

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

CRITICAL NOTES.

NEW LIGHT ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

ONE among many proofs of the genuineness of the readings for the Huntington Palimpsest is that they illuminate the Gospel story with *new facts*. The Gospel picture is not further defaced — it is *restored*. The text of our newly-found authority gives us some deeply interesting side-lights on our Lord's Passion. In St. John xiii. 11, Eastern Texts read:—

“For He knew who should betray Him: therefore said He, Ye are not all clean.”

But our MS., partly supported by the Harley Irish Gospels, which have *sancti* (*αγιοι*), and not *mundi* (*καθαροι*), gives us the following:—

“For He knew who was making himself the messenger of the Scribes and Pharisees: therefore, said He, Ye are not all holy (*αγιοι*).”

Judas was the paid agent of the Scribes; and it was the Jewish Scribes, and *not the Jewish people*, who crucified Christ.

Again, in St. John xii. 5, Eastern Texts tell us that Judas asked:—

“Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?”

But the Western Text of our Palimpsest does not mention almsgiving and simply reads:—

“Why was not this ointment sold to the Scribes and Pharisees?”

The traitor Judas was bound to the service of his real masters: and grudged therefore that the ointment should have been given to Jesus Christ.

In St. John xiii. 6, Eastern Texts read:—

“Then cometh He to Simon PETER: and Peter saith unto Him, Lord, dost Thou wash my feet?”

But the Western Text of our MS. reads:—

“The Lord Jesus was washing the feet of Simon ISCARIOT. Simon Peter saith: Lord, Thou wilt not wash his feet?”¹

The magnificent pathos and beauty of this sublime act of his Saviour towards Judas has been expunged, and Simon Peter substituted for Simon Iscariot, that the primacy of St. Peter over the other Apostles might be asserted even in the order in which the Lord Jesus washed His disciples' feet.

Confirmations of the newly-found text are not to be expected from late MSS. of the Fathers. All the MSS. of the Fathers have undergone, ever since the Vulgate was promulgated in 382 A.D., a searching revision by the servants of the Roman Catholic clergy who upheld the purity of the Vulgate. The Western readings of Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and other Church Fathers have undergone more and more expurgation in the process of recopying their works during the past centuries. Early MSS. of Beatus, such as the Morgan MS. (copied in 968 A.D.), retain Western readings which have disappeared in MSS. of Beatus copied two and a half centuries later.

Confirmations of Western readings are now to be found rather from the *indirect* Scripture references of the Fathers than from direct quotations, so easy to alter. In the editions of Irenæus, St. Luke xxiii. 34, when directly quoted, is found exactly as we find it in the Vulgate. Is our Western reading of this verse to be condemned because it is not found to-day in Irenæus! By no means. For the earliest MS. of Irenæus (known as the Codex Claromontanus) at Paris is not earlier than the tenth century, and has doubtless undergone the same revision that we find in all twelfth-century MSS. of Beatus.

¹The Harley Irish Gospels cancel “his” before “feet,” but do not insert “my,” reading: “Lord, thou wilt never wash feet?” The Harley Gospels are thus here, as elsewhere, an half-way house between our MS. and the Vulgate. Compare St. John xii. 19, where the Harley MS. supports our MS. in reading the blasphemous utterance of the Pharisees which is suppressed in Eastern Texts: “Behold, all the world is gone after One that hath the devil.”

But is it not possible that here and there even in late MSS. a Western reading may have survived the attrition of the ages? Yes, we have proof that this may be so. In the Third Book of Irenæus "Against Heresies" we read:—

Et cum tyrannidem paterentur: rogabat Patrem ut ignosceret his qui se cruci fixerunt ("Because they were UNDER A TYRANNY, He prayed the Father to pardon those who crucified Him").

This confirms the newly-found Western reading of Codex Huntingtonianus:—

Pater dimitte illis quia spiritibus serbiunt malignis qui hodiunt spiritum filii hominis ("Father, forgive them because THEY ARE THE SLAVES OF EVIL SPIRITS, which hate the spirit of the Son of man").

Further confirmations will only be forthcoming with the further study of early MSS.—not printed editions—of the Fathers. Nothing to support the Western Text can be gained from the testimony of late MSS., or of printed editions based on late MSS.

Again, in St. Luke xxii. the Palimpsest, partly supported by the Verona Gospels, exhibits verses 48–51 as follows:—

"And the Lord Jesus said, Simon, thou art betraying the Son of man with a kiss.

