

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WITH the increase in the circulation of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES we have endeavoured steadily to increase the contributions by distinguished scholars. But the result has been that the lighter features which characterised it at the first, and through which we believe it won its earliest success, have been more and more crushed out. In the enlarged series, to which we go forward in October, room will again be found for many of these early features, while we shall at the same time have freedom to secure the co-operation of able writers in larger measure than hitherto.

The issue for September will contain an account of the very full programme which it will be in our power to offer. Now we shall only speak of the Guild of Bible Study (of which the report for the current volume will be found on another page).

In October 1890, the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, wrote to the Editor as follows:—

*"I regard your proposal to concentrate the study of your Guild on limited portions of the Old and New Testament as likely to be extremely helpful. A little done well, gives power to advance; and new subjects are approached with more confidence. I earnestly hope the Guild may thrive and need larger space than at present in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES."*

What Dr. Rawson Lumby thus hoped for has taken place. It is to meet the demands of a thriving Guild more than for any other single reason that THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be

published in an enlarged form, beginning with the issue for October.

It is proposed that the Members of the Guild should study, with the aid of some Commentary, either the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, or the Epistle to the Hebrews, or both.

The results of this study may be sent to the Editor from month to month in the shape of Notes, exegetical, expository, or critical, or Notes of Sermons or Addresses, or short illustrative paragraphs. The best of these papers will be published every month in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and the writers, seeing them there, may send to the Publishers for the book they select out of a list which will be given.

Members may also test their progress at the end of the session by answering questions which will be found in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June. For the best answers, modern books of value will be given.

The Guild will now be more formally constituted through the enrolment of Members. The sole condition of membership will be the promise to study (that is, not merely to read, but to study with the aid of some reliable Commentary) the proposed portion of Scripture between the months of November and June.

This promise is not to be held in any respect binding should unforeseen circumstances prevent its being carried out.

Church dignitaries, Professors of Theology, and any person engaged upon the *study* of any other

portion of Scripture, will not be expected to make the promise, but will be enrolled as Honorary Members.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September, Professor Graetz of Breslau will reply to Dr. Swete's criticism of his theory as to the origin and date of the Septuagint.

Principal M'Clellan's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, "On the Rendering 'Daily Bread' in the Lord's Prayer," has attracted considerable attention, and, what is better, has led to some serious study. "It has given me two days' hard study, which, however, I do not regret," says one correspondent. Another very kindly sends Bishop Jebb's letter on the subject, from Foster's *Life*, and at the same time makes the interesting remark that in the three petitions of the first part of the prayer we have the Ruler, the kingdom, and the subjects; while the three petitions of the second part seem to refer to the present, the past, and the future needs of the petitioners. Jebb's letter is well worth reading still, notwithstanding its polemical references to "the justification man." It is the work of a sound scholar, and contains nothing which can be pronounced wrong even yet, fuller MS. evidence and textual study only going to confirm its positions.

The most important part of Bishop Jebb's letter, however, is its arrangement of the prayer, which is as follows. We give it exactly as it stands:—

- I. ΠΑΤΕΡ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, }  
 Ἁγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομα σου, }  
 Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, }  
 Γενθῆτω τὸ θέλημα σου, }  
 Ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. }
- II. Του ἄρτου ἡμῶν του ἐπιουσίου, }  
 Δος ἡμῖν σημερον' }  
 Καὶ ἀφεῖς ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα τὰ ἡμῶν, }  
 Ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιερῶμεν τοῖς ὀφειλεταῖς ἡμῶν' }  
 Καὶ μὴ εἰσενεγκῆς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν πειρασμὸν, }  
 Ἀλλὰ ρυσαὶ ἡμᾶς ἀπο τοῦ πονηροῦ Ἀμην. }

The letter ends with a curious suggestion, which we must give in the Bishop's own words:—"I have yet one more observation, which, perhaps, is too trifling to be hazarded; and yet there may be, possibly, something in it. In the arrangement that

I have offered above, the parallel lines uniformly terminate with the same letter; a technical nicety which our Lord might have seen it wise to descend to, both for the aid of memory and to secure the integrity of the prayer from subsequent mutilation or addition. Many poems of the Old Testament are acrostics, the lines beginning with the letters of the alphabet in regular succession. Why, then, might not a contrivance less palpable, but somewhat similar, be resorted to in the New Testament? That I may not be misunderstood, I shall add what, perhaps, is needless: the first and fifth lines end with the letter Σ; the second, third, and fourth with Υ; the sixth to the eleventh with Ν."

