

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WITH the issue for October, *The Bibliotheca Sacra* closes its sixty-fourth year of existence, and enters upon a fresh subject of study, hopeful and promising. It is the study of Christian sociology. And in order to give it justice Mr. Swift Holbrook, of Chicago, a prominent employer of labour, has been associated in the editorship.

Mr. Holbrook contributes to the current issue a series of "Sociological Notes," and a long article which has the first place in the magazine. The Notes are more personal, more American in fact, than the article. They express Mr. Holbrook's creed. They also enable us to see clearly that whether we find Mr. Holbrook worth reading or not, we shall at least be able to read him.

Mr. Holbrook's creed is expressed in this single sentence: "He believes in a more equitable distribution of the product than at present prevails; but he emphatically denies that the best way to secure it is by revolution." He believes that the more equitable distribution will come *without* revolution, even in America. For he has faith in the middle class. "We spell God and gold nearly the same, but God comes first and has a capital. The American people love justice and fairplay, and our great saving power is the middle class, who, after all, are nearest to God, for they strive not, as the wealthy, unduly for material wealth

and prosperity; not, as the lawless and ignorant, for the overthrow of established authority and the reign of anarchy. The saloon, demagogism, and ignorance are the worst foes of the American people."

The article, which goes by the simple title of "Christian Sociology," contains some wholesome truth well expressed. Dr. Lyman Abbott has said that St. James' "royal law," "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is only the Judaistic law justice; and that Christianity, as Christ exemplified it, demands that thou shalt love thy neighbour better than thyself; in proof whereof he quotes, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you." And now the effort to love one's neighbour better than oneself is coming to be quite a cult in American society. But Mr. Swift Holbrook will have none of it. "It will result," he says, "precisely as Hopkinsianism in New England did as preached by Dr. Emmons. The effort to get Christians willing to be damned, in order that their neighbours might be saved, was such an ignoring of duties to self, that it was not simply unnatural, it was unchristian."

There are few subjects upon which more has been written in recent years, and about which more indecision still remains, than the Kingdom

of God. And now an article appears in *The Contemporary Review* for October, over the signature A. N. Jannaris, which denies the existence either of the phrase or of the idea which the phrase represents. Jesus, says this writer, who is a Greek, and speaks with an authority upon the language of the New Testament which we are only beginning to recognise, never called Himself a King, and never spoke of His Kingdom. Once the name King is used in a parable (Matt. xxv. 34, 40), but the reference is to His second coming. In all cases in which we speak of the Kingdom of God and of His King, Jesus spoke of His lordship or dominion, and called Himself simply Lord.

The "*Kingdom of God*," or the "*Kingdom of Heaven*," in our English Versions is therefore a mistranslation. And it is none the less unfortunate that it has been so innocently made. There is no doubt that "Lord" (*κύριος*) is the title applied to Christ by all except His enemies; for although Matt. xxv. 34, 40 is not the only apparent exception, the other exceptions are equally apparent, and all refer to His parousia. Now the Greek word rendered "Lord" (*κύριος*) has no abstract noun of its own. The two possible formations (*κυρία* and *κυριότης*) were not in use in this sense. The one occurs but twice in the New Testament (2 John 1, 5), and is translated Lady in our Versions; the other but four times, and all in the latest Epistles (Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 10; and Jude 8). It was necessary therefore to use the abstract noun (*βασιλεία*) formed from the common word for King; and accordingly, wherever that abstract noun is used by Christ of His own supremacy, it ought to be translated "lordship," or "dominion."

Immediately one thinks of the second petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come," and the effect of this new translation upon it. Now the Lord's Prayer is the very subject of this Greek writer's article. And it is not the second petition only that is brought into a new and unexpected light.