"When they who were with the Lord Jesus heard this, they said, Lord, shall we smite him with the sword?

"Then Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it; and smote Simon Iscariot and cut off his ear.

"And the Lord Jesus said, Forgive him, for he serveth evil spirits which hate the spirit of the Son of man. And He healed Simon Iscariot."

It was thus the traitor Judas that the impetuous St. Peter struck at in his indignation at his treachery. It was Judas whom the Lord Jesus "loved to the end," and whose ear the Lord Jesus restored.

In St. John xv. 25, there is a highly instructive variant between the Eastern and Western Texts. The Eastern Texts all read:—

"That the word might be fulfilled which is written in *their law*; They hated Me without a cause."

The new Western witness reads:—

“That the saying of the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled, They hated the Holy Spirit without a cause.”

Here is the difference between East and West. The Eastern Text would save man by law; the Western Text would save man by the love of the Holy Spirit. Hence the Holy Spirit was suppressed, and the Jewish law substituted. The word of God was made void of all meaning in order to establish legalism and Jewish traditionalism.

Our oldest Hebrew MS. dates from 880 A.D., and our Greek MSS. of the Old Testament all have come to us by way of Alexandria. We can therefore have no confidence in either the one or the other as exhibiting the *first* form of the words of the prophet Isaiah. To condemn the witness of our MS. because its citation is not found in the modern Hebrew text derived from late Hebrew MSS. of Isaiah, is to declare of a field long overrun with tares, that, had there ever been wheat in it, we should find the wheat there to-day.

At least, the Text now recovered is the LOWER STRATUM, and therefore the first laid down. What is everywhere laid above it and substituted for it is the authoritative Vulgate, which was imposed on the whole world from 382 A.D. until 1881 A.D. In 1881 the Alexandrian-Constantinopolitan Text was new minted, and issued with some additional fourth-century *bêtises* of Alexandrian Arian grammarians. To assume that the Greek text of the fourth century at Alexandria faithfully represented the Apostles' autographs is to ignore the fact that such a vast forgery as the Clementine Homilies passed for genuine Scripture from the second century until recent times.

E. S. BUCHANAN.

New York City.

CHRIST IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

It is probably vain to speculate as to who were the first readers of this Epistle. But it is easy to see that the occasion of it was the existing need of emphasis upon the spiritual

presence of Christ in the world. Very likely in this second half of the first century, a generation after Jesus had arisen from the dead, too many still put their faith in the historical Jesus and bemoaned the fact that he had died. Hence the emphasis in our Epistle upon the "throne of grace," the Session at the right hand of God, and the "sameness" of Christ, "yesterday, to-day, and forever."

Jesus is presented under each of three different aspects. He is Son, King, and Priest. It will be convenient to study the exposition in that order.

JESUS THE SON.

This is the first name that greets the reader. On the one hand, "the prophets," by whom revelation came in the past; on the other, the son (a son) in whom all revelation finds its climax. The latter is supreme among prophets, distinguished men like Moses and Aaron, even among angels (iii. 2-5; iv. 8).

Congruous with the statement that the Son is begotten (i. 5) he is said to be heir of all things, and to bear such a unique likeness to the Father that he is "the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance" (i. 3). One is reminded of what Jesus himself said to his contemporaries, "He that beholdeth me beholdeth him that sent me" (John xii. 45). And to Philip, when he asked, "Lord, show us the Father," the answer was, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John xiv. 9).

It is not at all likely that the first readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews questioned whether Jesus enjoyed an "eternal preëxistence" or not. The writer's high purpose was achieved when he had shown that the Son was entitled to any appellation or characteristic that befits God. He is a sorry quibbler who can read the first chapter of Hebrews and doubt the essential divinity of Christ.

A being who was present and creatively active at the creation (i. 2) not only of this earth, but of "the worlds," and who sustains an immanent relation to creation, yea, "uphold-

ing all things by the word of his power" (i. 3), needs not to have his divinity interpreted, or explained away.

The term "son" as here used does not seem to refer to the human nature of Jesus, although our writer is very fond of showing the reality of the human side of the Lord. The term "son" seems rather to be chosen to relate this humanly conditioned and natured man to the divine Father of all. Certainly the choice of the human name Jesus leads the writer to magnify the facts of his human experience. His human ancestry appears in vii. 14: "It is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah." He was surrounded and beset by human conditions of suffering and even death. This is made apparent repeatedly in the Epistle. The son is "made perfect through suffering," and partakes of the besetments of his brethren, being made like them in all things, else he could not properly sympathize with or help them (ii. 17, 18: v. 2).

