

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

LAST winter the Egypt Exploration Fund had the joy of discovering the first mention of the Israelites on an Egyptian monument, and much was heard of the discovery. This winter a discovery has been made (if it *has* been made) which casts the last winter's into the shade. A telegram has been received at the British Museum saying that Professor Flinders Petrie, or someone else, has found the *Logia* of Papias.

Papias, it is perhaps sufficiently settled now, was Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the early part of the second century. He wrote a book entitled *Exposition of the Logia of the Lord* (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις). What he meant by the *Logia* of the Lord is one of the oldest and one of the keenest matters of controversy in the history of the Christian Church. The word is usually rendered 'Oracles,' for so is the same word translated in the New Testament. But we are scarcely nearer the meaning. It is enough to say that opinion ranges between *Discourses* of Jesus on the one side, and the *Gospels* on the other. And the interest of the controversy lies in this, that if it was only some Discourses of our Lord's that Papias wrote his commentary on, then the Gospels were presumably unknown, or at any rate not yet authoritative, when Papias lived and wrote. If it was the Gospels them-

selves, why, then, they were both extant and already accepted as 'Scripture.'

But if the *Logia* of Papias has been found, it will do more than settle that ancient controversy. Papias tells us that he did not scruple to add to the *Logia*, or their exposition, reports of conversations which he had held with early disciples of the Lord. Who these disciples were is, again, a matter in dispute. But even if the 'Beloved Disciple' was not one of them, but only some other John, after all Papias may have gathered some very precious things out of all that Jesus did in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in the books we now possess.

Before passing away altogether from last year's discovery in Egypt, it may be well to notice a valuable contribution to the subject in *The Expositor* for March, by Professor James Orr of Edinburgh. In brief, Professor Orr believes and argues that the Exodus took place not under Merenptah, nor under the Nineteenth Dynasty at all, but under the Eighteenth Dynasty, and probably under Amenhotep II., the immediate successor of the great Tahutmes III. And he believes that both the Bible and the recent discovery demand that.

Professor Orr finds that to take Merenptah, or any other king of his dynasty, as the Pharaoh of the Exodus, is to get hopelessly out of touch with the dates in the Bible. There is no room left, then, for the period of the Judges, 'arrange them in "strands" as one may'; and, on the other hand, there is too much room left for the period between Abraham and the Departing of the People of Israel out of Egypt. But if you take the (monumentally corrected) date of the founding of the temple, say 965 B.C., and work backward, you are brought to 1445 B.C., or thereby, as the date of the Exodus. And if you take the date of Chedorlaomer at about 2100 B.C., and work forward, reckoning 650 years as the biblical interval between Abraham and the Exodus, you are brought to almost exactly the same point, 1450 B.C.

And there are confirming testimonies. With some hesitation Professor Orr accepts Colonel Conder's identification of the Khaberi, whose arrival in Palestine alarmed the then king of Jerusalem, with the Hebrews. But with more confidence he sees in 'the daughter of Pharaoh' who rescued the infant Moses, the great Hatasu, one of the most remarkable women in history. 'If Moses was, as commonly supposed, about eighty years old at the time of the Exodus, his birth would fall in the later years of Tahutmes I., when Hatasu, his daughter—who at the time of her association in rule with her father "was about twenty-four years of age, of great capacity and power"—was just attaining to womanhood. A more exact correspondence could not be conceived.'

In the rehabilitation (if that is the word they use, 'whitewashing' is used by their enemies) of the traitor Judas, the text that chiefly stands in the way is St. Mark xiv. 21: 'Good were it for that man if he had never been born.' It seems so plain, and it is undoubtedly so emphatic. If the translation is right, Judas is hard to rehabilitate.

But the translation can scarcely be defended. It is true the Revised Version makes no material

change, but in the margin it adds the innocent information that the Greek is: 'Good were it for him if that man had not been born.' Now, that is curious Greek for that meaning. And when we remember the invariable sense of the adverb (*καλόν*), which is here translated 'good,' the words seem stranger still. For this adverb or neuter adjective invariably describes a 'good and beautiful' thing. That is to say, it is not a negative or neutral epithet, but decidedly positive and comforting. What, then, can be the meaning of 'a good and comforting thing it had been for him if that man had not been born'?

