
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

BISHOP WELLDON—for so it seems we must call him now—has published, through Messrs. Seeley, a new volume, to which he has given the title of *The Hope of Immortality*. It is not a hopeful title. Surely immortality is more than a hope now. Surely it is a positive possession, since Jesus died and rose again. But there is immortality in Christ, and immortality out of Christ. It is not denied that they that sleep in Jesus shall God bring with Him. It is denied that any others shall awake to an everlasting day beyond the grave.

So Bishop Welldon writes his book to prove that. And even to the reader who has settled that question long ago, it is an interesting book. For Mr. Welldon has the knack of touching reality in all he writes. This matter of immortality may be outside the range of practical interest, but death is within. And when Mr. Welldon opens his first chapter in this way: 'In the experience of every man, there is no such moment as when he looks for the first time on the face of death. He can never forget that moment, nor ever live as though it had not been. He may have spent many years in the world, and the years may have been rich in interest and happiness, but at last he stands face to face with the reality which solemnizes and sanctifies all things. From that time, even if he be frivolous and careless, he never wholly loses the sense of the awful vision. He knows that for him—for all his hopes, desires, ambitions, enterprises, victories—there is but one end. He is another man.' When Mr. Welldon opens his first chapter in that way, he has found his audience.

And that moment we have entered upon his proofs of immortality. For the things which death suggests, as soon as the first strong agony of bereavement begins to spend itself, are these: There is first *the thought of peacefulness*. The life may have been embittered by circumstances, harassed with care, stained with sin, tortured with pain; it may have been distressed, misunderstood, scorned, reprobated, condemned—yet its end is peace. The feeling comes to us that the wicked in death do cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. Next there is *the thought of beauty*. The beauty of death, says Bishop Welldon, is as exquisite as it is transient. Whereupon inevitably he quotes the lines from Byron's *Giaour*—

> He who hath bent him o'er the dead
> Ere the first day of death is fled.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> (Before decay's effacing fingers
> Have swept the lines where beauty lingers)
> And marked the mild angelic air,
> The rapture of repose that's there,

The fixed yet tender traits that streak
The languor of the placid cheek.
. . . . . .
Some moments, ay, one treacherous hour,
He still might doubt the tyrant's power;
So fair, so calm, so softly sealed
The first, last look by death revealed.

And then there is *the thought of expectancy*. 'I do not know how to describe it,' he says, 'but it is there. The spectacle of death is somehow not complete in itself. There is something prophetic in the face of the dead.'

It is 'the face of the dead' that carries all these. But what is dead? It is the body alone, we say. The soul, we say, or sometimes we say the spirit, is yet alive. Bishop Welldon agrees with that. It is the soul that possesses immortality. It is the soul that lives when the body dies. It is the soul that lives for ever. There is, he admits, a Christian doctrine which says that the body shall be raised from the dead, and shall share the immortal life of the soul. But it is Christian. It is purely a subject of revelation. It cannot be proved. There is not a single proof that can be found for it outside the Bible. 'It is a doctrine which must be accepted, if at all, upon the authority of a Divine Revelation.' On that authority he himself accepts it. But he evidently finds little in it to touch his doctrine of immortality. What is the nature of the resurrection body he cannot tell. He supposes it will be like the body of Jesus when He was transfigured. He is not quite sure why the body should be raised at all, though he suggests that it may be necessary to preserve our personal identity. He does not belittle the doctrine. But he finds no necessary place for it in his great doctrine of immortality. Immortality is the continued existence of the soul.

But what is the soul? 'It is the great disaster in our Bible,' said Canon Gore in Westminster Abbey last month, 'in our Authorized, familiar Bible, that the same word was translated sometimes "soul" and sometimes "life."' The word is *psyche* (ψυχή). Bishop Welldon knows how difficult it is to translate that word, and he does not abuse even the Authorized translators. He believes that the only way of arriving at a definition of it is to examine it historically. And when he examines it historically he finds that, outside the Bible, it has three different meanings, according as it is the soul of a plant, an animal, or a man. The soul of a plant was in Greek philosophy its life, or more strictly, its principle of growth and fertility. The soul of an animal was its life *plus* its sentient or appetitive principle. The soul of a man was his life *plus* his sentient or appetitive principle *plus* his intellectual principle or reason. Thus, according to the Greek conception, even the plant has a soul. But the soul of the animal includes greater powers than that of the plant, and the soul of man greater still. It is only, however, when we come to the Hebrew Scriptures that we find the soul in man used to cover a faculty which is so much greater than all the rest that it often receives a separate and supreme name.