The reference to the perfection of Jesus and his mastery of obedience through his human experience points to immaturity in his humanity, but nowhere implies that he was ever disobedient or imperfect morally. The immaturity may be reflected in the confession, "Of that day and hour knoweth . . . not even . . . the Son, but the Father only" (Matt. xxiv. 36). And another of the Synoptics (Luke ii. 52) tells us that Jesus "advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."

No doubt the man who wrote the Epistle under review was familiar with much of the synoptic material; in fact, he gives us at times even further details than there set forth. He knew of the temptation (ii. 18; iv. 15); and in reference to the agony in the garden (v. 7-10) he says: "Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered." "Tempted in all points, like as

we are," points to a knowledge of more than the three typical temptations of the wilderness.

In the view of this writer, the name "Son" was applicable a generation after his death. Whatever it predicates of Jesus still inheres in him. For to sin deliberately against Christ is to "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame" (vi. 6).

JESUS AS KING.

The references to the kingship of Jesus are indirect rather than direct, as in the case of his sonship. The disappointment of a band of disciples who had hoped that "this was he who should have redeemed Israel" lingered fully a generation after the ascension. The First Gospel had as its chief aim, doubtless, the establishment of Jesus as the King of the Jews and to vindicate the ancient prophecies as fulfilled, after all, in his life and death. Our writer would turn the attention of his friends in the Gospel from the details of a life lived in the flesh to a life lived in and with them, from the historical Jesus to the mystically present Christ. Hence his emphasis upon the "Session" of Christ at the right hand of the Father and the practical value of the "throne of grace."

The "Session" is mentioned at least twelve times, in such phrases as: "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (i. 3); "sat down on the right hand of God" (x. 12); "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (i. 8); and "entered . . . into heaven itself" (ix. 24). (So i. 13; iv. 14; vii. 26; viii. 1; ii. 9; iv. 16, and other places.)

The analogy between Melchizedek and Jesus carries with it royal dignity as well as priestly functions. The Messianic expectation of the Jews was cast in the kingly form, hence the necessity for our writer to emphasize the real kingly nature of Jesus. The Epistle dwells little upon the details of the passion of Christ, even passing over the resurrection without a mention, unless it be the benediction in xiii. 20, "who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep."

This silence on the great topic so precious to Paul and so elaborately treated in the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel may be variously explained. The most likely explanation seems to be the desire to impress the reader with the fact of a present and living Christ. To this end, details of the passion and even of the resurrection would only detract. Note the exhortations in the Epistle; as, "Consider . . . Jesus, . . . for he hath been accounted worthy of more glory than Moses. . . . Take heed, . . . lest there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God" (iii. 1-12). Again, the "throne" upon which Jesus the King sits is called the "throne of grace." "Let us draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help in time of need" (iv. 16).

JESUS AS PRIEST.

Christ the High Priest appears often in the Epistle. Sometimes the priestly function seems closely interwoven with the royal and filial; for, as the reader is urged to draw near unto the "throne of grace" with boldness, so he is exhorted (x. 21 ff.): "Having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith . . . and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh."

A remarkable analogy is drawn between a certain Old Testament character, Melchizedek, and Christ. An expression in the One Hundred and Tenth Psalm is coupled with one in the Second Psalm and applied to Jesus (v. 5, 6; vii. 17):—

"Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee:
As he saith also in another place,
Thou art a priest for ever
After the order of Melchizedek."

There is scarcely any need, knowing the general manner in which Alexandrian writers used the Old Testament, to find too close a resemblance between Melchizedek and Christ. All one needs to know of the former is that he was not of the

regular priestly line, i.e. of the tribe of Levi, as, in fact, Jesus was not (Heb. vii. 14). Yet Melchizedek was greater than Levi; for Levi, in the person of his ancestor, Abraham, paid tithes to Melchizedek (vii. 9, 10), and the lesser pays tithes to the greater. So the priesthood of Jesus has nothing to do with the Levitical priesthood, but is far superior to it. There are many particulars in which that of Christ excels.

In the first place, ordinary priests are men of infirmity (vii. 28); while Jesus is "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (vii. 26). Again, the legal priesthood is inadequate. The argument is: "If there was perfection through the Levitical priesthood, . . . what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be reckoned after the order of Aaron?" (vii. 11). That this new priest is better, yea, even perfect, is confessed in the saying, "Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (vii. 25). The writer has just shown that the priests of the law are continually dying, and that the law itself never made anything perfect (vii. 19, 23).

