

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE present number contains a sermon by Canon Westcott on the late Bishop of Durham, the proof of which has been carefully revised and corrected by Dr. Westcott for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. It will be acknowledged by all to be the truest word that has been spoken on the subject. Dr. Westcott informs us that in a short time this sermon will be printed in a small volume along with two others which he preached at the Bishop's consecration and at the dedication of his memorial church at Sunderland last July.

---

In the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES we shall give the first of some short papers on the Modern Religious Press. They will be accurate in information and independent in judgment.

---

The response made to the suggestion of our Wilts correspondent in last number has been most encouraging. It is impossible to arrange the whole subject for practical working this month, but we shall lose no time. The suggestions are of two kinds—one in reference to those who should be invited to contribute, the other in reference to the subjects of contribution. An earnest and frequent desire is expressed that laymen should not be excluded. We are assured that a large number of our most intelligent laymen take an interest not only in the reading of expository work, but even in contributing to it. Under careful and independent management it seems possible to foster this interest, and at the same time obtain some results of permanent value. But as to this, and in reference to the subjects and

method of procedure, we shall have definite arrangements made before our next issue.

---

*Lux Mundi* is likely, after all, to prove a new "Essays and Reviews". The essay which has raised the conflict is on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration," and is written by the Rev. Charles Gore, the Principal of Pusey House, who edits the volume. It is divided into three parts, of which the third part only deals with the Inspiration of Scripture, and it is that part which has the disturbing element in it. Mr. Gore, with great frankness, declares himself ready to accept the results of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, and expounds a doctrine of the Inspiration of Scripture which is capable of embracing them. This from the successor of Dr. Pusey is unexpected enough, and it is made still more remarkable from the declaration in the preface that Canon Holland, Dr. Talbot, Canon Paget, Mr. Lyttelton, and the other able and representative essayists are all in substantial agreement with Mr. Gore's views.

Mr. Gore's view of inspiration is this :

Every race has its special vocation, of which its great writers are the interpreters. Thus the calling or mission of Rome, let us say, is to teach mankind the science of government, and Virgil is its great interpreter. This calling is a divine inspiration : in this sense every race has its inspiration and its prophets.

But this inspiration is natural : the inspiration of the Jews was supernatural. That is to say, the Jews were selected, not to teach a merely human art or science, but to be the school in which was

taught the relation of man to God. Their great writers are the exponents, not of an art or science which at best only indirectly involves the thought of God, but of the very relation of God and man, of holiness, of sin, of restoration. Virgil was the inspired interpreter of a message of God to men: the prophets, the psalmists, the historians, of the Old Testament are also such inspired interpreters: the difference between them is in the subject of the inspiration.

What, then, asks Mr Gore, is meant by the Inspiration of Holy Scripture? He makes his answer perfectly plain. Take the account of the creation with which the Bible opens. We take note of its affinities in general substance with the Babylonian and Phœnician cosmogonies; but we are much more struck with its differences, and it is in these we shall look for its inspiration. We observe that it has for its motive and impulse, not the satisfaction of a fantastic curiosity, or the later interest of scientific discovery, but to reveal certain fundamental religious principles: that everything as we see it was made by God; that sin came of man's disobedience to God; that God has not left man to himself; that there is still a hope and a promise. These are the fundamental principles of true religion and progressive morality, and in these lies the supernatural inspiration of the Bible account of creation.

The special *point of view* of the writers of the Bible—that is their special inspiration. They relate human events like profane historians, collecting, sorting, adapting, combining their materials, but the motive of their work is not to bring out the national glory of the chosen people, but to declare how God has dealt with them. As for matters of fact, the Old Testament writer, prophet, psalmist, historian, does with them as a Greek poet or historian would. Mr. Gore does not agree with Canon Cheyne that he is indifferent to them. Dr. Cheyne protests against the supposition that such narratives as the record of Elijah are true to fact. "True to fact! Who goes to the artist for hard dry facts? Why, even the historians of antiquity thought it no part of their duty to give the mere prose of life. How much less can the unconscious artists of the imaginative East have described their heroes with relentless photographic accuracy!" Mr. Gore does not agree with this. The writers of the

Old Testament, having to keep before the chosen people the record of how God has dealt with them, have a special sense of the value of fact. But neither in the Old Testament nor in the New do we find "that the inspiration of the writers enabled them to dispense with the ordinary means or guarantees of accuracy". Just as the prophets "at times foreshorten the distance and place the great deliverance and the 'day of Jehovah' in the too immediate foreground"; as the "prophetic inspiration is thus consistent with erroneous anticipations as to the circumstances and the opportunity of God's self-revelation"; so, "within the limits of what is substantially historical," as in the history of Abraham, "there is still room for what, though marked by spiritual purpose, is not strictly historical".

