
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

of its illustrations are quite new and quite illustrative.

The third series of the Moorhouse Lectures, the series for 1910, was delivered by the Bishop of Ballarat, Dr. Arthur Vincent Green. The subject of the Lectures was 'The Johannine Writings.' But Dr. Green does not use the word Johannine in the title of the book containing them. For he does not believe that any of the writings which usually go by the name of the Apostle John were written by him. He believes that they are the product of a school of writers whose centre of abode was Ephesus, and who probably looked to the Apostle John as their founder. He accordingly calls his book *The Ephesian Canonical Writings* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). The whole book is a plea for suspense of judgment. Here are two characteristic sentences. 'Admitting that the evidence for St. John's direct authorship is better in the case of the Apocalypse than in that of any other writing in the New Testament, we must still exercise some patience of the agnostic position. If any man is persuaded that here at least he has the very sentences of John the Apostle, let his persuasion be tempered by charitable recognition of the many inevitable uncertainties which encompass this much debated question.'

The Life of Christ, Part II., by the Rev. W. M. Rankin, B.D., Glasgow (Publications Office of the U.F. Church of Scotland; price 6d.). Mr. Stevens' excellent primer (Part I.) on the Life of Christ has been followed by one equally admirable from the pen of Mr. Rankin, who has also, we believe, undertaken the third and final instalment of the series. The little work before us, which covers the period of our Lord's ministry extending from the Rejection at Nazareth to the Anointing at Bethany, bears traces of the widest reading and most careful study of the subject. It is written in a clear and interesting style, and the material is skilfully adapted to the various ages of the young people for whom the textbook is intended. The illustrative comments and the literary parallels are well chosen, and the whole work may be confidently recommended, especially for the use of Bible classes. In his Preface the author acknowledges indebtedness to Professor Denney for help in planning the book, and to Dr. Selbie for revision of the proofs.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Aberdeen.

Part V.

VII. Some may object to our view that the Rite in the early Church exercised a strong influence on the historians, and may support their objection by pointing to the variations in the accounts given by those historians. This argument ignores human character. Take any dozen people, however similar in education and previous circumstances they may be, and get them each to give an account of some scene at which they have been all present. You will find that they give twelve different accounts, varying slightly in details and in manner of stating the same detail; yet all twelve will be easily recognizable as accounts of the same scene by eye-witnesses.

We therefore presuppose as our starting-point the strong guiding force exerted on every narrator by the familiar Rite. This we regard as fundamental in the right understanding of the authorities. The Rite must have been by Luke regarded as performed regularly from the earliest time, and as being therefore unquestionably authoritative for the words and the actions of the original incident. All this is perfectly natural. In Ac 2^{42} the Breaking of the Bread[1] is certainly the Sacrament, which already was the symbol and pledge of the unity of the Christian society from the day when

[1] In 2^{46}, 'breaking bread' is an act of ordinary life, which may and probably was accompanied by the rite, but is not mentioned with reference to the rite. In 20^{7} the Christians at Troas assembled for the common meal (which was doubtless accompanied by the Sacrament, though no formal mention is made of this).

it constituted itself as a united body on the first Pentecost. Even in the lifetime of Jesus the act was felt to have some special and peculiar significance (Mk 6^{41} 8^{6}, Mt 14^{19} 14^{36}, Lk 9^{16}, Jn $6^{11.23}$), and He was recognized by His disciples at Emmaus after His death 'in the breaking of the bread' (Lk 24^{35}). Such recognition was obviously not due to one performance of the action; especially as there is clear reason to think that the two at Emmaus were not Apostles.

This act was therefore not connected by the early Church merely with the last occasion on which it was performed by the Saviour before His death. The act was characteristic of Him during His life, and remembered as performed by Him on various occasions at the giving of food by Him to His friends and followers. The most impressive by far of those occasions was that which occurred on the night before He was betrayed; this, however, was only one among many occasions; but it was marked out from the rest by the words of Institution, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

There is no reason to think that the Sacrament was at first preserved as an annual or weekly or monthly celebration. It was performed frequently, and apparently was regarded as being suitable on all occasions when a number of the Brethren were assembled to eat together, or when any incident or occasion occurred of bread being eaten in very impressive circumstances.[1]