Bishop Welldon does not disclose the whole Biblical doctrine of the soul. He confines himself to the psychology of St. Paul. Now St. Paul divides human nature into three elements which are distinct. The first is the body (σῶμα); the second is the soul (ψυχή), which includes the life, the sense, the affection or appetite, and the reason; the third is the spirit (πνεῦμα). The spirit is that faculty in man which only the Bible recognises. It is the faculty by which man apprehends God.

It is Bishop Welldon's belief that there is nothing clearer in St. Paul's theology than this tripartite division of the nature of man. He is body, soul, and spirit. But he believes it is equally certain that the tripartition is not always observed by St. Paul. Sometimes the 'soul' is set as a single comprehensive term against the 'spirit,' and then it includes the body. Sometimes it is set in contrast to the 'body,' so as to cover all the parts of human nature that are not visible and material, and then it includes the spirit. But

there is no confusion in that. The confusion arises only when we fail to notice that.

Now, since it is the soul in man (including the spirit) that is immortal, the importance of understanding what the soul is, becomes at once apparent. For the conception that is formed of immortality will correspond with the conception that is formed of the soul. In Homer's poetry the soul is little more than the mere vital principle. Hence when Odysseus finds Achilles in the world below and seeks to comfort him for his death by saying that he is a mighty prince among the dead as he had been among the living, Achilles answers: 'Speak not comfortably to me of death, O great Odysseus. Rather would I live on ground as the hireling of another, with a landless man who has no great livelihood, than bear sway among all the dead that be departed.' Homer stands at the beginning of pagan literature. The emperor Hadrian stands at the end. But his conception of the soul and its future was scarcely higher. Bishop Welldon quotes Matthew Prior's translation—

> Poor little pretty fluttering thing,
> Must we no longer live together?
> And dost thou prune thy trembling wing
> To take thy flight, thou know'st not whither?
> Thy humorous vein, thy pleasing folly,
> Lies all neglected, all forgot;
> And pensive, wavering, melancholy,
> Thou dread'st and hop'st thou know'st not what.

And even Socrates, standing in the middle and towering philosophically over both, has nothing better to say than, 'The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways, I to die, and you to live: which is better God only knows.' It was St. Paul that said, 'I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.' For St. Paul was a Hebrew and a Christian.

So when Bishop Welldon reads that Christ brought life and immortality to light, he does not understand that when Christ came men were first endowed with immortality. Men had long believed in immortality of a kind. It was another kind of immortality that Christ brought to light. He Himself usually called it by the name 'Eternal Life.' Now immortality, 'so far as experience goes,' begins at birth. 'The Eternal Life' is immortality in its perfect realization. It is the immortal life as lived in conscious intimate relation to God. It begins, says Bishop Welldon, 'not at birth, but at baptism.'

Every generation has its doubters, and the doubters of every generation have their own special reasons for doubting. In our day and generation the reasons for doubting the miraculous that surrounds the Lord Jesus Christ are found in criticism of the earliest Christian documents. Jesus of Nazareth did not claim to be miraculous, or to do miraculous deeds. The present Gospels make Jesus miraculous. But when we go back to the sources of the Gospels, and the earliest Christian records, we clear the miraculous away. That is the claim of the modern doubter, the opponent of miraculous Christianity.

And that is what makes Harnack's latest book so highly important. For Harnack is the historian of early Christianity, perhaps the leading historian of our time. His words about the books of the New Testament—their date, integrity, authorship, and the like—carry unexampled weight. He is also a believer in unmiraculous Christianity, the follower of an unmiraculous Christ. If, then, he should make it possible for us to take the Christ of the Gospels and Epistles as a reliable portrait of the actual Christ, we should know that we owe it to historical necessity, not to dogmatic bias.