The very first words, "Our Father which art in heaven," receive fresh emphasis. For this writer reminds us forcibly of the strong antithesis which runs throughout the language of our Lord when He refers to heaven and earth. "There are two mighty powers depicted as two spiritual figures. One represents the principle of good, and the other the principle of evil. The former is the Supreme Being. It is God who has sent Christ 'to save His people from their sins.' He dwells in *heaven*, and has angels as attendants and messengers. The other, the principle of evil, is His adversary, Satan. He rules over *this world*, assisted by a host of evil and unclean spirits or demons in the execution of his evil work, which consists in laying snares for man, and tempting him to sin, so as to cause his perdition. Jesus Himself very frequently alludes to this personified evil by various more or less euphemistic names, such as *Satan*, the *wicked* or *evil one*, the *chief of spirits*, the *foe*, *Beelzebub*, the *ruler of this world*. We have thus before us a graphic representation of two mighty allegorical figures engaged in a spiritual struggle, the one to *save* and the other to *destroy* mankind, with the approaching outcome that Light will prevail over Darkness."

Therefore we see that the words "in heaven" in the Invocation of the Lord's Prayer do not simply indicate locality or environment. They at once place us in the position of spectators of this grand conflict, and assure us that our prayer is directed to the present and ultimate Conqueror. It is faith triumphant over sight even in the very opening sentence, for though we are upon the earth where Satan is prince, our Father is in heaven.

The second petition would be translated by this Greek writer, not "Thy kingdom come," but "Thy dominion come." And the advantage of the new translation, besides its greater accuracy, is from the present point of view easily manifest. It retains the thought of the great spiritual antithesis. We pray, not simply that we may acknowledge Christ as King, and welcome the spread of His

Kingdom; we pray that He may extend His sway over the hearts and lives of men; displacing the present baneful sway of Satan.

And this is no anticipation of the third petition, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth," though it leads easily into it. For, according to this modern Greek author, "will" is here as unfortunate a mistranslation as was "kingdom" in the previous petition. Whether we take "will" in its archaic sense of "volition," or in its wider usage of "wish," "pleasure," and the like, it does not, in either case, render the meaning of the Greek word (*θέλημα*) which our Lord employed. That word designates, not the wish or will, but the *result* of the will, the thing which has been determined. God is represented in the Gospel of Jesus Christ as having not merely the will or wish, but the determination to redeem the world. It is therefore as untheological as it is ungrammatical to translate this masterful expression by the weak and wavering term "will." Whatever this prayer is, it is a prayer of faith. But it is faithless to say "Thy will be done." It admits that God's will may not be done, but be finally thwarted on earth by the cunning of the evil one.

It is well known that the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer, though it is so simple and childlike in our Versions, contains the most untranslatable word in the New Testament. It is rendered "daily" in the Authorised Version, and the Revisers have retained that rendering, though in their margin they give us another "for the coming day." These two translations, either "Give us this day our *daily* bread," or "Give us this day our bread *for the coming day*," at present hold the field. A. N. Jahnaris believes that they are both impossible.

"Daily" is impossible, because it is not a translation, and no one pretends that it is a translation. It is what the sense of the passage seems to demand, but it is no translation of the Greek word employed. And "for the coming day" is im-

possible, because it flatly contradicts our Lord's own teaching.

The difficulty arises from the circumstance that the Greek word (*ἐπιούσιος*) appears here for the first time in the Greek language, and never took root in that language. It was a coinage for the immediate necessity, and that necessity was never again felt with so sharp a precision. We are therefore thrown back upon the etymology or analogy of the word, and upon our Lord. The hard and fast etymology does not help us. It seems to give us "coming," the bread "for the coming day," and that is not possible. But there is a word several times used in the Septuagint (*περιούσιος*), a new word, and very like to the one before us. It is obviously coined from a common word (*περιουσία*), which signifies wealth, abundance. When Jesus says, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth" (Matt. vi. 19), He does not use this word, but He exactly expresses its idea. It means more than we actually need. Well then, if Jesus had in mind that noun (*περιουσία*) and its new adjective (*ἐπιούσιος*) used by the LXX., and He wished to express the very opposite idea from that which they conveyed, what was more natural or more easy than that He should coin the word (*ἐπιούσιος*) and fix His meaning for ever? If that is the origin of the word, then Jesus taught His disciples to pray not for abundance of bread, not for bread to be treasured up as wealth, but for simply enough of bread, for bread that was sufficient for immediate need. "Give us this day our sufficient bread."

