
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

frontiers. The finest legions were composed of Goths and other Northern tribes, and, when the great invasions did come, they were in no way inclined to fight against their own kinsmen.

Such was the fate of Israel also. It came much more swiftly, for the country was but tiny as compared with the enormous extent of the Roman world. It was, moreover, attacked by enemies far more powerful than any whom Rome had to face. In spite of the superficial brilliance of the reign of Jeroboam II., the social and economic rottenness soon manifested themselves, and within a generation the end had come. The Assyrians appeared once more on the political horizon, as they had done a century earlier. Then they had been resisted by the united forces of the little states of Palestine, and had succeeded only when the prophetic revolution in Israel broke up the alliance. An attempt was made by Pekah and Rezon to repeat the exploits of their predecessors, but it ended only in failure. We may guess that the strength of Damascus had been sapped in much the same way as that of Israel, and the refusal of Ahaz of Judah to join the allies was a fatal bar to success. But even if Ahaz had been willing to cast in his lot with the enemies of Assyria, it is clear that Tiglath-pileser would have had little difficulty in overcoming the resistance of the coalition. The life had gone out of Palestine, her people were now slaves, and the inevitable result was a foreign master.

Judah, less exposed to foreign assaults, survived for a century and a half, but, in the end, she suffered at the hands of the Chaldeans the fate which had already befallen northern Israel. But it was to the last generation of her existence that we owe some of the clearest statements of the social principles which the true Israel had inherited from her Aramæan ancestors. Whatever date we assign to Deuteronomy, we shall probably agree that it is a fair presentation and application of principles which go back to the earliest days of Israel's national history. The so-called humanitarian attitude of this law-book involves an appreciation of the rights of the individual, especially of the subject. The law of the monarchy [1] may be much earlier than the end of the seventh century B.C., but Jeremiah's denunciation of Jehoiakim [2] certainly dates from that time. Both give expression to a fundamental doctrine, that every Israelite citizen, every person within the covenant-group, is to be treated as a brother, and not as a slave. Here is, perhaps, one of the most important contributions Israel made to human thought and life.

[1] Dt 17^{14-20}. [2] Jer 22^{13-19}.

St. Peter and St. Paul.

By the Right Reverend Lewis B. Radford, D.D., formerly Bishop of Goulburn.

There are two Peters who have engrossed between them the attention and interest of the majority of Christians. There is the homely familiar figure so vividly near to us every Holy Week, so humanly akin to us in his slowness to understand, his hurry to protest or to promise, his tragic self-confidence, his wavering between courage and cowardice, his denial and his penitence, his persistent devotion and his splendid recovery. And there is the shadowy figure of the reputed founder of the Roman Church and father of papal supremacy, the central focus of ages of ecclesiastical controversy. But these are not the only Peters in the New Testament, nor the whole of St. Peter. No human figure in the New Testament is sketched in fuller detail or in richer colour than St. Peter. Yet there are whole tracts of his life and work which remain unstudied or unappreciated by many readers of the Acts and Epistles.

I. St. Peter ought to be studied first in his friendships and associations. He appears first as a disciple fetched and brought to Jesus by his brother Andrew. Strange to say, the two brothers are never mentioned together again in the New Testament, except in the lists of the Apostles. Peter's warm heart seems to have spent its affection most generously upon two friends, both much younger men.

(1) There is the disciple whom Jesus loved, almost indisputably St. John. They were sent together into the city to prepare the last Passover; and Christian mystical interpretation has seen in

