Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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.

DR. RENDEL HARRIS has written another book about twins. In the year 1903 he published *The Dioscuri in the Christian Legends*. He has found the topic of twins sufficiently attractive and sufficiently difficult to draw him on to fuller study. He has now published a much larger volume, and called it *The Cult of the Heavenly Twins* (Cambridge Press; 6s.).

It was not Castor and Pollux that first caught the attention of Dr. Rendel Harris. His Heavenly Twins were Christian saints. He was examining certain Byzantine calendars, and was struck by the frequency with which the names of SS. Florus and Laurus occurred. He began to wonder who they were, and why they were so popular. His first discovery about them was that they were twins.

He suspected that they were twins from the similarity of their names. For, everywhere and always, similar names have been given to twin children. In the Rig-Veda we find Yama and Yami; in Roman history we have Romulus (and now Dr. Rendel Harris firmly believes that the earliest form of Romulus was Romus) and Remus. And in Teutonic mythology we come upon Baltram and Sintram. Are these all? By no means. Dr. Rendel Harris does not doubt that Huz and Buz in Gn 22^{21} are twins. He has not forgotten that Huz is called Nahor's firstborn, and Buz his brother. That makes no difference. In Gn 46^{21} we come upon Huppim and Muppim. And when we pass to the New Testament we discover in Ro 16^{12} Tryphæna and Tryphosa, the most striking case of all.

Having suspected from the similarity of their names that Florus and Laurus were twins, Dr. Rendel Harris became convinced of it from the similarity of their functions. He had passed for the moment from the calendars of the saints. He was reading Tolstoi's *Peace and War*. Two Russian peasants are talking there. "'Certainly I say my prayers,' replied Pierre. 'But what was that about Frola and Laura?' 'Why,' swiftly replied Platon, 'that's the horses' saints, for we must have pity on the cattle.'" So in Russian folklore Florus and Laurus are the patron saints of horses. But so are Castor and Pollux. It was a nice discovery.

And when Dr. Rendel Harris returned to his calendars and observed that St. Helena is honoured in the Roman Church on the same month and day (August 18th) as Florus and Laurus are honoured in the Greek Church, the identification was complete. For every one knows that in Sparta, the great centre of the cult of the Dioscuri, the

worship of Castor and Pollux went hand in hand with the worship of Helen. No doubt St. Helena, the mother of Constantine, is historical, while the Greek Helen is mythological, more or less. So also Castor and Pollux are mythological, while Florus and Laurus were evidently martyrs of the Early Church. Dr. Rendel Harris does not mean that in either case the individuals were identical. He means that in the Christian Church the cult of the saints took the place of the cult of the pagan divinities. The names were changed, the worship remained the same.

But Florus and Laurus did not take the place of Castor and Pollux everywhere. Dr. Rendel Harris went through his calendars for other twin brethren, and found them not a few. But his interest was never really roused until he came to Edessa. In the city of Edessa, it is well known, the leading saint is St. Thomas the Apostle, and it is universally conceded that St. Thomas is somebody's twin brother. Whose twin brother is he? He is the twin brother, according to the Church of Edessa, of none other than our Lord Himself.

The evidence is to be found in the Apocryphal work called the Acts of Thomas. There Thomas is actually called the 'twin of the Messiah.' He is spoken of as Judas Thomas, and by Judas is meant Jude, the brother of our Lord. It is a confusion of these apostles which seems to have been made very early in the Eastern Church. Even in the Sinaitic Syriac Gospels, discovered by Mrs. Lewis, Judas and Thomas are identified in Jn 14^{22}. But in the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas not only are our Lord and Thomas twins, but they are so like one another that people are constantly mistaking the one for the other.

Now it is impossible to doubt that this combination was made under the pressure of the ancient cult of Castor and Pollux. For in the legends and worship of the Dioscuri the most significant fact is this, that one of the twins was immortal and the other mortal. It is the most significant fact, because it is the most primitive explanation of the birth of twins, and was once perhaps universal as the explanation of that phenomenon. When Dr. Rendel Harris has reached Edessa, and has discovered that a mortal and an immortal are held in honour there in the Christian Church as twin brethren, there is no rest for him until he has investigated the whole subject of the treatment of twins all the world over. The new book contains the results of his investigation.

