

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

NO formal review of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* has been given in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*. It will, therefore, not be out of place if something is said about the reviews which have appeared in other periodicals. The reviews have been favourable, more uniformly favourable and more highly favourable than in the case of the *Dictionary of the Bible* or of the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. But there have been some unfavourable comments. And we shall not consider the one without considering the other.

---

There are two things, however, upon which the reviewers are unanimous and emphatic. The first thing is the necessity for an encyclopædia of the kind. Let us begin with the *Athenæum*. The review will be found in the issue for December 5, 1908. The reviewer speaks of the need which has arisen 'to compare our own religious ideas with the forms of thought underlying various other creeds, and in like manner to inquire how far the outward expression of the religious faith prevalent, under varying aspects, among the Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and Slavonic races, tallies with, or differs from, the ceremonies observed among races, mainly holding religious doctrines of another kind.' And then he says: 'The study of comparative religion has been taken up seriously, and the interest in it is likely to increase as time goes on.'

'That there is a growing demand for such an extensive work of reference,' says the *Methodist Recorder*, 'is certain. Knowledge of the religions of the world has increased at a rate so rapid as to baffle even specialists, and the science of Comparative Religion has come among us to stay and to influence religious thought in a thousand incalculable ways. Without such a dictionary of reference as this, how can ordinary students work to any purpose? With it we may look for a marked development of knowledge in the wide field covered by its learned and informing articles.' The writer of the review in the *Methodist Recorder* is Professor W. T. Davison of Richmond.

---

Turning to one of the dailies, we find the *Glasgow Herald*, in a review marked by great ability, showing with absolute clearness the necessity for such a work of reference in our day. 'Through the enormous advance that has been made in recent years in the study of religion as a fact of human consciousness, and of the various religions of the world in the past and in the present as evolutions of that universal fact, a vast but unorganized body of knowledge has rapidly accumulated. The significance of this new knowledge for every intelligent and thoughtful mind, but especially for the Christian student, it is impossible to overestimate. Nothing is more certain than that the study of comparative religion has worked

with something like revolutionary effect upon our conceptions of Christianity, and that in the light of the new discipline the Christian Church will be compelled to reconsider its attitude to the ethnic religions and even to revise some of its most cherished doctrines.' \_\_\_\_\_

Nor is it religion only that needs such a work of reference. 'The study of religious origins,' says the reviewer in the *Glasgow Herald*, 'is inextricably interwoven with the study of the evolution of ethics, while ethics no less than religion requires to be treated anew on encyclopædic lines. A new psychology has taken the place of the old, and biology has made good its right to be taken into account in any attempt to analyse the data of moral experience. Nor can ethics be studied now apart from sociology, nor sociology apart from economics.' \_\_\_\_\_

In like manner the reviewer in the *Athenæum* says: 'No one will deny that, from our modern point of view at any rate, ethics is closely bound up with religion; some will even say that it is the essential part of it. And as philosophy is on one side connected with ethics, and on the other with such a decidedly religious problem as a view of the universe and man's position in it, it is clear that the three topics must go together, as being in many directions indissolubly interwoven and complementing each other, where they seem less closely united.' \_\_\_\_\_

That is one thing, then, upon which the reviewers are agreed—the need of a great work of reference on Religion and Ethics. The other thing is the general fitness of this Encyclopædia to meet that need. If there were a reviewer of a contrary opinion we should quote him. So far as we have yet seen there is none. \_\_\_\_\_

Few of the reviews will carry more weight than that in the *Athenæum*, and in truth few of the reviews are more weighty. After a searching examination of the volume, and after making

interesting notes on some of the articles, to which we shall afterwards refer, the reviewer concludes in this way: 'The general result of our examination enables us to say that the editor has risen to the height of his great undertaking. The work deserves the fullest and best encouragement which the world of readers and investigators can give it.' 'The range of subjects and the thoroughness of their treatment,' says the *Christian World*, 'are both extraordinary. Nothing produced in this country at any rate, and we know of nothing similar in Germany, for even the Hauck-Herzog *Real-Encyklopädie* has a much narrower outlook, can compare with the new undertaking as planned and thus far carried out.' 'It may be said at once,' says Dr. D. W. Forrest, in the *Scottish Review*, 'that Dr. Hastings promises to achieve a remarkable success in realizing his comprehensive conception.' \_\_\_\_\_