the two companions on this errand the two types of discipleship, namely, the active and the meditative, or the two elements of the communicant life, namely, duty and devotion. Some such contrast stands out clearly in the Fourth Gospel. The two men are so different in the ways in which they show their love for Jesus. They were together again when the news came of the empty tomb. John outran Peter; youth and love carried him more swiftly, but reverence held him back at the open door; it was Peter who went right in and was followed by John, but not immediately. They were together in the boat on the lake of Galilee; it was John who was the first with the keen eye of love to recognize 'the Lord' in the friendly stranger on the shore; it was Peter who then with the eager impetuosity of love plunged into the water to swim to the Master. They were devoted to each other, perhaps unconsciously because of the very difference of their temperaments. Later that very morning, after his own restoration to the apostolate and the prophecy of his own martyrdom, Peter, turning round and seeing the beloved disciple following them, asks the Lord, 'And what about him?' There was no mere curiosity in the question; it was simply affectionate anxiety about the future of a young friend. What work is in store for him? Must he suffer too? After Pentecost the intimacy of friendship becomes the close companionship of joint service. Together they go into the Temple courts to pray; Peter speaks the word of healing to the lame beggar, but associates John with himself, 'Look on us.' Together they stand before the Council and refuse to promise to refrain from preaching the gospel. Together they go down to Samaria at the request of the other Apostles to lay hands upon the baptized Samaritan converts. They are never mentioned together again; we are left to imagine or conjecture the later history of this friendship between age and youth, between meditative devotion and impulsive enthusiasm, in the service of the Master whom both loved so dearly and yet so differently. Their Epistles to the faithful lie near together in the New Testament, and should be compared and contrasted in the light of the fact that the distinctive notes of the Epistles are the outcome of two characters, one of which had ripened swiftly amid the strenuous labours of a far-travelling apostolate on its way to martyrdom, while the other had ripened slowly through long years of pastorate in an age of incipient heresy.

(2) St. Peter's other friend was John Mark. It was to the house of Mary, Mark's mother, that Peter went straight home after his deliverance from prison. We think mostly of Mark as the young companion who forfeited St. Paul's confidence by his turning back from the mission field, and in the end made good and proved an altogether faithful and helpful companion in the Apostle's confinement at Rome. But in the Epistle which Peter wrote to the Christians of Asia Minor from 'Babylon,' almost certainly Rome, he sends greetings from 'Mark, my son.' The note of intimacy here is strong. Its origin is not so clear. Mark and his mother may have owed their conversion to Peter; but 'my son' (it is not 'my child,' the usual term for a convert) indicates rather a young disciple to whom the Apostle was a second father. The debt of filial piety was certainly richly repaid. The Gospel according to St. Mark in its original form consisted of a series of lessons penned by Mark as the 'interpreter' of Peter's story of the gospel, for the benefit primarily of Christian converts and catechumens in Rome.

(3) The most perplexing and fascinating question of St. Peter's life is his relation to St. Paul. They were apparently never companions in missionary work until perhaps those last days in Rome; and even that association is not quite certain. Were they ever close friends, or only distantly friendly colleagues in different regions of the world-wide mission of the Church? Scholarship is still divided over the piecing together of the fragmentary references in the Acts and in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Briefly and roughly the story seems to fall into three stages. (*a*) First there was the stage of *consultation*. Some years after his conversion St. Paul went up to Jerusalem 'to visit Peter,' or 'to become acquainted with him' (R.V.m.), and spent a fortnight with him. The Apostles then recognized that Paul seemed as clearly called to be the missionary of the Gentile world as Peter was to be the missionary of the Jewish people at home and abroad; and they gave each other the right hand of fellowship, as they went off to their respective missions. (*b*) Then came the stage of *conflict*. At Antioch in Syria, Peter seems to have wavered in his loyalty to the principles of the freedom of Gentile Christians from Jewish observances and their spiritual equality with Jewish Christians; he associated with the Greek converts for a time, and then on the arrival of rigid Jewish Christians from Jerusalem he withdrew from that association. Paul protested fiercely against this inconsistency. We might judge differently if we had Peter's version of the story. What St. Paul called disloyalty to the truth of the

