

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE new session of "The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study" commences next month. We have chosen the Book of Zechariah and the first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Few of the prophets present more interesting problems than Zechariah, while the Acts of the Apostles is at once the easiest and the most difficult of all the books of the New Testament—easy to read and gather innumerable lessons from, most difficult to give a final account of.

The sole condition of membership in "The Expository Times Guild" is the promise to study one or both of the appointed portions of Scripture between the months of November and June. That promise is made by the sending of the name and address (clearly written, with degrees, etc.) to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, at Kinneff, Bervie, N.B. There is no fee, and the promise does not bind anyone who, through unforeseen circumstances, finds it impossible to carry it out.

The aim of "The Expository Times Guild" is the study, as distinguished from the mere reading, of Scripture. Some commentary is therefore recommended as a guide, though the dictionary and concordance will serve. Now there are commentaries innumerable on both the books that have been chosen for study this session.

On Zechariah there are W. H. Lowe's (Mac-

millan), at 10s. 6d., and C. H. H. Wright's Bampton Lectures (Hodder & Stoughton), 14s. Lindsay Alexander published, through Nisbet, in 1885 a good popular exposition at 6s. And then there are Dr. Stalker's papers in our own pages, and many more. We have a great liking for Orelli's work, it is so sane and so succinct. Orelli's volume on the whole of the Minor Prophets has quite recently been translated into English (10s. 6d.), and what he has to say on Zechariah is all that anyone need wish to have said; the rest one can discover for oneself. Orelli, then, and another may be confidently recommended; and the publishers (Messrs. T. & T. Clark) have kindly agreed again to send Orelli's *Minor Prophets* direct to any member of the *Expository Times Guild*, on receipt of six shillings.

The other we would recommend is Professor Dods' little book. It covers the three last prophets, and costs but half a crown, but it is very valuable. In our thinking Dr. Dods has never done anything equal to it, and we should not be surprised if Dr. Dods himself is of the same opinion, for he must know what it cost him. The introduction has all the felicity and more than all the strength of Professor Dods' best work. For nearly all of us, Professor Dods' *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi* will be enough. It is one of T. & T. Clark's "Bible Handbook" series, of which Dr. Dods himself and Dr. Alexander Whyte are the editors.

Of the Acts it is not so easy to speak. There are books in plenty; but we have not yet got at the Acts. Dr. Lumby, in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, is a serviceable, sensible volume. Professor Lindsay, in the same series as Dr. Dods' *Zechariah*, has conveniently divided his commentary into two volumes (Acts i.-xii. and xiii.-end, 1s. 6d. each), and it is both convenient and competent. Then for the student of the Greek, there is Mr. Page's edition (Macmillan, 2s. 6d.), a very able work.

But in the *Acts* one is not likely to go far wrong, as one is certain not to go altogether right. Try Meyer for a big book. There are two volumes (published at 21s., which the publishers will send for 12s.). Meyer is often perverse, but the reasons he gives for his perversity show you the right way to take; and he is often most suggestively right.

As the study of these portions of Scripture advances, short expository papers may be sent to the Editor. The best of them will be published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and the writers, seeing them there, may send to the publishers for the work they select out of a list which will be given.

If there are any students of the Bible engaged on any other portion than those chosen for study in the Guild this session, on sending their names to the Editor, they will be enrolled as honorary members.

Mr. Benjamin Kidd's *Social Evolution* has been in the hands of the reviewers for four months now, and they have had much to say about it. Yet it does not appear that any of them has been able seriously to damage its surprising argument. Lord Farrer, in *The Contemporary Review*, makes a point when he speaks of its literary and editorial defects, but he scarcely makes another. And even they of whom it demands so much, even the materialistic Darwinians, seem unable to avoid the blow, or to break the force of its unwelcome conclusion.

