

work such a miracle as would make Herod a religious man again though he kept his sin. Jesus came; Herod 'questioned him in many words.' *But He answered him nothing.*

For God heareth not sinners. But if any man (or woman) be a worshipper of God, and doeth His will, him He heareth. These two things are necessary—worship and conduct. And knowledge is necessary.

There is another case of silence. Jesus withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon. And behold, a Canaanitish woman came out from those borders, and cried, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. *But He answered her never a word.*

What a stone of stumbling it has been. Dr. John HUTTON takes it to be due to the ignorance of the disciples. He had to teach them that God is no respecter of persons. Well, He had, and

He taught them. But the woman must not be forgotten.

Why did He not answer her? Because she lacked knowledge. She wanted bodily healing, and she wanted it for another. He will heal the daughter, but He will also heal the mother, and that as soon as she is able to receive the healing. If He heals the daughter at once the mother may be content to go. Once He healed ten lepers and let them go. Only one of them returned to thank Him for it.

See how the knowledge came to her. It came along with faith. It came as faith. Her earnest desire for the healing of her daughter made her importunate. And such importunity has a double power. It prevails with God to give, and it opens the soul to receive. The knowledge came with the faith, came in leaps and bounds; and when she was able to receive the fulness of the gift, 'O woman,' He said, 'great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'

William Sanday and his Work.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

Second Paper.

DR. SANDAY'S second work, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (Macmillan, 1876), has for its second title *An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work entitled 'Supernatural Religion.'* It was written at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, and therefore of necessity is of a controversial character. This did not make the production of it more pleasing to the writer; but to some extent this characteristic makes it more valuable to the reader, if he cares to know how such a work may be written with as little as possible of the controversial spirit, and as much as possible of consideration towards a provoking, and sometimes unfair, opponent. The opponent had sent Sanday a copy of the sixth edition of his work, a

courtesy which is duly acknowledged in the Introduction to the dissection of it.

Of this second work Sanday said in October 1909 that he had forgotten very much of what was in it, but he 'suspected that it would be found to contain the germ of most that he had been able to offer in the way of critical method ever since.' This is very true. If those who have been familiar with the subject for some years were to read Sanday's book now for the first time, they might here and there become rather impatient, and wonder why he spent so much time and trouble in prolonged investigations of points about which nearly every one whose opinion is of weight is agreed. Yes, they are agreed now; but there was

no such general agreement in 1876. It was then not only possible for the author of *Supernatural Religion* to question or deny the truth of many of these positions, but even to gain in some quarters a reputation for impartiality; for there are persons who take for granted that any one who attacks Christian traditions must be impartial, and that defenders of them are always prejudiced; whereas scepticism may be as prejudiced as belief. If some of Sanday's careful arguments seem now to be somewhat unnecessary, it is largely owing to what he and others have done in this field that some critical questions which are discussed at length in this volume are now regarded as settled. They can never again be open to such an attack as was made on them then in *Supernatural Religion*; and even then some of the attacks could fairly be called wanton. It is now, for instance, generally admitted that Justin Martyr either used all our Four Gospels, or a Harmony constructed out of them, or possibly a collection of *testimonia* extracted from them. Any one of these conclusions implies that in Justin's day the authority of the Four Gospels was established.

But although the scientific investigations which Sanday gives us in this work might now, in some cases, be taken as read, his masterly discussion of what he rightly calls 'the most enigmatic and tantalizing of all patristic utterances' will long retain its value. This refers to the famous extract which Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 39) gives us from the commentary of Papias on the Oracles (*τὰ λόγια*) of the Lord. 'Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew tongue, and every one interpreted them as he was able.' 'Mark, as the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not in order, all that he remembered that was said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor attended upon Him, but later, as I said, upon Peter, who taught according to the occasion and [but] not as composing a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses; so that Mark made no mistake in writing down some things as he remembered them. For he took care of one thing, not to omit any of the particulars that he heard or to falsify any part of them.'