The first review of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS that was published appeared in the *British Weekly*. It is no secret that it was written by Dr. Robertson Nicoll. Indeed, his hand cannot be mistaken. Nor can he be imitated in his gift of going through a book rapidly, even a large book like this, and discovering its weakness and its strength. He did discover some weak spots in the Encyclopædia, and we shall refer to them. But to the work as a whole he gave the highest praise. Again, we think we can detect the hand that wrote the very competent review in the *Aberdeen Free Press*. 'Taking the volume as a whole,' says the reviewer, 'and looking at its contents, we congratulate all concerned on the conspicuous success which has crowned their efforts. The Encyclopædia will take a foremost place, if not the first place, among many similar enterprises in our own country, in America, in France, or in Germany.' The *Methodist Times* says that 'the Encyclopædia appears likely to take its place among the great achievements of the twentieth century.' The review in the *British Friend* is signed. It is signed by Professor A. S. Peake of Manchester. 'The work,' says Professor

Peake, 'certainly takes rank as one of the most important literary enterprises of our time, and no one who is interested in Anthropology, in Comparative Religion, in Ethics, or in Biblical and Christian Theology can safely neglect it.'

But now let us come to details, and consider some criticisms. The reviewer in the *British Weekly* is appreciative, as we have said. Nevertheless he has somewhat against us. He considers the space occupied by the article on the 'Amana Community' excessive. He points out, however, that, as mentioned in the preface, the 'Communitistic Societies of America' will be described in a single article, and that this Community has been chosen for fuller treatment as an example, a method which is to be followed with other communities, castes, and orders. The *Athenæum* reviewer is also struck by the length of that article. 'As, however, it is a community,' he says, 'which aims at reviving primitive Christian life under modern conditions, the subject is more important than it might seem at a first glance.'

One article, and one only, has been spoken of as unsatisfactory. It is the article on 'Apologetics.' Dr. Robertson Nicoll was again the first to refer to it. His criticism had been foreseen by the editors, and could have been prevented. But it seemed to them that an article on Apologetics, as it could not possibly be made exhaustive of its subject—for to write exhaustively on Apologetics is to write exhaustively on Christianity—should carry out the practical purpose of mapping out the field and directing attention to the most accessible literature. This is exactly the view that is taken of the article by the reviewer in the *Church Times*. His words are: 'One subject of great importance—Apologetics—is treated from the practical rather than the historical point of view, and a synopsis of arguments in defence of the faith is inserted, with the design of meeting present-day objections.'

Reference is made in the *Baptist Times* to the

extreme brevity of the article on 'Animism.' Mr. Abrahams, in the *Jewish Chronicle*, also speaks of it as 'short but first-rate.' The writer of the article is Count Goblet D'Alviella of Brussels. It would have been possible for him, under the title Animism, to write a book something like Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, but in an encyclopædia, in which every topic embraced under the title 'Animism' must come up for separate treatment, that would not have been wise. Count D'Alviella has given an account of the meaning of the term, its origin and its history, with a list of the most important works of reference, and then he has given cross-references to the titles under which each topic embraced by it will be found treated.

Now it is a great satisfaction that in a volume of this size, the work of so many different authors, those are the only articles to which exception has been taken. Others have been singled out for particular commendation. First of all that on 'Aristotle,' by Professor Jackson, which the *British Weekly* and the *Athenæum* both call 'masterly'; the *Scottish Review*, 'a model of succinct statement'; and the *Record*, 'an exhaustive monograph which leaves nothing to be desired'; while the *Outlook* describes its author as 'the greatest student of Aristotelianism in this country.'

