

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is very difficult for the follower of Christ to believe in war. Even now, when war is on us, and we must justify our entering into it, we find great difficulty in giving it a place among the things of Christ. It is not that there are no texts. Such a text as, 'Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword' (Mt 10³⁴), occurs at once, and has done much service since the War began. But the quotation of a text is ever a precarious argument. It is the spirit of Christ that we have to do with. And it is very difficult to associate with the spirit of Christ as we know it the things which war now stands for.

And yet Canon SCOTT HOLLAND, who believes in Christ, believes also in war. He believes in war as he believes in earthquakes and avalanches. He may have had his trouble with earthquakes and avalanches. It is not easy to gather them under the providence of God. But, the alternative being atheism, Canon SCOTT HOLLAND has found a place for them there. And there also he has been able to find a place for war.

Canon SCOTT HOLLAND has been preaching on peace and war. His sermon will be found in the August issue of *The English Church Review*. The normal thing in the providence of God, he says, is peace. God gives us peace, great spaces of it, and He and we say little about it. But at the end of a

great stretch of peace comes war. It always comes. The peace may have been long and very profitable. Throughout all its length we sat comfortably under our vine and fig-tree. Our corn and wine increased. We did not long for war and we did not look for it. But it came. It always comes. Very likely it comes when least expected and least desired. But it always comes. For it also is part of the providence of God.

War comes for judgment. During the time of peace we had the opportunity given us, not of becoming enriched with goods—that is of little consequence in the providence of God; but of becoming rich in goodness, of gaining a strong character, of doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with our God. Have we used the quiet time of peace in that way? War—or it may be earthquake or avalanche, but usually it is war—war comes to test us. It is our day of judgment, our day of visitation, or simply our Day.

Now Canon SCOTT HOLLAND says that the issue is decided, not by the war, but by the previous peace. For our moral freedom is confined to the time of peace. That, he says, is our Lord's constant warning to us. 'The crisis allows no space for freedom. We cannot help ourselves then. What we are, we are. The light breaks in; the day reveals it. We do, on the sudden,

what is in our nature to do. And since our nature is what it is, we do what we must do. It is no good, then, as the Lord shows in the parable, to wish we could run about and get oil for our lamps. If we have no oil, our lamps are out, and the bridegroom has passed in, and we are shut out. So hard it seems! Yet we have been free all along. We could have got oil any day we chose. We were left perfectly free to get ready. We were in our own power. Now that our nature is formed, no doubt we must do what it dictates. But why did it take that shape? Why have we made this kind of act natural? We might have had a different nature; we might have been changed. There was repentance: and Christ: and forgiveness: and the washing away of sins: and the gift of the Holy Ghost. All these were ours, and quiet years were given us, on purpose that these should have time to do their work upon us. We could draw upon all these resources. We had everything that we needed. We were perfectly free: and we were at peace. And now peace has gone; war is on us, and our freedom is over, and we are, what we are! "We are judged, and there is no help for it!"

But why are we tested by war for what we have made of ourselves in peace? Surely war is a more severe and searching instrument than we need. A character formed in time of peace, should it not be tested by something less terrible? After a long spell of peace, how can we be expected to meet the awful temptation of war?

CANON SCOTT HOLLAND'S answer is a striking one. He says that if we are to be ready for the emergency when it comes, an emergency such as war, we must secure for ourselves a character stronger than the peaceful time seems to require. He admits that this is very difficult to believe. 'We tide along well enough. The days are ordinary, commonplace. We are left alone, as it were; not bothered, not tempted beyond what we are accustomed to. We meet our obligations. We do what decent people ought to do. It does

not cost us very much to keep proper standards, to behave ourselves fairly well. What more do you want? We are quite as good as most people, rather better, in fact. And we are quite sure of ourselves, under all the conditions that are likely to happen. We shall not go wrong or fall away. Trust us! So we say. And it seems so needless, so puny, so troublesome, to be keeping stricter rules of conduct than are necessary, and examining into motives, and worrying over sins. We shall do well enough: so we outwardly feel.'

