

to dismiss this type of comment for ever from the realm of scientific exegesis.

The interchange of εἰς and ἐν in the later language is graphically illustrated by the fact that in modern Greek στό with the accusative (= εἰς τόν) actually takes the place of the obsolete dative (p. 63).

We wish we could dwell on the luminous handling of various important matters which we have noted. A great deal of wearisome discussion, e.g., would be saved if expositors attended to Dr. Moulton's dictum on the Article that 'in all essentials its use is in agreement with Attic' (p. 80). Predominant N.T. usage shows that the noun is generally anarthrous when joined to a preposition. The author holds that 'for exegesis, there are few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention than this omission of the article when the writer would lay stress on the quality or character of the object' (p. 83). We should be inclined to say that even here there is always danger of pedantic exegesis.

Passing on to the verb, we can do no more than call attention to the very satisfactory treatment of the so-called 'participle of subsequent action.' It is gratifying to find that Professor Ramsay's examples of what he conceives to be real subsequence, as, e.g., the daring interpretation of κωλυθέντες in Ac 16<sup>b</sup>, are ruled out of court (pp. 133-134). Another very instructive paragraph is that on Aoristic Perfects in the N.T. Dr. Moulton will not admit any 'except under very clear necessity' (p. 143). Thus, at one stroke, he sweeps away the examples found in He 7<sup>13</sup> 9<sup>18</sup> 11<sup>17</sup> as being simply a marked feature of the writer's style 'to describe what "stands written" in Scripture.' Those in the Apocalypse (ἐἴληφεν and εἴρηκα), as having no 'apparent reduplication,' may have been regarded by the writer as real aorists. The form ἔσχηκα which Paul seems to

use in a genuinely aoristic sense (2 Co 2<sup>13</sup> 1<sup>9</sup> 7<sup>5</sup>, Ro 5<sup>2</sup>), resembling as it does such aorists as ἔθηκα and ἀφῆκα, lent itself from force of circumstances to this usage. For, as Dr. Moulton points out, 'there is no Greek for *possessed*, the *constative* aorist, since ἔσχορον is almost (if not quite) exclusively used for the *ingressive got, received*' (p. 145).

A capital example of the adequacy and attractiveness of Dr. Moulton's method is to be found in the section on οὐ μή (pp. 187-192). Here he brings out the noteworthy fact that two-thirds of the instances occur in the Gospels, and almost all of these are from the actual words of Christ. These, along with quotations from the O.T., practically exhaust the occurrence of οὐ μή in the N.T. Perhaps it is not too fanciful to say, with the author, that 'since these are just the two elements which made up "Scripture" in the first age of Christianity, one is tempted to put it down to the same cause in both—a feeling that inspired language was fitly rendered by words of a decisive tone not needed generally elsewhere' (p. 192). Very fresh and illuminating are the pages on prohibitions (where the distinction between present imperative and aorist subjunctive is aptly sketched, p. 122), on imperatival participles (pp. 180-182, most important for exegesis), on the use of the optative in N.T. and contemporary literature (pp. 194-199), and on the participle in periphrastic tenses (where the canon which we found to apply to Semitisms is usually valid, pp. 225-227). It ought to be noted that the N.T. student may incidentally learn from this book a great deal of interesting comparative philology (see, e.g., pp. 128, 164-165, 169, etc.).

Besides ten pages of additional notes in small type, the book is provided with three full indexes, embracing quotations, Greek words, and subjects. The printing is most accurate. We have noticed misprints on pp. 15, 18, 91, 119, 138, 178, 179.

## The Master Mystic.

BY THE REV. CLAUD FIELD, M.A.

MYSTICISM has been much in the air lately, but hardly any mention has been made of one who is perhaps the greatest of all mystics—Jalaluddin Rumi. It is in his writings, if anywhere, that we must look for an eirenicon between Moham-

medanism and Christianity. He was born at Balkh in Central Asia early in the thirteenth century, and died in 1272, when Dante was a child of seven. The collocation is suggestive. Dante, of course, had never heard of the Persian

Sufis, but his pilgrimage through the Inferno, Purgatory, and Paradise bears a certain resemblance to the Sufistic stages passed in the journey towards 'wasl,' the goal of Sufistic theology—union with God.