Westcott (*Canon*, p. 65) points out that *ἐμνημόνευσεν* and *ἀπεμνημόνευσεν* might mean 'as Peter related them,' instead of 'as Mark remembered them'; and this Selwyn (*First Christian Ideas*, p. 25) prefers. Selwyn also prefers 'did no in-

justice to Peter' to 'made no mistake' for *οὐδὲν ἤμαρτε*, which is less possible. What from the present point of view is important, as illustrating Sanday's fairness, is the fact that at the end of his careful examination of the probabilities respecting the testimony of Papias, he sums up rather in favour of the writer whose book he is criticising (p. 159). But on *Supernatural Religion* as a whole, he said that the writer had 'overshot the mark very much indeed. There is a certain truth in some things that he has said, but the whole sum of truth is very far from bearing out his conclusions. . . . There are indeed truths which find a response in our hearts without apparently going through any logical process, not because they are illogical, but because the scales of logic are not delicate and sensitive enough to weigh them.'

We now come to what seems to be a barren field in Sanday's life, so far as literary productiveness is concerned, namely, the seven years (1876-1883) which he spent, enormously to the advantage of that University, at Durham. It was after he had become Principal of Hatfield Hall that the number of men began to go up at Durham very rapidly. But during those years very little was published by him. That does not mean that he was doing nothing for the world at large. The reading and thinking that were to bear fruit a little later were always going on. In particular, the little commentary on *Romans* in the 'New Testament Commentary,' edited by Bishop Ellicott, was preparing the way for the work on that Epistle which he and Dr. Headlam produced in 1895, and which is still the chief authority on the subject.

His election to the Ireland Chair brought him back to Oxford, and his Inaugural Lecture as Professor, by its fulness and suggestiveness, at once raised high expectations respecting the work which was to come. He rather soon became one of our safest guides towards solutions of some of the highly complicated problems connected with the Old Latin Versions. His contributions are found in the Oxford *Studia Biblica*, 'Old Latin Biblical Texts,' No. II (1886); and an 'Essay on the Cheltenham MSS. of the Books of the Old and New Testament and the Writings of Cyprian' in *Studia Biblica*, No. III.

But textual criticism did not absorb his energies. He returned to the higher criticism in the useful little volume, *The Oracles of God*, which contains nine lectures on the Nature and Extent of Biblical

Inspiration and on the special Significance of the O.T. Scriptures at the Present Time (Longmans, 1891). This volume prepared the way for the Bampton Lectures of 1893 on *Inspiration*. Few Bampton of late years have been more widely read or have done better service in reconciling thoughtful persons to the conclusions, some proved and others probable, of Biblical criticism. Considering that they were written during illness and under pressure, they are a remarkable production as regards both research and judgment. The writer's own criticism on them was that 'they are more eloquent than I like.' But there is no rhetorical embroidery. A single illustration may suffice; it is from the fourth lecture.

'Let us take as a specimen the oldest and simplest of these codes, the so-called "Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx. 23-xxiii. 33). This book is older than the prophetic narrative in which it was incorporated, and according to Cornill (*Einleitung*, p. 75) embodied the customary law of the early monarchy: that is to say, it not only contains the formulated decisions of that age, but the formulated decisions which had accumulated gradually up to that age. Looking at this code, there are two things which strike us about it. One is its essentially religious character. The provisions of it are expressed as coming from God Himself. They carry with them Divine sanction and are based upon the Divine attributes (Exod. xxii. 22, 23, 24, 27). When we consider this characteristic, which is not peculiar to the Book of the Covenant but runs through the whole legislation from first to last, we see clearly how an element of inspiration enters into it. The lawgiver, whoever he is, the succession of lawgivers, have really "stood in the council of the Almighty." They speak, and are authorised to speak, in His Name. The consulting of the Lord was not a mere delusion. It was an expression of the fact that Israel was really the people of His choice, that He had promised to dwell with them and walk with them, and that he should be their God and they would be His people.'

See also pp. 126, 139, 152, 160, 282, 340, etc. There is eloquence in all these passages; but probably most readers feel that the eloquence is quite in place, and that it has the appearance of

being spontaneous. The writer has no reason to regret or resent its presence. But Sanday's literary friends, who are very numerous, can testify to the frequent contrast between his generous appreciations of their productions and his diffidence with regard to his own. And any artificial straining after effect, such as Dean Burgon used to indulge in with his extraordinary variations of typography, was abhorrent to him. He disliked even the use of italics for the purpose of emphasizing a word or phrase; and this was one of the things about which it was not easy to move him. There were some matters with regard to which one felt that, with all his habitual gentleness, one was up against a stone wall.

