

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

A SHORT while ago Dr. M'Laren of Manchester published a volume of sermons under the title of *Christ's Musts*. It is an unmelodious title, but it is a great subject. 'Must' is Christ's own word. Our word is 'ought.' We say we ought to do a thing. Christ could not say He ought; that would have suggested the possibility of His not doing it. As Mr. Askwith, in his *Christian Conception of Holiness*, puts it, 'In the ideal state of human existence every "ought" will have become a "must"; Christ's every "ought" was a "must."'

Dr. M'Laren divides Christ's 'Musts' (it is a pity that the combination is so inharmonious) into four classes. In one class He recognizes and accepts the necessity for His death. 'Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.' In another class He expresses His filial obedience and consciousness of His mission. 'I must work the works of Him that sent Me while it is day.' In a third He anticipates His future triumph. 'Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring.' And in a fourth He applies this greatest principle to the smallest duty. 'To-day I must abide at thy house.'

Following the example of Professor Ramsay and Professor Blass, another great Greek scholar, Dr. W. G. Rutherford, the Headmaster of Westminster

School, and author of *The New Phrynichus*, has appeared in the field of New Testament study. He is very welcome. These men bring fresh breezes with them. The breezes may sometimes ruffle us a little, but they are bracing.

Dr. Rutherford has published a new translation of the Epistle to the Romans. He has not discovered a new text. That subject he scarcely touches. Yet his translation differs constantly from the translations we are familiar with. And the reason of that, says Dr. Rutherford, is that the Authorized translators did not know the Greek language which they had to translate; the Revisers did not translate the Greek language which they knew.

Even the Revisers did not know the Greek of the New Testament as we know it now. Since the Revised Version was published in 1881 great strides have been made in the knowledge of New Testament Greek. 'The observations of Viteau, and more especially of Blass, have furnished a sound foundation for further research, and before scholars are done with this fascinating study they will extinguish many misconceptions, and will succeed in demonstrating that, different as it is from classical Greek, the singular speech in which the oracles of God are enshrined has nevertheless

a precision and a force of its own.' The Revisers did not know that as we know it now. Still, they knew more than their predecessors did. And yet, says Dr. Rutherford, their predecessors often got at the meaning by following the demands of the context, while the Revisers missed it by following the literal signification of the words.

The mistakes of the Revisers are due to two chief sources. They 'contrived to convince themselves' that the same Greek word, whatever its context, must invariably be rendered by the same English word. Now such a theory would always be pernicious in translation, but is peculiarly unfortunate, says Dr. Rutherford, in the translation of St. Paul. For St. Paul's vocabulary is extremely meagre. The same word (he mentions *πλοῦτος*, *περισσεύειν*, and *ὁμοίωμα*) has to do duty in many contexts. This is no fault of St. Paul's. It is due to his being born a Jew, which in other respects was an advantage to him. It is due to his being born a Jew, and then missing the grammatical and rhetorical discipline which most towns in the Roman Empire at that time provided. It is no fault, and it is no disparagement. The marvel is that with so defective an instrument he achieves such results. Had he known Greek better, says Dr. Rutherford, he would have proved himself one of the greatest masters of expression and of style. But the Greek he knew was the Greek of popular language, not the speech of the learned. The regularity which the Revisers expected in him they therefore had no right to expect.

The other chief source of the Revisers' mistakes was their misunderstanding of the way in which certain prepositions had come to be used in later Greek. Dr. Rutherford thinks that St. Paul himself did not understand the usage of the Greek prepositions well. He says that he frequently misuses them. For he had to learn Greek, and no man can learn to use two languages idiomatically. 'In proportion as he learns the one he must be content to unlearn the other.' Still, his

misuse of prepositions does not make his meaning unintelligible, or prevent it from being transferred to another language. Dr. Rutherford believes that if the Revisers had been less literal in their translations of St. Paul they would have been more successful.

For the chief difficulty of the Greek preposition as it is found in the New Testament is its pregnancy. Thus in Mk 6<sup>52</sup> it is said that the disciples, seeing our Lord walking on the water, were beside themselves for fear, 'for they had not understood at the loaves.' Thus the words are rendered literally (*οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις*). To turn that into English literally is to make no sense. It is necessary to say that they 'had not understood at the time when the miracle of the loaves was performed.' Again, in Jn 13<sup>26</sup>, Jesus is said to have dipped a piece of bread and offered it to Judas, 'and after the piece of bread Satan entered into Judas' (*καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον, τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς*). One has heard the emphasis laid so strongly on Satan as to suggest that Satan entered in after the bread, and might be found there along with it. The meaning is that, after the piece of bread had been offered to Judas, Satan took possession of him. Once more, 'What shall they gain who are baptized for the dead?' (1 Co 15<sup>29</sup>) means 'what shall they gain who are baptized, if their baptism (the suffering involved therein) only brings them death like other men?'