Looking into the book without attempting to exhaust it, for there are few things in heaven or in earth that it has not some relation to, let us touch upon two matters. There is first the matter just referred to, which is the title of the opening chapter—'that the Heavenly Twins are one mortal, and the other immortal.' The Greek legends of the Dioscuri tell us that Castor was buried in Greek soil, but 'that Polydeuces (or Pollux, as the Latins call him), was made immortal by Zeus. 'The Greek mythologists,' says Dr. Rendel Harris, 'have added a beautiful description of the discontent of the deified Polydeuces because his brother could not share his honours with him, and his determination not to enjoy heaven alone, together with an account of the way in which Zeus rewarded the disinterested affection of Polydeuces, and divided immortality for one between two, thus furnishing the Greek moralists with their classical instance of the higher forms of love and sacrifice.'

Why was one of the Dioscuri reckoned mortal, and the other immortal? There was a time when the key to all the mythologies was found in the sky. In those days Castor and Pollux were explained as if they were the morning and the evening star. Now, one star is lost in the light before the rising sun, and the other is lost in the dark after the setting sun. One star is 'up,' while the other star is 'down.' And the ancients, perceiving this, did, in their mythological and pictorial way, speak of the one as mortal, and of the other as immortal.

The explanation of mythology by natural phenomena rose and fell with Professor Max Müller. It was often beautiful. Sometimes it may have been true. But the study of Comparative Religion has nearly made an end of it. When Dr. Rendel Harris would discover the reason why one twin is reckoned mortal, and the other immortal, he goes back to a far earlier time than that of the flower of Greek mythology, or he goes to a land in which the practices are still prevalent which brought the Greek and all other mythologies into existence. He goes to Australia, or America, or the West Coast of Africa.

Now when, for example, he follows Commissioner McTurk to the country of the Essequibo Indians, he finds that the birth of twins is looked upon as an unnatural thing. One child at a birth is the only natural thing. Therefore one of the children has a natural father, but the other a supernatural. 'An Indian woman,' writes Commissioner McTurk, 'gave birth to twins. At the time there was considerable sickness in the neighbourhood, and a *pui* man was called in. He declared the cause of the sickness to be one of the twins, who, he said, was the child of a Kenaima, as a woman could not naturally produce two children at a birth. The particular child was sick and fretful, and one night on the cry of an owl or other night bird the child woke and commenced to cry. The *pui* man, who was present, declared the cry of the bird to be the Kenaima father of the child calling to it, and the child's crying its answer. The next day, at his instigation, a large hole was dug in the ground and a fire built in it, and when it was well ablaze, the infant was thrown into it and burned to death.'

The other matter is this. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (13[1]) the Christians to whom that Epistle is addressed are recommended to observe hospitality towards strangers, and the encouragement is given that 'thereby some have entertained angels unawares.' The reference, says Dr. Rendel Harris, is no doubt to the hospitality of Abraham when visited by the three angels; and he believes that the three angels were the Semitic Dioscuri and their companion. What are his arguments?

One argument is that 'angels do not properly belong to the first period of the Hebrew legends; and that when they do occur, they are the product of later reflexion, and may easily be the displacement of earlier forms of theophany.' The other argument is that one of the most ancient and widespread offices of the Heavenly Twins was to restore to a man of advanced age the power of producing offspring. It is true that in the Hebrew narrative it is Sarah, and not Abraham, that receives this power. But the Hebrew text of the passage is obscure. Dr. Rendel Harris believes that the present text contains a misunderstanding, and that the promise was made to Abraham as well as to Sarah. So, indeed, the Targums take it; for Onkelos reads: 'One of them said, Returning, I will return to thee in the coming year; and *you shall be revived*, and behold, Sarah thy wife shall have a son'; while the Jerusalem Targum has it: 'He said, Returning, I will return to thee at that time to revive you, and behold, Sarah thy wife shall have a male child.'

