THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first volume of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS has been published, and the publishers have sent a copy for review.

The idea of editing an Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics arose in this way. The *Dictionary of the Bible* contains a series of articles in Theology. But the theology closes with the Canon. It is what we call Biblical Theology. Now we have all come to understand that theology should never close. It is a record of life. It is itself a living thing. It cannot be arrested anywhere. It must live with the life of the Church. It must develop as the Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. The need of a Dictionary of Progressive Theology was evident.

But to confine the Dictionary to Theology was to rob Theology of its progress. A doctrine that has life in it cannot be usefully described without taking into account the manifestations of that doctrine in the religious life of the world. These manifestations are not versions of the Christian doctrine, nor are they perversions. They are parts of the complete doctrine, and must be taken account of in any scientific description of it. An article on FAITH is incomplete without some reference to the Hindu doctrine of BHAKTI-MARGA. An article on the Atonement can no longer be written by a man who misses the significance of those infants buried under the foundation-stones of dwelling-houses which Mr. Macalister has been discovering at Gezer. A Dictionary of Theology must now be a Dictionary of Religion.

And it must include Ethics. For, while the idea rose out of the study of Theology, the necessity of including Ethics became very soon apparent. Religion cannot be described apart from Ethics. It is true that there is a series of great articles in the Encyclopædia on ANCESTOR-WORSHIP, and they seem to be purely religious articles. Again, there are great articles on ACTIVITY and ANALOGY, and they seem to be purely ethical. So also it is true that there was a Congress of Religions in Oxford in September, and a Congress of Ethics in London in the end of the same month, and the one Congress seemed to be distinct from the other.

But at the Congress of Religions, the President, Sir Alfred Lyall, repeated his belief, already expressed in his *Asiatic Studies*, that Religion cannot survive without Morality, or Morality exist without Religion. And at the Congress of Moral Education (as the exact title was), Canon Glazebrook said that man's ideal of duty for himself is inextricably bound up with his conception of God's nature and providence; while Miss Alice Ottley, without protest, asserted, 'The relation between Ethics and Religion

is in my view so vital and so essential that it is difficult to separate them even in thought.'

Those who attended the Congress of Religions held in Oxford in September had one sore disappointment. It was when Professor Sanday read no more than a few extracts from his paper.

Professor Sanday was President of the Christian Section. He had prepared his address with his usual care. It was already printed and in the members' hands. They could read it at leisure. There would be very few of them who would not, sooner or later, read every word of it. But when he rose to deliver it, there was that hush of expectancy which waited but rarely upon even the presidents' addresses. And very great was the disappointment when he found it necessary to read only a few fragments of it, and sit down. The previous addresses had covered part of the ground, and the time was short.

The address is in our hands. It has been published at the Clarendon Press (1s. net). It must be read with care. It may be read with ease. The whole field is surveyed with just judgment, and there are many penetrating estimates.

The instruction given to the presidents of sections was to furnish a survey of the literature of their department, covering the period since the last Congress was held. The last Congress was held in Basel four years ago. Professor Sanday preferred a certain round number of years which he called an Olympiad. He then interpreted the scope of his department and his survey.

His department was Christianity. But what is Christianity? At a Congress of Religion held in Oxford the Christian Section must be the centre of interest. To it all the other sections must have avenues of approach. Professor Sanday rightly concluded that he would be expected to know this. He therefore resolved to survey the literature of Christianity, first as literature which the other sections had produced bearing on Christianity, and next as literature which Christianity had produced bearing on the other sections.

He knew that this would involve some overlapping with other presidents' addresses. And it was the overlapping with the address of Dr. Morris Jastrow, who was president of the Semitic Section, and whose address immediately preceded, that caused the great disappointment. Nevertheless, the method, in the hands of Professor Sanday, was the best that could have been chosen. In order to carry it out he determined to speak, first, of the literature dealing with the Old Testament, as of that which preceded Christianity; next, of the literature of Greece and Rome, of Persia and India, as of that which surrounds Christianity; thirdly, of the literature of the New Testament as of that which originated Christianity; and lastly, of the religion of the Church, as of that which develops Christianity.