Jalaluddin Rumi was brought up at Konia, the ancient Iconium, and it is a curious fact that the *Masnavi*, his great work, betrays an acquaintance with St. Paul which is very rare among mediæval Mohammedan writers. He accuses St. Paul of overlaying the simplicity of primitive Christianity with complicated dogmas, much in the style of 'broad' critics. His writings betray the influence of the Neo-Platonic philosophy, such expressions as 'Aql-i-Kull' occurring for the Logos, and 'Nafs-i-Kull' for the Pncuma. These should be useful when some future Henry Martyn treats of Christian theology in Persian.

Jalaluddin had pondered the meaning of the 'kernel' and the 'husk' six centuries before Dr. Abbott. He says, in a couplet much quoted by free-thinking Mohammedans—

I extracted the marrow of the Koran,  
And flung the bone to the dogs.

He is perfectly aware that religious belief is based upon an accumulation of probabilities, but in the Sufistic stage of 'wajd,' or ecstasy, he can rise into the sunlight of clear assurance. The cast-iron dogmas of Mohammedanism are molten into universal religious truths in the alembic of his poetry. To him the true Caaba is not the square temple which the Mohammedan pilgrims perambulate at Mecca, but the human heart. 'You may circle round the Caaba a thousand times,' he exclaims, 'God cares not for it if you hurt one heart.' So with regard to the incessant ablutions enjoined by Islam, he says: 'Yes, your hand can wash your body, but what hand can wash your heart?' In this he rises far above the average morality of Mohammedans who dispute whether sins of thought are sins at all. So again, in contrast to the common Mohammedan idea of God as an Almighty Despot looking with half-pitying contempt at the antics of humanity, he says—

Union exists beyond all thought and speech  
Between great Allah and the soul of each.

Browning, with a poet's intuition, represented the Arab physician Karshish and the Persian sage Ferishtah as alternately attracted and repelled by the doctrine of the Incarnation. In the same way,

the great Eastern mystic felt an irresistible yearning, like Plato, that Divine Wisdom would assume a visible shape. 'Oh, that I might behold,' he says, 'in flesh the splendour of the Friend!' At the same time he condemns the doctrine of the Trinity, the origin of which he ascribes to a kind of theological squinting or seeing God double. Our Lord to him, however, is something more than the mere prophet to which the Koran reduces him. Jalaluddin seems to incline to the Arian hypothesis. 'Jesus came in flesh,' he says, 'but was of the nature of angels.' In Sufi phraseology the word 'Jesus' seems at times not to connote personality, but to be a synonym for spirit, while the body, exactly as with St. Francis, is called 'the ass,' no doubt with reference to the Gospel narrative of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem. In one striking passage, of which the following is a rough but fairly literal translation, he says to a Sybarite—

You deserted Jesus, Ass without disguise,  
In a crowd of asses you would take the prize!  
Destiny of Jesus points to wisdom's rank,  
Destiny of asses simply is a blank.  
Pity keep for Jesus, pity not the ass!  
Let not fleshly impulse intellect surpass.  
If an ass could somewhat catch of Jesus' mind,  
Classed among the sages he himself would find,  
Though because of Jesus you may suffer woe,  
Still from Him comes healing; never let Him go!

The perusal of this and many similar passages by thoughtful Mohammedans, must leave on their minds somewhat of the effect that Matthew Arnold wished the Socratic method would have on the prejudice-bound minds of his countrymen, *i.e.* of inducing a fresh play of thought and feeling over their stock notions and habits. This is not mere conjecture. The Babis in Persia, who have suffered cruelly for their beliefs, one of which is that Mirza Ahmed, their founder, was the door or manifestation of God, have the *Masnavi*, Jalaluddin's chief work, at their fingers' ends. They often quote the couplet—

One must have King-recognizing eyes,  
To recognize the King in mean disguise.

It is much to be regretted that no one of the calibre of Fitzgerald has risen to do for Jalaluddin Rumi what he did for Omar Khayyam. Nothing is better adapted to act as an interpreter between East and West than suitable translations of the great Eastern mystics.