

and the great Central Government cannot afford to move one inch from the grand position which it has always occupied, as the impartial protector of each one of its meanest subjects in the observance of such religious duties and feelings as he or she may please to practise or adopt, being of sufficient age to be a judge of the matter. This is the very mainspring of our power in India, and any attempt to depart from it on the solicitation of short-sighted missionaries and ignorant philanthropists should be sternly resisted.

ROBERT CUST.

P.S.—Opinion of an Indian medical officer, dated August 20th, 1889 :

“I have seen a good deal of leprosy in India, and have had abundant opportunities of observing the disease :

“I have tried Gurjun oil and carbolic acid, but I have only found two things at all effectual :

“(1.) Application of strong carbolic acid to the ulcer.

“(2.) Stretching the sciatic and other nerves.

“This last has cured several cases, and the cure seemed to be permanent. I have done this in sixty or seventy cases, and my successor in a greater number.”

ART. II.—HEBREWS VI. 4-6.

Ἄδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσάμενους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γεννηθέντας Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενους Θεοῦ ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε μελλοντοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

THIS passage has always been reckoned among the greatest difficulties in the Epistle to the Hebrews, if not in the whole of the Scriptures of the New Covenant, and has never yet been explained or elucidated in such a manner as to yield a thoroughly satisfactory analysis, either grammatical or logical. I propose to endeavour to disentangle it upon a grammatical principle, which does not seem to have occurred to anyone but myself; but which, if accepted in this particular case—as it unquestionably is theoretically in general by the best grammarians—appears to reduce it to absolute clearness and simplicity.

I will first give the translations of the Authorized and Revised Versions, the former of which seems to embody the view of the ancient, and the latter that of most of the more modern commentators.

In the Authorized Version it runs :

For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted

the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.

Here the word *them* after *renew* is probably reflexive=*themselves*, as in the last answer in the Catechism: "Repent *them* truly of their former sins;" in the collect for the second Sunday after Easter: "Endeavour *ourselves* to follow the blessed steps of His most holy life;" in the exhortation to the Communion Service: "Repent *you* truly for your sins past;" in the Authorized Version of 1 Sam. xiii. 19: "Lest the Hebrews make *them* swords or spears." These reflexive uses of pronouns, with or without the addition of "self," may be multiplied *ad infinitum*; but I think the above will be sufficient.

The Authorized Version will thus be in agreement with the Fathers, who unanimously treat the accusative cases preceding *ἀνακαλιζέειν* as being subjective, and *ἀνακαλιζέειν* as being predicated of them, rather than with Beza and most of the modern commentators, who treat them as objective, and governed by *ἀνακαλιζέειν*.

The fact that Origen takes these accusative cases as subjective appears to me of great importance, as his education was Hellenistic; Chrysostom, on the other hand, who takes the same view, is a less important witness, as his education, like our own, was classical. Tertullian takes the same view as Origen ("De Pudicitia," 20), where undoubtedly *renovari* is a right correction for the text *revocari*, and Tertullian thus is a witness to the current acceptation of the passage at an early period. Origen, in his "Greek Commentary on St. John" (tom. xx. 12), paraphrases *ἀνακαλιζέειν* by *ἀνακαλιζέειν ἑαυτὸν*, and in the old Latin translation of his "Commentary on St. Matthew" we find the Greek word represented by *renovari*, which points rather to *ἀνακαλιζέσθαι* than *ἀνακαλιζέειν ἑαυτὸν* in the lost original. There is also a remarkable reading of one MS. in the Greek text of Origen on St. John, which gives *ἀνακαινισμὸν ποιεῖν ἑαυτῶν*, instead of *ἀνακαλιζέειν ἑαυτὸν*. Chrysostom paraphrastically has *ἀνακαινισθῆναι*. The inference hence drawn by the Fathers is, that baptism cannot under any pretence be repeated; thus confining the sense of the passage to the renewal of the covenant made by man with God, without any reference to that made by God with man.