He spoke first of the literature dealing with the Old Testament. And he had just entered upon his survey of the literature on the Old Testament, when he came to Kautzsch and his article in the fifth volume of the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. 'For us in England,' he said, 'it was of special value that the extra volume of Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, which came out in 1904, contained an article on "The Religion of Israel," by Dr. E. Kautzsch, which was of the dimensions of a treatise, and that no small one. It would have been impossible to have a more admirable or more weighty summary of the work done upon this subject in recent years. I would take this opportunity to say that I hope that all our younger English students will make a point of grounding themselves thoroughly in this article as a solid foundation not only for the study of the Old Testament, but of all that depends upon the Old Testament; in other words, of Christianity as a whole.'

This led him to remark in passing, and he made the remark chiefly for the benefit of 'our foreign guests,' that 'a large proportion of the work done in this country during the last ten years or more, and not a little of that which may be expected in the near future, has found and is likely to find its way into dictionaries.' He gives two reasons. It 'is partly due to the great energy and organizing ability of the editors of these dictionaries, but also to the fact that a dictionary offers a convenient opening to students who are conscious that their country is somewhat in arrears, and who are anxious to make up for lost ground.'

We have no doubt that, besides the dictionaries already published, Professor Sanday had in mind chiefly the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. That dictionary or encyclopædia covers the whole of the ground represented at Oxford, and Professor Sanday has himself undertaken some of the greatest of the articles which it will contain.

But to return to the address. There are touches of delightful friendliness. 'Another colleague and friend of mine, Dr. Cheyne, I wish indeed could be here to speak for himself. He will, I am sure, have the sympathy of all in the serious illness which keeps him away. He has always been in the forefront of progress, and has been one of the very first to greet new knowledge of every kind.'

And there are flashes of delicious humour. 'I spoke of Benzinger's conversion as significant. Some might think still more so the remarkable excursion into the field of theology of P. Jensen, who is one of the most courageous and learned of those who have broken their teeth on the Hittite language. He published in 1906 the first volume, in more than a thousand pages, of a work entitled *Das Gilgameschepos in der Weltliteratur*, the effect of which is intended to show that not only the greater part of the Old Testament, but even the substance of the Gospels themselves, are but faint echoes of the old Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh (corresponding to the Biblical Nimrod) and the Flood. These strange doctrines are said to have made one convert in Jensen's fellow-Assyriologist Zimmern; but I greatly fear that for the rest they are likely to be preached to an unbelieving and perverse generation. By his own admission Jensen is gifted with a very fertile imagination, and with him imagination takes the form of extreme quickness to perceive analogies, which is apparently combined with some reluctance to criticise them. The consequence is an elaborate construction which seems to be built on the principles made classical by Fluellen:

> There is a river in Macedon; and there is also moreover a river at Monmouth. . . . 'Tis so like as my fingers is to my fingers, and there is salmons in both.'

When we pass with Professor Sanday to the 'Surroundings,' we see at once that this scholar has not been left behind in the progress of the study of Religion. He is a specialist in Christianity. There it behoves us all to be specialists. But he has discovered, we know not how, that Christianity can no longer be studied in a compartment by itself. He surveys the literature of Greece and Rome—not generally, but as touching on Christianity and Religion, with swiftness and with accuracy. The names he mentions in the Græco-Roman department are those of Wissowa, Aust, Warde Fowler, Carter, Bailey, Farnell, Harrison, and Gruppe—names and nothing more to some of us. But they have all to be reckoned with now, even by the preacher of the gospel.

The New Testament period is introduced by a summary of the great controversy which preceded the present Olympiad, the controversy over the title 'Son of Man.'

By the time that the Congress sat at Basel, that controversy, says Dr. Sanday, had nearly worked itself out. What was the result of it? On the one hand, it was admitted that in the Aramaic of Palestine, as it was spoken at the

Christian era, the phrase had come to mean simply 'man' or (with the article) 'the man.' But, on the other hand, it did not by any means follow that it had not been used by Christ Himself and of Himself. For the evidence showed that it was deeply rooted in the Synoptic as well as in the Johannine tradition, and that it was confined to this, being absent from the usage of St. Paul and the Primitive Church in general.

