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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS has now been published. It contains 903 pages, together with 22 pages of preliminary matter. The last 15 pages are occupied with illustrations, which are printed on specially prepared paper.

It is a book for all who have an interest in Religion and Morality. These two things are neither separated in it nor combined. They are set down together as they occur. The Editor gives no reason for including them in one work. He believes that there is no longer any call for an explanation. It is enough that the one cannot now be treated apart from the other with any good result either for knowledge or for life.

It is especially a book for the teacher. And the preacher is a teacher. But whether he occupies the pulpit or the platform, the chair of the professor, or the desk of the author and editor, it is a book for the teacher, that he may be able to teach with ease, with interest, and with authority.

It is not a book of Apologetics. Having to do with Religion it has of course to do with Christianity. Christianity will no doubt occupy more space in it than any other religion, more perhaps than all other forms of religion combined. But THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS is not prepared for the purpose of proselytizing. Every religion, and each doctrine and practice of every religion, will be described by one who may or may not be an adherent of that religion, but who in any case will be thoroughly acquainted with it, and able to write authoritatively upon it. If, however, after all the religions have, as it were, had their chance, it should appear that Christianity possesses the highest moral and spiritual value, then the Encyclopædia will no doubt prove itself to be an apologetic for Christianity. And if it takes its place thus among the labourers in the great harvest field, the Editor will rejoice. But it is time we understood that only by adhering with all our might to the unbiassed unassailable truth of things can we pray the prayer, 'Thy kingdom come.'

Very great care has been taken to find the best writer for each article. Often it happens that the man and the subject go unquestionably together, that there is no other man for the subject, and no other subject for the man. It is not surprising, therefore, that the first volume should contain articles by no fewer than one hundred and ninety-five authors, of whom one hundred and thirty-five have written but a single article. Thus Professor Achelis of Halle writes on the Agapetæ, Mr. Mardiros Ananikian on Zoroastrian Armenia,

Mr. Antonio Apache on the Apaches, the Rev. John Batchelor on the Ainus, Professor van Berchem on Muhammadan Architecture in Syria and Egypt, the President of Trinity College, Oxford, on Æschylus, Professor Bousset on Antichrist, Sir Edward Brabrook on Arbitration, Professor Baldwin Brown on Christian Art, Dr. A. E. Burn on Adoptianism, Professor Burnet on the Academy, Professor Coe on Adolescence, Professor Cowan on the Action Sermon, Count Goblet d'Alviella on Animism, Professor Dill on Alexander of Abonoteichos, Dr. Duckworth on Abnormalities, Principal Garvie on Agnosticism, Professor Geffcken on Allegorical Interpretation, Major Gurdon on the Ahoms, Professor Yrjö Hirn of Helsingfors on the Origins of Religious Art, Dr. Hoernle of Oxford on the Ajivikas, Professor Inge on the Theology of Alexandria, Professor Chiuta Ito on Chinese Architecture, Principal Iverach on Altruism, Professor Henry Jackson on Aristotle, Professor Jevons on Anthropomorphism, Professor Kennett on Arks, Professor Kilpatrick of Toronto on the Anger of God, Principal Lindsay on Amyraldism, Professor Littmann (Nöldeke's successor at Strassburg) on Abyssinia, Professor Macdonald on Allah, Professor McGiffert on the Apostolic Age, Professor McGlothlin on the Anabaptists, Sir Clements Markham on the Andeans, Principal Marshall on Adoration, Shams-ul-Ulma Modi on Parsi Adultery, Professor Moss on Alexander the Great, Mr. Bass Mullinger on the Albigenses, Dr. Robert Munro on Anthropology, Professor Nöldeke on the Ancient Arabs, Miss Owen on the Prairie Tribes of the Algonquins, Professor Paton on the Ammonites, Dr. Mary Mills Patrick on Anaxagoras, Professor Prince on the Eastern Algonquins, Professor Sayce on Early Armenia, Sir Alexander Simpson on Anæsthetics, Principal Simpson of Leeds on Apostolic Succession, Dr. Srawley on the Theology of Antioch, Professor Strack on Anti-Semitism, Dean Strong on Absolution, Professor Strzygowski on Muhammadan Art, Sir Richard Temple on the Andamans, Professor Wenley on Acosmism, Dr. Mackie Whyte on Alcohol, Mr. Woods on the Antediluvians, and Professor de Wulf on Æsthetics.

