

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first part of Professor Sayce's new Archæological Commentary on the Book of Genesis, which is to be written for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, will appear in our next issue. The same issue will contain the portrait and an account of the influence and work of a distinguished Oxford scholar. It will also contain the first of Professor Davison's papers on the Theology of the Book of Psalms.

---

Professor Mahaffy of Dublin has contributed an article to a recent issue of the *Sunday School Times* on 'Turning the other Cheek.' The well-known verse, 'Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also' (Matt. v. 39), offers, he says, a certain obstacle to our genuine acceptance of Christianity. And he thinks that if Christian people would examine themselves they would see that they do not accept such precepts as that, and the like of it, literally, but have some device which rids them of the obligation.

---

One device is to regard such precepts as the expression of a complete rule of conduct, but *in an exaggerated form*. Aristotle says that in moral exhortations men should be urged towards the extreme that they dislike, in order to produce the happy mean. We are like crooked sticks. Our bent is all in one direction. And just as you bend your stick far in the opposite direction in order to

make it straight, so Jesus would urge us as far as possible away from the extreme into which we are prone to fall, by setting before us the other extreme, and urging us to seek to attain it. We shall not attain it. We do not need to attain it. But the effort will leave us at the golden mean where Christ would have us be.

---

Another device is to regard these precepts as not expressing a complete rule of conduct. There are times when it is right to turn the other cheek; there are other times, however, when it is cowardly or criminal. Jesus set before men an ideal of humility and charity that has wrought wonders in the world. But, says a modern philosopher, 'much thought of some years ago,' J. S. Mill, He failed to inculcate manliness and that courage which was so amply developed by the laws of mediæval chivalry. The Christian ideal is therefore right in itself, and not even an exaggeration; but it is incomplete: it must be supplemented by an equally emphatic statement of the warlike ideal which resents injury.

---

But Professor Mahaffy will have none of these devices. He who adopts the first is ignorant of Christ; he who follows the second is ignorant of Christianity. If we admit, however tacit and timid our admission be, that our Lord sometimes exaggerated and must be corrected by our common

sense, then He is no longer our Lord, but a fallible human teacher. If, on the other hand, we say that meekness must be supplemented by resentment, we miss the one grand feature of early Christianity. For in the history of the early Church the one thing that stands out above all other things, and needs no correction or apology, is the extraordinary heroism which was shown in the face of death and torture, not only by men, but by feeble women and tender children. It amazed the heathen magistrates, who were striving after fortitude by the aid of philosophy. It amazed the wild savages, who mistook gentleness for cowardice, when they found that it was harder to terrify the missionary who came with the gospel than the invader who came in battle array.

So, then, these two things are established: firstly, our Lord said what He meant, and meant what He said, literally and strictly; and secondly, our Lord's precepts are compatible with the greatest courage, the noblest heroism. Still there is a difficulty. How is the Christian to maintain his dignity and his manliness under circumstances which would lead the ordinary man into meanness and self-contempt? By the ordinary view of the world, it is mean to swallow insults; it is unmanly to acquiesce in tyranny. How can the Christian afford to do what the world thus looks down upon?

He can afford it, says Professor Mahaffy, because of his superiority to the world. He can afford to seem undignified, because he has so great a dignity. He can afford to be counted mean, because he is so noble. When a child strikes you, do you immediately resent the attack and return the blow? If a woman attacks a man by night in the streets of one of our cities and insults him in violation of all the laws of social decency, is he a coward that he does not return the insult? Is he a coward even if he seeks escape in flight? Again, is it not bravery that makes the wife of the drunkard ready and even anxious to receive his blows and listen to his foul words, if by so doing she may screen him from

public derision or deliver him from the grasp of the law? And in every case is it not superiority that makes such conduct possible? Is it not the parent's superiority to the child, the man's superiority to the degraded woman, the wife's superiority to her drunken husband? They do not fear the contempt of the onlooker; because there is no doubt of the motive, there is no hesitation where the greatness lies.

