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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

The writer of these Notes once went over a distillery in the north of Scotland, on the invitation of the distiller, in order to see the various processes in the manufacture of whisky. When a certain vat was reached, the distiller drew particular attention to it. 'That,' he said, 'is the place where the good grain is turned into poison.' 'It is considered a pleasant way of taking poison.' 'That may be,' he answered; 'it is poison all the same.' 'Yet you sell it?' 'Yes,' he said, 'I sell it; I do not drink it, however; if other people drink it, that is their business; I have nothing to do with that.'

Is it poison, then? That is no longer in dispute. Just because it is poison its sale is regulated by Act of Parliament. And if the sale is regulated, that is prohibition. It is partial prohibition. All that remains is to consider, to consider carefully and in the light of Christ's commandment (which the distiller had for the moment forgotten), whether partial prohibition is enough.

The present writer spent his ministerial life in two country parishes and in a great city. Soon after he went to one of the country parishes he was visited by one of the farmers. His eldest son, he said, had given way to drinking, and he wondered if the new minister could do anything with him. But it was too late. In a few months he died a drunkard. It was the minister's first funeral in the parish.

The family had consisted of the old man and two sons. The younger son was working on the farm—a large and prosperous farm. He was a fine-looking young man, well educated, most unselfish and most gentlemanly. Every year the Sunday School picnic was held at that farm, and the farmer's son was the secret of its invariable success. His way with children was wonderful.

The old man called again. His second son was drinking. The story does not need lengthening. It is common enough. One thing, however, is worth mentioning—the fight he made. Of his own accord he went to an institution for some months. Last week he died.

Now the point is this. What would partial prohibition have done for those young men? They got their liquor in the neighbouring town. Suppose that all the licences in that town had been withdrawn except one, yet, when the craving was on them—a craving, let us remember, caused by the poisonous nature of the drink—they would have gone and found what they wanted in the one licensed place remaining.

No doubt there still remains the other remark of the distiller: 'That is their business; I have nothing to do with that.' Does the BISHOP OF DURHAM agree?

William Sanday and his Work.

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

First Paper.

THE death of Dr. Sanday is the greatest loss which the cause of Theology, in its widest and highest sense, has sustained in the present century; and it will be some time before those who are best qualified to estimate its magnitude will be able to do so with full judgment and accuracy. Nevertheless, one who keenly feels the loss and has large knowledge of the facts may be allowed to make some contribution towards such a result. Sanday's death may be looked at from two opposite points of view. On the one hand, it may be said that, after half a century of almost ceaseless study and production, he passed away without having written a page of what was to have

been the great work of his life, a critical life of Christ, or of the by-work which was to have preceded or accompanied it, a Synopsis of the Four Gospels. The project of the life was widely known as his, and not many years ago the University of Oxford granted him a dispensation for a year from the duty of lecturing, to enable him to get on with it. He read much and thought much; but there was no other fruit beyond this continuation of the long course of preparation. The Synopsis, in which he was to have had the skilled help of the Rev. W. C. Allen, author of *St. Matthew* in the 'International Critical Commentaries,' was advertised for some years in the volumes of that series. That also was never really begun. Of these projected works we shall never see either, or know more than certain details which are found in the numerous works, very varied in size and subjects, which he has produced on his road to the unreached goal.

On the other hand, it may be said that his life's work is complete; that he has taught to all who are teachable, that is, all who love the truth better than their own preconceived ideas, the way in which the truth must be sought, and the spirit in which controversy must be conducted, by those whose chief aim is not mere victory in argumentative logic, but the truth which makes one free. In short, we seem at the outset to have got down to the situation which Bishop Westcott sometimes regarded with so much satisfaction—'the bed-rock of a contradiction.'

We need both statements in order to get a clear and well-balanced impression; but it is the second of the two that will guide us with most sureness towards a just estimate. The first tells us of the treasure which we have not got, and which we can never obtain in the shape in which he would have given it to us. The second reminds us of what we have got; and it may become a priceless and enduring possession.

