
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.

In the *Expositor* for July the Rev. A. E. Garvie, B.D., makes an original attempt to meet an old difficulty in the harmony of the life of Christ. The difficulty has to do with the cleansing of the temple. It is a serious difficulty, but its seriousness does not lie in the fact that there are two cleansings reported, one by St. John at the beginning of the ministry and one by the Synoptists at the end. It lies in the fact that the cleansing recorded by St. John is an exercise, as it seems, of Messianic authority, whereas the Synoptists are careful beyond all things to show that Christ did not assert His Messianic claims throughout all the early ministry.

The difficulty is old, for it is obvious. We have all made our attempts to explain it. Mr. Garvie says he once made an attempt before this, but it does not satisfy him now. He thought that St. John had made a mistake. St. John's memory was at fault. Marvellously accurate as to times and places, he was inaccurate in his old age as to early impressions. The husband can scarcely think himself into the time when he did not know his wife, can scarcely recover the impression of his first chance meeting with her. So St. John. He had passed through many developing experiences since the early days of his following of Jesus, and he cannot put himself wholly back into them. He remembers where the impressions were made, he can say when, but the impressions themselves have passed away. Jesus did not assert His Messianic dignity at the outset by cleansing the temple. St. John is confused in his recollections.

That was once Mr. Garvie's explanation. It is not his explanation now. He does not say why he abandoned it. But we gather that further study gave him more respect for St. John's memory. This explanation would not do, because everywhere else St. John shows that his memory for impressions is as good as his memory for times and places.

So Mr. Garvie had to find another way of meeting the difficulty about the early claim of Messiahship. He now holds that Jesus did make it. St. John has made no mistake. Rather St. John is earlier in his recollections than even the Synoptists—we do not say clearer, we say earlier. He records an experience or set of experiences through which Jesus passed before the time at which the Synoptists take up the public ministry. They were humiliating experiences for Jesus. But Mr. Garvie thinks that He could not help passing through them.

Jesus began by announcing His Messiahship. It may not be in its fullest sense, it may not be in much deliberate language, but He began

naturally by showing what He found Himself to be. So He drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple. But He had to answer for it. To His surprise the priesthood did not believe in Him. They demanded a sign. They would not accept the only sign He could give them. He had accordingly to be more cautious. He did not cleanse the temple again till the ministry was near its end and the claim of Messiahship at once imperative and inevitable.

This early confiding period in the life of Jesus Mr. Garvie traces through other events. It is seen in the interview with Nicodemus. It was a time of testing. If Jesus was disappointed, it had to be. For it must first of all be seen whether the rulers and the people are ready to believe in Him. How can that be seen if they do not get a chance? Jesus gave them all a chance—John the Baptist, the priests, the Pharisees, His mother, His disciples. The few disciples stood the test. The rest failed, and Jesus sorrowfully withdrew into Himself, for now by this disappointing experience He 'knew what was in man.'

There is a quotation in Mr. Garvie's article, just noticed, which had better be looked at separately. It is the words of St. John (2^{24}), 'Jesus did not trust Himself unto them, for that He knew all men.' Mr. Garvie thinks that in these words we may find 'a hint of a change from confidence to caution.' That is to say, Jesus knew all men *now*, after He had gone through the bitter experience of trusting them and being disappointed. He did not know all men until He had tried what was in them. Now He had tried them, and *as the result of His experience* He knew them, and would commit Himself no longer to them.

Is that St. John's meaning? It is not the meaning that occurs to one. What reasons does Mr. Garvie give for his interpretation? He gives no reasons. But Mr. Garvie is not an interpreter at haphazard; nor is he simply desperate here, being driven into a corner. When we search for reasons ourselves, we notice at once that the verb which St. John uses (γινώσκειν), is the verb which signifies knowledge that has been acquired by observation and experience, not the verb which expresses intuitive and absolute knowledge (εἰδέναι). Mr. Garvie's exposition may not convince us yet; but if the distinction between the two Greek verbs to *know*, which is so persistently drawn out and defended by Westcott, is to be relied on, then we must at least consider why it is that St. John here says Christ's knowledge of men was acquired knowledge, and how and when He acquired it.

In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1902, of which the first part has just been published, Professor Irving Wood of Northampton, Massachusetts, discusses the origin of the Magnificat.

