

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE are two directions in which the study of the New Testament promises the freshest results at present. The one is the discovery and decipherment of papyri and inscriptions. It is best represented by Deissmann's *Bible Studies*. The other is investigation into the language chiefly spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ. It is made most accessible in Dalman's *Words of Jesus*.

Dalman's *Words of Jesus* has just appeared in an excellent English translation. It is noticed on another page. Here we shall be content to touch on the interpretation of a single New Testament sentence.

It is the statement in St. Luke 17²¹, 'Behold, the kingdom of God is within you.' That is the translation of the Authorized Version. It is retained in the Revised Version. But there is doubt in both. The margin of the Authorized Version reads, 'Behold, the kingdom of God is among you,' and the margin of the Revised Version 'in the midst of you.' The question is whether it should be 'within you' or 'among you,' and it is a question that is much debated.

The words used by St. Luke (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) may mean either. But when he expresses 'among' elsewhere, he always uses another phrase (ἐν μέσῳ, Lk 2⁴⁶ 8⁷ 10³ 22²⁷⁻⁵⁵ 24³⁶, Ac 1¹⁶ 2²² 27³¹). The

probability, therefore, is that here the meaning is 'within you.' Again, the contrast is with the words 'with observation'—'the kingdom of God cometh not with observation' (17²⁰). Now, says Dalman, the complete negation of 'with observation' is not 'among you,' but 'within you,' 'in the secrecy of the heart.' And so he would not disapprove of Ephrem's rendering, 'in your heart,' though it is rather a paraphrase than a translation.

But the words were addressed to the Pharisees. How could it be said that the kingdom of God was in the Pharisees' heart? Dalman replies that the words, 'then is the kingdom of God come upon you,' in Lk 11²⁰ were also addressed to the Pharisees; and these words were spoken when the Pharisees had obstinately refused to recognize the claims of Jesus. It was to the general company of His hearers that our Lord said, 'The kingdom of God is within you.' He thought of the seed of the word. It is always sown in the heart. Some hearts may be too hard or too shallow to admit it or retain it. But when it is retained it germinates silently, secretly. One is brought within the kingdom, and another, and another. The kingdom of God comes. And it is all 'without observation.'

Professor Dalman has published through Messrs.

A. & C. Black the facsimile of a letter which he describes as, 'apart from a letter from Rome to the Fayûm, the oldest original letter that has so far been transmitted to us from the hand of a Christian.'

During one of the fierce Roman persecutions a woman named Politike 'stood before one of the highest officials in the kingdom.' She was charged with being a Christian, and confessed the crime. Two courses of action were set before her. If she offered sacrifice to the Genius of the Emperor, she was set at liberty. If she refused, her possessions were confiscated and she was sent into banishment. Consent was the act of a moment. Refusal was a lifelong misery. And for Politike it was the harder that it meant separation from her dear son Neilos. But what help is it to a woman if she keep the whole world and harm her own soul? She refused to sacrifice; she forsook her child for His name's sake, and was sent into the Great Oasis.

'They reach Syene, take a hurried farewell of the eternal river,—the river Politike loved so well that her son was named after it,—and then a little caravan moves westwards into the barren land, the bare tops of whose hills are traced in sharp outlines in the evening sky—the desert! The desert with its parching heat and bleaching bones, unfolding a tale of robbers, murder, and the malice of demons! And what, forsooth, will happen when, all these terrors passed, they arrive at the Oasis?' Six times the sun rose and set. The tortures of the desert were becoming intolerable. Outlines of buildings and trees began to appear on the horizon. They reached at last the city of Kysis. The soldiers made their report to the captain of the castle. Politike was set free. She might go wherever she pleased—alone, like the scapegoat in the wilderness.

A man approached. He had been waiting till she should be set at liberty. She shrank from him. He uttered the name of Jesus—

How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer's ear:
It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds,
And drives away his fear.

We sing that lightly; Politike felt it. In a little time she was among friends, cared for and comforted. She was sent further inland for greater security, and an effort was set on foot to bring her son Neilos to her.