As to their respective sacrifices, the Levitical priests go into the holy place of the temple once a year, with certain sacrifices. But these things of themselves do not take away sins. The reader supposedly admits that this ceremony is only a shadow of something real, a type of something to come, since the same thing is done over and over, year after year (x. 1). It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could purify a human heart from sin (x. 4).

But the High-priest Jesus never ministered in the Temple at Jerusalem. His sacrifice is not performed at stated times. For once and for all he offered, not the blood of animals, but his own blood (ix. 23-28). The comparison is clearly shown: "For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer . . . sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ . . . cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (ix. 13, 14).

Furthermore, since the sanctuary in Jerusalem is not the scene of Jesus' priesthood, we must look elsewhere for the "holy place" into which he entered. The writer identifies it with heaven: "For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us" (ix. 24).

PRACTICAL RESULTS OF THIS MINISTRY OF JESUS.

The atonement of Christ is a fact apart from all theory. The fact is dependable. "We may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us, which we have as an anchor of the soul" (vi. 18, 19). Yet it is possible to neglect even so great a salvation as this offered in Christ (ii. 3).

The death of Christ has more than mere subjective value. This writer believes that "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (ix. 22). He plainly states: "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate" (xiii. 12). The believer must act. "Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach" (xiii. 13). It is necessary to draw near unto God through Jesus before he is able to save to the uttermost.

The divinity of Christ is not a mere speculative dogma with this writer. It is life in and through and for sinful men. He is the Son made perfect, it is true, but perfected through his ministry for men. Hence we have not an high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Jesus has such perfect sympathy with men that he can succor them in their deepest woes and darkest sins.

Only practical lessons come from this treatise, after all. It is a study of the living Christ, ever present because spiritually accessible. If he were on earth bodily Jesus could not be a priest at all (viii. 4); but the throne of grace, to which access is had by a "new and living way" (x. 19), is a universal boon. To paraphrase a remark of Deissmann's, Christology, as a theological science, stands brooding beside an

empty grave: Christianity as a life of hope, the life thought of by our writer, stands face to face with the Living Presence, the Son, the King, but most of all, the Priest, at the Throne of Grace.

ERNEST W. BURCH.

Mitchell, So. Dak.

BELIEF OF SCIENTIFIC MEN IN GOD AND IMMORTALITY.

THE recent book on God and Immortality by Professor James Henry Leuba¹ has received such wide comment, and been cited as authority by such diverse men as Cardinal O'Connell, Mayor Curley, and Rev. William Sunday, that it seems specially important to examine it with a view of estimating the value of its statements and inferences. The first 127 pages of the book and Chapter VI. pertain to the historic argument for God and immortality, drawn, largely, from the fact that a future life (or immortality) has been believed almost universally. Space, however, prevents giving attention to this part.

It is more important to deal with Part II., which is a statistical study of the present belief in a personal God and personal immortality in the United States, as indicated by anonymous answers of certain groups of people, and this is the original part of the book. But a fatal lack in this part of the book is background. How do these groups compare with the population in general? On page 223 he speaks of one respect in which our scientists are "ordinary men." Would it not have added to the value of the book, and perhaps materially changed his conclusions, if he had kept this in mind and (to use chemical language) run a blank test and tried to see how his special groups compared with that same ordinary man or man in the street? His groups are all in the literary or scientific classes. He should have found how the results with them compared with five hundred labor leaders, five

¹ *Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological, and Statistical Study.* By James Henry Leuba. 12mo. Pp. xvii, 340. Boston: Sherman, French and Company. 1916. \$2.00.

hundred men selected from the directory of directors, or by taking random names from local directories. Can we get a rough idea of the faith of the average man?

One may note that of about 102,000,000 people in the United States there are 14,815,870 Catholic communicants and 25,194,837 communicants of churches who are not Catholics; so that something like 39% of the whole population are communicants, at least nominally, or 29% of the Protestant population. This should be corrected for children younger than the age of those to whom Leuba wrote, and for a few men still on church books but without faith, and for many non-communicants who believe in God and immortality. But in default of better information it might show that, if only four men out of ten in Leuba's lists believed in God and immortality, this *might* be only what would be true of the average man. His surmise that fifty years ago American students would have "answered with uniformity and assurance" in the "terms of the catechism then in use" fairly made the writer rub his eyes and look up Leuba's age to see what he knew of the age of Huxley and Tyndall at first hand. How interesting a questionnaire of that date would be, to compare with his! Perhaps the chief use of his present questionnaire may be to compare with another fifty years from now.

