

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE issue of a new book by Professor Marcus Dods is an event of some importance. It is an event of the highest importance when the subject of the new book is the Bible. For although it would be ridiculous to say that Dr. Dods knows no book but the Bible, it is perhaps impossible in our day to name any man who has given himself to the study of the Bible more absorbingly. It may be that Professor Sanday of Oxford has done so, but we cannot think of another to put beside those two.

The new book which Professor Dods has published has itself an interesting history. In the year 1879 William Bross of Chicago, who had been Lieutenant-Governor of Illinois, desired to establish some memorial of his son, whom he had lost a quarter of a century earlier; and it seemed to him that if he could encourage men to write books about the Bible, if he could, in his own words, 'call out the best efforts of the highest talent and the ripest scholarship of the world, to illustrate from science, or any department of knowledge, and to demonstrate, the divine origin and authority of the Christian Scriptures,' this was the best memorial of his son that he could establish. So he entered into an agreement with the trustees of Lake Forest University to that end.

They took the responsibility. They decided that once every ten years a prize of six thousand dollars should be offered for the best book on the Bible. The prize is open to all the world. The book must be of a certain length; of which and of all other conditions the trustees will send particulars. They further decided that from time to time they should select and appoint some scholar to prepare a book upon the Bible, a book which would 'illustrate or demonstrate or commend the Christian religion, or any phase of it, to the times in which we live'; and that they should ask the scholar chosen to come to Lake Forest College and read his book publicly before publishing it. The first scholar selected was the President of Princeton Theological Seminary. The second was Professor Marcus Dods. Professor Dods read his book before Lake Forest College in May 1904. It is now published. Its title is *The Bible: its Origin and Nature* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net).

There are those in this country who would not have chosen Professor Marcus Dods 'to demonstrate the divine origin and authority of the Christian Scriptures.' For in every country there are men who offer a perpetual sacrifice to the great god of mental sloth. In this country, their victim for many years has been Professor Dods. These men will die before perceiving that

their distrust of Professor Dods is due to their own indolence. Being too indolent to read with care either the books of Professor Dods or the Bible, they will keep their sacrifice burning to the end. But the trustees of Lake Forest University have done wisely. For the recovery of the Bible and the Christ of the Bible, for their re-establishment in the hearts of men of honest intention, this new book by Professor Marcus Dods will do more than any book which has been published in our day.

Among the minor evidences of Christianity it has been customary for a long season to reckon the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil. For the Fourth Eclogue, which was written forty years before the birth of Christ, is a prophetic poem, and the promise of peace and prosperity which it offers to the generations to follow is associated with the birth of a little child. The Church has not always known what to do with the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil. To acknowledge it Messianic was easy at the beginning. But when in later ages every effort after righteousness outside official Christianity was banned, and ascribed to the imitative cunning of the devil, it was impossible to suppose that a mere pagan like Virgil could be found in the line of prophetic succession. But there the Eclogue stands, with its 'little child' in the midst. And now we are ready to receive it again. Our only doubt is whether it belongs to the true science of comparative religion or is merely an echo of the Jewish Messianic expectation.

In the *Classical Review* for February, Mr. H. W. Garrod has a note on the Messianic character of the Fourth Eclogue. Mr. Garrod does not place Virgil among the prophets. The little child is an echo of Isaiah. He believes that it came to Virgil through Herod the Great.

Mr. Garrod's evidence is entirely circumstantial. The Fourth Eclogue was written in honour of Pollio, who was Consul in the year 40 B.C. Now Pollio the Consul was an intimate friend of

Herod the Great. When Herod sent his two sons on a mission to Augustus, either in 24 or 27 B.C., the young men, says Josephus, 'lodged at the house of Pollio, who was very fond of Herod's friendship.' Mr. Garrod thinks that the fondness of this friendship may be explained by the supposition that Pollio was instrumental in securing for Herod the throne of Jerusalem. We do not know for certain that Herod owed his throne to Pollio. All that Josephus tells us is that he received it in the year of Pollio's consulship. But it is quite unusual for Josephus to date his years by consulships. And that Pollio had already an interest in the Jews, and in Herod in particular, is clear to Mr. Garrod from the statement of Josephus in another place, that Pollio the Pharisee and Sameas his disciple were honoured by Herod above all the rest, because they advised the citizens to receive him. For Mr. Garrod thinks it extremely probable that this Pollio the Pharisee belonged to the family of C. Asinius Pollio the Consul.

