

Recent Foreign Theology.

Gautier's 'Souvenirs.'

UNTIL recently a visit to the Holy Land was a rare experience, and the fortunate few who had this experience at once hastened to give to the public an account of their adventures. The Scotchman who boasted that he had travelled through Palestine without publishing a book about it was a *rara avis*. Now we have changed all that, and even so distinguished a traveller as M. Gautier finds it necessary in his preface to excuse himself for offering to the public a narrative of his travels in the Holy Land. The public, however, we feel certain, will regard this apology as quite uncalled for. In fact, a book which combines fascinating interest with solid and valuable information in a more satisfactory fashion we have never met with. One of the features which give a special charm to the work is the presence of fifty-nine beautiful illustrations reproduced from photographs taken on the spot by Mme. Gautier. Several of the papers that make up the book appeared originally in the *Revue Chrétienne* and elsewhere, and M. Gautier has utilized any criticisms that were passed upon them in that form. As an instance of this, it may be mentioned that the note on the Wells of Beer-sheba by the present writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of July 1896 called forth communications from Dr. Driver and Dr. Trumbull on the same subject. All this is referred to by M. Gautier, who characterizes Dr. Driver's note as 'très instructive et documentée,' and gladly utilizes it to revise and supplement his original statements.

Sabatier's 'Religion and Modern Culture.'

AT the recent *Congrès des Sciences Religieuses* held at Stockholm, Professor Sabatier read the paper which forms the subject of this notice. The relation between religion and modern culture, which appears so frequently as one of conflict, is examined with all Sabatier's exactness, the problem is stated

¹ *Souvenirs de Terre-Sainte*. Par L. Gautier. Lausanne: Bridel & Cie., 1898.

² *La religion et la culture moderne*. Par A. Sabatier. Paris: Fischbacher, 1897, pp. 43.

with the necessary variations, as far as Protestantism and Roman Catholicism respectively are affected, and an attempt to mediate between the rivals is carried out with our author's characteristic courage and skill. This brochure merits careful study.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

The New 'Herzog.'

THREE volumes of Dr. HAUCK'S new edition of the *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* are now complete. In the first part of the fourth volume there is an interesting biographical sketch of

DR. CHRISTLIEB,

the well-known Bonn professor, who contributed to the second edition of *Herzog* a masterly article on 'The History of Christian Preaching,' and whose lectures on *Homiletic* have recently been translated into English. It is not surprising to learn that at Tübingen Christlieb was more powerfully influenced by Beck than by Baur, for his *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief* contains a well-directed assault on one of Baur's main positions: that the resurrection of Christ lies outside the sphere of historical inquiry. Professor Sachsse, the author of the article, is right in saying that Christlieb's seven years' pastorate in London 'widened both his outlook and his heart,' for then it was that his interest in foreign missions was aroused; that he learnt to respect the peculiarities of other Churches; and became a warm advocate of the principles of the Evangelical Alliance. In his own preaching Dr. Christlieb emphasized the central truths of the gospel, and in his lectures on *Homiletic* he contends most earnestly that the Christian preacher is above all things 'a witness.' It is a book which could only have been written by one who had himself 'led many seeking souls to certainty, and educated for the Evangelical Church a large number of capable ministers.'

In two lengthy and able articles, two Halle professors—Kähler and Loofs—deal with the important subject of

CHRISTOLOGY.

Professor Kähler writes on 'The Teaching of the Scripture,' and defines Christology as 'the doctrine of the Person of Christ as distinguished from the representation and the discussion of His life and His work.' To those who regard Jesus of Nazareth as a man like other men, though called to a special work, the study of Christology is superfluous, or rather it should be included in anthropology. Nor is Christology to be treated as a branch of the science of biography; it aims not at setting forth the historic Jesus by the recounting of such facts of His life as criticism can disentangle from the Gospel narratives, but at discovering what the Scriptures teach about the Person of Christ.

Speaking of Christ's witness to Himself, Kähler pertinently asks, 'Did Jesus fully and completely give expression to the truth about Himself?' and in replying to this question, he shows that Christ expected the new covenant to be established by His death upon the cross, and by His resurrection. 'For Him to have borne complete witness to Himself before He had finished the work that was given Him to do would have been as purposeless as unintelligible. Hence the witness borne to Him in the New Testament writings begins always with those decisive facts, and not with His own earlier sayings.'

