

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Hittite inscriptions have been deciphered at last. The Hittite language has begun to be read.

Who says so? Professor Jensen or Professor Sayce? Both say so now. Professor Jensen has said so all along, and taken the credit to himself. Now Professor Sayce gives him the credit, and frankly admits that the thing is done.

In the tenth volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, the volume for 1899, there raged a keen controversy regarding the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions. Dr. Jensen claimed that he had deciphered them, or at least was well on the way. Dr. Sayce and Dr. Hommel denied it. So fierce was Dr. Jensen in his assertion that Professor Ramsay came in to reprove him. But Dr. Selbie summed up in Jensen's favour, and it seems that Dr. Selbie was right.

And yet it is Professor Sayce that comes out of it with most credit. With German plainness of speech, Professor Jensen taunted him with reluctance to acknowledge his own defeat. Professor Sayce had certainly admitted that his own attempt had failed. 'And for years past,' he said, 'I have maintained that, with our present materials, the task is hopeless.' But Professor Jensen was not content with that. He was not pleased that Professor Sayce had not 'pursued

further the path of confession,—an unpleasant one to be sure,—and at least tried to bring himself to confess that another has been more successful than himself.' The taunt did not make confession easier. Yet now, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Professor Sayce comes forward and unreservedly says: 'I have to acknowledge that the credit of first recognizing the direction which the decipherment of the Hittite texts should take, and of making the first steps along it, is due to Professor Jensen.'

And yet more difficult must it have been to make this acknowledgment, that he himself just missed what Dr. Jensen saw, and lost what Dr. Jensen gained. The decipherment has been due to the fortunate discovery of the name of the city of Carchemish on one of the Hittite monuments. It was not Professor Jensen that made that discovery. It was a Frenchman of the name of Six. M. Six suggested the identification to Professor Sayce before he approached Professor Jensen. But Professor Sayce was away on a wrong scent and did not appreciate it. Professor Jensen 'had the wisdom and penetration to accept M. Six's discovery,' and the decipherment began.

So we turn to Professor Jensen. The best account of the Hittites must be that which he has contributed to the volume of *Explorations in*

*Bible Lands* (T. & T. Clark, 12s. 6d. net), edited by Professor Hilprecht.

Now when we turn to this volume we find with pleasure that Professor Jensen on his part is ready to recognize the share which Professor Sayce has had in the recovery of this remarkable people. The Hittite inscriptions have been found in districts as far separate as Smyrna in Asia Minor, Nineveh, and Hamath in Syria. One was found in one place, another in another. And they were not all alike. 'It was after the discovery of a number of these inscriptions that Sayce in particular, the versatile and active English scholar, pointed out an identity of kind existing between several of them, thereby rendering a service, the importance of which is not to be underestimated.' 'Thus,' he continues, 'there sprang into existence an historical people whose very existence up to that time seemed wholly unknown to us. To all appearance this people was possessed of a great past. It had extended or at least had marched victoriously over a considerable part of Asia Minor; it had reached the Euphrates, perhaps even crossed it, penetrating into the East, and had passed down into Syria. It boasted of an art, derived, it is true, from Egypt and the lands of the Tigris and the Euphrates, but still it was independent and creative enough to work out its own method of writing.'

Who was this people? Professor Sayce called them Hittites. For in the place where some of the inscriptions were found, that is to say, in Syria and the district lying to the north of it, is found that territory to which the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments give the name of *Khate*. The Old Testament calls its inhabitants *Khittim* or Hittites.

But Professor Jensen disputes the identification. It would be all right, he says, if all the 'Hittite' monuments had been found in *Khate*, that is, in Syria and its neighbourhood; or if it could be proved that the inhabitants of *Khate*, *i.e.* the Hittites, had travelled through Assyria and Asia

Minor and had left inscriptions as they went, and especially if the date of the inscriptions agreed with the date of so widespread a supremacy of the Hittites. But these demands, he believes, cannot be met.