Mr. Garrod's conclusion accordingly is, that every word of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil is coloured by Jewish ideas of a reign of peace and splendour, of a mysterious Prince and Saviour who should reorganize the earth, and that these ideas reached Virgil from Pollio the Consul, through Pollio the Pharisee or Herod the Great, or both.

One point of interest remains. If the Messianic expectation of the Jews reached Virgil through Herod, then Herod at least knew, if he did not share, that expectation. Mr. Garrod believes that he both knew and shared it. He calls Herod a much maligned man. He believes him guiltless of the massacre of the Innocents. That story, he suggests, is an echo of a much earlier event, the slaying of Hezekiah and his band. Mr. Garrod would like to believe that Herod, if he had found the Babe in Bethlehem, would honestly have joined the wise men in presenting unto Him gifts.

In the *Preacher's Magazine* for March there is

a preacher who is troubled about the little children of Bethel who were cursed by Elisha and then torn by the two she-bears. Many a preacher has been troubled before him. He finds relief in the thought that the little children must have come out of bad homes. They had heard their parents laugh at the story of Elijah's translation. They had heard them say that the chariot and the horses were a figment of Elisha's own brain, and that Elisha had better 'go up' after his master! What the parents said in private the children repeated in public. They even bettered their instruction, mocking Elisha openly, and saying, 'Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head.'

The preacher finds relief in this. It was right that these wicked parents should be deprived of the children whom they were training so ill. It was well for the children to be taken from such evil homes. He remembers that Holman Hunt calls Herod's Massacre of the Innocents 'the *Triumph of the Innocents*.' He thinks that there is a sense, a high and noble sense, in which the death of the little children of Bethel might be called 'the Triumph of the Innocents' also.

But Mr. Crosby (for that is the preacher's name, and he comes from New Zealand) does not believe that the little children belonged to Bethel. The narrative shows that Elisha was on the road to Bethel, but how far he had gone it does not show. Mr. Crosby thinks that he had only just started from Jericho. So it was the children of Jericho that mocked him. For the children were behind Elisha. Had they come out from Bethel they would have come to meet him, and been in front. Now if the children came from Jericho, Mr. Crosby understands why Elisha cursed them. For Elisha had blessed the people of Jericho by healing their waters, and they had addressed him as 'my lord.' They were guilty, not only of unbelief, but also of ingratitude; not only of ingratitude, but also of unpardonable hypocrisy. If the children whom Elisha cursed were children

of Jericho, Mr. Crosby has little doubt that they well deserved it.

There has been a great conflict in Cambridge over the teaching of Greek. The question has been, in vulgar language, whether Greek should remain a compulsory subject for graduation. More politely, and perhaps also with a keener sense of the issues involved, Dr. Adam of Emmanuel College says the question is 'whether the language and literature of ancient Greece should hold their place in every sound *curriculum* of liberal education.'

The controversy has called forth much clever writing. But this paper by Dr. Adam, which appears in the *Guardian* of 1st March, seems to lift the subject out of its local occasion. For Dr. Adam's answer is not to the question why Cambridge undergraduates should study Greek, but what is the place of Greek in modern education?

Dr. Adam opens his paper by quoting the saying that 'at the Reformation Greece rose from the dead with the New Testament in her hand.' The author of the saying is unknown, but it is a remarkable saying. In Dr. Adam's judgment it expresses in a single sentence the two great reasons why the language and literature of Greece should retain their place in modern education. The one reason is that Greek is the language of the New Testament; the other that (in Dr. Adam's own words) 'classical Greek literature is the most perfect expression known to man of that love of intellectual freedom which was the dominating feature of the great intellectual Renaissance out of which the Reformation sprang.'