But the angels are three. If the twins are two of them, who is the third? Dr. Rendel Harris is not quite sure of that. The third angel, he says, may be due to 'the composite nature of the sources of the legend and the rough amalgamation of the editors.' And it is to be observed that the angels are not always three; sometimes they are only two. But Dr. Rendel Harris has more delight in the recollection that, in all parts of the world, the twins are often accompanied by a third person. It may be a sister, as in the legends of India and Greece. It may be a mother, as in certain tales that are still more primitive. Or it may be a superior god, as Dr. Rendel Harris believes it is here. In Greece the visit would be made by Zeus and the Dioscuri; among the Hebrews it is made by Jahveh and the Kabiri. Now, the Kabiri, who had the headquarters of

their cult in Phœnicia, are simply the Semitic equivalents of the Greek Dioscuri.

What does St. Paul mean when he says, 'I speak as a man' (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω)? Three times he uses the phrase, in Ro 3^5, in 1 Co 9^8 (λαλῶ), and in Gal 3^{15}. A good deal hangs upon its meaning in the last passage. It will help to determine the question whether the word which immediately follows (διαθήκη) means a covenant or a will. And that is an element in the larger question whether in this whole section (Gal 3^{15-20}) the Apostle is using legal Roman phraseology or not. And that, finally, is an important element in fixing the locality and the date of the Epistle.

Dr. Dawson Walker has published a volume of Biblical Essays, to which he has given the title of *The Gift of Tongues* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). The second essay in the volume is on 'The Legal Terminology in the Epistle to the Galatians.' In that essay he discusses the phrase, 'I speak as a man.' And he seems to make it perfectly clear that the Apostle does not intend to repudiate inspiration when he uses this phrase, but means to say that he is going to use an illustration taken from human life as opposed to one taken from Scripture.

Dr. Dawson Walker finds the meaning of the phrase most clearly expressed in 1 Co 9^8. St. Paul has just been maintaining his own claim as an apostle to receive support from the Church. He has illustrated his claim by a series of comparisons with other recipients of support in return for work—the soldier, the vine-dresser, the shepherd. He then goes on, 'Do I speak these things as a man? or saith not the Law also the same? For it is written in the Law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.' There is no question of inspiration here. The apostle is not thinking of such a thing. He brings what he says 'as a man' into contrast with what the Law says. And the Law stands for Scripture. Clearly his meaning is that what daily experience tells us, Scripture tells us also. And the phrase, 'I speak as a man,' means 'I speak in accordance with the customs of the life in which I live.'

The phrase has the same meaning everywhere. It has the same meaning in Gal 3^{15}. And from the use of this phrase Dr. Dawson Walker concludes that the Apostle goes on to speak of a will, and not of a covenant. A covenant would recall Scripture. But St. Paul wishes to recall the affairs of daily life amid which the Galatian converts moved. The Authorized and the Revised Versions both have 'covenant' in the text and 'testament' in the margin. Dr. Dawson Walker would have these words change places.

Professor George Burman Foster is a great theologian. He has been described as the best theologian of America. And America is now that happy land, far far away, in which all Systematic Theology dwells. Professor Foster has written a book on *The Finality of the Christian Religion* (Chicago University Press; $4 net).

For the book of a great systematic theologian, Professor Foster's *Finality of the Christian Religion* is surprisingly unsystematic and untheological. It has been written for the express purpose of shaking our faith in all the systems of theology that we have ever clung to. If Professor Foster had himself held a Chair of Systematic Theology, his first clear duty was to resign it. As he holds, however, the Chair of the Philosophy of Religion, no such necessity is laid upon him. A professor of the Philosophy of Religion subscribes no formula and accepts no creed. He belongs to the new order. His purpose is to show that the old order is passed away. Professor George Burman Foster is a great systematic theologian, but now from the Chair of the Philosophy of Religion he announces, without compunction or reserve, that our little systems of theology have had their day and ceased to be.

His business is with the finality of the Christian

religion, and by its finality he really means its essence. For it is the essence of the Christian religion, as he conceives it, and only its essence, that will abide, or, indeed, that has remained until this day. All the rest has already departed. And what is the essence of the Christian religion? It is Jesus.

Jesus? The name is suspiciously short; but is not Jesus the centre of all theology? If Jesus abides, does not His life abide, and His teaching, His work, and His Person? Having Jesus, have we not all the problems of all the ages of theology? Professor Foster answers, No. We have Jesus, but we have no problems of theology. We have Jesus, but we have neither His life, nor His teaching, nor His Person, nor His work.