There are other names which are attached indissolubly to certain subjects, though they have written in this volume on more than one aspect of their subject. To Professor Cumont belongs Mithraism, and here he has written on Anahita and on Mithraic Architecture and Mithraic Art. Baron Carra de Vaux has written on Alchemy among the Muslims as well as on Abd al-Qadir al-Jilani. Mr. Crooke is the authority on the Animistic Tribes of India, and he has several articles in this volume. And Colonel Waddell is unsurpassed in knowledge of the 'great Unknown' land. He writes in this volume on the Tibetan Abbot and on Amitayus. Professor Flinders Petrie appears with articles on Egyptian Architecture and Egyptian Art; and Professor de la Vallée Poussin with articles on Adi-buddha as well as on Buddhist Ages of the World and Buddhist Agnosticism. Professor Arthur Thomson writes on Abiogenesis, on Adaptation, and on Age; and the late Master of St. John's has two characteristic articles, one on Accidie, the other on Acrostics.

It is a book for the preacher. But we do not expect, and we do not ask, the preacher to purchase it because it is a book of interesting information. The Encyclopædia must prove itself necessary for his work. He must discover that without it he cannot preach so well as he could preach with it. He must first see that the pulpit now demands a greater range of topic than formerly, and at the same time greater accuracy in the handling of every topic that is touched. He must know that the topics which arrest the attention are no longer niceties of intellectual distinction in theology, but such fundamental matters as the nature of God, and His entrance into the life of man in every part of the world.

In *The Expositor* for September there is an article by Professor B. D. Eerdmans of Leiden

on 'The Hebrews in Egypt.' The 'Hebrews in Egypt' keep the key of the chronology of the Old Testament, and they are very reluctant to deliver it up. Professor Eerdmans makes another attempt to recover it.

He begins with the stele of Merenptah. In the year 1896 a stele was discovered on which Merenptah had inscribed the record of the capture by him of certain cities in Palestine, and the devastation of Israel. But it has generally been held that Ramses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and that his successor, this very Merenptah, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. If the Exodus took place in the reign of Merenptah, how could he harry the fields of Israel in Palestine? Where would the forty years' wanderings come in? Where, apart from any wanderings, would there be found time to let the Israelites march to Canaan and settle down in the land? That is the first question. To that question three different answers have been made.

Mr. Fotheringham, in his *Chronology of the Old Testament*, published in Cambridge in 1906, answers that it is not Palestine that Merenptah refers to. It is Egypt. The Exodus has just taken place. Does Merenptah speak of the destruction of the crops of the Israelites?—'the crops of the Israelites, of course, are those planted in the land of Goshen and left behind unharvested in their hurried flight.'

Is this the solution of the difficulty? This solution, says Professor Eerdmans, is made impossible by the text of the inscription. The text of the inscription is: 'Askalon is led away; Gezer is taken; Yenuam is brought to nought; Israel is devastated, they do not have crops; Kharu has become as a widow by Egypt.' What have Askalon and Gezer to do with Goshen? And then Kharu is Palestine—of that there is no doubt.

Professor Ed. Meyer believes that the Exodus took place long before the time of Merenptah. It took place, he believes, even before the reign of Sety I. (1326–1300 B.C.). Miketta also holds that the Exodus occurred before Merenptah's day, though not quite so long before. He thinks that the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Thutmes III., and the Pharaoh of the Exodus Amenophis II. (1442–1423 B.C.). Then the harrowing of the Israelites by Merenptah might easily take place after they had settled in Canaan. Will that do?

