

the key of the subjectively ecclastic use. A new translation, one that shall not identify *reward* with *object*, will be set before the reader in another Article; in which the treatment in the Revised Version of nouns in *μα* and of the middle voice and of some hard texts will come under review.

T. S. EVANS.

THE SELF-STANDARD DECEPTIVE.

2 CORINTHIANS x. 12.

THE Jewish members of the primitive Church, even though they were sincerely converted to Christ, could not throw off the habits of a lifetime or the hereditary tendencies of their race. At no time indeed, no, not even when a new life had been quickened within them, do Pharisees find it easy to shed either their ecclesiastical habits or their theological opinions. Could they have had their way, Christianity would have been but a reformed or fulfilled Judaism, looking back on a Messiah who had come instead of looking forward to a Messiah who was to come, and provided with an additional rite—Baptism, and an additional feast—the Lord's Supper. Naturally, therefore, the broad and catholic spirit of St. Paul was an offence to them. *They* still plumed themselves on the superiority of the Jew over the Gentile, while *he* refused to see any vital difference between Gentile and Jew, but counted all "one in Christ Jesus." To them Religion was still mainly a thing of rites and precepts, while to him circumcision was nothing and the law was dead, and charity, or love, was at once the end and the fulfilling of the commandments. The gulf between them and him was as deep, the opposition as sharp, as that which obtains between the modern Sacerdotalist and

Sacramentarian, who holds the substance of religion to be submission to the priest and the due observance of ritual, and the Free Churchman who believes in a Divine Charity at work for the redemption of the whole race, and holds that to love God and his neighbour is the whole duty of man.

Once embarked in the controversy with St. Paul, these proud and self-satisfied Pharisees—the Judaists, as they are called—grew more and more bitter, and descended to the use of weapons more and more unworthy of good or reasonable men. At first, no doubt, they honestly shrank from the new and unwelcome development which it was his mission to give to the faith and the church of Christ. But, soon, pride of race and pride of caste came in to vitiate the honesty of their opposition to him; and, ere long, they were flinging at him any aspersion, however unworthy or untrue, that came ready to their hands and was likely to lower his authority. *He* had never seen the Lord, they said, or heard his words, and held no commission direct from Him. His personal appearance was mean, his oratory contemptible, his courage questionable; however bold he might be when writing letters from a distance, he did not dare to meet them face to face and set his claims beside theirs.

St. Paul is answering these and similar aspersions when we meet him here. His authority, he contends, is as good as theirs. He *had* seen the Lord, and that in the most wonderful way, and received his commission straight from Him. If they are such eloquent and impressive orators, why do they not at least make converts of their own instead of trying to snatch his converts from him? And as for courage, though he has never yet feared the face of man, at one point he may be lacking in the courage for which they are conspicuous; he dare not praise and commend himself as they do. He leaves his works to speak for him.

They, having no works to shew, naturally fall back on great swelling words and loud autocratic assumptions.

But he is not content with argument and satire. He wants to get at the root of the matter. He wants to understand, and to make them understand, what it is that lies behind their opposition to him, and which prompts them to oppose him instead of doing good and quiet work of their own. And he finds this hidden but potent motive in their ignorance and self-conceit,—in what we might term their provincialism, or even their parochialism. Their minds have not travelled, if their bodies have. They do not know how many forms the truth may take; nay, of the higher and larger forms of truth they have not as yet so much as caught sight. Only the forms familiar in their own province, in their own parish, in their own circle, among their own set, carry any authority with them. When they come out into the great open world of thought they are bewildered, lost. To encounter the wider modes of thinking, the nobler ways of action, which lie outside their rustic purview, only renders them uncomfortable, distrustful, suspicious, sharpens their bigotry, intensifies and crystallises their narrowness. They have been wont to measure themselves *by themselves*; and, judging themselves by that poor standard, they have been content with themselves, with their modes of thought, their ways of action. And even now that their native world of Judaism has come toppling about their ears, and a whole new world, “a new creation,” has been called forth by Christ, they still go on comparing themselves with one another, and judging all men outside their little circle by their petty provincial standard; and so they still continue to rate themselves as the wisest and best, and look down on men to whom they ought to look up.