He first gives the result of an inquiry into the belief in a personal God in a number of colleges — 56% men and 82% women believed, and 31% men and 11% women did not believe. Next follows a discussion of the belief in immortality in some one unnamed college. The percentage of believers was, among Freshmen, 80.3%; Sophomores, 76.2%; Juniors, 60%; and Seniors, 70.1%. The skeptical though doubtless unintentional bias (perhaps personal equation would be a better phrase) of Leuba seems to crop out here, as elsewhere, when he considers and rules out the explanation that, after a "*sturm und drang*" period, the Seniors became saner, by saying that the Junior class had "acknowledged exceptional independence and intellectual superiority."

Some objective proof of this would be desirable in marks or after work. One should also inquire if some courses in the College on Christian evidences or philosophy could have been factors. It is also well known how one or two men will often set the tone for a class. Leuba's explanation may be correct, but he swallows it too easily.

Next follows "Investigation C," of which he says that it "provides *incontrovertible* evidences of a decrease of belief corresponding with an increase of knowledge and of general mental ability." This seems not true. It is easily controvertible. This was a series of similar questions addressed to two sets of five hundred names in the book called "American Men of Science," and to names in the membership lists of the American Historical Association, the American Sociological Society, and the American Psychological Association. He divides each group of savants into men of greater or less eminence, and finds the relative proportion, in each group, of those who are unable to say that they believe: (1) in a God to whom we may pray (in the expectation of receiving an answer more than the subjective psychological effect of prayer), and (2) in personal immortality. In all cases among the greater men are the fewer believers, and he attributes this to "activity, tenacity, initiative and self-reliance that tend to resist the forces of tradition, authority and prestige." Now certainly in science originality helps towards eminence, and the conclusion looks plausible; but when we find that of the more distinguished physical scientists the percentage who believe in God and immortality, 35-40%,¹ corresponds to the percentage of communicants in the Protestant population, we are tempted to ask if, in these matters, savants are not like ordinary men, and if there may not be

¹ More among the sociologists and historians, but very few among psychologists. The group of psychologists is so reduced by elimination of all those teaching in Roman Catholic institutions and exclusively in medical schools, and those mere educators or philosophers rather than psychologists, that Leuba has only 50 greater and 57 lesser men left, and the variant result might easily be due to the influence of one man; for instance, Münsterburg.

an especial reason for a large excess of believers among the minor men. We note that 68% of the minor savants are teachers, 58% only of the greater men. Since from the historians he left out professors of church history and teachers in Roman Catholic institutions (presumably because only believers would be chosen for those places and it would be useless to inquire of them) it is natural to ask if the same selective effort is not at work, though not so rigorously, in Protestant colleges, in which case the lesser men would be selected with more regard to their belief than in the larger institutions and in case of the more brilliant men? It seems certain that this would be a factor, and one can easily imagine it produced the whole effect. How much effect, Leuba could perhaps find out by taking only savants employed in the Government civil service and seeing how the percentages shift.

One should test, also, for at least two other factors in the results. For instance, there may be, many say there are,¹ waves of skepticism and belief. If we are passing from a wave of skepticism to one of belief, the older and more eminent men being affected by the former, we should get part of Leuba's results. One or two cases occurred to me where a skeptic's chair has been filled by a younger and less famous believer, that led me to think of this. A comparison of the average age of greater and lesser men of believers and others should throw light on this. Another factor is that those who are or who become eminent in any line are most apt to be very much absorbed in it, to the neglect of other things. It would be interesting to see if similar results came out in a group, say, of major and minor railroad officials, or directors of banks.

I do not pretend, however, to have exhausted all possible causes of variation, but only wish to call attention to the fact, that, when we have a possible effect of many causes, we must not pick out the first cause that occurs to us and consider

¹ See, for instance, A. C. Benson's *Hugh, Memoirs of a Brother*, p. 133.

that "incontrovertibly" proved, as Leuba apparently does. Again, Leuba says: "I do not see any way to avoid the conclusion that disbelief in a personal God and personal immortality is directly proportional to ability making for success in the sciences in question." There are plenty of ways to avoid the conclusion (and if the conclusion be not true how trying for the budding savant, cultivating disbelief to help qualify him for eminence, to find that he has merely been disqualifying himself for service in the minor colleges); but as long as Leuba could not see any of the other ways he naturally did not investigate to see whether they were thoroughfares or blind alleys.