In 1899, vol. ii. of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* appeared. It contains many notable articles, such as Ramsay on *Galatia* and *The Galatians*, Ryle on *Genesis*, A. B. Davidson on *God* and on *Jeremiah*, Stanton on *Gospels*, Salmond on *Heaven*, Swete on *The Holy Spirit*, G. A. Smith on *Isaiah*, J. B. Mayor on *James* and *The Epistle of James*, etc. But it was said that it was worth while to get the volume if only for Sanday on *Jesus Christ*. This article was afterwards published as a separate volume with the title of *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, a second edition of which, with some modifications and additions, was published in 1905. In it he told us that he had not attempted to bring the work strictly up to date, but left it as an expression of his mind in the years preceding 1899. His beautifully illustrated work on *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* had appeared in 1903, and some of its features were transferred to this edition. The *Outlines* are now all that we can have of a *Life of Christ* by Sanday; but they are enough to give us a fairly good idea of what the greater work would have been, had he lived to produce it. During the remaining fifteen years of his life he continued to write and publish preparatory studies, but the master hand that could have worked them into a consistent whole is gone. With regard to miracles, his mind at this period (1899-1905) is plainly shown in the *Outlines* and in the paper on Miracles which he read at the Church Congress at Northampton in 1902; but that subject, and his attitudes towards it, may for the present stand over till we come to the later years.

The *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* was not the result of a few weeks spent in Palestine in the spring of 1902. It would have been written even

if that tour had not taken place. Its first purpose was to lighten the projected *Life* of 'a certain amount of topographical matter which would otherwise have to find a place in it. Its second purpose was to show how even the Lower Criticism, the humblest of all the handmaidens of Science, may sometimes contribute to questions of importance'; e.g. by deciding between the different readings, 'Gerasenes,' 'Gadarenes,' and 'Gergasenes.' Experts tell us that the traditional identifications of Biblical sites are to be received with great caution. Many of them are guesses unscientifically made in the Middle Ages. But some of them may be accepted as correct. Sanday thinks that the balance of probability is in favour of the traditional sites of Golgotha and the Sepulchre, and that there is a stronger balance with regard to the place of our Lord's trial and condemnation to death. He regards the identification of the 'upper room' of the Gospels (*ἀνώγειον*, Mk 14¹⁵ and Lk 22¹²) and of Acts (*ὑπερφῶνον*, 1³⁸) as right beyond reasonable doubt; and that it is 'not a very precarious step' to identify it as in the house of Mary, the mother of Mark. This latter identification is exceedingly attractive, but the evidence for it is slight.

In 1904 Sanday returned to the subject which he had discussed with so much youthful ability thirty-two years earlier, namely, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. In this later work we have eight lectures, delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in the autumn of 1904, repeated in Oxford in 1905, and then finally revised and published. They are, of course, much more mature than the earlier work; and they deal with a number of criticisms (mostly adverse to the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel and to its historical value) which had appeared in the interval, chiefly but not exclusively on the Continent; e.g. Bacon, Loisy, Jülicher, Schmiedel, Wendt, Wernle, and Wrede. When the earlier work appeared in 1872, a friend mentioned with amusement the superior and half-pitying kind of air with which some 'advanced' persons of Sanday's own generation spoke of this first venture: 'as if any one who believed that the Fourth Gospel could be authentic must be stupid.' In the Preface to the later work Sanday deals gently with his friend Dr. Cheyne, who had allowed himself to write: 'Apologetic considerations are brought in to limit our freedom. The Fourth Gospel must be the work of the Apostle John, and

must be in the main historical, because the inherited orthodoxy requires it.' Sanday asks whether Cheyne really thinks that this is one's only reason for holding these views; and he explains his own position. 'I hope that this attitude is at least as consistent with an earnest pursuit of truth as that which appears to assume that orthodox or traditional opinions are always wrong.'

Among the new points which had arisen since 1872 was the theory, strongly maintained by some critics, that the theology of the Fourth Gospel is derived directly from the theology of St. Paul, and that the theology of St. Paul is absolutely his own invention and has little connexion with the teaching of Jesus Christ. Christ's teaching, as presented in the Synoptic Gospels, represents the real primitive Christianity, which was quickly lost. St. Paul invented an entirely new form of Christianity, and the writer of the Fourth Gospel adopted it, putting much of it into the mouth of Jesus. By this adoption what is really Pauline theology is made to look like a product of Christ's teaching. In reality the Johannine picture of that teaching is taken directly from St. Paul. Sanday asks whether it is possible to assent to a theory, according to which nine-tenths of the teaching by which, during nineteen centuries, Christians have shaped their belief and conduct, have no Divine origin, but are the invention of St. Paul.

