

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first volume of the new *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*, which will be published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark in February, will extend to the word *FEAST*, and contain 863 pages, together with 16 pages of introductory matter. The page is imperial 8vo, of double columns. The type is a fine brevier, slightly larger than that used in Smith's *Dictionary*, and particularly sharp and easily read. It was cast, indeed, expressly for this work, which thus has its first impression. An occasional paragraph of less importance throughout an article, and the Literature at the end of it, are thrown into a smaller but still distinct and perfectly legible type.

The articles are signed. To this the only exception is in the case of those that are little more than cross-references. But the very smallest article, though unsigned, is done by some one who has given himself to a special study of the subject to which it belongs, for it has been felt that the small things demand the specialist's accuracy quite as much as the large.

Among the writers of the smaller articles, whether signed or unsigned, are the Rev. Willoughby C. Allen, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; the Rev. Harford-Battersby, M.A., of Liverpool; the Rev. C. Fox Burney, M.A., Fellow of St. John's

College, Oxford; Lieut.-Col. Conder; Professor Walter Lock; Professor Flinders Petrie; Professor Ryle; Mr. H. St. John Thackeray, M.A., Fellow of Selwyn College, Cambridge; Mr. Buchanan Gray, M.A., of Mansfield College, Oxford; Professor Thayer, of Harvard; and the Rev. Henry A. White, M.A., of The Castle, Durham.

Those men have their own special field, and confine themselves to it. Mr. Allen describes the members of the Aaronic family; Mr. Harford-Battersby some small names in Exodus and Numbers; Mr. Burney similar words in Kings; Col. Conder the obscure places in Palestine. Professor Lock writes on some of the persons named in St. Paul's Epistles; and Professor Flinders Petrie on some minerals and metals. Professor Ramsay does the whole of the Asia Minor work; Professor Ryle undertakes some personal names in Genesis; and Mr. Thackeray the lesser names in the Books of Esdras. Professor Thayer of Harvard has the whole subject of the language of the New Testament, including 'Abba,' 'Ephphatha,' and the like; Mr. Gray writes some difficult proper names; and Mr. White is responsible for the smaller subjects in the Books of Maccabees.

But the interest of the work will no doubt lie in its greater articles. These in the first volume are—

A

'Abraham,' by Professor Ryle; 'Acts,' by Mr. A. C. Headlam; 'Adoption,' by the late Professor Candlish; 'Agriculture,' by Mr. J. W. Paterson; 'Alphabet,' by Canon Isaac Taylor; 'Amos,' by Dr. John Taylor; 'Angel,' by Professor A. B. Davidson; 'Anger,' by Professor Orr; 'Apocrypha,' by Professor Porter; 'Arabia,' by Professor Margoliouth; 'Arabic Versions,' by Mr. Burkitt; 'Armenian Version,' by Mr. Conybeare; 'Arms' and 'Army,' by Dr. Barnes; 'Art,' by Professor Flinders Petrie; 'Ascension,' by Professor Denney; 'Asenath,' by Dr. James; 'Ashtaroth' and 'Ash-toreth,' by Canon Driver; 'Ass,' by Professor Post; 'Assyria,' by Professor Hommel; 'Astronomy,' by Mr. Pinches; 'Atonement,' by Mr. Murray; 'Atonement (Day)' and 'Azazel,' by Canon Driver.

B

'Babylonia,' by Professor Hommel; 'Balaam,' by Mr. Woods; 'Baptism,' by Dr. Plummer; 'Baruch (Apocr.),' by Mr. Charles; 'Baruch (Bk.),' by Professor Marshall; 'Bashan,' by Professor G. A. Smith; 'Bed,' by Sir Charles Warren; 'Belial,' by Mr. Garvie; 'Bethel,' by Mr. Cooke; 'Bible,' by Principal Stewart; 'Bishop,' by Professor Gwatkin; 'Blessedness' and 'Blessing,' by Professor Adeney; 'Bread,' by Professor Macalister; 'Brethren of the Lord,' by Professor Mayor; 'Burial,' by Dr. Thomas Nicol.

C

'Calf,' by Professor Kennedy; 'Canaan,' by Professor Sayce; 'Carmel,' by Professor Smith; 'Catholic Epistles,' by Professor Salmond; 'Cherubim,' by Professor Ryle; 'Christian,' by Mr. Gayford; 'Christology,' by Professor Beet; 'Chronicles,' by Professor Francis Brown; 'Chronology,' by Professor Curtis and Mr. Turner; 'Church,' by Mr. Gayford; 'Church Government,' by Professor Gwatkin; 'Colossians,' by Mr. J. O. F.