She was sent further inland to one Psenosiris. When she arrived, Psenosiris wrote a letter to his friend and brother-presbyter Apollon, who had spoken to Politike that day she arrived in Kysis. This is the letter—

'From Psenosiris the Presbyter to Apollon
the Presbyter, his beloved brother
in the Lord, Greeting!
Above all I salute thee often-
times, and all the brethren that are
with thee in God. I would have thee
know, brother, that the grave-diggers
here into the inner part
have brought Politike, who was
sent into the Oasis by the
government. And her have I
forthwith given over to the care of
the good and faithful among
the grave-diggers, until that
her son Neilos be come. And
when he hath come with God,
he will bear thee witness of
all that they have done to
her. Do thou also on thy part
make known to me what thou dost wish
done here. I will do it gladly.
I wish thee welfare
in the Lord God.'

It is a slip of papyrus. On the one side is that letter. On the other this address—

To Apollon × from Psenosiris
the Presbyter × the Presbyter in the Lord.

It is a simple letter enough, it has to do with simple folk. But it is an *original source* for the history of the Christian Church. Now 'the further back into the past we transport ourselves, the more scanty do such sources become, the

more carefully must every relic of the culture of that time be turned to the best advantage for the purpose we have in view. It is in this way that we accumulate, by quiet, unassuming work—work removed from the struggle for law and orthodoxy—the foundation-stones for a history of the Church, not indeed of the official Church, often rather of the unofficial, yet always of the Church, if we mean by it Christianity,—proofs of its elasticity, of its inexhaustible power of adapting itself, of transforming itself, of bending to the lowly and of ennobling the commonplace.' Professor Dalman quotes those words from Dr. Jülicher, the Rector of the University of Marburg. They give the reason why he writes so much and so carefully on THE EPISTLE OF PSENOSIRIS.

Mr. J. R. Wilkinson, M.A., formerly Scholar of Worcester College, Oxford, believes that he has discovered *A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel*, and under that title he has published a thin octavo through Messrs. Luzac, in which he tells the whole story. It is a story of gospel criticism, always acute but not always convincing, and the reader must go to Mr. Wilkinson's book for it. Here it is enough to notice an incident in the progress of the dissection.

The chief value of Mr. Wilkinson's discovery is perhaps the search which it sent him to make into the evidence for the existence of John the Baptist's disciples in Palestine after our Lord's resurrection. For it is to be observed that when he speaks of a 'Johannine document' Mr. Wilkinson means a document having to do with the party of John the Baptist. The evidence for the existence of such a party is not plentiful, but Mr. Wilkinson believes that it exists and is sufficient. That after the imprisonment of their master and during the ministry of our Lord the disciples of John held together, is shown by the reference to them on the subject of fasting (Mk 2¹⁸ and parallels).

But if they held together during Christ's ministry, His crucifixion was not likely to disperse them. The crucifixion of the Messiah was a stumbling-block to the Jews in general, how much more to the ardent disciples of John the Baptist. No doubt, in opposition to other Jews they and the disciples of Jesus had much in common. Each party made the immediate approach of the Messianic kingdom the chief article of their faith, each urged the supreme importance of repentance and change of heart, each laid stress on moral goodness and depreciated the saving efficacy of Jewish privileges, each acknowledged John the Baptist to be a prophet. They agreed in almost everything. In one thing only did they differ. But it was the vital thing. John's disciples could not accept Jesus as the Messiah. They could not reckon Him so great as their own master, from whom He had been glad to receive baptism. One thing, but it was the vital thing,—they rejected the Messiahship of Jesus, and the crucifixion was not likely to induce them to recognize it.