Greek is the language of the New Testament, and we cannot know the New Testament if we do not know Greek. But in order to read St. John's Gospel, must we first be able to read Plato's Gorgias? Dr. Adam answers that. It is necessary,

he says. For there are many passages in the New Testament, more particularly in the writings of St. Paul, which acquire a new and deeper meaning when they are read in the light of Greek philosophy, especially Platonism and Stoicism. This field of study has not been well worked yet. Bishop Lightfoot did a little for it in his essay on St. Paul and Seneca. Curtius and Canon Hicks have done a little more. But much still remains to be done. And until it is done we cannot grasp the full historical significance of Christianity in its relation to Hellenism as well as to Hebraism.

Greek is also the best instrument for awakening the intellect. Dr. Adam gives two reasons. First, Greek literature is full of life. 'You Greeks,' said the Egyptian priest to Solon, 'are always young.' It is this youthfulness and vitality of the masterpieces of Greek poetry and philosophy which renders them so stimulating. Greek and Latin are called dead languages. Dr. Adam quotes Lowell Russell in reply: 'Only those languages can properly be called dead in which nothing living has been written. If the classic languages are dead, they yet speak to us and with a clearer voice than that of any living tongue. If the language of Greece is dead, yet the literature it enshrines is crammed with life as perhaps no other writing except Shakespeare's ever was or will be.'

But in the second place, Greek literature, beyond all other means, develops the thinking faculties, and that is the end of education. For it is a rational literature. It seeks the truth; and it has faith in the power of human reason to reach it. It is also a literature which presents strong contrasts to our modern ways of thinking. And Dr. Adam knows no more potent cause of intellectual stimulation than the shock of contradiction and contrast. The contrast is greatest where the things are greatest. It is greatest in Ethics and Religion. 'The fundamental law of ordinary Greek morality, reiterated again and again by Greek poets, from Hesiod down to

Euripides, may be expressed in the precept, *Love your friends, and hate your enemies.*'

For these reasons Dr. Adam would retain Greek in the curriculum of every college and higher school. The conflict is over in Cambridge.

Did St. Paul ever see Christ in the flesh? He saw him once in the body. We believe that, and must maintain it. The half-hearted unbeliever tries to satisfy us and himself by saying that St. Paul *had* a vision on the way to Damascus, but it was a spiritual vision. Such half-loaves are worse than no bread. They are offered to tempt us and be taken away. We are told next that other men have had their visions also, that any man of ecstatic temperament may see Christ. We must maintain that St. Paul saw Christ in the body.

But did St. Paul see Christ in the flesh? If he did, it was on earth. For 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' He seems to say he did. He says, 'Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet would we know him so no more.' But Professor Bacon, who discusses the question in his *Story of St. Paul* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), does not believe that St. Paul ever saw Christ in the flesh, and he does not believe that that passage says he did. 'That passage,' he says, 'is simply a mistranslation.'

He says that the italics might show us that it is a mistranslation. What are the words in italics? In the Authorized Version the single word *him*, in 'yet now henceforth know we *him* no more.' In the Revised Version we read, 'yet now we know *him so* no more.' Professor Bacon believes that the italics are all wrong. He believes that St. Paul is not speaking of himself in particular, but of the Jews generally, when he says 'we.' And he believes that he uses the title Christ in its proper sense of Messiah, not simply as an alternative for Jesus. We should render, he says, 'Yea, though (as Jews) we have known a

Messiah of the fleshly type (what Jesus designates *savouring the things that be of men*), yet would we know such a Messiah no more.'

Two books on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit have reached us from America together. One is entitled *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*. It is written by Professor Irving Wood of Smith College. The title of the other is *The Holy Spirit Then and Now*. Its author is Professor E. H. Johnson of the Crozer Theological Seminary. Both books belong to what Professor Wood calls the modern scientific study of the doctrine. Professor Wood's own volume was mentioned last month. Let us look at Professor Johnson's now.