The dates alone forbid. The 'Hittite' inscriptions range over four centuries, from the Hamath inscriptions of 1000 B.C. to the Babylonian bowl of 600 B.C. But the kings of Khate of the Egyptian monuments are as old as 1300 B.C. Professor Jensen therefore concludes that the inscriptions found in Syria must belong to those petty princes who ruled in Syria and the north of it during the Assyrian supremacy of 900 B.C. and after. The Hittites were not Hittites.

Who were they then? They were the ancestors, says Professor Jensen (holding his former opinion more firmly now), of the Armenians who dwell there still. This is Professor Jensen's great discovery. It has been counted a heresy hitherto, a heresy of the rankest kind. Professor Sayce has nothing to say about it in his article in this month's *Proceedings*. But this article is 'to be continued.' It may be that in the second part another confession is forthcoming. Then the Hittites will pass out of history as suddenly as they came in.

There is an article in the new number, the number for April, of the *Hibbert Journal* on 'The Failure of Christian Missions in India.' The writer of the article is Dr. Josiah Oldfield.

The title of the article ought to be 'The Failure of Christian *Missionaries* in India.' Dr. Oldfield himself confesses that. His idea of the gospel may not be that of any missionary in India. His idea of Christ may be no more than that of a 'divine teacher'—he gives Him no higher name. That, however, he says, has nothing to do with it. The failure of Christianity in India is not due to Christ or the Gospels, it is due to the Christian missionary.

He brings three charges against the Christian missionary in India. The first is that he is ignorant. He does not know, and he does not try to know, the religions which he wants to destroy. Christianity is the only true religion, all other worship of God is 'heathen idolatry.' The Hindu knows more about Christianity, says Dr. Oldfield, than the missionary knows about Hinduism. He knows so much that when invited to adopt the Christian religion, he asks, 'Which Christian religion?' He sees Roman Catholics denying salvation to Protestants, and Protestants labelling the Church of Rome as Anti-Christ. If he joins the one, he will be anathematized by the other. His risk of damnation is no greater if he remains as he is, and he refuses to give up his ancestral faith.

The second charge is that the missionary is dishonest. High-caste Hindus, says Dr. Oldfield, read missionary reports. They see that in order to get funds for missionary work, it is necessary to paint Indian life in absolutely false colours. It is all one as if a Hindu, working in one of our East-end slums, with its filth and overcrowding, its drunkenness and debauchery, its foul language and immorality, were to go back to India and describe what he saw as if it were typical of English life.

The third charge is yet more personal. It is divided into three parts. First, the Indian missionary is an Anglo-Indian—'and no one who has not stayed for some little time in India can quite understand what that means.' There are the Indians and there are the Anglo-Indians, and the line drawn between them is sharp and deep. The missionary is in touch with the English official class, and at once belongs to the other side of the street.

Secondly, the habits of the Christian missionary are lower than those of the people he has gone out to convert. 'Again and again, a man in the position of a prime minister, or a judge, or a

pleader, has said to me, "Would you send an East-end coster to address the members of the University of Oxford in order to convert them to Christianity?"' That is how it appears to them when they find that the Christian missionary sits down to meat without bathing, without changing his clothes, and then eats flesh. He sets up, they say, a lower standard than St. Paul, who declared that he would eat no meat while the world standeth, lest he made his brother to offend. The high-caste Hindu will not become a Christian, because he feels that it would be a personal as well as a social degradation so to do.