So the great difference between Dr. Rutherford's translation of the Epistle to the Romans and the Revised Version arises from the translation of the prepositions. Dr. Rutherford endeavours to translate the prepositions properly. It may be due to our familiarity with the language of the English versions, but it cannot be said that Dr. Rutherford is always easier to follow. 'This,' he says, 'was once a plain letter concerned with a theme which plain men might understand. Why is it so far from plain now to many who in knowledge and even in spiritual discernment are at

least the equals of the tradesmen, mechanics, and servants to whom it was immediately addressed? Is the prologue, then, more easily understood as Dr. Rutherford translates it? This is his translation and punctuation: 'Paul, bondservant of Jesus Christ, apostle by call set apart for the gospel of God, which by the mouth of his prophets he did in sacred records promise of old concerning his Son, made man of David's race, avouched son of God when by an act of power conditioned by informing holiness he had been raised from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have received grace and commission to promote for his sake the obedience that is faith among all the gentiles, to whom you yourselves belong, Jesus Christ's by calling, TO ALL WHO ARE IN ROME BELOVED OF GOD, SAINTS BY CALLING.'

But a better test of Dr. Rutherford's advantage will be found in placing his version of that supremely difficult passage, Ro 3<sup>21-26</sup>, side by side with the Authorized and Revised Versions:—

AUTHORIZED VERSION.	REVISED VERSION.	DR. RUTHERFORD'S VERSION.
But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God <i>which is</i> by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through	But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through	But now is made known a righteousness of God apart from law, attested by the law and the prophets, a righteousness of God consisting in faith in Jesus Christ, intended for all who have faith, and no distinction made—for all have sinned and fail to realize the glory of God—righteousness being freely imparted to all by his grace in so far as they have an opportunity of deliverance by ransom provided in Christ Jesus, whom God of old designed as a pro-

AUTHORIZED VERSION.	REVISED VERSION.	DR. RUTHERFORD'S VERSION.
faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, <i>I say</i> , at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.	faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, <i>I say</i> , of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.	propitiation, to be accepted by faith, a propitiation consisting in the shedding of his blood, ordained to make known God's righteousness for the remitting of past sins through his forbearance, that thereby his righteousness should be made known in the present age; the import being that God is righteous, and does impart righteousness to every one who is actuated by faith in Jesus.

The new translation is more modern; it is also unmistakable,—and both are good qualities in a translation. But until we get familiar with it we shall not find it easier to follow.

*The Bible Student and Religious Outlook* of America has begun a new issue under the shorter title of *The Bible Student*. The fifth number opens with a series of notes by Professor Warfield, of Princeton, on blunders. Professor Warfield distinguishes blunders from mistakes. Anyone can make a mistake, he says, but it takes a genius, or at least an educated man, to make a blunder. A blunder is due, in short, not to ignorance, but to sleep. 'The best blunders are the nods of Homers, and you need the Homer as well as the nod.'

Dr. Herrick Johnson knew that the great demand made upon the modern preacher is to translate the scenery of the Bible into modern circumstances. So he told his hearers that Peter 'cowered before a barmaid,' and the translation is

published in his *Lectures on the New Testament*. Dr. Charles Wadsworth knew it also, and explained that the Epistle to the Colossians 'had been penned by two private secretaries, Tychicus and a young coloured man, Onesimus.'

These are what Dr. Warfield calls Homeric nods. He thinks Homer is present also when the very learned French writer, Dr. A. Lesson, in his work on *Les Polynésiens*, takes Shortland to task for calling the sentences or devices which the natives have adopted for intertribal distinction *mottos*. 'It is probable,' he says, 'that this is not the right word; for *moto* in Maori signifies only "to box," "to strike with the fist." It is our opinion that the indigenous expression is *motu*, which means "divided," hence separation, division, distinctive sign. Each tribe now has its *motu*.' Clearly Dr. Lesson knows more Maori than English.