Let us suppose the cases to be reversed. Let us suppose that, on the one hand, we had got the Life of Christ and the accompanying Synopsis in the form in which he had hoped to give them to us; and that, on the other, we had none of the by-products which he has hammered out for us in his conscientiously laborious and far-seeing preparation. In that case we should be incalculably the poorer. Excellent as the final result would have been, had he been able to reach it, it could not have taught us what these by-products can teach us. It would have shown us the large measure of truth which he had been enabled to reach; but we should be able to see only very imperfectly the routes and methods by which he had come to his conclusions. And, after all, the conclusions would have been his and not ours. As it is, it is precisely the routes and methods which we find so abundantly illustrated in his lavish output; and they teach us, if we make a right use of them, how to reach satisfactory conclusions for ourselves. Years ago, when he was at Durham, an undergraduate would come to him with some Biblical or doctrinal problem and ask him for a solution, adding, by way of excuse for troubling him, 'You see, sir, we look to you to tell us what to think about these things.' Then he would reply, 'No, my dear fellow, I am not here to tell you what to think. I am here to help you to think things out for yourselves.'

The insight, patience, and honesty with which he selected these routes and followed these methods were no doubt mainly the outcome of his own personal gifts and constitutional directness of character. But he owed something to the high quality and exceptional variety of the society in which at different periods of his life he moved. In the dedication of his second book he has told us of the influence of his old Headmaster, Dr. Pears of Repton. At Oxford he was in turn a member of five different Colleges. He matriculated as a commoner at Balliol. Thence he gained a scholarship at Corpus, where he took a First Class in Classics, and soon afterwards (1866) became a Fellow of Trinity. After a short period in the country living of Barton-on-the-Heath, in which he began to publish, he became Head of Hatfield Hall at Durham. The Ireland Professorship brought him back to Oxford, where he was elected to a tutorial Fellowship at Exeter College. Somewhat later, promotion to the Margaret Professorship made him a Canon of Christ Church. Thus at different times, during fifty years of University life, he was an intimate member of six different societies, five at Oxford and one at Durham. Add to this the series of addresses which he delivered in the United States and at Cambridge. Mention must also be made of the Seminar which met at his house in Christ Church once a fortnight during term time. Among its members were Sir John Hawkins, G. A. Simcox,

W. E. Addis, W. C. Allen, W. Temple, and others. Besides all these opportunities of being in constant touch with many of the best scholars among his English-speaking contemporaries, he secured for himself by his amazing industry a knowledge of what had been written in Germany during the past century, and was appearing there and in Switzerland and in France year by year, which was absolutely unrivalled. A list of the foreign works and pamphlets to which he refers, and from which he often quotes largely, in his numerous works, would be a surprising document. Bound together in three or four hundred volumes they have been deposited at Queen's College.

All this refers to work produced down to the time of his resigning the Margaret Professorship and becoming Emeritus Professor. Even then he did not cease to work, although he confessed to a lack of energy. In conjunction with Dr. Burney and the Rev. C. W. Emmet he began a series of notes on the Lectionary. Those who know *The Psalms Explained*, by the same three writers in the series of 'Tracts on Common Prayer' (S.P.C.K.), will know how valuable *The Lessons Explained* is likely to be. Shortly before his death, Dr. Sanday wrote to the present writer in high praise of Dr. Burney's contributions to this work.

