

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WE are glad to be able to announce as nearly ready a Dictionary of the Bible in one volume. We knew from the beginning that a five-volume Dictionary would be more than some men could attain to, and we began to lay our plans for a smaller book five or six years ago. We believe that when it appears it will be found to meet a real need of the present day.¹

It will not be an abridgement of the larger Dictionary. It will be an entirely new book. All the articles will be written afresh. Some of the scholars who wrote in the larger Dictionary have written in this also, but only in one or two cases have they written upon the same subjects. One case is Professor Gwatkin of Cambridge, who has written two articles under the same titles as in the five-volume Dictionary. But even they are not the same articles. The difference between them is striking and curious.

This, then, is the first thing, that the small book will not be an abridgement of the large. For abridgements have no life in them. Only one man has ever appeared who could abridge even a sermon and make the abridgement worth the reading—Charles Haddon Spurgeon. There have been abridgements of dictionaries, but they died before they were born. The publisher of one abridgement (it appeared in English not

many years ago) is reported to have stated that at the end of the first twelvemonth after publication he believed that only one *bonâ fide* copy had been sold.

The next thing is its scholarship. The authors have been chosen with as much care as the authors of the large Dictionary were chosen, and with more experience. We believe that the average of scholarship will be, if anything, higher. Each scholar has been assigned a list of topics of which it was known that he had made a special study—Dr. Kenyon, the Translations of the Bible; Dr. Moulton, the Language of the New Testament; Principal Henderson, Professor Findlay, Principal Garvie, and others, the Biblical Theology; Mr. Stewart Macalister, certain places in Palestine; Professor Nöldeke, Arabia; Professor Kennedy, the Antiquities of Israel; Professor Driver, certain difficult localities; Professor Skinner, Professor Buchanan Gray, and others, the Literature of the Old Testament; the Bishop of Moray, Canon Masterman, and others, the Literature of the New.

The articles are signed by their authors. It is the first time in a single-volume dictionary that the work has been put into the hands of a large number of specialists and that every author has added his name. It will not only give the book more interest, it will make it more authoritative.

For it is now recognized that anonymous writing is not infallible writing.

In the course of placing the work we have made some discoveries. We have discovered a writer for the article on our Lord, and another for St. Paul. We should have been glad to have had Dr. Sanday's hand in the article on St. Paul. But he had already undertaken it for the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

To whom has the article been assigned? When those sketches of love and Calvinism, signed 'Ian Maclaren,' began to appear in *The British Weekly*, Professor George Adam Smith (so the story goes) sent a telegram to the late Dr. John Watson of Liverpool—'Well done, Ian Maclaren!' To which the reply came, 'Well done, Higher Criticism!' Will our readers exercise their Higher Criticism here? To whom has the article on ST. PAUL been assigned? He is also a contributor to the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

Besides the general article on JESUS CHRIST, there will be a special article dealing separately with the PERSON OF CHRIST. The author is Professor H. R. Mackintosh.

The writer on JESUS CHRIST is Professor William P. Paterson, of the University of Edinburgh. The Church of Scotland says he is her greatest scholar. But his Chair is the Chair of Divinity: how did we know that he was the man for the Life of Christ? We thought of no other before him; and when we offered it he could not refuse; he had been preparing for it all his life.

The late Dr. George Matheson when he died had a book ready on *The Representative Women of the Bible*. It has now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (6s.). It completes his gallery of Bible portraits. It completes a work in which he found more happiness, we think, than in any other work he did. His imagination soars

almost out of sight in it. And yet the higher he rose on the wings of imagination the greater was his own delight and confidence.

The first portrait in the new volume is the portrait of Eve. And as it was Dr. Matheson's custom to add an adjective to each of his Bible characters, he calls Eve 'the Unfolded.' She is the representative of woman. She is woman; as Adam is man. She passes through the three periods of life which every woman passes through—a period of innocence or unconsciousness, a period of conscious expansion, and a period of conscious or voluntary self-repression.

Dr. Matheson believes that every woman passes through these three periods. He believes that, in one form or other, that is the normal course of all rounded and completed womanhood. Womanhood is not always rounded and completed. But where it is, that, he believes, is the order of its development.

There is first the unconscious simplicity of girlhood. Then there comes a change. The girl wakes into consciousness. She gets the favourable reflexion of a looking-glass, literally or metaphorically. Something happens which reveals her to herself; and suddenly she sees the possibilities of the garden in which she dwells.