It does not seem so. There is the difficulty of the store-cities. While they were in Egypt the Israelites were compelled to build store-cities for Pharaoh. These store-cities were called Pithom and Raamses. Now one of these cities was evidently called after a Pharaoh whose name was Ramses. That could not be Ramses I., the predecessor of Sety I., for his reign of two years was insufficient. But neither could it be Ramses II., although that has hitherto been the commonly accepted opinion. For Professor Eerdmans thinks it impossible that the Israelites could have left Egypt in the reign of the powerful Ramses II. And we have seen that there was no time for them to leave in the reign of his successor, Merenptah, and be settled in Palestine in time for him to harry their fields by the fifth year of his reign.

The third attempt to solve the difficulty is the most popular one. It is the attempt which has been made by Professor Flinders Petrie. Professor Petrie supposes that only part of the Israelites went down into Egypt. Part remained in Palestine. The 'Israel' that was devastated by Merenptah consisted of those tribes which did not go down into Egypt. Will that opinion stand?

Professor Eerdmans does not believe that it will stand. We know nothing, he says, of tribes of Israel that did not go down into Egypt. If there were such tribes they would not have forgotten this part of their history; they would not have forgotten to record it. For the sojourn in

Egypt was inglorious. It was from the degradation of slavery that the Israelites were delivered under the hand of Moses. If there were tribes that had never been in bondage to any man, they would have stoutly refused to be identified with those who had been slaves in Egypt; they would have resented any attempt of the historian to class them all together.

Thus all the ways of explaining the inscription of Merenptah yet offered have been named and rejected. The inscription has not been explained. The key to the Chronology of the Old Testament has not been found.

The trouble, it is to be observed, is with the store-cities. If the Israelites built Pithom and Raamses in the days of Ramses II., how could they have left Egypt in time to settle down in Palestine and have their cornfields destroyed in the fifth year of the reign of his successor? Professor Eerdmans has an answer of his own, and he now brings it forward. It is meant especially to meet the difficulty of the store-cities.

His answer is that when the Israelites entered Egypt there was already a Hebrew population there. If the store-cities were built in the reign of Ramses II., that Hebrew population built them. The Israelites had not yet entered Egypt in the reign of Ramses II. Nor had they entered Egypt in the days of his successor. Therefore the Israelites whose cornfields were destroyed by Merenptah were the Israelites whom we know, but *before they went down into Egypt.*

What proof does Professor Eerdmans offer of this astonishing theory?

First of all, he recalls the statement in the Book of Genesis that when Joseph's brethren came down into Egypt, he urged them to tell Pharaoh that they were shepherds. Why? Why did he wish them to tell what was sure to be unwelcome news to Pharaoh? For every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians. It was, says Professor Eerdmans, in order that they might not be compelled to labour as the Hebrews who were already in the land. And the scheme was successful at first. By and by, however, the Israelites were sent to the fields with their kinsmen. They may not have had to build Pithom and Raamses, but they had to 'serve with rigour,' and the Egyptians 'made their lives bitter with hard bondage.'

Next, there is in the papyrus Harris a reference to which Professor Eerdmans attaches the utmost importance. It occupies only a few lines. This is the translation: 'The land of Egypt was overthrown. Every man was his own guide; they had no superiors. From the abundant years of the past we had come to other times. The land of Egypt was in chiefships and in princedoms; each killed the other among noble and mean. Other times came to pass after that; in years of scarcity Yersew, a man from Palestine, was to them as chieftain. He made the whole land tributary to himself alone. He joined his companions with him, and seized their property. And they treated the gods in the same manner as they treated the people; offerings were not presented in the shrines of the temples. When the gods turned again to peace, rule was restored to earth in its proper manner.'

Notice here the name Yersew. Professor Eerdmans does not say positively that Yersew is Joseph. The names are scarcely like enough to compel identification. But the Egyptians in transcription may have corrupted Joseph into Yersew. And all the rest is in striking agreement. 'It is certain that Genesis tells the same things about Joseph that, in the papyrus Harris, Ramses III. tells about Yersew.'

Then the Israelites must have entered Egypt about 1205 B.C., under the reign of Septah. For after Merenptah came Sety II., an elderly man, who reigned five uneventful years. Sety II. was

succeeded by his son, Amun-moses, who died in the first year of his reign. Next came Septah. Septah was the consort of the princess Tausert, a daughter of Sety II. He was a weak ruler. The real ruler was a man of Semitic origin, who came from Palestine, and whose name, as we have seen, was Yersew. To Septah succeeded Setnekht, who reigned only one year. Then the nineteenth dynasty closed. With the first king of the new dynasty the foreign influence came to an end. 'He purified the great throne of Egypt.'