gospel may have seemed to St. Peter loyalty to the spirit of the gospel, an attitude prompted by sympathy with conscientious scruples. The question of the obligation of Jewish religious observances in the case of Gentile converts had been settled indeed at Jerusalem by the conference of Apostles and 'elder brethren' (R.V., but surely 'the presbyters and the brethren,' in modern language the clergy and laity), but by a compromise mainly in favour of the Gentile Christians; and a compromise is always hard to interpret and apply in particular circumstances. St. Paul was a rigid champion of definite principles. St. Peter was not an opportunist, but his impulsive sympathy may have led him to see and take first one side and then another of a difficult question, which has indeed risen again and again in one form or another in the later history of the Church. (*c*) In any case there was a final stage of *reconciliation*. We would give much to know for certain whether the two Apostles met in Rome. But the story of their last days is a matter of doubtful inference from fragmentary evidence. What we do know is that the First Epistle of St. Peter shows clear traces of acquaintance with the Epistles of St. Paul. Its bearer and probable amanuensis was Silvanus or Silas, a former companion of St. Paul. Mark, too, was then with Peter in Rome. It is unthinkable that Silvanus or Mark could have gone over from St. Paul to St. Peter in the sense of crossing the floor of the Church from one party to another. St. Paul may have been away from Rome on the missionary journeys which appear to have taken place between his two trials in Rome; or he may have suffered his martyrdom already. But neither Silvanus nor Mark could have felt at home with St. Peter if they had been conscious of any trace of lingering antagonism between the two great Apostles. By this time the burning question of the relations between Jew and Gentile under the gospel had died down in peace. The great danger of the day was the growing hostility of the imperial authorities and the darkening shadow of persecution. Under the pressure or in the face of that peril, apostles and converts were all united.

(4) It is uncertain whether the two chiefs of the apostolic band met their fate together, or which of the two came to his martyrdom first. They were from an early date united in their commemoration by the Church. Both were buried on the scene of martyrdom, Peter on the Vatican hill, Paul on the Ostian road outside the city. In the year A.D. 258 a fresh outbreak of persecution drove the Church at Rome to remove the remains of both Apostles to the Catacombs for safety, and the day of their reburial there, June 29, was kept afterwards as the Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. Under Constantine, the first Christian emperor, their remains were restored again to their original resting-places, and two churches were built in their names, the original St. Peter's on the Vatican, and the original St. Paul's 'Outside the Walls.' It was the possession of the twin sanctuaries of the great apostolic martyr that in later centuries drew so many Christian pilgrims to Rome. Even to-day Roman Catholic bishops are bound every few years to pay a visit to 'the thresholds of the apostles'; and papal bulls are only valid when issued in the joint names of St. Peter and St. Paul. They were not indeed the founders of the Church in Rome. It sprang from seed sown by pilgrim Jews fresh from the experience of Pentecost, by soldiers and traders and provincial officials and their wives and servants returning from Judæa. Paul's confinement opened doors for the spread of the gospel among the prætorian guards, the household troops, and perhaps within the court circles of the Empire. St. Peter may have exercised a brief pastorate over the Christian congregations, and perhaps done something for their organization in one Church of Rome. But though not its founders, they were its twin martyr-princes. In later centuries the basing of the claim of papal supremacy upon the apostolic primacy of St. Peter thrust St. Paul into the background. Roman ecclesiastical policy has always robbed Paul to pay Peter; Roman popular estimation has been summed up in the innocent indiscretion of a genial priest who once remarked that 'St. Paul never was a good Catholic.' Roman controversialists have even misquoted the ancient phrase *limina apostolorum* as *limen apostoli*, or translated it as 'the threshold of the Apostle.' Yet despite the predominance of the Petrine cult as the basis of the papal claim, Roman liturgical conservatism has kept June 29th in the Missal as the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the full title of a church or cathedral commonly known as St. Peter's proves mostly to be the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul. In the Roman breviary office hymn they are described as 'the teacher of the world and the doorkeeper of heaven, the twin parents of Rome and judges of the nations.'