The last part of the book considers the utility of this belief in God and immortality; and we are not surprised, after what has gone before, to find that Leuba concludes that we can get along well enough without it, and according to Darwinian principles it should then be a dying faith, as he evidently thinks it is. Yet it is well to remember that belief, faith, and certainty are attributes of mind, not of matter. As to the fact of a personal God, or life after death, what savants believe makes no difference. A few years ago most savants accepted the Laplacian Hypothesis. Now none (in Chicago) so poor as to do it reverence.

Leuba's investigation, then, shows nothing as to the probability of a personal God and immortality; but it suggests that, as to their belief in such matters, savants are much like ordinary men, though probably the smaller colleges tend to select believers.

It is quite possible that further critical study might show that high scientific concentration, or in fact concentration in any one field, was unfavorable to belief, and that conditions now are still as to faith much as in the days of the Roman augurs, of the Sadducees, and of the writer of the first chapter of the letter to the Corinthians. But Leuba's evidence for it is very weak. His questionnaire sent to other select groups, of labor leaders, of business leaders, of politicians, of civil servants, classed as to age, might, however, yield

valuable comparative results,—not as to the fact of God and of immortality, but as to the conditions of employment, of success, and as to the psychologic attitude of different occupations.

ALFRED C. LANE.

Tufts College, Mass.

LIMITING my remarks to what Professor Lane says about Part II. of my book, I will say at the outset, that the desire either to discredit or to increase the prestige of religion, leads to strikingly contradictory assertions regarding the prevalence of doctrines necessary to the existence of religious worship as it is now organized. For it is in religion as in politics, each side is prone to claim an overpowering majority in order to *produce* a majority. But since, in religion, authority is still almost as powerfully entrenched as it was in political affairs before the advent of representative governments, the side that asserts the dominance of traditional religious beliefs has it almost all its own way. It is the urgent need of definite knowledge concerning the spread and distribution of the beliefs in the existence of a God in direct intellectual and effective relation with man and in personal survival after death that induced me to undertake the statistical investigation reported in Part II.

The difficulties in my way had been brought into full light by the failure of preceding attempts. The improved methods I was able to follow make it possible to say, now for the first time, what proportion of all the members of several influential groups—physical scientists, biological scientists, historians, sociologists, psychologists, and certain groups of college students,—accept, reject, or doubt these two beliefs essential to the present forms of organized religion (I do not say to all possible forms of religion). We are furthermore in a position to compare the influence of knowledge of different kinds of eminence upon the acceptance of these beliefs.

Lane does not contest the validity of my statistics; it is

with my interpretation of them that he finds fault. I shall, therefore, after transcribing a few of the most important figures, consider his own attempt at explanation and his criticism of mine.¹

Believers in God

Lesser Men	49.7	39.1	63	29.2	32.1
Greater Men	34.8	16.9	32.9	19.4	13.2

Believers in Immortality

Lesser Men	57.1	45.1	67.6	52.2	26.9
Greater Men	40	25.4	35.3	27.1	8.8

When interpreting the meaning of these figures, I insisted that the facts at hand do not justify the opinion that greater knowledge accounts altogether, perhaps not even mainly, for the decrease of the number of believers as one passes in each group from the less to the more distinguished division. General knowledge, and still more knowledge in the fields of physical, biological, historical, sociological, and psychological sciences, doubtless influence one's belief in a God conceived as acting upon the physical universe and upon man, at man's request, desire, or desert (that is the only kind of God in question in these statistics). Of this probable effect of knowledge, a comparison of the statistics referring to the several groups appears to give satisfactory evidence (see pp. 279-280). In this connection the most striking facts are the low percentage of believers in immortality among the psychologists, a percentage lower than in any other group, and the almost entire absence of believers among the greater psychologists; these may, it seems, fairly be credited with the possession of the fullest knowledge now extant upon the problem of the survival of man.

