
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

and let it be our own nation; and does anyone doubt that this serious universe of ours, which must always be searching for serious instruments, will establish such a nation in the councils of the world? Nay, I should go further. Let me see such a nation, purged of all self-seeking, holding itself the instrument of a holy will; a nation yielding itself freely to its own highest personal and political tradition, seeking nothing in its own triumph but the triumph of those ideas and ideals which save and secure mankind; let me see such a nation, and is it a thing to be doubted that the arm of the enemies of such a nation should suddenly be paralyzed? For they should see, as, not our own soldiers only, but the advancing hosts of the enemy after the battle of Mons declare they saw, battalions of radiant fighters in the sky, withstanding them, causing their blood to turn into water, overwhelming them with the majesty of God.'

William Sanday and his Work.

By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., formerly Master of University College, Durham.

Third Paper.

Of the valuable by-works, by means of which Sanday prepared himself and his readers for the features which ought to be found in a critical Life of Christ, there are two, and only two more, which require to be noticed: but, for the purpose for which they were written, they are the most interesting and the most instructive.

In 1907 there was the volume with the attractive and significant title, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*. It consists of seven lectures, three reviews, and a sermon; and the writer tells us that 'the collection as a whole reflects a part of the process of self-education for the larger task.' Of course it also helps, and is meant to help, in the education of others. The doctrinal problems of our day are so far-reaching that for the present they can be handled only tentatively; and tentative handling is just what Sanday gives us. The problems must be faced, but without rash dogmatism, and without fear of criticism. *Nihil temere, nihil timide, sed omnia consilio et virtute*, as Döllinger put it. To many readers the first thing in the volume will be one of the most helpful items, the lecture on 'The Symbolism of the Bible.' Every intelligent reader of the Scriptures recognizes that a great deal of the language must be interpreted symbolically. But the large extent to which this is the case is perhaps recognized by comparatively few; and it is here that Sanday has been a real help to many of us. There is much in the field of thought, and especially of religious thought, which cannot be defined, or even described directly. We assent to the statement that God is Spirit, but we can form no mental picture of either God or Spirit. We can at best suggest an approximation, and in suggesting we make use of symbolical language. Sanday defines symbolism as 'indirect description.' The Hebrew Prophets, especially Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, were often told to perform symbolical actions; and nearly all the religious ritual of the O.T. was symbolical. This is true of the highest act of worship both for the Jews and for the heathen. In sacrifice there is the gift to propitiate the Deity, and the food which the worshipper shares with the Deity, in order to enter into communion with Him. Is not much of the story of the Creation, and of the Ten Plagues, and of the Exodus, symbolical? No doubt there is an historical basis; but the narratives which have come down to us are too symmetrical to be pure history; and the symbolism, rightly understood, is very instructive. Details in the descriptions of the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai may be regarded as symbolical of the central truth that the Ten Words really proceeded from God. Apocalyptic literature is mainly symbolical. Daniel and Revelation tell of past, present, and future under symbolical forms.

Our Lord employs symbolism to an extent which Oriental hearers would think quite natural, but

which to us seems to be exaggerated language; *e.g.* the mote and the beam, plucking out the right eye, faith removing mountains. 'I beheld Satan fall (not "fallen," as R.V.) from heaven' is another instance. Above all, the story of the Temptation, which (as Sanday repeatedly points out) must have come from Christ Himself, because the disciples were incapable of inventing it, is a palmary instance of symbolical language, in the instantaneous removals from the wilderness to the Temple-roof and to the high mountain: and it implies that Christ had power over nature, to turn a stone into a loaf, and to be sustained in the air.

In discussing the symbolism of Apocalyptic literature, the Book of Daniel is confidently placed between 167 and 165 B.C. From Dn 7^{18} probably comes the expression 'son of man,' about which there was so much discussion some years ago. The question whether Christ used it of Himself was followed by the question whether He had claimed to be the Messiah, to which Bousset (*Jesus*, p. 168) gives the conclusive answer: from the very beginning of the Christian Church the belief existed that Jesus was the Messiah, and such a belief would be absolutely inexplicable if Jesus had not declared to His disciples during His lifetime that He was the Messiah. A great deal of the volume is given to a lucid review of recent literature, especially to Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 1906, afterwards translated as *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*, to which, with characteristic generosity, Sanday gives an amount of praise which he himself seems afterwards to have thought was a little excessive. It is largely as a critic of the views of other writers that Sanday commends Schweitzer. At the end of the seven lectures he diffidently gives a piece of advice to earnest inquirers. Cease to ask what is the truth about this or that, a form of question which may savour of arrogance. 'Ask—at least at first and for a long time—what did God mean by it, for the Church, for the world, for me?'