For Mr. Kidd begins as a Darwinian, and remains, if not a Darwinian, certainly an evolutionist to the end. He makes no other assumption at starting than this, that man, like every other animal, tends to multiply beyond the limits which the average conditions of life comfortably provide for. Then comes the struggle for existence. As the struggle proceeds, the unfit drop out, only the fit survive. And it is in the survival of the fittest from generation to generation that social progress is made. In other words, the difference between the Australian aborigine, who cannot count beyond three, and, say, the Chancellor of the British Exchequer, is due to the struggle that the Chancellor's ancestors have had in all their generations,—a struggle for existence you observe, with the inevitable result that in every generation a vast number have lost in the struggle and dropped out of it, and only the fittest have survived, to pass their fitness on. The aborigines of Australia have not had that struggle; they have shirked it, in fact; and so they cannot count above three; and by and by there will not be three of them to count.

Mr. Kidd starts with that. And who is there to object to it? Not the Darwinian, for thus far it is Darwinism pure and simple. Nor the unbeliever in Darwin. For it is no matter of speculation. No demand is made for problematical millions of ages to work upon. It is not even the physical ascent of man from the ancestor of the ape. Mr. Kidd starts with the man when he is already man and is making his mark on history. Darwinian or anti-Darwinian, you cannot object, and you need not. But you can object, and you will, in the name of him who is just dropping out of the struggle at your side, in the name of the unfit and the perishing.

It may be observed that in most recent discussion of evolution the interest has rested, not on the fittest who survive; but on the unfit who perish. If it were lawful to express Darwinism in terms of the familiar adage, "It is the early bird that catches the worm," it will be seen that our chief concern is

for the worm. Mr. Kidd's whole book is written to give us reasons for that. Let only the fact of it be noted at present. We are told that social progress is possible only by the constant survival of the fittest, the constant sacrifice of the many that are unfit. We are not concerned about the fittest. Their prosperity does not interest us. We would know if nothing can be done for the unfit.

Mr. Kidd says nothing can be done. Reproduction beyond the limits of comfort, the consequent struggle, the survival of the fit, and the perishing of the unfit—these are the conditions of social progress, and there is no escape. He even goes so far as to form this startling proposition—and prove it good—printing it in italics, as we shall do after him: that, *if all the individuals of every generation in any species were allowed to equally propagate their kind, the average of each generation would continually tend to fall below the average of the generations which preceded it, and a process of slow but steady degeneration would ensue.* There is no escape. And have we not ourselves recognised it long ago? We pity the perishing. They never were pitied as they are pitied now. But even as we pity them, suddenly we recognise that we also are of the great army which no man can number, and we take our place without reproach.

They stand around me, gaunt and pale and gray,
Those old-world warriors, battle-stained and worn,
With bloodless hands in countless combats torn,
And faces marred in life's unending fray;
“Dear brother, welcome home!” they seem to say.
“We watched around thee on thy cradled morn,
Smiled at thy griefs, and knew thy joys forlorn,
Counting each milestone on thy hopeless way.

Have *we* not fought and failed? We thought, like thee,
To tear life's secret from its deep-set home,
To save fresh souls from sorrow's martyrdom,
And turn this rugged earth to revelry.
We too have fought and failed. In solemn glee
We claim thy kindred soul—Come, brother, come!”

We take our place without reproach, because we have learned to pity others. We pity and we pass, scarce knowing that our place is there. But what

will they do who have not learned to pity, and have not learned to bear? If they were of the brutes that perish, they could not help themselves. But being men, they are endowed with reason. And as they exercise their reason they discover—well, they discover that it is *against* reason that they, however unfit, should pine and perish that the fit may prosper and enjoy long life. As they exercise their reason they perceive that however essential to the progress of the race their sacrifice may be, it is against their own individual interest, and they refuse to make the sacrifice. They emigrate from that locality in which they are too numerous to live in comfort, or they voluntarily limit the number of their offspring, as they do in France to-day. Now, they say, we can *all* live comfortably here. Let us eat and drink, and at least not die to-day.