Professor Johnson calls the second chapter of his book, laconically, 'He or It?' Let us look at that chapter. The question of 'He or It' is supposed to be a very puzzling question in the doctrine of the Spirit. It is puzzling to that method of biblical study which follows the old rule of comparing Scripture with Scripture. But that rule is obsolete. The same words may have one meaning in one Scripture and another meaning in another. The modern rule is to compare Scripture with Scripture within the same author's writings. It may be presumed that St. John uses the word Spirit with the same meaning in his Epistles and in his Gospel. But it is not to be presumed that he uses the word in the same sense as Isaiah uses it. If the modern theory of the development of doctrine is true, or, in other words, if there is a science of Biblical Theology, the presumption is that he does not.

Now by the old rule the question 'He or It' has almost always, and sometimes passionately, been answered *He*. By the new rule, by the science of Biblical Theology, the question, says Professor Johnson, is not whether we may call the Holy Spirit *it*, but whether we may call it *he*.

Professor Johnson proceeds by his rule. He

begins with the Old Testament. He finds that in the Old Testament the Spirit of God is the life of God, His vital energy, His innermost self. It is therefore at the farthest possible remove from being a distinct person. As the spirit of a man is the man, so the Spirit of God is God. 'Who,' says Isaiah, 'hath directed the Spirit of Jehovah, or being his counsellor hath taught him?' (40¹³). 'Whither,' asks the Psalmist, 'shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence?' (139⁷).

Then Professor Johnson gathers together all the references of the Old Testament to the Spirit, and finds that they may be easily remembered as an effluence, an affluence, or an influence. The Spirit of God in the Old Testament is represented as the energy of God flowing forth *from* Him, or flowing *upon* things and persons, or flowing *into* persons. Efflux, afflux, influx—the words are unfamiliar, but they are expressive and complete.

Take the first mention of the word Spirit in our Bible. 'The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters' (Gn 1²). It is an effluence and an affluence. It flows from God, it flows upon the waters. As we pass to the Prophets we find that the prevailing aspect of the Spirit is its affluence. It comes *upon* Balaam (Nu 24²), upon frenzied Saul (1 S 19^{23, 24}), upon Elisha in double portion (2 K 2⁹⁻¹⁵), even upon the Messiah (Is 42¹ 61¹) in that anointing which Jesus claimed as His (Lk 4^{17f.}). In all this usage the prophet is rather an instrument than an agent. The Spirit controls his faculties rather than elevates his functions. The conception has not yet travelled very far from the ecstatic frenzy of the pythia.

But even in the Old Testament there is a higher view than this. The Spirit of God is also an influence. Joseph was 'a man *in* whom the Spirit of God is.' Isaiah was familiar with the Spirit's affluence on the prophets; but he knew also of its influence in them. 'Where,' he asks, as he remembers the days of Moses, 'is he that put his

holy Spirit within him?' (63¹¹). Daniel is recognized in the courts of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar as one 'in whom is the spirit of the holy gods' (4⁸ 5¹¹).|

When we pass to the New Testament we find a change. The Spirit of God is no longer exclusively impersonal. The Holy Spirit becomes *He*. But not at once. This is the fact which Professor Johnson wishes most to insist upon, that up to a certain point the Spirit of God in the New Testament is the same as the Spirit of God in the Old Testament. That is to say, it is simply God Himself in energy; it is simply the energy of God flowing from Himself, either upon men or things, or into men. The point of change is the fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel.

The first mention of the Holy Spirit as a person, as the Third Person in the Trinity, says Professor Johnson, is in the fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel at the sixteenth verse. It is a new revelation, wholly new and wonderful, however quietly Christ may have uttered it, however gently John may record it. And it has had far-reaching results. One result, alas! is infinite confusion in innumerable books which treat of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But that is no fault of the revelation. It is the fault of the writers of our popular theology, who will not take the trouble to understand before they write.

The writers of our popular theology, says Professor Johnson, having once discovered the Holy Spirit, discover Him everywhere. They find Him in the Old Testament, where He is not to be found. They find Him in the Synoptic Gospels, and He is not to be found there either.