But other statistical facts, as well as obvious considerations, indicate that knowledge is only one of the factors to be reckoned with when accounting for the differences dis-

¹ These figures are percentages of the total numbers of those who, in each class, answered the questions. The remainder record disbelief, or a state of doubt, or agnosticism. The order is that given above — physical scientists, biological scientists, historians, sociologists, psychologists.

covered. One of these facts is the great difference between men and women belonging to the same college classes. There are 82% of believers in God among the women and only 56% among the men. It is, I think, generally admitted that the sexes are not equal in the possession of the moral qualities designated by the familiar expressions "self-reliance" and "mental independence"; and I thought myself justified in holding that the attainment of eminence in the vocations considered in this research is to a considerable degree dependent upon the possession of this same trait. I was thus led to regard it as the other essential ground of explanation of the interesting facts brought out by my inquiry.

The presence of this trait would antagonize the disposition, natural to human nature, to be swayed by tradition; it would prompt to efforts tending to the establishment of independent opinions. The statistics of the more eminent persons and of the men students would thus reflect the action of greater self-reliance. When discussing the statistics of college women, I drew attention also to a similar effect produced by tenderness and affection. Persons in whom these traits are strongly marked are on that account less hospitable than others to ideas which threaten separation from the family and other social circles in which one has been reared.

Lane admits the plausibility of my interpretation; but he thinks that there are other possible and, to his mind, more probable explanations. That there are other minor factors, I do not deny; but even after reading his suggestions, I do not know of any essential factor outside of those I have singled out. He observes that the percentage of believers among the greater physical scientists is very nearly the same as that of the communicants in the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches, and asks whether this does not show that in matters of religious belief, these savants are very much like ordinary men. If so, the reasons I have advanced in order to account for the low percentage of believers among greater men would be uncalled for. Lane apparently failed to observe that "church communicants" and "believers in

personal immortality and in God" cannot be regarded as equivalent phrases. Is it not known that immortality and the existence of a God or gods who communicate with man, are taught not only by Christianity but also by every organized religion?¹ Everybody might accept these two beliefs, and yet no one might be acceptable as communicant in any save an insignificant number of Christian churches. To be a church communicant, whether in the Roman Church or in any Protestant denomination, except perhaps the Unitarian and a few other "heretical" congregations, one must not only accept these two beliefs, but also other articles of faith characteristic of Christianity — doctrines referring to Christ, his nature, and his mission on earth. My inquiry did not involve in any way any specifically Christian belief.

The confusion just set forth creates for my critic a serious difficulty: if the proportion of believers in God and in immortality among the greater physical scientists is about the same as that of the believers in these two doctrines among the American population in general, why is the proportion of believers among the lesser scientific men so much higher? He supposes that the greater number of believers among the lesser men may be due to the tendency of the smaller colleges to be influenced in their choice of teachers, more by the beliefs of the candidates and less by their eminence than is the case in the larger institutions. Should this remark be true, and I grant its probability, there would be a preponderance of believers in the small colleges. But why should these be lesser men? If we suppose that the moral qualities and the knowledge that make for greatness in science make also for the acceptance of God and immortality, most of the teachers in the smaller colleges would be greater men. And, on the supposition that all our colleges and universities prefer believing scientists, and that belief and scientific eminence are (within the limits of our inquiry) antagonistic, most greater scientists would be found outside these institutions.

¹ Unless Comte's Religion of Humanity should be regarded as an organized religion.

However that may be, my figures would remain what they are, for they are quite independent of the distribution of these classes of men among the institutions of the land. They reveal what proportion of *all* the lesser and of *all* the greater men, *wherever they may be*, are believers.

Lane is less unfortunate when he mentions, as a possible factor in the explanation of the same statistical facts, the existence of alternating waves of skepticism and of belief. But the supposition would not account, for instance, for the differences we have found to exist between the sexes, between the college classes, between the several groups of scientists (I allude to the great decrease of believers as we pass from the physical to the biological and then to the psychological scientists), etc. My own conviction, based on data belonging to diverse quarters, is that, with regard to the two beliefs in question, we are not passing into an age of greater belief, quite the contrary. That which leads many people into the erroneous idea that there is growing acceptance of these beliefs, is the decrease of a certain kind of rough-and-ready condemnation of religion in whatever form it may appear. How many of us believe in "religion" and either reject or doubt the essential doctrines of the organized religions! My personal recollection may not extend so far back as that of Lane, but I suspect that those who think that there is less unbelief now than in the time of Huxley put a wrong construction upon the great commotion arising from the promulgation of Darwin's theory of evolution. The stir made by great champions of that cause does not necessarily correspond to the number of disbelievers in God and immortality.