To that main conclusion were added some lesser results. Most scholars had come to accept at least a tacit reference in the phrase 'Son of Man' to the famous vision described in Daniel (7^{13})—the Human Figure as contrasted with the four Beasts which stood for the four world-empires. The same Figure was generally seen in the heavenly Judge of the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch, there too called the Son of Man. But Cheyne's idea that the 'Son of Man' was the Messiah in the form of the archangel Michael, and Gressmann's that the words stand for 'the heavenly man' or 'the ideal man,' just as 'the day' or 'that day' was used for the day of judgment, have not been generally regarded as convincing. Out of it all, however, has come the problem of the present day. For it was universally admitted that the conception of the Son of Man was eschatological. And the problem of the present day is the eschatology of the New Testament.

Now when Professor Sanday reaches the literature of the eschatological controversy, the book which he singles out for special remark is Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (1906). He does not altogether commend the book. Besides its combativeness, he sees two serious mistakes in it. It does not take sufficient account of the literary criticism of the Gospels; and it does not allow enough for the extent to which Christ, in adopting the current ideas of the time, also transformed them. But it is a book, he says, that has taken a strong hold upon him, and if it has conspicuous faults, it has also conspicuous merits.

The last period is that of the Christian Church. Duchesne's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église* (1906–07) is mentioned, 'the earlier portion of which, perhaps, preserves its engaging simplicity, in part at least, by not probing too deeply.' Then after a reference to the new edition of Loofs's *Dogmengeschichte*, completely recast, and a glance at Lucius and Burkitt, Professor Sanday once more lets us see how comprehensive must be the scholar's outlook to-day if he would be at home in anything. He passes to Reitzenstein. 'Reitzenstein is a classical scholar who has turned his attention to the study of Hellenistic Religion, and especially to the so-called Hermetic literature, in which Egyptian religion in its Greek dress comes in contact with Christianity.' Dr. Sanday names for reading his *Poimandres* of 1904 and his *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* of 1906.

The last sentence is given to Wernle. It is a sentence of generous recognition. For Dr. Sanday has never concealed his distance from Wernle's standpoint or his doubt of Wernle's method. He is speaking now of Wernle's *Einführung*, and he says: 'Dr. Wernle has a warm temperament and strong opinions of his own, and it must have cost him not a little to state both sides of the many open questions that beset the Christian theologian with as much objectivity as he has succeeded in attaining. His special gift of clear, well-proportioned, vigorous, and vivid presentation has ample scope in this volume.'

When St. Paul was bidding farewell to the elders of the Church in Ephesus, he laid, or seems to lay, some emphasis upon his courage as a teacher. Twice he spoke of it. At the beginning of his discourse he said, 'I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you' (Ac 20^{20}). And in the middle of it he said, 'I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God' (20^{27}).

The verb used in both verses is the same. And so the Revisers render it similarly in both, using

the phrase 'I shrank not,' which is new to Biblical English. Dr. Field, in his *Notes on Translation of the New Testament*, takes them to task for so doing. Perhaps he had a weakness for Biblical English. But, apart from that, he holds that the idea in the Apostle's mind was not that of shrinking from doing the thing. There was no suggestion of cowardice or courage. He simply said that he had not done it.

Lightfoot discusses the verb (ὑποστέλλω) in his *Galatians*. He thinks it is a military word. It describes a strategical operation. But Hobart shows that it was also medical, and its use in this place is evidence of the beloved physician's authorship of the Acts. In medical language, says Hobart, it was the technical word for withholding food from patients. And this agrees with Dr. Field. St. Paul says that he had not kept back anything from the Ephesians. He had not been silent on any part of the whole counsel of God. Tindale succeeded in using the same word in both verses and expressing the meaning well: 20^{20}, 'I kept backe no thinge that was profitable'; 20^{27}, 'For I have kepte nothinge backe, but have shewed you all the counsell of God.'

