

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

holiest man, the temptation which is as the whispering of the evil one in our ear, and as the terrible grip of his hand upon our throat. And thus in proper succession the petitions follow on one another. In fact, the teaching that underlies them, if fully expounded, would be found to correspond exactly with Butler's scientific analysis of temptation in his *Analogy of Religion*, and the Lord's Prayer is seen to be as true to the facts of the natural life of the human soul as is Butler's philosophical treatise itself.

A. T. BURBRIDGE.

MINISTERING IN SACRIFICE.

As a description of the function of the Christian Ministry the phrase "ministering in sacrifice" is not familiar to the reader of the English Bible. But if he examines the margin of the Revised Version at Romans xv. 16, he will find it suggested there as giving more correctly the force of the word which in A.V. is rendered simply "ministering"—the gospel of God. And that being so, the verse, with its context, certainly invites a closer examination than it commonly receives from those who repudiate the sacrificial aspect of the Christian ministry, which is usually presented as the "Catholic" view. In his book entitled *The Conception of Priesthood*, Prof. Sanday has drawn special attention to this passage, making it the text of his lecture on "Sacerdotalism," and finding in it evidence of a conception of his ministry in the mind of the Apostle which provides Scriptural support for a certain theory of sacrificing priesthood. The theory in whose defence this passage is appealed to, is that most recently defended and expounded by Dr. Moberly in his *Ministerial Priesthood*. And in raising the question whether the language of this verse will really bear the construction

put upon it and provide Scriptural support for this theory, I should like to acknowledge the admiration with which even those who profoundly differ from its conclusions must regard Dr. Moberly's book. It contains many high and moving passages. And its analysis of the relation of love and sacrifice, with the new emphasis it lays on the essential connection of the pastoral and the priestly aspects of the holy ministry, are only the most striking of many passages which are gratefully treasured by us all.

The purpose of Dr. Sanday's lectures and of the examination of this passage which they contain is frankly eirenical. He believes that between Hort, with Bishop Lightfoot and Hatch behind him, and Dr. Moberly and those he represents, there is more common ground than at first appears; that in a debate which turns largely upon the meaning of words the debaters have not used words in the same sense, but, while differing in appearance, have agreed in reality. Recognising that "the burning question in relation to the Christian ministry is precisely this, Is the Christian minister a sacrificing priest or is he not?" and that "the crucial point in the function of the priesthood is its relation to sacrifice," he finds in this passage, not indeed the *name*, but the *thing*; and, after summarizing Dr. Moberly's view, asks whether this conception of the Christian ministry has, or has not, a Scriptural sanction; and replying that it has, adds, "I doubt if there is any passage so strong as the verse I have chosen for my text."

Such, then, is the importance attached to this passage. It stands at the commencement of the epilogue to the Epistle to the Romans. The Apostle, having brought his argument to a triumphant conclusion, has added a series of earnest warnings and exhortations in which he gives practical application to his doctrine. Being about to close his letter, he seems to be touched with a sense of compunction. It is no conventional apology for his authoritative

speaking, which follows. It is not so much a fear that his tone may be resented as a true humility of spirit which prompts him to justify the tone of his closing utterances. There has been an accent of authority of which he himself at least is conscious. He has indeed written "somewhat more boldly" than his wont. And the grounds on which he proceeds to justify himself are certainly very remarkable. They are not those so frequently and so firmly adduced in other passages. He bases his authority, not on his apostleship, his standing in the eyes of men as one sent and commissioned by the Head of the Church, but on his standing before God as a *minister* (λειτουργόν) of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, *ministering in sacrifice* (ἱεουργοῦντα) the gospel of God that the *offering* (προσφορά) of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being "sanctified by the Holy Ghost" (R. V. marg.).

That we have here sacerdotal imagery is beyond dispute. The question is, how far the imagery is the colouring or the substance of the Apostle's thought. Of the three phrases emphasized, the first (λειτουργός) in itself and by itself might be called neutral. Etymologically it denotes no more than one who renders official service. The sphere of the service, whether in things secular or sacred, civil or ecclesiastical, falls to be indicated by the context. And the possibility of its use in a secular or non-ecclesiastical sense is sufficiently attested for the LXX. by passages like Joshua 1. 1, 2 Samuel 13. 18, 2 Kings 4. 43, and for the New Testament by Philippians 2. 25. On the other hand, the specifically ecclesiastical sense is the more common in LXX., though even there it is used of Levites rather than of "priests," and indeed sometimes in direct distinction from "priests." But it is open to doubt whether in any case in the New Testament the word or its derivatives would necessarily be taken in this sense apart from the context.