And lastly, the spiritual life of the Christian missionary is generally looked upon as lower than the spiritual life of the best Indian priests. Dr. Oldfield is not sure whether the Indian priests are priests whom they have known, or the ideal priest of whom they have read. But he holds that they have that impression. And in proof that it is not altogether an unjust impression, he relates an experience. 'The missionary,' said one, 'is a jolly fellow to talk to, a courteous, kindly, gentlemanly fellow; but I would not ask an English military officer to do a surgical operation for me because he was a jolly gentlemanly fellow.' "Let us test that, then," said I; "let us see if the Christian missionary is mainly a jolly good fellow." My friend gravely arose and ordered the carriage. We drove to the mission station. The boy who came out to us said that the sahib was at the gymkana (club). My friend looked at me, and we drove back. In response to a message sent to the gymkana, the missionary was good enough to call in at our bungalow on the way home—in flannels and with his tennis racquet!

Now it does not need a knowledge of India to see that Dr. Oldfield could be put into the witness-box about this matter with damaging results. But it is better not to do so. It is better simply to ask Dr. Oldfield what he thinks should be done.

He thinks that first of all missionaries—and indeed all of us—must discover that there is something good in Hinduism, and preserve it. Our ancestors had some ‘heathenish practices’ in their day, but the missionaries who came over to convert them did not destroy these practices from off the face of the earth, they ‘hallowed the heathen festivals and sanctified them with a benediction.’

And then he thinks that men must be sent out to India who are superior in saintly habits of devotion to the spiritual teachers whom they wish to convert, *and these only*—the italics being his own. The early Christian Church, he reminds us, won its triumphs by the growing recognition amongst Greek and Roman pleasure-satiated races that ‘these Christians are better, are gentler, are more honest, are more truthful, are more self-sacrificing, and live in all things at a higher level than we do.’

The *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* is dead. The *Princeton Theological Review* is born. So far as can be seen the death and the birth mean no more than the change of a cumbrous general title for a simpler and more specific one. In the new review, Professor Warfield is chief contributor and theological director, as he was in the old. Well, there is no better equipped writer, no more conscientious reviewer, in any theological quarterly in existence.

In the first number of the *Princeton Theological Review* Professor Warfield reviews a little book by Professor Henri Bois of Montauban on *Le Sentiment Religieux*. He is not at his best in the criticism of such a book. He is too much in sympathy with it. He does better with Professor Schmiedel or Dr. van Manen. But there is no subject of more immediate concern than the Religious Feeling, and it is worth our while to look at that idea of Religion upon which two scholars of such ability and safety are agreed.

Professor Bois first clears the ground. What is the Religious Feeling? No, first, What is it not? It is not to be identified with physical modifications. It is not merely the subjective expression of internal organic movements, obscurely manifesting themselves in consciousness, according to the widely adopted but absurd doctrine of James and Lange, Dumas and Ribot, that emotion in general is but a physical state becoming conscious of itself,—as if a mother mourning her dead child did not weep because she was sorry, but was sorry because she wept!

Nor is the religious feeling simply the feeling of the infinite, as Schleiermacher once suggested and Max Müller insisted. As a Neo-Kantian, Professor Bois scarcely knows what ‘the infinite’ means.

Nor is the religious feeling to be confounded with the moral feeling, as César Malan teaches, for morality and religion can exist apart from one another, and actually do sometimes exist apart. Nor is it identical with the social feeling, as Durkheim imagines, for history shows that religious sentiments owe their origin to the individual rather than the community. It has some kinship with the social feeling, for it manifests itself in the relations between one person and another. It differs, however, in this respect, that the relations it establishes are between human persons and divine. In short, it is not a social but a supra-social feeling.

Religion is a relation between human persons and divine. The divine may be singular or plural. But it is indispensable, says Professor Bois, that the deity or deities with whom the human person comes into relationship should possess *power* and *kinship*. God to be God, the God that makes a religion, must be the author of our being, or the sovereign of the world, or at least our *superior*; and He must have *likeness to us*, so that He is of our *kind*.

Then God must be a person? He must. On

that Professor Bois is unmistakable and emphatic. And therefore Buddhism, which has no personal god, is no religion. It is an evanescent metaphysical speculation provoked by a progressive dissolution of previous religions,—an episode of pantheistic metaphysics between two periods of religion,—‘the bitter and withered fruit of speculation, ripened in the bosom of a decomposition of religious faith.’