It was not a periodic rite, but almost a continuous one, as the expression of the belief in the continuous presence of Christ among them. Perhaps we might gather from the emphasis laid on it in Ac 2^{42}, that it was not performed after Lk 24^{30} (or after the Ascension) until the Brethren became aware at Pentecost of the continued presence of the Saviour with them. The Rite was the expression of the firm belief and knowledge that the Saviour was with them, and that the Bread and Wine were given by Him, and according to the Oriental mind were Himself. To the illogically logical and narrow European mind, which can rarely attain to the mystic perception of the truth, this belief and knowledge is often a cause of dissension on the question, whether the material substances given in the Rite are only the symbols of the Divine presence, or are transformed into new and Divine substance—a barren and foolish dissension, between the champions of two empty theories, neither of which has any reality to the mind that looks at the subject from the right point of view: both are products of Western thought, and both are foreign to the Oriental thought. The Western mind, through its desire to give precision and definite form to the vague and mystic, is always prone to misrepresent and misconceive Oriental thought; and thus falls into the error of materializing the ideal and spiritual.

The Oriental view is best understood by the example of a child, which takes a few stones and says, 'This is a castle, and this is a knight riding to attack it,' and so on. The child does not regard the stones as being mere symbols of the castle and the knight, nor does it regard them as transmuted into the castle and the knight. To the child they are what the child makes them. As the child lives its ideal life, which we call 'play,' these material objects become part of its higher life, and are what the things of that life are. The idea is all-powerful: the material fact is of no consequence. The child is right, and the Oriental is right. The idea is the important thing: the material is nought. The doctrine of transubstantiation sinks from the plane of the spiritual and true to the commonest level of materialistic commonplace. It is wholly unspiritual, and supposes the reality to be in mere matter. The doctrine of symbolism is narrowly logical and wholly unmystical. The Sacrament is purely mystic.

VIII. The fact that the doctrine and principle of the Eucharist already existed in the teaching of Jesus at a much earlier time, and was expressed in His practice, does not necessarily throw any doubt on His formal institutions of the Sacrament on the night before His death. The testimony of Paul (1 Co 10. 11) is quite clear and definite on this point; and it may be regarded as final. There is no difficulty and no inconsistency in the two positions: Jesus taught the doctrine during His life (though, like much of His teaching, it was not understood by the disciples), and gave some marked significance to the act of breaking and distributing the Bread in His daily life; on the last night He enjoined on the Twelve to repeat the act in His memory. Both are true.

[1] Ac 27^{35} is not strictly a case (though Blass regards it as being so), for the assembly was almost entirely of pagans; but probably Luke recognized it as being a Sacrament for Paul and for himself and Aristarchus (assuming that the latter was still with them).

It is not a case where we have to choose between one and the other.

One thing, however, follows inevitably from this previously existing germ of the Eucharist. That which was instituted was not a mere commemoration of the death of the Saviour; it had no analogy or connexion with a death-feast or a sepulchral feast, which was usually an annual one. It was the expression of a truth, of a vital principle, which had been part of the teaching of Jesus long before.

John thought that the earlier teaching of Jesus on this subject was even more important than the formal institution of the ceremony. While he devotes considerable space to recounting the events of the Supper on the Thursday night, he does not allude to the incident of the Bread and Wine. One must infer that he regarded this incident as not of absolutely vital consequence, and that he deliberately aimed at emphasizing the importance of the earlier teaching by omitting the final incident.

Now, considering the great part that the ceremony had played in the Church during the long period of somewhere near seventy years, which elapsed between the Crucifixion and the composition of the Fourth Gospel, we must attach great importance to John's omission of the incident while describing the Supper. In most cases it is unsafe and unjustifiable to lay much stress on, or draw serious inferences from, the silence of an historian about an incident which he omits amid the pressure of many events for attention; but this incident is exceptional; and one cannot see how it could be omitted except deliberately and of set purpose.

Moreover, the doctrine of the Eucharist is not omitted. It is stated elsewhere. The occasion on which John records the exposition of the mystic truth that is expressed in the Rite is important, and was certainly selected by him of set purpose (chapter 6). It was the day after the feeding of the five thousand, and the day after He walked on the Sea of Galilee. There is also in the context an allusion to the betrayal by Judas: $6^{64f.}$, 'There are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.' One can hardly avoid the thought that this allusion was intended to point the connexion between this exposition of underlying truth and the outward circumstances and occasion of the Last Supper. Further, John draws special attention (6^{23}) to the occasion, just before he reports the discourse on the meaning of the food given by God: 'Nigh unto the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks';[1] and here even in this brief reference he lays special emphasis on the importance of the 'giving thanks.' And once again he makes Jesus refer to some wonderful act in His opening words: 'Ye seek me . . . because ye ate of the loaves and were filled.'