Has Harnack made it possible? In the *American Journal of Theology*, for the quarter ending September, Professor Caspar René Gregory of Leipzig, writes very fully on Harnack's latest book. Professor Gregory is himself a distinguished New Testament scholar. Though he has

earned his fame as a textual critic, he is conversant with the whole field of historical study. He is a believer in a miraculous Christ. But he has as keen a sense of the claims of historic truth as Harnack. He snaps no advantage. We might even say he is somewhat ready to let advantage go. He examines Harnack's latest book from page to page, from point to point. He considers whether it is possible to believe in a miraculous Christ still. He finds it is almost inevitable now.

It is twenty years and more, says Professor Gregory, since Harnack turned his mind to the matter of early Christian literature. He had read Ritschl's *Old Catholic Church* in its second edition, and thought of editing it for a third. Then he resolved that he himself would write a History of Early Christian Literature, so he prepared himself. Not content with a knowledge of the Old Testament and a general classical education, he carefully studied the pagan literature of the period he proposed to cover. If I would understand, he said, what a *Christian* letter means, I must understand first how a heathen of the same time and place would have written it. And it is the same whether it is a letter or a petition or an apology or a panegyric or a narrative or a chronicle. He also read what others wrote. Year after year the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* published his reviews, and every review was read with interest by the scholar of Church History, for it was manifest that Harnack knew each minutest point, and all the particular surroundings of it. Then he began his *History*.

He planned his History in three parts. The first part was published in 1893. It is called *The Transmission and the Present State of the Early Christian Literature as far as Eusebius*. The second part deals with the Chronology. It is to be published in two divisions. The first division appeared in 1897. Its title is *The Chronology of the Early Christian Literature as far as Irenæus*. The second division will carry it on to Eusebius. Then the third part will contain *The Characterization of the Literature and its Internal Development*. The volume which appeared in 1897, and which carried the Chronology down to Irenæus, is the volume with which we have to do.

The volume is divided into two parts. Its first part covers 230 pages, has the general title of 'Introductory Essays,' and discusses the definitions of time in the *Church History* of Eusebius. Its second part is that which immediately concerns us. It deals with 'The Literature down to Irenæus.' The literature is not taken up in the order of the New Testament, or of any other collection in existence. Harnack's plan is to proceed from the easy to the hard, from the certain date to the uncertain. Accordingly he divides his material into 'writings that can be dated confidently within narrow limits,' and 'writings that for the present cannot be dated so.'

Well, the first thing to fix—because it is so nearly fixed already—is the chronology of St. Paul's life. Harnack fixes it in this way. St. Paul was converted, in all probability, in the year 30; that is to say, in the year of our Lord's Crucifixion, or in the year following. His first Christian visit to Jerusalem was in the year 33; his second, with the Council, in the year 47. The second missionary journey carries us onward, with the eighteen months in Corinth, to the spring of the year 50. In the winter of that year he is back to Ephesus, where he remains till 53. Next year he is made prisoner in Jerusalem, and sent down to Cæsarea. Festus comes into office in 56, and the Book of Acts closes in 59. Then the next five or six years give room for a further missionary activity, and bring us to the apostle's death in 64. Now these dates decide the dates of the great Epistles. Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans were written before the year 54, in which St. Paul was arrested in Jerusalem. Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians (if genuine) fall within the years 54 to 56 if they were written at Cæsarea, and within 57 to 59 if, as Harnack thinks more probable, they were written at Rome; while Philippians belongs,

of course, to these Roman years. Harnack does not count the Pastoral Epistles genuine. On the other hand, he argues rather for than against the genuineness of Ephesians. And even of the Pastoral Epistles he declares certain portions genuine, which is quite enough for us. For, as Professor Gregory says, 'If parts of them are genuine, it will not be hard to accept the rest in its mass as genuine.' At any rate, nobody has as yet suggested any solution of the problem that is half so plausible as the approximate genuineness.