It is then that temptation comes. The woman is conscious of power—the power of beauty, the power of wealth, at least the power of love—for there is no woman upon earth that cannot evoke love and use the power it gives her, if she will. She sees that her power may be utilized. There are things within her reach that are good for food, things that are pleasant to the eyes, and things to be desired to make one wise. How does she use her power?

Eve used it to her own advantage, and fell. Dr. Matheson expresses it with almost amusing modernness. He says she became extravagant. She did

not live within her income. For he says that, when a woman becomes conscious of her power, she is filled either with humility or with pride. If she is filled with humility, filled, as the Virgin Mary was, with a sense of wondering unworthiness, she is careful and anxious to keep within the bounds of that garden in which she has been placed. But if she is filled with pride, she thinks she has not had her due yet. There are trees in some neighbouring garden whose fruit she longs to pluck. She seeks experiences that are not sent to her. She wanders abroad. It is the very meaning of the word 'extravagant.'

That second period of womanhood is the period of expansion. The third is the period of contraction. Says Dr. Matheson: 'She has given up the pursuit of large things. She has settled down into a corner—the corner of home. She has ceased to be personal in her ambition; she has become impersonal. She sees herself no longer in her looking-glass, but in her family or in those in whom she adopts as her family; for the wings of the moth have been singed by that spirit of motherhood whose fire is the normal completion of every perfected female heart, married or single.'

In the new Roman Catholic quarterly, the *New York Review*, there is an article by Dr. Nicola Turchi, of the College of the Propaganda in Rome, on 'Christianity and the Comparative Study of Religions.'

Dr. Turchi says Religions. But he means Religion. For it is not the great Religions of the world that are to be compared. That has been done very often, and nothing has come of it. It has been done with an apologetic purpose, and the apologist has taken out of the study at the one end just as much as he put in at the other.

Dr. Turchi speaks of the Comparative Study of Religion. It is our newest and most hopeful science. It does not ignore the great Religions.

But it is not content with comparing them in their greatness. It is more interested in the beliefs and practices which are common to them than in the religious systems themselves. When it has done its work, the Apologist comes.

The Apologist comes to prove the truth of his own Religion. He could not do it before. He could not convince those who did not believe in his Religion. And even those who did believe in it had an uneasy feeling that the case was not fully before them. But after the science of Comparative Religion has been long enough at work, the Religion that has the Truth in it will be seen to be the true Religion.

Hitherto the Apologist has been somewhat shy of Comparative Religion. 'The historical and comparative study of Religion,' says Dr. Turchi, 'is in many ways a valuable aid for the better historical and philosophical understanding of Christianity. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that it does not yet enjoy, on the part of orthodox Christians, all the esteem that it deserves.'

Of course it is the old enemy ignorance that has done this. The Apologist fears, to use Dr. Turchi's words again, that 'its principles and conclusions will clash with those of Christian belief, and its pursuit be detrimental to our faith.' But to his own mind nothing could be less founded than this suspicion; and he quotes the experience of another. 'If he who takes it up,' says de Broglie, in an article in *Le Contemporain* so long ago as May 1883,—'if he who takes it up is in a state of doubt, if he is still sincerely seeking the truth without having yet found it, the history of religion will help him to reach the solution he so anxiously desires. If, on the other hand, he is already a believer, he will find in this study, carried on with care and the proper spirit, the confirmation of his faith, since the truth of Christianity can but be enhanced by being compared with other Religions.'

It is not to be denied that there are students of Comparative Religion who are opposed to Christianity. But when did their opposition begin? Not while they studied Religion comparatively, but before they entered upon that study. And they did not always enter upon the study conscientiously. They entered not as Scientists, but as Apologists. They did not study Religion to build up the truth, but to pull down Christianity. And one of their methods is to bring forward the resemblances between Christianity and other religions and to hide the differences out of sight.

There has just been published the translation of a small book by Professor Marti of Bern. It is called *The Religion of the Old Testament* (Williams & Norgate; 4s. 6d.). It is not Professor Marti's purpose in this book to sketch the religion of Israel. His purpose is to compare it with the other religions of antiquity.

He says that it is only quite recently that the right to make a comparison between the religion of Israel and the other religions of antiquity has been incontrovertibly established—the right, he adds significantly, 'to make a real comparison, and not one in which the result is prejudged on religious or dogmatic grounds, which sees on the one side only light and truth, and on the other only darkness and error, but one which places the religions side by side in a perfectly unbiassed historical spirit, and examines and judges each according to its kind.'