A new commentary on St. Mark was noticed a few months ago. It was noticed, we fear, with undue shortness. It is one of a series of commentaries which Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have set out to publish covering the whole of the New Testament. The volume on St. Mark is edited by the Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D., whose brief biography of Dr. Field has given him an introduction to our readers. Well, Mr. Burn discusses this passage, and Mr. Burn is a safe and sensitive exegete, and he gives a wholly different turn to it. He renders the sentence in this way: 'An excellent thing were it for Him (the Son of Man) if there had not been born that man' (the man who, while an apostle, becomes a traitor).

In its issue of 4th March, *The Christian World* draws attention to, and deprecates, a statement recently made by Mr. Moody, the well-known evangelist of America, on the reference to Jonah in St. Matthew. Mr. Moody said: 'If you deny the story of Jonah and the whale, you must deny the resurrection of Jesus Christ, because He said, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If you make the one to be a parable or a myth, I don't see how you can claim anything more for the other.'

On which *The Christian World* makes comment thus: 'We are amazed that a man so shrewd as Mr. Moody should be capable of such a statement. To put the Resurrection on the same level as the authenticity and literalness of a doubtful verse in Matthew, so that if one is denied or doubted the other must be, is an instance of theological recklessness, of trifling with vital religious interests, which is inexcusable in a man in Mr. Moody's position. The passage is of the most doubtful authenticity; the parallel narrative in Luke xi. 29, 30 entirely omits it, and there are the strongest reasons for regarding it as a later addition. Even if it were not, it would be impossible to take it literally, for, as a matter of fact, Christ was not "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

The Christian World adds that, even if the passage were unchallengeable and the meaning unmistakable, our Lord was entitled to use an illustration from popular literature without indorsing the literal truth of the illustration itself. When he desired to enforce some lesson, He did not hesitate to invent a parable for the purpose; why, then, should He hesitate to use one? And *The Christian World* ends by saying that if the doctrine of the Resurrection stands or falls with the historical accuracy of this story in the Book of Jonah, our Christian faith is in a perilous case.

Dr. Maclarens of Manchester is now delivering a series of sermons on the 'Promises to the Victor in the Book of Revelation.' The sermons are reported every week in *The Christian Commonwealth*. For the third time Dr. Maclarens has preached on the text Rev. ii. 17. The other sermons may be found in the third series of his *Sermons*, published by Macmillan, and in the volume entitled *Christian Certainties*.

When Dr. Maclarens preached first on Rev. ii. 17, he found a meaning in the 'white stone' which has the victor's new name written on it. When

he preached the second time, he found no ascertainable meaning in it, and he is in the same position still. But is it so that no certainty has been or can be reached about it, as he said before? Or is it so that it is used merely as the vehicle for the name, as he says now? In the first page of the first volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES some Notes were written on this 'white stone'; and, inasmuch as that first volume is now scarce and almost unattainable, it may be pardonable to repeat them briefly here.

'Before a young man could appear as a gladiator in the great public games, he had to pass through a long and severe process of training. During that time he went under the name of *tiro*, or apprentice. When he made his first public appearance in the arena, if he proved victorious, he received an oblong tablet of ivory (*tessera gladiatoria*) as a reward and sign of his proficiency, on which were written his name, that of his master, and the day of his first fight and victory. He was then admitted to the ranks of the *spectati* (distinguished persons). The name of *tiro* was dropped, and his new name of *spectatus* was inscribed upon his *tessera*. The *tessera gladiatoria* may not be immediately attractive, but there is at least no objection to the employment of a symbol by St. John which is used by the apostle of the Gentiles. And then, it fits the case. There is a change of name, the new name being more honourable, and commanding greater privileges than the old. And this white stone is given as a reward of victory — of a victory, it should be observed, not in a single brief contest, but which was the crown and finish of a long and self-denying course of discipline.'