One petition remains. It will be no surprise now to learn that our author accepts the translation, "Deliver us from the evil one," against which so much was said when it startled us in the Revised Version. But this throws light upon the first clause of the petition, "Lead us not into temptation," and gives it marvellous precision. To this author, with a native feeling for the meaning of his Greek tongue, "temptation" here is no generality. Temptation implies a tempter, and who can the tempter be but that same deadly foe whose presence

is so keenly felt throughout? We miss the reference, not merely by turning the personal "evil one" into the abstract "evil," but also by mistranslating the verb "lead." As it stands, and as we usually understand it, that word is positively heretical. It contradicts Scripture, and blasphemes God. God cannot be tempted by evil, neither tempteth He any man. The tempter is ever one and one only. And here our stumblingblock is simply due to the fact that the classical active voice is in Jesus' time passing into the Hellenistic middle, so that instead of translating it "Lead us not into temptation," we ought to have translated it, "Let us not be brought into temptation (the tempter's snare), but deliver us from the evil one."

Principal Witton Davies, of Nottingham, contributes to *The Freeman* a short account of the men and sayings that most impressed him at the recent Oriental Congress. The Congress was held in Geneva, and it is scarcely surprising that he missed some Englishmen there. The President of the Congress was Dr. Naville; and "among biblical scholars present I may name Professors Wellhausen (one of the quietest in the Congress), Stade, Bickell, Von Orelli, Kautzsch, Delitzsch (son of the well-known commentator), Budde, Bruston, Bevan (author of an excellent commentary on Daniel), Dr. C. H. H. Wright, and Dr. Toy." And there were others besides these. Oppert, Hallévy, and Jensen, the great African scholars, were there; also the "Arabicists," Socin (direct descendant of the heretic Socinus), Derenbourg, D. H. Müller, Margoliouth; and men who have made themselves a name in Syriac, like Nestle and Gottheil. Moreover, "my Welsh fellow-countrymen will be interested in knowing that Dr. Windisch of Halle, the celebrated Celtic authority, is an active member, and I have been asking him and others to start a Welsh section, for we Welsh claim to have come from the Garden of Eden, which is generally placed in the East." Finally, Mr. Witton Davies does not forget the two learned sisters of Cambridge, Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson.

Principal Davies never heard theologians debate more hotly or heartily than these Semitic savants. And yet he observed that Wellhausen, who was there and whose positions were sharply criticised more than once, "never uttered a syllable in public during the whole Congress."

Dr. Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University, seems to have been well forward. He presented to the Congress the latest instalments of his Hebrew Bible; he accused Delitzsch the younger of misplacing Paradise by not understanding biblical words in a biblical sense; and next day he led the way towards a great discussion by a discourse on "The Origin of the Five Books of Moses."

In that discourse, says Principal Witton Davies, "he put forth the following dates as practically agreed upon by the best judges, and briefly spoke of the influences under which the parts were brought together into one 'Torah.'" The letters stand for the several documents. J = Jehovistic; E = Elohist; D = Deuteronomic; P = Priestly:—

J	B.C.	850-700	
E	"	750-650	
D	"	621	
P	"	500	
J E combined						B.C.	630
J E D						"	550
J E D P						"	444
Torah in present form						"	400

"In every practical problem," says Professor Marshall in his *Principles of Ethics*, "common sense is the ultimate arbiter." And Mr. John Mackenzie, in his *Manual of Ethics*, the second edition of which has just been issued, after hesitating, lest that statement should sweep his science out of existence, ends by fully accepting it. "In every practical problem common sense is the ultimate arbiter."

That is to say, what science has to do is to discover the principles; it is for "common sense" to apply them to the details of life. It is not the function of any science to lay down practical pre-

cepts or to prescribe rules of conduct. And from that law even the science of ethics is not excluded. "It is not to tell us what in particular we are to do; it is not even to furnish us with definite rules to be applied in particular cases; it is to enlighten us with respect to the principles by which common sense is to be guided in its practical judgments."