Next comes the article on the 'Ancient Arabs.' 'One article,' says the *Aberdeen Free Press*, 'we have read with great delight. To it we shall recur again and again. Indeed, we might say the same regarding many articles, but in connection with the article on the Ancient Arabs we say it with emphasis.' And in the *Methodist Recorder* Professor Davison speaks of Professor Nöldeke's article on the Ancient Arabs as 'a masterly summary which perhaps no one else could have written.'

Other articles which have received special commendation are 'Altruism,' by Principal Iverach; 'Agnosticism,' by Principal Garvie; 'Alexandrine Theology,' by Professor Inge; and 'Antiochene Theology,' by Dr. Srawley. The *Scottish Review*

and the *Belfast News Letter* both mention Professor M'Giffert's 'Apostolic Age.' The *Guardian* singles out 'Apollinarism,' by Dr. Adrian Fortescue, and in doing so welcomes 'the association of Roman Catholic scholars with Anglicans and Presbyterians.' 'It is good,' says the editor, 'that the articles in an encyclopædia should be written from various points of view, and Dr. Hastings has been exceptionally fortunate in having obtained the assistance of men of all schools.'

The annual volume of the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* for 1907 to 1908 has now been issued (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). It is the eighth volume of the new series, and it contains the papers read before the Society during its twenty-ninth session. One of these papers was 'An Inductive Inquiry into the Reality and Value of the Religious Sentiment.' The paper was read by Professor Caldecott.

Professor Caldecott based his 'inquiry' upon a volume of autobiographies. The autobiographies are of thirty-four of Wesley's early Methodist Preachers. They were collected by T. Jackson, and published by John Mason, 14 City Road, London, in 1846.

The number is not large to found an inductive inquiry on. But Dr. Caldecott thinks that 'psychological inquiry to-day needs quality rather than quantity in its data.' And they are well distributed. Ten belonged to Yorkshire, four to other northern counties of England, three to London or its neighbourhood, four to the midlands, three to the south-west, three to Cornwall, two to Wales, three to Scotland, and two to Ireland. They are also well distributed among the trades and professions. Nineteen belonged to the employer class, all in a small way of business; amongst the others were a printer, three weavers, a china factory worker, a mason, a carpenter, a baker, a miner, an agricultural labourer, and two private soldiers (in Flanders campaigns).

Now we need not take offence at Professor Caldecott for making these early Methodist Preachers the subject of a psychological inquiry. They make themselves the subject. That is the meaning of their autobiographies. Our only occasion of offence would be if we found that he assumed that their religious experience was due to the circumstances of their upbringing or to the state of their health. Dr. Caldecott does no such thing. He says it is not his business to discuss the 'objective validity' of their beliefs, and perhaps it is not. But he uses not a word that would throw doubt on the reality and religious value of the beliefs themselves. He even opens his inquiry by stating that 'these young men' were *not* of ill-balanced nervous systems. 'They all lived vigorously, and most of them continued laborious pursuits until advanced old age.'

Well, the first thing that Professor Caldecott discovers in the thirty-four autobiographies is that each of the preachers brings his whole self into view. Each of them sets himself before himself for judgment. He asks of himself, 'What am I worth in totality, integrally?' And in each case the answer is the same. They are worth nothing. They make their examinations independently. They come to the same conclusion. They are all worthless.

So unanimous is this experience that it seems as if it were a necessary step in all real apprehension of religion. Newman says it is so. 'Self-knowledge is the root of all real religious knowledge'—these are Newman's words. But what is the occasion of it? On that also the testimony of these young men is unanimous and unmistakable. Each of them passes the judgment of worthlessness on himself 'by reference to the thought of an Omniscent Being before whom he conceives himself as standing.'

How does this judgment of themselves affect them? The result is misery. When the self is thus touched at the core, the emotion which arises at

once dominates the situation. The misery evoked is new in intensity, and perhaps also in quality. It bites into the mind. The distress is exquisite; no other emotion can countervail it; consolation is unattainable—'I must seek (relief) till I find it, or die in the search,' says one.