'One thing remains. The new name is one "which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it." This is the victorious Christian's special privilege. We must take it, therefore, to be in *contrast* to the name of the conquering gladiator, which everyone knew, and which he would himself take pride in exhibiting. As the Christian, who may

not share in the public idolatrous banquets, is fed with food the more refreshing because spiritual and unseen, so the gift he receives, when his victory is won, is the more noble because it cannot be boasted of in public, being conferred not by vulgar applause, but by Him who seeth in secret. The very glory of it lies in its secretness, for it is his own peculiar treasure, the gift of his Heavenly Father's hand, too fine to be seen by common eyes, too precious for common appreciation.'

Canon Gore believes in Evolution as he believes in the Higher Criticism. The great difficulty in the way of a popular acceptance of the Higher Criticism is the language of our Lord on the 110th Psalm and the like. The great difficulty in the way of a popular acceptance of Evolution is the Fall. So Canon Gore, who had already spoken on the Higher Criticism and the language of our Lord, has now spoken on Evolution and the Fall. On the eighteenth day of February, Montgomery Hall, in Sheffield, was crowded to hear Canon Gore lecture on 'The Theory of Evolution and the Christian Doctrine of the Fall.'

The lecture is reported in *The Church Times* of 19th February. It is divided into seven parts. For Canon Gore began by saying that 'there is a widespread and popular notion that there is a marked contradiction between the scientific theory of Evolution and the Christian Doctrine of the Fall,' and that contradiction 'may be stated and examined under several heads.'

First of all, Evolution says that man began his career at the bottom; Christian doctrine holds that he began it at the top. Says Christian doctrine, Man was created perfect, and subsequently fell into sin and accompanying misery. Says Evolution, Man emerged at the beginning from a purely animal life, and slowly struggled upwards to the present level of attainment. That is the first contradiction. But, as so stated, Canon Gore finds it too absolute. It is not true that the Bible

represents man as created perfect. No doubt theologians have thought so, from the Augustinian age until now, and some of them have unreservedly said so. Thus Robert South supposes that 'Aristotle was but the rubbish of Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise.' But the Bible does not say so, and it was repudiated by the earliest Christian theologians, East and West. Thus, in answer to the question whether Adam was formed perfect or imperfect, Clement of Alexandria replied: 'They shall learn from us that he was not perfect in respect of this creation, but in a fit condition to receive virtue.'

The Bible, says Canon Gore, does not claim that man was created perfect. It looks *forward* to man's perfecting; it does not look backward. It traces the beginning of civilisation in Abel the keeper of sheep, in Cain the tiller of the ground; Jabal is the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle; Jubal is the father of music; Tubal-Cain is the first forger of brass and iron. The Bible indicates the origin of religious worship with Enoch, the origin of architecture with the Tower of Babel. Noah, Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, all represent steps of advance along the line of the chosen people. And, later on, it appears that upon the chosen people centres a hope for all the nations, and a purpose is discovered in universal history. Even the Bible does not place perfection for man at the beginning; it teaches him to strive to find it at the end.

But Canon Gore is ready to allow that the Bible gives us to understand that man ought to have developed much more happily than he has done. There is a twist in his nature, and it does not work itself out as God intended it to do. And, then, the first three chapters of the Bible tell us that that twist,—that perversion of the heart of man,—arose out of an original act of rebellion on the part of the first human pair. So the Bible says that sin is unnatural to man, a later and lamentable entrance into him; and this entrance of sin has made his development so much more

tortuous and slow. But the Bible does not say that all development is on account of sin ; it does not say that man was created perfect. Thus far science and theology are not at enmity.

But the second antagonism is more serious. Science says that the actual development of man, however tortuous it may have been, was the only development he was ever capable of. For science says that you may call sin sin if you please, but man can never help it. Man has no freedom of action. He is and does what his nature makes him be and do, and his nature has been fixed—well, at least, since ever there was a man. You may call sin sin, but it is only the survival of brute instincts which men have come to be ashamed of, because they have made some progress along the highway of Evolution.

And Canon Gore at once accepts that gage of battle. That, he says, is the real conflict between Evolution and the Bible. If sin is admitted by science to be sin, Canon Gore has no fear that science and religion will fall out finally as to the fact of the Fall. But if science persists in denying that sin is sin—persists, that is to say, in denying that man has any freedom of will, and, therefore, that he can have any responsibility for his actions—if science persists in denying that, then science and the Bible can never agree together.