To a very considerable extent Sanday succeeded to the position which Dean Church, from the time when he was simply 'Church of Oriel,' held in the Church of England. In neither case was the position sought by the men who held it; it came to them unsought, and perhaps undesired. And it came to them because they had so many valuable qualities in common—candour and lucidity, dislike of exaggeration and unreality, respect for scientific method and exactness, sympathy with intellectual and religious difficulties. Both lived through times in which weaker minds were thrown into a panic through the encroachments which science and Biblical criticism seemed to be making on the Christian faith, and in which even the stronger ones were in perplexity as to how the respective claims, which seemed to be antagonistic, were to be reconciled. During all the troubled time between 1841 and 1890, Church was a kind of stay and standard for perturbed Churchmen. This was the period of commotions about Tract 90, the Gorham Case, *Essays and Reviews* (a title, by the way, which Church himself had anticipated), Colenso, Irish Disestablishment, and the appointment of Temple to the see of Exeter, to say nothing of Darwin and Huxley. In all these times of ecclesiastical tumult Church never lost his head or his courage, and his calmness spread to others. Many a puzzled mind found a resting-place in the thought, 'I will wait and see what Church thinks about it.' Even before Church died, Sanday was beginning to take a somewhat similar position, chiefly with regard to what seemed to be attacks on the Bible, involving denials of the inspiration and trustworthiness both of the Old Testament and of the New. The essays in *Lux Mundi* and many similar criticisms had shown that much that had hitherto been believed to be true respecting the Bible could not be believed any longer. The Reformers had set it up as an infallible authority to take the place of the mediæval doctrine of the infallibility of the Church; and it was demonstrated in various particulars that the Bible was not infallible. The disastrous superstition of its verbal inspiration, involving the doctrine that every statement contained in it must be literally true (a doctrine still believed by some excellent persons), was disproved again and again; and some were dreading, while others were drawing, the monstrous conclusion that the Bible was consequently worthless as a vehicle of religious truth. Sanday was among the foremost to show that this monstrous conclusion did not by any means follow. This he did in *The Oracles of God*, 1891, and the Bampton Lectures on *Inspiration*, 1893, and elsewhere. He showed that, if there was some loss in parting with the traditional Bibliolatry, there was far more gain in spiritual power. There was gain in truth, in security, and in reality. It would henceforth become less and less possible to make private and perverse interpretations of Scripture and split up Christendom into petty and eccentric sects according as individuals accepted or rejected these perverse interpretations. And he was so large-minded and fair and conciliatory, as well as so obviously well-informed, that many of the disquieted came to rely on him as an earlier generation had relied on Church. 'Let us wait and see what Sanday has to say about it' was now the attitude of many. This fact is fully recognized by Mr. R. A. Knox with characteristic flippancy in *Some Loose Stones*, 1913, previous to his retirement into the Church of Rome: 'We have to be reassured by a yearly statement from Dr. Sanday,

comparable to the weather report, as to "What we may still believe."' Roughly speaking, Sanday has been in the front rank among those who have taught us that the Bible has been given to us, not to save us trouble, but to save our souls. It does not supply us with infallible science or infallible history, subjects in which we have to find our way by our own industry and intelligence, but with infallible principles, in following which we can guide our footsteps according to the Reign of God in this world, and look forward hopefully to enjoying His more complete Reign in the world to come.

Sanday's intimate friend, Professor C. H. Turner, has rightly said in *The Church Times* of 24th September, that a most marked quality in him was 'his capacity, one might almost say his genius, for friendship.' Perhaps few persons now living could say this with greater authority—the authority of prolonged experience. And it is most true. Among the friends who have passed away may be mentioned Edwin Hatch, H. F. Pelham, and above all Robert Moberly. Those who were with him when Moberly was on his death-bed are not likely to forget the intensity of his anxiety while life still lingered, and of his grief when it fled. Among those of his friends who are still alive, Dr. Headlam, his colleague in the monumental Commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans*, holds a prominent place. There have been and are many others. In order to be among his intimate friends it was by no means necessary to hold much the same views as himself. In some respects the differences between him and Moberly were profound, as regards not only certain conclusions, but mental attitude. This fact, so far from causing difficulty, was regarded by himself as an advantage. He said that Moberly's mind supplied just those elements in which he felt that his own mind was defective; between them there was all the more prospect of reaching the right balance. This remark is eminently characteristic. In discussions he was always anxious to understand thoroughly, and do full justice to, the other side,—always ready to yield when the other side seemed to be the better. Opponents could scarcely have a more considerate or more chivalrous adversary. In discussions with Moberly it was a great joy to him when, by different routes, they arrived at approximate conclusions.

It is remarkable how early in life he grasped the principles on which the work which has been so distinguished in amount and quality was to be conducted. In the Preface to his first publication, *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel* (Macmillan, 1872), he points out that 'there is no limit to the efficacy of scientific method, if it is but faithfully and persistently applied,' and predicts immense progress in the whole position of Theology, 'if we could but concentrate upon theological questions a small part of that activity which is devoted in this country to practical pursuits.' This prophecy has been abundantly fulfilled, and Sanday himself has had a large share in producing the fulfilment. He suggests that historical or critical questions should be taken one by one, with a view to reaching some conclusion respecting each, or at least seeing how far a definite conclusion is attainable. When plenty of these facts have been scientifically ascertained, there will be sure ground for a general gradual advance. His first work is a contribution towards this end. It is an attempt, in one important particular, 'to institute a searching examination of the documents, so as to discover their true nature and value.'