Professor Loofs writes on 'The Teaching of the Church,' and begins a most important contribution to the literature of the subject with the statement that 'various as are the forms in which Christianity appears in the oldest non-biblical sources of Church history, the bond of union in all the societies was the apostolic preaching about Jesus, and not the religion of Jesus.' In present-day discussions it is often assumed that the primitive Jewish-Christians believed that Jesus was a man, born in the ordinary course of nature of David's seed, but at His baptism set apart and endowed for His Messianic work. With great force Loofs argues in reply that the narrative of the baptism of Jesus shows clearly that He was no mere man; then He received the fulness of the Spirit, and this statement cannot mean that then He was endowed with prophetic genius. 'The thought—that at one definite period in the history of our little earth the living God stood to one man in such a unique relation that in Him the fulness

of the Divine Spirit dwelt—is so exceedingly sublime that all other Christological views that are conceivable can surpass this but slightly in so-called irrationality.' Loofs holds that such a view requires belief in the supernatural as much as the statement that 'the Word became flesh,' but he makes use of this argument to minimize the differences between those who believe that Christ was born of a pure virgin and those who reject the narratives of His miraculous birth as later additions to the Gospels.

In the course of his examination of the Christological doctrine which is associated with the names of the great teachers who arose in Asia Minor, Loofs is confronted with the Johannine problem, and, inasmuch as the question of the authorship of

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

is now being re-opened, his weighty words on this subject have a special interest. He avows himself a thorough believer in its apostolic authorship. 'It is true that in "Introductions" which regard the Fourth Gospel as a philosophical descendant of the canonical Gospels much is said of the scanty traces of the Gospel of John in the period before 150; but as a matter of fact there is no book in the Bible whose influence in the history of dogma from the generation in which it was written can be so clearly followed as that of the Gospel of John.' The characteristic features of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel are succinctly stated: the writer assumes that the pre-existent Lord is distinct from God, whilst he strongly emphasizes monotheism; the *logos*-conception Loofs traces rather to religious than to philosophical thought—the Word that called the world into existence and that from eternity was the Life and Light of men became a Person, for Christ not only brings God's word, He is Himself the Word of God; on the other hand, this Gospel of the Word is as far as possible from all Docetic views of the Person of Christ, for it records many incidents which reveal His true humanity.

However 'naive' it may appear to theologians like Holtzmann and Pfeiderer, who 'caricature the Johannine theology,' Loofs frankly owns his inability to account for all the phenomena presented by this Gospel in any way but one: the evangelist was an eye-witness of the historical appearance of the Lord, and to him the man Jesus Christ was a self-revelation of God. For the

correctness of his view of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, Loofs further urges that no better proof can be given than the echoes of its teaching in the writings of Ignatius.

Professor Lemme, of Heidelberg, to whose thoughtful articles on ethical subjects in the *New Herzog* reference has been made in these notes, has published an attractive booklet on

FRIENDSHIP.¹

A lecture delivered in Cassel is expanded into six chapters, which are entitled respectively: 'Love of One's Neighbour,' 'Love of the Brethren and Friendship,' 'Friendship in the Ancient World,' 'Friendship in the Christian Era,' 'The Forms of Friendship,' 'The Degrees and Claims of Friendship.'

The treatment of this theme is at once scholarly and popular; the style is clear and forceful, sometimes epigrammatic; the illustrations are admirably chosen from a wide range of literature; in short, it is the work of a Christian philosopher. Some indication of its quality may be given in a few extracts:—

'Without friendship we may be saved, but not without Christian love of our neighbour. . . . It may very well be that brotherly love sincerely and inwardly unites us with one who can never be our friend owing to difference in social position and calling, or through lack of sympathy.'

'The ancient world was familiar with religious offerings, which were presented to the gods in a spirit of selfishness which claimed gifts from the gods in return; it was familiar also with devotion to the state and fatherland in patriotic enthusiasm for the national welfare with which the fortunes of the individual were closely linked; but unselfish gifts of love, prompted by the inward constraint which springs from self-sacrificing devotion to the common weal, were unknown until Christianity produced them.'

'Not to demand love from others, but to receive with thanksgiving, as heaven's gracious gift, all the love of which we are conscious,—this is an essential secret of earthly happiness. The less love we demand and the more we give the more shall we receive.'

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

¹ *Die Freundschaft.* Von Dr. Ludwig Lemme. Heilbronn: Eugen Salzer.