Without a personal God, Professor Bois holds that there is no religion. Pantheism is not a religion. It is a form of the degradation of religion, through which it passes before it vanishes into open atheism. Man starts—starts after the Fall, remember, for Professor Bois is as orthodox as Professor Warfield, and will not have it that man’s first state was polytheistic—man starts sometime after the Fall with the belief in numerous personal gods. But in his very nature there lies the need of unity. And he proceeds to turn his many gods into one by two different processes. By the one process he rises from the idea of many divine persons to the idea of a single divine person, ever greater and more powerful, and ever more personal in proportion as He is conceived more clearly as one. Polytheism has become Monotheism. By the other process he eliminates the plurality of persons by eliminating all that makes for personality, by withdrawing from God, first moral qualities, then intelligence, until all that remains is brute force. Polytheism has passed into Pantheism.

That is the first part of the book. The second has to do with the individual and his god. If religion is a social—a supra-social—relationship between man and a personal god or gods, where does it touch a man, and what does it do for him?

It touches him, says Professor Bois, in his intellect, it touches him in his feeling, and it touches him in his will. Especially does it touch him in his will. And now it appears that the purpose

of this second part is to point out the mischief that arises from intellectualism and emotionalism in religion, and to assign the primacy to the will. ‘From all sides stands out this great psychological law, that the will with its rational rule, called duty, is indispensable for the foundation and maintenance of religious health; that the Christian ought to know how to guard himself from taking pleasure, even religious pleasure, for his direct end or for his criterion; and that it is only by the will and action determined by duty, that he will be able to acquire and conserve a normal and complete religious life, in which all parts of his nature shall dwell together, harmoniously combined and established, and in which he will give himself entirely to his God and his brethren, only to find his gift returned to him in benefit.’

The difficulties surrounding the miracles of the New Testament centre in demoniacal possession. Did Christ drive out demons? Did He believe that He did? What was the matter with the persons who were supposed to be possessed with devils? These are the questions.

A new attempt has just been made to answer the last. It is made in a book of essays which is written by Mr. H. A. Dallas, and published by Messrs. Longmans, under the inoffensive title of *Gospel Records*.

The question is, What was the matter with those who were supposed to be possessed with demons? Mr. Dallas says they were possessed with demons. Mr. Dallas is an uncompromising evolutionist, and he says that in the evolutionary progress of the race, the faculties that have arrived last at their destination are the spiritual faculties. The physical organism was developed first; next came the mental capacities; and the spiritual were established last. Now the last, because they are last, must be the least stable. Man’s spiritual faculties must be the most easily disturbed. If, then, any adverse influence affects him from with-

out, the mental and bodily powers may withstand the strain while the spiritual faculties are disturbed.

The disturbance affects the whole person. It at once affects the mind and it soon affects the body. But at first it was a spiritual disturbance only, it rose in that which is most characteristic of man, in that which is noblest in him.

That a man is open to such disturbance may be due to his own evil habits. In *delirium tremens*, for example, although in that condition the spirit is no longer capable of self-control or responsible for what may be said or done, it may have been entirely responsible for the habits that led to the condition. But whether the person is responsible for his state or not, in such a state he is peculiarly liable to be invaded by suggestions from other spirits; and these suggestions—or may we not say the spirits that make them?—may so completely take possession of him, that he loses all that makes for personality, and as we say is ‘not himself,’ but is possessed.

To strengthen his theory, Mr. Dallas quotes the opinion of an eminent Dutch physician, Dr. F. van Eeden of Bossum. ‘While studying dreams, and the disturbances of the diseased mind,’ says Dr. van Eeden, ‘I have often had a vivid impression that in some instances they could only be the result of evil influences working from the outside, like demons with diabolical scheming and provision. It must have struck every observer how often it appears as if a wicked spirit takes advantage of the weak and ill-balanced condition of a human mind to assail it with all sorts of dreadful, grotesque, or weird ideas or fantasies.’