There are at present four views respecting the nature and origin of the Magnificat fighting for supremacy among scholars. The oldest—we may still call it the orthodox view—is that the Song is Mary's own, an utterance inspired, as Professor Wood says, by the emotional situation, the content of which is determined by Mary's familiarity with the lyric religious poetry of her nation. The newest view—which of course is Harnack's—is that the Magnificat is a literary composition of the author or editor of the Third Gospel. Between these two views lie other two. One of them is that the Song is a Jewish-Christian hymn. The other is that it is entirely Jewish, with the exception of a single phrase.

Of these four views Professor Wood adopts the last and defends it. The Magnificat is simply a Jewish patriotic psalm, one phrase having been introduced to fit it for its place in the Gospel according to St. Luke. He gives two reasons for his opinion.

One reason is that the Magnificat makes no allusion to Mary's peculiar position. With the exception of a single phrase, it might have been

composed at any time by a Jewish Messianic poet. The other reason is that it is national and not personal. Cut out one phrase, and all that is left refers to the nation of Israel, none to any individual. The LORD is praised because He hath done 'great things.' But what are these 'great things'? They are scattering the proud, putting down princes, lifting the humble to exalted places, feeding the poor with good things while the rich are sent empty away, helping Israel His servant (or son, παῖς) according to the promises of old. These 'great things' are all the common stock of the national Messianic poetry.

The phrase that is so much in the way is found in the 48th verse. The whole verse is, 'For he hath looked upon the low estate of his handmaiden.' The phrase is made up of the words 'of his handmaiden' (τῆς δούλης). It is the gender that causes the trouble. If it were masculine (τοῦ δούλου), there would be no difficulty. For then it would apply to the 'Servant,' used of the nation of Israel. Such a use of 'Servant' is familiar. We find it in Isaiah (48^{20} $49^{3.5}$), in Ezekiel (37^{25}), and in the Psalms (136^{22}). And Professor Wood believes that the 'editor' of St. Luke changed the masculine to the feminine when he chose this national song and put it into the mouth of Mary. There was no sinister purpose in his act. He had no thought of having the Song regarded as Mary's composition. 'He used it only as a fitting literary expression for the Messianic hopes and patriotic aspirations which he assumed to have filled her mind during the period preceding the birth of Christ.'

The first place in the *American Journal of Theology* for July is given to Professor McGiffert of New York with an article on 'The Origin of High-Church Episcopacy.'

What does Professor McGiffert mean by 'High-Church Episcopacy'? He means 'the theory which maintains that Episcopacy is of divine appointment and is essential to the very being of the Christian Church; that only he is a true bishop who stands in the direct line of apostolic succession, and is consequently in possession of grace handed down from the apostles in unbroken sequence; that Episcopal ordination is not simply expedient, but necessary to the constitution of the clergy; and that the sacraments through which alone the grace of Christ ordinarily operates can be validly performed only by one episcopally ordained.'

It is no question, therefore, with Professor McGiffert of rival forms of Church government. It is not the origin of Episcopacy that he considers. It is the origin of Apostolic Succession. It is a special theory of Episcopacy. He accepts the definition of his subject which he finds in Haddan's *Apostolic Succession*, where the matter is put cumulatively and completely thus: 'Without bishops no presbyters; without bishops and presbyters no legitimate certainty of sacraments; without sacraments no certain union with the mystical body of Christ, namely, with His Church; without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation.'

That is the 'High-Church' theory of Episcopacy. Professor McGiffert asks, When and under what circumstances did it arise?

It did not arise in our Lord's day. There was a Christian Church if you choose, but there was no definition, no theory of it then. Nor afterwards, as long as the disciples reckoned themselves members of the Jewish covenant. The Jews constituted God's true Church. And the early Christians were Jews. They were distinguished from other Jews only in accepting Jesus as the Messiah. It was a considerable distinction. But they did not know yet that it made them a separate Church. So they continued to observe the customs delivered unto the fathers and to count themselves of the number of that elect people who formed the Church of God.

The first person to frame a theory of the Church was St. Paul. The limits of Judaism had been passed. Gentiles had been received into the Church, and they were Gentiles still. The Christian community could no longer persuade itself that it formed part of the old Jewish ecclesia. It was a new covenant people, the true Israel of God, a new Church. The idea is first explicitly stated in St. Paul. And it is stated so frequently there that the list of passages which Professor McGiffert gives need not be repeated.

