raised. It is well for us to seek the answer. For there is more in it than an answer to the objection, there is 'a whole region of spiritual truth which needs continually to be explored afresh.'

Supposing that He *had* shown Himself to His enemies after He rose from the dead, what would have been the effect of it? A great triumph, no doubt; a triumphal entry into Jerusalem, perhaps, every one seeing Him and adoring. But the time for that was not yet come. It has not come even now. The day is still in the future when 'every eye shall see Him, and they also that pierced Him.' He had just had one triumphal entry into Jerusalem, the time had not come for another.

But it would have persuaded His enemies to believe in Him. Would it? They cried, 'Come down from the cross, and we will believe.' But they did not even mean it. And if He had come down, which was not possible, they would not have believed. 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.' Lazarus rose from the dead, and when the chief priests heard of it they held a council to put Jesus to death. They did believe that Lazarus had been raised, but they did not believe on Jesus.

It was not after the resurrection that Jesus began to confine Himself to His disciples. From the very first He had refused to give the mere onlooker a sign. They wanted to take Him and make Him a king. By praying to the Father He would have had more than twelve legions—twelve legions *of angels*—at His command. The way to the kingdom was easy, then. But He would not

pray. Belief in Him must be due to the submission of the will. Following must be an act of love. It may be a paradox, but it is true, that if none could love Him until they believed in Him, neither could any believe in Him until they loved Him.

It was by no new manner of working that He kept Himself to His own after He rose from the dead. And it was no surprise to them. For He had told them that it would be so. 'Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me.' They could not understand it then. 'How is it,' asked Judas, 'that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?' Jesus' answer went to the root of the matter. 'If a man love Me, he will keep My word: and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.'

It would have been easy to show Himself to the world after the resurrection. But would the world have seen Him? Before the resurrection the world saw Him, but what did they see? What He was they did not see, and they would not have seen it after the resurrection. The time is past for even the disciples to see Him merely. Now they must look into Him, now they must know Him. And so, even to them, He is not visible as before. He comes and goes. He is seen, He is unseen. When He is seen, they see more than they did before; and when He is unseen, they begin to see Him best of all.

'Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?' We are asking Judas' question still. Do we not burn to show Him to the world, and He will not let us? He holds Himself back. The world cries, Let us see Him if He is risen. We know that He is risen. We know that the historical proofs of the resurrection are just as good as ever they can be, just as good as history can make them. And we wonder that the world does not see it and believe. The world does see it. The intellect of the world is on the side of the resurrection. But until it pleases God to reveal His Son in the individual's heart, the proof of the resurrection is powerless.

'My knowledge of Christianity,' says Canon Armitage Robinson (we have followed his sermon somewhat fitfully, but we shall close with his very words), 'my knowledge of Christianity will depend on my religious education, on my intellectual powers, on my keeping my mind unbiassed and ready to accept evidence, on my diligence in studying the great problems of religion and life. My knowledge of Christ will depend on something wholly different from these, on the attitude of my will towards Him, on my reverence, my obedience, my love.' 'If a man love Me, . . . we will come.'

Recent Research in the Language of the New Testament.

By the Rev. H. A. A. Kennedy, M.A., D.Sc., Callander.

I.

Within the last two or three decades, the scientific study of the Greek language has passed through a complete revolution. This has resulted not only from the more accurate investigation of details by specialists, but, above all, from the rigid application of the historical method which has been made possible by the increasing store of materials. Modern Greek has been carefully and systematically studied. The conditions of Hellenism have come into clearer view. The later developments of the language, in their varieties, have been examined from the historical standpoint in their