There now follows the substance of a sermon preached before the University in February 1907 on 'The Haunting Problem of Miracles,' towards the solution of which the conditions seemed to him to be more favourable than they had ever been before. The difficulty always is 'how to deal at once sympathetically and justly with the beliefs of men of another age, whose mental equipment was very different from our own.' We have, what they had not, fixed ideas as to the uniformity of the ordinary course of nature; but in common with them, we have large experience of answers to prayer. Add to this the widespread belief, shared by Jews, Christians, and Pagans, that certain individuals have stood in close relation to God with a special commission from Him, and that they had credentials to prove this commission; and these credentials were commonly what we call Miracles. See Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 77 f.

In his first book Sanday was able to accept all miracles for which the evidence seemed to be adequate, including the Water turned into Wine, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and the Raising of Lazarus. Then he resolved to lay the subject on one side and come to no conclusion about it until he had seen his way with regard to a number of matters more or less connected with it. It was always his wish to work from the circumference to the centre, and to settle the outlying facts before attempting to decide the main one. For this reason he held his mind in suspense for some years. He himself says till 1912; but, thinking that the views he had reached were somewhat extreme, in his capacity of Professor he kept silent about them. Unknown to himself the conclusion seems to have been reached, or at least approached, ten years earlier, when he read a paper on Miracles at the Church Congress at Northampton in October 1902. In it he pointed out that the evidence for miracles was not only strong but stringent. It was incredible that St. Paul should, quite incidentally, claim to have proved his apostleship by working miracles, when he was writing to people who would know whether he had done so or not. Some who heard him may remember a spontaneous insertion into the paper. 'If I am told that Von Manen maintains that we have no genuine Epistles of St. Paul, my answer is that in this matter Von Manen does not count.' But towards the end of the paper there is a limitation which prepares the way for the final distinction between miracles which are only *supra naturam* and miracles which are *contra naturam*.

It was apparently Bishop Gore's Open Letter on the basis of Anglican Fellowship which caused Sanday to make public the conclusion at which he had arrived; but for that he would probably have taken a still longer time for consideration. But he regarded the Bishop's letter as a 'Challenge to Criticism,' and a condemnation of younger scholars

whose conclusions were much the same as Sanday's. With characteristic courage and generosity Sanday broke silence, and took his place side by side with those whom the Bishop had denounced. If they were condemned, he was condemned also, and the condemnation was unnecessary and unjust. There is no insincerity in publicly saying 'I believe' before a number of propositions, one of which must be, while others may be, understood symbolically. Creeds are binding only so far as they have the authority of Scripture. Criticism shows that immense portions of Scripture must be regarded as symbolical, and this fact necessarily affects the Creeds, which depend on Scripture.

The chief but not the only point in dispute was that of the Virgin Birth. Sanday said that he had no desire to put 'nots' into the Creed; but there were some statements which, although one did not deny them, one could not affirm them in a literal sense. He believed most emphatically in our Lord's Supernatural Birth. Lk 1^{35} 'carries us into regions where thought is baffled.' The language is deeply metaphorical and symbolical, and one is not bound to interpret it as meaning a Birth which seems to be 'unnatural.' 'Whatever the Virgin Birth can spiritually mean for us is guaranteed by the fact that the Holy Babe was Divine. Is it not enough to affirm this with all our heart and soul, and be silent about anything beyond?—Be it so. But there are many who hold that the traditional interpretation gives a Birth which may be natural in the case of the Incarnation, which was an event so unique and mysterious that we cannot safely decide that what is clearly said in Lk 1^{34} and Mt $1^{18\text{-}20}$ would be against nature if understood literally.

There is less difficulty about 'the actual resuscitation of the dead body of the Lord from the tomb'; for it is futile to ask what became of the material particles of the dead body. On the third day various persons found that, although the linen cloths had not been unwound, the body was gone. In the subsequent appearances the Lord seems to have had either a spiritual body which at His will could have material qualities, or (less probable) a material body which at His will could have spiritual qualities. But the truth may again be quite beyond our comprehension. That His body 'saw corruption' along with the bodies of the two robbers is against all the evidence which we possess.

