

stand, for the presence of the accusative *με* before the deliberate subjunctive *ποιήσω* seems to be anomalous. I know of no similar example, and the only reference to this construction I have come across is Nunn, *Syntax of N.T. Greek*, sect. 122, where it is said that the use (of the deliberative subjunctive) occurs even when words are inserted between *θέλειν* and the subjunctive; but the only example given is the B text of Mk 10²⁶. It appears, therefore, that this reading is too unusual to be accepted with confidence. Is there a solution to its origin, besides the explanation of conflation?

Wellhausen¹ accepts the reading of D, which omits *τί θέλετε*, and renders, 'Ich will es euch tun.' Rawlinson² thinks the omission accidental. The reading of D, *ποιήσω ὑμῖν*, suggests another solution of the origin of the B text. Might not the original reading have been *τί θέλετέ με ποιῆσαι; ποιήσω ὑμῖν*? If so, haplography would easily, and obviously, owing to the juxtaposition of *ποιῆσαι* and *ποιήσω* result, respectively, in *τί θέλετέ με ποιῆσαι ὑμῖν* (8^c L, the original order, no doubt, *ποιῆσαι με* of T.R. being merely a case of transposition), and *τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν*. The latter would then soon have been corrected either into *με ποιῆσαι* or *ποιήσω* (so Bruce). This suggested text also makes the omission of the first clause, resulting in the D text, quite easy and natural as a case of haplography.

It is true that with this suggested reading, we get what at first appears a startling statement from the lips of Jesus. 'What do you wish me to do? I will do it for you!' It seems to be a rash response. But is it so startling or so rash as it seems?

There is a striking parallelism in the sequences of events recorded in the two passages of Mk 8²⁹⁻³³, and 10³⁶⁻³⁸. In the former, there is first Peter's confession of loyalty to his master. Then (in the

parallel passage in Mt 16¹⁵⁻¹⁹) there is expressed the joy of Jesus at His disciple's loyalty, and great promises of reward—the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and the power of binding and loosing, *i.e.* he is to rule the Church. Then follows a prediction of the sufferings, rejection, and death of the Son of Man. Peter protests, and receives the rebuke of Jesus that he is not spiritually, but worldly minded. In the latter, there comes first a declaration, voiced by Peter, of the loyalty of the disciples. 'Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.' This is followed by the joy of Jesus expressed in the promise of rewards to His disciples. In the parallel passage in Mt 10³⁷⁻³⁹ they are promised twelve thrones from which they will judge the twelve tribes of Israel; *i.e.* they are to rule the Church (cf. Mt 16¹⁹). Then follows a prediction of the sufferings and death of the Son of Man. And then come James and John with their request, and the enthusiastic and ready response of Jesus. 'What do you wish me to do? I will do it for you!' At this point Jesus is displaying the same spirit of joy which recognized the loyalty of the disciples with promises of infinite reward; and the same spirit which Matthew's Gospel, with true insight, attributes to Him in His words to Peter, 'Blessed art thou' (16¹⁷). But on learning their desire He was disappointed, and rebuked them. 'Ye know not what ye ask.' It was power and distinction they wanted. They had not taken to heart His warnings of the approaching sufferings. It was the same with Peter. He shrank from the very idea that there would be suffering.

The suggested reading of Mk 10³⁶, *τί θέλετέ με ποιῆσαι; ποιήσω ὑμῖν*, brings out the enthusiastic willingness of Jesus in response to the request of the sons of Zebedee, only to be followed by disappointment, disillusionment, and a rebuke.

A. J. B. HIGGINS.

Lancashire Independent College,
Manchester.

¹ *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, iii. 89.

² *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 145.

Entre Nous.

Our Sufficient Beauty.

At a time when most publishers are holding back from publishing volumes of sermons, Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have ventured with three really fine collections. In the January number we spoke

of two of these—*Christian Intimacies*, by the Rev. George J. Jeffrey, and *Captain of the Storm*, by the Rev. Arthur A. Cowan. This month we have *Our Sufficient Beauty*, by the Rev. G. T. Bellhouse, B.D. (5s. net). When he was at Regent Square, Mr.

Bellhouse published a distinctive volume, but we think this is his first since he went to Westbourne Church, Glasgow. The title is taken from Mr. H. G. Wells' 'The History of Mr. Polly,' 'Man comes into life to seek and find his sufficient beauty.' It is in the last sermon, 'We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ,' that we find this quotation made use of. In the second half of the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel there is described how five men, two together and the other three separately, came to find their 'sufficient beauty,' even Jesus Christ. Apart from the first two they all found Him along different paths. In a very fresh way Mr. Bellhouse describes these ways to Christ. Andrew and John had earlier contacts—the preaching of John the Baptist. Peter, vivid, impulsive, most at home in a boat on the lake, what was he won by? By Jesus' faith in him. And Philip? He did not come to Jesus. Rather Jesus went to him. He is the typically practical individual. He was won by the practicality of the Master. A complete contrast in temperament was Nathanael. He was the sort of man who was always tortured by problems. What won him? 'It was surely that he felt that this Teacher felt all the things he felt, felt all the pain and misery and injustice of this world as though they were His own, and yet, in spite of it, was able to believe and say "Father." This surely is the significance of Jesus' remark, "Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee." Under that fig tree, Nathanael had been wrestling with one of his perennial problems. And Jesus felt for him and longed to help. And Nathanael felt He could help.'

Life Consisteth Not.