John's account of the teaching of the Master regarding the mystic truth which was afterwards embodied in the Sacrament is contained in his sixth chapter. In this chapter Jesus explained to those who on the previous day had eaten of the loaves the meaning and nature of 'the bread from heaven.' The 'Father giveth you the true bread from heaven,' and 'I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' But 'no man can come unto me, except the Father which sent me draw him.' 'I am the living bread which came down out of heaven . . . and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.'

In this discourse the gradual transition is clearly indicated from the simpler idea 'bread' through the stages 'bread from heaven,' and 'I am the bread of life' to the mystic saying 'he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him . . . he that eateth me, he shall live because of me.' But 'it is the spirit quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing' (6^{63}).

I do not profess to be able to enter so perfectly into the Oriental mode of thought as to understand fully the final form which this exposition took in the mouth of Jesus as reported by John; but the observation of the successive steps by which the simple passes into the more mystic statement, enables even a Western mind to apprehend something of the meaning that the words had in the

[1] It is worthy of note that He 'gave thanks' (*εὐχαριστήσας*) before He distributed the loaves (as Jn. 6^{11} expresses it); but Mark (followed by Luke and Matthew) says that He spoke a blessing (*εὐλόγησεν*). There is here the same variation, but differently distributed, as is found in the accounts of the Last Supper.

mind of John as he looked back in old age to that scene. Westcott remarks rightly that this discourse cannot 'be simply prophetic of the Sacrament,' and that 'it treats essentially of spiritual realities with which no external act, as such, can be co-extensive.' He quotes Augustine, 'believe, and thou *hast* eaten,' as giving the sum of the thoughts in a luminous and pregnant sentence. But, as Westcott goes on to say, 'the truth which is presented in its absolute form' in Jn 6 'is presented in a specific act and a concrete form in the Holy Communion.' And he regards the whole situation in the way that Jesus 'gave by anticipation a commentary, so to speak, on the Sacrament which He afterwards instituted.'

These words of Westcott's express the situation as well as any man can ever express for all others a truth which can be known only to one who has lived it, and which each man will express to himself in a different way according to the life whereby he has realized for himself the truth.

We must notice also that John explains why this earlier teaching had passed unobserved and unrecorded. It was beyond the comprehension of the disciples. Many of them even said, 'This is a hard saying,' and murmured at it, 6^{60}; and the reply of Jesus seems to indicate John's belief that the truth had become intelligible to him and to all only after the Resurrection and the Ascension.

IX. St. Paul is in essential agreement with the Fourth Gospel (6^{31-59}) as to the nature of the Sacrament: that the life-giving bread is Christ, and that life can be had only through eating that bread. He does not, it is true, express the principle in so mystic a form; but, when he draws the parallel between the sacrificial meal which was the force binding together the pagan society, as the communion of Dæmonic Powers, and the eating of the Eucharistic meal which was the communion of the body of Christ, and then shortly afterwards quotes the Saviour's own words, 'this is my body,' it seems irrational to doubt that he is expressing the view of the Fourth Gospel.

John's point of view is closely related to Paul's, but travels far beyond it, and reaches a different level of thought. In such a transcendental exposition of the absolute truth, there cannot possibly be any association with a fixed day, or month, or season, or year. John states the ultimate fact, which is always present as the foundation of the Divine life in man. Yet he would hardly have laid such stress on the sensuous facts of eating and drinking, unless he had had the Sacrament in his mind as he wrote.

Paul has clear before him the practical problem, how is the scattered people of God to be united in a close fellowship and brotherhood? The sole bond that could effect this union was, of course, an ideal and mystic one: no external or temporal bond was sufficient. Paul insisted to the Corinthians that the Eucharist embodied a power which was strong enough for this purpose; and it is beyond doubt that he gave the same teaching to all his other Churches. The power that lay in the Rite could operate effectively only if the participants co-operated rightly in the act. God will not and cannot help men unless they do their part: the action must be mutual. But the power always is present in the Rite; if men do not participate rightly, and fail to perform their part in the act, the Rite is not merely neutralized: it becomes a force to destroy the unworthy participator. 'He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, unless he discern,' etc.

The nature of this power that lies in the Rite of the Bread, Paul does not explain clearly in his brief statement. The Divine nature is present in the Sacrament: the Saviour is with those who worthily participate, and thus they become a unified and single body. What further teaching the Apostle imparted to his converts beyond what he says in that Epistle we are not informed; but he evidently assumes that the Corinthians had learned to know his doctrine.

John stands entirely apart from the practical problem: he does not allude to the unification of the Church as a congeries of separate individuals. He only explains the mystic doctrine that every one who rightly partakes of this food from heaven becomes united with and merged in the Saviour's personality. In that is involved the unification of the Church; but John does not descend to the relation of man to man; he speaks only of the relation of man to God.