This is the position of the Christian. He does not need to resent an insult. He can afford to pass an injury by. It is his superiority to the world and the men of the world that gives him this privilege. He is nobler, and therefore he does not fear to seem less noble.

But is this not to flee one vice and fall into another? If the Christian feels so great a superiority to the men of the world that he can despise their judgment, is there not the danger that he will swell with self-importance? Practising humility, will he not cover himself with pride as with a garment? No, there is no danger. For the dignity of the Christian is not personal dignity. It is the dignity of his Master. He himself has renounced self-importance. It is thus that he is a Christian. There is no other way of becoming a follower of Christ, and no other way of continuing to follow Christ, except by denying self with all its importance and taking up the cross every day.

In the November issue of the *Arena*, there is an article by the Rev. W. E. Manley, D.D., on the word Hell. Its complete title is, 'Hell no Part of Divine Revelation.' Dr. Manley writes as a believer in the Word of God contained in the Old Testament and in the New. He incidently mentions and expressly accepts our Lord's resurrection from the dead. But he says that 'there is no term in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures which has the meaning of the English word hell.'

Dr. Manley writes in earnest. He has reason to be earnest. For this doctrine, he tells us, was once the occasion of much unhappiness to himself, casting a blight over the best years of his youth, unfitting him for both study and work, and seriously threatening life. And worse than that, 'in our childhood a beloved mother was brought to the grave in the most shocking manner by her faith in this dreadful doctrine.' Then he tells the story, which we shall certainly not repeat after him; and he adds, 'These things occurred nearly seventy years ago; but they are as fresh in our memory as if they were of recent date. They have furnished us a strong motive to make all possible effort to remove from the Church and the world the cause of this misery.'

Now Dr. Manley has found no way of accomplishing this object so successful as the way he adopts in this article. He tracks the word hell through the whole Bible. That is to say, he takes the English versions, and wherever the word occurs in them, he turns to the original, discovers what its actual meaning is, and sets that down. And when he has followed every instance out, he comes to this conclusion, that 'there is no term in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures which has the meaning of the English word hell.'

Four words are so translated in our versions. One is Hebrew, and occurs in the Old Testament. It is Sheol. The others are Greek, and occur in the New. They are Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna. Sheol is found in the Old Testament sixty-five times. In the Authorized Version it is rendered thirty-one times *hell*, thirty-one times *grave*, and three times *pit*. In the Revised Version it is only fifteen times rendered *hell*, only fifteen times *grave*, and five times *pit*; while thirty times it is left untranslated—the Hebrew word Sheol being transferred to the English pages. The Revisers admit, says Dr. Manley, that the word does not mean hell. They hold that it means a place of departed spirits, both good and

bad. They ought therefore, he contends, to have left it untranslated always, since they could not properly render it either hell or grave. He himself believes that in every instance it ought to have been simply rendered *grave*.

For he says that in every instance of its occurrence Sheol is simply the grave. It is not a particular grave or burial-place. For that there is another Hebrew word in use. It is the grave or place of the dead in general, quite the sense of the English word itself. The burial-place in which Jacob's remains were placed at Hebron is called *geber*; but Jacob speaks of going down to *sheol* to his son, mourning.

Whereupon Dr. Manley runs through the Old Testament and touches on every occurrence of the word. And with admirable ease, though it may be ease which is the long result of great uneasiness, he finds that every occurrence is best fitted by the meaning 'grave.' When Jacob says that he will go down to Sheol to his son Joseph, mourning, he simply means that he will die or go down to the grave. When David sang his song and said, in 2 Sam. xxii. 6, 'the sorrows of Sheol compassed me about,' he sang, says Dr. Manley, of such sorrows as bring one down to the grave. The Revisers have preferred 'cords' to 'sorrows,' which would be yet more easily accessible to Dr. Manley's interpretation. When Job answered and said (xxvi. 6),

'Sheol is naked before Him,  
And Abaddon hath no covering,'

Dr. Manley simply remarks: 'Sheol is the limit of our vision, but not of God's; the passage is obscure.' In Ps. ix. 17 we read: 'The wicked shall be turned into Sheol,' and Dr. Manley interprets for us: 'This is the way a victorious army treats its fallen enemies—it turns them into the grave.' And again he misses the more manageable rendering of the Revisers—

'The wicked shall *return* to Sheol,  
Even all the nations that forget God.'