That is the first point. The second is the definition of the year 64 as the time of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome. For Harnack considers it fairly certain that St. Peter visited Rome and died there, though he has as little belief as any of us in the notion that he ever was bishop in Rome, let alone a bishop of twenty-five years' standing. The third point is the tradition that the apostles spent twelve years at Jerusalem before they were finally 'scattered abroad,' a tradition which is closely connected with the absurdity of St. Peter's bishopric, but which Harnack, nevertheless, sees no reason to reject. The fourth point is the date of the Apocalypse. Harnack accepts the date found in Irenæus, that is, the end of Domitian's reign, say 93 to 96. The fifth and last point here is the date of the Acts and Third Gospel. For the Acts Harnack holds 80 to be the earliest, and 93 the latest, possible year. Then the Third Gospel would be not much earlier than 78, and certainly not later than 93.

These are the New Testament dates in Harnack's first part. Passing over the later writings in that part with the mere mention of the birth of Polycarp in 69, the Epistle of Clement in 93 to 95, the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp between 110 and 117, or perhaps 117 and 125, the *Shepherd* in its final form in 140, the work of Papias 145 to 160, and the death of Polycarp, February 23, 155, we come to the second part, which deals with the New Testament and other writings, whose dates and authorship are more difficult to determine.

Take first the Epistle of Barnabas. Harnack thinks that nothing hinders and everything speaks for the year 130 or 131 as its time of writing. The *Didache* is partly dependent on it, and was probably written (in some out-of-the-way corner) in the period between 131 and 160. Clement's so-called Second Epistle is probably the letter or essay sent by Soter to Corinth, and so dates from about 170, or a little earlier. Then we come to the five writings that bear the name of St. Peter, and the interest rapidly deepens.

It is no surprise to learn that Harnack does not believe in the Second Epistle of Peter. It is certainly dependent upon Jude, he says; and Professor Gregory adds that few will dispute the statement. As for Jude's Epistle—to take it in the way—Harnack insists that it does not pretend to be from the brother of Jesus, and he cannot understand how 'the quite obscure brother of the Lord,' as he elsewhere names him, could have written vv.[17, 18]. He thinks the letter was written by some one, who may not even have borne this name, between the years 100 and 130, and was afterwards embellished with the allusions to Jude. Be that as it may, and Gregory does not agree with it, for he sees no difficulty in the verses named, the Second Epistle of Peter is dependent upon it, and Professor Gregory is willing to place its date as late as 120, or even 130.

But the question of serious magnitude (for the Apocalypse of Peter and the Preaching of St. Peter need no mention here) concerns the First Epistle of St. Peter. Again Harnack denies the authenticity. It is a letter, he says, which originally had nothing to do with St. Peter. At a late date some writer, perhaps the author of 2 Peter, embellished it with the references to the Apostle Peter at the beginning, and less distinctly at the end. He cannot believe that the original writer deliberately

sat down and wrote the letter as a forgery. He could more easily believe that it is genuine. Why he cannot believe that, is because it is too dependent upon the Pauline Epistles. But Professor Gregory points out that Harnack bases this dependence upon words of Jülicher, and Jülicher's words by no means carry all they seem at first to carry. Jülicher says, that if St. Peter had written this Epistle, he would have learned more from St. Paul than from Jesus. But, says Gregory, that is a conclusion that is worse than precarious. For it undertakes to say what St. Peter would have done after he had learned from St. Paul certain new developments in the doctrine of Jesus. Grant that St. Peter had learned these new developments; he had great respect for St. Paul's learning and for his personal Christianity: what more likely than that, with the eagerness native to him, he seized upon these developments, seeing them strengthened by the great success of the apostle to the Gentiles, and wrote his letter under their influence, putting into it just such evidence of dependence as we find, rather than going back to the experiences of his disciple days? That supposition is at anyrate as likely as the other. And Gregory does admirably when he says that it is unscientific to give up a tradition that is not positive nonsense before we have a theory that leaves less to be explained.

