
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

the influence of Henry II., were first made to acknowledge the authority of the Bishop of Rome. The forged decretals of the early Bishops of Rome were then believed in as true as the Gospels. Many, however, still held aloof. It was not until the thirteenth century that the Pope appointed an archbishop in Ireland.

Such, then, was the origin of England's rule and that of the Roman Church in Ireland. The latter based on a forged document, the former accomplished purely for a mercenary consideration, and obtained by conquest, to satisfy the ambition of a vacillating, superstitious, and time-serving monarch.

C. H. COLLETTE.

(To be continued.)

Reviews.

THE HIBBERT LECTURES.[1]

1891.—*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Conception of God as illustrated by Anthropology and History.* By Count GOBLET D'ALVIELLA.

1892.—*Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.* By C. G. MONTEFIORE.

1893.—*Lectures on the Bases of Religious Belief.* By C. B. UPTON.

1894.—*Via, Veritas, Vita; being Lectures on "Christianity in its most Simple and Intelligible Form."* By JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D.

BY the death of Mr. Robert Hibbert in 1849, a sum of money was bequeathed by him for the foundation of a trust fund, to be applied in a manner indicated in general terms by the testator himself, but with considerable latitude of interpretation to the trustees. For many years the funds were devoted to the higher culture of students for the Christian ministry, but subsequently it was deemed advisable to deflect the use of these funds somewhat, and employ them in the institution of a Hibbert Lecture, on a plan similar to that of the "Bampton" Lectures.

The trustees were fortunate enough to secure, as the first lecturer on the new foundation, the services of one of the most accomplished and learned scholars of this generation—Professor Max Müller. His lectures, on the "Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India," were delivered in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey in 1878. Every student of comparative religion is tolerably familiar with these brilliant lectures, which manage to combine a maximum amount of information with the maximum amount of lucidity—a combination at all times not very common, but never absent from any work to which Max Müller has set his hand. The object of the Hibbert Lectures was, as the memorial drawn up previous to their establishment stated, "the capable

[1] All the volumes of the Hibbert Lectures are published by Messrs. Williams and Norgate.

and honest treatment of unsettled problems in theology," freed from the "traditional restraints which in England have interfered with an unprejudiced treatment of the theory and history of religion." The memorial bore the signatures of many of the leaders of "advanced thought"—among them Dean Stanley, Dr. Martineau, Principal Caird, and Canon Cheyne.

The whole tone of the lectures from first to last has been "advanced"; and, with two exceptions, the lecturers have all been Unitarians or Theists. The two exceptions are Professor Sayce and the late Dr. Hatch. The predominant bias, therefore, of the Hibbert Lectures is clear. Hence we need not look in any of the fifteen volumes, of which the series consists, for any of those "confirmations" of the Christian religion, or those "refutations" of opponents which we are accustomed to look for in the Hulsean or Bampton Lectures.

The object of the present brief paper is to give a sketch of the last four sets of lectures delivered on the basis of the Hibbert trust. They are in every way characteristic of the series as a whole, now brought to a close by the publication of Principal Drummond's "Via, Veritas, Vita." Count d'Alviella's work on the "Idea of God" stands first on our list—not indeed in worth, but in priority of time. The book, so its author tells us, is to be regarded as a continuation of his "Contemporary Evolution of Religious Thought in England, America, and India." The book is frankly naturalistic—that is, discarding any notion of supernatural agency in the production of religious ideas, it seeks to find a justification for, and explanation of, the highest developments of religion in the lowest forms of religious culture. The comparative method has been pursued throughout; the old theory that man began at a high level of culture is rejected; and the genesis of the "Idea of God" is sought for in the worship of natural objects, and in the adoration paid to the dead. The debt which D'Alviella owes to Dr. E. B. Tylor is, of course, ample, and due acknowledgment of the debt is made throughout the work.