Professor Eerdmans' argument is that all the circumstances point to the arrival in Egypt of Joseph and his brethren in the days of the weak Septah. Soon after that the dynasty came to an end. The first king of the new dynasty 'knew not Joseph.' He was an energetic ruler, and would be likely to imitate the great Ramses II. If the store-city of Raamses was already built, he would in any case send the Israelites to join those Hebrews who had been long in Egypt before them, and were already doing the work of slaves in the fields. Thus he, and perhaps his successor, 'made their lives bitter with hard bondage.' Then they cried to God, and in the fourth generation Moses came down to deliver them.

'In the fourth generation Moses came.' But is it not stated in Gen. 15^{13} that the sojourn in Egypt was four hundred years? Professor Eerdmans believes that that reference is, not to the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, but to the sojourn of the Hebrews there. In Gen. 15^{16} it is said that they left Egypt in the fourth generation. This reference, Professor Eerdmans believes, is to the Israelites themselves. Reckoning twenty years to a generation (for they marry early in the East), he gets the eighty years which lie between the descent in 1205, and the exodus in 1125.

The theory is not altogether in the air. For in Exod. 12^{38} we are told that when the Israelites went up out of Egypt 'a mixed multitude went up with them.' Who were they? Not Egyptians. That is impossible. 'Evidently,' says Professor Eerdmans, 'they were Hebrews of non-Israelite origin.' They had intermarried with the dark-coloured half-Semitic (or wholly Semitic) tribes who lived on the southern frontier of the Egyptian empire, and who were used by the Egyptians as slaves or soldiers. Even Moses had married a Kushite woman. And the name of Aaron's grandson Phinehas is pure Egyptian and means 'the negro' (pnḥsi). The tradition of the 'mixed multitude' knew of a sojourn in Egypt of four centuries; the Israelites knew of only four generations. The Israelites must have entered Egypt in the reign of Septah, about 1205 B.C.; they must have left it about 1125 B.C., when Ramses XII. was reigning.

There is an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* this quarter on 'The Theology of the Keswick Convention.' The article is anonymous. Whoever the writer is, and we have no skill in this kind of divination, he is frankly out of sympathy with Keswick.

He is not out of sympathy with the theology of the Keswick Convention. He is out of sympathy with the Convention. He has attended it. He has attended it once at least. For he speaks of having observed only two episodes of a particular kind 'during the whole course of one Convention.' But he has no sympathy with it. And his knowledge of the theology of the Convention he has derived from the writings of its leaders, especially the five volumes which he places at the head of his article—(1) *The Keswick Convention: Its Message, its Method, and its Men*, edited by C. F. Harford, M.A., M.D.; (2) and (3) *The Keswick Week*, for 1905 and 1907; (4) *Unclaimed Privileges*, by Evan H. Hopkins; and (5) *Hymns of Consecration and Faith*, newly edited by Mrs. Evan Hopkins.

The Keswick Convention has a history. And its history begins before its existence. There were conferences at Mildmay and in other

parts of London, at Barnet, at Perth, Dublin, Manchester, Nottingham, Leicester, Stroud, and other places, and in the United States. In 1874, from August 29 to September 7, there took place at Oxford a 'Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness,' at which about a thousand people were present. It was due to the initiative of Sir Arthur Blackwood. The Oxford Conference was followed by one in Brighton Pavilion, at which about eight thousand people were present. Canon Harford-Battersby was at Oxford and at Brighton, and received great spiritual help at the former meeting. Desiring to give his parishioners the same, he arranged at Brighton to hold in Keswick the Convention of 1875. This was the first of the series held there ever since.