Two other brief remarks, and I am done. Lane's slur upon my explanation of the imperfect progression formed by the four college classes, is hardly fair (see my explanation, pp. 216-217). And the most charitable comment I can make upon his attempt to cast discredit upon the figures most stubbornly in the way of his suppositions—those referring to the psychologists—is that he has not carefully considered the relevant facts. As I wanted a group of psychologists,

and not one of educators or of philosophers, I eliminated from the membership list of the American Psychological Association the names of those who are known to be educators or philosophers rather than psychologists. I also eliminated those who teach psychology exclusively in medical schools—two or three persons;¹ they are, first of all, physiologists or neurologists, and are designated as such in "American Men of Science." And, finally, I left out, as in the case of every other group, those professing in Roman Catholic institutions; these number also two or three persons. These eliminations, necessary in order to get an homogeneous group of psychologists, were made, not after, but before the question-blanks were sent out. The list thus revised counted not 107 names, as my critic asserts, but approximately 192 (see pp. 266-267).

JAMES H. LEUBA.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

A CASUAL glance at my review will show that I did not regard "church communicants" and "believers in God and immortality" as equivalent phrases, and that I suggested various ways better than the one I used but involving long labor of getting the proportion of "believers . . ." among men in general. I cannot quite follow Professor Leuba in what he next says. Does he imply that the Unitarians and Universalists are insignificant? And does he not see that if any widespread denominations accept "believers in God and immortality" without requiring any farther beliefs, it does not make any difference what additional beliefs other denominations require as to the inclusion of the body of "believers" in some denomination or other? The wording of the questionnaire in its definition of God is worth careful attention. It is not the same as a "God or gods who communicate with man." Organized Unitarianism would accept the latter,—I do not know that it would accept the former. In answer to his query there are, I think, a large number of

¹The lists are not accessible to me where I write.

Unitarians, and many other communicants in other denominations, who do not believe in a "God acting upon the physical universe at man's request," who to that extent counterbalance those outside all denominations that do, in suggesting that the proportion of "believers" in Leuba's sense might be similar to that of communicants.

Leuba asked why the "believer . . ." should in larger proportion be "lesser," and again proceeds to argue on a new definition of "lesser." I used "lesser," as he did in his book, to refer to the unstarred men in Cattell's list of American Men of Science, and it is perfectly well known that there are a large number of men in the A. A. A. S., and hence in this list, who may indeed be much greater than many of the starred men, — I have some in mind, — in teaching, in politics, in literature, in some other field than the section on science under which they are entered in the A. A. A. S. list and would not be starred, who therefore are classed by Leuba as "lesser." Now my suggestion was, and he grants its probability, that the same factor for which he allowed in Roman Catholic institutions worked also less vigorously in small Protestant and still less vigorously in the larger universities, and there are a number of reasons why a man in a large institution was more likely to be starred.

The very fact that he was connected with it carried prestige. He was more likely to be definitely specialized. The larger salaries would attract the abler man, etc. That is why "lesser," i.e. unstarred, men might be more abundant in the smaller colleges, whose faculties are in general "believers." In other words, the body of "lesser" men would be diluted by a number, mainly believers; and instead of our colleges being "godless," as Leuba's statistics have been used to show, they may indicate the contrary.

It is significant that a man with the experience of Gladstone should cherish the conviction that "persons who are engaged in political employment, or who are in any way habitually conversant with human nature, conduct, and concerns, are much less borne down with scepticism than special-

ists of various kinds and those whose pursuits have associated them with the study, history, and framework of inanimate Nature"; while Darwin surmises the same thing with regard to his own experience when, referring to his feelings in earlier days, whilst standing in the midst of the grandeur of a Brazilian forest, he says: "I well remember my conviction [at that time] that there is more in man than the mere breath of his body. But now the grandest scenes would not cause any such convictions and feelings to rise in my mind. It may be truly said that I am like a man who has become colour-blind, and the universal belief by men of the existence of redness makes my present loss of perception of not the least value as evidence."

The main object of my criticism is to show that the method of multiple working hypotheses has not been used, and to suggest certain hypotheses as to the statistics which Leuba grants to be plausible or probable, and to suggest also certain analysis of the statistics by which their presence, as not only true but efficient causes, could be detected. These tests could be applied only on the original results of the questionnaire of it all. This Leuba has not done. He considers the factors "minor" and not essential, and falls back on his own "conviction," which carries only the weight of authority of a "greater" psychologist.

A. C. L.