This interpretation and the deductions drawn from it are rightly rejected on both exegetical and grammatical grounds by most modern commentators, who see plainly enough that the iteration or non-iteration of baptism is an utterly insufficient factor to be the main topic of so grave a passage as the one under consideration. They endeavour to mend the matter by taking the accusative cases in question as objective, and

governed by ἀνακαινίζειν. And the Revised Version of the passage, which adopts their conclusions, runs thus :

For [as touching] those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God and the powers of the life to come and [then] fell away, it is impossible to renew [them] unto repentance ; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.

But the words *as touching* and also *them* after “renew” have no more existence in the original than *then* before “fell away,” and are only introduced in order to make the passage clearer ; in which, for my own part, I do not think they are successful. Leaving out these words, we get a plainer, firmer, and better sentence :

For those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, and fell away, it is impossible to renew unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame.

The sentiment here involved is that it is impossible to renew unto repentance advanced Christians, who fall into some grievous error or apostasy denoted by παραπεσόντας. And the reason for this impossibility is : “seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame.”

Against this modern interpretation I would advance four objections : (1) That the ear of the old commentators led them to take the accusative cases preceding ἀνακαινίζειν as subjective, rather than objective. (2) To whom is it “impossible” to renew such persons unto repentance ? To man or to God ? If to man, is not the whole passage solemn trifling, and still feebler than the rejected interpretation of the ancients with regard to the non-iteration of baptism ? If to God, is it not flat blasphemy to attribute such an impossibility to Him, with whom all things are possible ? And is it not worse than trifling to say that “impossible” only means “very difficult” ? (3) How do such persons re-crucify the Son of God to themselves ? They may certainly be said to “have trodden under foot the Son of God” (and thus, perhaps, “to have put Him to an open shame”) “and to have counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and to have done despite to the spirit of grace” (Heb. x. 29). But in no sense can they be said to have re-crucified the Saviour. (4) “Seeing they crucify” is also an explanatory paraphrase in both versions of the simple participle ἀνασταυροῦντας, which would quite as well, or better, bear the translation “by crucifying again,” the Greek participle in agreement constantly corresponding to the Latin ablative absolute with the passive participle.

Let us now return to the view of the old commentators, which appears, after all, to contain truth, though by no means the

whole truth. I think they were simply led astray from the real meaning of the passage by the faulty analysis of the old grammarians, who considered that a transitive verb was used intransitively by the omission of the reflexive pronoun, and that thus ἀνακαινίζω without an object expressed = ἀνακαινίζω ἑαυτόν = ἀνακαινίζεσθαι. In condemning this grammatical theory I am happy to go along with the late Dean Alford, whose name ought never to be mentioned without respect by students of the Scriptures of the New Covenant. But I cannot go along with him in deeming it impossible that ἀνακαινίζω should be used intransitively. I think that I can easily supply the law of such an intransitive use of transitive verbs, and also that the interpretation that will result from this, combined with the considerations mentioned above, will be found of a much higher nature than the mere prohibition of repeated baptism. The ungrammatical practice of supplying the reflexive pronoun to a transitive verb used intransitively is, I think, the grand thing that has misled the old commentators exegetically as well as grammatically.

Let me now proceed to the enunciation of the grammatical law, which I have observed to prevail in the intransitive use of transitive verbs in collocations, in which no direct object appears, and even in cases in which none can be supplied, which, however, I do not think will be found to be the fact in the present instance. It is this: *Any transitive verb may be used to express the simple performance of the action denoted by it, without the mention of any object upon which it acts.*

Thus in Aristophanes' "Equites," 349:

ὕδωρ τε πίνων κάπιδεικνύς τοὺς φίλους τ' ἀνῶν
ᾧον δυνατὸς εἶναι λέγειν.

And drinking water and making a display and annoying your friends, you thought you were capable of speechifying.

ἐπιδεικνύς simply means "making a display," without reference to what is made a display of.

In the "Laches" of Plato, 183 B, we have: οὐκ ἔξωθεν κύκλα ἐπιδεικνύμενος περιέρχεται, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς δεῦρο φέρεται καὶ τοσοῦτ' ἐπιδεικνύσσω. "He doesn't go round about outside making a display of himself, but comes immediately hither, and makes a display to people here;" where the middle ἐπιδεικνύμενος points to the person in question making a display of *himself*, while the active ἐπιδεικνύσσω points to his "making a display," no matter of whom or what.

