

## Reviews.



*History of Intellectual Development : on the Lines of Modern Evolution.*  
Vol. I. By JOHN BEATTIE CROZIER. London : Longmans, Green  
and Co.

THE purport of this work is clear from its title, but as regards its main treatment it might better have been styled a history of religious development, for of the three heads that Mr. Crozier arranges under the term "Intellectual"—Religion, Science, and Philosophy—he pays by far the most attention to the first. In his system the development of religious thought is more important to humanity at large than that of philosophical; accordingly, he relegates the greater systems of metaphysics to only a secondary place. This renders his book of more immediate value to the religious student, as such. Even in the first division of his syllabus, the evolution of Greek thought, his treatment is more of the religious than the purely philosophical nature, and in one particularly interesting chapter he discusses the relations between Neo-Platonism and Christianity. The other three parts of this volume deal with the evolution respectively of Hindoo thought, Judaism, and Christianity. It is readily apparent that there is a good deal of relationship between Greek thought and Christianity, and hence with Judaism. For the testimony of St. Augustine will recur to our minds. Himself brought up in the writings of Neo-Platonism, he traces many common points in its tenets and those of Christianity; what he did not find in Neo-Platonism was the Incarnation of God and its corollaries. This mediation of Jesus, the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, proved to be the magnet which attracted men; or, as Mr. Crozier puts it (p. 72): "The little boat of Philosophy was at last drawing to that religious shore to which from the first it was destined." In the second section of the volume Mr. Crozier deals with Hinduism, Buddhism, and Theosophy. The first two are contrasted at a disadvantage with Christianity in several respects, *e.g.* (p. 116), "Christianity differs from both Hinduism and Buddhism in the same way as the principle of love differs from the principle of asceticism, as the solicitude of affection differs from the sordid calculations of hope and fear. It acts, not by repressing the lower, but by stimulating the higher nature—raising it up above itself, as it were; by holding up before it for its contemplation a Divine ideal and object of love, in whose presence the lower desires shrink into the shade."

It is curious that while these venerable systems have left no impression on the course and growth of Christianity, yet in these latter days some, restless and indocile, have turned for religious comfort from the living truth of Christ to the frail and tottering fabric of Oriental thought. Those who recoil from the feeding of the five thousand are yet prepared

to trust in Madame Blavatsky's heaven-sent cups and saucers. Such a stolid credulity baffles all arguments, and is proof against demonstration itself. Yet Theosophy supplies an indication of the craving that mankind has after religious belief, and furnishes an example of the spirit of revolt against that domination of the seven senses which some physical scientists would fain lay upon us. In that respect it is of interest. Mr. Crozier does full justice to this side of Theosophy, and yet his candid and exhaustive examination is summarized in the words (p. 123): "Far from superseding Western modes of thought as its followers believe, it will not even be able to unite with them so as to take its place in the philosophical evolution of the future." With all its pretensions, Theosophy can do nothing for the progress or civilization of the world.

The third part is occupied with the development of Judaism. While we do not give an assent to a great many of Mr. Crozier's propositions, or acquiesce in his choice of expressions, we fully recognise the learning and ability of his argument. We would protest to some extent, however, against a characteristic which our author shares, indeed, with many other writers, but which is none the less a little unchivalrous, if we may use the term, in matters which are of the most vital importance to at least one of the sides engaged. For instance, in seeking to prove that the Jews borrowed angels from the Persian religion, Mr. Crozier remarks (p. 205): "The Jews had already taken their stories of the Creation and Deluge from 'ancient Babylonian myths.'" What a library of controversy is concealed in that authoritative sentence, even in the question-begging predicate 'taken'! Is this statement either sufficiently correct (p. 227): "the Book of Daniel, which all scholars are now agreed in believing to have been written shortly after the Greeks and Syrians were driven out of Jerusalem by the Maccabees"? It does not follow that, because a theory is even very generally held, it is proved. A universal proposition is none the less dangerous to lay down because it is "up-to-date," and we do not think that an argument, otherwise really temperate and interesting, is strengthened by such assumptions.

The fourth and last part of the present volume deals with the evolution of Christianity. Mr. Crozier, instead of giving references in footnotes, prefers to tabulate his authorities at the beginning of each division, and the names certainly show an exhaustive range of reading. In the present section, for instance, are such diversely-separated writers as Dale and Didon, Renan and Ritschl, Newman and Strauss. But his own reflections evidence originality, his style is his own, and his conclusions also. Speaking broadly, there is a very great deal to welcome in his management of his theme. There is an ungrudging and splendid tribute paid to the work of the religion of Jesus in moulding the development of human happiness and culture. The impotence of the scientific spirit to effect this of itself is clearly shown. The fragrance that lingers about the memory of the Divine Founder of Christianity lends an undoubted charm to these brilliant pages, certain passages in which are positively