*The Church Quarterly Review* for January opens with an article on the subject of New Testament Lexicography; and the article itself opens with a very remarkable anecdote, illustrative of the ignorance of Scripture on the part of some learned persons. The writer says that a contemporary scholar, who has devoted a considerable part of his life to the collection and editing of fragments of the Greek comic poets, includes in his collection a portion of 2 Tim. iv. 6: (ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς . . .) "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my . . ." Finding the words quoted in some grammar or lexicon, and perceiving that the first four are capable of scansion (they form, he says, the first half of an iambic tetrameter), he has appropriated them, with the remark that, although as they stand "*ipsa nocte obscuriora*," they manifestly belong to some lost comedy!

The most valuable part of the Article is its discussion of the meaning of some important New Testament words. One of these is "Mystery" (μυστήριον). There is no doubt that the popular conception of that word is quite wrong. A mystery, in popular speech, is something incomprehensible—"It is a perfect mystery to me". But it is doubtful if the Greek word *ever* has that meaning. A "mystery" in the New Testament, as in Greek authors generally, is a revealed secret, an important truth which was not revealed till the time came when it could be apprehended. St. Paul, in Rom. xvi. 25,

26, almost defines it when he says: "The mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but is now manifested and made known to all the nations".

How has the word "mystery" come to have the popular meaning of that which *cannot* be understood? There is, in the English language, another word of a quite different etymology—a "mystery" (properly spelt "mistry") play. This word comes from *ministerium*—service, work, and was once used to signify a trade or occupation; the mystery plays being so called because the actors were artisans. The writer of this Article thinks our word has received its meaning of incomprehensibility from a confusion with this one. But that is scarcely possible. The old word "mistry" has no notion of secrecy or incomprehensibility about it. Much more likely is it due to a misunderstanding of the meaning of the word in some important passages of the Authorised Version itself.

One of these passages is 1 Cor. xiv. 2: "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man understandeth; howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries" (*πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστήρια*). The usual interpretation is that the last clause is equivalent to the one before it. Thus: "No man understandeth, but in the Spirit he speaketh what no man understandeth". But we have only to state it so, to refute that interpretation, for such "a flat tautology" is impossible with St. Paul. Take the word in its usual signification. The sense is: "No doubt he is unfolding spiritual truths". Thus it is possible that there is just a touch of irony, or, it may be, gentle reproof to the fault-finder; as if the Apostle would say: "His words may be unintelligible to you, but in the Spirit (or by means of the Spirit) he is bringing to light hidden truths".

But more important is the verse: "This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church" (Eph. v. 32). As the writer of this Article says, the English reader can hardly avoid taking this to mean: "This is a very mysterious thing". But the very form of the words in the original (*τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν*) makes that meaning impossible. The Revised Version is

nearer when it gives "This mystery is great". Taking the word in its ordinary sense: "This doctrine (hitherto hidden, but now revealed) is a great one" (not a doctrine concerning husband and wife, but, as the Apostle immediately tells us, concerning Christ and His Church), we may thus translate: "This teaching is deep: I however mean it with reference to Christ and His Church".

Amid so much conjecture, we are glad to see an authoritative word on the late Dr. Hatch's Concordance to the Septuagint. Dr. Sanday, in the course of an intensely interesting article in the *Expositor*, informs us that "it is so well launched that its completion is secured". Dr. Sanday says of it that it is perhaps the work "by which twenty or fifty years hence its originator will be best remembered. Some work is absorbed in the onward progress of science; other work remains as indispensable as when it was first published. Hatch's Concordance will belong to the latter category; it will be the foundation of countless studies yet to come." It will be issued from the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

In a scholarly little paper in the *Church Sunday School Magazine* on the "Influence of the Hebrew of the Old Testament upon the Greek of the New," Prebendary Scott of St. Paul's refers to an example in St. Luke, the most purely classical of the Gospels, where, in one short sentence, there are two remarkable Hebraisms. The sentence is in Luke xxii. 49: (*κύριε εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρα*) "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" The literal translation is: "Lord, *if* we shall smite *in* a sword". The *if* is to be explained by the omission of "tell us" (Lord, tell us if we, &c.), according to the common Hebrew custom of omitting such words as introduce a remark. Thus in Psalm ii. 2:

"The rulers take counsel together  
Against the Lord, and against His anointed (saying),  
Let us break their bands asunder".