Now this intense distress is not due to the fear of punishment. Punishment is almost invited. It is the only reward they have merited, and it cannot be too severe. They are such offenders that nothing can be more just than that they should be counted reprobate and cast off for ever. 'I wish I were dead; if God pleases to save me, it is His infinite mercy; if He damns my soul, be it so: He is righteous and just.'

But they are not content to remain in this state of poignant misery. They take steps for its removal. The first step is an effort at self-vindication. The 'man that is in them' tries to rise against this overwhelming sense of worthlessness. But it is in vain. In every instance the effort at the rehabilitation of themselves is a failure. Nor are they more successful when they turn to amusement, to the pleasures of social intercourse, to the discharge of their duties in life. The emotion of the distress which occupies them rises still above all distractions. It occupies them everywhere. They cannot escape from it.

They escape from it at last. They all escape in one way. Again the unanimity of the experience is as surprising to the inductive inquirer as the experience was surprising to the men themselves. They escape from it, in Professor Caldecott's language, 'by making a transfer.' 'They abandon self-regard altogether, and decide to entrust their case wholly into the hands of Him before whom they conceive themselves to stand condemned.'

And this decision is arrived at 'when there comes into their experience a feeling that there is directed towards them a love which will—for a

reason they assign—so countervail the judgment of condemnation as to replace it and become the dominant attitude towards them.' Professor Caldecott does not say how they arrive at this belief. Perhaps they do not say in their autobiographies. Perhaps they did not know. But he says that, however arrived at, the belief in such a love does actually awaken in them a responsive love which explodes the emotional situation by its powerful energy; and dispossessing, for the moment at least, all other emotions of their influence. 'Overwhelmed with the presence of God,' is the expression of a Scotchman after a resistance unusually prolonged, and at the outset of a fifty years' ministry. 'My heart with a kind, sweet struggle melted into the hands of God,' says, not a mediæval Spaniard, but a Yorkshire clothier of the eighteenth century.

Many of the traditional judgments about Israel have had to be modified or abandoned. It was once believed that no other nation practised circumcision. It was once claimed that no other nation had received the gift of prophecy. We know now that the practice of the rite of circumcision is spread over the face of the earth. And Professor Maspero has just been telling us that Egyptians had their prophets as well as the Jews.

The claim to prophecy, however, as a force in the life of Israel, has not to be abandoned. The Egyptians had their prophets. But what were they? In the thirty-first chapter of his most recent volume, a volume which has been admirably translated into English by Elizabeth Lee, and published under the title of *New Light on Ancient Egypt* (Fisher Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), Professor Maspero gives an account of an Egyptian Book of Prophecies.

Like the Hebrews, says Professor Maspero, the Egyptians had their holy prophets, whose predictions, circulated from mouth to mouth, were then

written down, and copied through long ages in fragments more or less changed from the original, and, lastly, became classical texts, read and commented on in the schools. And he describes one of them. It fills one of the papyri sold by Anastasi to the Leyden Museum. It was paraphrased in German by Lauth more than thirty years ago, and expounded in French by Maspero himself. Yet its significance was missed. And now Dr. H. O. Lange has taken it in hand. It is but a fragment, and Lange has 'plenty to do to explain the detail'; but enough is decipherable and deciphered to enable us to form our own judgment of the value of prophecy in Egypt.

The name of the prophet is Apout. In the beginning of his book he no doubt told whether he was a prophet by profession, or had been called to the office unexpectedly, and even against his will. But the beginning of his book is gone and we may never know. As the book now begins, he stands before Pharaoh. He prophesies disaster. The disaster seems to be due to the weakness or worthlessness of the Pharaoh himself. For in the end he prophesies a triumphant return of prosperity under a sovereign raised up by God who will suddenly appear and become a true shepherd to his people. But to whatever it is due, it is dreadful enough in its severity and it spares neither high nor low.