The Keswick Convention has its own history. Its own history is a spiritual history. It is divided into three periods. In the first period the main aspect of the gatherings, and the chief topic of the speakers, was *peace and joy*, the peace and joy which follow consecration. Of this the Rev. C. A. Fox and Mr. Hudson Taylor were the great exponents. In the second period the life of faith was more particularly directed into practical activities, and *work and personal testimony* were discussed, and were then carried out 'in a great many works of a charitable and evangelistic character, both in this country and abroad.' In applying this to foreign missionary work Mr. Eugene Stock had much influence. In the third stage, which is the present stage, a wider range of subjects is discussed. *Teaching* is the word by which Mr. Figgis describes this phase. 'The two simultaneous Bible-readings given on four mornings (Tuesday to Friday) are a marked feature of the Convention. The Revs. Evan Hopkins, A. T. Pierson, G. Macgregor, H. W. Webb-Peploe, Hubert Brooke, and Andrew Murray, and the Bishop of Durham, are especially mentioned in this connexion.'

And when he has referred to these three periods the writer of the article most happily recalls a passage of Scripture which is illustrated by the three. It is St. John 10^9, 'I am the door of the sheep; by me if any man enter in, he shall be kept safe, and shall go in and out and find pasture'—*go in*, that is peace and joy; *go out*, that is work and personal testimony; *find pasture*, that is teaching.

With the theology of the Convention, we say, he is not out of sympathy. He is out of sympathy with the Convention. And he gives the reason. 'The two great tents in which the meetings are held, bear, inside and out, a large motto, "All one in Christ Jesus."' That means that 'sects and denominations are present as well as the Church which is undenominational because Catholic.' And while 'this union of various forms of Christianity is on the one hand a source of strength, on the other it is perhaps a greater source of weakness, as we shall try to show.'

The writer's criticism is short. It consists of two parts. First, the Keswick Convention makes too much of the emotions. He says, 'We have heard a speaker with extravagant gestures and passionate tones call for more emotion, and, after stirring up the audience to his utmost, call on them excitedly to "sob." This produced hysterical symptoms from more than one.' And he adds, 'The danger of appeals to the emotions is illustrated by the insanity which frequently appears after the Convention.'

The other part of the criticism seems to be directed to the theology taught at the Convention, but it is still directed to the Convention. 'Keswick takes the principle of Hebrews 6^{1-3}, without the whole basis on which it rests.' The author of the Epistle speaks of going on unto perfection. So does Keswick. But the author of the Epistle shows that the higher truths rest on a six-fold foundation, Repentance, Faith, the teaching of Baptism and Confirmation, Resurrection and Judgement. And some of these are neglected at Keswick. Why are they neglected? Because of the large motto, 'All one in Christ Jesus.'

With the theology of the Keswick Convention the writer of this article is, as we have said, in sympathy. What is the theology? It can all be summed up under one short phrase: 'Holiness by Faith.'

The writer proceeds to quote from the Bishop of Durham a definition of Holiness and a definition of Faith. But it is not necessary. Both words are taken in the way we all understand them. There are two things, however, which have to be attended to.

The first is that the faith which is exercised at the Keswick Convention is not the faith which justifies. That faith is understood to have been exercised already; and justification, or the passing from death unto life, is understood to have already taken place. The Convention is 'for the *deepening* of the spiritual life.' Now when faith is exercised with a view, not to justification but to sanctification, not to life but to greater holiness of life, it is still an act and instantaneous. That is the secret and the surprise of the Keswick movement. It is an act, but such an act—

> Oh, the little more, and how much it is!
> And the little less, and what worlds away!

It is an act which gives entrance into a new life. Not the life of the Spirit; that is entered already; but the life of holiness, the life of daily fellowship with the Spirit, conscious and serene. It is spoken of sometimes as a crisis, just as the first reception of Christ by faith is a crisis; but it is a crisis that has always a further experience before it. In the words of Bishop Moule, it is 'a crisis with a view to a process.'

That process is sanctification. Its goal is holiness, perfect and entire. And so the second thing which has to be attended to is the Keswick teaching on holiness of life.

Does Keswick teach perfection? That is the question which is usually asked, and it is usually asked in that blunt and aggressive form. The Keswick teachers answer No. They constantly answer No. At every Convention they repeat the negative. Keswick, says the Bishop of Durham, has been preserved 'from ever formulating, as its authentic message, a dream of sinlessness.'