In Plato's "Apology," 41 C, we have: οὐ δήπου τούτουγε ἕνεκα οἱ ἐκεῖ ἀποκτείνουσιν = "I feel sure that those in the next world do not inflict death for this fault," without any mention of the persons on whom death is to be inflicted.

In "Livy," v. 1, we find: "Ita muniebant, ut ancipitia muni-

menta essent." Here *castra* is usually supplied after "muniebant." But this is unnecessary. "Ita muniebant" = "They so fortified" (*i.e.*, "They so constructed their works") "that their fortifications faced both ways." Also v. 12: "Tribuni plebis de tributo remiserunt" = "The tribunes slackened as regards the tributum," where the intransitive uses of the Latin and English verbs correspond.

Instances in the New Testament admitted by the Revisers are Luke xiii. 14: ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς = "Being moved by indignation because Jesus had healed on the Sabbath." Luke v. 17: "εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν" = "The power of the Lord was with Him to heal;" lit. "so that He should heal." Luke xx. 47: ἐτοιμάσας = "And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes." 2 Cor. x. 6: φανερώσαντες, where the Revisers translate: "Nay, in everything we have made [it] manifest among all men to you-ward," when I think a preferable translation would be: "Nay, in everything we made [matters] manifest in all respects to you-ward." Jude 19: οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες = "These are they who make separations."

Madvig, in his "Latin Grammar," § 94, expresses the law which I have given above in different words, and gives as an instance: "Amo, I am in love," without reference to any object of love. Jelf, in his "Greek Grammar," § 359, 4, explodes the common notion that the personal (he should have said *reflexive*) pronoun or some substantive is to be supplied, but does not give any law by which the usage is regulated. He gives, however, a long list of such verbs, not including those which I have mentioned above, but including ἀνακουτίζειν, ἀφανίζειν, and σφακελλίζειν, which exactly correspond in form to ἀνακαινίζειν. The late Dr. Donaldson, in his "Greek Grammar," § 430, goes further still, and says:

Although it is the custom to place the transitive before the intransitive verb in the active form, there can be no doubt that in the active, as in the passive inflexion, the intransitive usage is anterior to the transitive, which is merely a causative, or secondary, signification, and requires an objective case as a secondary predication to complete it. . . The true theory of syntax, according to which every oblique case represents an adverbial, or secondary predication, renders it necessary to consider every verb, even of the active form, as having been originally neuter, or independent.

Thus much as to the general principle of the intransitive use of transitive verbs.

But as I am convinced that I can supply the suppressed object of ἀνακαινίζειν in the passage under consideration, I will quote an important passage of Sophocles ("Ajax," 1396). This furnishes so perfect a parallel in the use of κομίζειν to that of

ἀνακαινίζειν, that I have kept it back hitherto in order to produce it with greater force. Here Teucer says to Ulysses:

τὰ δ' ἄλλα καὶ σύμπροσσε, κεί τινα στρατοῦ
θέλεις κομίζειν, οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἔξομεν.

But in other respects act with me, and if you are willing for some member of the army to attend [the funeral] we shall feel no vexation.

To *κομίζειν* it is clear that *τοῦ νεκρὸν* is to be supplied, "to escort [the corpse]," or "attend [the funeral]." Teucer will not allow Ulysses to attend the funeral himself, for fear of offending the shade of the departed Ajax, but thinks that if he is willing to send a representative all cause of vexation will be removed.