II. From the personal relations of St. Peter and St. Paul and their joint primacy in the honour roll of the apostolate we pass now to the question of their Christianity and churchmanship and its bearing on the Christianity and churchmanship of our own day. St. Paul's protest in defence of the

menaced unity of the Church at Corinth seems at first sight to suggest that there may have been something in St. Peter's teaching which was misinterpreted into an occasion for the formation of parties within the Corinthian Church or in distinct congregations in Corinth—a Pauline party, a Petrine party, an Apollos party, and yet another party perhaps which seems to have described itself as Christian, very much as some people to-day disown all idea of party and build a party on the basis of that very denial of all partisanship, or even create a new denomination which asserts its claim to be undenominational by calling itself the Church of Christ. It is quite possible that this partisanship at Corinth was in some way or to some extent the result of a mistaken or exaggerated idea (perhaps a distorted echo of the conflict at Antioch), that Paul and Peter were virtually preaching two versions of the gospel. Peter may have paid an unrecorded visit to Corinth. Apollos had certainly preached the gospel acceptably and effectively in Corinth, and some Corinthians apparently pinned their faith to the teaching of Apollos, the Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria, which may have been distinctively liberal and allegorical. Perhaps on the other hand the differences within the Church at Corinth were not doctrinal so much as personal; they may have centred round the question of apostolic authority or even grown out of the response to attractive characters. If they were, as is probable, doctrinal differences, for us the question of any real difference between the teaching of the two Apostles must be judged on the evidence of their extant Epistles and their addresses as reported in the Acts. Briefly it may be said that there is no difference in the substance of their teaching, but only in the emphasis laid on various elements in their common teaching of the one gospel. (1) Both to Peter and to Paul, Jesus Christ is the Son of God. But to Paul the dominant thought is the pre-existent Son of God, the eternal Christ. To Peter it is the Jesus who was exalted to the throne of God by His resurrection and ascension. Neither Apostle ignores either truth. But the difference in their emphasis is intelligible. Peter had the memory of discipleship and companionship with Jesus to interpret in the light of the Resurrection and the Ascension; what impressed him most was the elevation from the human ministry to the Divine majesty, the vindication of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. Paul had almost certainly no personal experience of the earthly ministry of Christ; it was the ascended Christ that first broke upon his view and changed his life. (2) There are differences, again, in the way in which the two Apostles regard the Christian religion. Briefly, it has been said, Peter was a disciplinarian, Paul a mystic. A disciplinarian, says one thoughtful interpreter of St. Peter (Dr. Bigg in the 'International Critical Commentary'), is a man who hears God speaking to him; a mystic is a man who feels the presence of God within him. The two types can be seen in sharp contrast when we compare the devotional writings of Laud, the forefather of the catholic revival, and Fox, the father of the Quakers; but in most cases the two tendencies run into each other in various forms and degrees. Both statements are true of both Apostles; but one is more true of Peter and the other of Paul. To Peter the Christian life is mainly a life of obedience to the law of God; the gospel is a new commandment. To Paul the Christian life is primarily the experience of the indwelling Christ, the communion of the soul with Christ. To Peter grace is a gift bestowed; to Paul it is an indwelling power. (3) There is yet another contrast. To Paul there is present constantly an antithesis between law and gospel, between flesh and spirit, between the world and God. To Peter life is rather a continuous experience of progress in faith and love. Here again the explanation is obvious. Paul's life was in two distinct chapters; he had experienced a sudden and violent conversion, from Pharisee to Christian, from persecutor to apostle. Peter had one great painful experience, his denial, but it was a break in the course of a continuous discipleship. His Christian life was more of a unity; his soul had grown gradually and steadily. To use mystical language, Paul belonged to the twice-born; Peter to the once-born. (4) Again, Paul is full of the thought of the present working of Christ in His Body the Church; Peter seems always to be looking forward to the coming of Christ to complete and crown the work of His earthly ministry. It is possible to exaggerate these contrasts into a false antithesis; but there is real truth in them. There are other contrasts, but these will suffice to illustrate the fact that two apostles holding and preaching the same faith feel the appeal and press the thought of different portions and aspects of that faith, partly because of differences in temperament or in experience, and partly because of differences in the religious history of the various peoples to whom they are preaching that faith. Yet on the central and fundamental truths of that faith there is no contrast nor even divergence. In the very Epistle in which St. Paul condemns and deplores the tendency to gather parties or cliques