The precise force of *λειτουργός*, therefore, must be ascertained from a consideration of the subsequent phrases. And in them the sacerdotal colouring is plain. As regards *ιερουργεῖν*, it is hardly necessary to investigate its use as a neuter verb. It plainly means "to work in sacred matters," "to perform sacred rites"; and, as these rites were for both Pagans and Jews consummated in sacrifice, "to offer sacrifice." Its force as an active verb is not so obvious, and its interpretation often depends on whether emphasis is laid on the first or on the second of its roots. Thus Erasmus at first rendered it in this passage, "administrans," but afterwards "sacrificans." The passage in Basil of Cæsarea (quoted by Fritzsche) establishes the sense of "sacrifice" for post-Biblical Greek, for in his Commentary on Psalm cxvi. (cxv.) *ιερουργήσω σοι τῆς αἰνέσεως θυσίαν* finds a parallel in *θύειν τῷ Θεῷ αἰνεσιν*. And though the well-known quotation from 4 Maccabees (vii. 8) is itself difficult to render, it furnishes a close parallel to St. Paul's language, *τοιούτους δὴ δεῖ εἶναι τοὺς ιερουργούντας τὸν νόμον ἰδίῳ αἵματι*. "Sacrificans legem" stands as much in need of explanation as "sacrificans evangelium"; but at the least the word conveys this—"sacerdotis modo aliquid tractare" (Fritzsche). Hofmann denies either priestly or sacrificial connotation in the word, and insists on rendering, "administering holy service"; but he stands almost alone among commentators of mark. Meyer ("in priestly fashion administering the gospel of God,") and Godet ("accomplissant le sacerdoce de l'évangile"), both admit the sacerdotal quality of the word.

As to the third of these phrases there can be no doubt whatever. There may be uncertainty as to the reality which answers to the figure, and as to the point at which the figure passes over into reality, but the language of the last member of the verse (*ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορά κ.τ.λ.*) is

plainly derived from the familiar ritual of sacrifice. And of course the clear meaning of these words will govern the construction we put on the preceding phrases, confirm the sacerdotal interpretation of *ἱερουργούντα*, and decide the meaning to be ascribed to *λειτουργός*. As Calvin puts it in his Commentary: "Nihil certius quam Paulum hic ad sacra mysteria alludere, quae a sacerdote peraguntur."

It follows then from a candid exegesis of this passage that the Apostle of the Gentiles did realize his ministry in terms of priesthood, that he was conscious of performing a sacrificial function, and that this aspect of his ministry was so far from being secondary or accidental in his estimation, that, on this occasion at least, he based upon it his right and claim to speak authoritatively to the Church of Christ.

This looks like acquiescing in the theory of the ministry presented by Dr. Moberly and defended by Prof. Sunday. But in reality we are still far short of that; for we have not yet touched the true *differentia* between the Roman theory and the Reformed. It is only partially true to say that the crucial question is: Is the Christian minister a sacrificing priest or is he not? The true *differentia* comes into view when the question is raised: What does the Christian minister offer in his priestly capacity? The Romans assert, the Reformed deny, that it is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. It is this connection between the New Testament idea of sacrifice as offered by or within the Church of Christ and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper for proof of which one looks in vain whether in exegetical studies or in dogmatic expositions. And yet it is in this assumed connection that the Catholic conception of priesthood finds its supreme function, and out of this connection that it has deduced its most serious errors.

On this, which is really the crucial question, Dr. Moberly offers no detailed discussion. I hope it is not uncharitable to say that just here in his argument, hitherto so careful

and elaborate, and, admitting his premises and method, so largely convincing, the mediæval conception of priesthood as finding its expression in the Sacrifice of the Mass (or Eucharist) slips in without either Scriptural justification or logical necessity.