Murray; 'Colours,' by Mr. G. W. Thatcher; 'Communion,' by Professor Armitage Robinson; 'Conscience,' by Mr. Kilpatrick; 'Corinth,' by Professor Ramsay; 'Corinthians,' by Principal Robertson; 'Cornelius,' by Dr. Grieve; 'Cosmogony,' by Principal Whitehouse; 'Covenant,' by Professor A. B. Davidson; 'Crimes,' by Professor Poucher; 'Cross,' by Professor Adams Brown; 'Cyrus' by Professor Sayce.

D

'Damascus,' by Mr. Ewing; 'Dancing,' by Mr. Millar; 'Daniel,' by Professor Curtis; 'David,' by Mr. H. A. White; 'Dead Sea,' by Professor Hull; 'Decalogue,' by Professor W. P. Paterson; 'Demon,' 'Devil,' by Principal Owen Whitehouse; 'Deuteronomy,' by Professor Ryle; 'Disciple,' by Professor Massie; 'Dream,' by Principal Jevons; 'Dress,' by Mr. Mackie; 'Drunkenness,' by Professor Willis Beecher.

E

'Ecclesiastes,' by Professor Peake; 'Education,' by Professor Kennedy; 'Egypt,' by Mr. Crum; 'Egyptian Versions,' by Mr. Forbes Robinson; 'Election,' by Mr. Murray; 'Elijah' and 'Elisha,' by Mr. Strachan; 'Enoch,' by Principal Chase and Mr. Charles; 'Ephesians,' by Professor Lock; 'Ephesus,' by Professor Ramsay; 'Epistle,' by Mr. Bartlet; 'Esau,' by Professor Cowan; 'Eschatology,' by Professor A. B. Davidson, Mr. Charles, and Professor Salmond; 'Esdras,' by Mr. Thackeray; 'Esther,' by Dr. M'Clymont; 'Ethics,' by Mr. Strong; 'Ethiopia,' by Professor Margoliouth; 'Euraquilo,' by Professor Dickson; 'Exodus,' by Mr. Harford-Battersby; 'Exodus (Route),' by Professor Rendel Harris and Mr. Chapman; 'Ezekiel,' by Professor Skinner; 'Ezra,' by Professor Batten.

F

'Fable,' by Professor Massie; 'Faith,' by Professor Warfield; 'Fall,' by Professor Bernard; 'Family,' by Professor Bennett; 'Fasting,' by

Canon Stanton; 'Fear,' by Principal Burrows; 'Feasts,' by Principal Harding.

In attempting to appreciate the meaning of the Fatherhood of God, one consideration, says Mr. Forrest in his Kerr Lectures, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, that must be taken into account is, whether the New Testament writers mean one and the same thing. He does not think they do. In a Note to his second lecture he briefly discusses 'the Fatherhood of God in the Synoptics and in St. John'; and he comes to the conclusion that there is a difference.

Mr. Forrest believes that, in the Synoptics, God is shown forth as the Father of all men. It is true that in the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus designates God as 'your Father,' both St. Matthew and St. Luke mention that He is addressing His disciples. But the word 'disciples' means much the same as 'hearers.' Many of those who were with Him at the beginning, went back from Him. Presumably some of these were addressed in the Sermon on the Mount. We cannot therefore infer, says Mr. Forrest, that all who were then addressed had in them even the beginnings of 'that spiritual experience which makes men in the full sense the sons of God.' And then he utters the sweeping and emphatic assertion: 'The attempt to show that on this or on any other occasion when Jesus speaks of "your Father," He confines the reference to one class possessed of a certain spiritual quality, utterly breaks down.'

He says that all the words in the Synoptics which tell of Christ's seeking the outcast involves the same truth of God's universal Fatherhood. The joy and astonishment of the multitudes at His words sprang from the new truth His life was revealing to them. It was the recognition of God's fatherly tenderness towards them that awoke in them the repentant and filial spirit. Wendt, he concludes, puts the Synoptic view in one epigrammatic phrase: 'God does not *become* the Father,

but *is* the heavenly Father even of those who *become* His sons.'

But the teaching of St. John is different. God's redeeming *love* is assuredly universal; God's Fatherhood is apparently not so. Once only does Jesus in St. John use the phrase 'your Father.' And then (20¹⁷) it occurs in a connexion—My Father and your Father—which brings out emphatically the central thought of the Fourth Gospel, and the words are plainly addressed to His own. When in St. John's Gospel Jesus speaks of the Fatherhood of God, it is a Fatherhood founded on the acceptance of Himself as the Son.