For in this book, Professor Foster is a critic of the New Testament Scriptures. In his endeavour to discover the finality of the Christian religion he sets aside all systematic theology and comes to the New Testament. When he comes to the New Testament he sets aside all that the Acts and the Epistles and the Apocalypse tell us of the Christian religion, and comes to the Gospels. When he comes to the Gospels he sets aside all the facts of the life of Christ, all the words of His teaching, all the theories of His Person, and all the evidence of His work. It is a long road that we have to travel with Professor Foster before we reach the finality of the Christian religion, and when we have reached it, we find that we have left all these things behind us.

Then what is Jesus? It is the *disposition and self-consciousness* of the Man of Galilee. But we must quote here.

'We are searching,' says Professor Foster, 'for the abiding importance of the Person of Jesus and for the permanent element in his teaching.' For though 'Jesus' means neither His Person nor His teaching, it means something which Professor Foster thinks he can get out of His Person or His teaching. 'We have seen,' he continues, 'that it was not belief in angels, in spirits, and in the hereafter that constituted his peculiarity and his power. It was not his working of miracles, nor his belief in demons; he knew that he was not sent to do miracles, and his belief in demons he shared with his times. Besides, there were casters-out of demons enough before and since his day. Nor was the annunciation of the speedy coming of the kingdom of God peculiar to him; it had already been made by the Baptist, and had long been the thought of Pharisees and zealots. Certainly, the claim to be the Messiah does not constitute his peculiarity. Apart from the debatable question whether he claimed for himself on earth the title of Messiah, there is the further question as to the special character of his Messianic idea, and the kind of Messiah he wanted to be—not the folk-Messiah certainly, for it was precisely this Messiah that was the 'devil' in the temptation stories. Nor does the claim to be the incarnate God on earth amount to a peculiarity; others subsequently made it for Jesus; Jesus never made it for himself, and would not have understood what was meant by it. Indeed, if the oldest sources are to be trusted, Jesus said nothing even as to his pre-temporal existence with God, or of his return to heaven. Finally, his moral precepts are not universally valid. Some of them were applicable only to his own time and place; perhaps more narrowly still, to the mode of life of his immediate disciples. Nor were his moral ideas, taken distributively, new. What then?'

Yes, what then? Professor Foster answers, '*He* was new, and his power to make men new was new likewise.' And when he has said *He*, he goes on to explain, and says, 'What was certainly new was the disposition and self-consciousness of Jesus,' as we have already seen.

Now 'disposition' and 'self-consciousness' are unsatisfactory words. The disposition of Jesus? His self-consciousness? You may make anything you like of either of them. Precisely so, says Professor Foster. No man must make anything

of them for you: no man or men, no theologian, and no Church. You may make what you like of them. What you make of them will make you. But whatever you get out of them you must get it for yourself. 'You must see with your own eyes,' he says, in his frank, unmerciful way, 'for they are the only eyes you have to see with.'

But he helps us a little. For he says that the unique thing in Jesus is His own belief in Himself; and that His own belief in Himself made Him believe in man. More than that, he says it was His own belief in Himself that made Him believe in God. Tennyson says that if we could tell what the flower in the crannied wall is, we could tell what God and man is. We can tell what God and man is, says Professor Foster, when we can tell what Jesus is. For Jesus was a man; and surely, says Professor Foster, you have some idea of the kind of man He was. But what Jesus was any man may be. For Jesus believed in Himself, and believing in Himself He believed in man, in every man; and He believed in His power to make every man as Himself.

Again, He believed in God. Why? Because He believed in Himself. His God is just Himself. And when Professor Foster has said that, he stops to look at what he has said and wonder. Is God like Jesus? Professor Foster remembers John Stuart Mill and Huxley, and some of the terrible things they have said of 'nature red in tooth and claw,' and the God who made it so. Is God like Jesus? Professor Foster can scarcely believe it. For, you see, he knows the disposition of Jesus (and you and I, he says, must surely know it also). It is one of the things that abide and give the Christian religion its finality.

But he hesitates only for a moment. Yes, God is as good as Jesus. For the other thing that abides and gives the Christian religion its finality is the self-consciousness of Jesus. And Jesus knew in His own self-consciousness that He and the Father were one. 'What man needed most of all to learn was just the truth, immediately certain to Jesus, that

> The All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
> So, through the thunder comes a human voice
> Saying, O heart I made, a heart beats here!
> Face my hands fashioned, see it in myself!