round the name and under the implied leadership of one teacher or another, he insists on the fact of the unity of all the apostles in the faith: 'whether then it be I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed.' If we could be sure that the so-called Second Epistle of St. Peter were Peter's own letter, we should have the last word on the question. In support of his own teaching about the purpose of the Divine delay of the coming end of all things, the writer appeals to the authority of St. Paul: 'even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unstedfast wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.' Some commentators think this passage two-edged, in fact a half-hearted and doubtful compliment. Some think it an attempt to minimize the supposed differences between the teaching of the two Apostles. It is surely a sincere tribute, even though more generous than graceful. We can well sympathize with the writer in his occasional difficulty in understanding some passages in St. Paul's Epistles; but he clearly has no sympathy with the people who gave a doctrinal twist and a misleading turn to such passages, whether to serve partisan purposes or to suit personal prejudices. And it is an interesting testimony; the writer was at least a disciple who had either heard or read St. Peter, and therefore a valuable witness to what the next generation thought of the essential unity of the teaching of the two Apostles.

III. What now is the bearing of this question of this apostolic unity in diversity upon modern Christianity? (1) First, there is a lesson for an age of partisan churchmanship, diminishing in extent and in intensity, but still a sore scandal and a grave hindrance to the Church's mission in the world; and also for an age of divided Christendom whose separated churches represent hardened dissensions. It is a plain duty to try to understand and appreciate the original and fundamental differences which caused and still perpetuate separation or suspicion. As with St. Peter and St. Paul, so with later Christians. The differences are in many cases not so much in substance as in emphasis. They are sometimes due largely to personal temperament. Some people love to make their communion with their Lord quietly; others love the splendour of the corporate self-expression of a choral eucharist. Some find peace of conscience in secret confession to God; others find that peace hard to win without some ministry of absolution. Some desire direction and control, and welcome the customs and rules of the Church as a framework for the growth of the spiritual life; others feel that the fashioning of Christian character should and can be trusted to the freedom of the soul to seek the guidance of the Spirit. Then, again, these differences are often due to peculiar experience, which, strange to say, works in two ways. Some souls just grow along the lines of early training and inherited tradition, finding them more and more satisfying; others find them unsatisfying, and move gradually or suddenly right across to a kind of churchmanship which once they resented or suspected. Once more, these differences are sometimes brought out by the variety or change of environment. Ministers confronted by a new need or opportunity in their work turn to some hitherto untried method or unappreciated truth which now seems to leap into light as a revelation and a solution. Men and women plunged into a new crisis or coming under a new influence are led to lay hold upon or stress a hitherto unfamiliar side of religious belief or practice, perhaps even to the point of exaggeration or isolation from other sides. But in the light of a better understanding of what lies behind different types of doctrine or ritual, we should not merely refrain from condemnation or controversy. We must make room for each other more generously or advances towards each other more trustfully. The mere acquiescence of reluctant toleration is not enough; what is needed is constructive and co-operative sympathy. It takes both Peter and Paul, and John also, to represent the whole gospel. It takes all sorts of Christians to make the Church. And finally we must be prepared to redress the balance of our own faith. A wise old layman once said at a joint missionary meeting: 'The S.P.G. has only to remember that it is the Society for the Propagation of the *Gospel*, and the C.M.S. to remember that it is the *Church* Missionary Society.' The wonderful thing about the New Testament is that although students can distinguish different types of teaching in its different books, yet the New Testament is a doctrinal unity. Moralist, mystic, methodist, sacramentalist, theologian, are all at home within its pages; but they must all read the whole New Testament if their Christianity is to be complete. (2) There is also a lesson for our own spiritual life, in fact a threefold lesson. (*a*) There is a call to self-examination, not of our sins, our failure to obey the law of God, but of our shortcomings, our failure to grasp the whole truth of God. There is a tragic double warning in the New