Mr. Wilkinson believes that in the early days of the primitive Church the disciples of John extended far beyond the bounds of Palestine. In the city of Ephesus there were found both Christians and Johannines. They do not seem to have been actively hostile, though they were distinct. When Paul came upon some twelve of the Johannine sect together, and put to them the question, 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?' they answered in all sincerity that they had not heard that the Messianic gift of the Holy Spirit had yet been poured forth. Another reading of their answer is, that they had not so much as heard of the existence of a Holy Ghost. But Mr. Wilkinson thinks that is too much to believe of any disciple either of Jesus or of John. What they said in effect was that they did not know that the Holy Ghost had been poured out in recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus. When they were led by Paul's words to believe that this evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus was in

existence and could be furnished them, they believed, and were baptized into the name of Jesus. And when Paul laid his hands on them, they also received the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Apart from those twelve, however, and in an earlier narrative, one of John's disciples is given by name. His name was Apollos. That Apollos was a member of the Johannine sect is evident, Mr. Wilkinson holds, from the statement that he 'knew only the baptism of John' (Ac 18²⁵). And he thinks that when Priscilla and Aquila 'took him unto them and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly,' what they did was to carry him further than yet he had been able to go, until he acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah.

There is certainly a somewhat serious difficulty. For, in the same sentence in which it is stated that Apollos knew only the baptism of John, it is also stated that he 'taught carefully the things concerning Jesus.' Mr. Wilkinson has no way with this difficulty but the drastic way. It is an interpolation. But he is not alone in thinking so. Jüngst and Spitta have called it an interpolation before him. Well, if that statement is out of the way, the course is clear. Apollos was a Johannine; he was likely to be a tower of strength to the sect; but, being brought to the Lord by the instrumentality of Priscilla and her husband, it was almost worth placing his conversion by the side of that of Paul himself. And when Apollos found it advisable to leave Ephesus (as Paul had had to leave Damascus) after his conversion, the Christians in Ephesus encouraged him, and wrote to the brethren in Achaia to receive him.

'God has two families of children on this earth, says Francis W. Newman, *'the once-born and the twice-born.'* If we are familiar with our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, and with the theology that has sprung from it, we understand at once that all are born once into this world, that all *ought* to be born again, but some refuse or are

rejected; and so we say, Yes, there are the two classes of God's creatures, the once-born and the twice-born. We understand what Francis Newman means.

But that is not what he means. What he means is that we are *all* God's children, but some of us think that we are not God's children until we are 'born again,' and so we agonize till we have passed through that experience. We are no better, however, and we may be much worse, than those who accept their sonship by nature without agony. There are the once-born and there are the twice-born, and—well, it is better to let Newman describe the once-born and we shall understand.

The once-born, says Newman (*The Soul*, 3rd ed., 1852, pp. 89, 91), 'see God, not as a strict Judge, not as a glorious Potentate; but as the animating Spirit of a beautiful, harmonious world, Beneficent and Kind, Merciful as well as Pure. The childlike quality of their nature makes the opening of religion very happy to them: for they no more shrink from God, than a child from an Emperor, before whom the parent trembles. They read his character, not in the disordered world of man, but in romantic and harmonious nature. Of human sin they know perhaps little in their own hearts and not very much in the world; and human suffering does but melt them to tenderness. Thus, when they approach God, no inward disturbance ensues; and without being as yet spiritual, they have a certain complacency and perhaps romantic sense of excitement in their simple worship.'

Is this religion? Professor William James of Harvard seems to think it is. He calls it 'the Religion of Healthy-Mindedness.' Professor James delivered the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion before the University of Edinburgh during the session 1901-1902. He has now published them through Messrs. Longman under the title of *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. They have been

somewhat condensed for publication. Nevertheless, the volume offers a generous page to the reader, and we shall not run any risk when we prophesy that this will have the widest circulation of all the volumes on the Gifford foundation that have yet been published.

Well, it is Professor James that makes the quotation from Francis Newman. And, as we have said, he seems to agree with Newman that the once-born are really religious, for he describes them throughout a whole chapter, to which he gives the title of 'the Religion of Healthy-Mindedness.'

It is easier for Professor James to class 'the healthy-minded' as religious than for some of us, because he is a psychologist, and not a theologian. As a psychologist he concerns himself only with phenomena, that is, religions which show the signs of religion. And the signs of religion being 'to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with one's God,' it is quite within the power of Professor James to call the healthy-minded religious, and proceed to offer us examples of them.