Three follies are rebuked by the Apostle in this brief passage which, egregious as they are, are nevertheless

always at work in the world, and were never more conspicuous, never more ludicrous, than they are at the present day.

1. The first is the folly of *measuring ourselves by our immediate neighbours*, by the standard of our sect, our set, our coterie, instead of by the loftiest standard and the noblest examples we can find,—and of being content with ourselves if we come up to that poor parochial standard. “With all your pretensions to superior wisdom you are *not* wise,” said St. Paul to his Judaic opponents and detractors; “and you shew your lack of wisdom in this: instead of trying yourselves by the largest and finest standard of human thought and conduct, or even by the noblest standard of *Jewish* thought and conduct, you are for ever measuring and comparing yourselves with one another. You do not want to know any truth that lies beyond your present limited reach, or to copy any nobler example than you can find in your own little ‘set.’ To be as wise as they are is enough for you. To be as good as they are is enough for you. You know, you want to know, of nothing wiser, nothing better. You do not believe that the wide world holds anything wiser or better. And hence, in your infatuation and self-conceit, you despise men to whom, because they are of a larger and more open mind, God has revealed his will more fully than to you, and given a larger measure of his wise and holy Spirit.”

To give the thought a modern turn which will sufficiently expose its folly, we may say that these men were each of them setting his private watch, not by the true mean time, nor even by the parish clock, but by one another’s watches; and when they had got the hands of their several dials to touch the same point, they determined that *that* was the true time for them, and for all the world, let the sun say what it would.

A folly so antique and so egregious can scarcely, we might

think, have survived to these modern days. But though you should bray men in a mortar, you would hardly get all the folly out of them. Men travel so much, communication with all parts of the world is now so constant and so rapid, that it seems almost impossible for a little knot of neighbours to isolate themselves from the rest of the world, to cherish a handful of narrow prejudices in common, and to give themselves all the airs of superior wisdom because they are so ignorant and so foolish. And yet these wiseacres, these "superior persons," are by no means uncommon; nor are they to be found only among the uncultivated vulgar. Cliques of poets, cliques of painters, cliques of literary and even of scientific men, cliques of politicians and metaphysicians, flourish among us who can see no wisdom or virtue beyond the limits of their own school, who pity or condemn the world at every point on which it ventures to differ from them, and who doubt the wisdom of Providence itself if it does not favour their cause. What is the parish clock, or Greenwich mean time, or even the sun itself, to them, if it does not tally with their pocket dial?

Even in the common walks of life this folly is as rife as ever. Which of us does not know men who *will* play "Sir Oracle" somewhere—in the club, the town council, the market place, the Church, if they can, and if they cannot, in their own office, on committees, among their own dependents, or at least by their several hearths? Which of us does not know some one man, of no extraordinary culture or gifts, who is perfectly ready to lay down the law even on subjects which he has never attempted to bottom, and to shew an architect how to build, a lawyer how he ought to have conducted his case, to teach a statesman politics, or a minister theology, or a musician music? Nay, if we are honest and know ourselves at all, must we not confess that we ourselves are constantly tempted to mount the tripod, utter oracular verdicts which have no inspiration,

hide our ignorance under airs of wisdom and authority, and, in playing the critic and censor, play the fool?

And yet we, who are so ready to think ourselves wiser than our neighbours, are quite content with ourselves if we are, or can decently assume that we are, as good as the general run of our neighbours; quite content if, when we measure and compare ourselves with them, we come up to the standard of conduct current among them. When we sit in judgment on them, our verdict may not be a favourable one; we may not rate them very high: but when we sit in judgment on ourselves, if we can only persuade ourselves that we do not fall beneath them, we see little necessity for rising above them. How many a man of business is content with himself, or sufficiently content to make no earnest effort at amendment if, in the conduct of his business, he takes no advantage which his neighbours and rivals would not take, launches into no speculation into which they would not launch, sanctions no adulteration, no deception, no overcharge which they would not sanction! How many religious persons are quite content with themselves if they know as much of the Bible as their fellow-worshippers know, or do as much for the Church! nay, how many take what their neighbours think and do and give as their main standard, and are at some little pains *not* to go beyond the general and customary limits!