'And that is exactly where the danger of peace comes in. It tempts us to be content with satisfying the conditions of peace. But what we have to do in peace is to prepare for the hour when peace is over. How foolish to plead, in that hour, "How was I to know that I should fail? I had done well enough in peace." You might just as well plead, "How was I to know that I should break under temptation? I had done well enough when no temptation was attacking me."'

The fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer differs from the other petitions in two ways. In the first place, it is the only petition for the things of the body. And, in the second place, it is the only petition of which the meaning is in dispute. Its meaning is in dispute chiefly because it contains a word which had never been used before.

Dr. E. A. ABBOTT has published a new book; and in the very beginning of it he discusses the meaning of this petition. The new book is a chapter in a forthcoming volume of *Diatessarica*, to be entitled 'The Law of the New Kingdom.' It is published in advance, separately, 'in the hope that it may receive criticism resulting in corrections and improvements, and that it may reach some who would not be likely to read the larger and more expensive work.' Its own title is *Miscellanea Evangelica (II.)*. Published at the Cambridge University Press (3s. net), it is

occupied entirely with an exposition of Christ's Miracles of Feeding.

That is why Dr. ABBOTT enters at once on a discussion of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer. For it seems to him that one of the miracles of feeding, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, 'challenges some kind of comparison' with the giving of the manna in the wilderness. Now concerning the manna it is said in Exodus, 'The people shall go out and gather the word of the day in its day'—according to the literal translation. That is to say, the amount necessary for each day was to be gathered on that same day. And it was to be eaten on that same day. None of it was to be left till the morning.

Dr. ABBOTT's mind is at once deflected to the Lord's Prayer. For the fourth petition is strikingly similar. What if the idea in it should prove to be exactly the same? 'Give us this day our daily bread'—what if that should be, quite emphatically, a prayer for just enough bread to serve for the day that we have entered on?

There are two forms of the petition, one in St. Matthew's Gospel, the other in St. Luke's. In St. Matthew we ask for bread for this day, and for this day only. The verb being aorist, makes that unmistakable. 'Give us this day our daily bread.' In St. Luke we ask for a continuous giving of bread. The verb is in the present, the continuous present tense: 'Give us,' we say, '(continuously) day by day our daily bread.'

The difference is difficult to account for. Dr. ABBOTT cannot account for it. All that he can say is that for him the original form is St. Matthew's. For it seems to him that, as in the giving of the manna, so in the Lord's Prayer, emphasis is laid on the day. The promise is not a supply of bread for one day after another, but only for the day we have entered on. And as the promise, so should be the prayer. We are expressly taught to pray, as it seems to Dr. ABBOTT, not for a con-

tinual supply of food, but for food sufficient for this one day.

That is the idea in the Epistle of St. James. 'If,' says St. James (2^{15, 16}), 'a brother or sister be naked, and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet ye give them not the things needful to the body; what doth it profit?' Here Dr. FIELD has pointed out, and Dr. ABBOTT agrees, that it is not a daily supply of food that the brother or sister is in need of, but *the day's* supply. It is even probable that the words used, both by St. James and by our Lord, have in them a hidden but felt contrast to that which is more than sufficient. Dr. FIELD quotes from Menander a line which contrasts the life that is 'dependent on the day's supply' (ἐφήμερος, St. James's word) with the life that has superabundance (περιουσία). And so our Lord may be tacitly teaching us to ask for the one day's supply only, and for only a sufficient supply for that day; and St. James may mean to say that God gives us sometimes the opportunity of fulfilling our own prayers—not by arranging for the supply of a brother's or sister's necessity once for all, but by attending to its supply on the very day on which it is brought to our notice. For in this way the brother or sister will recognize their dependence upon God every day of their lives, and we will consider, every day we pray our prayer, what opportunity of answering it God is to give us *this* day.