Nor when Dr. Manley passes to the New Testament and examines the passages which speak of Hades, or Tartarus, does he find his difficulties insurmountable. He does not discuss the meaning of Gehenna in this article, leaving it for another; but it is manifest that as in every place of their occurrence Hades and Tartarus are found to mean the grave, Gehenna will also be found in every place of its occurrence to mean no more.

The only passage before which he halts for a little (he never hesitates) is the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. He says: 'The rich man was buried in Hades (Luke xvi. 22). This is the reading of the Vulgate, and, if correct, Hades has the sense of grave, like the other instances that have been quoted. At the same time, the parable is based on the heathen views of Hades, which were the same essentially as those of our late Revisers and other liberal orthodox Christians. The Jews obtained them of their Gentile neighbours. *Not a single idea of this kind* did they get from revelation. For this reason the passage has nothing to do with our subject. Our discussion is concerning the Bible usage and not the heathen. That Jesus constructed a parable out of heathen ideas, then held by the Jews, or at least some of them, is no proof of the truth of those ideas, nor that He meant to give them His approval. Parables are employed to illustrate and enforce truth; but they need not themselves be true. Parables are made of fiction as well as of fact. A parable is generally made up for the occasion. The character of the parable of Dives and Lazarus does not permit us to use it as proof of future rewards and punishments; for these constitute the parable itself. Such a parable must represent something else—something having a resemblance to the parable, to be sure, but never the same. The context must show what the parable really means.'

Such is Dr. Manley's way with the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. These are his own

words, italics and all. Are we able to follow him? Well, there is no doubt that what he says of parables in general is true and very well said. It is also at least possible that he is right when he holds that Jesus could use, and in this instance did use, the current conception of His hearers as the machinery of His parable, without Himself accepting them. But none of these things so much as touches the matter in hand. For it is Dr. Manley's desire to prove that when the grave closes over the wicked, their sins and their sorrows are at an end together. But if this parable has any meaning at all, it surely means that death does not end all, but in the world to come there is retribution: 'Now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.'

It seems to be so at least. No doubt it may be argued, and we are quite ready to hear it argued, that Jesus might use the whole scenery of a world to come as the mere instruments of His parable, His sole purpose being to persuade His hearers to live a right life here. We are willing to have it argued so. But how can we allow the argument to be confined to this single instance? If it is possible that Jesus meant no more than that on this occasion, and all the rest was imagery, it is not possible that when He said on another occasion, 'These shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,' He meant that their punishment would come to an end at the grave.

And so we are driven to ask, first, if Dr. Manley has gained much advantage when he has proved that hell is no part of divine revelation. He evidently thinks he has. When he himself discerned that hell was not in all the Bible, he had no more trouble, he says. 'Since that time not a doubt on this subject has obtruded itself on our mind for a single moment.' And he knows no way of persuading people to surrender the 'unsavoury dogma of endless woe' so successful as the delivery of a course of lectures on the word hell, tracking the word through the whole Bible. But

when he has delivered his course of lectures, and when he has traced the word to its last hiding-place, what a vast territory remains untravelled still. And not only is there a vast territory of promise and fulfilment, there are also strongholds in it that have not yet been touched, one strong tower especially which has not even been seen from far. It is not the hope of any prophet or saint of the Old Testament; it is not the reasoning of any apostle of the New; it is not even the words of the Lord Jesus Christ; it is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Though Dr. Manley has proved that the word hell is no part of divine revelation, what of that when Jesus Christ remains, — Jesus Christ, who came from God and went to God, that He might be the *Judge both of the living and of the dead?*