Thirty-seven years later he said of this 'youthful production' that he was not ashamed of it, but that at the present time (October 1909) it would be 'very much out of date.' That need not mean that even now it has entirely lost its value. At any rate that is not the view of second-hand booksellers, who sometimes ask sixteen shillings for it. No doubt there are some positions in the book which half a century of criticism of the Fourth Gospel have rendered less tenable, or even untenable, and which Sanday himself has either abandoned or restated with less certainty. But there are some, and those important ones, which he has continued to maintain, and with no less firmness; *e.g.* that the beloved disciple, or *possibly* some one who was most intimate with him and could write in his name, was the writer of the Gospel; that the traditional belief that the beloved disciple was the son of Zebedee, one of the Twelve Apostles, has been shown by Dr. Drummond to be a tenable and even probable hypothesis; that chap. 21, with the exception of the two last verses, is an appendix added by whoever wrote the preceding chapters; and that the First Epistle of St. John is also by the same writer. On all these points one may follow him with satisfaction, and

on most of them with conviction; all the more so when we find a critic so thorough and so unbiassed by tradition as Dr. Percy Gardiner declaring that the Fourth Evangelist 'regards himself as commissioned to give to the Church the testimony of an eye-witness of the events which he records,' and that his Gospel is 'professedly historical and in parts full of genuine historic tradition,' and that 'we have much reason for believing that the Gospel was written by a disciple of John the Apostle,' also for believing that chap. 21 and the First Epistle are by the Evangelist, whoever he may have been (*The Ephesian Gospel*, pp. 53, 61, 65, 74, 79, 83).

In the two volumes of his *Via Media* (1877), Cardinal Newman, who may certainly be regarded as one of the most consummate controversialists of the nineteenth century, crosses swords with himself and endeavours to answer the arguments which he had urged against the Church of Rome forty years earlier, when he was a member of the Church of England. Of course Protestants might be suspected of being prejudiced; but not a few critics of this apologetic work were of opinion that on various particulars the attack of the Anglican was superior to the Roman defence. Somewhat similarly there are one or two particulars in which quite friendly critics are inclined to think that the position which Sanday took in his first work is stronger than that which he thought that he was compelled to take in his latest ones, especially with regard to certain miracles. In 1872, respecting the Miracle at Cana, he wrote: 'The miracle may have, and probably has a symbolical meaning; but if so, this must not be laid to the account of the Evangelist and in no way invalidates his testimony. The description is throughout that of actual occurrence. The details on which stress is laid are not those which lend themselves to allegory. . . . These considerations strongly tend to make us believe that the miracle in connection with which they occur is real' (pp. 51, 52). Respecting the Feeding of the 5000 he wrote: 'Those who look upon the question of miracles as foreclosed on *a priori* grounds are compelled to violate all the canons of historical evidence, or else to fall back upon rationalizing expedients that are considerably more incredible than miracles. . . . I feel compelled to believe in the truth of the general narrative—because of its consistency, because of its marvellous and transcendent originality, because of the utter impossibility to account for it either by conscious or unconscious invention' (p. 126). Respecting the Raising of Lazarus he wrote: 'I prefer to abide by the ordinary canons of historical evidence; and if we confine ourselves to these, the evidence for miracles is abundant and conclusive. Not least so is it with reference to the Raising of Lazarus. An unbiassed reader coming to this narrative and putting its miraculous character for the moment out of sight would naturally conclude that it was history of a very high order, and that it bore all the marks and signs of having been written by a person who had been present at the occurrence himself' (p. 182).

It may perhaps be admitted that the criticism which has accumulated during the last forty years would require somewhat more moderation in tone in the judgments just quoted. But in substance they still hold, and have not yet been proved to be erroneous. If they do not amount to proof, neither do the arguments by which we are urged to discredit them. It is by no means certain that the distinction drawn between miracles which are *supra naturam* and miracles which are *contra naturam* is real; and if it is not, then the reason for rejecting the latter class, while we accept the former, falls to the ground. But this subject must be left for a future paper.

Literature.

DENNEY.

Sir William Robertson Nicoll has published a selection of the letters received by him from Dr. Denney during a friendship of more than a quarter of a century's duration. *Letters of Principal James Denney to W. Robertson Nicoll, 1893–1917*, is the title (Hodder & Stoughton; 8vo, pp. xliii, 270; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a book to be read at a sitting—however long the sitting. To know Denney and to know the books and men Denney discusses is to be