And it seems so reasonable. It is reasonable. It is exactly what reason demands. But it will not do. This is the great lesson which history reads to us now—that the family or the nation which said “Let us live and let live” was swept off the face of the earth. Great moving passages of Scripture come crowding in upon our ears. “He that saveth his life shall lose it”; “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone”; and the like. But we do not need them yet. This lesson history herself can read us (and she reads it with exceeding plainness): Remit the struggle for existence, and first stagnation, then degeneration, and there is no power on earth that can keep that nation or that family alive.

Now this is the central thought of *Social Evolution*. Men are not as the beasts that perish. They will not struggle helplessly on for existence. They have reason. And reason tells them that that struggle is suicidal, that “there can be only one duty in the individual, namely, his duty to himself, to make the most of his few precious years of consciousness. Every other consideration must appear dwarfed and ridiculous in comparison. Every pain avoided, every pleasure gained in these few years, is a consideration, beside which the in-

tellec must count any aspiration to further a process of cosmic evolution, in which the individual has no interest, as mere dust in the balance." But such is the law of life for man, that, if he acts according to reason, he will soon be lower than the beasts that perish, and perish more miserably than they. Something in the man must rise up against reason, and persuade him to lose his life in order that the race may find it.

But first you think to force him from without. That way has been tried. Slavery was a gigantic effort to get man to deny himself for the progress of the race. But it was a scientific failure. It turned the law of life upside down. They who struggled and grew fit to live were only the slaves. The masters, relieved of the struggle of life, became the unfit. The fittest, being slaves, suffered and perished as though they were the unfit; the unfit, because they were masters, lived on, and perpetuated their unfitness—for a time.

Then patriotism was tried, and that was more successful. For it was partly of the man himself, a string that could be struck to some kind of virtue within, in many cases an actual uplifting self-denying power of marvellous moment. "England expects every man to do his duty." And these men heard the words, and though they knew that their duty mainly was to stand and die, they did it with a shout of gladness. But patriotism is mostly failing us now. It never was successful in a time of peace. We must have something that reaches farther, and that touches deeper than even that. And we have it in Religion.

Now, to appreciate the emphasis of the introduction of religion here, it must be borne in mind that Mr. Kidd is a Darwinian evolutionist, that his work is scientific, not theological, and that he introduces religion here simply because he cannot help it. The science is Social Science. It is scarcely out of its cradle yet. Nevertheless, this one law seems established beyond all probability of question, that social progress is by struggle and

survival, struggle and death. Now we know that men will not perish of their own natural inclination. "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life." Something must be borne in upon him that will induce him to act contrary to his natural reason. That something, says Mr. Kidd, is religion. It is older than slavery and patriotism, and it has had a wider reach. These two, indeed,—Reason which says, "I will not die for others"; and Religion which says, "You will,"—are scientific agencies that are as ancient and as far-travelled as man.

It follows, then, unless this man is yet to be found guilty of some extraordinary scientific blundering, that religion is as *scientific* as any other fact in nature. No doubt it is not found in nature. The very point is that it is begotten from above, or, in Mr. Kidd's phrase, is super-rational. But it is needed in nature. The phenomena of social science are inexplicable without it. Social science is not a science, nor even an entity, without it. For it is as finding and formulating the great law of progress that it claims to rank as science, and there *is* no progress without religion.

It follows further that the religion which social science demands is not any religion you please, but that religion which is most successful in inducing the individual to subordinate his own interests to those of the social organism around him. Mr. Kidd points out as he passes along, that this is the one certain mark of a religion. Reason says, "Do this, and it shall be well with thee." Religion steps in and says, "In the name of God do this other instead, and it shall be well with thy neighbour." And he seems to think that, in this sense, religion is found in every race on the face of the earth. But it is manifest that *any* religion, even if it be genuine, will only do for a time. That religion which supplies the strongest ultra-rational sanction for a man's conduct will win in the race of religions, and drive all others to the wall. And he has no hesitation in saying that that religion is Christianity.