But we are driven, in the second place, to ask if Dr. Manley has proved that hell is no part of divine revelation. And in order to do that, we turn inevitably now to the greatest book we have had for many a day on this great doctrine of Immortality. Now in Professor Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, at the 199th page, we read with utmost clearness that 'Sheol denotes a definite realm of the dead, and is not identical with the grave.' And when we have read beyond that page, and on to the end of Professor Salmond's faithful investigation, we are able to see that Dr. Manley is not only wrong, but that he has missed the very lesson which Christ came to impress us with, that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

In the last issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES some Notes were given of Professor Sayce's recent utterances, the one a speech, the other a magazine article, on the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. To these utterances Canon Driver has made reply in the *Guardian*. Now Canon Driver is master of an English style that is not one whit less forcible than Professor Sayce's own, for it makes up in dignity what it lacks in colour. It is a style,

moreover, that is peculiarly effective in controversy. It never misses an opportunity, but it never presses an advantage. Every word lends its influence to the reserve and sweet reasonableness which make its greatest charm. The reader may begin in bitter hostility; before he ends he is at least charmed into neutrality, if not won wholly over.

The opening sentences of Canon Driver's reply are these: 'The statements to which Professor Sayce has recently committed himself in his article in the *Contemporary Review* for October, and in the paper read by him at the Church Congress—of which the latter may be described as a shorter recension of the former—contains so much that is exaggerated and inaccurate, and are so calculated to misinform rather than to enlighten the reader on the subject with which he deals, that, though I would gladly have remained silent, the interests of truth compel me to come forward and contradict them. The task, I need hardly say, is no grateful one; personally, I recognise ungrudgingly the high merits of Professor Sayce as an Assyriologist; I admire cordially the zeal and disinterestedness with which he has devoted himself to archæological research; but when, in order to promote the interests of one study, he adopts the strange expedient of gravely misrepresenting another, I feel, however regretfully, that the time has arrived for a protest to be made, and the truth to be distinctly stated.'

The first statement by Professor Sayce which Dr. Driver then approaches, is the statement that the critical analysis of the Pentateuch rests in large measure upon the assumption that writing was practically unknown to the Israelites in the age of Moses. To this Dr. Driver gives a courteous negative. 'It is totally untrue.' The age of Moses might have been as prolific in literature as the age of the Renaissance, and the arguments against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch would be exactly as strong as they are at present. For the critical view of the Pentateuch depends

not upon any assumption that Moses was unacquainted with the art of writing, but upon the internal evidence supplied by the Pentateuch itself, and the relation which its several parts bear to one another, and to other parts of the Old Testament.

Secondly, Professor Sayce asserts that the modern criticism of the Pentateuch is 'conducted by critics, European or American, whose training and modes of thought are utterly alien from those of the East.' Canon Driver asks whether it has not been Western scholars, and Western scholars alone, who by patient and laborious study have recovered the clues to the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and the cuneiform tablets of Babylonia and Assyria. Is our whole knowledge of these languages, and consequently our knowledge of the history and religion of those great ancient civilisations, to be reckoned of no account because the scholars who have gathered it for us are men whose 'training and modes of thought have been utterly alien from those of the East'?

Again, Professor Sayce declares that our knowledge of the Hebrew tongue is 'in the highest degree imperfect.' Really? asks Professor Driver. 'In the highest degree?' he asks, with surprise. And he emphatically adds that while such an expression might be true of our knowledge of the language of the Hittites, it is wholly inapplicable to our knowledge of Hebrew. There are isolated words and passages where the meaning is uncertain. But these are chiefly in the poetical books. 'We possess abundant materials for determining both the meaning and the varying usage of all the words commonly employed in the historical narratives, with which, all but exclusively, the critic of the Hexateuch has to deal.'