There are still many people who hold that a miracle is a violation of the laws of nature. If this were a true definition, then miracles do not happen and have never happened. God is not a God of confusion (1 Co 14^{33}); He does not violate His own laws. A miracle is a wonderful work, which seems to us in our ignorance to be against nature, and we wonder how it could possibly be done. As soon as we know how it could be done, it ceases to be a miracle. Many acts of Christ and His disciples, which were genuine miracles then, would not be miracles now. By suggestion, hypnotism, telepathy, thought-reading, etc., the same kind of things are done now; and there are gifted persons who can perform some of them frequently. Evidently these 'mighty works' are not against nature. This being so, it seems to be rash to assert that certain other wonderful acts recorded in the N.T. are against nature and incredible. We are here dealing with a unique Personality in a unique crisis in the history of the human race. Can we decide what the laws of His actions must be? Can we be sure that such actions as the miracle at Cana, or the Walking on the Water, would in His case be *contra naturam*? Such acts may have been the natural acts of a Supernatural Person. Sanday again points to the Temptation as an important part of the evidence in support of miracles. The story must have come from our Lord Himself; and 'the whole story turns on the possession of the power to work miracles.' Not only so: it turns on the power to work miracles which are said to be *contra naturam*.

In 1910 he published *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, which he expected would be the last of the preliminary studies which he had been making in the long and careful preparation for writing a Life of Christ. He had long ago made up his mind as to the scale on which the final book must be written, and the method to be employed in writing it. His aim was to exhibit leading principles in a form in which they could be understood, not merely by experts, but by an intelligent and interested public; and he desired to free the main work as much as possible from side issues and details. Hence these preliminary studies.

It is in classifying modern Christologies that Sanday gives us two useful terms which have been adopted by some other writers. He speaks of two main types, 'reduced Christianity' and 'full Christianity.' By the former he means those who go

no further than 'God was in Christ' (2 Co 5^{19}), in whose life the communicable excellences of the Godhead were manifested to mankind; by the latter those who accept in full the traditional belief that Christ was God. This distinction is sometimes made by saying that the former admit the Divinity of Christ, the latter His Deity: but apparently this distinction is being abandoned. In each class there are degrees, in the one of fulness, in the other of reduction; and with the fullest form of reduced Christianity, as represented by Albrecht Ritschl, Sanday more than once expresses considerable sympathy. It has the advantage of aiming at being strictly scientific, and it seems to succeed in being so. It embraces those portions of our beliefs which are most capable of verification. The lowest form of reduced Christianity admits as evidence very little of the N.T. It accepts only the Synoptic Gospels, and of them only those portions which criticism shows to be earliest in origin. These give us the best evidence that we have as to the self-consciousness of Christ, and our estimate of His personality cannot go beyond His own. But, as Sanday points out, 'broadly speaking, all the rest of the N.T. treats of Christ as God, and the Church Universal has done the same.' St. Paul and St. John may be taken 'as witnesses to the effect upon their own minds and upon those around them.' And St. Paul uses language which is very strong. He quotes with deep sympathy passages from Denney, E. A. Abbott, R. Moberly, and Du Bose respecting the real meaning of the Incarnation.

But his own contribution to the discussion goes far beyond that of the useful classification, 'full Christianity' and 'reduced Christianity.' He makes suggestions respecting a tentative modern Christology which at once attracted much attention and provoked much criticism, but which do not appear to have gained any large measure of adherence. They are acute and interesting, and may be useful as a form of thought. We may perhaps regard them as a kind of symbolism, 'indirect description' in a case in which definition is impossible.

Taking from F. W. H. Myers and Professor W. James the new psychological distinction between the conscious or supraliminal self and the unconscious, or subconscious, or subliminal self, Sanday believes that this distinction, which is now generally accepted, may be of much service to the theologian in framing a scientific basis for a modern Christology. We each of us are a greater being than we suppose. 'Each is in reality an abiding psychical entity far more extensive than he knows. The self manifests through organism; but there is always some part of the self unmanifested, and always some power of expression in abeyance or reserve.' It may easily be the case that this subconscious self is the region in which one human spirit meets another human spirit, and is enabled to see, and make the other see, 'new depths of the divine.' In other words, the proper or primary sphere of divine action upon the human soul may be the subliminal consciousness.

