

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The 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

in the Lord Jesus—specially in His glory—you will not and cannot pay regard to a man's wealth or fine clothes.' It would seem that this harmonizes with other teaching in the N.T. The Crucified is also the Ascended: the Cross is the Crown: he who would be first is to be the servant of all. The Glory is Love that condescends to Service and Sacrifice set forth before men and angels as God's very nature. The Johannine parallels as to the Lord's being 'glorified' naturally suggest themselves, and perhaps we may even read this special sense of 'glory' as meaning 'the triumphant vindication of what Jesus stood for, *i.e.* that service is the path to victory' into St. Matthew's words (25³¹), 'the throne of his glory,' where He will sit to judge those who have and those who have not done service to Him in the persons of His little ones.

The question has been raised by a member of the Hellenistic Greek Seminar at Manchester University (before which this interpretation was laid in the first instance), whether such a non-personal objective genitive as has been here suggested is found in the N.T. after πίστις. Four passages have been quoted as bearing upon this point, and it is worth while to refer the reader to them. They are (1) Ac 3¹⁶, τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ; (2) Ph 1²⁷, τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; (3) 2 Th 2¹³, πίστει ἀληθείας,—in all which passages an objective genitive seems the unforced way of explaining the syntax; (4) Col 2¹², τῆς πίστewς τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is certainly susceptible of the same treatment. In any case the examination of these passages seems to confirm the possibility from the grammatical side of interpreting St. James as has been suggested above.

T. NICKLIN.

Hulme Hall, Manchester.

Luke xvii. 21.

THE true interpretation of Lk 17²¹ is not to be settled so easily as Mr. Lewis assumes. In my rendering referred to, I am more than content to be in the company of Dr. Moffatt; and I must suggest that the assumption that such an interpretation is to be curiously dismissed as but one of 'certain heresies' is quite unwarranted. If the reader will consult Dr. Plummer's note in the 'International Critical Commentary' hereupon, he will find a much more fair, and true, and reliable statement. If, also, he will but turn to the plain

and careful account in my book mentioned, on pp. 110 and 111—which cannot, of course, be here quoted *in extenso*—he can estimate the reasons there given for declining to accept the summary dismissals of either (1) or (2) in Mr. Lewis's contribution. As to (1): the thoughtful reading of Dr. Moffatt's rendering of this whole passage should suffice, for ordinary minds, to rule out the 'therefore' here suggested, with its inference. Whilst in regard to (2): such an assertion simply begs the whole question in dispute, which is neither criticism nor reasoning. No one, presumably, will deny that ἡμῶν is plural. But all the examples quoted on behalf of the 'Field' conclusion relate to the singular. As in Ps 38⁴, ἐντός μου; or Mt 23²⁶, τὸ ἐντός τοῦ ποτηρίου.

The whole force of the context, one cannot but feel, shows that the decision that here ἐντός ὑμῶν can only mean ἐντός ἑκάστου is sheer dogmatism.

Mr. Lewis's final judgment concerning the duty of the Revisers expresses indeed his own opinion, but nothing more. So that there is yet liberty left for others to 'maintain patience in assertion' that Dr. Moffatt is right—as certainly also, I cannot but maintain, is my exposition in the book from which it is taken.

FRANK BALLARD.

Sheffield.

Obadiah 5.

IN the *Daily Telegraph* of December 16th, 1926, Colonel T. E. Lawrence writes as follows of a Turkish onslaught on the Awali suburb of Medina: 'This bitter taste of the Turkish mode of war sent a shock across Arabia: for the first rule of Arab war was that women were inviolable; the second, that the lives and honour of children too young to fight with men were to be spared; the third, *that property impossible to carry off should be left undamaged*' (italics mine).

Does not this third rule of Arab warfare lend some support to the idea that the first half of Ob⁵ should be interpreted as meaning, 'If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night . . . would they not steal *only* till they had enough?' This, as has been pointed out, is required in order to make the first part of the verse parallel to the second, 'If grapegatherers came to thee, would they not leave some gleaning grapes?' and any difficulty in the conception of desert raiders leaving any valuables undamaged behind them seems now to be removed.

V. D. SIDONS.

Wealdstone.