More persuasive is Professor Sayce's gibe that the analytical critic is always so 'cocksure of his analysis.' And therefore Canon Driver gives it more attention. He will not deny that critics speak with confidence when they consider that

the data permit. 'Does Professor Sayce himself never speak confidently when he tells us the meaning of a cuneiform inscription, or deduces from it historical inferences, even though the inference, to other scholars, seems precarious and arbitrary?' But when the data do not permit it, Professor Driver does not think that the critics are more confident than other men. Even Wellhausen closes his *Composition of the Hexateuch* with the remark: 'I have here frequently followed untrodden paths, and am far from imagining that I have everywhere arrived at secure results.' And, not to go farther afield, Canon Driver cites a sentence from 'the most recent critical work which has come to my hands'—the *Commentary on Judges* (in the 'International Critical Commentary'), by Professor G. F. Moore of Andover: 'These questions [respecting the structure of Judges vi.—viii.] are as yet far from a definitive solution; the attempt which is made below can claim only the character and value of a critical experiment.' And he adds: 'Professor Sayce himself could not speak more modestly were he deciphering an inscription in a hitherto unknown tongue.'

Those are the main points of Professor Sayce's attack on the literary analysis of the Hexateuch; and those are the leading sentences of Canon Driver's effective reply. Canon Driver speaks out plainly and sometimes with due emphasis, but it is difficult to say that he takes an unfair advantage. And when in the closing paragraph of this discussion he summons Professor Sayce as a witness against himself, we cannot deny him the privilege, or refuse our admiration for the use he makes of it. For he is able to make Professor Sayce tell us that as late as May 1894, in the third 'revised' edition of his *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, he held the very opinions which he now condemns. 'One of the most assured results,' he said then, 'of the literary analysis of the Old Testament records has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch.' He also said that this fact 'is fully in accordance with the teachings of Oriental archæology.' He

proceeded to illustrate it by the composite character of certain ancient Egyptian and Babylonian texts. And his final verdict was that 'the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament has thus been justified in its literary analysis of the Books of Moses.'

From the offices of the Christian Evidence Society (13 Buckingham Street) we have received the Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of that Society. It confirms an impression which we have been lately led to form, that at the present day what may be called the professional defence of Christianity is, in our own country at least, unusually able and unusually satisfactory. The weakness of professional defence from the beginning until now has been the attempt to defend what is indefensible because it is untrue. In short, professional apologetes have often been marked by a zeal which quite outran their knowledge.

That this is greatly altered, we owe it perhaps most of all to the able books on Christian Apologetics which have recently been published. To name only the ablest of them all, the influence of Professor Bruce's *Apologetics* has been very wide and wholly healthy. One can scarcely be mistaken in tracing its tone, and even occasionally its phraseology, in some of the most exalted speeches here. For speeches were made at the annual meeting, and they are quoted either fully or at considerable length in this Report. The speakers were the Master of Trinity, Dr. R. M. Thornton, the Bishop of Grahamstown, the Rev. H. H. Pereira, the Rev. F. Relton, and Professor Redford.

Mr. Relton's speech is particularly useful. He was told 'to indicate as briefly as possible the present position with regard to Christian Evidences in this country and elsewhere,' and he

does exactly what he was told to do. He says that during the last half century two battles have been going on—the battle of the Documents and the battle of the Doctrines. Of the battle of the Documents, the greater part—for the New Testament part is the greater part—has been already won. We are now engaged in the battle of the Doctrines. And what strikes him as new and most encouraging in respect of it, is the fact that it is being conducted on both sides by men who are not antagonistic to, but who are in deep sympathy with, the spirit and the idea of the Christian life and Christian truth.

But what does Mr. Relton mean by the battle of the Doctrines? We shall see that in a moment. 'The result of the battle of the Doctrines, as I take it, is given to us in the writings of three men in particular,—I select continental writers by preference,—Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology*, Lobstein on the *Pre-Existence of Christ*, and Sabatier on *St. Paul's Epistles*.' Now, these men belong to a new school. They are in sympathy with the supernatural, they are studying the New Testament according to the scientific method of investigating facts, and seeing to what conclusions the facts lead them. And what is the result of their work? They admit the doctrines of the Resurrection, the Atonement, the Ascension of our Lord, the Session in Glory, and His mediatorial work; they admit the doctrine of the Second Advent; and Beyschlag admits what he calls the economic Trinity, the Trinity of Revelation, not the Trinity of Essence. They fall short only in one point. And now, says Mr. Relton, the battle we have to fight—the point about which controversy is still raging, and will rage for some time to come, the central point which will have to be dealt with very cautiously and very tenderly—is the doctrine of the Pre-Existence of our Lord implied in the Incarnation.