Does Jesus' thought or man's need go beyond this? Is it not,' he asks, 'the absolute religion?'

The Demonology of the Gospels is a difficult subject to deal with. No man should approach it in the pride of his heart. But what is a preacher to do? Of every three texts we are told to choose two from the Gospels. And the advice is good. But we have not gone far into the Gospels when we find some demon crying out, or some one possessed with a demon. What is a preacher to do?

Professor Foster would say that we have nothing to do with the demonology of the Gospels. He would say that we have nothing to do with anything in the Gospels, except with the disposition and the self-consciousness of Jesus. And we may have to come to that. But what about next Sunday? We have begun to lecture on the miracles. 'This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee.' Then follow Him to Capernaum. It is only a few days after. 'And straightway there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And the unclean spirit, tearing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him' (Mk 1^{23-26}). What is the preacher to do with that?

Professor Foster would tell us that it was all a hallucination. The man, he would say, was under a hallucination, and so was Jesus. Jesus, he would say, 'held the antique psychology according to which an alien spirit could enter and inhabit a human body.' Would he bid us tell our people

so? It is not that we should be afraid. The heresy hunter has claimed his last head. But what would be the use of it?

The preacher does not often deal with Demonology. But if you turn to Dr. George Matheson's *Studies in the Portrait of Christ*, you will find that he deals with it as a preacher. Does Dr. Matheson believe in Demonology? Does he believe that Jesus believed in it? It does not matter whether he does or not. He deals with Demonology as a preacher, not as a physician or other man of science. He finds no occasion to astonish his hearers with statements about an 'antique psychology.' He is something of a man of science himself, and he is very modern. But in the pulpit he is a preacher. And as a preacher he knows that the only thing which he has to take out of the Gospels is their gospel.

Now, in this story of the unclean spirit in the synagogue at Capernaum, Dr. Matheson has no difficulty in finding the gospel of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the healing of the demoniac (and not even Professor Foster doubts the fact of the cure, however it was accomplished) he sees the widest stretch of the sympathy of Jesus. He thinks Jesus began with individuals. He called Andrew and Peter and James and John. He thinks that He passed next to the family. After He had called Peter He entered into his house. Peter's wife's mother lay sick of a fever. And He touched her hand and the fever left her. Then He passed out into the world and healed the demoniac.

That is not the actual order of events. But Dr. Matheson is not troubled about the order. It is not events that he has to do with in the pulpit, it is influences. Besides, if this demoniac was healed before Peter's wife's mother, other demoniacs were healed afterwards. From the family Jesus passed out into the world and found a demoniac. He could not have gone farther. He had reached the utmost limit to which His sympathy could go. He will have compassion on the poor. He will make the blind to see and the lame to walk. He will touch the leper in his loathsomeness. But when He has come into contact with the demoniac and has driven the unclean spirit out of him, the last call has been made upon His power to save. He has reached the limits of the wide, wide world.

Jesus healed the demoniacs with authority. This was the testimony of the people. 'With authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him.' But by what authority? By the authority of sympathy with the man. And sympathy could no farther go. Was the possession merely mental derangement? 'To the physician of a mental ailment,' says Dr. Matheson, 'the first thing requisite is that he should put himself in the place of the sufferer. Other maladies merely require a sympathy with pain; this needs a sympathy with limitations. If I have to deal with the mentally afflicted, I must contract my own nature so as to meet theirs. I must learn to think with their thoughts, to see with their eyes, to palpitate with their delusions. I must divest myself of my experience. I must meet them on their own ground, not on mine. I must reason with them on their own assumptions, not on mine. I must study to imagine things as I have *not* felt them, to deal with things as I have *not* known them. There is no such self-abnegation as is involved in the contact with mental disease.'

And it was more than mental. The demoniac was at the farthest reach from Jesus because he was possessed with an unclean spirit, while Jesus was possessed with the holy spirit of God. In coming into contact with a demoniac, and having authority to heal him, our Lord showed that all authority had been given unto Him on earth. He is able to save unto the uttermost.

Come, ye sinners, poor and wretched,
Weak and wounded, sick and sore;
Jesus ready stands to save you,
Full of pity joined with power;
He is able,
He is willing; doubt no more.