

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

JESUS I know, and God I know, but who is Christ?

There is an article in the *Hibbert Journal* for January with the title of 'Jesus or Christ?' The author is the Rev. R. Roberts, Bradford. In the same number there is a review of the DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. The reviewer is the Rev. J. H. Weatherall, Bolton. The meaning of the article and of the review is the same. Both writers frankly cast away the name of Christ with all that belongs to it. Jesus they know, and God they know, but a Christ who is compounded of both they are resolved to have nothing more to do with.

The one article is a review of the DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. The review has been somewhat long in coming, and there is not a great deal of it when it has come. But it is full of meaning.

The reviewer has no need for a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. With this particular Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels he has little fault to find. But he does not need it. What he needs is a Dictionary of Jesus.

His 'interest in Jesus is eager and affectionate.' But for the name 'Christ' he would 'with all

reverence' substitute the name 'God.' The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels should have been called a Dictionary of God and the Gospels. Let some one—Mr. Weatherall himself or some one else—now edit a Dictionary of Jesus.

The Rev. R. Roberts, who is described as 'Congregational Minister; late Chairman of the Bradford Education Committee,' is the author of the other article. He is very bold about it. It is no longer to be 'Back to Christ.' The cry is now to be 'Back to Jesus.' 'In developing the thought "Back to Christ," Evangelicalism,' he says, 'has found itself driven to make stupendous claims on behalf of Jesus.' *Are* they claims on behalf of Jesus? he asks; or are they made on behalf of a spiritual 'Ideal' to which we may provisionally apply the word 'Christ'? He gives the name quite provisionally. He is done with it long before his article is done.

Jesus I know—well, a little. 'The silence of non-Christian literature as to Jesus has more significance than is usually assigned to it. When we turn to the New Testament, we have a body of literature whose evidential value has been, and still is, the riddle of Christendom. Close and careful reading of its documents reduces our knowledge of the actual facts of the life of Jesus to a small, and, it must be added, a narrowing compass.

Beyond the narrative of birth and infancy and one incident in the boyhood, the Synoptists give us only detached fragments of events in one year of His life. The Johannine narrative extends the chronology so as to cover portions of perhaps the last three years. Criticism, of course, greatly reduces the value of this face view of the story. Following it, we pass through narrowing areas of admissible statement, till, guided by Dr. Schmiedel's "pillar" passages, we reach the position of Professor Khaltoff, from which the figure of the historic Jesus has completely vanished.'

Jesus I know a little; and God I know still less. But as for Christ—'Identifying Jesus with Christ,' says Mr. Roberts, 'they make God a Being who is omnipotent, yet limited in power; omniscient, yet defective in knowledge; infinitely good, yet One who declines "to turn any part of His knowledge as God into science for man." This seems to me to be language which stultifies itself. It would be an abuse of language to say that it deals with a mystery. It is flat contradiction.' That is the conclusion of the article and of the whole matter.

When the *DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS* was published it was spoken of as 'first of all a preacher's dictionary.' The same thing could have been said about the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. But in this case it seemed better to let the preacher find it out for himself.

He has found it out. 'I have sampled it in various places,' writes a correspondent of the *Methodist Times*. 'Last night, being exceedingly angry, I read the article on *ABUSE*. If any man wants to preach a number of sermons on this subject they are all here. The analysis is one of the most masterly things I have ever come across. There is also something upon the law of the matter that may be of use when you have to deal with a man who, in his anger, has "forgot nuthin'."

'I had to take,' he continues, 'a class of old men, whose hearts are young enough, and of all sorts and conditions of good women, who have to bear burdens quietly. I read over the article on *ACCEPTANCE*, and, illustrating it out of Wesley's Hymns and out of the Old and New Testaments, I gave them the matter as a talk. Now, suppose I had said that I was going to talk to them out of the last encyclopædia, would they not have been justly dismayed? But they took to it as if it had been Wesley's Sermons.'