They find Him, they find Him in His full personal and trinitarian meaning, in the narratives of the birth of Christ. In the Annunciation the angel says to Mary, 'The holy Spirit shall come upon thee,' whereupon our popular theology has not only discovered the Holy Spirit, but has also

discovered that the Third Person in the Trinity is in some sense the father of the Second. Yet the language is *expressly impersonal*. For the words 'the holy Spirit shall come upon thee' are immediately repeated and explained in the parallel phrase, 'the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.' The absence of the article before 'holy Spirit' and before 'power' might at least have arrested the attention. But, says Professor Johnson, it is much more to the purpose to recognize that up to this point the Holy Spirit has never been introduced as a person; and to give the words a personal meaning now is to contradict every sound rule of Scripture interpretation.

There is an article in the *Contemporary Review* for February on 'The Bankruptcy of Higher Criticism.' It is written by Dr. Emil Reich, traveller and man of letters. The object of the article is to give an account of the religion of the Masais, a negro tribe of German East Africa. Dr. Reich does not himself know the Masais. He is indebted for his knowledge of their religion to a German officer, whom he calls Captain Merker, who has recently published an 'elaborate monograph' on the Masais. But Dr. Reich does not entitle his article the Religion of the Masais. He calls it the Bankruptcy of Higher Criticism.

What has this negro tribe of German East Africa got to do with the Higher Criticism of the Bible? The article is nearly done before we discover that. But the discovery is worth waiting for.

The title of the article and the first few pages of it, although both a trifle rhetorical, are full of promise. 'Hitherto,' says Dr. Emil Reich, 'the school of Higher Criticism has met with no really serious opponents.' A really serious opponent seems to have come at last. He is a root-and-branch reformer, and his words are strong. How comes it, he asks, that the world does not see the incongruity of allowing itself to be lectured upon ancient history, upon the origin of religions, and

upon subjects even more sacred, by some little German philological pedant in some obscure German town? It is because the world lacks a sense of humour. Dr. Emil has that sense. He will not let himself be lectured so. But just when our expectation is raised to the utmost, Dr. Reich suddenly informs us that he has no intention whatever of answering the higher critics, or of touching one of their arguments.

What is the reason? The reason he gives is that 'the works of the higher critics abound in erudition, and to refute them by exposing the nullity of their evidence all along the line would entail an amount of barren labour which serious thinkers scarcely care to undertake.' Dr. Reich is assured of 'the complete wrong-headedness of the whole method of Higher Criticism.' He is sure that its wrong-headedness 'cannot fail to be manifest to anybody who bases his judgments upon the true essence of the matter in dispute, and not upon mere externals.' But he does not say what the true essence is. As a serious thinker he has no time to waste in refuting the higher critics. He passes on to tell us about the religion of the Masais. And just as he passes to that, which is the proper subject of his paper, he shows us that his acquaintance with the higher critics is not intimate enough to keep him from confounding Professor Sanday of Oxford with Professor Sandys the Public Orator of Cambridge.

And as his knowledge of the critics is, so is his knowledge of their criticism. The only criticism that he has heard of is that which reads the Old Testament off the clay tablets of Babylonia. It is the criticism of Professor Friedrich Delitzsch that is Higher Criticism to him. And the reason why the Higher Criticism has become bankrupt is that among the Masais have been found legends of the Creation, the Fall, the Flood, and the Ten Commandments, so like the Old Testament stories, that if you say the Hebrews borrowed them from the Babylonians, you may just as reasonably say

that they borrowed them from this negro tribe in German East Africa.

The Higher Criticism will have to wait until Dr. Emil Reich has time to answer it. Meanwhile, what he tells us of Captain Merker's discoveries among the Masais is well worth attending to. Captain Merker is an ideal discoverer. He has spent eight years among the Masais, in the neighbourhood of Mt. Kilimanjaro. He had scarcely settled there when he became aware of remarkable coincidences between many of the native traditions and those which we find in Genesis. But he was not thrown off his guard. He did not greedily pursue the natives with questions. He waited patiently until he won their confidence and they came to him of their own freewill. And when they came, and he could now ask them questions, he was scrupulous not to suggest or bias the answers, he was careful not once to refer to the Old Testament.