This leads to a bolder suggestion; that the subliminal consciousness is the proper sphere of the Deity in the incarnate Christ. The common view of the Incarnation draws a vertical line between the human nature and the Divine nature in Christ, and regards some of His actions as falling on the human side, and some as falling on the other side. This lands us in grave difficulties. These disappear, or are reduced, if we draw a horizontal line between the upper or human region, which is always in evidence, and the lower deeps, which are rarely in evidence, and are the natural home of whatever is divine. This involves the limitation that 'only so much of the divine could be expressed as was capable of expression within the forms of humanity.' It leaves us free to think of Christ's life on earth as fully human, and yet not merely human. There is a region in which the Deity of the Incarnate has a channel of continuity with the infinitude of Godhead. As in ourselves the conscious self is but a small portion of the real self, so the record that has come down to us of the life of Christ shows a genuinely human consciousness, but comes utterly short of the real history of Him who was both Son of Man and Son of God.

This striking and stimulating hypothesis may serve as symbolism, as 'indirect description' of what cannot be described directly. The mystery of the Incarnation is beyond our comprehension; we accept the fact, but we cannot explain. Yet a tentative, though inaccurate, method of describing it may be helpful to some who crave an explanation of some kind. It appears that Professor Henri Bois accepts it as a form of 'reduced Christianity,' rejecting what goes beyond that. Dr. H. R. Mackintosh gave it sympathetic but adverse criticism in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES and in *The*

Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, pp. 487–490. And there were other critics. Sanday answers some of them in a subsequent pamphlet, *Personality in Christ and in Ourselves*, 1911. He says that his critics have supposed him to be more of an innovator than he himself proposed to be. Without being a philosopher he has had to enter philosophical ground. But philosophers have not yet determined the exact meaning of Spirit, or the precise relations between Spirit and Matter. Meanwhile we may try to feel our way, and he does so.

Besides the writings which have already been noticed as being in the main stream of his productiveness, there are some minor works which must at least be mentioned. *Two Present-Day Questions: Biblical Criticism and the Social Movement*, 1892. *The Conception of Priesthood*, 1898; see also an article in *The Guardian*, 29th March 1899. *An Address to the Christian Section of the Third International Congress of the History of Religions*, 1908, a marvellously comprehensive survey of recent literature. *The Primitive Church and Reunion*, 1913. Articles in *The Modern Churchman*, June 1915 and January 1919. There are also several pamphlets on the War, dealing generously, and in some particulars rather too generously, with the enemy, but in other respects really helpful. In sending me the article of June 1915, he wrote: 'It will be rather like a talk—and you *can* fill it out (p. 141). Please understand that they asked for a lead,—and I gave them what I could in ¾ hour'—or possibly '1¾ hours'; the writing is not very legible.

A few quotations from a large number of letters will illustrate some of the statements made about him in these papers, and will throw light upon others. A serious accident in early life caused permanent injury to the muscles of his right arm, and his handwriting had always a jerky, eager look, which seemed to fit the alertness and activity of his thought.

17th Jan. 1913. 'And now perhaps I may turn to my own matters. I felt your kind wishes all the more because the outlook before me is quite a serious one. I was very near telling you about it when last I wrote, but it seemed too long a story for a letter. Now I shall be able to make it shorter because I hope by Monday or Tuesday to send you a pamphlet (not for publication) which I have just been printing, and which will, I think, explain the whole situation. It is really a continuation of my paper on Miracles at the Church Congress [at Middlesborough, 1912]. I have at last worked through to a conclusion which covers all the ground, and which comes out more radical than I myself (until a short time ago) quite anticipated. The most critical part came out in a paper which I read last term to a small, but rather select Society (Gore, Holland, Lock, etc.). There was no discussion, because discussion was adjourned and is still to come. I wasn't at all happy about it, because I had to omit a good deal, so that the main point came out too abruptly. I have talked very little about it, but I am afraid it made something of a sensation.

'I am happier about the pamphlet, which I have now, I think, got pretty well to my mind. Still you will see that the position is serious, both subjectively and objectively. The crucial point is the question of the V.B.

'Don't think of writing till you have the pamphlet. And I very much hope that you won't find it trying to read, because throughout I have tried to emphasize *Sic* as well as *Non*.'