With regard to the authorship and consequent authority of the Fourth Gospel, Sanday, from 1872 onwards, in spite of all that he read on the other side, seems never to have wavered; and the negative critics during that period were both numerous and strong. It was with a hearty exclamation of satisfaction and belief that he began his review of Dr. James Drummond's *Enquiry into the Character and Authority of the Fourth Gospel* (Williams & Norgate, 1903).

"At last a really good book on the right side," is the greeting some of us will be inclined to give to Dr. Drummond's book. A like greeting might have been given to Dr. Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part I., which preceded it by a few weeks, and covers part of the same ground. The appearance of these two books almost together is the more welcome because they come at the end of what, from the point of view of which we are speaking, has been a

long series of disappointments' (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1904).

Sanday's view throughout is that the Fourth Gospel was written by the disciple whom Jesus loved and who was most intimate with Him; and that therefore his Gospel has all the authority of an eye-witness. Chap. 21 (with the exception of the concluding verses) was afterwards added by this same disciple as an appendix to correct the rumour that Christ had said that he was not to die. It is quite possible that this beloved disciple was not one of the Twelve, but on the whole it is probable that he was the Apostle John. Whoever he was, he wrote the First Epistle of John, and he may also have been the writer of the Second and Third Epistles. He wrote long after the events which he records; and the speeches which he inserts are sometimes not the actual words uttered, but expansions of them, giving the full meaning of what was said, as it had come home to him during many years of thought. Thus he gives us, not history, but a meditation on what he had heard, and seen, and handled, as interpreted by the experience of the Church during half a century.

Sanday's retention of the main portion of his earlier views with regard to the Fourth Gospel was not the obstinate dogmatism that refuses to listen to adverse argument. Few persons who have written so much have been so ready to revise their reasonings and conclusions. Conclusions as to some of the details have been revised by him. In other cases the reasonings have been modified in

the course of criticism, but they have been found to lead to the old conclusions. The whole of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle, with possibly the Second and Third Epistles, are by the same writer, who was almost certainly some one who was very intimate with our Lord, but may possibly have been the intimate disciple of such a person. That these main conclusions are in the highest degree tenable is seen from the results of years of independent research by Dr. R. H. Charles. He gives them in the Introduction to his recently published *Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, which almost overwhelms one with its wealth of learning and argument. He is convinced that the Gospel and 1 John are by the same hand, and holds that the reasons for assigning 2 and 3 John to the writer of the Gospel are still more convincing than those for assigning 1 John to him. But he does not believe that any Johannine Book was written by the Apostle. Like Sanday, he does not think that the evidence that the Apostle John, like his brother James, was put to death by the Jews in Jerusalem, and therefore before A.D. 70, can be entirely disregarded. On the contrary, he inclines to the view that it is true, while Sanday does not. Of course, if it is true, we have nothing that was written by the son of Zebedee. None of the Johannine Books was written before A.D. 70. Nevertheless the amount of agreement between these two scholars, reached by different routes, is remarkable; and it is evidence that Sanday has not, without good reason, held in the main to his earlier conclusions respecting the Fourth Gospel.

Literature.

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER.

A STRONG book on Preaching has been as urgently required as any book we can think of. Preaching has been growing in estimation, especially in the Church of England. In consequence, many lectures have been delivered and many books published. But they have been limited in scope or in sympathy. Some of them have been simply trivial. Even the Yale Lectures, immortal as a few of them are, never go the whole way. The book that will satisfy all reasonable desire has been

written by the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., Principal of New College, London. It belongs to the 'International Theological Library'—*The Christian Preacher* (T. & T. Clark; 8vo, pp. xxvii, 490; 18s.).

'In deciding on the plan of the book, the writer first asked himself the question, For whom should he write, for the scholar delighting in the minutiae of the history and the literature of the subject, or for the minister desiring to be helped to make the best of his calling as a preacher? While some of his interests drew him to the first, the dominating purpose of his life has driven him to the second.