What are the Masai traditions? There is a tradition of the Creation. In the beginning the earth was a waste and barren wilderness in which there dwelt a dragon alone. God came down from Heaven and fought with the dragon. The spot where the struggle took place was afterwards known as Paradise. Then God created all things—sun, moon, stars, plants, beasts, and, last of all, two human beings. The man was called Maitumbe, and the woman Naitergorob. The man was sent down from Heaven. The woman sprang from the bosom of the earth.

There is also the tradition of a Fall. God placed Maitumbe and Naitergorob in Paradise, and gave them permission to eat of every tree of the garden except one. He often came down to see them, using a ladder which He had set up between earth and heaven. One day He could not find them. They had eaten of the forbidden fruit, and were crouching among the bushes. The man blamed the woman, and the woman blamed the serpent. God's wrath was kindled

against them, and He drove them forth from Paradise.

The Masais have also their story of the Flood. They have their Noah, whose name is Tumbainot. Tumbainot builds an ark in which he saves himself, his two wives, and his six sons. When the waters are subsiding he sends forth a dove. Four rainbows are the sign which tells the Masai Noah that the wrath of God for the iniquity of man has been appeased.

But the most remarkable parallel between the religion of the Masais and the Pentateuch is that of the Ten Commandments. The Masai story of the delivery of the decalogue, says Dr. Emil Reich, might have been translated almost literally from the Bible. The mountain is there with its peals of thunder and its raging storm. Out of the midst of a cloud the voice of God is heard proclaiming His commandments. And this is the first commandment: 'There is one God alone, who hath sent me unto you. Heretofore ye have called him the Forgiver (*E^s majan*), or the Almighty

(*E^s magelani*), but henceforth ye shall call him 'Ngai. Of him ye shall make no image. If ye follow his commandments it will be well with you; but if ye obey him not famine and pestilence shall chastise you.'

Is Captain Merker sure that these traditions are not due to Christian teaching? He is quite sure. For no foreign missionary has ever penetrated into the Masai country. And if the traditions had come from Christianity it would be impossible to explain why they stopped short at the Decalogue, why the teaching of the New Testament is utterly unrepresented.

Captain Merker had been some time among the Masais before he discovered that these legends are not the common property of the whole tribe. He discovered that he had to gain the confidence of certain privileged families which alone possess the secret and in which the stories are handed down from father to son. These families may die out. Captain Merker believes that he was sent to the Masais just in time.

Land Tenure in Fiji.

BY LORIMER FISON, HON. MEMBER OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.

IF we would get at the root of the system of Land Tenure in Fiji, we must first of all ascertain the structure of society there, and the more closely we examine it the more complicated does it appear to be. Our difficulty is increased by the fact that custom is not uniform throughout the Group; and it is impossible within our present limits of space to do more than to examine one particular field. Since it has been authoritatively asserted that the land is 'vested in the ruling chiefs, under a feudal system which has existed from time immemorial,' it may be well to select a neighbourhood where the power of the chiefs had reached its highest pitch before the Group was annexed to the British Empire. That place is Bau (Mbau), where the great chief Thakombau used to reign. It had in its neigh-

bourhood a number of affiliated *koro*, or villages, more or less closely connected with it, and it was recognized as their *koro turanga levu* = great chief town. In them, as well as in Bau itself, we find chiefs of various degrees, full-born commoners—who are called the *taukei ni vanua* (= owners of the land); and in addition to them, men who have but an imperfect status in the *koro*, or even none at all.

Looking at one of these affiliated *koro*, we find it to be divided into 'quarters,' of which there may be more or fewer than four, and each of them belongs to a part of the community called a *mata-gali*, a word which fortunately tells its own history. Literally, *mata* means 'eye' or 'face.' Hence *mata-ni-singa*, 'the eye of day' = the sun.