Family ties will be broken. Society will be overturned. Dejection will lay hold of all the people. 'It is in vain that the Nile will overflow, the fields will no longer be cultivated by its aid; each man will say, "What is the use of it? Do we not know what is going to happen to the land?" The barbarians of the desert will profit by the general weakness to invade the rich black earth they have so long desired. They will massacre the brave people who resist them. And the slaves, being no more in bondage, will supplant their masters. "They will hang gold, lapis-lazuli, silver, malachite, cornelian round the necks of their wives, while princesses will be thrown into

the streets, and high-born dames will say, "If only we had something to eat!"'

The description seems graphic enough. But Professor Maspero has no great opinion of its sincerity. The prophecy 'is in a very elaborate style. Alliteration abounds, and every sentence moves to a fairly regular rhythm. In more than one case I should even say that there were assonances, if our ignorance of the exact pronunciation did not compel me to step warily. It is certain that the brilliancy of expression, and the sonority of the elocution, concealed the poverty and the banality of the matter from the auditors.' And what Professor Maspero (who has read his Amos and Isaiah) wonders at most is that the inspiration of the prophet is all so commonplace. He cannot understand what were the qualities that justified his success.

But is it not worth something that in the picture of the restoration the dominating figure is that of the 'good shepherd'? It is true that the good shepherd is no more than an idealized portrait of the Pharaoh. And to the Egyptian the ideal Pharaoh was the king who provided him with delicate fare, fine clothes, precious jewels, a house cool in summer and warm in winter, a garden with an artificial lake in which he might breathe 'the soft wind of the north,' songs, dances, a harem, and above all, no work to do, or at least as little as possible. It is true that the king predicted by the Egyptian prophet will ensure his subjects this lazy sensual existence until the day comes when death exiles them to Osiris. Yet is it nothing that the prophet sees the need of a king to ensure this, and that he calls him the 'good shepherd of his people'?

Messrs. A. & C. Black have published a translation, made by Mr. Maurice Canney, of Professor Schmiedel's book on *The Johannine Writings* (3s. 6d. net). It is the translation of three books, not of one. In the German they make Parts 8, 10,

and 12 of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*. Professor Schmiedel has made additions to these for the English edition. And now the hope is that this volume 'will serve as an introduction, and in some respects as a supplement, to Professor Schmiedel's famous Encyclopædia articles.'

Professor Schmiedel's manner is not unknown. We find an excellent example of it in the discussion of the day of Jesus' death.

'Was Jesus' trial possible on the feast-day?' That is the first sentence. 'It would seem not.' That is the second. And then Professor Schmiedel proceeds to say that, that being so, it looks as if John were right and the Synoptics wrong. It looks as if the Synoptics had made the Last Supper a Passover by mistake and John had written afterwards to correct them.

But is that possible? It is quite possible to Dr. Schmiedel's mind that the Synoptists made a mistake. But that John corrected them—that is not possible. For Professor Schmiedel has found John wrong everywhere else, and he is not going to find him right here. 'Consider,' he says, 'what this means. Hitherto, as compared with the Synoptics, the Fourth Gospel has always proved less correct, and often quite untrustworthy. Is this discovery to be all at once reversed?'

Accordingly Professor Schmiedel sets out to prove that the Synoptics may be right, but that here also the Fourth Gospel is certainly wrong. How may the Synoptics be right? It is possible that the trial before Pilate did take place, as the Synoptics say, on the day of the feast. But it was not a trial. The Jews had by this time lost the power of life or death. Jesus must in the end be sent to Pilate. Why then should the Council be at the trouble to condemn Him? 'We may well believe that the High Council had shrewdness enough to hit upon the expedient' of simply declaring that no judicial court would be

held, and that only a charge would be prepared to bring before Pilate.

On the approach of the Congress of Religions in Oxford, Professor Driver and Professor Sanday preached in the Cathedral of Christ Church. Their sermons have been published by Messrs. Longmans, under the title of *Christianity and other Religions* (1s. 6d. net). The volume contains two sermons by Professor Sanday, and one by Professor Driver.