From all this it is evident that Dr. ABBOTT has some trouble with the word translated 'daily.' This is the word which appears for the first time in the Lord's Prayer. He is not content to translate it 'daily.' That is the very idea, he believes, that the prayer is intended to discountenance. It is not daily bread that we are taught to pray for, but this day's bread. And it seems absurd to call that bread, which we are to ask for this day only, our *daily* bread.

He takes the word to mean 'belonging to the

coming day.' He understands that the prayer is to be prayed early in the day. The day is yet before us. We pray for bread for the oncoming day. It is not a prayer for the bread of to-morrow, as some have strangely understood it. That could be possible only if the prayer were uttered in the evening; and even then it would probably contradict that immediate dependence upon God's providence to which Christ so often recalls us. It is not 'give us this day the bread of to-morrow.' It is 'give us this day this day's bread.'

Now it must be confessed that if that is all that the new word means, it was scarcely worth coining. It is not surprising, therefore, that throughout the history of interpretation other meanings have been found in this word. The latest effort of the kind has been made by Mr. E. S. BUCHANAN, a distinguished critic of the New Testament text. Mr. BUCHANAN'S effort is discussed by Dr. RENDEL HARRIS in the *Expositor* for September.

Mr. BUCHANAN recently delivered a lecture at the Union Theological Seminary in New York on 'The Search for the Original Words of the Gospel.' Dr. RENDEL HARRIS discusses that lecture. He discusses it in his own way. He begins with the Union Theological Seminary. 'The Union Theological Seminary at New York,' he says, 'is one of the bright spots to scholars who, under various attractions, are drawn to visit the American shores. Here, at least, one is sure of a cultured audience and of spiritual attention, an audience for whom the most scholarly theme will not be too erudite, nor the most inward interpretation of life too mystical. A man with a message could not set his sail for a more pleasant harbour, which in itself will be, in its turn, a point of departure. Apollos, if he had lived in the present day, would have gone there by instinct: I am not quite so sure about Priscilla, as the standard of value may be somewhat affected by the problem of sex.'

He is sure enough, however, that to those of the admitted sex who go there certain advantages belong. They carry with them knowledge, which may possibly have been unappreciated or ill appreciated at home, and the prospect of carrying away its proper equivalent. For those who go to lecture at Union Theological Seminary will remember that if grace and gold are ever to agree, New York or Chicago is the proper place for them to demonstrate their reconciliation. 'However, on this point I do not wish to speak too definitely: it might lead to personal questions and cause misunderstandings—as, for example, when, on my last visit to America, the Income Tax Commissioners of the city of Birmingham implored me to disclose to them what was the net value of the trip; and I do not think they would have been satisfied if I had served them with the proverbial reply that a rolling stone does not gather any appreciable, or dutiable, moss.'

'By the way,' he continues (for, as we have said, Dr. RENDEL HARRIS discusses Mr. BUCHANAN'S lecture in his own way), 'the proverb which I am quoting has some interesting analogies: in the *Imitatio Christi* there is a sentence to the effect—"Qui multo peregrinantur raro sanctificantur," which means that they who make many pilgrimages are seldom saints. This obvious meaning was overlooked by one of the great translators of the *Imitation*, who gave us instead the dictum that "Those who travel much are seldom saints." This also I am not prepared to dispute: if it is true, it is another form of the doctrine of the rolling stone, the moss in this case being the outward and visible signs of sanctity.'