## Friedrich Loofs.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. F. SLATER, M.A., DIDSBURY.

DR. SANDAY has taken as the subject of his first lectures, as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, at Oxford, 'Recent Researches into the Origin of the Apostles' Creed.' We need not remind our readers of the recent German investigation upon this subject, nor of [the widespread controversy which it has occasioned. While acknowledging the value of English work in this sphere,—particularly in the writings of Heurtley, Swainson, Swete, and Lumby,—Dr. Sanday intimates that 'the Germans have brought him nearest to the origin of the Creed.' The labours of Caspari, Hahn, Harnack, and Zahn in this department of inquiry are well known. If these learned and zealous explorers differ somewhat in their results, they agree to trace the beginnings of the most ancient symbol of the Church to apostolic days. Among his authorities, however, the Lady Margaret Professor declares Loofs to be 'the most attractive theologian in Germany'; and that 'if any one is likely to speak the last word on the origin of the Creed, it is Loofs.' As this name has not yet become widely known in the theological world, the readers of this journal may be interested in some account of his works.

Herr D. Friedrich Loofs is Professor of Church History in the University of Halle. It is gratifying to find that this venerable school of sacred learning has a teacher so well equipped with patristic and current theology, and yet thoroughly in sympathy with the best critical ideas. Perhaps we ought not to be surprised that this ancient fountain of Pietism can yet supply inspiration to minds saturated with the modern, scientific spirit, as is that of Professor Loofs.

His latest publication consists of three sermons on the Creed, preached before his university.<sup>1</sup> The first discourse begins with the remark that one half of the Sundays in the year are, in the Church calendar, called 'Trinity-Sundays.' Trinitarian doctrine was once very prominent in Church teaching, but has recently fallen into the background.

<sup>1</sup> 'Das Apostolikum in drei, am 1, 3, und 5 Trinitatis-sonntag 1895, im akademischen Gottesdienste zu Halle gehalten Predigten, ausgelegt von D. Friedrich Loofs, ordentlichen Professor der Kirchengeschichte am der Universität Halle.' Halle: M. Niemander, 1895.

Yet, we must either renounce the formulas, or more carefully study their significance. Are we not still baptized into 'the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost'? He goes on to show that the articles of the Creed are organically connected. If the first article asserts our trust in God as our Father, it yet refers to the later portions which exhibit the work of the Son and the Spirit. Further, he is careful to point out that faith is not a merely intellectual operation, but a spiritual experience. The child does not need a philosophic interpretation of his relation to his parent before he can trust him. 'Trust, that yields itself wholly to the hand of God, that knows itself safe as a child on his father's breast—trust, that suffers itself to be led, blind, without self-choosing, that is Faith.' 'I believe' is the first article of the Christian faith, and indeed its sum.

The connexion between the first article of the Creed and the second is found in the conditions of humanity. Can man thus 'trust' in God? Can he, when tragic sorrow is upon him, trust in God as a loving Father? Can he, when truly convinced of sin, confide in a holy Being? Surely, the work of the Son and the grace of the Spirit here become a necessity. The articles of the Creed can not be taken in complete isolation. 'True faith has neither pieces nor parts;' it is a complete whole. The first article is not enough by itself, as some think; it needs the contents of the second and third parts to make a full account of Christian faith.