But whence come the evil suggestions that such a person receives? Who are these evil spirits? This is the original, shall we say the eccentric, part of Mr. Dallas’ essay.

We must use his very words: ‘When we remember that at every tick of the clock, some soul

is passing into the discarnate state, and that a large number of these are morally, as well as mentally, very undeveloped, with characters unformed, or perverted by evil purposes, or without purpose at all, with low instincts and earthly desires, it is not difficult to surmise whence some, at least, of the suggestions may emanate which produce such unhealthy effect; neither is it hard to understand that spirits of this description may find a certain advantage of their own in exercising tyrannical control over the minds of those still embodied, and that they may gain thereby contact with the conditions they have just quitted, which may afford them some satisfaction.’

The first volume of the ‘Presbyterian Pulpit,’ issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication of Philadelphia, is called *The Sinless Christ*. It contains eight sermons by the late Professor Purves. The last of the eight has the title of ‘The Waiting Dead.’

When Jacob died, his son Joseph went to the house of Pharaoh and said, ‘If now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, in the ears of Pharaoh, saying, My father made me swear, saying, Lo, I die; *in my grave which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt thou bury me.*’ And when Joseph himself came to die, he ‘took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and *Ye shall carry up my bones from hence.*’ These two passages (Gn 50<sup>4</sup>. 5. 24. 25) Dr. Purves took as his text.

Both Jacob and Joseph wished to be buried in Canaan. It was a very natural wish, and many pretty platitudes could be preached about it. But Dr. Purves does not seem to have been in the way of preaching platitudes, if we may judge from this volume and another that has been published along with it. Besides, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says that it was *by faith* Joseph ‘gave commandment concerning his bones.’ And the whole drift of his argument shows that

the faith consisted not merely in the belief that the Israelites would be delivered from the Egyptian bondage, but that Canaan was the land of promise, and God's promise never fails.

Canaan was the land of promise. The promise had been made to Abraham, and it was very precise: *To thee* and to thy seed. Yet Abraham never entered into possession of Canaan. When Sarah died, he was compelled to approach the people to whom the land of promise belonged, and buy a sepulchre in which to bury his dead out of his sight. Nor did Jacob possess the land, nor Joseph. And yet God's promises never fail. Jacob and Joseph knew that the time would come when they—even they themselves, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Joseph—would possess the land of Canaan. And they gave commandment that their bones should be buried there to wait for the time that was to come.

The day was coming. Jacob and Joseph could not tell when it would come, nor how. But they had faith in God's promise. It would come. Abraham's seed would one day possess the land, and they would be there to join in the joy of possession. Meantime let their bones be laid to rest in that land, that when the day came they might be ready.

The burial of the patriarchs, therefore, says Professor Purves, suggests the thought of the waiting dead—of the dead as waiting for something to happen, whereby their own joys would be made complete. 'Thus the men of old times were gathered to their fathers, and thus we also lay our believing friends to rest. While the Bible sheds but little light upon the world beyond the grave, while it refuses to answer many questions that trembling voices raise, this representation of the dead as waiting is found in the New as well as the Old Testament, and it is meant to have practical influence upon us who are still alive.'

What are the dead waiting for? They are

waiting for the living. Not simply for the living to join them in the other world. Joseph died, thinking less of his own happiness after death than of the blessing that was to come upon his descendants in the land of Canaan. He looked to the future, but not so much to the world he was to enter beyond death, as to that world which was to come upon this earth when the promise to Abraham had been fulfilled. He thought of resting with his fathers until their children should have inherited the land, and the Shiloh, the promised seed, should have come, with blessing for all the nations. Then he too would be at hand to share in the joy and help forward the blessing.