The Vicar of St. Andrews, Stoke Newington, has also discovered its use for the pulpit, and writes about it in his Parish Magazine. 'To some, perhaps,' he says, 'the problem will be where it is to go. But it must go somewhere, of that there is no question, even if a good many volumes of other kinds have to move. For it is indispensable.'

The reviewers also have made the discovery. The reviewer in the *Baptist Times* says: 'The Encyclopædia will be a complete armoury for the preacher and the teacher.' In the *British Congregationalist* the reviewer says: 'The ways in which this monumental encyclopædia will prove its worth are far too many to be suggested. That it will be indispensable to the minister who desires to be thoroughly equipped, we fully believe.' And if it is feared by any that preachers may be too well supplied for the exercise of their own originality, the *Church Times* closes with a word of reassurance: 'The profusion of information brought together on every topic may be expected to assist, instead of hindering, the exercise of an independent judgment.'

How is it, then, that an Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics is necessary to the preacher in addition to a Dictionary of the Bible? That question, which is central, has been answered by a preacher.

There is none of the reviews that has given the

impression of care and time (we might add intellectual ability) more emphatically than a signed review in the *United Methodist*. 'The need for such an encyclopædia,' says this reviewer, 'is beyond dispute. The first thing required of the preacher (after personal character) is that he shall know the Bible, and shall know it exhaustively and critically, in the spirit as well as in the letter, and in the light of the latest information available. To meet this demand there came the Dictionary of the Bible, followed by the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. But the preacher must know more than the Bible.'

What else must the preacher know? 'He must have a true sympathy with the religious aspirations of man. That sympathy is fed on the comparative study of religion, as he watches his fellows seeking God, if haply they may feel after Him and find Him. And though the seeking often seems to be merely groping, yet he views it with respect and even reverence as the expression of a religious instinct which cannot rest unsatisfied. Then in tracing back some theological problem, he is often led into the region of Natural Science, and has to appeal to the chemist or the biologist for guidance. Further, in seeking to apply his belief to the practical affairs of life, he is entering the sphere of sociology, and he needs the latest and best information on that subject.'

Now, as the reviewer says, 'it is too much to expect that the preacher should be a higher critic and a scientist and an economist; and if he attempts too much he is sure to fail in his mission. Yet his knowledge of these subjects, though it rarely appear in his conversation, and still more rarely in his pulpit ministrations, is sure to aid him, to an almost incredible extent, in understanding and expounding the things that he most surely believes.'

And now let us take three sentences from the correspondent of the *Methodist Times*, of whom we have already spoken. 'Depend upon it, the

subjects here handled are going to keep the field for many a year to come, and are not only going to keep the field but to monopolize it very largely. If a man will use this book carefully, will ground himself in the leading subjects, and seek out the light that is here when he is bogged in his thinking, then he will become one of them that really know. I congratulate the young men of the ministry on this fresh stage in the evolution of their privileges and resources.'

One of the benefits which the Revised Version has conferred upon us is to compel our attention to the difference in modern English between small letters and capitals. We say 'in modern English.' For in the English of the time when the Authorized Version was made, capitals were used according to the fancy of the writer rather than the subject of the writing. And even the fancy of the writer varied with his mood or the fashion of the moment. Professor Arber has made out a useful *Harmony of Bacon's Essays*. Take a sentence from the essay 'Of Studies.' In the first two editions (1597-98) it appears thus: 'Craftie men contime them, simple men admire them, wise men use them'; in the third (1607-12) thus: 'Craftie Men contemne them; simple Men admire them, and wise men use them'; in the fourth (1612): 'Crafty men contemne them, simple men admire them, and wise men use them'; but in the fifth (1625): 'Crafty Men Contemne *Studies*; Simple Men Admire them; and Wise Men Use them.'

The Authorized Version can show nothing like that in the way of variety. The translators had received instructions from 'the Most High and Mightie Prince, James' that they were to be translators only, and not interpreters. So they were sparing for the time in the use of capitals. Still they used them. 'The chiefe Butler and the chiefe Baker' are both found with capital letters in the two editions of 1611, and even the 'Butlership' of the 'chiefe Butler.' The 'Tabernacle of the Congregation' is always honoured with a capital

letter, and everything that belonged to it, the 'Table' and the 'Candlestick' and the 'Altar of incense,' and the 'Laver.' 'Cassia' in the same chapter has a capital, though 'cinamon' and 'myrrh' are without it; even the measure called a 'Hin,' and the 'Apothecarie' who has the measuring of it.

When the Revisers began their work they found that most of the superfluous capitals had already been dropped from the Authorized Version. But a new difficulty presented itself. They were under no command to avoid interpretation. They found that they could not avoid it. And again and again they made their interpretation by the short but most unmistakable method of using or dis-using a capital letter.

In Mt 2⁶ the Authorized Version is 'For out of thee shall come a Governor.' The Revisers prefer 'a governor.' In 12⁸, 'For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day,' the revision is 'lord of the sabbath.' In 12¹⁸ we come upon the central and difficult word 'spirit.' It is a quotation here from Isaiah. The Authorized Version uses a small letter, 'I will put my spirit upon him.' This is the way with all the previous versions but one. The Geneva Version has 'Spirit.' The Revised Version prefers the capital also. The speaker is God. In 23¹⁰, 'Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ'—so the Authorized Version. The Revisers say 'one is your master,' in this case departing from the Geneva of 1557, and following all the rest of the versions. The Geneva Version uses the old word 'doctor.' In the 1557 edition it is, 'Be not called Doctors, for ther is but one your Doctor, and he is Christe.' But in the edition of 1560 the capital is dropped—'doctors' and 'doctor.'

Does this matter of a small letter or a capital seem a trifling one? It is never trifling. In ordinary English it is always a matter of importance. Carlyle was as careful of his capitals as of

his punctuation; and we know that he was as careful of a comma as of a date. But in the English translation of the Bible it sometimes rises to a matter of the highest moment.

One of the arguments which Professor Denney makes use of, in his new book on *Jesus and the Gospel*, in order to prove that Jesus was not a fellow-believer, but the object of faith to the writers of the New Testament, is the use that they make of the word 'Name.' Three times that word is used absolutely. In Ac 5⁴¹ we read that 'they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the Name.' In 3 Jn 7 we read that 'for the sake of the Name they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles.' In both passages the Revisers recognized the force of the word and used the capital letter. But there is a third passage. In Ja 5¹⁴ Dr. Denney holds that the true reading is, 'Let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name.'

The twentieth series of the Cunningham Lectures was delivered last winter by the Rev. W. Fairweather, M.A., and the volume containing them has now been published. Its title is *The Background of the Gospels* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net).

When it was known that the Cunningham Lecturer for 1907-8 was to be the Rev. William Fairweather, it was expected that the subject of the lectures would be Judaism in the period between the Old Testament and the New. For Mr. Fairweather has given himself to that subject so closely, and has written so much upon it, that they can scarcely be thought of apart. And it was hoped as well as expected. For the religion of the times preceding the Christian era has lately been discovered to carry far-reaching influence. It touches the interpretation of the Gospels at every step. It touches the Person of Christ.

Our Lord has much to say about the end of the

world. So have the pre-Christian Apocalypses. Did He simply take over the popular conceptions derived from these Apocalypses? Again, and to bring the matter to a point, the Apocalyptic literature anticipates the end of the world as near at hand. Did He also anticipate its speedy end? And was He mistaken?

Mr. Fairweather examines the evidence. He has read what the Apocalypses have to say about the end of the world; he has read what Christ said; and he has read what the modern critics have said about the Apocalypses and about Christ. He considers that on two points the evidence is sufficient and the controversy closed. One point is that the belief of the nearness of the end is inherited by the New Testament from the Apocalypses of pre-Christian Judaism. The other is that the Apostles of our Lord shared it. The Apostles shared it—and were mistaken. That is what Mr. Fairweather means. Did our Lord share it? Was He mistaken also? That is the question for us.

Now Mr. Fairweather refuses to be deterred from investigating by any consequence. 'We are here,' he says, 'upon ground where we must tread reverently.' But we must tread it. And if we find that our Lord was mistaken, we shall receive strength to understand. Wendt says it is 'manifestly presupposed.' Bousset says it 'cannot be denied.' Charles says it is 'proved beyond question.' What does Mr. Fairweather say?

He reviews the evidence. Now the evidence which the scholars who have just been named rely upon is a series of passages in the Synoptic Gospels. These are the passages: 'Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power' (Mk 9¹), or as St. Matthew has it, 'till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (16²⁸). 'This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished' (Mk 13³⁰). 'When they

persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come' (Mt 10²³).

But these are not all the passages. In the Parables of the Ten Virgins and the Unmerciful Servant, Christ speaks of the Parousia as if it were not to take place until after a long period of waiting. The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, and again the Parable of the Blade, the Ear, and the Full Corn, imply so gradual a growth of the Kingdom as manifestly to demand much time. And openly, and without a parable, Christ makes the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles a necessary prelude to the final consummation of the Kingdom. That, says Mr. Fairweather, was clearly not practicable within a single generation.

Thus there are two classes of passages which deal with the time of the End. Mr. Fairweather takes both into account. He recalls three independent attempts which have been made to reconcile them. Professor Bruce suggested that the great eschatological discourse recorded in Mt 24 and Mk 13 is not a unity, but a piecing together on the part of the evangelists of sayings uttered on separate occasions, with the result that future events are represented as closer at hand than the words of Jesus really warranted. Professor Godet thought that the passages which seem to imply the imminent nearness of the end refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, and not to the end of the world, so that it is only the destruction of Jerusalem that Jesus places within the lifetime of the current generation. Dr. Forrest holds that our Lord spiritualized the popular eschatological terms, and so, while He saw with penetrating glance the true significance and final issues of moral facts and forces, He saw them in no exact temporal perspective, or in the relations of far and near.

With none of these methods of meeting the situation is Mr. Fairweather quite satisfied. He

goes back to what our Lord says about Himself. Is it possible that He was ignorant of the time of the End? There is one thing that He says He was ignorant of on earth. It is closely related to this very thing, if it is not this very thing itself. 'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father' (Mk 13³²). And he comes to the conclusion that Christ's impression as regards the time of the Parousia may not have been a constant quantity. He thinks that it may have oscillated somewhat in view of new developments in the providential order. And the extreme limits of oscillation may be reflected in those passages on the one side which speak of the End as if it were to be long deferred, and those on the other side which seem to imply that He considered it near at hand.

Many books have been published lately on Mysticism. But the growing interest in it will make another welcome—*The Mystical Element of Religion*, by Baron Fr. von Hügel (Dent; 2 vols., 21s. net). And the more welcome that it comes from a Roman Catholic. For Mysticism has been the peculiar possession (should we not add the peculiar glory?) of the Roman Church throughout all her history. The Roman Catholic is at home here.

Seven years ago, Baron Friedrich von Hügel began to study the Life and Writings of Saint Catherine of Genoa. He had been born in Italy, and early impressions had remained with him. He had felt and he retained 'a vivid consciousness of the massively virile personalities, the spacious trustful times of the early Renaissance there, from Dante to the Florentine Platonists.' These personalities, these times, were 'as yet truly Christian.' He grew up; he acquired strong and definite religious convictions. These convictions were often out of touch with the types of devotion prevalent in Western Christendom. But when hemmed in and depressed, his mind went back to that early Italian world, that ampler pre-

Protestant, as yet neither Protestant nor anti-Protestant, but deeply positive and Catholic world, and he was strengthened and sustained. He prayed that some day he might be permitted to portray one of those large-souled pre-Protestant, post-mediæval Catholics.

Then came John Henry Newman's influence, with his *Dream of Gerontius*, and the attraction of St. Catherine of Genoa, with her doctrine of the soul's self-chosen intrinsic purification. Twenty times he visited Genoa, 'the terraced city that looks away so proudly to the sea.' He found the records of St. Catherine's life and doctrine in apparently hopeless confusion. No trained scholar had seriously analysed them since their constitution into a book in 1552. He had done much critical work on classical and scriptural texts. Could he not endeavour to bring stately order out of this bewildering chaos, perhaps discover the authors, the dates, and the intentions of the various pieces of this many-coloured Joseph's coat? It would train his own mind. It would bring him within the atmosphere of a most delicately psychological, soaring, yet sober-minded eschatology, with its striking penetration and unfolding of a soul's central life and alternatives. He resolved to write the Life and edit the Works of St. Catherine of Genoa.

But who could come in contact with such a life and such a religion without desiring to discover the worth of so keen a sense of, and absorption in, the Infinite? Having begun to write a biography of St. Catherine, with some philosophical elucidations, Baron von Hügel finished by writing a great book on the philosophy of Mysticism, illustrated by the life of Caterinetta Fiesca Adorna and her friends.

It is not a book for review. No review could give any adequate account of its richness, its luxuriance, of idea; or of the well-matched luxuriance of language which this Italian born has made his obedient instrument. The author

himself has followed three separate threads of interest throughout it—one historico-critical, one philosophical, and one religious,—and he fears that his readers may follow one thread to the neglect of the other two. But he need not fear. There is no such likelihood. There is no such possibility. He has left out of account his own personality, which weaves all the threads into one piece of precious tapestry, complicated enough in pattern, absorbing enough in interest to the most diverse types of mind. The purpose of writing a review of it has long been laid aside. The present purpose is to say something about the thoughts which have come to St. Catherine of Genoa and to Baron Friedrich von Hügel about Heaven.

St. Catherine believed in Purgatory. Baron von Hügel believes in Purgatory also. He believes that a truly purgatorial middle state with its sense of succession, its mixture of joy and suffering, its growth and fruitfulness, is profoundly consonant with all our deepest spiritual experiences and requirements. We may not agree with him in that. We do not agree with him. But what he says about Purgatory does not vitiate what he says about Heaven. It is curious to note that there is little disagreement in the various branches of the Church of Christ regarding the state of Bliss. However long they make the journey, and by whatever variety of road the soul is supposed to travel, there are no great Catholic or Protestant controversies regarding the state that is reached at last. If Heaven were all our preaching, we could close our ranks to-morrow. Baron von Hügel discusses three things which perplex him about Heaven, and they are things of the most fundamental importance. But there is no hint or fear that they will be made the watchword of sects or parties.

The first thing that perplexes Baron von Hügel about Heaven is whether there will be Time there. Tennyson held that there would be neither Place nor Time :

From out our bourne of Time and Place,
The flood may bear me far.

Rothe held that there would be both. Baron von Hügel agrees with neither. He has been studying again Kant's critique of the two categories of Space and Time, and he has come to the conclusion that Time is of indefinitely richer content and more ultimate reality than Space. He believes that we are done with Space when we are done with this world, but that we shall carry Time with us into the next.

Not clock time. Not mathematical uniform time as it is measured atomistically on the face of a clock, but time in its interpenetrative duration. But what does St. Augustine say? He says that in the next life our thoughts perhaps will not be flowing, will not go from one thing to another, but we shall see all we know simultaneously in one intuition. And what does St. Thomas say? St. Thomas is more positive. All things in Heaven, he says, will be seen simultaneously and not successively. Now, Baron von Hügel is too good a pre-Reformation Catholic to differ when St. Augustine and St. Thomas agree. Yet he cannot believe that duration will come to an end. For its entire absence would apparently make man into God. He therefore thinks that 'the category of Simultaneity will, as a sort of strong background-consciousness, englobe and profoundly unify the sense of Duration. And, the more God-like the soul, the more would this sense of Simultaneity predominate over the sense of Duration.'

His second perplexity is whether the happiness of Heaven is abstract or concrete. Is it pure thought alone, or is it also emotion and will? Is it solitary and self-centred, or is it social and outgoing?

Now if the mystical state is to be taken as the nearest approach that we see upon earth to the heavenly state, it may be expected that the happiness of Heaven will be pure thought alone, self-centred and solitary. But the biographer of St. Catherine of Genoa traces a sad impoverishment in the religious life to the esteem in which the antique world

generally held the psycho-physical peculiarities of trances, when it looked upon them as directly valuable, or even as prophetic of the soul's ultimate condition. The exaltation of the contemplative above the active life was an inheritance which the Christian Church received from Plato and Aristotle. It was a corruptible inheritance. Life is complete and perfect only when it embraces both elements, each at its fullest, and the two in a perfect interaction. And in the world to come, when earthly power doth then show likest God's, the highest life must be the life of him who takes a direct and detailed interest in the world as God does, and cares for every sparrow that falls to the ground.

The last of Baron von Hügel's perplexities is whether there will be any pain in Heaven. He thinks there will be. He cannot think that it would be Heaven without it.

For what is the highest and best thing that we know upon earth? It is devoted suffering, heroic self-oblivion, patient persistence in lonely willing. Will there be no equivalent in Heaven? It would certainly be a gain, says Baron von Hügel, could we discover it. For a pure glut of happiness, an unbroken state of sheer enjoyment, cannot be made attractive to our most spiritual requirements.

Some Problems suggested by the Recent Discoveries of Aramaic Papyri at Syene (Assouan).¹

BY THE REV. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

THE recent discoveries of Aramaic papyri near Assouan (Aswân) have thrown a welcome light over an obscure period of Jewish life, viz. 470-407 B.C. Our Old Testament sources for information respecting this period are: (1) Certain undated prophecies, viz. those ascribed to a writer designated as Malachi, and those which have been collectively termed during the last fifteen years 'Trito-Isaiah.' Critical investigations of the contents have led nearly all scholars to ascribe the first (the oracles of Malachi), and the majority of recent scholars to ascribe the second (the Trito-Isaiah chapters 56-66), to the earlier part of this period of sixty or more years. It should be observed, however, that this view has recently been challenged by Rothstein in his essay on *Jews and Samaritans*. I say nothing at present about the prophecies of Joel.

(2) Belonging to the second rank of evidence we have the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which were compiled about two centuries after the events to which they refer took place. Here we are in the midst of controversy as to the actual historic value

of the documents. The most that we are warranted in affirming (though the followers of Kusters would demur to this statement) is that the researches of Ed. Meyer go far to vindicate the historic value of certain portions of Ezra and Nehemiah as based on contemporary official records and as on other grounds inherently probable.

We welcome, therefore, the appearance of these papyri, and congratulate those who have edited them, as they present to us a bright and clear spot of light in the prevailing obscurity—that long period of deepening historic uncertainty that shrouds Jewish history from 500 B.C. till 170 B.C., the eve of the Maccabæan revolt. Fortunately there is no scope for endless argumentations about the date of these documents, viz. the three papyri from the stronghold of Yeb, with its temple to Yahu, edited by Sachau, and the collection of 'business documents, edited by Cowley and Sayce, belonging to a somewhat earlier time. For most of these documents are dated. It is true that they belong to an outlying region, and not to Palestine or even Babylonia. Yet they are, nevertheless, of great value. For the three papyri edited by Sachau, to which I shall mainly refer, are copies of a letter addressed from the Jewish settlement at the

¹ Read before the Third International Congress for the History of Religions held at Oxford, Semitic Section (September 16, 1908).