In the second sermon Professor Loofs refers to Luther's explanation of Christian faith in God. The great Reformer exhibits the relation of the faith that 'Jesus Christ is my Lord, who has redeemed me, a lost and condemned man,' with that in God as the Creator and Preserver of all. Melancthon said that the first articles both looked to the last, which contains the clause: 'the forgiveness of sins.' But the faith of the majority of Christians cannot rest on critical grounds. They may not be able to give to all the items of the Creed the exact significance of theological science. There are portions of the Creed itself which are not original or fundamental. Such



clauses as 'Maker of heaven and earth,' and 'He descended into hell' were added to meet transitory conceptions in the minds of an early generation of Christians. 'That cannot be fundamental which may not be made clear to all Christians, old and young; it can not be fundamental, which perhaps a Paul and John did not know' (p. 21).<sup>1</sup> If a man believes in God as his Father and in Christ as his Redeemer, he has the root of faith from which the rest will grow. He may not understand 'eternal sonship,' and yet have faith in the Redeemer. 'All formulas which pass over the sphere of our experience are metaphorical, imperfect, and controversial' (p. 23). Yet, no Christian faith can be sufficient which does not believe in Christ as revealing to us the living God, and as the Conqueror of death.

It will be seen that the preacher emphasises the subjective side of Christian faith. The personal experience of sin and salvation is more to him than the elaboration of the most venerable or critical doctrine. We may all be glad that German defenders of the faith are learning more to rely upon the evidential value of Christian experience. The doubts raised by historical and literary criticism may be too subtle to be removed by immediate refutation on the same lines; but the appeal to the consciousness of faith is always irresistible. Professor Loofs uses it with so much appreciation that we can understand Dr. Sanday when he speaks of him as 'an attractive theologian.' He has evidently drunk deeply at the best sources of the theology of the Reformation, and can express himself with the truest spiritual power and pathos. Rationalism may withstand logic and history, but is powerless before such a testimony as the following:—'When I feel the power which goes out from the words, "Thy sins are forgiven thee"; when I know that His word, "I have overcome the world," is true, notwithstanding Golgotha, then I can understand and believe the Easter-tidings, and I bow the knee, with Thomas, before Him who has risen, and say, "My Lord and my God"' (p. 24).

In the third sermon on the Holy Spirit there is much that is interesting, and some statements which might be criticised. He allows that the

Spirit works in the 'Holy Catholic Church'; but the Church is not an outward and visible organisation: it is the 'fellowship of all believers.' He regrets that the idea of the visibility of the true Church 'haunts many evangelical heads.' The kernel of the older doctrine he believes to be that it is the one God who made us, has redeemed us in Jesus Christ, and sanctifies us by His Spirit. Many 'inadequate expressions in hymn-books favour misunderstanding,' and lead to Tritheism. To those who make 'Spirit' synonymous with 'Power,' he recommends the study of Force in the light of recent science. It is better to leave the inexplicable unexplained.

But the reputation of Loofs does not rest on his *Predigten* alone, though these clearly reveal his grasp of evangelical truth, and his faculty for exposition and application.<sup>2</sup> His *Guide to the Study of the History of Dogma* shows that he is a learned and accurate adept in ecclesiastical history.<sup>3</sup>

This book is a marvel of comprehensive and condensed information. In one volume of 450 pages the genesis of Christian doctrines and ideas is carefully reviewed, and the critical statements of the leading divines of every age are quoted and considered. For lecturers and students in church history the book is a rich and convenient manual. For any who have been almost oppressed by the vast proportions of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, Loofs' *Leitfaden* will bring timely and real assistance. We have not space to describe the book in detail, or to illustrate the theological system of the author. He is evidently a disciple of Harnack, but is sufficiently independent to inspire confidence. A passage in the preface to the second edition—which was intended to explain his relation to Harnack—does not appear in the third edition; because he thinks that every one knows his obligations to this distinguished teacher, and also the points of difference between them. Dr. Loofs, clearly, does not dread the result of an inquiry into the intellectual and religious developments which prepared the way for Christianity. He carefully surveys the progress of Gentile philosophy with that of Alexandrian and Rabbinical thought,

<sup>2</sup> An earlier volume of sermons was published in 1892.