24th Jan. 1913. 'You are indeed a true friend. You make the best of me, and you judge as kindly as it is possible to judge this last phase of my thinking that I could not help imparting to you. I do not feel at all inclined to defend myself. I am most anxious to lay stress on the effect of the 'unique Personality,' and your way of presenting the latest discoveries about the nature of matter is very impressive. But I think that what weighed with me a good deal was the feeling (1) that one must not have one rule for O.T. and another for N.T., and (2) that it makes a difference if one approaches N.T. through O.T. If one does this, it seems to be less necessary to have recourse to special explanations; and what seem to be exceptions in fact are reduced to different modes of expression. However, I shall have to run the gauntlet of considerable criticism in about three weeks' time.'

28th Jan. 1913. 'I really can't thank you enough for writing me a second letter—and such an admirable one. The day may come—though I don't see it in prospect just at present, except in quite a private circle—when I might be very glad to have leave to quote it in public. For there are things which I don't think *could* be better said. I am afraid I couldn't say all that you say. But I

am most glad to have that side put so well before me.'

6th April 1913. He dictated a letter from Folkestone to say that he had been struggling with severe illness for nearly eight weeks, in the hands of a nurse, and with a doctor coming every day. 'The throw-backs have upset all my plans, and I must wait and see what is possible.'

Christmas Day, 1914. 'Ever since August, beyond the work of the day for the day, my thoughts have been running mainly upon the War. Just now I am struggling with a pamphlet—one of the Oxford series, if it comes off. I want to state the case in such a way as could be *put into the hands of a German*. But I find it very difficult.'

21st July 1915. 'One can't help comparing our respective fates. I don't really repent of mine. Given such powers—or want of powers—as I have, I can't help hoping that I may be found to have spent them not wholly without usefulness *to a certain class of minds*, and with a view to the future. . . . Don't you feel as Westcott did when he said that he had accomplished all his programme and more than his programme?'

[The answer to which is, that I never had even so much as a programme.]

26th March 1920. 'I'm afraid I have been very idle. I don't quite know how far that is the right word. I am hoping, if all's well, soon after Easter, to get to Bath with my sister, and there to talk over things with an excellent doctor there and to see how the land really lies. But the last few months, since I came here [from Ch. Ch. to 18 Bradmore Road] I have seemed unduly lethargic and helpless. I am sadly behindhand with getting the house into order; and yet now one seems to feel the Spring coming back into one's veins again, and I *may* take a new start, or something of one. . . . We are just finishing—though I don't suppose that it will be out before autumn—some Notes on the new Lessons, like those on the Psalms. I am quite in hopes that it will be a help and mark an advance. Burney is excellent on O.T. But we shall have to do what we can to get it into circulation, and I am afraid shan't be able to give ourselves many copies.

'You certainly have the advantage of me—have not so many of the weaknesses of age—though the years ought to be substantially in my favour. And yet I can say that, like you, I have a great deal to be thankful for.

'*P.S.*—I shall have to post this before I can hear of the Sports and Boat Race, which still keep their interest.'

Trinity Sunday, 1920. 'Many thanks for all your kind solicitude about my health. It easily might be much worse. The doctor is quite encouraging, and he advises me to lead the very quiet life, which is just what I wish to do.'

These hopes were not to be realized. In September he went into a nursing home with a view to an operation, which, however, was not of a serious character. Before the operation took place he had, in quick succession, two strokes of paralysis. After lying unconscious for a day or two, on 16th September he passed *ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*.

Under the Fig-tree.

By Professor Dr. Gustaf Dalman, Greifswald.

In Palestine one very often has reason to long for shadow. A fig-tree may in such cases seem inviting enough on account of its big leaves (1 Mac 3^7) and hanging branches. When a fig-tree is watered from a fountain or rivulet (Ps 1^3), its verdure may be so luxuriant that somebody sitting under it would be quite hidden from anybody passing by. In spite of this I personally never liked to rest in a fig-tree's shadow. Its smell seemed to me disagreeable, and I missed the cooling breeze which one always enjoys so much under an olive-tree. Even the Arabs avoid sleeping under fig-trees, believing them to be haunted.[1]

In olden times it must have been otherwise. Judah and Israel liked to dwell every one under his vine and under his fig-tree (1 K 5^5). Rabbi Akiba

[1] According to my own inquiries, but see also Baldensperger, *P.E.F. Quarterly*, 1893, p. 203 *seq*.