So Professor Purves, who was a great and sane theologian, for years a professor in the theological seminary of Princeton, calls them the 'Waiting Dead.' Their spirits were in heaven, with Him who is the God of the living. And they were happy in heaven with God. But they were not yet complete. They were waiting till all things should be fulfilled, till the kingdom of God should be fully established in the earth, waiting till the end should come, when they would be reunited with their risen glorified bodies, and take their place in the new heavens and the new earth.

They laid their bones in Canaan. They did not know that the whole earth would be filled with the knowledge of the Lord. They laid their bones in Canaan because Canaan was the land of God's promise. They were not mistaken. But they saw only a part of God's great purpose. This is the grand argument of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. His argument is not that they found their country in heaven. They found it, they will find it, here on earth. But not until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in. Not until the kingdoms of this earth have become the kingdom of our God and His Christ.

So they wait meanwhile. They wait till we have

finished our course and fought our fight. For 'they without us cannot be made perfect.' They cannot be made complete. They cannot receive the completion of their risen body, and take their place in the new earth.

And it is something, after all, that their bones were laid in Canaan. What do we mean when we say that Livingstone's heart, buried under a great tree at Ilala, has taken possession of Africa for Christ? Surely more than the fact that Livingstone died in faith that Africa would yet receive the gospel. The heart of Livingstone took pos-

session of Africa as the bones of Joseph took possession of Canaan, in the sure hope of a joyful resurrection, in the confidence that that land would share in the glory of the time when Christ should come to reign upon the earth in everlasting peace.

They wait while we work. They watch us. We are surrounded with a great cloud of witnesses. Jacob is among them, and Joseph. And they cannot but wonder that we are doing so little to hasten the day of His coming, the day that they themselves are waiting for.

## The Fact of the Atonement.

BY THE REV. ROBERT MACKINTOSH, B.D. (EDIN.), M.A., D.D. (GLASG.), PROFESSOR OF  
APOLOGETICS IN LANCAHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

WITHOUT wasting words upon apologies for dealing with so great a truth—a truth so great that it is a constant challenge to our attention—I may say something regarding the form of the title which I have chosen. One could not undertake to speak on the fact of the Atonement unless he believed that there was a certain distinction to be drawn in that region between fact and theory, and that, while theories are tentative and changing, the fact may be certain and immovable. At the same time, I wish at the outset to repudiate the view urged by many great Englishmen, both in the past and in the present, that we can assert the fact without framing any theory of it at all, and that when we have done that we have done everything. Such is not the position which I am prepared to urge. I should prefer that we regarded this discussion as a process of search. What do we mean—what ought we to mean—when we speak of the *fact of the Atonement*? In the course of answering such a question, we may find many vistas opening before us; if God so wills, our investigation may be instructive and profitable.

### I.

If we are asked what we mean by the fact of the Atonement, the first answer which rises to our lips is surely this: We mean the fact that Jesus Christ

died. Other things may be theories, doctrines, assertions; this is part of the unchangeable record of human history—Jesus died as well as lived. If there is revelation anywhere, if there is redemptive power anywhere, we shall surely find it here; for here we are in contact not with opinions or doctrines, but with realities—with realities, too, of a peculiarly impressive and significant kind. We must not, however, go too fast. It might be asserted by way of criticism that though you have a fact of *Jesus' death*, you have no fact of *Christ's atoning death*, unless you are able to add something to so brief a statement of facts—this at least, Jesus died *for our sins*. But, if you say that, has not your fact altered its colour and character? Has it not taken up into itself an immense mass of theory, of doctrine, some will say of dogma? At any rate, has it not assumed such a significance that theories, doctrines, dogmas are the inevitable results of belief in it—of belief in the fact of the Atonement—in the fact that Christ died *for our sins*? Let us verify this statement by thinking of a contrast. It has been acutely remarked in regard to Professor Bruce's little summary of facts about our Lord at the beginning of his article 'Jesus,' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, that the summary might well have been composed by an intelligent pagan. It is more like Tacitus' way of speaking on the