He says that Emerson is an admirable example of the healthy-minded in religion. Theodore Parker is another. He quotes two passages from Theodore Parker's writings. This is part of one of them: 'I have done wrong things enough in my life, and do them now; I miss the mark, draw bow, and try again. But I am not conscious of hating God, or man, or right, or love, and I know there is much "health in me"; and in my body, even now, there dwelleth many a good thing, spite of consumption and Saint Paul.'

That is well enough. But a still better example is Dr. Edward Everett Hale, the eminent Unitarian preacher and writer. Many of Professor James's examples are taken from MSS belonging to Professor Starbuck of Stamford University, who sent certain questions on the subject of personal

religion to many and various individuals, and received many and various replies. It was to one of Dr. Starbuck's circulars that Dr. Hale replied and said: 'I observe, with profound regret, the religious struggles which come into many biographies, as if almost essential to the formation of the hero. I ought to speak of these, to say that any man has an advantage, not to be estimated, who is born, as I was, into a family where the religion is simple and rational; who is trained in the theory of such a religion, so that he never knows, for one hour, what these religious or irreligious struggles are. I always knew God loved me, and I was always grateful to him for the world he placed me in. I always liked to tell him so, and was always glad to receive his suggestions to me. I can remember perfectly that, when I was coming to manhood, the half-philosophical novels of the time had a deal to say about the young men and maidens who were facing "the problem of life." I had no idea whatever what the problem of life was. To live with all my might seemed to me easy; to learn where there was so much to learn seemed pleasant and almost of course; to lend a hand, if one had a chance, natural; and if one did this, why, he enjoyed life because he could not help it, and without proving to himself that he ought to enjoy it. A child who is early taught that he is God's child, that he may live and move and have his being in God, and that he has therefore infinite strength at hand for the conquering of any difficulty, will take life more easily, and probably will make more of it, than one who is told that he is born the child of wrath and wholly incapable of good.'

Those men are religious. More than that, they have at least a nominal connexion with Christianity. But there are others. For 'in that theory of evolution which, gathering momentum for a century, has within the past twenty-five years swept so rapidly over Europe and America, we see the ground laid for a new sort of religion of Nature, which has entirely displaced Christianity from the thought of a large part of our genera-

tion.' Professor James, as usual, gives an example. He takes it from Dr. Starbuck's collection. In this case he gives the questions as well as the answers.

First question—*What does Religion mean to you?*
 Answer—'It means nothing; and it seems, so far as I can observe, useless to others. I am sixty-seven years of age, and have resided in X. fifty years, and have been in business forty-five, consequently I have some little experience of life and men, and some women too, and I find that the most religious and pious people are, as a rule, those most lacking in uprightness and morality. The men who do not go to church or have any religious convictions are the best. Praying, singing of hymns, and sermonizing are pernicious—they teach us to rely on some supernatural power, when we ought to rely on ourselves. I *teetotally* disbelieve in a God. . . . As a timepiece stops, we die—there being no immortality in either case.'

The second question was—*What comes before your mind corresponding to the words, God, Heaven, Angels, etc.?* The answer is—'Nothing whatever. I am a man without a religion. These words mean so much mythic bosh.' Question three—*Have you had any experiences which appeared providential?* Answer—'None whatever. There is no agency of the superintending kind. A little judicious observation as well as knowledge of scientific law will convince any one of this fact.' Two questions follow, and then comes—*What is your temperament?* To which the answer is—'Nervous, active, wide-awake, mentally and physically; sorry that Nature compels us to sleep at all.'

'If we are in search of a broken and contrite heart,' says Professor James, 'clearly we need not look to this brother.' No. But is he religious? Professor James apparently thinks he is. He says that his 'state of mind may by courtesy be called a religion, for it is his reaction upon the whole nature of things, it is systematic and reflective, and it loyally binds him to certain inner ideals.'

Professor James seems driven to acknowledge his religion. For if his own word may be taken for it, he manifests the fruits of religion in his life. So the question arises—Is this person one of 'the healthy-minded' in religion? Is he one of the once-born? And are all the once-born, including such an one as this, who expects the same immortality as a timepiece, really heirs of eternal life?