Now if this is true of all the sciences we know; if the masters of each science whose laws have yet been discovered have come forward to tell us that this is true of their particular science, and there is no exception; is it not highly improbable that the greatest science of all should be found at fault? There is no science that contains principles so noble, and there is none that touches practice at so many points as the science of the Life in Christ Jesus. Its laws have not yet been formulated by us. They are still handled as if they were mere instances. But is it probable that this great science is the one exception to the rule given above? If every other science finds only principles for us, and leaves their application to our own "common sense," is it likely that the science of the Spiritual Life should make a new departure, and besides finding for us the grand principles of conduct, which we all admit it does, find also the exact application of them for every one of us, and for every circumstance in which we may be placed?

It is not likely. For, in the first place, we have come to recognise the universality of order in God's universe, and that it is the same Hand that is at work. And, in the second place, we can actually make our direct appeal to Him who gave us the laws of the Life in Christ.

We know that our Lord discovered to us the principles of the spiritual life. We know that He never ceased declaring and repeating them. Now He veiled them of necessity in parables. Now He spoke plainly and spoke no parable. And now He opened not His mouth, but made them real and made them ours, in deeds of love and self-surrender. Did He ever apply these principles in

the circumstances of any man's daily life? No, He never did. But once when called upon He was in haste to refuse to do it.

It is the well-remembered incident of the man who cried out of the crowd and said, "Master, speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me" (Luke xii: 13). Archdeacon Farrar describes it as "the most foolish and unwarrantable interpellation ever made to our Lord." And no doubt it was, though it is now made every hour of their lives by some of His closest followers. Christ's reply was swift and unmistakable: "Man!" ("the word is sternly repressive," says Farrar again) "who made Me a judge or a divider over you?" He was expounding the laws of the Kingdom, the principles of the Life in Christ. And one of these principles is that brothers must deny themselves for one another. Here was a clear case for its application then. But He would not apply it.

He never acted otherwise, though His disciples often expected Him to act otherwise. This was one of the inconveniences (if the word may be allowed) of His presence here, one of the things that made it expedient for them that He should go away. All things that He had received of the Father He had made known unto them. But they were not satisfied with that. They would run to Him for decision in every little perplexity that arose over the application of these things. But He would not be a judge or a divider even over them. He would not tell even them whether they ought to give tribute to Cæsar or no. It was inexpedient that they should ask such things. And He went away.

And now that He is gone we ask them more than ever. We cannot conceive the disciples running to Jesus for His decision upon the practical problems of their life so frequently as do many of His followers now. The Holy Spirit has been given to guide us into all the truth. But we do not want to possess the truth. We are content that the Holy Spirit should retain all the truth in

His own possession, and let us call upon Him for a clear judgment whenever we need it. Before we knew Christ Jesus we made our own decisions by the exercise of our own "common sense." And that common sense we knew to be the total sum of all the powers of mind and will which we possessed. Since we have become new men in Christ Jesus we have put away all these things—understanding, memory, thought, will, decision—we have put them all away as childish. We know that our new birth has covered all our faculties and made them new; has enlightened our mind, strengthened our will and disengaged it from former causes of interference. We know that we are able to form judgments and make decisions as we never were before. But we have renounced the right. When perplexity arises we simply ask a sign, which we never fail to receive, and then we follow it without hesitation, though it sometimes leads us into most unlooked-for situations.

Here is the question then. We are living under the dispensation of the Spirit: is it intended that the Spirit's guidance should be through the newly-ennobled faculties which we possess, or is it intended that we should now shut our eyes as if the new life in Christ had smitten us with blindness, and, like Simon Magus, call for some sign to lead us by the hand?

The question is a pressing one. For the theory, or rather the practice, which has just been suggested, meets us frequently in life, meets us sometimes in literature also, and has recently been seen in most unexpected places.