On page 258 we find the priesthood of the ministry displaying itself *κατ' ἐξοχήν* in the ritual of the sacraments. The priesthood of the ministry follows as a corollary from the priesthood of the Church. But when we seek for the connection between the priesthood of the Church and the sacraments, particularly that "of the altar," we find it making a sudden appearance on page 255. It is grounded, so far as it is grounded at all, on the priestly character of the Church as found in her "identification with the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ." But the doubt forces itself upon us whether "identification" is a wise word to use in an attempt at a definition. Dr. Moberly is fond of it. It may almost be said to be his key to the problem. It takes the place occupied in older theology by "acceptance" or "appropriation." He speaks of the Church as "reflecting, nay, in a real sense as being, [Christ] Himself." There is a curious relation here suggested with those at the other extreme of thought from Dr. Moberly, who are trying to find the key to moral problems of practical life in the "identification" of Christ and the Christian. Both schools provoke the same question: Is this thought true? is it a safe guide for our thinking? While so much in His personality, in His life and in His sacrifice, was admittedly unique, the idea of "identification" between our blessed Lord and any human disciple, or any body of disciples, is surely a dangerous logical weapon. For we may happen to postulate "identity" in the very things in which He is unique. And is not one of these things the work He wrought for us, *erga Deum*, deriving its validity, according to our faith, from that oneness with the Father which was

His in a way in which it cannot be ours? In fact this "identification," whether it be of Christ and the individual believer, or of Christ and the Church, as in certain defences of "Catholic" doctrine, touches very closely on the kernel of our faith. It seems at least to impinge on the Divine glory of Christ.

In Dr. Moberly's view the priesthood which finds its consummating expression in the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, is but a particular case and representative manifestation of the general priesthood of the Church. The Church identifies herself in her Eucharistic worship with our Lord's "sacrificial self-oblation to the Father." And yet it is precisely this connection between the priestly attributes of the Church, not to speak of individual ministers, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which seems to be wholly lacking in Scriptural authority, for which even this passage in Romans xv. cannot be claimed as support.

The Scriptural evidence is remarkable. For there is one class of passages in the Epistles where the language of sacrifice is freely used in reference to the Christian Church; and, on the other hand, there is one passage where the Eucharist is distinctly referred to, its ceremonial described, and its significance exalted. But neither when the Apostle is dealing with the sacrament is there any allusion to priesthood or sacrifice, nor when he is enforcing the duty of sacrifice does he connect it in the most distant way with the sacrament. Such holding apart of two ideas which were fundamental, the one to the life, and the other to the ceremonial, of the Church is surely incredible if the apostolic Church saw any connection between the two. And yet this connection is essential to that theory of ministerial priesthood which is known as "Catholic," and which Dr. Moberly expounds.

For that theory, Dr. Sanday claims the support of this passage. And we have seen to what point that claim can

be substantiated. The Apostle does describe his ministry in terms of priesthood and sacrifice. But is the sacrifice the sacrifice "of the altar"? and does he represent his priesthood as finding its culmination, or even in any degree its expression, in this sacrament?

I believe that a further consideration of his words must lead to our answering both questions in the negative, and our conviction will only be confirmed by an examination of his other references to sacrifice.

We shall be led to this conclusion if we give due weight to the strangeness of the expressions which the Apostle uses. They must have fallen very strangely on the ears of those to whom they were addressed. Probably they were intended to be startling, and in their pregnant brevity there was the clear assertion of a new situation. Paul begins each clause by striking a familiar note. But each of the three phrases as a whole forms a crashing discord. The opening words in each case are sacerdotal in their associations. "A minister in priestly service of Christ Jesus," "ministering in sacrifice," "in order that the sacrificial offering" . . . But each clause closes with a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, a phrase in startling contradiction to the anticipations of his readers. This will readily be granted in regard to the first of the three; for it is a commonplace of Paul's self-description. "A temple functionary," but not officiating for, or to, Israel, nay, a new thing, a temple functionary officiating for the Gentiles.

The same pregnant antithesis is surely to be found also in the following clauses. It is suggested by the very difficulty which has all along been felt in rendering or interpreting the former of the two, *ἱερουργούντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*. The translators give either a literal but unintelligible rendering, like Erasmus' "sacrificans evangelium," and Luther's "opfern das Evangelium," or one which obliterates the force of the verb, as Weizsäcker with "im heiligen Dienst der Evan-

gelium Gottes." In fact, the more we press, as Dr. Sanday has justly done, the etymological force of *ἱερουργούντα*, the more plainly does its incongruity with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον appear. That incongruity must have been intentional and significant. The natural, the anticipated, way of closing the phrase would have been with some such word as *λειτουργίαν* or *θυσίαν*: and by substituting τὸ εὐαγγέλιον the Apostle would startle his readers into perception of the fact that as the sphere of the priestly ministry had widened, so the form and material of its operation had changed entirely. Paul was conscious of conserving in himself the priestly character, but he found its functions fulfilled, not in offering sacrifice, not even in "pleading" a sacrifice offered once for all, but in proclaiming the gospel, and in the Divinely mediated results which followed the proclamation. This was plainly seen by the older commentators. Theodoret remarks: "The preaching of the gospel he calls a sacrificial work, and genuine faith an acceptable offering." And Chrysostom paraphrases: "This is my priesthood, to preach and proclaim."