<sup>1</sup> The preacher here attaches a note which shows how far he would go in meeting the modern doubters on some points. 'Dass obiger Satz sich auf das "empfangen vom heiligen Geiste, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria" bezieht, mag hier im Druck ausdrücklich bemerkt werden.'

<sup>3</sup> *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte, zunächst für seine Vorlesungen*, von F. Loofs, Doctor und Professor der Theologie in Halle: dritte verbesserte Auflage. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1893. Another important work is a monograph: *Studien über die dem Johannes von Damaskus zugeschriebenen Parallelen*, 1892.

and of all other systems which might be supposed to contribute to the formation of the doctrines of the Church. But all these together could not create the 'Personality of Jesus'; and a 'purely historical understanding of Jesus, His work, teaching, and self-consciousness, is impossible.' On some points Dr. Loofs seems disposed to yield to

critical views, though we gather that he holds the canonical authority of the books of the New Testament, and entirely rejects the Tübingen speculation. His works encourage the hope that the time has come in Germany when the best results of modern inquiry and criticism are to be used in the service of a living Christianity.

## An Anonymous Poem.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. F. G. CHOLMONDELEY, M.A., LEEK-WOOTTON, WARWICK.

THE article on 'A Neglected Poem,' which appeared a while ago in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, turned back my attention to another poem of a somewhat kindred character, which is probably not so well known as it deserves to be. It is entitled 'Confessions of a Poet,' and the same sort of interest attaches to it as to the 'Confessions of St. Augustine,' in that it is the honest, fearless avowal of the writer's own inward struggles towards a full acceptance of the Christ. Claiming to be a poet, he has amply vindicated his claim to the title, though one cannot regard the little book as fortunately named; it is not the poet confessing himself we find, but a troubled soul clothing its confessions in the garb of poetry. This soul has gone into revolt for a while with Shelley; has faced the mysteries of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* with Milton; while for motto appears on the title-page a quotation from Plotinus, 'I am endeavouring to bring the God within me into harmony with the God which is in the Universe.' A few pages of preface furnish a link between the motto and the poem itself. A brief notice of its contents may prove not unacceptable, I hope.

The first stage tells of an early delight in Nature, a simple yielding to her charm, as the eye drinks in the varying phases of her beauty. But Nature has other moods; there is more to know than on the smiling surface at first appears, and

<sup>1</sup> The adjective no longer applies. The author, it now appears, is the Rev. Alfred Starkey. He has quite recently reissued the poem in an expanded form, along with two other poems, and with a new Introduction prefixed, in a little volume, entitled *Religio Clerici* (Elliot Stock, 1895).

the attempt to read her riddle is disquieting. Her fair sights please, but

What avail all these  
Which are as picture-books to children, grown  
Past the old pleasure of the coloured form,  
And hungering for the knowledge and the truth  
Imparabled therein?

Thus questionings arise, perplexities, misgivings. Man finds himself confronted in Nature with contradictions such as he finds in his own being, comminglings of beauty and terror, love and hate. And hence the very sense of sympathy with Nature breeds more and more dissatisfaction and dismay, a sort of unreasonable impatience with Nature for her inability to reveal the inner secrets of her being. Man feels himself the child of Nature, yet can wring no explanation from her of the baffling problems that encompass both. Gazing upon her, he is as one beholding his natural face in a glass. It is himself over again. The frowns, the bad passions, seem only too faithfully reflected there.

These subtle discontents, aggravated by a sense of helplessness and utter imperfection, are recognised as the first stirrings of God within, believed in indeed ('for God to me was never doubt or dream'), but not yet so known as it is dimly realised, that perhaps only saints can know Him. The veil seems but a thin one that is separating him at this point from the light, and there are even moments of partial uplifting when flashes of the light stream through. But it is but an intuition, a presentiment. He stands as it were at the threshold of the Promised Land, yet he must back into the wilderness and wander long, ere that threshold shall be passed and an actual entrance won.