Again, it is clear that Dr. Otto knows his classics better than his New Testament when he writes on 'The Gods in Latin Proverbs' in 'that excessively learned' German review, Wölfflin's *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie* (1886, iii. 213). 'We read of Apollo,' says Dr. Otto, 'in Ambrose's *de ben. patr.*, 12, 59: "As the good husbandman said: I have planted; Apollo watered," where, without doubt, Apollo is identified with the sun-god who pours down the rain and sunshine upon the fields.' Apollon has been credited with things he probably never did, like the writing of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But 'the sun-god who pours down rain' is a new rôle for him.

But there are more elaborate and less excusable blunders than these. Dr. Warfield quotes two of them. The first is due to Dr. John Vaughan Lewis. Dr. Warfield found it among things 'Worth Repeating,' in the *Sunday-School Times*. The title is 'Three Marias and three Loves.' On the 'three Loves' Dr. Lewis says that there were three words in Greek to express the idea of love, while in the English there is only one. The three

words were *eros*, *philia*, and *agape*. Since *eros* had become too degraded for use in the New Testament, St. Paul coined another to take its place. That other was *charitas*. So the Pauline triad for love, he says, is *philia*, *agape*, and *charitas*. And then he explains the special force of each word. *Philia* was the love of Mary Magdalene—an impassioned love not rebuked of Christ in the days of His flesh, but which might not touch His risen person. *Agape* was the love of 'Mary of Cleopas,' a sympathetic love 'that caught its best inspiration from her sister, the blessed Virgin.' The Virgin Mother's own love was *Charitas*, a spiritual love, originally from above.

For elaborate absurdity, Dr. Warfield doubts if that can easily be beaten—and then he proceeds to beat it in a long quotation from an English writer. The writer is 'no less esteemed a teacher than the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan.' He is writing in the late Mr. Moody's *Record of Christian Work* (February 1900) on the meaning of the name JEHOVAH. He finds that that name is made up of three words,—*yehi*, 'He will be'; *hove*, 'being'; and *hahyah*, 'He was.' Take the first syllable of the first word (Yeh), the second syllable of the second (ov), and the last syllable of the third (ah), and you have the name Jehovah. Therefore the whole name means the supreme, eternal, self-existent God—'He that will be, He that is, He that was.'

When Professor A. B. Davidson wrote his article on GOD in the new *Dictionary of the Bible*, he was taken to task by an *Athenæum* reviewer for saying that the name Jehovah was not older than the time of the Reformation. The reviewer apparently fell into Mr. Morgan's blunder, though not so elaborately. Professor Warfield quotes from Dillmann: 'That "Jehovah" is no form at all, and rests only on misunderstanding of the *Kere perpetuum* of the Massorites, who read it sometimes "Adonai" and sometimes "Elohim," is well enough known; no Jew ever read "Jehovah," and indeed no Christian for the first fifteen hundred years

of our era ; Galatin, the Italian confessor of Leo X., first ventured on "Jehovah," and the pronunciation spread rapidly in the 16th century, although Luther, in his version at least, still retains "Lord" for it.'

'A critical case for testing any theory of the variations of conscience is that of the trial of Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac. I have never yet seen a satisfactory explanation of this moral perplexity.'

The book from which those two sentences are quoted is *The Christian Conception of Holiness*, by Mr. E. H. Askwith, M.A., Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is a book on ethics. It does not, however, treat ethics apart from religion. It marks a stage in the progress of the science of ethics in showing that that is no longer possible. But its originality does not consist in that. Its originality consists in showing that revealed religion is the highest known (we think also the highest possible) form of ethics ; that, in short, the whole duty of man lies in the New Testament conception of holiness.

In the light, then, of the New Testament conception of holiness, Mr. Askwith looks at the sacrifice of Isaac. He is not concerned with its literary character. It makes no difference to the moralist whether it is a historical occurrence or only 'truth embodied in a tale.' It forms part, not of the New Testament conception of holiness, but of the revelation upon which the New Testament conception rests. That earlier revelation is no doubt progressive, moving to higher tablelands along with the race whom it enables so to move. But just because it is progressive, its stages must be at the worst lower ; they cannot be out of line with or contradict the revelation that follows them. We cannot be commanded to offer our sons in sacrifice ; but unless that contradicts a fundamental ethical intuition, Abraham might properly have been commanded so.