It meets us in life. Two men recently came together to consider the propriety of having special services in a certain place. The question was, Shall we have them now, or shall we wait till the harvest is over? One of the men suggested that they should ask the Lord in prayer. They knelt down. But while they knelt the thought came into the mind of the other that they were praying for two different things. The one was praying for

a "sign," the other was praying that they might be enabled to weigh carefully all the circumstances, and decide without selfish interference. If the passage of Scripture, "Wherefore criest thou unto me? speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward," had occurred to the one, he would, without a moment's further hesitation, have decided that the services should be held. If it had occurred to the other, he would have put it away from him as having no relation whatever to the question.

It meets us also in literature. A volume was recently published under the title of *The Same Lord*, which gave an account of the mission tour of the Rev. George C. Grubb, M.A., in Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. It was written by Mr. Edward Millard, who was one of Mr. Grubb's mission party, and whose wife was the only lady accompanying it. That volume contains the following among many similar incidents. We give it in Mr. Millard's own words.

"But in the midst of all this rejoicing at so many souls saved, and our need as regards financial affairs more than supplied, there was one thing we did not understand. For two days Mrs. Millard had been troubled with a swollen face (accompanied by terrible pain), which appeared to be a gum-boil. We applied hot poultices, and poppy and camomile fomentation (which we heated in a saucepan on the fire), and later on, a leech, and yet the pain was equally bad and the swelling only increased. This continued, and yet we were not certain about praying over her and using no means. All Friday and Saturday the poultices gave no relief, although applied day and night every half-hour, and it became almost impossible to take even a spoonful of beef-tea.

"After tea on Saturday evening we were sitting in the private room writing, when suddenly it came very strongly to me that the Lord wanted us to trust Him to heal her without means. So I said to the others, 'Perhaps the Lord wants to heal her by His own divine power.' We immediately knelt down, and waited some considerable time in

silence. Then the Lord said to me, 'Take the saucepan off the fire'; so I got up and did that, as the first step of obedience. Then Jackson said, 'Lord, it is done. We praise Thee!' and Mrs. Millard said, 'The pain is gone.' We simply shouted praise to God. Some tea and an egg were brought up, which she ate, and then sang a hymn at the top of her voice. Hallelujah! Praise be to God, our Lord has not changed! His power and His love are the same, and to Him be all the glory, Amen."

Now if that is actually God's way with us, the narrative will stand. We need not even protest against its apparent irreverence, which is only apparent, nor regret its lack of congruity, which is very real. But if it is possible that that is not God's way, is not the risk that is run somewhat serious? All's well that end's well, and it ended triumphantly this time. But it does not always end so.

A few weeks ago this paragraph appeared in the daily newspaper. We again quote it word for word:—"Mr. C. C. Lewis held an inquest on Wednesday at Great Baddow, near Chelmsford, on the body of Oscar Tyrrell, aged seven months, whose parents are members of the Peculiar People sect. The father said that no medical advice was taken when the child was ill. This was from no obstinate feeling, but from a trust in Christ and for conscience' sake. The coroner said it was the duty of parents to call in medical aid to their children. The Peculiar People were a most orderly, respectable, and sober body as a rule, but this appeared to be their weak point. He knew cases in which they had called in medical aid for their children so as to conform to the law, but had not called it in for themselves. He had a case not long ago in which a member of the Peculiar People called in a veterinary surgeon to his pig. It seemed strange that a man should get professional aid for his pig and not for his child. The father: 'The Lord has not told us about animals. There is no promise about them. It is to His people.' The foreman of the jury

said there were not kinder or more indulgent parents than Mr. and Mrs. Tyrrell. The jury returned a verdict of 'Death from Natural Causes.'"

We need not now send back that jury to reconsider their verdict. They admitted that it clashed with the evidence. And yet they felt that they could not return any other. But if that is so, if the plea of "a trust in Christ and for conscience' sake" is henceforth to prevail so unexpectedly in our courts of justice, surely it becomes us to do all in our power to enlighten conscience, and to make trust in Christ a zeal according to knowledge.