And thus it follows, finally, that the most unfortunate name that ever a lover of science and of Darwin chose for himself is the popular name of Agnostic.

To the *United Presbyterian Magazine* for September, the Rev. D. R. Alexander, B.D., contributes some pleasant recollections of the late Professor Dillmann. He speaks of his personal appearance—"the broad brow, the piercing eyes, the snowy-white hair, the large right hand supporting a massive head." And then of his work: "One marked feature of all his work was its thoroughness. A spirit of earnestness pervaded his life. His two chief courses of lectures were on Introduction to, and Theology of, the Old Testament. In the former, the literature was treated according to periods of history. In the latter, the aim was to show how the Old Testament was a preparation for the New. The last day I went to see him I expressed the pleasure and profit which I had gathered from his lectures. 'I hope,' he remarked, 'you have found them helpful, not only for criticism, but also for life.'"

In a note in the *Academy*, Professor Sayce seems partly to settle and partly to unsettle an old geographical difficulty. In the Book of Joshua it is told how Othniel the son of Kenaz risked his life in the capture of a city called Debir, all for love of Achsah the daughter of Caleb. And the historian, both here (Joshua xv. 15) and in the exact repetition in Judges (i. 11), remarks in passing that the name of Debir before was Kirjath Sepher.

Now it has been difficult to explain Debir, more difficult to explain Kirjath Sepher, and most difficult of all to identify the place which had these two names in succession. As to the identification, it was long ago suggested that the modern Dhâheriyeh, south-west of Hebron, was the place, and it has even been accepted by Major Conder, and printed in the Society's semi-official list. But that is the part which Professor Sayce

unsettles. "The little information given as to the site of the city in the Old Testament seems to exclude its identification with Dhâheriyeh, where, moreover, Professor Petrie found no remains of early date." That is all he says. And he seems to send out Kirjath Sepher once more to seek a resting-place.

But the meaning of the names he helps to settle. Debir, no doubt, means hinder part or back; but of what? The old conjecture, made first by the fertile mind of Ewald, was that it meant the back of the hill, the southern slope, and that the Israelites, wishing to change the old name, Kirjath Sepher, into something, followed the custom of our own ancestors, who named the place from the lie of the land, and sometimes called it Sunnyside, and sometimes Cauldham. But that derivation has been given up in favour of the hinder part, that is, the *sanctuary* of a temple. And Professor Sayce thinks that "Sanctuary," as in 1 Kings vi. 5, is much more likely than "Hill-slope."

But more ancient and more attractive is the name Kirjath Sepher, and it is about it that Professor Sayce has something new to say. As it stands in the Hebrew the word means "City of Book." The LXX. have slightly altered it into "City of Letters" (*πόλις γραμμάτων*). And Professor Sayce emphatically holds that they have thereby given a more correct rendering than "Moore and his German followers," who changed *sepher* "book" into *sephâr* "border," in order to get rid of the reference to the use of writing in pre-Mosaic Canaan. Nevertheless, the proper form of the word is not any of these, and its meaning neither "Book-City" nor "Border-City," but "City of Scribes."

Dr. W. Max Müller has discovered that the writer of the Egyptian papyrus called "The Travels of a Mohar," which belongs to the age of the Israelitish Exodus, associates together two towns in Southern Palestine, which he calls Kirjath-eneb and Beth-Thupar. Now Dr. W. Max Müller

believes, and Professor Sayce agrees, that this Egyptian writer has transposed the two terms Kirjath and Beth. As in the Bible, Kirjath belongs to Thupar, and Beth to Eneb, giving Kirjath-Thupar and Beth-eneb. But Thupar is not Sepher "book," but Sopher "scribe." "It turns out, therefore," concludes Professor Sayce, "that the Masoretic and Septuagint texts, though perfectly correct in the view they take of the general meaning of the name of the ancient city, have punctuated it wrongly; and that, instead of Kirjath-Sepher, or 'Book-town,' we ought to read Kirjath-Sopher, or 'Town of Scribes.'"