The simple animism of early ages, and the worship of ancestors, are steps, according to the theory of Tylor and others, by which man gradually climbed to a higher pedestal of thought. Little by little the objects of nature are no longer adored *themselves*, but it is the personality with which they are supposed to be endowed to which worship is addressed. Hence the gradual emerging of Polydemonism and, a little later still, Polytheism, in all its multiplicity of forms. In the struggle for existence between the conflicting powers, naturally enough there would be certain gods who attained pre-eminence to the exclusion of other gods, who were gradually subordinated to a lower rank in the hierarchy of heaven. This would almost inevitably eventuate in what Max Müller has aptly termed "Henotheism," or a successive belief in single supreme gods; and this, be it observed, is a great step towards that Monotheism which has characterized the religions of all the highest races. Still, the movement from Henotheism to Monotheism is slow and arduous; the dualistic stage, during which the struggle for order and the struggle for good successively manifest themselves, must previously be passed through. It is not, however, very easy to see how the various steps of this evolution succeed one another; gaps are numerous, and the very ease with which the development moves on is apt to excite suspicion in the reader's mind. Last in the mighty scheme comes Monotheism, born, not like Athena from the head of Zeus, fully armed, and endued with all perfection and grace, but in due time as the summit and crown of the long religious evolution of the remote past. God has become at length the absolute unity, the One without a second. I have sketched in, shortly, but (I think) sufficiently, the main features of that theory of religious develop-

ment which is to the front just now, and which is supposed to satisfy religion on the one hand, and the claims of science on the other. The real fact seems to be, however, that this supposed explanation, when adequately tested, explains nothing. How are we to account for the known fact that, thousands of years ago, in the dim dawn of history, man had attained some of the noblest thoughts upon the being of God and His relation to men which have ever been made known to the world? The Egyptian "Book of the Dead" or the "Maxims of Ptah-hotep" alone afford demonstration of this. The earliest records we possess tell the same tale; they point to a time far back when all men everywhere acknowledged one supreme Being. Take the Rig-Veda, for example; at the period when the earliest hymns were produced two systems co-existed, the one wholly naturalistic, the other resting on a moral and spiritual basis; and the remarkable fact is that the latter system was by far the more ancient of the two.

Naturalistic interpreters say, "This may be all very true; but in the pre-historic period things were as we maintain; and it is useless to rely upon written records, which are, one and all, of comparatively recent growth." In other words, we are asked to discard known data, and base our conclusions entirely upon the dominant hypothesis of evolution, which, however true in many directions, becomes totally inadequate when rigidly applied to the explication of religious ideas. Evolution or development there has doubtless been in religion as elsewhere; but to make this word an "Open, sesame!" for unfolding all things in heaven and earth is simply an abuse of terms. Indeed, as the late Canon Cook so admirably said in the introduction to his extremely learned and valuable work, "The Origins of Religion and Language" (a work, by the way, most unjustly ignored; perhaps for the reason that its line of argument is too cogent and convincing to be wholly tasteful to men with preconceived notions): "All ascertainable facts . . . are absolutely irreconcilable with the theory which regards all spiritual and soul-elevating religions as evolved by a natural process from a primitive naturalistic polytheism; they support the view, which alone supplies a true, rational, and adequate account of the movements of human thought, according to which religious beliefs were first set in motion by communications from God."

We may now pass on to the second of the four volumes under review.

Mr. Montefiore's lectures may be looked upon as giving, in a comparatively brief compass, the net results of modern criticism, so far as it bears upon the Old Testament. Destructive this criticism, of course, is; and there can be no room for doubting that its general acceptance among people must seriously affect their conception of Christianity itself as a Divine revelation. This is often denied by critics who wish to "push" their views, and obtain greater currency for them in the minds of the orthodox; but the denial is itself disingenuous. Once concede the main position demanded by the higher critics, and we are bound, in common honesty, completely to readjust the whole body of our religious opinions. Internal relations must be adjusted to external relations, in religion as in other things. Now, I do not say that some sort of adjustment is not necessary; possibly it is inevitable, for it is absurd to suppose that our mental focus may not require alteration in view of the vast discoveries of recent years, and after the perpetual labours of hundreds of devoted students in the field of archæology and criticism. Doubtless it may well be that the "fresh light," sprung from what quarter soever, will dazzle and bewilder us; the advent of a new truth has a tendency to disconcert men at the first.