But what did the Apostle mean? When he is writing to the Corinthians he says, 'I fed you with milk, not with meat' (1 Co 3^{2}). And the reason he gives is that they were not then able to digest meat. Does he mean to tell the Ephesians that he had treated them differently? Does he say that, however high the doctrine, he had not kept it back from them, and however hard the duty, he had not refrained from laying it upon them? If that is his meaning, why did he treat the two Churches differently? And what is the modern preacher to do?

What is the modern preacher to do? It is a question that is rarely asked, or rarely asked aloud. For the modern preacher is supposed to be always declaring the whole counsel of God and holding nothing back. If an opportunity is given him to review his preaching, he either boldly uses the Apostle's language, 'I shrank not to declare unto you the whole counsel of God'; or, if he is silent, it is with some sense of reproach. But ought he to be ashamed? Is it the duty of the preacher to declare to the congregation, whatever the congregation may be, the whole counsel of God and to 'keepe nothinge backe'? Canon Glazebrook has been thinking over it, and he says that it is not his duty.

At the First International Moral Education Congress, which was held at the University of London in September, Canon Glazebrook read a paper on 'The Study of the Bible.' There are many congresses now, and at most of them there is some one who reads a paper on the study of the Bible. But the papers do not always help us to study it. Canon Glazebrook spoke for the most part to teachers. The preacher is a teacher, never more than now. Canon Glazebrook is himself both a teacher and a preacher. Over his immediate audience he spoke to a still greater audience of preachers, perplexed as the public-school teachers are, about this matter. The doctrine is high, the duty is hard. Must they declare the high doctrine in every case, must they insist on the hard duty? And he answered them and said they must not.

His subject was the study of the Bible. Now if he had started with the Sermon on the Mount, he would have had to face the difficulty all at once and in its most aggravated form. For the Sermon on the Mount says, 'Be ye perfect,' a very high doctrine indeed; and it says, 'If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also,' a very searching duty. But the Sermon on the Mount suggests the way out. Does our Lord not refer to an earlier system of doctrine and an earlier code of morality? 'It was said to them of old time.' There was a period of youth and immaturity for the world. In that period the Law said, 'An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.' There is a period of youth and

immaturity for every man and woman. Canon Glazebrook says that in that period it is a mistake to feed with the strong meat of the Sermon on the Mount.

'In the art of life,' he says, 'as in other arts, the teacher has to deal not only with ultimate principles, but also with those *media axiomata* which are useful and necessary guides to the beginner. The teacher of painting is content at first to give empirical rules, leaving the higher truths of beauty to be recognized when the pupil is ripe for them. The teacher of geometry lays down rules and definitions which are not exact, and teaches the pupil to regard them as absolute until he can understand how they are all modified by the conception of a plane as part of an infinite sphere.' And so far all is well. The wise teacher of painting or geometry gives milk to babes and keeps back the strong meat till they are of full age. But the teacher of religion and ethics is in a somewhat different position.

For he knows that his pupils are already familiar with at least the phrases of higher principle. They may be fit to walk only by the *media axiomata*. He may have to make appeal to imperfect principles and motives, otherwise his teaching will lack the appearance of reality and he will lose his influence. Yet he cannot ignore the absolute principles of truth, purity, and unselfishness, which are summed up in such a familiar sentence as, 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.' So he, and he alone, is face to face with the serious problem. How is it possible at the same time and for the same persons to recognize two sets of motives and standards?

If the teacher of ethics—ethics for the young and immature—had a text-book which treated two different stages of morality as different, and yet showed the connexion between them, a text-book which revealed unity in varying cases of moral practice without confusing the moral sense, then he would use that text-book and would make progress. That text-book is the Bible. In a supreme and wonderful degree the Bible is the best text-book of progressive morality in existence.

For the Bible alone contains examples, beautifully simple and concrete, of the preparatory and the final stages of moral principle. 'It is the record of the way in which one of the most gifted races of mankind was led upward from a very low standard of conduct to the highest. It presents each standard in turn as absolute, yet it implicitly reconciles them by ascribing them all to the same authority. Without formal reasoning, but by the simple force of dramatic narrative, it shows how the savage patriotism, which cried, "Blessed shall Jael (the murderess) be above women in the tent," may be a stage in the evolution of that human brotherhood which declares that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, bondman nor freeman.'