enthraling. But with all this, there are also, from the conservative point of view, certain drawbacks. The principle of evolution is occasionally strained and pushed to excess. There is an indisposition to admit what seems a necessary corollary to certain evidence. For instance, Mr. Crozier nowhere, so far as we have been able to discover, expresses his belief or disbelief in our Lord's resurrection. Yet he does not shrink from saying (p. 307) : "The resurrection, in which the disciples firmly believed, following closely after, quickly reassured them." Again (p. 350) : "That Jesus had been crucified, and had risen again the third day, and been seen of His disciples, Paul had heard proclaimed from the mouths of hundreds of eye-witnesses within a few years of these events." Again, Mr. Crozier himself refers (p. 354) to a certain event as taking place "very early, probably immediately after His death and resurrection." Numerous other such expressions occur, and if they can be unreservedly used, why not go the one step farther, which seems logically demanded, and speak plainly of the Resurrection as an accomplished fact? On the other hand, our author does not hesitate, on the strength of fragmentary and isolated expressions in the New Testament, to carry our Lord's *kenosis* to an extent farther than is generally thought warrantable by theologians. The chapter on Pauline Christianity is interesting, but not convincing. There is much, very much, to which no Evangelical Churchman could give his assent. Perhaps the general tone of the book may be somewhat illustrated by the following extract (p. 272) :

Then began the slow dismantling of the grand and imposing edifice which Mediæval Catholicism had erected above the simple shrine of Jesus. The first to fall was the great superstructure of dogma, ritual, and practice, which, as we have seen, had grown out of the doctrine of the Incarnation and the efficacy of Sacramental Grace, viz., the authority of the Pope, the doctrine of transubstantiation, of purgatory, the worship of images, of the Virgin, of saints and angels, of relics and the rest. These the Reformation and Calvinism rudely destroyed, but left standing for some centuries yet the old Mosaic cosmogony, with the doctrine of the Atonement resting on it; the verbal inspiration; and the belief in a *material* heaven and hell. And now that these, too, within living memory, have begun to crumble and are slowly dropping from the beliefs and imaginations of men, is it too much to hope that the universal cry of the new century will be "Back to Jesus!"—back to His pure and sublime spirituality, and to that morality of the spirit which, although it has to be interpreted by growing and ever-widening science and experience of the world, is itself applicable to all places and true for all time?

In any case, the book is one which commands attention. It is suggestive, stimulating, and provocative. Informed with learning, it breathes the spirit of the age; and, bearing that in mind, one feature alone would cause us to be thankful for its testimony; we mean its protest against Materialism and the rule of the senses, and its recognition of the domain of Religion.

W. A. PURTON.

## THE NEW BIBLE DICTIONARY.

*A Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, M.A. Vol. I, A—FEASTS. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark. Price 28s.

Both the editor of this new dictionary and the publishers have long ere this deserved, and no doubt won, the gratitude of all Biblical scholars and students. Dr. Hastings is the well-known editor-in-chief of the *Expository Times*, a monthly publication which ranks high among the best examples of periodical literature. Messrs. T. and T. Clark, had they done nothing else worthy of note, have, by familiarizing Englishmen with the works of the modern masters of German theology, such as Kurtz, Dorner, Dillmann, and Delitzsch, laid students under a considerable debt. But they have done much more. Witness, for instance, the "International Critical Commentary," still in progress, which the firm has, with rare zeal and foresight, undertaken. But of the new dictionary we may say with truth—*Finis coronat opus*. Admirably edited, bearing the marks of patient and scholar-like revision on every page, and fully equipped with every resource which modern scientific research, whether literary or archæological, has been able to bring to bear upon the subjects handled, the book is indeed a notable contribution to our knowledge of the "Divine Library" of the Old and New Testaments.

A comparison with the well-known dictionary edited by the late Dr. William Smith will naturally be made by most readers of the more modern work. Let it be said at once that, in its day, Dr. Smith's Dictionary was an entirely excellent performance, much of which is still as valuable as ever it was. But, as was inevitably the case, the lapse of thirty-five years has brought with it signal changes both in our knowledge of Scripture itself, and in our acquaintance with those subsidiary sources of information from which so much valuable assistance has been derived for the better understanding of the thought and feeling of early ages. In 1863 archæological research was, from some points of view, still in its infancy, nor, at that epoch, had the literary analyses of Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen effected that partial revolution of ideas in the religious world with which we are to-day so well acquainted. In 1863 the doctrine of Evolution had only tentatively been applied to the departments of biology and natural history; it had still to be applied, with that remorseless logic which has characterized the scientific mind of subsequent years, to the entire fabric of human life and thought, through their endless ramifications. Thirty years ago the textual theory of a Hort, the subtle inquisitiveness of the Higher Criticism, the brilliant combination of the new in hypothesis and the old in sentiment in "Lux Mundi," were all alike undreamt of. The climate of thought—to borrow Glanvil's suggestive phraseology—has completely changed. *Tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis.*