The remaining Epistles may be touched briefly, and then to the Gospels. For the Epistle to the Hebrews, so wide a range as 65–95 is given. The author was probably Barnabas. The Pastoral Epistles began with certain letters, or fragments of letters, written by St. Paul in the years 59–64, and were wrought over and enlarged between 90 and 110. The Epistle of James was probably not a letter at all, was written between 120 and 140, and did not bear the name of James till near the end of the second century. Those are Harnack's findings. On the Epistle to the Hebrews, Gregory makes no objection. Harnack's curious attitude to the Pastorals, he has discussed already. Touching the Epistle of James, he says that it is enough that we do not know very much about it, that the guesses of Harnack are manifold enough to permit of almost anything in the way of authorship, and he adds that, where there are such intricate and doubtful conditions and relations, it is just as well to stay by the tradition, under all the doubts, as to float away into a sea of the wildest uncertainty.

We come to the Gospels. Harnack counts twenty Gospels as once in existence. But of only thirteen have we any real knowlege. Now, of all these Gospels there are only five with which we need to concern ourselves. Besides the canonical Four there is only one, and 'I should like,' says Professor Gregory, 'to express my personal satisfaction at the circumstance that only one Gospel can in any way approach so near to our canonical Four.' It is the Gospel of the Hebrews.

The great witness to the Gospel of the Hebrews is Jerome. Jerome saw it in the library at Cæsarea and elsewhere. At Bethlehem he translated it into Greek and Latin. Thrice he says it was written in Hebrew letters, once that it was composed in the Chaldee and Syriac language, eight times that the Nazarenes used it, and finally he declares roundly five times that it was the Hebrew original of the canonical Matthew. Jerome must have known that it is unlike the canonical Matthew. Perhaps he wished to boast that he had seen the original of our Greek Matthew; perhaps he wished to fall in with the tradition of four Gospels and no more. But Harnack insists upon it, that the Gospel of the Hebrews was translated into Greek long before Jerome's day, for it is cited by Origen as if it were only a Greek book, and Clement of Alexandria gives a nice Greek reading from it. In short, Harnack holds that this Gospel cannot have been written later than 100 A.D., and that nothing prevents it having been written in the sixties of the first century. 'Like Mark, it had no account of the birth of Jesus, its introduction to the baptism is the most ancient in its cast that we

have, and the other differences between it and the Four Gospels, tend for the most part, so far as they are not unimportant, to show that it is very old, and even in some points older than the canonical Gospels.'

Of the Gospel of Luke we have heard already. Harnack now fixes it down to the years 78 to 93. St. Mark he places between 65 and 85, insisting upon it that it is not necessarily to be placed after the fall of Jerusalem. He finds that the years 70–75 fit best for the Gospel according to Matthew.

The Johannean problem remains. It scarcely remains a problem. True, Harnack denies that the Apostle John is the author, though he holds that neither Apocalypse nor Gospel can be later than 110 A.D. But he denies it on the ground that when Irenæus recalled the words of Polycarp attributing the Gospel to the apostle, he made a mistake. Harnack thinks that Polycarp referred to a presbyter John, who was a very near pupil of the apostle of that name. So the whole matter turns upon that. Professor Gregory does not think that Irenæus made a mistake. Even if he did, and if the Gospel came from an intimate pupil of John, and was written before or shortly after the apostle's death, it would still, he says, be a most valuable Gospel, and not a whit less reliable than those of Mark and Luke, let alone the totally anonymous Matthew. But there is no argument of Harnack, or any other, that compels us to refuse the Gospel to St. John.

'And when He again bringeth in the first-born into the world He saith: And let all the angels of God worship Him.' The passage stands at the very opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews (it is the sixth verse of the first chapter), a passage of universally acknowledged difficulty. 'When He again bringeth in the first-born into the world'—when is that? 'And let all the angels of God worship Him'—whence are these words? Those are the two great difficulties. The *Biblical World* of August publishes an article on the passage by the Rev. W. M. Lewis, who has something definite to say about both the difficulties.

Mr. Lewis considers first whence comes the citation, 'And let all the angels of God worship Him.' Two sources have been suggested—Ps 97^{7} and Dt 32^{43}. The objections to the former are two. Firstly, the words are not the same. We see that at a glance when we lay the passages together in the Greek—

He 1^{6}, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.

Ps 97^{7}, προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ.