Among the Periodicals.

The Book of Job.

PROFESSOR BUDDE'S *Job* still continues to engage a large share of the attention of Old Testament students, both in our own country and on the Continent. It is reviewed in the *Th. Tijdschrift* (November 1897) by Dr. OORT, who opens with a warm eulogium upon the book for the acuteness and clearness of its exposition, as well as its fair and accurate statement of views opposed to the author's own. It is a work, from every page of which one has something to learn. Oort further agrees with Budde that the shorter text of the Septuagint is due partly to the translator's desire for brevity, and partly to his carelessness, and that it does not present us with an older and more original version. Naturally, the reviewer differs on some important points (of which he gives instances) from Budde, both as to textual emendation and exegesis.

Our readers, however, will feel most interest in the view Oort takes of Budde's conception of the aim of the poet, and in particular in his judgment on the Elihu speeches, for which Budde so strongly contends as an integral part of the original work. The grounds upon which these have been rejected, the Strassburg professor classes under three heads. Of these the most important is the third, which founds upon the contents of the speeches. Yet Oort will have it that there is more in some of the other objections than Budde is disposed to admit. The sudden appearance and disappearance of Elihu is a strong argument in favour of interpolation. That he is not mentioned in the prologue is indeed nothing to the point, but it is harder to explain why he passes unmentioned in the epilogue. Surely the man who had seen farther into the truth than any of the other speakers deserved some recognition. An artist doubtless may blunder, but even this does not help us to comprehend how Jahweh ignores Elihu entirely, and answers Job as if the latter had spoken the last word, for to him, and not to Elihu, the question must refer, 'Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?' Even Budde himself feels the force of this objection, although he calls it an argument *e silentio*. Oort feels, too, that Budde has hardly done sufficient justice to the objection founded upon the linguistic

differences between the Elihu speeches and those of Job and his three friends. As to the main question, the poet or the interpolator must have considered that Elihu had a different and better solution of the problem to offer than the three friends, else he would not have brought him upon the scene. Well, it is not very easy to discover anything new in Elihu's speeches, which are largely a *réchauffé* of arguments that have been repeatedly used by the three friends. Certainly there is more emphasis laid in 36⁸⁻¹² than elsewhere upon the use of suffering to teach a man, and to wean him from sin. But this truth has been already propounded, and even more clearly, in 5¹⁷, in a speech of Eliphaz. That Elihu's speeches contain the doctrine that suffering is a manifestation of God for the purpose of purifying is denied by Oort, who finally agrees with the great majority of critics of Budde's work that these speeches are a later interpolation.

That the poet borrowed his materials from a popular tradition, which told the story of a pious sufferer, is generally conceded; but Budde's theory that 1¹⁻²10^a and 42^{10b-17} formed a 'popular' book, of which the poet expanded the first half by the introduction of the three friends, and then interposed the long series of poems between this and the second half, appears to Oort extremely improbable. It is much more natural to assume that the poet worked up the materials into a prologue and an epilogue for himself. Further, the reviewer cannot agree with Budde that a new conception of Job as sinning through murmuring comes in in chap. 3, and that the poet's aim is to show how suffering purifies the soul. If so, he succeeds well in concealing his intention. All through the long poem, amid all the reiterated arguments, the truth he means to unfold is never once clearly stated. The fact is, *the poet has no solution of the mystery of the sufferings of a righteous man*. God is great, and we comprehend Him not; it becomes man to submit in faith and without murmuring to the mysteries of Providence. But the poet teaches, withal, that honest, even violent, protest against the apparently unjust and, in any case, hard ways of God is better and more in accordance with God's will than fine phrasing, and justifying Him at all costs. The honest critic of God's ways is to be preferred to the flattering *quasi*-believer. Oort has no sympathy with those who say, with Cornill, that a book which teaches

nothing more than this might well have remained unwritten.

The Oxyrhynchus Fragment.