Thus Dr. RENDEL HARRIS approaches Mr. BUCHANAN'S lecture. 'Mr. E. S. Buchanan is one of the younger race of Oxford Biblical students; he has been for years occupied in the examination of Old Latin Texts of the Bible, and it was the result of his work on these Old Latin Texts, and I think the hope of obtaining assistance in the prosecution of his thankless research,

that led him to give the lecture which I am now going to describe—not merely to Biblical scholars who know the value of the Old Latin Texts, but still more to those who are interested in religious autobiography; for in connexion with his work, Mr. Buchanan has had one of the most interesting religious experiences that could be imagined, and has disclosed the main features of these experiences with a frankness which is as unusual as the experience itself. For certainly we did not expect that a man who comes to lecture on Old Latin Texts would stop to tell us how, in the midst of his studies, he had found his soul. We know that while Saul was seeking his father's asses he found a kingdom, but he did not announce that he would lecture to a school of the prophets on the asses themselves, if I may, for a moment, speak disrespectfully of Old Latin Readings.'

Mr. BUCHANAN, it seems, had lost his soul over the matters of predestination and future punishment. As an undergraduate in Oxford he got into spiritual trouble over words like 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated,' or 'these shall go away into everlasting punishment,' and such ideas as he had been taught to associate with them. He found his soul in a visit to Dr. JOHN WORDSWORTH. 'I am editing,' said the Bishop of Salisbury to him, 'I am editing the Latin Vulgate myself, and studying the Old Latin readings, and I find that instead of the verse which says, "they shall go into the eternal torture," the oldest Latin MSS. say "eternal fire."'

'Now to most of us,' remarks Dr. RENDEL HARRIS, 'this would not constitute an appreciable relief, but with the young Buchanan it was entirely different; he saw the way out. He courageously mounted on the first various reading that came along, and rode off in search of religious liberty. As I say, one would not have thought the particular beast that he mounted would have carried him far, but it did. He went back to his rooms with the determination to become a New Testament student and a textual

critic, and eventually Bishop Wordsworth became his patron and helped him until his death out of his ripe scholarship and, what does not often go with ripe scholarship, his adequate revenues.'

Well, it was in pursuit of his studies as a textual critic that Mr. BUCHANAN came to the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer. He had been collating certain Irish manuscripts. Now the Irish manuscripts which he had been working among are in Latin, and their text is an older text than the Vulgate. Here and there, however, they have been altered to agree with the Vulgate, these alterations being sometimes made by writing the Vulgate text over the original, after a little scraping. In one of the manuscripts he found that the Vulgate form of the words, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' had been written over an erasure. 'Was it possible to find out what was there before the scribe wrote the traditional sentence? There came a bright day in April when his keen and practised eye was able to read the underscript, and to his astonishment he found the words, "Give us to-day for bread the Word of God from Heaven."'

Here is a new rendering of the new Greek word. Here is a new petition. It is no longer a prayer for the things of the body, but for the things of the spirit. If this translation is right, the Lord's Prayer from beginning to end is a prayer for spiritual blessings.

Mr. BUCHANAN is positive that the Old Latin reading was 'Panem verbum Dei celestem da nobis hodie' ('Give us to-day for bread the Word of God from Heaven'). And Dr. RENDEL HARRIS thinks we need not doubt his expert eye. But granting that this was the Old Latin reading, are we bound to say that it represents the meaning of the words spoken by our Lord? Mr. BUCHANAN is sure that it does. Dr. RENDEL HARRIS is not so sure.

For Origen, in his treatise *De Oratione*, studies

the Lord's Prayer clause by clause. When he comes to the petition for daily bread, he declares it impossible that the petition can be for the bread of this body. That would be to pray for something which is at once earthly and insignificant. What Christ bids us pray for, says Origen, must be something great and heavenly. And what can that be but Himself? 'I am that bread of life.' It is His flesh. 'The bread that I shall give is my flesh.' Now this flesh, says Origen, is the Logos or Word of God which came down from Heaven. Dr. RENDEL HARRIS concludes that the Old Latin reading which Mr. BUCHANAN has discovered in the Irish manuscript is simply a gloss out of Origen's commentary on the passage.