I think it may be taken for granted that if *ἐγκαίνιζω* signifies to *dedicate, consecrate, or inaugurate*, *ἀνακαινίζω* will properly signify to do over again what is represented as being done in the first case by *ἐγκαίνιζω*; *i.e.*, to *re-dedicate, re-consecrate, or re-inaugurate*. In Deut. xx. 5 we have *ἐγκαίνιζω* in the sense of "to dedicate," or "handsel" a house. "What man is there that hath built a new house and hath not dedicated (handselled) it (*ἐνεκαίνισεν*)? Let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it." Again, 1 Kings viii. 63: "So the king and all the children of Israel dedicated (*ἐνεκαίνισαν*) the house of the Lord." And so forth. In the New Testament we have the word twice. Heb. x. 20: *ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν* = "By the new and living way which He (Jesus) dedicated (or better, *inaugurated*) for us." And, secondly, a passage without which I could not now be writing with any confidence — Heb. ix. 18: "*Ὁθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται* = "Wherefore, even the first covenant (*διαθήκη*) hath not been dedicated (or better, "is not recorded as having been inaugurated") without blood." Here no one pretends to supply anything but *διαθήκη* to *ἡ πρώτη*, the subject of the verb. And if *ἡ διαθήκη* is a natural and proper subject for the passive *ἐγκαίνιζεσθαι*, it cannot but be a natural and proper object, or suppressed object, for the active *ἀνακαινίζειν*. I think, therefore, that I may venture to claim with some confidence that, in supplying *τὴν διαθήκην* as the suppressed object of *ἀνακαινίζειν*, I have discovered the "missing link" which is required for the perfect explanation of this most difficult passage.

I think, too, that the following illustration from our own language will go far towards bearing me out in supplying *τὴν διαθήκην* as the suppressed object of the apparently intransitive *ἀνακαινίζειν*. It is the custom in Great Britain for policies of insurance to be renewed by annual payments, and if the payment be not made within a certain time after the fixed date, the

person insuring is no longer able of right (*ἀνακαλιξέω*) to *renew*. To *renew* what? His insurance, the policy for which he has allowed to lapse. Similar expressions are also in use with regard to the renewal of leases. And it is to be observed that in these cases the word *renew* is constantly employed in an apparently intransitive manner, its object, whether insurance or lease, being suppressed.

Thus, advanced Christians, who deliberately and voluntarily apostatize or lapse (*παραιπίπτειν*), and take up another religion instead of the Christian covenant, are represented in this passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews as unable to *renew*. To *renew* what? Their covenant (*διαθήκη*) with God. Why so? Because there are two parties to a covenant, and if it be broken it must be renewed by both, unless there be special arrangements made for its renewal by one only. There is no such provision in the Christian covenant; therefore, if cast aside for another religion after full enjoyment of its privileges, it cannot be renewed by man, nor could it possibly be renewed by the iteration of baptism, the theory of the non-iteration of which is, therefore, correct as far as it goes. But it would require renewal by God as well as man. And it will not be renewed by God, because it would require the re-crucifixion of Christ and the repetition of His shame and sufferings, whereby God made His New Covenant with man, as will be admitted by every Christian.

Baptism is not the making of the covenant, which was made upon the Cross on God's part, as well as on that of man; it is merely the authorized mode of the individual man's entrance into it. It is irrational and outrageous to assert that apostates of the class described in this passage cannot *repent*; but it is both possible and reasonable to affirm that they cannot remake their covenant with God afresh, and that they are thus thrown upon the *uncovenanted* mercies of God. For that covenant consists of an act on God's part as well as on that of man, and God does not a second time offer His Son either for incarnation or for crucifixion.

But the expression *εἰς μετάνοιαν* must be dealt with before the explanation of the passage is complete. Singular uses of the preposition *εἰς* are met with in both sacred and profane authors. In Acts vii. 53 we find: *οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε*, which the Revisers translate: "Ye who received the law, as it was ordained by angels, and kept it not." In Matt. xii. 41 it is said of the Ninevites that "they repented *at* the preaching of Jonah" (*μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ*), where the expression presents an extraordinary similarity to the one immediately under discussion. If we choose to press the meaning of the preposition *εἰς* in *εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ*, we may consider it as a pregnant expression,

implying that they repented at and altered their course in the direction of the preaching of Jonah. In Thucydides vii. 15, we have the remarkable expression: ἅμα τῷ ἤρι εὐθύς καὶ μὴ ἐς ἀναβολὰς πράσσετε—"Do it immediately with the spring, and without delay." In Thucydides iii. 108 we find: ὥστε μῆτε ἐς ἀλκὴν ὑπομεῖναι—"so that they did not await their charge so as to come to close quarters" [but were panic-stricken, and caused the whole army to take to flight]. Again Thucydides viii. 88:

Βουλόμενοι αὐτὸν τοῖς Πέλοποννησίοις ἐς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Ἀθηναίων φιλίαν ὡς μάλιστα διαβάλλειν.