The greatest difference between them is the omission of καὶ, 'and.' That 'and' should have been omitted in the quotation in Hebrews would be no wonder, since it is not required there; but that it should have been inserted when not in the original passage is simply incredible. But secondly, the sense is against it also. In the Psalm the author calls upon the angels to worship Jehovah; in the Epistle the writer makes Jehovah call upon the angels to worship the Son. The argument, says Mr. Lewis, clearly requires a scriptural quotation, the reference of which to the Son or Messiah could not be disputed by the readers of the Epistle.

Why not find the source in Deuteronomy then? The words in the Greek are exactly the same, including the 'and.' The sense is the same also. For the context tells us that the speaker is Jehovah; and Jehovah summons the heavens to rejoice with *him*, the angels to worship *him*, this being some one from whom Jehovah clearly distinguishes Himself. Who is this other person? Not an angel, for the angels are called to worship Him. Not 'a' son of God, for the sons of God are encouraged to be strong in Him. To the readers of the Epistle the answer would be undisputed. He can be none

other than the First-begotten. Why then do we not choose Deuteronomy at once as the source of the quotation? The only reason seems to be that the passage is not found in the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy, it is an addition made in the Septuagint.

Now what is the event in the history of the Son of God to which the writer of the Epistle applies this citation? That is the second and the greater difficulty. The choice lies, however, between two events, the Incarnation and the Second Advent. Hitherto, at least, that seems to have been all the choice. But Mr. Lewis has another suggestion. Noticing that the word for 'world' is not the ordinary one (*κόσμος*), but one which signifies rather the 'civilized world' (*οἰκουμένη*), a word which has frequently a restricted as well as a moral meaning, he takes the writer to refer to the Jewish world or Mosaic Age. Now the First-begotten was brought into the Jewish world first in the Song of Moses. Therefore the writer simply refers to that occasion, so familiar to his Septuagint readers, upon which the words he quotes were used. He says, 'On the occasion of the first mention of the Messiah as Son of God, Jehovah says, "And let all the angels of God worship Him."'

But the most original part of Mr. Lewis's article is the argument he builds upon this for the authorship and date of the Epistle. The argument is that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the joint production of St. Paul and St. Luke, and that it was written in Cæsarea between 58 and 60 A.D. It would thus immediately follow the Epistle to the Romans.

Well, it is admitted by Westcott and others, that part of the same verse (Dt 32^{43}) is quoted by St. Paul in Ro 15^{10}. The words quoted in Romans are, 'Rejoice, ye nations, with His people'; and they follow the line, 'And let all the angels of God worship Him.' During the period of St. Paul's missionary journeys, says Mr. Lewis, the Song of Moses appears to have been much in St. Paul's mind, and was the source of frequent quotations. He even says that the Pauline Epistles may be chronologically arranged according to the order of the citations from this song. 'The rock,' in 1 Co 10^{4}, and the words, 'they sacrifice to devils, and not to God,' in 1 Co 10^{20}, are from vv.$^{4.\ 17}$ respectively of the song. The words in 2 Co 7^{5}, 'without were fightings, within were fears,' are an echo of v.^{25}.

Now in Romans 12^{19} St. Paul quotes v.^{35}, 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.' The same verse is quoted in He 10^{30}. The citation differs from the Hebrew text, and also from the Septuagint, but the words are precisely identical in both Epistles. Davidson says, 'the author may have been familiar with the Epistle to the Romans.' Westcott says, 'the passage had taken this form in practical use.' Mr. Lewis counts it much more reasonable that the same author had adopted a variation of the original, or had relied on his memory for the words of a Song that was much in his mind at a certain period, and used the same form in two Epistles which proceeded from him in close succession. In Ro 15^{10} St. Paul reaches the last verse of Moses' song, and quotes 'Rejoice, ye nations, with His people!' If he was the joint-author of Hebrews and wrote it on the occasion suggested, then the very next chapter of his writing (except the chapter of salutations in Ro 16) was the first chapter of Hebrews, 'and in the opening verses of that chapter he quotes from the same verse the words which are immediately connected with and precede those quoted at the close of the Romans, "And let all the angels of God worship Him."'