Is Mr. Forrest right in this? And if he is, are we to find a contradiction here between the teaching of the Synoptics and the teaching of St. John? Mr. Forrest is sure that he is right; but he does not believe that there is a contradiction. St. John simply presupposes the attitude of the Synoptics. He takes it for granted that men have *already* heard from Jesus' lips the glad tidings that God is the Father, even of them that disbelieve, and, having welcomed it to the saving of their souls, they are *now* in a position to be spoken to and spoken of as the sons of God, and as having God for their Father, through faith in Jesus Christ.

The Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is a man of much ability and no little learning. But it is evident that he undertook a task which was beyond the power of both, when he determined to turn a French higher critic into an English traditionalist. It may be, no doubt, that his failure is due to the way he went about it. Had Mr. McClure paid a visit to Paris, and attempted to persuade Professor Maspero that he was wrong in accepting the results of Old Testament Criticism, we know not but he might have been successful. But when Professor Maspero had written a great book in French which accepted these results, and Mr. McClure resolved to turn it into English in such

a way that it would deny them, the task was too great for him.

It is true he seemed to turn Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations* into English, and an English reader would never have guessed that Maspero was a critic. But it was not Maspero. Over in France and in his own handwriting, Maspero was a critic still. It was only in England, and entirely against his will, that he seemed to be anything else.

Now it is not a matter of absorbing consequence whether Professor Maspero is a higher critic or not. And it is cause of much thankfulness that the question which has arisen over the English translation of his book, has not been raised over that. It is indeed a question wholly distinct from that; of greater consequence far than that. It is a question, not of literary method, but of morality. And it is on that ground that Mr. McClure has been driven to answer for it.

He has answered in a printed pamphlet. Of that pamphlet Mr. McClure sent us a copy. It seemed to say, and said it cleverly, that Professor Maspero was acquainted with the changes that were being made in the English edition, and had given them his approval. If that were so, the matter was scarcely settled. It was right with Professor Maspero, but it was wrong still with the English public. For the public believed that when they read the English translation of Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations*, they were reading the work of Maspero. They did not know, for they were nowhere told, that it was Maspero plus (or minus) Mr. McClure.

So the matter was far from right, even if Professor Maspero had sanctioned all the changes that were made, even if Professor Maspero were abundantly satisfied. But Professor Maspero had sanctioned very few of the changes, and he was not satisfied at all. It happened that, some time before this pamphlet came to us, we were in correspondence with Professor Maspero on another matter, and

the translation of his *Struggle of the Nations* was mentioned, whereupon Professor Maspero sent us a detailed account of the whole transaction he had had with Mr. and Mrs. McClure anent the English translation. The communication was private in regard to its details. Until this moment we have not mentioned even the fact of it. And now we do so, not to touch on the details—though they have been made public recently through another to whom Professor Maspero has written since, and given him that permission—but simply to say that neither in that pamphlet nor in any other communication has the secretary of the S.P.C.K. given an account of his dealings with Professor Maspero with even an approach to the actual facts.

And the secretary of the S.P.C.K. still maintains the position he has taken up. He does not recognise the damage he has done to the Society of which he is the secretary. We have no concern with that. But, what is much more than that, he does not yet recognize the moral obligation that lies upon a translator to give his author's meaning as accurately as he can.

While the question of the translation of Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations* was openly under discussion in the press, Mr. McClure was engaged upon the translation of Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. In a month or two thereafter it was issued. If the scope of the work is taken into account, it seems quite correct to say that Hommel's *Hebrew Tradition* is as often mistranslated as Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations*, and with the same apparent intention.

A few of the mistranslations in Hommel were mentioned when we wrote some notes upon it here. A writer of manifest ability has sent a full review of the book to the *New York Nation* of October 21. That writer has carefully compared the English translation with the original. He fills two long columns with passages that are mistranslated,—fills them till they are running over,—and he shows that only a few give evidence of

carelessness or ignorance, the great majority are 'conscious and reckless perversions of the text.' The conclusion to which this American reviewer comes, in so responsible a journal as *The Nation*, is in these words: 'Translations made under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge must henceforth be regarded with suspicion.'

Professor McGiffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* came upon us with a great surprise. There are those of us in this country who must admit something little short of a panic when the book was cast down suddenly in our midst. If it had been a German work, or even the translation of a German work, we should have welcomed it as a blessed sign of a return to sounder criticism and safer ground. But it was the latest volume of the 'International Theological Library.' And we had come to expect that the volumes of the 'International Theological Library' would be English and conservative, so far at least as the New Testament was concerned.

Professor McGiffert's volume is not English, and it is not conservative. And on second thoughts we find that we had no right to expect it so to be. If it is not English, neither is it German. It is simply independent; and, having admitted its very remarkable ability, we admit that we have no right to object to that.