Professor Driver found his text in Malachi. The words are: 'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering, saith the LORD of hosts' (Mal 1<sup>11</sup>). After reviewing the circumstances which led to the utterance, Professor Driver turned to the words themselves and asked what was the meaning of them.

He called the passage a remarkable one. For it seems to say that the sacrifices which the heathen offer to their gods and goddesses are acceptable to God. It seems to say that, if they are offered in sincerity, they are more acceptable to Him than the insincere offerings of Israelites. And more even than that, it seems to say that when 'the heathen in his blindness bows down to wood and stone,' his worship is worship of the LORD, simply because it is worship in sincerity, though not in truth.

The prophecy seems to mean that. It does mean that. The words and their meaning are unmistakable. We are wont to quote the words of St. Peter, 'In every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him' (Ac 10<sup>35</sup>), as the very utmost stretch of broad Christianity. Professor Driver says that Malachi goes beyond St. Peter.

Then Dr. Driver recalls a passage which is rarely

used in this reference. It is a passage in Deuteronomy (4<sup>19</sup>). 'The writer of Deuteronomy, in warning the Israelite against idolatry, bids him take heed "lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, even all the host of heaven, thou be drawn away and worship them, and serve them, which the LORD thy God hath divided (*i.e.* allotted) to all the peoples under the whole heaven.'" And

this passage is more surprising than the other. For it says that Jehovah has assigned the heathen their gods, just as He chose Israel for His own peculiar possession. 'The God of Israel is supreme: He assigns to every nation its objects of worship; and the veneration of the heavenly bodies—which was widely diffused in antiquity—by nations other than Israel, forms part of His providential order of the world.'

## The Bearing of Criticism upon the Gospel History.

BY THE REV. W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND  
LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, OXFORD.

### II.

THE controversy on the Fourth Gospel is very obstinately conducted, more obstinately than any other in the whole field of New Testament Criticism. If we date from the appearance of Bretschneider's *Probabilia* in 1820, it has been going on now for nearly ninety years; and yet the two sides confront each other as stubbornly as ever; neither will give way. Attack and defence are evenly balanced; a convinced book on one side is followed by a convinced book on the other.

I have specimens of both classes before me at this moment. The massive commentary of Dr. Theodor Zahn came out at the beginning of last year, and is a worthy monument of one of the most learned men of our time. By the side of this the Dean of Westminster's three Advent Lectures, published under the title *The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel*, will naturally seem slight, but the value of the little book must not be estimated by its size. Like everything the Dean writes, it is based upon close and careful first-hand study; and it has modified more than one current view in a sense of which future discussions ought to take note. Still more recently there is another excellent *Introduction to the N.T.*, by Professor Fritz Barth of Berne, which upholds the traditional view. And a volume of Baird Lectures on the treatment of the Gospels by Eusebius (*The Four Gospels in the Earliest Church History*, 1908), by Professor T. Nicol of Aberdeen, does the same.

On the other side I may mention two English books and two German, the latter both commentaries. Mr. Ernest F. Scott's *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology*, and Professor Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission*, both appeared in 1906, and are both adverse on the point that is most important for our present purpose, the historical value to be attached to the Gospel. Of the commentaries, one is by a young theologian W. Heitmüller of Göttingen, and forms part of a series edited by Johannes Weiss. The object of this series is popular, but the commentary on St. John is a competent piece of work characteristic of the school from which it proceeds. And the same may be said even more strongly of the commentary by Walter Bauer, which takes the place of an older work by H. J. Holtzmann: it is extremely close, exact, and conscientious.

We might place perhaps in an intermediate class books like Dr. Edwin A. Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary* (1905) and *Johannine Grammar* (1906), which are admirable collections of materials that do not as such point to a particular conclusion, or the very candid little book by Mr. H. L. Jackson (1906), in which the balancing of arguments seems to be more important than the final construction put upon them; and, lastly, two delicately discriminating papers by Dr. Lock in *The Interpreter* for July, 1907, and *Journal of Theological Studies* for April 1908.