Testament against the danger of a one-sided religion. The Pharisees were moralists of a rigid legalizing type ; and their legalism left them bereft of both sympathy and insight. The Sadducees were ecclesiastics of a ritualistic type ; and their ritualism left them blind to faith and love ; they lost their belief in angels and in a resurrection ; they hardened their hearts against the gospel even when the Pharisees began to feel its appeal. We must therefore look into our own religion, and see whether there is not something to learn from other people's religion, and particularly from the religion of the people to whom we are tempted to deny the name of 'good churchmen' or 'orthodox Christians.' The Church of England has not been ashamed to learn again from other Christians, in such things, for example, as freedom in prayer and the place of silence in worship ; and they have begun to learn again from her the value of method in prayer and of order in worship. All Anglican Christians must be ready to learn from each other, the evangelical from the catholic, and the catholic from the evangelical, and both of them from the liberal as certainly as the liberal needs to learn from both of them.

(*b*) There is a call to self-analysis. This is no question of the new psychology or of any formal self-dissection. It is simply a question of trying to understand the meaning of our own likings and dislikings in religion, in matters of doctrine or ritual or discipline. Have we ever asked ourselves why we prefer this or that kind of worship, or object to this or that type of teaching? Have we ever tried to trace the origin of our convictions or the ground of our beliefs? If not, we may be missing much of the significance of our life's experience. We may be failing to recognize the guidance of God, the wonderful way in which God has been fashioning our souls, in which Christ has been training us in discipleship, in which the Holy Spirit has been leading us into all truth. And so we may be unprepared to learn the next lessons which God is waiting to teach us.

(*c*) One more thought—the ideal Christian, of course, is both complete and perfect, complete in all parts of the spiritual life as well as perfect in each part. The ideal churchman is evangelical, catholic, liberal, mystic and moralist, with equal emphasis on all these elements of churchmanship. But we are far from this ideal as yet. Perhaps, after all, the best thing we can do for God and the Church and ourselves is to perfect the best that is in us, to develop the one spiritual talent or the two that God has given us. One soul has a genius for prayer and meditation, another for methodical intercession, another for the imitation of Christ, another for practical service, another for sympathetic guidance or for illuminative interpretation. Sometimes these gifts are rooted in a temper of character or a habit of mind. Sometimes they are associated with some particular line of truth or some distinctive type of theology which has always been congenial, or which has gained a special hold upon this soul or that in the course of its own peculiar experience. If we have struck in one way or another some lode of spiritual wealth, or found a treasure of our own in the field of religion, let us thank God for it, and work it to the full. 'There are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal.' St. Peter's gifts lay in one direction, St. Paul's in another. Each of them made the most and the best of his own gifts, and God made the most and best of them both ; and so both of them have borne rich fruit in the life of the Church of God.

Literature.

COPTIC GNOSTIC TREATISE.

For our knowledge of Christian Gnosticism we are considerably indebted to Coptic documents, not least to that contained in the Bruce MS., though the *Pistis Sophia* is perhaps the most important of all those thus preserved. Over forty years ago M. Amélineau and Dr. Carl Schmidt discussed the Bruce MS., but no treatment of it in English has been available, and the present edition—*A Coptic Gnostic Treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus* (Bruce MS. 96, Bod. Lib., Oxford), a Translation from the Coptic ; Transcript and Commentary, by Charlotte A. Baynes, O.B.E., F.R.A.I., with photographs of the text (Cambridge University Press ; 30s. net)—has a completeness and usefulness to which previous publications cannot lay claim, in spite of the great value which Dr. Schmidt's work