But what Keswick rejects in terms, this writer says Keswick teaches in fact. The Keswick teachers speak of victory, of 'perfect victory' over sin. The writer knows what they mean. They mean that the fellowship in the Spirit which the first act of surrender makes conscious, has in it the potentiality of sinlessness. And, more than that, having in it the potentiality of sinlessness, it has also the realization of sinlessness, if the fellowship is maintained unbroken through daily whole consecration. But the multitudes that throng to Keswick do not understand the meaning. There is a danger, says this writer, that some of them may expect that after the crisis of self-surrender they will sin no more; or, still worse, believe themselves to be living a life without sin.

From Keswick to the science of Psychology. From the Bishop of Durham to Professor Coe. But these extremes have met now. These men have looked one another in the face. It will not be possible any longer for the believer in 'Holiness by Faith' to be ignorant of the laws which regulate the reception of 'the Blessing.' It will not now be possible for the student of Psychology to ignore the Keswick Convention.

In the *American Journal of Theology* for July, Professor Coe has an article on Psychology in relation to Regeneration. Its title is in the form of a question. 'What does Modern Psychology permit us to believe in respect to Regeneration?'

Its form is not of Professor Coe's own choosing. To him as a scientific observer the question has been put by a Christian believer. He is a little flattered by the form of it. 'It is somewhat

startling to be asked what beliefs psychology *permits* Christians to entertain.' He mildly protests. 'Why should our beliefs trail at the heels of science?' But there it is; and he has no doubt that he can give an answer to it. For he says that 'experiences concerning which the Church has insisted that "thou knowest not whence it cometh" are now described as coming in definite ways, like other mental phenomena.'

The discussion has a double reference. It bears upon religious experience and upon religious education. Both are matters of the utmost consequence, and both have reached an acute stage of controversial interest.

It has to do with religious education. For the time has come when parents and teachers have been compelled to ask the question what religious education is. And the answer reveals a distressful difference. On the one hand there are those who say that it is not education that is needed, but regeneration: they may even add that the less education the better chance for regeneration. On the other hand there are those who say that education in religion is as education in mathematics: it is a form of culture,—perhaps the highest form, perhaps not—but a form of culture. And without a throb of regret, they ask, what remains of the doctrine of regeneration.

But the chief bearing of the discussion is on our own religious experience. And here the first thing that has to be considered is whether psychology leaves room for regeneration.

Professor Coe replies at once that it does. 'The popular belief that profound and permanent changes of character may take place suddenly; that likes and dislikes may thus be revolutionized, and that the whole may occur with little or no sense of effort, so that even persons of weak and perverted will may be set right and kept right—this belief, so dear to the evangelical heart, is strengthened, on the whole, by psychological study.' He admits that there is nothing new in this. 'The facts were known, of course, before the psychologist took a hand; but impressiveness has been added to the facts, by freeing them from their setting of tradition and popular impressionism, and by recording them in the more accurate language of science.'

So far, so good. Against regeneration psychological science has nothing to say. Psychology not only leaves the door open for regeneration, it gives the sanction of science to the popular belief. It calls the phenomena of the New Birth facts, and records them 'in the more accurate language of science.' But what is this that follows? 'Careful study fails to support the notion that such a change is within the reach of all.'

Here is a surprise. We have long been familiar with the doctrine that God has elected some to everlasting life and left others in their original state of sin and misery. But who would have expected that psychology should come to the aid of Calvinism just when its enemies were rejoicing over its final discomfiture? Does Professor Coe say that regeneration is not within the reach of all?

No, that is not what he says. What he says is that sudden conversion is not within the reach of all. He says that when the phenomena of a revival meeting are carefully reduced to fact, it is found that some have passed through a sudden and profound upheaval, while others, anxiously desiring it, pleading for it, and waiting for it, go away disappointed. Again the facts are familiar enough. It is the explanation of them that is new. Professor Coe's explanation is that such persons as go away disappointed do so, not because they are of the reprobate, nor because they have failed to fulfil some condition of belief or morality, but simply because they are psychologically different, and their regeneration is to come 'through the action of a normal intelligence and a deliberate will.'