Mr. Elliot Stock has recently published a small book on the Lord's Supper which deserves attention. It is as revolutionary as was Professor Gardner's pamphlet on the same subject. But while the latter commanded notice from the eminence of its author, and was found quite unworthy of the notice it commanded, this little book is practically anonymous. Its title-page tells us it has been written by "William Robson"; it would have been equally enlightening if it had said "John Smith." Its claim upon our attention is itself.

It opens somewhat abruptly by asking us to consider what St. Paul meant by "the body of Christ." The passage set before us is 1 Cor. x. 16, "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" What did St. Paul mean by "the body of Christ" here? We are assured that there can be no doubt about his meaning, since he uses the phrase in four of the greatest Epistles he wrote, and in every Epistle in which he uses it he specially and fully defines its meaning. In the Epistle to the Romans he writes: "Even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office, so we, the many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another" (xii. 4, 5). In 1 Corinthians, "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?" (vi. 15); and after repeating the thought through-

out the twelfth chapter, he ends by the clear statement, "Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (xii. 27). Of the Epistle to the Ephesians this is the central idea, and occurs continually. Take the end of the great exaltation passage in the first chapter, "and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Finally, in the Epistle to the Colossians, "He is before all things, and in Him all things are held together, and He who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, is the Head of the Body, the Church, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence" (i. 16-18).

In all these places, then, by "the body of Christ" St. Paul means the Church. And there are no places in his writings where the phrase means anything else. If he has occasion to speak of the natural body of the Lord before His death, or of His glorified body after the ascension, he speaks of the one as "the body of His flesh" (Col. i. 22); and of the other as "the body of His glory" (Phil. iii. 21). The Lord's Body in St. Paul's mind is the gathered company of the Faithful, the Church, and never anything else.

That is therefore the apostle's meaning also, our author holds, in 1 Cor. x. 16, "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" He enters upon a discussion of the sense in which *Koinonia*, translated "communion" here, is to be understood. We need not follow him into that, since he finds no other than the well-received sense of common participation, such common participation in the meal being a bond of union among the members. It is enough that that sense admirably suits the meaning which he gives to the words "the body of Christ," whereby he gets, as the meaning of the whole sentence: "The bread which we break, is it not a bond of the union of the Church?"—is it not the symbol of our Christian fellowship and brother-

hood, of our being members of the Church, and so of our belonging to Christ, and of our oneness with Christ our Head?

That translation is probably revolutionary enough to demand all the arguments which our author gathers before he gives it. But it is not for that he has gathered them. That is but a step towards a far bolder and, it must be confessed, far more arduous undertaking. The real purpose of his little book is to show that this and no other is the apostle's meaning in the grand passage, 1 Cor. xi. 22, 23—that there also, when the apostle repeats the words which he says he received of the Lord, "This is My body, which is for you," by the "body" he understood the Church, as he understood it everywhere else.

And first he seeks to show that there are insurmountable difficulties in the way of the common interpretation. To what does the word "this" refer—"This is My body, which is for you"? It must refer to something that is not verbally expressed. It must have been something present and visible, and which the apostles could at once comprehend. There seem to be but two things with which it can be connected, either the bread which had been broken, or the company around the table, amongst whom the bread had been broken. Now a little consideration, our author believes, will show that the word "this" could not have been used of the bread after it had been broken amongst the disciples, could not have been applied to a divided and distributed loaf. And the grammar is against it in another way. "This" is neuter in the Greek, "bread" is masculine. "*This bread* is My body" is an impossible combination. Grammarians speak of the attraction of the neuter substantive "body," but that is the last resort of helplessness. On the other hand, a *complex* idea, such as a union of persons engaged in a common employment or sitting together at a common meal, properly and uniformly requires a neuter pronoun to express it.