But fresh adjustment of mental focus, in obedience to the demands

of just and equitable criticism, is one thing; a complete *volte-face* is another. Yet it is the latter movement which we are bound to execute, and without delay, if Mr. Montefiore's conclusions be true. There is virtue, however, in that little word "if." No dispassionate student will peruse the Hibbert Lectures of 1892 without recognising their cleverness, their brilliancy, and their speculative daring. Of course all the lecturer tells us *may* be true; but sober judges will ask for proof. Now, I do not hesitate to affirm that, for a multitude of the statements made in the course of these nine lectures, positive proof there is *none*—none whatsoever. Ingenious theorizing; subtle generalizations, hiding, in the mist and cloud of them, those particulars without which the very position to be established melts into thin air; hasty and incomplete surmises, which disregard any awkward facts which would run counter to them, and catch eagerly at the straws of every hypothesis which has wriggled itself into momentary notice—all this sort of thing one becomes only too familiar with as one turns the pages of Mr. Montefiore's interesting work—alas! as interesting as it is unconvincing.

With the various conflicting problems which the progress of Old Testament criticism has given birth to, we are not here concerned; these are matters for which specialists are alone sufficient. But upon the *results* of this extreme criticism sensible men, who are not specialists at all, are competent to pass judgment; that judgment will assuredly be given, sooner or later, against the baseless speculations of Wellhausen and his followers. The reaction is, in the opinion of competent observers, already setting in; and the pendulum of criticism, which has swung so far in one direction, will return to a more settled equilibrium. We shall probably learn that the hypothesis of two (or three) Isaiahs is a needless piece of critical radicalism, the differences between the earlier and later chapters being perfectly well accounted for on the simple supposition that they represent the early and later work of Israel's greatest prophet. The Psalms, too, when we can look at them again through an undistorted medium, will appear to be, not the exclusive work of post-Exilic writers who (we are asked to believe) composed hymns in a dialect as unfamiliar to them as Chaucer is to us, but the book of Israel's praise, contributed to by various hands at various times, but containing the choice products of the sweet psalmists of Israel from the earliest period down to the close of the Canon. Finally, throughout the "Divine library of the Old Testament" we shall see the working of one Divine Spirit, controlling its authors—known and unknown—superintending its compilation, and guiding its destinies; and we shall refuse to accept any hypothesis, though never so deftly framed, which relies for its force upon causes purely naturalistic.

Mr. Montefiore's book might have remained as a landmark in the history of Old Testament criticism, had he not permitted himself to be biased so completely in favour of a theory, as to be unable to see where that theory breaks down. It is valuable, however, from many points of view, and of the author's desire to get at what he believes to be the truth there can be no question; furthermore, it is useful in showing that, while a rigid traditionalism in matters Biblical is impossible (and irrational to boot), the counterblast provided by the higher criticism is even less rational, even less possible. For the moment, would it not be wise to collect still further facts and more trustworthy data than we have hitherto been content to accept, at the same time avoiding those allurements of theory and speculation which have proved a stumbling-block in the way of orthodox and progressive alike?

In Professor Upton's excellent work we have the philosophy, so to speak, of the Hibbert Lectures clearly defined and put before us in a singularly attractive form. Its general view of the universe agrees in

the main with that of Lotze, as set forth in "Microcosmus." Lotze's theory is a sort of ideal-realism, which is striking the dominant note of philosophy in Germany at the present time.

Professor Upton's book aims, not at representing theology from any orthodox standpoint, but at finding a natural and rational ground for theism in the normal self-consciousness of man. Hence, while fully sympathizing with those who contend for the felt immanence of God in His rational order, and who shrink from that notion of God which is so occupied with His transcendent majesty as to forget His ever-present power and love, Professor Upton summarily dismisses from his philosophy any idea of Incarnation, as Christians understand the term. The only Incarnation contended for in these lectures is one which, though more completely manifested in Christ than elsewhere, "is by no means peculiar to Him, but is, in its essence, the intrinsic property and highest privilege of all rational souls."