Again, from a leading article in the *Daily News* of May 22nd, 1891, we quote the following:—"The specimens in English show that the form, and even, to some extent, the substance of the great prayer, has varied at different periods of the language. In the text of it sent from Rome about 1150 by Pope Adrian, the Englishman, one part of the supplication runs—

'That holy bread that lasteth ay,  
 Thou send to ous this ilke day.'

This is curious in its purely symbolical rendering of the petition for sustenance. Wickliffe, on the other hand, seems to stipulate, in the interest of a good appetite, that he is not to be fed with bread alone—"Geve to us this dai our breed over othir substance."

It will be observed that Pope Adrian's text approaches closely to Principal M'Clellan's rendering. We shall say nothing of the way in which the *Daily News* has misunderstood Wickliffe's rendering "over-othir-substance," which is simply a literal translation of the Latin *super-substantialem*.

What is a "seared" conscience? To sear is to dry up, and the adjective sear (spelt also sere) is almost appropriated for the dried-up leaves of autumn; whence sorrel, the diminutive of sear, the reddish-brown colour of the withered leaves. But the verb to sear, starting from the same point, early took a somewhat diverging direction, and signified to scorch—

"I would to God that the inclusive verge  
Of golden metal, that must round my brow,  
Were red-hot steel, to sear me to the brain!"

SHAKESPEARE, *Richard III.* iv. 1.

From scorching it is not far to cauterising, and the old writers on surgery use it so; whence Palsgrave, in his dictionary: "I sere with a hooted iron, as a smyth or cyrurgien doth. *Je brusle de fer chault.*" This is the sense in which the word still maintains a precarious foothold in the language. A seared conscience is a cauterised conscience—a callous, dulled, deadened conscience, a conscience that has, by neglect and abuse, gone past feeling and beyond appeal.

It is in this sense the phrase is understood in the single occurrence of it in the Bible—1 Tim. iv. 2, "Having their conscience seared with a hot iron." But there is a strong probability, as Professor Wolf points out in the *Homiletic Review* for June, that the meaning of St. Paul's word here is just the opposite of that. The phrase is simply "branded in their own conscience" (κεκαυτηριασμένων [or rather with Tisch., Treg., Westcott and Hort, κεκαυστηριασμένων] τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν). The verb used (cauterizo), although the English *cauterise* is taken from it, does not mean to cauterise, but to mark with a *cauterion* (καυτήριον), or branding iron. "This cauterising," says Huther, "was done not only to slaves, that they might be easily distinguished, but it was also a mark of punishment, indicating the subject to be a criminal."

Accordingly, Dr. Wolf believes that the clear sense of the passage is, that as criminals bore upon their forehead the brand of their infamy, so the false teachers and seducers, against whom St. Paul gives warning, had stamped upon their conscience the sense of their sin. "So far from having become insensible to the sinfulness of their conduct, these heretics carry about with them the perpetual consciousness of sin. It is branded into their conscience with a red-hot iron. The evil they are doing by their false teaching they do in the face of their better knowledge. As the previous passage has it, they are 'speaking lies in hypocrisy.' Professing to teach divine truth, they

are knowingly teaching error. They are acting against the unmistakable and ineffaceable self-reproach written upon their conscience with a burning pen. A similar party is spoken of in Titus iii. 11, as one who 'sinneth, being self-condemned.' The testimony of his own conscience glares upon his eyes like the brand upon a criminal."