In *La Vie Nouvelle* of 30th October last, Professor C. BRUSTON discusses the recently discovered Logia. He agrees with Batiffol (*Revue Biblique Internationale*, 1st October 1897) that the text has not been published by Grenfell and Hunt in the order intended; that the page which they give as the *recto* was the *verso*, and conversely. If this be so, the fragment attributes only five sayings to Jesus, the others not being preceded by the words λέγει Ἰησοῦς. The first saying is that numbered 6 by Grenfell and Hunt, 'A prophet is not accepted in his own country,' etc. (cf. Lk 4²⁴ and parallel passages). The second (G. and H.'s 7) is, 'A city built upon the top of a high hill,' etc. (cf. Mt 5¹⁴, 7^{24, 25}). The third is a combination of the mutilated saying which G. and H. call *logion* 8 and their *log.* 1, thus reproduced by Bruston, 'Thou wilt search in thine [eye to take away the beam that is therein] (?), and¹ then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye (cf. Mt 7³⁻⁵ and parallels). The fourth and fifth sayings (G. and H.'s 2 and 3) are respectively, 'If ye fast not to the world,' etc., and 'I stood in the midst of the world, and was seen of them in the flesh' (?), etc. The first three are amplifications of familiar sayings in the canonical Gospels. The fourth and fifth, in which fasting and the Sabbath and hunger and thirst all appear to have a metaphorical sense, sufficiently reflect the spirit of primitive Christianity; but that they were really spoken by Jesus we are not compelled to believe. Upon the whole, Bruston thinks that this fragment, interesting as it is, will prove to be of less importance than was at first supposed.

Hommel's 'Ancient Hebrew Tradition.'

The anticipations expressed in many quarters when this book appeared have been realized. It has been welcomed for the light it throws on some linguistic and archæological questions, but the aim of the Secretary of the S.P.C.K. to damage the so-called 'higher criticism' has not been served in the slightest degree. This is the concurrent testimony of all experts who have

¹ Here, according to Bruston, the *verso* begins.

reviewed the book. Readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES have already been made acquainted with the judgment passed upon it by Professors Driver and Margoliouth, and by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, and many of them have doubtless read also the incisive examination of it by Mr. Bevan in the *Critical Review* (Oct. 1897, pp. 406 ff.). It will be of interest to note the impression produced upon Wellhausen himself and upon so thoroughly competent a judge as Ed. König.

Wellhausen reviews Hommel's work in the *GGA* of August last. How little he feels that any fundamental position of his is jeopardized by the *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* is proved by the good-humoured playful handling to which he subjects the book. What everyone will admit to be a careful and fair summary of the contents (interspersed, no doubt, with a few pithy comments *more Wellhauseniano*) is followed by a statement of the reviewer's conclusions. This Babylono-Minnæan-Egyptian caricature may do for the S.P.C.K. 'Christian knowledge' will apparently include in future not only Jewish but also Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian antiquities, and we may expect to hear *Credo* uttered by Gudea and Khammurabi as well as by Pilate. 'Hommel stirs up a quantity of ancient dust, and, when his readers can no longer see or hear, he tells them that he has refuted pentateuchal criticism. In point of fact he never enters upon the latter at all, at most he brushes lightly against its outmost periphery.' Wellhausen goes on to show how little the proper names compounded with *ilu* or *el* are an argument in favour of monotheism. And what damage can it do the 'school of Wellhausen' to prove that much of the ritual system of P can be traced back to a very high antiquity? No one dreams of contending that this system was first devised and introduced after the exile. What the 'school of Wellhausen' seeks to do is to bring into proper sequence the three strata of laws and traditions represented in the Pentateuch. This it accomplishes by comparing the different strata with one another and with the history. The problem is a literary one, to be solved by literary methods. As to Hommel's stock argument, founded on Gn 14, Wellhausen finds a great gap between the premises and the conclusion. What avails it to prove (if it be proved) that inscriptional evidence has supplied us with the equivalents of the Old Testament

Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer, and Tidal? It is perfectly true that if a personage never existed, any narrative of exploits of his must *ipso facto* fall to the ground. But the converse is not true that the historical existence of a personage proves the historicity of the narrative concerning him. Hommel, moreover, has to admit that in the monuments the actors in question are found in Elam, not at the Dead Sea, and that Khammurabi (Amraphel) appears not as an ally of Kudurdagmal (Chedorlaomer), but as engaged in hostilities against him.