The book, in consequence, has a chill about it which seems to cling to all books written from the purely theistic point of view. Elevated as its philosophy is, chaste and noble as its ethical system declares itself to be, one inevitably feels a lack of colour and warmth throughout its pages. Its ethics yield, or seem to yield, no satisfaction to the heart, though intellectually they are complete enough. And what energizing power of a living personality have we in a moral code which is content with reiterations of the "categorical imperative," and in frigid insistence upon the claims of duty? Motive-power is lacking; and, in the life of a man, motive-power is requisite if he is fully to realize his own boundless potentialities, and give utterance to the hidden things of his inmost spirit. Now, motive-power must come from without, for man cannot create such a power wherewith to move himself; and this motive-power can only be drawn from One who is Himself the source of all moral suasion and the fountain of spiritual strength. He must also be able to sympathize with man, suffering with him in his sorrows and sharing in his joys. Christ alone, the God-man, "in whom dwelleth all[1] the fulness of the Godhead in bodily shape," answers to the ever-present, ever-recurring needs of human life in all its manifoldness and subtle complexity. Disguise it as we may, pure Theism logically ends in some form or other of sublated dualism; it is the glory of Christianity that it has taught men that behind this dualism a synthesis may be looked for. In the Son, God has made Himself object to Himself, and so ceases to be pure subject; in the spirit He has returned upon Himself again in an eternal reconciliation. This is the dialectic of the highest Christian philosophy.

If Professor Upton's book is the philosophical outcome of the teaching of the Hibbert Lectures, not less may we regard Dr. Drummond's work as the summing up of its teaching on the *practical* side. Christian students will welcome it and prize it—so far as it goes; for its ethical teaching is based upon the life and words of Christ. There is no dishing up here of an emasculated theology; the teaching of the book does not pretend to be some ethical substitute for religious faith. But while we welcome and value these lectures, so singularly reverent in tone, so beautiful in their setting, we need not blind ourselves to one significant fact—that the Christ of these lectures is not the *living* Christ of the Gospel, but a *dead* Christ. Dead, too, for all that His words live on as a potent and never fading influence in the life of humanity. For us, who believe that we are permitted to see with deeper insight into the mystery of God, "He is not dead," but "ever liveth to make intercession

[1] Πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θειότητος σωματικῶς.

for us." The difference between the two standpoints is vital; to minimize it would be disloyalty to the highest truth. In presence of this, all other difficulties vanish away; and it is upon one thing alone that the entire problem finally hinges—"What think ye of Christ?"

On all sides we may observe, if our attention is wisely directed, a desire—a world-hunger, I had almost said—to get back to the historic Christ. The "return to Christ" is, as Dr. Fairbairn[1] has justly noted, one of the great religious tendencies of our day. But that return is not a return to a dead Christ, buried in His rock-hewn grave in Judea nineteen hundred years ago, but a return to a *living* Christ, who truly moved with gracious presence among His fellows, and was indeed a man, tempted and tried even as men are tried and tempted to-day, and who yet was something divinely more. It is in Him, and none other, that we see "all things summed up—man, humanity, creation—in the last issue of life, and united to God."[2]

EDWARD HENRY BLAKENEY.

February 27, 1895.

Short Notices.

St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. By Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D. T. and T. Clark. Price 7s. 6d.

Professor Bruce's previous studies in Christian doctrine have long since earned the gratitude of students of the New Testament. Among living apologists his name stands deservedly high. Scarcely any thoughtful expositor would care to be without his "Training of the Twelve," on the whole his most valuable contribution to contemporary theology. The present work on St. Paul's conception of Christianity is intended as a companion to the author's "Kingdom of God," published six years ago. We have no hesitation in commending the new book to the notice of our readers. It is not an "epoch-making" book (the phrase has been so misused of late years that one is tempted to distrust it), but it is certainly a book which no student of early Christianity can well afford to neglect. It is written with a striking fulness of knowledge, and in an admirable spirit, and Dr. Bruce has lavished his best efforts in elucidating the main drift of St. Paul's conception of Christianity. With many of the writer's conclusions we venture to disagree, for they are considerably less Pauline than were the views of the great Apostle himself. Here and there, too, as one pauses to reconsider the argument, the feeling that is uppermost is that what is being pressed upon our immediate attention is not so much "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity," as Professor Bruce's. But, perhaps, in a work of this kind, such an event is not altogether avoidable.

There are twenty-one chapters altogether in the book; and one may safely say that there is no single chapter of all the twenty-one which does not amply deserve detailed notice of some sort or other. No review, in fact, would be quite adequate which did not run to pretty well the same length as the volume itself. We cannot, however, close this brief reference to a really noteworthy book, without thanking Professor Bruce for having furnished us with so stimulating and careful an inquiry into a subject fraught with the highest interest. Even where complete agree-

[1] "Christ in Modern Theology" (1893).
[2] Westcott, "Gospel of Life" (1892).