In one of our earliest issues we had a note upon the use in Scripture of the words "Rock" and "Stone." This is the subject of one of Dr. Hopkins' "Unwritten Books" in the *Church Review* (N.Y.). He holds that the two words are employed with perfect precision, and in clear distinction throughout the Bible; "Rock" being used of God, or of Jesus Christ in His Divine nature, and "Stone" being applied to our Lord in reference to His human nature only. Thus, even when they come together in the sentence, "He shall be for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel" (Isa. viii. 14), Dr. Hopkins believes that the prophet separates the two, speaking first of the Messiah in His human nature, because the Jews were scandalised first by the things concerning His human nature—His poverty, His Galilean origin, His refusal to be made a king—and next of the Messiah in His Divine nature, because not till late in His earthly ministry were the Jews amazed at His Divine claims, and denounced Him for making Himself equal with God.

In the discussion of these words, the critical passage is the deliverance of our Lord to St. Peter, Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter (Greek, *Petros*), and on this rock (Greek, *petra*) I will build my Church." Says Dr. Hopkins: "There is a perfect harmony of all Holy Scripture, Old Testament as well as New, if we interpret the words, 'On this rock I will build my Church,' of the deity of Christ Himself, of which St. Peter had just made confession. If we interpret them of St. Peter, we go against the entire analogy of Holy Scripture, including St. Peter himself in his epistles. We apply a higher title to St. Peter, who on one occasion was a 'Satan,' than Holy Scripture gives even to the spotless human nature of Christ Himself!"

portion of Scripture, will not be expected to make the promise, but will be enrolled as Honorary Members.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September, Professor Graetz of Breslau will reply to Dr. Swete's criticism of his theory as to the origin and date of the Septuagint.

Principal M'Clellan's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, "On the Rendering 'Daily Bread' in the Lord's Prayer," has attracted considerable attention, and, what is better, has led to some serious study. "It has given me two days' hard study, which, however, I do not regret," says one correspondent. Another very kindly sends Bishop Jebb's letter on the subject, from Foster's *Life*, and at the same time makes the interesting remark that in the three petitions of the first part of the prayer we have the Ruler, the kingdom, and the subjects; while the three petitions of the second part seem to refer to the present, the past, and the future needs of the petitioners. Jebb's letter is well worth reading still, notwithstanding its polemical references to "the justification man." It is the work of a sound scholar, and contains nothing which can be pronounced wrong even yet, fuller MS. evidence and textual study only going to confirm its positions.

The most important part of Bishop Jebb's letter, however, is its arrangement of the prayer, which is as follows. We give it exactly as it stands:—

- I. ΠΑΤΕΡ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, }  
 Ἁγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομα σου, }  
 Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, }  
 Γενηθῆτω τὸ θέλημα σου, }  
 Ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. }
- II. Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον, }  
 Δός ἡμῖν σήμερον' }  
 Καὶ ἀφές ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα τὰ ἡμῶν, }  
 Ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιεμένοι τοῖς ὀφειλεταῖς ἡμῶν' }  
 Καὶ μὴ εἰσενεγκῆς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν πειρασμόν, }  
 Ἀλλὰ ρυσαί ἡμᾶς ἀπο τοῦ πονηροῦ Ἀμην. }

The letter ends with a curious suggestion, which we must give in the Bishop's own words:—"I have yet one more observation, which, perhaps, is too trifling to be hazarded; and yet there may be, possibly, something in it. In the arrangement that

I have offered above, the parallel lines uniformly terminate with the same letter; a technical nicety which our Lord might have seen it wise to descend to, both for the aid of memory and to secure the integrity of the prayer from subsequent mutilation or addition. Many poems of the Old Testament are acrostics, the lines beginning with the letters of the alphabet in regular succession. Why, then, might not a contrivance less palpable, but somewhat similar, be resorted to in the New Testament? That I may not be misunderstood, I shall add what, perhaps, is needless: the first and fifth lines end with the letter Σ; the second, third, and fourth with Υ; the sixth to the eleventh with Ν."