Is it immoral, then, to take a human life? Is it a fundamental moral intuition that the taking of life is sin? Mr. Askwith says it is not. Murder is sin, because murder contradicts law. Its sinfulness lies in its illegality. That is the meaning of the word 'murder.' But even to-day (and here there is no reference to the ethics of war), man does, under certain circumstances, take away the life of man, and that deliberately. It is therefore not a primary moral intuition not to kill. In being commanded to take his son's life Abraham could not feel that any ethical first principle was contradicted.

On the other hand, gratitude is an ethical first principle. To make return for benefits received has always been a duty. Its reach is seen only in Christianity. 'God so loved the world' is the basis of man's highest ethical attainments. Abraham did not feel its full force. Yet Abraham did feel its force. It was to him a primary moral intuition.

Now Abraham had received this child from God. The circumstances of the birth, the very atmosphere of Abraham's life, pointed directly to God as the Giver. What shall I render unto the Lord for this benefit toward me? Surely not less than the people around him were ready to give their gods. The trial to Abraham's faith lay, not in the taking of his son's life, but in casting away the heir whom God had given him. Abraham's faith triumphed over that, and Abraham's gratitude had its way.

Our fathers got over the offence of the sacrifice of Isaac by packing everything into typology. We find it no offence. It is an untarnished instance of the highest ethical intuition we shall ever know.

The Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, has published, through Mr. Murray, another volume of sermons. The title of one of Dr. Salmon's sermons is 'The Colour-Blindness of Judas.'

Is it possible to say anything new about Judas Iscariot? Will it be worth saying? Dr. Salmon says something that seems to be new, and it seems to be worth saying.

Dr. Salmon does not try to whitewash Judas. The only great attempt made in that way was made by a man of genius, and it failed. But he does try to show that we are not so very much better than Judas. For essentially his mistake, his crime, was due to colour-blindness. He had eyes and saw not. He did not see who Jesus was.

In the first place, Dr. Salmon cannot believe that Judas was an irreligious man. The other apostles had full confidence in him, and Jesus chose him. His religion, however, was more cool-headed (add cool-hearted if you wish) than that of the rest of the Twelve. 'It was in vain that their Master told them that their enterprise would but end in an ignominious death for Himself. This was to His eager disciples simply incredible; they thought that He must be using words in some mysterious sense.' But Judas was not carried away by his comrades' enthusiasm. He began to have the most gloomy misgivings as to the success of the cause to which he had rashly joined himself. He knew the enmity of the Jewish rulers, the power of the Roman arm. He and he alone was at one with Jesus in that, and to him the triumph of the Jewish rulers was the end of the cause of Jesus.

Why, then, did he not simply withdraw from the cause? He had comrades in it, says Dr. Salmon, and he could not leave them to perish. This is Dr. Salmon's point. Is it too improbable? He says that Judas saw that nothing could save Jesus. But it was still possible to save His disciples. He believes that Judas bargained that the disciples should be spared. He cannot otherwise understand the forbearance of the Roman soldiers when Peter drew his sword. This takes the venom also out of Judas's kiss. For it was necessary to indi-

cate Jesus alone and quietly. The usual kiss of salutation would do that best.

So Judas did not simply withdraw. For he believed with Caiaphas that it was necessary that one man should die in order that many might not perish. He alone could save the rest. He could save them by becoming His betrayer. It is as if some one of the Gunpowder conspirators had discovered the evil or futility of that plot. How is the mischief to be prevented at the cheapest sacrifice? Only by giving the ringleader into the hands of the government on a stipulation that the rest should escape. Judas did not simply withdraw. He covenanted for thirty pieces of silver and betrayed Jesus unto them.

But those thirty pieces of silver? We make too much of those thirty pieces of silver, says Dr. Salmon. The day is not long past when British judges took rewards, and British statesmen were in the pay of France. It is more than indelicate to our thinking to receive rewards, even though it be for administering strict justice. But it was not considered indelicate then. And how much less would the code of honour of Judas's day recoil from taking reward for an action which was considered just and even merciful.

There is, last of all, the death of Judas. He saw it was a crime, and went and hanged himself. But Dr. Salmon thinks that that is no unusual proceeding. The suicide did not follow immediately on the crime, as is usually inferred from St. Matthew's narrative. The narrative in the Acts gives time for Judas to become, and perhaps enjoy becoming, a landed proprietor. What led to the change of the mind, the remorse, and the suicide, Dr. Salmon does not speculate. Was it the resurrection from the dead, the very event that gave the rest new courage? Dr. Salmon says only that if Judas had not been colour-blind he would have seen that it was better that the whole nation should perish than that this one Man should die.