Wishing to put him into ill odour with the Peloponnesians on account of the friendship of himself and the Athenians.

Aristophanes, "Equites," 90, gives us: οἶνον σὺ τολμᾶς εἰς ἐπίνοιαν λουδορεῖν—"Have you the audacity to speak ill of wine as regards inventiveness?" Similar parallel passages may easily be multiplied, but the palm always remains with Matt. xii. 41: μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωάνη, which I think we may safely take as our guide, whether we think fit to press the preposition εἰς or not. It would also be perfectly legitimate to take the two passages of Thucydides, vii. 15 and iii. 108, as guides, and supply τραπομένους to εἰς μετάνοιαν in Heb. vi. 6, in which case εἰς μετάνοιαν would be simply translated "on repentance," or "on betaking themselves to repentance."

There is no difficulty in the expression πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν, an exact parallel to which presents itself in Aristophanes, "Equites," 1099:

καὶ νῦν ἑμαυτὸν ἐπιτρέπω σοι τουτοῖσι
γερονταγωγεῖν κάναπαιδεύειν πάλιν.

But the word ἀνασταυροῦντας may at first sight present a little difficulty to some people. The regular word signifying "to crucify" in the Scriptures of the New Covenant is σταυρώω, and ἀνασταυρόω would thus naturally mean to recrucify; or crucify again. But ἀνασταυρόω is commonly used by other writers in the simple sense, "to crucify." This might seem to cast a doubt upon my interpretation, were it not for the following word, ἑαυτοῖς, which limits the sense of ἀνασταυροῦντας to a private act of crucifixion, "for themselves," as opposed to the grand, final, and never-to-be-repeated crucifixion of the Son of God for all mankind, which took place once for all on Mount Calvary.

I therefore translate the passage under consideration as follows:

For it is impossible that those who were once illuminated, and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted that good is the word of God and the powers of the life to come, and fell away [or lapsed] should renew their covenant with God on repentance, by re-crucifying for themselves the Son of God again, and putting Him to an open shame.

This explanation also, affords a striking commentary upon

Heb. x. 31: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." It is a fearful thing so to fall *unprotected by a covenant*. But it is not so to the true believer, who falls asleep with his hope full of immortality, and who, like Paul (Philip. i. 23), desires to depart and be with Christ. What could remain to apostates thus unable to re-enter into covenant with God, and finding no more sacrifice for sins remaining, "but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, which shall devour those exposed to it"? (Heb. x. 27). Such persons may by God's *uncovenanted* mercy be saved, but they cannot in this life enjoy assurance of their salvation. Somewhat similar is Paul's declaration to his Galatian converts, that if they persisted in receiving circumcision (Gal. v. 2), in addition to their profession of Christianity, "Christ would profit them nothing."

It must be remembered, too, that the class thus contemplated must necessarily be a small class, consisting, as it does, only of those *advanced* Christians who apostatize, lit. *go on sinning* (*ἀμαρτάνοντες*) voluntarily (*ἑκουσίως*, Heb. x. 26). The early Church was certainly right in taking the more merciful view, and readmitting to communion, after probation, those who had lapsed (*ἀκουσίως*), involuntarily, from physical terror in time of persecution. They were certainly not guilty of such an apostasy as is contemplated in the above passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

ART. III.—HIGHER RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

A MOVEMENT is in progress in our southern dioceses about which very little has been said in print. It is none the worse for that, but the time seems to have come when discussion in public will help it, not by giving it impetus—of which there is no lack—but by comparison of methods and results. The movement for promoting "higher religious education" corresponds to similar movements for promoting higher education of a general kind by means of reading circles and University extension classes, and in some districts has decidedly gained the start of them. The classes who have some degree of leisure and education, especially the women of these classes, have of late years been called on by the Church to do much for others, and the Church now proposes to do something for them. It is not because they are deficient in knowledge, but because they are educated and cultivated, that it is proposed to help them to go further. Their existing culture and education constitute their claim.