Again, from a leading article in the *Daily News* of May 22nd, 1891, we quote the following:—"The specimens in English show that the form, and even, to some extent, the substance of the great prayer, has varied at different periods of the language. In the text of it sent from Rome about 1150 by Pope Adrian, the Englishman, one part of the supplication runs—

'That holy bread that lasteth ay,  
 Thou send to ous this ilke day.'

This is curious in its purely symbolical rendering of the petition for sustenance. Wickliffe, on the other hand, seems to stipulate, in the interest of a good appetite, that he is not to be fed with bread alone—"Geve to us this dai our breed over othir substance."

It will be observed that Pope Adrian's text approaches closely to Principal M'Clellan's rendering. We shall say nothing of the way in which the *Daily News* has misunderstood Wickliffe's rendering "over-othir-substance," which is simply a literal translation of the Latin *super-substantialem*.

What is a "seared" conscience? To sear is to dry up, and the adjective sear (spelt also sere) is almost appropriated for the dried-up leaves of autumn; whence sorrel, the diminutive of sear, the reddish-brown colour of the withered leaves. But the verb to sear, starting from the same point, early took a somewhat diverging direction, and signified to scorch—

"I would to God that the inclusive verge  
Of golden metal, that must round my brow,  
Were red-hot steel, to sear me to the brain!"

SHAKESPEARE, *Richard III.* iv. 1.

From scorching it is not far to cauterising, and the old writers on surgery use it so; whence Palsgrave, in his dictionary: "I sere with a hooted yron, as a smyth or cyrurgien doth. *Je brusle de fer chault.*" This is the sense in which the word still maintains a precarious foothold in the language. A seared conscience is a cauterised conscience—a callous, dulled, deadened conscience, a conscience that has, by neglect and abuse, gone past feeling and beyond appeal.

It is in this sense the phrase is understood in the single occurrence of it in the Bible—1 Tim. iv. 2, "Having their conscience seared with a hot iron." But there is a strong probability, as Professor Wolf points out in the *Homiletic Review* for June, that the meaning of St. Paul's word here is just the opposite of that. The phrase is simply "branded in their own conscience" (κεκαυτηριασμένων [or rather with Tisch., Treg., Westcott and Hort, κεκαυστηριασμένων] τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν). The verb used (cauteriazō), although the English *cauterise* is taken from it, does not mean to cauterise, but to mark with a *cauterion* (καυτήριον), or branding iron. "This cauterising," says Huther, "was done not only to slaves, that they might be easily distinguished, but it was also a mark of punishment, indicating the subject to be a criminal."

Accordingly, Dr. Wolf believes that the clear sense of the passage is, that as criminals bore upon their forehead the brand of their infamy, so the false teachers and seducers, against whom St. Paul gives warning, had stamped upon their conscience the sense of their sin. "So far from having become insensible to the sinfulness of their conduct, these heretics carry about with them the perpetual consciousness of sin. It is branded into their conscience with a red-hot iron. The evil they are doing by their false teaching they do in the face of their better knowledge. As the previous passage has it, they are 'speaking lies in hypocrisy.' Professing to teach divine truth, they

are knowingly teaching error. They are acting against the unmistakable and ineffaceable self-reproach written upon their conscience with a burning pen. A similar party is spoken of in Titus iii. 11, as one who 'sinneth, being self-condemned.' The testimony of his own conscience glares upon his eyes like the brand upon a criminal."

In one of our earliest issues we had a note upon the use in Scripture of the words "Rock" and "Stone." This is the subject of one of Dr. Hopkins' "Unwritten Books" in the *Church Review* (N.Y.). He holds that the two words are employed with perfect precision, and in clear distinction throughout the Bible; "Rock" being used of God, or of Jesus Christ in His Divine nature, and "Stone" being applied to our Lord in reference to His human nature only. Thus, even when they come together in the sentence, "He shall be for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel" (Isa. viii. 14), Dr. Hopkins believes that the prophet separates the two, speaking first of the Messiah in His human nature, because the Jews were scandalised first by the things concerning His human nature—His poverty, His Galilean origin, His refusal to be made a king—and next of the Messiah in His Divine nature, because not till late in His earthly ministry were the Jews amazed at His Divine claims, and denounced Him for making Himself equal with God.