But science cannot prove that men have no freedom of choice, and insurmountable scientific facts are against it. A scientific theory that will stand is one that explains the phenomena it has to do with, and it stands as long as it does that. But this theory explains none of the phenomena at all. For every human being admits a sense of responsibility. And even the advocate of scientific determinism himself acknowledges that it will not work, and had better not be tried.

Therefore, if science and the Bible are at variance on the freedom of man's will, it is all the worse for science. Now, the Bible says plainly

that sin is lawlessness. If modern science says that it is law—that it is the inevitable working out of a man's own nature—let science see to that ; it is the theory of the Bible that fits the facts.

But, thirdly, does not your Bible say that the moral fault or taint in human nature is the outcome of actual transgressions on the part of remote ancestors? Is not 'original sin' described as due to actual sin? But modern science denies that acquired characters can be inherited. Adam and Eve may have eaten of the forbidden fruit, as the Bible says they did, and granted that the consequence was serious for Adam and Eve, their act cannot pass to their descendants in any result whatever. If there is any taint in human nature, it must have come into it before human nature began—it must have been derived from some pre-human ancestry. The fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children's teeth are set on edge—such a sentiment might pass in an unscientific age. But even Jeremiah perceived its inapplicability, and now Professor Weismann has proved it impossible.

To which Canon Gore might have replied that neither St. Paul nor reformed theology represents Adam's sin as inherited by Adam's posterity, but only, to use an inadequate word, imputed to them. And why he does not so reply is puzzling. What he does reply is that Professor Weismann has made many disciples, but that does not prove his doctrine true. 'I believe I am right in saying (1) that the doctrine has not yet assumed a fixed form ; (2) is strongly disputable ; (3) in its latest forms does not absolutely deny that acquired characters can be transmitted ; and (4) does not, in fact, commend itself at all generally to that branch of scientific inquiry which is specially concerned with the practical aspects of human nature—I mean medical science.' As for that contradiction, then, it is no contradiction yet, and we can afford to wait until it is.

And practically the same answer is made to the alleged contradiction that comes fourth. Accord-

ing to Christian doctrine, it is said, mankind is derived from a single specifically human pair, made human by a special inspiration of the Divine Spirit. According to the theory of Evolution, a certain species of apes under certain favourable conditions gradually advanced to become what might be called man, though of a very low type. But let us be more precise. St. Paul says: 'God made of one all the nations of the earth,' and He certainly means of one individual. Again, the latest work of ethnology of a distinctly non-Christian character (Canon Gore means Mr. Keane's *Ethnology* in the Cambridge Geographical Series) speaks thus: 'The Hominidæ are not separately evolved in an absolute sense—that is, from so many different anthropoid precursors, but the present primary divisions are separately evolved from so many different Pleistocene precursors, themselves evolved through a single Pliocene prototype from a single anthropoid precursor.' The language of the one is 'biblical,' the language of the other is 'scientific'; but, as to this matter of a single ancestor, their witness agrees together.

The end is now in sight. But Canon Gore is ready to give as well as take. If science ridicules an actual Garden of Eden and an actual apple tree, Canon Gore would rule the ridicule out of date, for he does not cling to either. 'The doctrine of Sin and of the Fall in its true importance has a much surer basis than the supposition that Gen. iii. is literal history. The doctrine of the Fall is not separable from the doctrine of Sin, or the doctrine of Sin from that of moral freedom. It rests upon the broad basis of human experience, especially upon Christian experience, which is bound up with its reality. Most of all, it rests for Christians on the teaching of Christ, for Christ's teaching and action postulate throughout the doctrine of Sin. But that doctrine, in its turn, goes back upon the Old Testament, which is full of the truth that the evils of human nature are due not to its essential constitution, but to man's wilfulness and its results; that the disordering