The *in* is the Hebrew preposition (*ב*), not the Greek in any of its classical meanings. The Hebrew preposition means *in, by, among, at, upon, with*, all of which in classical Greek would be expressed by different words. The LXX. were satisfied to take the simple Greek preposition (*ἐν*) *in*, and treat it as representing the Hebrew with all its breadth of meaning, especially its instrumental force. Whence

we have here, "with a sword". The Vulgate takes over the Hebrew idiom also, which is as utterly foreign to the Latin tongue as to the Greek—*Domine, si percussus in gladio*. In English it would be intolerable.

In a recent number of the *Homiletic Review* Dr. Howard Crosby refers to an instance of an opposite kind, where the difficulty is all with the *English* prepositions. In Rom. viii. 24 he thinks we should translate, "For we were saved *in* hope," not "For *by* hope were we saved," as the Revised Version gives it, though that is to be preferred certainly to the Authorised translation, "For we are saved *by* hope," which mistranslates the tense as well as the preposition. The Greek has no preposition, but uses the simple dative alone (τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν). We are familiar enough with the dative used to express the instrument, but there are undoubted instances where an instrumental dative *in appearance* cannot be so rendered in English. Thus Rom. xi. 23 (ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμένωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ) is correctly rendered "If they continue not *in* their unbelief," though the simple dative is used. Again Rom. xii. 11 (τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες) both Versions render, "Fervent *in* spirit," though here also it is the simple dative in the Greek. Dr. Crosby believes that Rom. viii. 24 is another instance of the same construction. He says he is at a loss to understand what is the meaning of being saved *by* hope. We may be saved by grace (on God's side), and by faith (on man's side), but how can hope be instrumental in salvation? The meaning of the whole passage he gives as clearly this: "All creation is waiting a new order of things. Even we Christians are expecting a redemption of the body, for *in* this hope we were saved". The hope accompanied the salvation, but was not its cause.

Few things are more utterly wearisome than forced scientific illustrations of spiritual truth; few things are more delightful than scientific illustrations that are apposite and telling. In a fine sermon in the *Preacher's Magazine* for February, Dr. Dallinger illustrates the text, "Ye are the light of the world," in this way: It is a law of the physical universe that force and energy can only be obtained at the cost of changes in matter. Thus, for example, every ray of sunshine is a bundle of powerful forces, but how do they arise?—at the cost of the sun. Again, the forces of these sunbeams have been changed, say, into a tree; the tree becomes carbonised into coal. Coal is therefore stored-up sunshine: supply to it oxygen and heat, and what do we get? Light, heat, chemical action, that is to say, *you get back the sunbeam again*.

"I am the light of the world," said Jesus; but, in prospect of His departure, "Ye are the light of the world". For, as the coal that originated in the sunbeam, but in the bowels of the earth lost all

trace of the power that gave it origin, can yet be caused once more to pour forth the splendour of the ray by which it had origin; so man, though degraded and demoralised, may, through living faith in Christ, be made luminous by the touch of the Spirit, and able to give forth the light that is in him—the stored-up beams from the Sun of righteousness. "I am the Light of the world:" "Ye are the light of the world"—but between these there lay the long dark ages in which "the world knew Him not".

DEAR SIR,—In the February number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES which has been sent to me, I notice two allusions to myself. I am sorry to see that in the first my review of Dr. Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek* should be described as "unappreciative". I do not think that this could have been written in view of *both* the articles of which my review consisted. In the first I spoke as strongly as I could in the other sense, and had some fear that my language might be regarded as too strong. It happened that the second article contained all my expressions of dissent, but it could not be fairly judged apart from the first. I often find it difficult to make language convey the exact impression one desires; and, in the present instance, I should have especial reasons for regretting my failure. But I cannot recognise the justice of the epithet you have chosen.

I shall have a word more to say shortly on *διαθήκη* in Heb. ix. 15 ff. But no doubt the view you prefer has a great deal to be said for it.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES belongs to a class of literature of which I have, perhaps, less experience than I ought to have, yet I am much struck by its honesty, independence, and thoughtfulness of judgment.—Yours faithfully,

W. SANDAY.  
Oxford, Feb. 4.

We are glad to put ourselves right with Dr. Sanday, as well as put our readers right on the point in question, by printing Dr. Sanday's letter. We need say nothing of our desire not to misrepresent one to whom we shall often have to express deep obligations as we continue to conduct such a Magazine as this. In a subsequent letter Dr. Sanday informs us that his remarks on the meaning of *διαθήκη*, which he believes to be correctly translated *testament* in Heb. ix. 15 ff., are contained in the second of two articles on Dr. Westcott's *Hebrews* which he has contributed to the *Academy*,—where we hope they will shortly appear. He adds: "I should be sorry to seem to disparage the use of the Septuagint, which I agree with you in thinking very important. Still I do not think the LXX. alone decisive, as in the case in question, where it seems to me that the balance of the evidence is altered as soon as we take in the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs."