

exclaims, 'to live in the flesh,—if this is the fruit of my work, then what I shall choose I wot not.' The fruit of his work is the prolongation of opportunity. 'To depart and to be with Christ' is only 'far better,' because it will allow his energies to have fuller scope. With all his underlying mysticism, the Apostle was more Greek than Latin in his estimate of the Christian life. It was not so much *rest* within the Infinite that attracted him, as *movement* within the Infinite. The Western and mediæval type of Christian thought was fascinated more by the idea of rest than of progress. Eternity with its serene Beatific vision, unclouded by the battles of Time and its unaccomplished aims—this was the reward which dazzled the eyes of Augustine, Scotus Erigena, Bernard, Aquinas, and Dante. 'To the mediæval thinker there was no great outlook upon time: no essential message of love was borne upon its stream save that very message which it had itself retarded and was still obscuring. The evil in the world must be fought against, but could never be exterminated; it would, in some inconceivable manner, be transfigured to God and to His saints, but would never be annihilated to itself.'¹ But to the Greek type of thought, with which the modern world is more and more proving itself to

¹ Wicksteed, *Religion of Time and Eternity*.

be in sympathy, the problem of evil is not hopeless; nor does the universe bear upon it the marks of irretrievable failure. Our quickened sense of knowledge and of mastery over the forces of nature carries with it the unquenchable vision of progress. Alike in the moral and social sphere, the Christian life, while inwardly a peace with God, is outwardly a war against forces which cannot be finally impregnable. Evil, cruelty, injustice, hatred, vice—against these 'we fight to win.'

Through every grade and rank of Christian service, humble and unnoticed, conspicuous and public, there is to be seen the spirit of an unconquerable energy—unresting and unsatisfied, until the battle is won. There are moods of the soul when we cry:

I do not ask to see
The distant scene—one step enough for me.

But when the kindly Light has revealed the way and we have taken the 'step' firmly, let us move forward in the strength of what we have already attained, reckoning every advance in wisdom and love so much clear gain for that 'upward' calling wherewith we have been called by Christ, every fresh call to duty and service a 'degree' to be surmounted as the condition of our growth in the knowledge and grace of our Lord.

In the Study.

A Study in the Subconsciousness of St. Paul.

DID St. Paul know Jesus in the flesh? Professor Johannes Weiss has no doubt whatever that he did.

The volume by Professor Weiss on *Paul and Jesus* has been translated into English by the Rev. H. J. Chaytor, M.A., Headmaster of Plymouth College. It belongs to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought' (2s. 6d. net each), a series which is making rapid progress. Three volumes have been issued together this month, the other two being *Revelation and Inspiration* by Professor Seeberg, and *Christianity and the New Idealism* by Professor Eucken. We shall probably have to return to Seeberg, certainly to Eucken, the great

philosophical force of the future, from whom we have another volume translated this month, *The Meaning and Value of Life* (A. & C. Black; 3s. 6d. net), both books being turned into English by the same translators, Lucy Judge Gibson and W. R. Boyce Gibson. But for the present let us remain for a little with Weiss.

Professor Weiss has no doubt whatever that St. Paul had seen Jesus in the flesh. And he thinks he knows when he had seen Him. It was during His last visit to Jerusalem. He thinks it probable that he was a witness of Christ's Passion and Crucifixion. For if he was in Jerusalem at the time it is not likely that he would omit that, being so passionately enthusiastic a pupil of the Pharisees.

Then, if St. Paul witnessed the Passion and

Crucifixion, Professor Weiss can understand his 'entirely enigmatical behaviour' after his conversion. He 'retired to Damascus.' Now, says Professor Weiss, it is contrary to all historical and psychological experience that Paul should have retired to Damascus and solitude, instead of seeking information concerning Jesus, if he had possessed no knowledge of Jesus before his conversion. But if he had seen Jesus and had already learned the facts of His outward personality, there was no need to go to Peter or any other Apostle for enlightenment. The one question before him now was the nature of his future relations to Jesus, and the manner in which his knowledge of the man Jesus could be reconciled to the heavenly vision and his Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. What was before him was the task of constructing his gospel message, so that the facts which belonged to the life on earth and the facts which belonged to the life in glory might fall together and be the power of God unto salvation.

More than that, if St. Paul was present at the Passion and Crucifixion, Professor Weiss can then understand the conversion itself. He says that without the assumption that what St. Paul saw and heard of Jesus had made a strong impression upon him, any psychological explanation of St. Paul's vision is impossible. What he saw and heard *had* made a strong impression upon him, stronger, indeed, than he himself had realized or was afterwards willing to admit. 'No one,' says Professor Weiss, 'will deny that it is psychologically possible for an impression to persist below the threshold of consciousness, and imperceptibly to penetrate and modify the whole of a man's inward life. We should be depreciating both the personality of Jesus and the receptivity of Paul, if we refused to admit that the form and the words of the long-suffering One, His intellectual supremacy and constancy, His confidence and truth, His sympathy and earnestness, were able to produce that indelible impression even upon the hostile and refractory mind of the Pharisee.'

Ⓐ Study in Evolution.

At the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association this year, Dr. F. E. Weiss, Professor of Botany in the University of Manchester, delivered a lecture on *The Bearings of the*

Darwinian Theory of Evolution on Moral and Religious Progress. The lecture is published by Mr. Philip Green (1s. net).

We must not expect too much from Dr. Weiss. His lecture would take only an hour in delivery; and within that space he gives some account of four things—Darwinism, Evolution, Morality, and Religion. But we may expect that what is said will be said representatively. We may count upon it that what Dr. Weiss says would be said by the great body of scientific workers of our day. And then we may also expect that whatever is said about morals or religion will be said both frankly and reverently. For this is the great change that has come over the conflict between Science and Religion. We are not sure that the issue is less vital or the battle less hot. But we shall never again return to the barbaric methods of a Burgoon or a Tyndall.

Well, Dr. Weiss admits that nothing could be more subversive of morality than the struggle for existence, with the survival of the fittest. And the struggle for existence, with the survival of the fittest, is Darwinism. But Darwin himself discovered that his great discovery had not unlimited application. The survival of the fittest is an excellent theory to account for the progress of the individual. But if nothing else interfered, only one individual would be left at last to make progress. Darwin found two things interfering with the ambitious selfishness of the individual, and working in the interest of the race. The first was the instinct of the mother to deny herself for the sake of her offspring; and the second was the tendency among certain animals to live in flocks or herds. The instinct of the mother develops into parental love, 'one of the most beautiful of human virtues.' The gregarious instinct develops into comradeship and communion.

Is there anything offensive in that? If we are moral, does it greatly matter where our morality came from? Darwin did not say that we are no more ethical than the lower animals. He said that with the advent of man there entered a wholly new and highly momentous element into the sphere of morality. That element is man's ability to reason. And after Darwin, all the evolutionary moralists—Hobhouse, Westermarck, Weiss—recognize a distinction between the moral actions of man and the non-moral impulses of animals. The distinction is that man has the

power of framing general conceptions and formulating rules of conduct.

These rules are at first of limited application. They are tribal or 'imperial.' And the examples held up for imitation are at first examples of patriotism—narrower or wider as the chance of birth or the fortune of war may direct. But even Darwin looked forward to the time when patriotism should pass into brotherhood. In the *Descent of Man*, he says: 'As man advances in civilization, and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to men of all nations and races.' 'Where there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free'—these are not Darwin's words, but that is his meaning.

Evolution has also touched religion. Dr. Weiss remembers that there is no realm of thought in which the theory of evolution has met with greater opposition than in theology. But it has done theology good. It has stimulated theological research and inquiry. It has called for a closer and more critical study of the Bible. And, above all, it has opened the way to that new discipline which is called Comparative Religion.

This is all gain—fathomless, limitless gain. Nor is there any countervailing loss. For the evolutionist has never suggested that he could trace the origin of religion to an animal instinct. Where he finds the dimmest flickerings of religious light, the evolutionist always finds a thinking individual. And all that he can affirm about the origin of religion is that it is already *in* man. Says Dr. Weiss: 'As we find practically some form of belief in the supernatural in all savage races, we may presume that it springs from a common necessity of all thinking individuals to speculate about their person and their surroundings and about life and the hereafter.'

It may seem that there is not much room left here for revelation. But where did this 'common necessity' come from? If we claim that it must have come from God, Dr. Weiss has not a word to say against that. He has not a word to say against it if we go on to declare that God who planted the common necessity pledged Himself by the planting of it to satisfy its desires.

It is usually held that the one keen controversy between Christianity and evolution is whether Christianity is an ascent from animism, or animism a descent from Christianity. But is that a serious issue? Is the Old Testament committed to it? Is the theology of St. Paul committed?

A Study in the Faith of Jesus.

In the October number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Principal Forsyth expressed his surprise that so little has been written about the faith of Jesus. 'A year or two ago,' he said, 'I remember searching such writers as I could reach who might be expected to handle the point, but without success.' This was the beginning of an article on 'The Faith of Jesus,' by Dr. Forsyth himself. And now this month, in a volume on *Jesus according to St. Mark*, written by the Rev. J. M. Thompson, Fellow and Dean of Divinity of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford, and published by Messrs. Methuen (5s. net), we come upon a section on the Faith of Jesus.

The section on the Faith of Jesus is part of a chapter on Jesus' Religion. Mr. Thompson says that the religion of Jesus was directed by the conditions of His early life. As a Jew He worshipped one God. He had a Jew's zeal for holiness. He shared in a Jewish patriotism. As a Galilæan He was brought up in the provincial simplicity and piety for which the Lake-country was so remarkable. As a carpenter of Nazareth He inherited an active working faith; one that faced the hard facts and cramping circumstances of life.

But Jesus' Churchmanship—the word is Mr. Thompson's, but he apologizes for it with inverted commas—Jesus' Churchmanship was not that of His contemporaries and nothing more. If the Galilæans disliked the formalism and official pretensions of the religious sects, Jesus made distrust of formalism a ruling principle of His religion. While He attended the village synagogue every Sabbath day, He was a convinced Non-conformist with regard to some of the commonest practices of religion. While He shared the general reverence for Jerusalem with its temples and its festivals, He could never think of it without a foreboding of its fall. His religious outlook went beyond Galilee and Jerusalem, but it rested upon the religious needs of fishermen and carpenters,

upon the unlovely lovable lives of publicans and sinners. And when the Baptist's preaching came, all this raw material of religion was fused into a white-hot love of God and man.

What forms did the religion of Jesus take? What were the momentous things in His religious principles and practice? Humility and faith, says Mr. Thompson, pre-eminently these two.

His humility was based on a sense of the reality of sin. For to be humbled by sin, says Mr. Thompson, one need not have sinned. It is enough if one has been tempted to sin. To be tempted is to have seen sin face to face and to find oneself, apart from God, powerless.

How did His humility find expression? It found expression, says Mr. Thompson, in the want of expression. This he takes to be a great personal characteristic of Jesus that He shrank from self-expression in personal affairs. He chose no more than twelve to whom to communicate the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. He excluded all but three from the scenes of His most important miracles, from His moments of ecstasy or from His prayers. Even the privileged three must pray apart at last, when the supreme temptation came upon Him in the Garden of Gethsemane. Jesus had His religious experiences, and they could not be hid. But He did not care to talk about them. The story of the baptism and temptation is the only part of the gospel which seems to be told by Himself.

The other element in the life of Jesus that most definitely determined His religion was His faith.

The faith of Jesus, says Mr. Thompson, was first of all an entire *trust*, trust in God's presence with Him, and care for Him. It was by faith that He disregarded physical dangers or the fear of death. It is recorded that once He slept peacefully in a small boat during a severe storm. Did He sleep because He was weary? The disciples were weary also. But they toiled in rowing, for they thought their rescue from death depended on it. Jesus slept because He had faith in God; and when He awoke He rebuked the disciples for want of it.

Mr. Thompson does not suggest that Jesus deliberately neglected the ordinary precautions that are necessary in order to sustain life. When a journey had to be undertaken the disciples usually provided food for it. Yet on one occasion,

when they had neglected so to do, and Jesus made some reference to the leaven of the Pharisees, He was astonished when they suggested that He was thinking of their neglect. It was to Him as impossible that He should starve as that He should drown. And when He sent forth His Apostles to preach, He sent them with no provision for their journey, as if He would compel them to exercise that faith in which He Himself habitually lived.

The next thing is that the faith of Jesus was His *power*. It was through faith that He worked miracles. When the disciples confessed that they could not cast out an evil spirit, He called them a faithless generation. All things, He said, are possible to him that believeth. And if it is objected that such an attitude can only lead to disillusionment, the answer is that, in Jesus' case at least, it never did.

The third thing is that the faith of Jesus was faith in the *purpose* of God concerning Him. Here is at once the simplicity and the majesty of it. How could He drown or starve? God was keeping Him for a special work. God was designing His life and death in view of a great future end. And so, when death came, it was a voluntary death. It could not be otherwise than voluntary. It was the crucial experiment designed by faith to solve the mystery of His existence.

§ Study in the Synoptic Problem.

There are some things about the Synoptic problem that are settled. One thing is the priority of the Second Gospel, and the use of it in the First and Third Gospels. But there are some things that are not yet settled. Of these the most keenly contested is the relation of the First Gospel to the Third. And of that circle of controversy the very centre is the question how it comes to pass that these two Gospels differ as they do, when it is evident that they are relying on the same document. The Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge believes that the difference may be due to translation.

Professor Stanton has published the second volume of his book on *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net). The first volume gave a history of the Canonical Gospels, described the use of them by the Church in the earliest days, and told what had

been said about them, and in what estimation they had been held. In the second volume Professor Stanton examines the Gospels themselves. Not the Fourth Gospel, however. This volume is wholly occupied with the Synoptists.

Now, in examining the Gospels themselves, Professor Stanton has not gone very far when he reaches the Sermon on the Mount. And he has not gone very far into the Sermon on the Mount when he reaches the Beatitudes. And when he reaches the Beatitudes, the first difficulty that stares him in the face is how to account for the difference between the Beatitudes in St. Matthew and the Beatitudes in St. Luke.

The differences are obvious to everybody. For while St. Matthew says, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit,' St. Luke says simply, 'Blessed are ye poor'; and then St. Luke adds, 'Woe unto you that are rich.' There are no 'Woes' in the First Gospel. What is the explanation of the difference?

Professor Stanton thinks that the differences may be due to translation. He thinks we have here different Greek translations of the same Aramaic original.

For the agreement in substance is close. It is in expression that the difference is wide. The difference in expression is distinctly greater than it is in the case of the Parable of the Vineyard, or of the Sower and its interpretation. It is true that there is a still greater difference in expression between Mt 24 and Lk 21, the great eschatological Discourse. But the difference there is due to the number of distinct sayings which have been added or substituted by St. Luke. In any case, the difference between the Beatitudes of St. Matthew and the Beatitudes and Woes of St. Luke 'reaches, if it does not even go beyond, the extreme limit that can be allowed for where the same Greek document was employed.' Consequently Professor Stanton suggests that the two Evangelists used different translations.

But if they used two different translations, the difficulty now is to account for the similarities. The words are very often the same, and very often they are remarkable words. Let any one who desires to see how two competent translators will vary in expression, look at the terrible passage from Nietzsche, which is quoted according to two different translators in the present number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Professor Stanton accounts for the similarities by pointing out that

the two translators of the Gospel document would not be in the full sense independent. They would be sharers in the same special vocabulary and associations. Certain expressions would be fixed in their mind through oral tradition. And if all that is not sufficient, why, then, Professor Stanton offers the suggestion that the second translator may have had the first translation beside him as well as the original document.

Virginibus Puerisque.

THE KEY-FLOWER.

Some time ago we expressed our surprise that the Rev. John A. Hamilton had turned aside to other things after making manifest that his special gift (and how priceless a gift it is) was preaching to children. He has returned. The new volume is *The Wonderful River, and other Addresses to Children* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.). Let us notice the book by simply quoting one of the addresses. And let it be, not the address on a Drop of Water, or the Hermit Crab, or the Eye, or any other of the scientific addresses. Let it be one of the folk-lore addresses. Let it be the address on the Key-Flower.

But, first of all, let us remark that Mr. Allenson has also published a volume of Original Prose and Poetry suitable for Home Reading or for Social Meetings, written by Mary Knowles Jarvis, and called *Rest awhile Stories* (1s. 6d. net); and a new volume of sermons by the Rev. John Thomas, M.A., of Liverpool, called *The Dynamic of the Cross* (3s. 6d. net).

There is an old story which used to be told by our far-off fore-mothers to their children, that runs like this:—One day when a girl had rambled into the forest, she met a lady, tall and stately, on whose beautiful face there was the kindest smile, and she spoke to the girl in a voice which made her think of the sound of the wind among the fir-trees, and of the mingled laughter and sobbing of the brook, as it leaps and runs down the mountain side, and of the song with which her mother lulled the little ones to sleep at night. The lady invited the girl to go with her deeper into the forest, and took hold of her hand to lead and uphold her along the dim forest ways.

The girl did not feel in the least afraid, but went willingly whither the lady led, until they came to a rocky wall covered almost with a curtain of hanging and creeping plants in full flowering. She lifted the flowery curtain aside a little and showed the girl a door which had been hidden by it, a door closed and locked. She gave the girl a primrose, and bade her touch the key-hole of the door gently with the flower,

and when she obeyed, the lock turned and the door opened, and the girl saw inside the cave a chest on which lay a pile of primroses.

'Go in,' said the lady, 'and remove the flowers from the chest, when you will see that below them there are heaps of gold and precious stones. Fill your apron with the treasure and carry it home, but before you leave the cave, put back the flowers as you found them; or a black dog will come out of the darkness and follow you all the days of your life.' The girl did as she was told, and when she had filled her apron and put back the flowers, the lady was gone; and as the girl stepped out into the open, the door closed and the lock snapped fast again. The girl carried the treasure home to her mother, and there was never any want of food or clothing in the cottage; they had abundance even in the hard winter-time.

What does the story mean? I am not quite sure about that. There is no doubt the lady is Bertha, of whom our fore-fathers and fore-mothers believed that she made the corn and the grass grow. She held the same place as a goddess with them as Ceres held among the Romans, and the story may mean that in the spring-time Bertha gives to the earth a key, by which the hidden treasures of the soil, the roots, and seeds, long locked by the frost, are opened to mankind, who are enriched thereby. That seems the likeliest meaning of the story; and if it is the meaning, we see that our fore-fathers, who had not the knowledge of God which we enjoy, yet had their grateful and graceful thoughts of the Being who, as they imagined, 'gave them rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness.' That is a pleasant and beautiful thought.

There will be no harm in our putting another meaning into the story, if we remember that it is not the first and original meaning. We may use it to remind ourselves that some things as tender and delicate as a primrose have the magical quality of opening locked doors behind which treasure is hidden. Humility is such a thing; it is a key-flower. You may meet one day with a gentleman who despises people 'that bother with weeds,' though the number of such gentlemen is fast diminishing, happily. But to those who were humble enough to notice wild plants we owe the fruits, roots, stalks, seeds which we eat as vegetables or dessert. And to such people we owe also the chief medicines which soothe our pains and heal our diseases. To the humble persons who have taken pains to mark the doings and productions of insects we are indebted for our ink, for many dyes, for wax and honey, and silk, as well as for the knowledge of means to protect ourselves and our property from injury and ruin.

A thousand comforts and enjoyments, to which we are now so much accustomed that we scarcely think of them, have been gained for us by men and women who looked

attentively at grasses, and wild herbs, and toadstools, and galls, and caterpillars, and beetles. A wise man has warned us

'that he who feels contempt
For any living thing, hath faculties
Which he has never used;
That thought with him
Is in its infancy.'

Whatever God has thought fit to make deserves our notice, and there are great treasures still hidden, which will be unlocked only by the key-flower of humility. If you recall the stories which you have heard and read of famous discoverers, you will perceive that their discoveries were chiefly made by giving their minds to the observation of common, humble things which other folk thought beneath their notice.

There is another key-flower which is as much like humility as the primrose is like the cowslip, and that is kindness, which has a magical power in the opening of hearts, which have been long locked and barred. You may have a schoolfellow who is sullen and rough-mannered, and you are inclined to be as short and sulky with him as he is with you. But try the key-flower. It may be that it has never been applied to him. He may come from a very unhomely home; it may be that the locked door has been thumped on with a stone, which has the effect of jamming the lock tighter and tighter. It won't do any harm to try the key-flower, and it may have a wonderful result. There are boys and girls, and men and women too, who have fine qualities under a rough outside.

Let me tell you a little story. A half-withered cactus in a pot lay in a corner of a garden, and a visitor asked the owner of the garden why it lay there. 'It is no good,' was the answer; 'it never flowered.' The visitor thought it might not have had a fair chance, and he asked, 'Did you ever give it warm water?' In the end the owner was persuaded to let the plant stand in a window, and to water it with slightly warm water, whereupon the cactus revived and put out a wealth of splendid flowers. All it had needed was rather more kindly treatment. And it is just so with a good many human beings. Was not that one of the secrets of Jesus? He touched hearts with the key-flower of kindness, and people, who had seemed hard and bad, became better and gentler as He spoke to them, and outcasts and despised persons were made apostles and saints.

There is a name you know very well, that of John Williams, the missionary and martyr. Do you know that he was what some people called a 'bad boy,' until he went to Sunday school and met with a kind and patient teacher? What a store of treasure was opened when the key-flower of kindness touched his heart.