But there is another and a wholly novel conception of the Church in St. Paul. The Church is the mystical Body of Christ. Where did the apostle find that idea? He found it in his own experience. He knew by experience that Christ dwelt in him. Christ dwelt similarly in every true believer. But believers formed the Church. Therefore Christ dwelt in the Church. And as believers were related to one another as are the members of the human body, the Church in which Christ dwells is the Body of Christ.

So there is in St. Paul first of all the simple thought of the Church as a collective name for Christians. He can salute the 'Church' in a particular place or the 'saints' in a particular place. It is immaterial which word he uses. He can even say, 'Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, unto *them* that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints' (1 Co 1^2). And, in the second place, there is the thought that these saints make up a Body for Christ to dwell in, both because they fulfil the functions of the members of a body, and because Christ dwells in every one of them.

These are St. Paul's theories of the Church. It is to be noted regarding them that St. Paul never thinks of the Church as existing before its members or independently of them. In St. Paul and in every New Testament writer, the Church apart from its members is nothing.

That is Professor McGiffert's first step. The second is that as each member of the Church has his own peculiar gift—the gift which fits him for his place in the Body—he is to exercise it for the benefit of the Body. The possession of a special gift was regarded by the early Christians as a divine call to some specific form of service in the Church. Some were called to be apostles in the Church, some to be prophets and teachers, some to be workers of miracles, some healers of the sick, some interpreters of tongues, some helpers, some counsellors, some shepherds of the flock (1 Co 12^{28}, Eph 4^{11}). These gifts were the gifts of the Spirit. All Christians received of the Spirit. But some received more liberally than others. And especially did one Christian differ from another in the nature and purpose of his gift.

Now the greatest of all spiritual gifts was the gift of teaching. For to teach was to declare the will of God. There was no code of laws in the new Covenant as in the old. There was no tradition of the elders. When occasions rose and surprises came the Church turned to those who possessed the gift of teaching.

There were three classes of those who possessed this gift. They were called apostles, prophets, and teachers. The last had the gift in a special and narrower sense.

The apostle and the prophet were believed to receive more direct revelations than the teacher, who gained his knowledge of God's will more by study and reflexion than by immediate inspiration. Again the apostle was more of an evangelist or missionary than the prophet or teacher. He went from place to place preaching the Word. But all were teachers in the broadest sense. All revealed the will of God. And all exercised the authority that belonged to the superiority and value of their gift.

But now the important thing to observe is that they exercised authority only in so far as the

Church admitted their inspiration, their possession of the gift of the Spirit. It was not they that exercised the authority, it was the Spirit speaking by them. Practically they were the rulers of the Church, but their rule could be challenged by any community and simply set aside. St. Paul was an apostle, but he had to establish his position to the satisfaction of the Churches in Corinth and Galatia. And in the Apocalypse (2^2) reference is made to the fact that the Church of Ephesus had tried certain men who claimed to be apostles, and had found that they were not.

The Church had to test its teachers. It must have been difficult. But the Church of Christ has never been permitted to shirk a responsibility simply because it is difficult. It seems, however, to have been found expedient to frame some rules for the testing of professed teachers. They may be found to-day in that early manual of Christian practice called the *Didache*. They deserve attention: 'Concerning the apostles and prophets so do ye according to the ordinance of the gospel. Let every apostle when he cometh to you be received as the Lord; but he shall not abide more than a single night, or if there be need a second likewise; but if he abide three days he is a false prophet. And when the apostle departeth let him receive nothing but bread, until he findeth shelter; but if he asketh money he is a false prophet.'

Thus the apostles and prophets went everywhere preaching the Word, and thus they were received and tested. They had authority. They were the practical rulers of the Church. But they ruled it only in so far as the Church acknowledged the gift of the Spirit that was in them.

Now the High-Church theory of Episcopacy is that one of these classes of teachers, that is to say, the apostles, were themselves the Church. Or at least that they were the foundation of the Church in such a sense that the Church derives its powers from them, and exists only because of its permanent connexion with them. Is there any hint in the New Testament that the apostles were thus separate from the other teachers? Professor McGiffert says that the only shadow of a hint is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians ($2^{19f.}$).