As to Paul, one would be inclined to say that the purely idealistic character of his words could not be misunderstood, were it not that they have been misinterpreted. He says clearly that, although an idol is nought, yet to eat at the table of an idol is to imperil or destroy the life and the character of a Christian; and that 'meat will not commend us

to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse, nor, if we eat, are we the better.' These things are material and nought in themselves. They become what the mind of man makes them. All that vast power for good or for evil which Paul saw in the Sacrament was purely ideal, and lay in the spirit of the man who came to the Lord's Table, and in the degree to which he sympathized with the mind of the Saviour and with the life of the Brethren who sat along with him.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Gen. iv. 1, 2. 'Now the man had known Ḥavvâh his wife' (cf. the similar construction in 1[2]). This implies that the knowledge had begun before the expulsion from Paradise, and not immediately after it, as commentators usually assume. It was the birth of Cain which took place after the expulsion. Cain, or Cainan (v.[9]), 'the smith,' answers to the Babylonian *ummânu*; while Abel, as was pointed out many years ago by Oppert, is the Bab. Abil, 'son,' which was borrowed also by the Sumerians under the form of *ibila*. The initial vowel is represented in the Heb. transcription by ה, as in הכל, *hêkal*, from Bab. *êkallu*, Sumerian *ê-gal*; cf. also the name of Abraham for Aba-ramu. The latter part of v.[1], explaining the name of Cain from the verb *qânâh*, is a late insertion, like most of the etymological notes in Genesis; it is inconsistent with the statement in 4[26], and is unaccompanied by a corresponding explanation of the name of Abel, the reason being that *hebel* in Heb. meant 'vanity,' which did not suit the character ascribed to Abel in the history.

רֹעֵה צֹאן, *ro'êh ṣôn*, 'shepherd of a flock,' is an Assyrianism, *rêu tsîni* in Ass. being used in contradistinction to *rêu alpê*, 'ox-herd'; *rêu itstsuri*, 'bird-keeper'; *rêu sattukki*, 'keeper of the daily sacrifice, etc. 'Tiller of the ground' is a translation of the Ass. *ikkaru*, which is derived from the Sumerian *engar*, 'the ground,' and is ideographically expressed by UR-APIN, 'man of the ground'; that is to say, 'the peasant' or 'fellaḥ,' as distinguished from the NU-GISSAR, or 'gardener,' as Adam had been in Paradise. The population of Babylonia consisted of agriculturists (*ikkari*) and artisans (*ummani*), the former inhabiting the country, and the latter the town, the whole body of them being collectively called *ummânu*. In contrast to them were the uncultured West Semitic nomads, whose home was in the desert on the west side of the Euphrates, but who tended the flocks of their Babylonian masters, and many of whom pitched their tents on the river-banks of Southern Babylonia. Wool was a staple industry of the Babylonians, and the flocks were all herded by the West Semitic Beduin. Hence the shepherd represented the West Semitic Beduin, while the peasant and artisan constituted the civilized population of Babylonia. In one sense they might be called brothers, since they alike spoke Semitic languages, and a certain portion of the Babylonian people belonged to the Semitic race.

In the story of Cain and Abel, therefore, we have a reflexion of the relations between the two adjoining populations as they were regarded from the Beduin point of view. The elder brother is naturally the Babylonian master, to whom the Beduin shepherd stood in somewhat of the relation of the wife to the husband (v.[7]); he possessed metal weapons of destruction (vv.[8. 22. 23]), was the builder of cities (v.[17]), and exchanged agriculture for the artisan's craft (vv.[12. 22]).[1]

3, 4. The Hebrew translated 'in process of time' would be *ina kît yumê* in Assyrian; but the original phrase was probably *ina yumê-su*, 'at that time,' as the reference is to the time when Cain and Abel were already respectively an agriculturist and a shepherd. The ground had already been cursed (3[17]); hence the fruit of it was not acceptable to Yahweh, who had cursed it. On the other hand, Yahweh was the God of the Sutu or West Semitic Beduin (4[26]), whose offering to Him was the best of their possessions—the firstlings, namely, of their

[1] The fact that the word *ummânu*, 'smith,' came to be applied (as in the story of the Deluge) to the whole body of the Babylonian population, so as to include 'the peasant' as well as 'the smith,' would explain how Kain, the first 'smith,' has absorbed the first *amel-ikkari* (Heb. *'ish hâ-adâmâh*), or 'agriculturist,' who, according to 9[20], was really Nukhum, or Noah (see notes on 5[29] and 9[20]).