That right, says Professor Marti, has been attained. It is now generally recognized in the scientific world. It has in some places become even popular. And then he utters his warning. For as soon as it becomes popular—as soon, that is to say, as it is taken up by unscientific and prejudiced writers—the points of resemblance between one religion and another are emphasized, and the points of difference are disregarded or deliberately thrust into the background. Then we

have a few professional apologists who pose as students of religion but are not, telling us that one religion is as bad as another, and the only wise man is the agnostic. The remedy at present is not to write more apologies, but to become serious students of Religion.

Although the readers of the Revised Version were much troubled, when it appeared, at what some of them called the introduction of Satan into the Lord's Prayer, it is probable that the greatest disappointment of all was the new rendering of Lk 2¹⁴—'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.' Is there nothing that can be done with that passage yet?

Mr. M. S. Freeman, of Kent in Ohio, writes upon it in *The Biblical World* for April. He admits that nothing can be done with the Revisers' Greek. The arguments for the genitive are irresistible. Therefore the triplet of the Authorized Version—'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill toward men'—should undoubtedly be a doublet, as the Revised Version has it. But he believes that something can be done with the rendering.

Something must be done with it. For it is not true. What is the meaning of 'men in whom he is well pleased'? It means that God is actually well pleased with all men as they are,—and that is not true. Or else it means that the proclamation of peace on earth is limited in its application to such men as are, in their character and conduct, well-pleasing to God,—and that also is not true. For if that were true, why did God care to send a gospel?

The context has a strong Hebrew colouring. This phrase is 'a Hebrew of the Hebrews.' Mr. Freeman goes back to the Hebrew language for it. Now, in Isaiah's Parable of the Vineyard, there is a verse (5⁷) which reads, 'For the vineyard

of Jehovah of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant.' The phrase is literally 'the plant of his delight.'

Think of the literal vineyard first. The man plants it, takes care of it, and expects fruit from it. But he is disappointed. Take the metaphorical vineyard next—the House of Israel. God had called the nation into being. He had given them a pleasant land to dwell in. He had offered to be their God, and hoped that they would be His people, bringing forth the fruits of righteousness. But He had been disappointed. Did the disappointment of the owner of the vineyard prove that he never had had delight in it, and never would have again? Did the disappointment of Jehovah in Israel prove that Israel would never arise and return to Him and call Him Father?

Turn now to the angels' song. God is at present disappointed with men upon earth. But it does not follow that He will be disappointed for ever. His purpose is a purpose of grace. And the Gospel of Peace comes to a world which, in spite of all the disappointment, has always been the object of His love and His hope, and will again be His delight.

What should the translation be? It should be a translation which says that God still looks to men on earth to be His delight in spite of all His disappointment in them.

Glory to God in the highest,
And on earth peace, among men—to whom
God looks for his good pleasure.

It does not appear that unbelief in the miracles of the Gospels is making any progress. The unbeliever has discovered no new reasons for the faith, or want of faith, that is in him. It is a generation since Professor Huxley assured us that he knew nothing in physical science that stood in the way of the occurrence of a miracle; and he

professed himself ready to believe in any miracle if he were offered sufficient evidence for it. Dr. Edwin Abbott has just the same to say to-day.

Dr. Abbott is a hardy unbeliever. He began his unbelief in miracles early. He has held to it throughout his long life. Few men have thought more about the subject, or written more. And what does Dr. Abbott say about miracles now? He says that he does not reject miracles because they are violations or counteractions of the laws of nature. He has no prepossession against miracles as a whole. He rejects each particular miracle because he does not find sufficient evidence for it.

Now, here is a curious situation. It was noticed last month that one of the New Theology men finds Jesus sinless, but denies the sinlessness of Jesus, because that would be a miracle. Dr. Abbott's mind seems to work the other way. He does not find any miracle in the Gospels, but he believes that 'Christ is Divine, the Incarnate Son of God, and the just object of Christian worship along with the Father and the Holy Spirit.'

Dr. Abbott has written a new book. He calls it *Apologia* (A. & C. Black; 2s. 6d. net). His purpose in writing it seems to be chiefly to explain how it is that he denies all miracles and yet believes in the Divinity of Jesus Christ. But he does not explain it. With all his determination to use plain words, and he repeats that determination frequently, he never makes it clear how there can be no miracles in the Gospels when they contain an account of a man who was Divine, whose birth he calls an Incarnation, and who is now to be worshipped along with the Father and the Holy Spirit. It would be easy enough to understand his meaning if he amused himself with words, saying 'divine' when he meant 'human,' and 'human' when he meant 'divine.' But he has the utmost contempt for such jugglery, a contempt which no pen but his own is sufficient to do justice to.