And so, in innumerable ways, we go on measuring ourselves by ourselves and comparing ourselves with ourselves, —not looking out into the great world, or even into the great Church, beyond our narrow sectional or sectarian barriers; not trying ourselves by the only perfect standard, the will of God as manifested in the life of Christ; our standard sinking because it is so seldom rectified, until, if God do not correct us, our religion becomes little more than a name or a habit, and our life grows to be as worldly and self-regarding as public opinion will suffer it to be.

We need to be on our guard, then, and to set our watches by the sun, not by our neighbours' watches, nor even by the parish clock, lest we lose the true time altogether.

2. The second folly rebuked by St. Paul grows out of the first. For when men have satisfied themselves that they have reached the standard in vogue among their neighbours, and need strain no higher, they commonly *make themselves the standard by which other men are to be tried*. Having first made their immediate neighbours—mostly people who agree with them and feel with them—their standard, the standard by which they have tried themselves, they go on to make themselves the standard by which they try neighbours outside their immediate circle, if not also those who are within it; condemning all who differ from them, whatever the cause of the difference; condemning us if we believe less than they do, but also condemning us if we believe more; condemning us if we stand still when they advance, but condemning us none the less if we advance when they stand still; fitting bad motives to our good deeds if our good works take a form which they have not sanctioned, or even refusing to admit that there can be anything good outside the field which they have blessed.

It was thus with the Judaic opponents of St. Paul, though they were not what we should call bad men, unless a narrow and rigid sectarianism makes men bad, as perhaps it does. Whatever he taught, whatever he did, they suspected him, or even condemned him, until at last they formed a habit of attributing the worst motive to his best deeds, and even condescended to ridicule his personal appearance, as if there were some argument in that! Did he remain unmarried that he might be more free to encounter perils in the service of the Church? *That* was to reflect on St. Peter and the other Apostles who had taken a wife. Did he preach the Gospel without charge that his

disinterestedness might appear unto all men? That was because he *wanted* to be seen of men, and to imply that they, his opponents, had no right to live by the Gospel they preached. Did he refuse to impose circumcision on the Gentiles? That was both to insult the Jews and to make void the law. Did he collect alms from his Gentile converts for the poor Jews of Jerusalem? Let him be watched, or he might appropriate them to a private or a sinister use.

Now this was surely a terrible depth of baseness in men who professed to be animated, and in some measure were animated, by love for Christ. But may not we sink as low if once we make self the standard by which other men are to be judged? Who can have forgotten how the Church of our own day once treated those whom it dubbed "heretics" simply because they were before their time—such men as Maurice, Robertson, Lynch—though it now regards them as among its wisest and most devoted ministers; or how it treated Robertson Smith but the other day? It is but a little while since everything these men said was suspected, and everything they did misrepresented; and even good men could find no good thing in them.

Or if we turn to the political world, are similar instances lacking? Must we not confess that the temper which can see no good in a statesman of the opposite party, especially if he be either an avowedly religious man or a man a little before his day, is growing more common, and his very wisdom is denounced as folly, his very goodness derided as hypocrisy, and a selfish, or factious, or sinister motive is attributed to him even when his public conduct is most just, most patriotic, most loyal or generous?

It might well scare us from this ugly suspicious mood, so unworthy of reasonable, so doubly unworthy of Christian men, did we but remember the elementary rule, that we find the motives we attribute to others in our own hearts; that what we suspect in others is what we ourselves might

be guilty of in their place ; that the man who can see no good, nothing but base and sinister motives, whether in statesmen or in teachers of the Church who differ from him, is a man who would himself prove a rogue, devoid of patriotism, were he in power, or a fomentor of error and unbelief were he an advocate and defender of the faith. The one man whom it is wise of us to suspect is he who is for ever suspecting others—betraying his own character in the character of his suspicions ; the one man whom we may lawfully condemn is he who is for ever condemning others.