The scholars of America have received the book more wisely. In the *Biblical World* for November there is an incidental but emphatic reference by Professor Votaw, and a long and thorough review by Professor Shailer Mathews, both of the University of Chicago. Professor Votaw carries on a series of 'Inductive Studies' in the Acts, of which one feature is a discriminating list of books for further reference. And at the end of one of his 'Inductive Studies' he adds this Note: 'There has just been published a *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* by Professor A. C. McGiffert, Ph.D., D.D., of Union Theological Seminary,

New York. It is safe to say that it is of more value than any other single work on the subject. It is fitted to become the text-book for the thorough critical study of Primitive Christianity. The student will do well, now at the close of this study of Acts, to review the whole field by the aid of McGiffert's important contribution to the knowledge of this period of history.'

Thus Professor Clyde Votaw; and he knows the literature of the Acts intimately. Professor Shailer Mathews contributes a review of fifteen pages long. He does not agree with Professor McGiffert in several of his main positions. He gives excellent reasons for not agreeing with him. But he holds that it is in McGiffert one can best see what the difficult questions of the Acts of the Apostles are, how difficult they are, and how it is possible to form a judgment for oneself upon them. And he says that 'the character of the volume in general makes it on the whole the most notable addition to theological literature, on the side of critical Church History and New Testament criticism, as yet made by any American.'

There is one matter in the Book of Acts of keenest interest to us all, on which Professor McGiffert takes an independent stand, and Professor Mathews is strongly drawn to take his stand beside him. Why does the Book of Acts end as it does? Professor McGiffert's answer is, 'It ends with the life of the apostle.' No one can give that answer who holds by the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Professor McGiffert does not hold by that. He holds that the Pastoral Epistles have for their foundation genuine epistles of St. Paul, written by the apostle in the year 51-52; but as they stand they are the reworking of these epistles by some disciple after the apostle's death. And Professor Mathews thinks that the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is at anyrate so uncertain that it ought not to interfere with the question of the ending of the Book of Acts; and plainly says that if Professor McGiffert's reason will not do, no

reason has yet been given why the Book of Acts should end as it does.

In his new book on the *Women of the Old Testament*, Dr. R. F. Horton has given a new interpretation to the narrative of the Witch of Endor.

As a preliminary, however, it may be said that Dr. R. F. Horton has a way of his own with most of the women of the Old Testament, and always takes his own way. His way with the Witch of Endor is first of all to make her out 'so human, so womanly—one might almost say so innocent—that our sympathy is inevitably elicited.' In this respect he finds the Witch of Endor different from all the witches of the ancient and modern world. 'When Shakespeare wished to introduce one who practised the black art, he summoned all his powers to paint a woman gruesome and repulsive. The witch in Horace is equally horrible, with black teeth, and a heart blacker still. The famous sorceress of the Greek legend is beautiful but terrible. Canidia is the butt of the Roman poet's satire. Medea is the subject of the Greek poet's tragedy. But the only portrait that is drawn for us in Scripture of a woman who practised forbidden spells and incantations is so human, so womanly—one might almost say so innocent—that our sympathy is inevitably elicited.'

Does the Scripture purposely paint her so? Dr. Horton acknowledges that the Scripture has not been generally read in that way. Five-and-twenty years ago it was felt necessary, in dealing with the Witch of Endor, to protest that she was an impostor, who preyed on the credulity of man. That was in the days when Smith's *Dictionary of*

the Bible was written, says Dr. Horton. But in the quarter of a century since Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* was written, much has happened, even in the region of witchcraft. And Dr. Horton believes that it is no longer possible for the unbiassed exegete to treat the Witch of Endor as an impostor, as in any way other than what she claimed to be.

For in the last quarter of a century men have become familiar with spiritualistic *séances*. They are no longer unanimous, says Dr. Horton, in pronouncing ghostly visitors mere hallucinations. 'Spiritualists'—we had better quote his words—'spiritualists are firmly convinced that through a suitable Medium they enter into communication with intelligent spirits; they are convinced that these spirits are those of the dead; they believe that in many cases the spirits of well-known persons of the past can be identified; they attach immense importance to the communications of these spirits, whether such communications are descriptions of the unseen world, statements of religious truth, or forecasts of future events.'

'That is to say, there are many thousands of reasonable English people to-day, brought up in the religious and scientific atmosphere of the nineteenth century, who affirm the reality of precisely such occurrences as the one that is recorded in this chapter.' Therefore Dr. Horton concludes that it is only when we are prepared to pronounce all these persons deluded or deceivers, that we may with consistency describe the Witch of Endor as an impostor. To Dr. Horton she is no impostor. He holds that she was a Medium, and the apparition that she saw was of precisely the same kind as those which occur in *séances*.