This question is the question of questions for us to-day. Other difficulties will wait, this one must be settled. The 'sick souls' are not too well received among us at present. It is the 'healthy-minded' we encourage. Our God is 'the happy God.' And we seem to have settled it in our minds, though we have not yet inserted it in our creeds, that in Adam all do *not* die, and that there is *less* joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth than over one happy and healthy person who sees no occasion for repentance.

We have settled it so in our practice. Sooner or later it was bound to come into our theology. This very month it seems to have come.

Mr. F. R. Tennant, M.A. (Camb.), B.Sc. (Lond.), was appointed Hulsean lecturer before the University of Cambridge in the session 1901-1902. He lectured on *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*. After the lectures were listened to, they were published at the Cambridge University Press. No one took exception to the lectures, no one has banned the book. And yet Mr. Tennant rejects the doctrine of the Fall, and calls Original Sin a figment.

Does Mr. Tennant deny that the doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin are contained in Scripture? No, he does not deny that. He holds, however, that they occupy a much less prominent place in Scripture than they do in historical theology. 'The fictitious importance,' he says, 'assigned by Theology, in its most scholastic and artificial periods,

to the doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin is an accident of history, not the outcome of the necessary development of the Faith.' And he believes that though they are found in Scripture they have no business to be there, and may be dropped out with advantage.

The doctrine of the Fall, on which hangs the doctrine of Original Sin, is found in Scripture twice. It is found in the third chapter of Genesis and in the fifth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

It is found first in the third chapter of Genesis. To understand its place there, we must remember that God's way with the human race is according to evolution. Revelation is by gradual development. And it does not matter whether we say that God gradually made Himself known to man, or that man gradually became sensible, by the use of his God-given faculties, of God. Now, the Book of Genesis strikes into this gradual process at a certain point. The mind of man has emancipated itself from mere Nature religion, but it has scarcely yet passed into Ethical Monotheism. The book, therefore, contains echoes of remoter thought,

elements of prehistoric speculation, when religion was a kind of nature-poetry and the deities were natural phenomena. It has been purified and adapted to the spiritual and ethical standpoint of a writer or collector of oral traditions (the critics call him J or E), who lived somewhere near the threshold of the prophetic age. But the prehistoric unethical elements have not been purified out of existence; and we see one glaring example of them in the third chapter: it is the story of the Fall.

St. Paul accepted this story. He believed that Adam was a historic person, and that this sad experience of his was historic also. For St. Paul had been trained in the Jewish schools, and in such a matter as this simply accepted the current Rabbinical teaching. But it is doubtful to Mr. Tennant's mind if St. Paul does more than use this prehistoric survival as an illustration. At any rate, Mr. Tennant counts it none of his business to get entangled in Talmudic methods of interpretation. He takes the words 'in Adam all died' as 'a useful mode of speech for practical exhortation, without troubling' himself 'about its incompatibility with the results of accurate psychological or ethical analysis.'

Caesarea.

AN EXPOSITORY STUDY OF ACTS X.

BY THE REV. T. D. BERNARD, M.A., CANON OF WELLS.

THERE were two stages in the delivery of the gospel to mankind, divided—or we should rather say, conjoined—by an act of God, which expanded the Judaic into the Catholic Church. It takes place at the fitting moment and on the appropriate spot. The narrative leads us from Jerusalem, the centre of Judaism, to Cæsarea, its point of contact with the empire and the world.

For that purpose Cæsarea was built by Herod, a seaport and a citadel. A spacious harbour was formed by a solid breakwater, and the lines of a great city laid out. 'It speedily became the virtual capital of Palestine. *Cæsarea Judææ caput*

est, says Tacitus; he means the Roman province of that name. Judæan, Cæsarea never was. The gateway to Rome, the place was already a piece of Latin soil. The procurator had his seat in it; there was an Italian garrison; and on the great white temple that shone out over the harbour, stood statues—of Augustus and of Rome. It was heathendom in all its glory at the very door of the true religion. Yes, but the contrast might be reversed. It was justice and freedom in the most fanatical and turbulent province in the world' (G. A. Smith, *Geography of Holy Land*, p. 140). In this place, and in the very heart of