But if the Old Testament (for it is of the Old Testament only that Canon Glazebrook is speaking), if the Old Testament is to be used as an instrument of moral training, so that the moral sense is not confused and the ordered progress is felt to be a reality, it is necessary that the sequence of thought should be followed. For the history of the earliest times, says Canon Glazebrook, we must use the earliest documents, 'not those which read into patriarchal stories the after-thoughts of post-exilic piety.' The teacher must never obtrude, but he must frankly assume, the assured results of modern scholarship. 'He must not allow the vivid narratives of Samuel and Kings to be confused by the revisions of the Chronicler; nor apply to the age of the prophets the standards which were set up by their disciples who wrote the books of the law.'

It is when the teaching of the Old Testament is simple, frank, and historical that it becomes the best text-book of ethics in the world. For it possesses these two incomparable advantages—it is full of humanity, and it is full of variety. The

epics of Joseph and David, says Canon Glazebrook, the tragedies of Elijah and Isaiah, have an undying charm. And the examples are varied as they are interesting. It offers examples of almost every stage of moral development. Whatever the pupil's moral attitude, there is some Jewish hero that appeals to him. That hero's actions can be traced to their motives, and followed to their consequences. He can be treated with sympathy in so far as he attains the standard of his times, and yet criticised in so far as his motives are not those which we recognize as absolute. So the pupil may learn at once to appropriate those *media axiomata* which fit him, and yet to realize that there is something beyond and above them.

The Jesus-Paul Controversy.[1]

By the Rev. W. Morgan, M.A., Tarbolton.

II.

In his book on the *Origin of Paul's Christology*, Brückner works out Wrede's ideas along the line indicated by the title. Paul's leading Christological conceptions are all traced back to their source in Judaistic literature. In the Psalms of Solomon (17, 18) the figure of the Messiah has already become superhuman, and in the Similitudes of Enoch He appears as the Son of Man—a pre-existent, heavenly being. His real enemies are no longer earthly, but superhuman and demonic powers, requiring a being who is more than man to overcome them.

Wrede's critics do not, in the main, find fault with him for deriving the categories of Paul's theology from current conceptions. He is here working on ground that is common to all New Testament students of a liberal complexion. Where they join issue with him is with respect to the extremely narrow limits within which he confines the influence of the primitive Christian community, and of Paul's own religious experience, in the shaping of his theology. Wrede does not altogether ignore the fact that, from the very first, the Christian community believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and that He died for our sins according to the Scripture; but he allows no sufficient weight to it. Often he talks as if the Apostle alone were responsible for transforming the simple religion of Jesus into a theology. Jülicher rightly points out that, before Paul's conversion, Christianity had already taken this direction, and that Peter, James, and the rest found no fault with his Christology, or with the meaning he attached to Christ's death, but only with his doctrine of the law. Paul had much more in common with the primitive Christian community, and was much more indebted to it than Wrede allows. And Wrede is equally wrong in minimizing the importance of the part played by the Apostle's religious experience. There is not a doctrine to which it has not contributed something. His heart always goes hand in hand with his intellect. To regard the Pauline theology as a mere intellectual structure of ideas, and those mostly borrowed, is to do it a gross injustice.

We come to a question that cuts even deeper. One may quite well admit Paul's large dependence on current conceptions for the categories of his theological construction, and at the same time hold that in that construction he embodied the substance of Jesus' gospel and the essential meaning of His life. But this is what Wrede does not admit; and it is here that his critics are most sharply opposed to him. According to Wrede, the theology of Paul reveals hardly a trace of the

[1] 1. 'Paulus.' Professor D. W. Wrede, Breslau. *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher.*

2. *Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie.* Dr. Martin Brückner.

3. *Jesus und Paulus.* D. J. Kaftan.

4. *Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus.* D. Paul Kölbing.

5. *Die Grundgedanken der paulinischen Theologie.* Dr. Carl Clemen.

6. *Paulus und Jesus.* D. Adolf Jülicher.

7. *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus?* Arnold Meyer.