He knows, of course, and he knows that Mr. BUCHANAN will not delay to remind him, that the spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer is older than Origen. Tertullian also wrote a tract *De Oratione*, and in that tract he also expounds the clauses of the Lord's Prayer. And when he comes to the prayer for daily bread, he takes it first to be a prayer for natural blessings, but immediately corrects himself. 'We prefer to understand it spiritually,' he says. And then he uses the words, 'Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de caelis' ('The bread is the Word of God who came down from heaven'). The words are not identical with those which Mr. BUCHANAN found in his manuscript, but they are strongly suggestive of them.

It is possible, therefore, that the Old Latin reading of Mr. BUCHANAN'S Irish manuscript is *not* a gloss from Origen, but an interpretation of the petition that is older than Origen. Who can tell how old? Dr. RENDEL HARRIS cannot tell, and leaves it there.

Among the arguments that are used to disprove the divinity of Christ, there is one that has some plausibility and much popularity at the present

time. It is the argument that a Being so exalted would be useless as an example.

It is an argument, however, that, apart from its popularity with the thoughtless, tells with any force of conviction only upon those who cherish a certain theory of human nature. The theory is that in all the history and in all the geography of the world human nature is very much alike. It has not sunk so low on the whole as some theologies declare, such language as 'wounds and bruises and putrefying sores' being altogether out of place. Nor has it risen so high as, curiously enough, the very same theologies claim. It is very much of a piece, and it has been very much of a piece since the beginning.

Miss E. M. CAILLARD does not believe that. Does any one ask, Who is Miss E. M. CAILLARD? Surely not. Her *Progressive Revelation* cannot have been wholly missed by anybody, though it may not have deeply influenced everybody. But at present we introduce Miss CAILLARD as the author of *The Church and New Knowledge* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). This is one of the volumes of the 'Layman's Library,' a series which is edited by Professor BURKITT and Professor NEWSOM. These men chose the previous volumes of their series with discrimination, and we may be confident that they have not made a mistake in choosing this volume.

Miss CAILLARD does not believe in a dead level of attainment for the race. And still less does she believe in its incapacity for progress. She admits that we are constantly falling back upon some weak compromise of life and conduct. But why? For two reasons. First, because we have not before us the standard of the Ideal Man. And next, because we forget the promise of power to reach that standard through the Divine Man.

Miss CAILLARD speaks of the Ideal Man and the Divine Man. Are these different men, or one and the same? They are one and the same.

Christ is the Divine Man who gives men the power to reach the standard of true manhood—that, if you will, through the Divinity that dwells in Him. And Christ is the Ideal Man, through the humanity that is His. With all diversity of attainment, no one has yet risen to the full stature of manhood in Christ Jesus. But that stature is attainable, for He is Man. And that stature will be attained, for He is God and will see to it.

What, then, is the stature of manhood in Christ Jesus? Miss CAILLARD says that it consists of four elements. These elements are all attainable; for they were all present during the life on earth of the Man Christ Jesus. But He was God on earth as well as Man? He was; but He veiled His Godhead. Born under the law, He submitted to the restrictions of law, and even of custom in so far as they did not hinder His self-manifestation as a Man, or the work which had been given Him to do.

The first element of manhood which Miss CAILLARD sees in the Man Christ Jesus upon earth is His perfect control of His own physical organization. His human body was no hindrance to Him. By means of it He did His work. It was the obedient servant of His will. It suffered, certainly. Throughout the hours of the Passion it suffered in a supreme degree. But it never gained the upper hand, or stood between Him and the work which His Father in heaven had given Him to do.

He was not anxious about the body, or the things of the body. He carried out His own precept, 'Take no thought for the body.' When spiritual necessity came upon Him, He did not hesitate to place the body under a stress which might well have appeared excessive. It was so during the Temptation in the Wilderness. He made every demand upon the body that His work required. But He made none out of presumption. When invited to fling Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple, He refused. That was no part of

the work which the Father had given Him, and the body should not be asked to bear it. If it had been part of His work, no physical shrinking would have deterred Him from the daring act. He would have thrown Himself over in absolute confidence that God would bear the body up.