'Possessions work oppression. Possessions tyrannize over a man, compel him to attend to them, or contrariwise they clog his consciousness by the dead weight of their indifference and inertia. English middle-class houses of the last generation were heavy with sheer accumulation; suitable and unsuitable, useful and useless, grotesque and picturesque, lay down together on floors, mantel-pieces, cabinets and the like, the sole justification for their convergence being that they were the possessions of a certain householder. Twentieth-century houses are less encumbered, nevertheless we are all of us occupied with "our things"—"I must pack my things," "I must sort my things," "I must fetch my things," such words are constantly on our lips, and they testify to the concern

that we have for these things of ours. And yet so many of our things mean so little to us. We barely use them, but we insist on carrying the burden of them lest at some time we should want to use them. And we fail to see that in the interval of their disuse they are mere lumber, mere dust. There is, I think, no doubt that the majority of men suffer, consciously or unconsciously, by reason of the things which they possess.'¹

Myth and Truth.

'Truths which break through language and escape, which spread beyond anything we can say of them, are what we call myths. We are inclined to derogate myths to the level of the fairy stories of our childhood, but in this we are indeed grossly mistaken, for "the saner and greater mythologies are not fancies, they are the utterance of the whole soul of man, and, as such, inexhaustible to meditation." . . . The first chapters of Genesis are a fable, you say; yes, but a fable more true than fact. Wittgenstein says, "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must keep silence," and he is right in recognizing that a sea of silence flows round the logician's little island of the explicit. But myth breaks this silence, utters the unutterable symbolically, at one remove, as it were. "Behind the myth are concealed the greatest realities, the original phenomena of the spiritual life."²

Lord Halifax and General de Gaulle on Missions.

Lord Halifax wrote in a letter to Dr. William Paton: 'I am myself quite clear that the support of foreign missionary work in time of war is an essential part of the Church's witness. I should much regret if the responsibility which Christian people rightly feel towards the special needs and charities that press upon us in war-time should lead them to desert this permanent and universal Christian obligation.'

Mr. Charles Collet, the London secretary of the Paris Missionary Society, has been entrusted with the full responsibility for the Mission fields of the Society in British Africa which are under the administration of General de Gaulle. In reply to requests for facilities for correspondence with the Cameroon and Gaboon Missions, Mr. Collet has received the following letter from General de Gaulle:

¹ E. M. Rowell, *Time and Time Again*.

² *Ibid.*

'I am happy to inform you that there is no obstacle of any sort to the activity of the Evangelical Missions in the territories where they are working. Indeed, as soon as we had finished the occupation of Gaboon, we thought of your missions and of their needs and of the means of giving them the help which they needed, and at the request of the Governor of Gaboon a special credit has been placed at his disposal so as to allow him to help, with both money and supplies, the missionary establishments which are in his territory. The local authorities have my instructions to facilitate, as far as possible, the work of the missionaries of whatever confession in their territories.'

Weymouth New Testaments.

It is interesting to note that there has been some criticism of those in charge of Church of Scotland canteen work for having distributed large numbers of New Testaments in Weymouth's modern translation. A story given in the April number of *Life and Work* from a northern camp is a fair comment on such criticisms. The New Testament had been, not pressed upon the men, but offered to any who came and asked for them. Immediately some thirty-six were applied for—one by a man who was billeted in a hut with five others. Next day he remarked, 'It was jolly interesting. I sat up half the night reading it.' And later his five companions came to ask for copies also. One of them remarked, 'We might as well be reading it for ourselves as have Johnnie reading snatches to us at two o'clock in the morning.'

Programme Not Enough.

'The foundations of our New Jerusalem depend not upon material programmes, but upon the acceptance of the ideal of love as the guiding principle of personal and national life.

'That the change can be accomplished if we really desire it, and that the initiative can come from our own sorrowful but undaunted country I have never doubted, even in its darkest hours of complacency and self-seeking.

'To-day, after witnessing London's endurance of its crucifixion without panic or vindictiveness, I am more than ever confident that the British people—provided that their innate decency is neither destroyed by the propaganda of hatred nor warped by excess of avoidable suffering—are as capable as any people in the world of accepting a way of life determined by love rather than by power.

'We beseech thee to take us as we are, and of thy mercy make us what thou wouldst have us be.'¹

Ignorance of the Average Person.

The *Baptist Times* of 10th April reports that Miss Dorothy Sayers (the well-known writer of 'detectives') spoke the previous week at a meeting of the Baptist Board. She avoided sentiment, except the strong feeling of the tragedy of the sheer ignorance of the average person. Miss Sayers said she had been alarmed by the complete ignorance of children, and others, of the Bible and of Christian truths. Without an understanding of fundamental truths they have no clear way of life. 'A great part of the world has denied the Christian ethic; the other part has forgotten the reason of their faith.' The word 'dogma' was the most frequently repeated in the address: 'This is a world-war of dogma, between two different and contrary explanations of the universe.'

The use of theological terms in the pulpit was emphasized. Ministers must do something about it! Salvation—redemption—worship—communion—these mean something quite different to the minister and the ordinary man. 'The simple Gospel itself is by no means simple.' There is a necessity to teach the people 'some sort of doctrine about the nature of man, what we mean by sinfulness—the internal dislocation within man which roots evil in his good; and the uniqueness of Christianity.'

THE SON.

The manger where He lay
New-born upon the hay,
The bench at which He toiled,
The hands His labour soiled,
The simple words He said,
The multitudes He fed,
The grave by which He sighed,
The Cross on which He died,
His resurrection face
Bright with celestial grace—
All the long way He trod,
Still speaks the love of God.²

¹ Vera Brittain, *England's Hour*.

² R. Glanville, *Jesus and His Passion*.