In the *Theol. Literaturblatt* of 31st December last König examines Hommel's work, and reaches conclusions practically identical with those stated above. He begins by remarking that, after the contributions of Hommel (in 1890 and later!) to the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, no one could have anticipated his coming forward in this way as a zealous opponent of the 'school of Wellhausen.' König, however, emphasizes what there is a wish in some quarters to overlook, that, while ranging himself side by side with Klostermann, Hommel has yet not abandoned his old standpoint regarding the 'sources' of the Pentateuch. He has no sympathy, for instance, with the views of Professor Green of Princeton, who denies the existence of 'sources' altogether. Regarding Hommel's three main positions,—the monotheism of Israel, the historicity of the patriarchal and Egyptian narratives, and the early date of the Priestly Code,—König agrees with Wellhausen regarding the irrelevancy or the fallacy of many of the arguments adduced. To give only two instances. Hommel argues that P cannot belong to the exilic or post-exilic period, else it would contain a multitude of Babylonian and Aramaic loan-words. To which König makes the crushing rejoinder, 'How many words of that kind are to be found in the addresses of Haggai or Zechariah?' Again, the circumstance that in the middle books of the Pentateuch *āni* is used almost exclusively for 'I,' is explained by Hommel on the ground that this was the original Israelitish form of the pronoun. But König points out that the Decalogue exhibits only *ānōkhi*, and that this form is much more common than *āni* in the Book of the Covenant, in Deuteronomy, and in JE. A similar tendency to prefer *ānōkhi* to *āni* may be traced if one compares the older prophetic and historical literature with the later.

Symbolo-fidéisme.

The *Revue Chrétienne* of November last contains a short article by Professor MÉNÉGOZ, reprinted from *La Vie Nouvelle*. This contains an emphatic disclaimer of certain tenets which have been widely attributed to the school of Sabatier, and to M. Ménégóz in particular. To attribute an absurd idea to an opponent and then to prove its absurdity is a familiar device, and seldom fails to produce some effect. Now, it seems that in France it has become customary with some of the opponents of *symbolo-fidéisme* to attribute to M. Ménégóz the formula that our faith is independent of our beliefs (*'La foi est indépendante des croyances'*). Presented in this way, the 'formula' is clearly absurd, and M. Ménégóz repudiates it with energy on behalf both of himself and of Sabatier. It is our ideas, our beliefs, that act upon our heart, our spirit, our conscience, and that under the influence of our personal dispositions produce faith or its opposite. The real formula of *fidéisme*, of which the above is a caricature, is, *'We are saved by Faith (Foi) independently of our beliefs (croyances)*. Just as the Pauline formula, *'We are saved by faith without the deeds of the law,'* excludes the Jewish-Christian error of salvation by faith and a keeping of the law; just as the Lutheran formula, *'We are saved by faith and not by good works,'* excludes the Roman Catholic error of salvation by faith and works of love,—so the *fidéiste* formula, *'We are saved by faith, independently of our beliefs,'* excludes the error of the ancient orthodoxy, both Catholic and Protestant, which teaches salvation by faith and orthodox beliefs, and denounces eternal damnation on those who reject the official doctrine of the Church. This comes out clearly in the *Quicumque* symbol: *'Quam (fidem) nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque*

dubio in aeternum peribit.' And it is to such a conception as this that M. Ménégóz opposes his 'formula.' The man who repents of his sins and gives his heart to God is a *believer*, whatever may be his doctrinal errors. It is upon this principle that we understand how Jesus welcomed into His kingdom pagans and Samaritans while He condemned orthodox Pharisees and treated them, in spite of their correct system of doctrine, as *unbelievers*. The demons have *beliefs*, but they have not *faith*. We are saved, then, by *faith alone*, not by such and such *beliefs*, any more than by such and such *works*. This faith, however, arises under the influence of the word of God, religious convictions, true beliefs, coupled with the inward action of the Holy Spirit. Knowledge of the truth is an *objective* condition of salvation, a *pedagogic means* of the first importance in leading men to repentance and faith. Hence M. Ménégóz and his school attach the utmost importance to the pure preaching of the gospel of Christ, and resolutely combat doctrinal error. But faith, in its turn, produces good works, and *fidéisme* proclaims with the same emphasis as St. James that faith without works is dead. Roman Catholics find it hard to grasp the doctrine of salvation by faith, *independently of good works*, and defenders of their system combat such a notion with arguments of rare dialectical subtlety. Protestants of the old school find it as hard to grasp the doctrine of salvation by faith, *independently of beliefs*, and their polemic against it is equally subtle. Yet M. Ménégóz has the persuasion that just as the motto *sola fide* triumphed in the primitive Church and at the Reformation, so will it triumph in our own day over the attacks of which it is still the object within the Churches of Protestantism.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.