The passage is: 'So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone.' If it is a hint, it is a very meagre one. For, in the first place, prophets as well as apostles are mentioned as the foundation of the Church. And, in the second place, the apostles and prophets are the foundation on which the Church is built *as preachers of the gospel*, not in any official capacity. That is made clear in the next chapter, where St. Paul speaks of the mystery which has been revealed to the apostles and prophets in the Spirit. Neither here nor elsewhere in the New Testament is there even a hint that the apostles are essential to the existence of the Church, or essential to the salvation of its members.

How did that idea arise, and when? It arose early in the history of the Church, but after the times of the New Testament, and it arose in three steps of evolution.

The first step was made when the ruler,—whether apostle, prophet, or teacher,—who ruled as occasion demanded by declaring the mind of the Spirit, and only in so far as the mind of the Spirit was recognized in him, became a settled regular officer of the Church. This step is already accomplished in Clement of Rome. How far Clement's instruction in the matter represents the practice of the Church we cannot say. Writing from Rome to the Church in Corinth, a generation later than St. Paul wrote to the same Church on the same subject, Clement did not give his own mind as St. Paul did, and appeal to the Corinthians to recognize therein the mind of the

Spirit; he laid down rules (for the most part out of the Old Testament) which were to be rigidly enforced and be referred to regular officers, who were to be implicitly obeyed.

These regular officers were already there. They had arisen out of the necessities of the time, aided by the weakened sense of the Spirit's presence. They were chosen for the most part, we need not doubt, from the wandering apostle or the prophet or teacher. For it was necessary that some one should be set apart to administer the charities of the Church. It was necessary that some one should possess authority to regulate the order of worship, some one who should be always present. And it was necessary that some one should be chosen to express the mind of the Church in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. These duties were all spiritual. It was therefore natural that the Church should choose for their exercise the men whose gifts were spiritual above those of all other men, the apostles, prophets, and teachers. But as soon as the apostle, prophet, or teacher received permanent and absolute control of the activities of the Church, it was of less consequence to the majority that he spoke the mind of the Spirit, it was of more importance that he maintained good order. Clement's letter was probably called forth by the struggle between the regular official of the Church in Corinth and the visiting apostle or prophet. For the two must have existed together for a time and often have come in conflict. Clement decided in favour of the regular official, and the first step was taken.

The second step is seen in Ignatius of Antioch. It is still early in the second century.

In the early Church the conduct of the Lord's Supper demanded the presence of a regular official more than any other Christian exercise. It was recognized as the most important thing in worship. It was most difficult to observe it decently and in order. The alms of the Church, moreover, were usually distributed at its celebration. And, finally, it was in connexion with the Eucharist that discipline was most commonly administered. The celebration of the Supper was the occasion upon which the regular Church officer was most needed, and upon which he was most influential. The right to administer the Eucharist became the most coveted privilege. Clement seems to say that this right belonged to the regular officials of the Church. But Ignatius goes farther and says that unless administered by the regular officials of the Church it is no true Eucharist. It did not matter much what name the officials went by—overseer, bishop, deacon, leader,—it did not matter. For the most part one man was found best fitted for the office, and the name of bishop (ἐπίσκοπος) or overseer was usually given to him. But the name did not matter just at first. No official, no Eucharist—that is the attitude of Ignatius. The second step is taken.

These steps were made in the interest of good order. The third step was more theoretical, and it was longer in being taken. Before the end of the second century we find it accomplished. Again it has to do with the Eucharist. The Eucharist is recognized, not only as the great feature of the Church's worship, not only as its chief sacrament and means of grace, but also as a true and real sacrifice. Now the officiating bishop becomes a priest. He is separate from his brethren. He exercises powers they do not possess. Henceforth the Church is the Clergy. And they have the power, simply in virtue of their office, of admitting to the kingdom of heaven. For none can enter without the forgiveness of sins. And the forgiveness of sins is dependent on the sacrifice of the Eucharist, which none but the priest can make. The theory is in existence in the second century. By the middle of the third it is in full exercise. The High-Church doctrine of Episcopacy has begun its singular career.

The Epistle of Psenosiris was, by a slip of the pen, attributed in last month's issue (p. 481) to Professor Dalman instead of to Professor Deissmann.