Hence a dictionary of the Bible, from the novel standpoint reached by

recent research and speculative criticism, was a desideratum—all the more so as a grand opportunity was missed, some five or six years since, of bringing Dr. Smith's work into line with modern requirements.<sup>1</sup>

The present undertaking, therefore, is unusually welcome. On the principle, we suppose, that "it never rains but it pours," yet another dictionary is announced for publication in the autumn, on similar lines to the present work, to be entitled "Encyclopædia Biblica." We rather regret this; but perhaps students will be the gainers, from some aspects of view at any rate.

A review of a work like the present, if at all adequate, would at least require a stout quarto for its accomplishment. And, in point of fact, a review of a dictionary or cyclopædia is at all times an almost impossible task; hence all that is proposed here is briefly to indicate the *scope* of the book. The value of a great work of reference is not to be calculated by a random turning over of its leaves, or even by a cautious perusal of some one article—which may or may not be thoroughly representative of the whole book—but by constantly consulting it at every turn, and on the occurrence of each fresh difficulty.

First, then, this dictionary is remarkably full—fuller, we believe, than any other work of a similar kind. To mention one admirable example of such fulness, all obsolete or rare words occurring in our English versions of the Bible have been explained and illustrated. This task—surely no light one—has been undertaken by the editor, Dr. Hastings, who has carried it out with characteristic thoroughness.

By way of guarantee that the various articles in the dictionary may be regarded as authoritative and trustworthy, the name of the writer is appended to that article, or portion of an article, for which he is responsible. In some ways this is a net gain; but from one point of view it is a loss. A dictionary ought to be strictly impersonal to carry full authoritative weight; but in the case of a signed article something of the personal element is intruded, to the detriment, perhaps, of authority. However, it may be true that the advantages of the present system outweigh any disadvantages it may possess; yet we wonder whether the *Times* newspaper, for example, would carry the weight which it undoubtedly does, if the names of the writers were always attached to its leading articles?

On the whole, the list of abbreviations employed throughout the dictionary is not so extensive as to be exasperating; still, even so, the list is sufficiently formidable. Nearly every available source of information has been ransacked, whether in books or periodicals, and the list of contributors to the work—or, rather, to vol. i.—is, on the whole, singularly representative of British scholarship at its best. But we miss the honoured names of Bishop Westcott, Dr. Gifford, Principal Fairbairn,

---

<sup>1</sup> Only the first volume was re-issued in a revised state. The second and third volumes were left untouched—a strange oversight indeed!

Canon Bright (to mention them only), from the list, while some others—it is not necessary to specify them particularly—are pleasantly conspicuous by their absence.

The tone of the book, generally speaking, is distinctly good; but we regret to see it assumed throughout (so far as we have yet noted) that the conclusions of the "Higher Critics" are proved beyond a doubt. Now, in the teeth of such books as those of Robertson, Sayce, Cave, and Ellicott, this position is altogether too confident. We wish to recognise fully the debt which scholars owe to such a work as Wellhausen's "Prolegomena," which has done much valuable service in the cause of truth, if only by forcing the attention of sound thinkers to certain crucial points of exegesis and criticism that cannot be glossed over. But, latterly at least (though we think we are right in detecting already the signs of a coming reaction), literary criticism has run mad. Archæology, to say nothing of logic and common-sense, must have fair play. Then, and not till then, we may assume the truth of those "results of criticism," which are often, after all, but the brilliant hypotheses of a certain school of theologians who are nothing if not self-confident.

One turns with a special degree of interest to two or three articles in the present volume, notably that on "The Bible" and "The Church." The former has been entrusted to Professor Stewart, of St. Andrews, and occupies 27 columns (=13½ quarto pages). It is not quite so satisfactory as might have been expected, though useful enough if handled with discrimination; it is certainly weak in its summary of the literature and bibliography of the vast subject under review. The second article, "The Church," has been written by a brilliant young Oxford scholar, Rev. S. C. Gayford, of Exeter, and this piece of work we cordially welcome, without necessarily endorsing all the writer's conclusions. The brief but admirable article on "Church Government" is from Professor H. M. Gwatkin's accomplished pen; and Mr. Crum (to mention one more contributor) has given us a most noteworthy study of Egyptian history, etc., in his luminous dissertation upon Egypt.

There are three maps in this volume, and most excellent maps they are. We should add that the printing of the book is all that can be desired; the type small, but beautifully clear; the paper good, and the "errata" marvellously few, considering that the volume contains 900 closely-packed quarto pages.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