Here, then, at once, is a most severe test for us. Perhaps we shall find none severer. Can we make our body thus the instrument of our will? We can. The follower of Christ made no boast who said, 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.' We must see to it, certainly, that we do not call upon the body for that which is no proper part of our life and service. But within the sphere of God's purpose we may believe that the healthy body will respond to every legitimate call that is made upon it.

The second element of manhood which Miss CAILLARD sees in the Man Christ Jesus is His control of Nature. This surprised the men of His time more than anything else. Perhaps it is our greatest surprise also. We can accept His miracles of healing while we hesitate over His feeding of the five thousand, His walking on the water, or His stilling the storm on the lake. And at first nothing seems to be further away from our accomplishment. In whatever else we take Him as example, we do not even turn to Him for an example in this.

But it is not the nature *miracles* that Miss CAILLARD is thinking of. It is of His ordinary attitude to the surroundings and circumstances of the life He lived. The point to observe is that He used these circumstances, just as He used His body, as the instruments of His will. He seems to have felt no restraint. He complains of none. He lived in a certain place, at a certain time, among a certain class of men and women; and He lived His full, free, perfect life so. The restraints that the great so often find irksome and hampering, were no hindrance to Him. He said, it is true, 'The Son of man hath not where

to lay his head,' but not in the way of complaint, only in the way of warning. His homelessness He accepted as He accepted an occasional home, doing His work unhindered by circumstances of any kind.

And this control of daily circumstance was altogether in line with that control of nature which so greatly amazes us. It was in the exercise of His work that He turned the water into wine, and said to the wind, 'Peace, be still.' We cannot follow Him in these acts. But we have an unquenchable conviction that the reason why we cannot is that we have not faith enough. We can never rid our minds of His words, 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed you.' Peter was a man of like passions such as we are, and if he had had faith enough he could have walked on the sea as Jesus was walking on it.

It may be, then, that faith has not yet brought us into fulness of fellowship. We cannot help believing that it is so. But meantime it is in the daily circumstances of life that we shall find our great example in Christ. We too have our work—work which the Father has given us to do, and we may do it under any circumstances of life, if we keep the standard of the Ideal Man before us, and believe in the promise of power through the Divine Man.

The third element of manhood which Miss CAILLARD sees in Christ is His perfect insight into and sympathy with His fellow-men.

Now these are not two, but one. The sympathy and the insight are inseparably united. If it were not so we should be able to take Jesus as our

example in sympathy alone; His insight into men we should set apart and far above us. We think Him never nearer us than when He had compassion on the woman that stood behind Him weeping. We think Him never further from us than when He knew what Simon the Pharisee was thinking and answered the unspoken thought. But His pity for the woman and His insight into the Pharisee's heart were one.

And in this at least we have no doubt, in these days of ours, that we can make Him our example. We have learned the lesson that love is the key to knowledge. It is just the progress which we have made toward an understanding of this element of our Lord's manhood, the assurance we have that in this matter we can really follow His wonderful example, that gives us confidence to believe that we can follow Him everywhere else.

The last element is His perfect sense of Sonship to God. This is the great marvel of His life, but it is least marvelled at. He called God Father. We also call Him Father. He prayed to Him. We can pray to Him also. He obeyed His will: He said, on occasion of a great decision, 'Not my will, but thine, be done.' We can say the same, in the measure of our faith and love and surrender. There is no need to exhibit the possibility of taking the Ideal Man as our example here. We take Him here if we take Him anywhere. And yet this is the element that enters into all the rest and makes them possible. It was the sense of Sonship that made the body His willing instrument; it was the sense of Sonship that gave Him control over Nature; it was His Sonship to God that enabled Him to recognize brotherhood in man. And all these things will be possible to us when we realize that we are sons of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.