What the results of this preaching were, and how they corresponded in thought with the liturgical procedure of the older dispensation, so justifying the imagery of these phrases, we see from the third clause of this passage. Here again we find an illuminating *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. "In order that the sacrificial offering of the *Gentiles* might be acceptable." In their pre-Christian days a similar phrase had been familiar to the readers of the Epistle. Jews and Gentiles alike had known the desire that their sacrifices might be acceptable to Heaven. But where the diction with which they had been familiar put τῶν ἀμνῶν, τῶν βοῶν, the Apostle boldly substitutes τῶν ἐθνῶν. And thereby once more he conveys with pregnant brevity the suggestion that lambs and bullocks were no longer the material of sacrifice. But their place had not been taken by another

representative sacrifice, however highly symbolic and refined. In their place he puts, as the material of sacrifice, men, a people, a community, that race to which he had a special commission as preacher of the gospel—the Gentiles.

That this is the sacrifice on which the Apostle's thought and desire are fixed, is commonly admitted—the offering which the Gentiles *are*, not the offering which the Gentiles bring. For this is the sense confirmed by the other passages where Paul exhorts his readers to present as "a living sacrifice" their bodies, to "present" their members as instruments of righteousness unto God. This is the "sacrifice of their faith," along with which he rejoices to be himself offered (Phil. ii. 17). This "spiritual service" (*λογικὴ λατρεία*) has now taken the place of the ritual representations which were shadows of the sacrifice to come. For this representative, or typical, character of the Mosaic sacrifices is not exhausted in their foreshadowing the great sacrifice of Christ. Christ was not offered *by men* to God. They represented also, under material forms, the offering by man of himself, which now, by the sanctifying of the Spirit and the sacrifice of Christ, had become possible in reality and in completeness. In all such passages there is the same tacit, but all the more emphatic, contrast between the form that has been done away and the substance, the moral reality of surrender that has taken its place. But of the idea that the earlier and grosser form has been replaced by a more symbolic but still material form there is not a trace. Had Paul recognised such a form in the breaking of bread and the pouring of the wine, he could not have refrained from saying so where he treats so profoundly of the Holy Supper and its significance.

On the other hand, those who regard the Apostle's language in Romans xv. 15, 16 as wholly metaphorical, as, for example, Dr. Jowett, in his Commentary, seem to do less than justice to his earnestness and sincerity of thought. Neither do

they do full justice to the consciousness of the Christian minister. Paul's language here is pictorial in the sense that it is coloured by the reminiscence of prophetic phraseology and of temple ritual, but the substance of it corresponds to an absolute reality, to an actual element in the consciousness of the Christian minister and in the process of Christian worship. He has been standing before men as the ambassador of God, ministering the Gospel of Christ in proclaiming the sacrifice of Calvary and the love-meaning in its heart, preaching Christ and Him crucified. The power of the Holy Spirit, shed abroad in their hearts in response to their asking, has wrought by the agency of His word to unite these men in one spiritual body, to cleanse and anoint them unto a holy priesthood. Using still the same human agency, the Spirit has quickened in the people the consciousness that they are not their own, the impulse to self-surrender, the willingness to live henceforth not unto themselves, but unto God. The offering is ready, the offering which *is* the people now "sanctified by the Holy Ghost." The Apostle-minister now turns as *their* representative before God. He presents in sacrifice no symbol, but a reality, the sanctified body, which has been cleansed by the Word and constituted by the Holy Ghost, as an offering acceptable to God.

Such appears to be the conception of the Christian ministry, in its priestly aspect, which underlies this passage. It has no more to do with the Eucharist than with any other means of grace. It may be prejudice that makes it seem to me simpler, profounder, and more ethical, as well as more truly spiritual, than that which is offered by the "Catholic" Church. But I cannot resist the conclusion that it is the conception held and presented by St. Paul.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.