In the discussion of these words, the critical passage is the deliverance of our Lord to St. Peter, Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter (Greek, *Petros*), and on this rock (Greek, *petra*) I will build my Church." Says Dr. Hopkins: "There is a perfect harmony of all Holy Scripture, Old Testament as well as New, if we interpret the words, 'On this rock I will build my Church,' of the deity of Christ Himself, of which St. Peter had just made confession. If we interpret them of St. Peter, we go against the entire analogy of Holy Scripture, including St. Peter himself in his epistles. We apply a higher title to St. Peter, who on one occasion was a 'Satan,' than Holy Scripture gives even to the spotless human nature of Christ Himself!"

But is not the real crux of this passage in the words which follow, of which there can be no question that they refer directly to Peter himself, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"? Dr. Hopkins holds that by proving the reference of "this rock" to be to Christ's deity, he has destroyed the foundation of the Romish claims. But if the Roman Catholic interpretation of the keys is to be left standing, it is doubtful if the basis of the claims has been very seriously shaken. This, however, does not enter into Dr. Hopkins' immediate purpose, and he does not touch that passage. But we may refer to an article of much greater power and elaboration than any of Dr. Hopkins' "Unwritten Books," an article in which the difficulty is keenly discerned and manfully grappled with. In the *Contemporary Review* for February, Principal Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, Oxford, writes on "Anglo-Catholicism and the Church." There he says that the only text which may seem to speak of peculiar official functions or offices as belonging to any of the Apostles is this saying to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." But he insists that the verse must be read in its connection. Peter had made his confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" on this rock, this truth confessed, His Church was to be built; and the confessor, the man who stood

by this truth, preached it, obeyed it, was as such to have the keys. It was not an absolute promise to an official, or to a man who holds an office, made because he held it, and to his successors, for of succession or successors there is no word; but it is a promise to a person who has made a confession, because of the confession which he has made.

Dr. Fairbairn strengthens his argument by calling attention to the startling saying to St. Peter in the very next paragraph of St. Matthew's Gospel. Because he rebukes Christ for prophesying of His death, St. Peter receives the awful rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" The saying, like the very different one which precedes it, is appropriate to the moment; "neither is absolute, nor significant of a permanent character, or inalienable office, or indefeasible function; but each is through and through conditional and relevant to the context. Peter, so far forth as he would dissuade Christ from His supreme act of sacrifice, is Satan, an enemy and tempter; so far forth as he confesses the highest truth as to Christ, Christ has committed to him the keys of the kingdom. Both must be conditional, or both absolute; but it were hardly reasonable to conceive Peter as through all time filling the incompatible offices of Satan and the keeper of the keys."

## The Office of the Ancient Jewish Priest.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM J. ADAMS, D.C.L., RECTOR OF ALL SAINTS', DORCHESTER.

THERE are few subjects in connection with Divine Revelation on which greater confusion prevails in the minds of Christians than the nature of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, the analogy and relation which exists between them, and the distinctive characteristics of each.

This confusion is not a harmless one. It is fraught with practical consequences which affect the religious life and standing of the believer. For by reason of this want of a clear conception of these two "administrations" or "ministries," many Christians are being led away backwards into Jewish principles and doctrines and practices.

This confusion centres in the Jewish priesthood. Here it culminates, and from thence it wends its

way into almost every part of the Christian system. We propose therefore, in the present paper, to inquire into the nature of the office of the priest of the Old Dispensation; and, having ascertained what were his functions and their typical meaning, then in a subsequent paper to discuss their bearing upon the sacred ministry of the New Dispensation.

In the patriarchal age, and before the constitution of the Jewish economy at Mount Sinai, the father of the family was also the priest of the family. He only offered up the recognised sacrifices and conducted the religious worship of the household. Abundant instances illustrative of this will at once occur to the minds of our readers in the lives of the patriarchs.