force in human nature has been moral, the force of sin; that human history represents in one shape a fall from a Divine purpose, a fall constantly repeated and renewed in acts of disobedience. These constant acts of disobedience are, in part, caused by an evil trait in human nature, and this in its turn exhibits the fruits of past sins. Granted this, the story in Gen. iii., whether it be historical, or whether, as great numbers not only of modern Christians, but of the greatest of early Christians thought, it is not an historical account of an actual event, has, at any rate, vital spiritual truth. The character of its inspiration is apparent. Teach a child what sin is, first of all, on the ground of general Christian experience and the blood of Christ, and then read to it the story of Gen. iii., and the child must perforce recognise the truth in a form in which it cannot be forgotten. There, in fact, in that story all the stores of truth are opened on the meaning of sin, and all the main sources of error precluded. Sin is not our nature, but wilfulness; sin is disobedience to the Divine law, the refusal of trust in God. There is such a thing as being tempted to sin and yielding to it, and then finding that we have been deceived, being conscience-stricken and fearing to face God; and the course of our manhood springs from nowhere, ultimately, but our own evil heart. And if our sins lay us under an outward discipline, which is God's punishment, yet in the very discipline lies the hope of our recovery. God the destroyer is also the God who has promised redemption. All that we want to know about God and man, about obedience and disobedience, about temptation, about the blessing and the cursing of human nature, about conscience good and bad, is to be found in that story of Gen. iii., written in language suitable to the childhood of the individual and of the race.'

Then comes the last of these antagonisms between modern science and the Bible, and it is disposed of speedily. Modern science finds that physical death belonged to the world abundantly before man appeared: Christian doctrine says

physical death was the mere consequence of sin. To which Canon Gore makes answer that Christian doctrine says no such thing. Long before science had investigated the early history of life upon our globe, Christian teachers in the East and in the West, St. Augustine as well as St. Athanasius, had taught that death is the law of physical

nature, that it had been in the world before man, and that man was by nature mortal, because, as being animal, he was subject to death. So when Scripture speaks and says: 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,' Scripture means that this was the death of the soul, and not the death of the body.

The Gospel according to James.

BY THE REV. J. A. KERR BAIN, M.A., LIVINGSTON.

'Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you.'—Jas. iv. 8.

It is characteristic of this fearless Christian genius that he should go the length of scouting the Evil One as a coward. The deepest Christian experience confirms his view, and men so different as Paul and Peter go straight in the line of it. Almost ever since, Christian biography, pictorially generalised by Bunyan, has adopted this note of James. It is one of several indications that he had a more through-going religious experience, a fuller consciousness of Christian truth, than has always been allowed to him. His view is purely Christian, and is begotten of Christian intensity. At first thoughts we can hardly regard the supreme Adversary as one who often finds flight his better course when only a man is confronting him. But that man is on the side of right and of Christ, and knows it; that adversary is on the side of wrong and of himself, and feels it. Hence the victorious truthfulness of the words just preceding those we have set for consideration: 'Resist the Devil, and he will flee from you'—from any of you, even from the child whom a tame beast might frighten.

When we would think or speak of God, we must, ever so plainly, reverse our whole thought and language to the opposite pole from this. HE—flee from any man? No. But James has the opportunity at his hand for a bold and blessed antithesis—God is nearing the side of a man whenever that man has the heart to approach Him. 'Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you.' He can dare to make the antithesis complete. The words are as fearlessly true as the other, and are more essentially, more richly, Christian. We acknowledge it to be altogether God-like, and in tone with all we know of Him—

as 'God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.'

These words may be regarded, then, as James' gospel. It is a gospel which is more inarticulate than it is inadequate. There is all his evangelic reserve in the words, but they mean the central evangelic verities. Beneath them, I think, we can feel reconciliation resting upon atonement; in them, I reckon, we can see both the theory and the practice of an effectual meeting between God and the soul. They apply equally to the first meeting in the soul's history, or to any meeting however long after the first: we must infer that the method is substantially the same in both.

I. The words, then, as a Christian gospel, imply this sad possibility: that *a man may be far off from God*.

When a man is separated by ten degrees of latitude from a plague or an earthquake, or a desolation of war, he has reason to congratulate himself on his good fortune. James is keenly aware that if God were only terrible, if He were the natural foe of a man, there is no distance that would be great enough as the measure of desirable separation between every one of us and Him. But here we are speaking only in a literal way, whereas James is speaking in a spiritual way. And it were folly, he would tell us, to congratulate ourselves upon any kind of distance from God. Do we think of ourselves as literally far off from Him?—we are wrong as to fact. Do we think of ourselves as spiritually far off from Him?—we are wrong in the whole situation of our being.

The entire subject takes its light from the great