Dr. Abbott rejects the miracles separately. We wish he had rejected them separately in this book. It would have been a pleasure to see him at work upon them one by one. For it is easy to reject the miracles as a whole. It is easy to reject them in groups. The difficulties begin when the miracles are taken separately and examined one by one.

There is an article in the current number of the *Hibbert Journal* on 'The Neurotic Theory of the Miracles of Healing.' It is written by R. J. Ryle, M.D. Dr. Ryle deals with one of the groups into which Dr. Abbott and others divide the miracles. For it is to be observed that Dr. Abbott divides the miracles into groups and rejects them in groups, and does not discuss them one by one. His first group contains cures that actually occurred, but that are not miracles, because in accordance with what are called laws of nature. His second group contains those so-called miracles which have sprung into existence out of poetical or metaphorical traditions which have been erroneously taken as literal. His third group contains visions, like the Resurrection, which have been mistaken for non-visionary facts.

Now of these three groups it is the first that Dr. Ryle discusses in the *Hibbert Journal*. It embraces the miracles of healing. For the miracles of healing are now by unbelievers in miracle separated from all the rest. They are separated so completely that they are actually accepted as having taken place. Dr. Ryle refers to Professor Percy Gardner. 'There can be no doubt,' says Professor Gardner, 'that any attempt to eliminate from that life, as recorded in the Gospels, all that is extraordinary and unusual in the relations of our Lord to the visible world, must result in its complete dissolution into myth and fancy.' He quotes from Professor Schmiedel, who says: 'The healing ministry, judged by critical tests, stands on as firm historical ground as the best accredited parts of the teaching.' And he quotes from Professor Harnack, who is more explicit still. Says Professor Harnack: 'That

the earth in its course stood still, that a she ass spoke, that a storm was quieted by a word, we do not believe, and we shall never again believe; but that the lame walked, the blind saw, and the deaf heard, will not be so summarily dismissed as an illusion.'

It is admitted, then, that the miracles of healing took place. All that is denied is that they were miracles. How did they take place? We are told that also. We are told that 'the diseases which were healed were what doctors commonly speak of as functional diseases of the nervous system, and that the production of a strong mental impression was the means by which the miracles of healing were brought about.'

These are the words in which Dr. Ryle sums up the unanimous consent of Dr. Abbott and the rest. But he does not deal with the critics of the miracles 'as a whole'; he quotes from 'each particular' critic. Dr. Abbott tells us that the mighty works were simply 'acts of faith-healing on a mighty scale.' The *Encyclopædia Biblica* lays it down that 'it is quite permissible for us to regard as historical only those of the class which even at the present day physicians are able to effect by psychological methods.' And Principal Estlin Carpenter says: 'The real force which worked the patient's cure dwelt in his own mind: the power of Jesus lay in the potency of his personality to evoke this force.'

Let us now see how the critics of the miracles carry out their criticism in detail. Let us see how they succeed with the miracles one by one.

What is this? Dr. Ryle says they never do carry it out in detail. He says they never attempt to deal with the miracles one by one. We have seen that Dr. Abbott does not, although he is most particular to tell us that he rejects each particular miracle by itself. Dr. Ryle affirms: 'It is not too much to say that no one of the writers who has pinned his faith to the Neurotic

Theory has made any attempt to carry it out in detail.'

This does not seem very scientific. For if science is anything, it is the examination of particulars first. After the particulars are examined, the general conclusions are drawn. But these men (who claim the exclusive right to that blessed word 'scientific') work the other way. Instead of an examination of each particular miracle, or, at least, the most typical instances of such faith-healing, we are offered, says Dr. Ryle, 'a number of quite commonplace allusions to the power of mind over body, and we find a complacent conviction expressed in several ways by several writers to the effect that a certain class of disorders, which are vaguely alluded to as "nervous," are promptly curable by emotional methods.'

If the critics of the miracles would proceed scientifically, there are two things, Dr. Ryle tells them, that they must do. First, they must show that the diseases which Christ is said to have cured were of the kind which experience proves to admit of psychical treatment. And then they must show some good grounds for the assertion that the way in which the cures of the healing ministry were effected was the way by which at the present day such cures are effected when what has been called 'moral therapeutics' has been the method employed. These two things cannot be done otherwise than by an examination of the miracles individually. It is very curious that the critics never make the examination.

But Dr. Ryle makes it for them. In the Gospel of St. Mark, to which he confines himself, there are twelve miracles of healing. Here are the twelve :

1. The man with an unclean spirit healed in the synagogue on the Sabbath (Mk 1²⁸).
2. Simon's wife's mother healed of a fever (Mk 1²⁹).
3. The healing of the leper (Mk 1⁴⁹).