Taking these difficulties, then, on the one hand, and the invariable usage of St. Paul on the other, our author believes that St. Paul understood the words, "This is My body, which is for you," to mean—This social union of breaking bread together to call Me to mind is My body, for you to become or constitute. The Church socially uniting in the act of eating the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ. And he asks, "What doubt can there be, that if the apostle's words had been discovered now for the first time, and that the doctrine of Transubstantiation had not held the ground, no other meaning of the words would have been dreamed of than that given by the apostle?"

Professor Davidson's articles on the theology of the first half of the Book of Isaiah come to an end in the present issue. After an interval he will take up the second half in the same way. Meantime the series will be continued, and it gives us great pleasure to be able to say that the next book dealt with will be the Epistle to the Romans, and that the writer will be the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Mr. Headlam and Professor Sanday have been working together for some time on this Epistle, and these articles, probably six in number, will represent Dr. Sanday's position as well as Mr. Headlam's own.

Dr. Stalker and Mr. Woods will continue their papers till the series is in each case complete. It is pleasant to see that the scholarship underlying both these series has been recognised. Dr. Stalker's, in particular, run the risk of being taken for ordinary pulpit discourses; but scholars have discovered the work that lies beneath their smooth surface.

Miss Woods has still one article to send on "In Memoriam." (It may be well to satisfy certain "anxious inquirers" at once, and say, Yes, she *is* Mr. F. H. Woods' sister. She is also the editor of one of the finest series of Books of Poetry ever Macmillan or any other publisher issued, and, moreover, she is the editor of *The Briar Rose*, a

quarterly of limited range, but very fine quality.) Then Miss Eleanor F. Jourdain will contribute three papers on Dante. Their title will tell their point of view. We hope we have Dante students to appreciate them.

Mr. St. Chad Boscawen has given us only one of his promised articles on "Some difficult Passages in the Old Testament lit up by the Monuments." But another is on the way, and we believe the rest will come. But our interest in this growing subject has led us to seek further afield. Mr. Pinches ought to have been in evidence much more than he has been. Now we hear from him again, and hope to receive from time to time the fruits of the latest decipherment. And Professors Sayce and Flinders Petrie will keep us in touch with the freshest discoveries in their several fields.

Dr. Elder Cumming has been giving much consideration to the unsettled question of our Lord's attitude towards the Old Testament. He will contribute a short series of papers on the subject. We shall also have a short series from the venerable Principal Brown on "Certain Passages I am not satisfied with in the Revised Version."

A writer who, for excellent reasons, signs himself M. D., will write notes on "Twenty Misused Scripture Texts," bringing out some unexpected things. Then there will be many separate papers which we must not begin to mention. For we must close with a word on the "Leading Theologians."

Seven "Leading Theologians" have appeared during the year—Edward Caird, Andrew Martin Fairbairn, Benjamin Jowett, William Milligan, Albrecht Ritschl, William Robertson Smith, and Alexander Vinet. Others, as the publishers say, are ready, some are in the press, and some in preparation. The next will probably be Adolf Harnack, by an attached pupil, the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A. Then we have Pfeleiderer to come by Principal Stewart; Dillmann, by Principal Davies, and probably others; the three great Cambridge scholars, Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort, each by a capable writer—Professor Salmond, Professor Ryle, and the Deah of Emmanuel; Herrmann, by the Rev. David Eaton, and Kuyper, by the Rev. J. P. Lilley; Professor Kennedy will write on König; and one of the earliest will be Cheyne, by Professor Peake; and Mr. Gwilliam has promised a special study of the late Dean Burgon.

All these have been announced already, except Harnack. To whom we must add the late James Morison, by a pupil, who thinks he will have a freer hand if his name is not given. And as opportunity serves we shall engage for more. There are many great names unmentioned yet—Davidson and Sanday and Driver and Dale and Flint and Robertson and others. These also, we hope, will come. And, in order to make the studies more complete, we intend to offer in future as full and accurate a bibliography for each author as can be procured.