The only power that can raise men out of this depth of baseness, or guarantee them against it, is the power, or the “secret of Christ,” who has taught us to love men and not to judge them. When we make Him our standard instead of ourselves, and learn of Him to live for others instead of for ourselves, the meek, gentle, generous temper we derive from Him will lead us to find the good there is in every man, and to foster in him that which is good rather than to condemn in him an evil which we may only too easily find in ourselves. The temper which suspects and censures its neighbours is at the farthest remove from the mind that was in Christ Jesus ; and if his mind be in us, that base and evil temper can have no lasting dominion over us.

3. St. Paul rebukes a third folly, proceeding from the previous two. Trying themselves by the standard of their neighbours, and finding that they met that easy standard fairly well ; and then trying their neighbours by their own standard, and finding that *they* met it by no means well, the Judaists were so puffed up by the overweening self-estimate thus induced as to conclude that it was they, and not St. Paul, who were the real Apostles of Christ : that while he was utterly unfit for the prominent position he had usurped, and utterly incompetent for the great work he had taken in hand, they, on the contrary, were eminently qualified to adorn the most distinguished posts and to undertake the

most honourable and heroic enterprises. Had the Church but been wise, it would have turned with one consent, from him, to them.

As we look back and weigh the rival claims of the Apostle and his opponents, we are tempted to smile at their pretensions, so utterly baseless and absurd do they seem to us, until we remember how bitter they made his life to him, how hard his work. But before we give way to our natural scorn or indignation, it will be well for us to ask if no touch of their folly taints our wisdom. Surely there are men, in the Church as well as in the world of to-day, who would enter with a light heart on the very gravest responsibilities, and who, without counting the cost and considering whether they are able to meet it, are willing to engage in enterprises which might task the highest wisdom and courage. Surely we must all have met with men who have somehow persuaded themselves that, in almost every department of human activity, they know more and could do better than most of their neighbours. Yes, there are many even to-day who cherish a comfortable conviction that they could have filled a much more dignified position than any they have attained, and could have worthily expended a much larger wealth than they have ever possessed. There are still many among us who think that the Church would have shewn a truer wisdom had it elected them, in lieu of some of their neighbours, to posts of honour or of difficult and dangerous service. And we must all know *one* man—any glass will shew him to us—who finds it hard to convince himself that either God, or the Church, or the world, has given him quite as much honour, or trusted him with quite as much wealth or responsibility, as he could have wisely used, quite as much therefore as it is good for him to have.

Measuring ourselves by ourselves, and comparing ourselves with ourselves, we are not wise. No, it is our ignorance and our folly, not our wisdom, which prompts

that overweening estimate of ourselves and our own powers to which we are all prone, and which leads us indirectly to criticise, if not to censure, the Providence in which we profess to trust. And the one true remedy for it is to measure ourselves, not by ourselves, but by the standard of Christ; and to compare ourselves, not with one another, but with Him who was so great and yet so humble, so rich and yet so poor in spirit, so wise and yet so meek, who did so much for God and man and was yet so lowly of heart.

ALMONI PELONI.

*ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE INSTITUTION OF
THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

In the article by Dr. Sanday, on the Revised New Testament (Vol. II. pp. 401 *et seq.*), he adverts to the four parallel accounts of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and notices a difficulty in the longer reading of St. Luke's account "arising from the apparent division of the Institution of the Cup into two parts, separated from each other by the Institution of the Bread." Dr. Sanday appears to hesitate as to whether the latter clause of the passage is to be accepted as genuine or not.

It appears to me that a comparison of St. Luke's account with the ceremonies observed by the Jews at the Passover supper in our Saviour's time presents at once a natural and reasonable explanation of the difficulty. I take the account of the Passover supper from Lightfoot's Temple service. There were four cups of wine drank at the supper, but only two of these were preceded by a blessing or thanksgiving: viz. the first and the third. Thus, according to the Talmudical schoolmen, "He gave thanks most especially over the first cup and over the cup of blessing, over the first cup and over the third."

Now let us compare the account of the Passover supper there given with St. Luke's account of this Institution of the Lord's Supper.