Besides, it is not a mere matter of faith-healing. Here lies the importance, and also, it must not be forgotten, the delicacy of the matter, that it opens up the whole field of "special" answers to prayer. There are those amongst us, and they are not a few, who would repudiate the two examples given, and even sever themselves from all association with "faith-healers," who nevertheless believe most implicitly in "special" answers to prayer, swiftly quoting innumerable instances from their own experience. But it is hard to see where the separation can be made.

It is certain that it cannot be made at the imaginary line which separates things sacred from things secular. With surprising infelicity Arch-deacon Farrar explains our Lord's refusal to arbitrate between the man and his brother by quoting the sentence, "My kingdom is not of this world." The sentence is true, but its application is impossible. In the sense Dr. Farrar means, Christ's kingdom *is* of this world. There is not a movement of this world, there is not an event that happens in it, that is not of deepest interest to Him. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without Him. The quarrel between these two brothers cut Him to the heart not less really than His heart rejoiced when Andrew went and first found his own brother Simon.

And there is no man who believes in "special" answers to prayer who limits them to things

spiritual. A few weeks ago there arrived at the door of the writer of these Notes a preacher of the gospel whom to name is to call up thoughts of a very close walk with God. He came unexpectedly, and he announced at once that he came for a certain piece of literature which he thought might be found in our possession. It was necessary, in order to find it, to search a file of some three hundred weekly papers, and yet he had to return by the very next train and must leave in fifteen minutes. We ran upstairs, brought down the file, gave him half the papers, and began to search the other half. The very first page that our eye rested on contained the information wanted. "What a strange chance!" was our exclamation; and immediately felt deeply rebuked when he said most quietly: "I was praying while you were upstairs that we might find the page in time." And he accepted it and went away.

The instance is not given for its singularity. It is given because it is recent, and because it is independent of hearsay; which must also be its apology if it seem too personal here.

The matter troubled us a little. Not that we felt there could be no such "special" answer to prayer. Certainly not because we felt the matter was too trifling for the interference of the Holy Spirit. And the trouble was not laid to rest when, a few days later, we spoke to the same preacher, and he quoted other instances of "special" answers which he had received. "I cannot but believe in special answers to prayer," he said; "I have had so many. For example, I often lose some of my papers, and after searching for some time I stop and offer prayer, when I am frequently led to lay my hand directly upon them." To which the obvious difficulty was expressed that such answers surely ran the risk of encouraging carelessness in the disposal of one's papers. Having many papers to handle in a day we were careful where we placed them, and were able to put our hand upon them without search. The trouble was not removed.

Nor was it removed when another example was quoted by another preacher, who heard the former, a preacher whose life is also a close following in the Master's footsteps. He said: "The late Dr. Andrew Bonar and I agreed that every Sabbath night we should remember one another in prayer. In the end of 1892 I was in New Zealand, and offering prayer for Dr. Bonar every Sabbath night as usual. But one Sabbath night I found I could not offer prayer for him. The next Sabbath night it was the same. And I could not offer prayer any longer for Dr. Bonar, till at last the word came that he was dead. He had died on the Friday preceding that first Sabbath evening when I could not offer prayer."

Upon which this new difficulty arose. In the sister Church to which this good man belongs there are good men also who are fully convinced that God has laid it upon them to pray for the blessed dead. If God is so careful that the blessed dead should *not* be prayed for, that He sends this servant of His a special sign of the death of his friend, how is it that He leaves these other servants of His constantly to do that very thing and to believe that they are glorifying Him thereby? The closest follower of the Lord Jesus Christ may be mistaken in the interpretation of a sign; but it is impossible that after all we know of Him our God should be found to be a respecter of persons.

Return, then, for a moment to the case of the child who died. If my child is ill, I call in the best medical skill I can command. In that I differ from the Peculiar People. But I do not leave the doctor to heal the child by his own skill. All the while my prayer is made to God; though it may be silently, and I may be intent over the things that he is doing; my prayer is made to God that He may so use the doctor's skill, so work through it, that the child shall be restored to health. In that I differ from the ungodly. The question therefore is not of the *fact* of special answers to prayer (though the word "special" is always faithless and unbelieving), it is of the manner in which the answer comes.