4. The paralytic let down through the roof (Mk 2⁴).

5. The man with a withered hand healed on the Sabbath (Mk 3¹).

6. The healing of a man with an unclean spirit (Mk 5²).

7. The healing of the woman with an issue of blood of twelve years' duration (Mk 5²²).

8. The healing of the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mk 7²⁵).

9. The healing of a man possessed of a deaf and dumb spirit (Mk 7³²).

10. The healing of a blind man (Mk 8²²).

11. The case of the man whose son had a dumb spirit (Mk 9¹⁵).

12. The healing of blind Bartimæus (Mk 10⁴⁷).

Now of these twelve no fewer than five are cases of possession by spirits. The spirits are described as 'unclean,' as 'dumb,' or as 'deaf and dumb.' It is probable, says Dr. Ryle, that the prominence of mental symptoms was the characteristic which chiefly determined the diagnosis of possession. They would be such cases as are still found in our own time and country, living always on the margins of lunacy and criminality. They would, in various degrees, be unmanageable, and many of them would present the characteristic disregard of decency which marks the same types at the present day. Are these, then, the kinds of persons who are susceptible of emotional cure? Are they likely to have been straightway healed by a word? Dr. Ryle says they are not.

There is no doubt, he says, that 'personal and emotional influences are important factors in the treatment of these unfortunate beings, especially when these influences are brought to bear in a systematic manner and over a prolonged period, in institutions wholly given up to the work. But these are not the subjects among whom to look for examples of faith-healing. And, it may be added, they are the subjects who lend themselves least of all to the modern remedial measures of hypnotism and suggestion.'

Let us return to the list of twelve. There appear to be two cases of paralysis. One is distinctly so described—the case of the man who was let down through the roof. The withered hand that was healed on the Sabbath was probably another. These cases would be confidently claimed for the Neurotic Theory. For there is no form of disease that is found more readily curable by a strong mental impression than motor paralysis, the inability to move the limbs by voluntary effort. But there are two kinds of paralysis. There is the hysterical kind, and there is the kind that is due to structural disease of the spinal cord or some other part of the motor nerve system. To which of these kinds of paralysis do the two cases before us belong?

There is little to go upon in either. Yet what little there is cannot be said to lead in the direction of hysterical paralysis. For, in the first place, hysterical paralysis is comparatively rare; while genuine paralysis from structural disease or injury is a common disorder. In the next place, hysterical paralysis is almost always found in women and

girls; the cases before us are those of men. Once more, the word 'withered' which is applied to one of the cases is a word which aptly applies only to a case of genuine paralysis.

Five cases remain. Dr. Ryle examines them one by one particularly. One is of fever, two of blindness, one of 'hæmorrhoids' or some disease peculiar to women, and one of leprosy. In not one instance is the ailment of a kind that lends itself readily to psychological treatment.

What is it that has led the critics of the miracles to ascribe these cures to faith-healing? Dr. Ryle believes that the consideration which has weighed most with them has been the fact that in connexion with acts of healing mention is so often made of faith. It is very kind of Dr. Ryle to make that suggestion, but it is not very complimentary to the critics. For even a medical man has little difficulty in seeing that the faith which the faith-healer demands is a very different thing from the faith which was demanded by Christ.

Marcion and the Canon.

BY PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.

THE *Revue Bénédictine* for January has a remarkable article by de Bruyne, entitled 'Biblical Prologues of Marcionite Origin,' in which the writer succeeds in showing that a very widely spread series of prefaces to the Pauline Epistles which occur in certain Latin Bibles must have been taken from a Marcionite Bible; and this discovery naturally suggests that we owe the Canon of the New Testament, in the first instance, to Marcion, and that the prefaces in question may go back to Marcion himself, for, in any case, the Marcionite hand from which they come antedates the Latin tradition in which we find the prologues embedded. And such a discovery as this of de Bruyne, taken with the suggestions to which it naturally gives

rise, forms an event in criticism, so far as the history of the Canon is concerned.

Now we all know that the Marcionite New Testament was a Canon: it defined inclusively and exclusively the books to be read in the Marcionite Church—one Gospel, viz. that of Luke; ten Pauline Epistles, forming the 'Apostle' to complete the 'Evangel'; and these ten Epistles occurred in a known order, which has left its mark on the literature of the subject. Hebrews was not included, but that required no deliberate exclusion, for it was clearly recognized as non-Pauline, and so self-excluded, rather than decanonized. But the case of the Pastoral Epistles is not so easy to explain. The orthodox, indeed, affirmed, and still