

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE third volume has been published of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Its first article is 'Burial,' its last article 'Confessions.' Between these articles lie some of the most important topics in all the study of Religion, and especially in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

---

The student of the Apocalypse is at sea if he knows not what 'Cæsarism' means. For in that book it is not Rome that is the enemy, but the worship of Rome; it is not Nero the man that is the Beast (though Nero was vile enough as a man), it is Nero the Emperor-god. Says Principal IVERACH, who writes the article: 'It was the refusal of the Church to submit to the Imperial cult that led to the declaration that they were outlaws, with no rights, and with no legal standing before the rulers. The test of their standing was whether they were willing to burn incense or to offer worship to Cæsar.'

---

Pass to the article 'Cakes and Loaves.' How little the shewbread means to us until we see it in the light of Comparative Religion. How human it then becomes, and how instructive. First note that in the chamber of Bel-Merodach, in his temple at Babylon, stood a golden table on which were placed twelve, twenty-four, thirty-six, or even seventy-two cakes of unleavened bread, which the god was supposed to eat. That is the nearest

illustration. But from that to the Beltane cakes of Scotland the steps are traceable, and every step has a religious memory clinging to it.

---

The liturgist will revel in the articles on the 'Calendar.' The introductory article has been written by the first authority on the subject, Dr. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. The author of the article on the Christian Calendar, Canon J. G. CARLETON of Dublin, has made himself equally master in his own department. There are other twenty-one articles on the Calendar, among them the Armenian Calendar, by Professor MACLER of Paris; the Babylonian, by Professor HOMMEL of Munich; the Hebrew, by Mr. F. H. WOODS, late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; the Jewish, by Rabbi POZNANSKI of Warsaw; the Mexican and Mayan (most surprising in itself and in its relationships), by Professor PREUSS of Berlin; the Roman, by Mr. WARDE FOWLER; and the Teutonic, by Mr. MUNRO CHADWICK.

---

Passing Professor KROEBER'S 'California,' we come to a short article by Mr. LAMBERT in Biblical and Historical Theology—'Call, Calling.' Not in Biblical Theology only. For that is the difference between the Biblical articles in the Encyclopædia and those in the *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

They are Historical as well as Biblical, and gain greatly thereby both in clearness and in completeness. The Bible doctrine is the foundation, the historical and creedal is the fulfilment or falsification.

Professor ORR's article on 'Calvinism' follows immediately. Professor ORR is a Calvinist. For it is part of the plan of the Encyclopædia that subjects of debate should be written, if necessary, from both sides; if not, from the inside rather than the outside. As an example of the former method, there are three articles on 'Church.' One is written by a Presbyterian, one by an Anglican, and one by a Roman Catholic. The reading of these three articles, in none of which are any words wasted, is soon accomplished, and is as profitable for the thorough furnishing of the man of God as the reading of many books.

The article on the 'Cambridge Platonists' has been written by an Oxford man. The author is Dr. J. A. STEWART, Professor of Moral Philosophy. This is Professor STEWART's conclusion: 'The Cambridge Platonists hold their place in an "Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics" on four main grounds: (1) They present the idea of "personal religion" in a very impressive way, and with great sincerity. (2) They were preachers of religious toleration and comprehension, at a time when everything seemed to be against the prevalence of these ideas. (3) They gave direction to English Moral Philosophy by supplying Shaftesbury and his followers, down to the Utilitarians of the nineteenth century, with the notions of "good-nature" and "fellow-feeling," as dispositions relative to the "public good." (4) On the other hand, their use of the Platonic doctrine of Ideas, in theology and epistemology, presents them as contributing also to the idealistic side of English Moral Philosophy. T. H. Green's "reproduction of the Eternal Consciousness in my consciousness" bears close comparison with the Cambridge tenet—"participation of man's mind in God's mind through apprehension of the *eternæ rationes rerum*."

Comparison of Green with the Cambridge divines makes it clear that his philosophy is a phase of Christian Platonism.'

There was a great article on 'Animals' by Mr. Northcote THOMAS in the first volume. Only a very few animals have still to be treated separately. But one of them is the 'Camel.' The camel belongs to the Arabs, and its story has been told by a Muslim scholar, Professor GAUDEFROY-DEMOMBYNES. But his article is completed by another, written by Dr. Louis GRAY, and recording the place of the camel in the Old Testament and the Talmud, in Persia, India, Africa, and Europe. Dr. GRAY notices some camel proverbs, such as the Talmudic one that 'in Media the camel can dance in a bushel-basket'; but there are none comparable for point to the two spoken by Christ.

The student of Religion is a student of the greatest breadth of knowledge as well as of its greatest depth. His interests are both intense and extensive. He passes from the 'Cambridge Platonists' to the 'Camel,' and from the 'Camel' to the 'Camisards,' and the alphabetical arrangement brings no sense of incongruity. For all is of God. The Platonists speculate about His being, the Arabs ignorantly but devoutly sacrifice their camels to Him, the Camisards sacrifice themselves. The one word 'God' links all together and gives to all the unsearchable riches of interest and eternity.

Few of the articles in this volume can have cost their authors more than the article on the 'Canaanites.' And few mark more distinctly the progress of knowledge. The results of the recent excavations are all here, with exact references to the original sources. And here for the first time in English is a clear account of the way in which the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine impressed themselves on the Old Testament. In a serious sense they conquered their conquerors, and have survived them. Take the single fact that in the earlier period the dead were usually deposited in

the contracted position of an unborn child.' It was no accident. It probably expressed the thought that death is birth into another life. What influence has that practice had on the belief in immortality; what preparation did it make for Him who at last brought life and immortality to light?

Or again. Take the fact that the Pharaoh of Egypt was worshipped as an incarnation of Amon-Re. In the palmy days of Egyptian sovereignty this worship was enforced in Canaan. Why have we no denunciation of this idolatry in the prophets? Why did it not drive the Israelites to the desperation of death, as the worship of the Roman Emperor drove the early Christians? Simply because it was so contrary to the genius of Semitic worship that it took no hold of the inhabitants of Canaan, but passed away along with the Egyptian rule before the prophets began to write.

From the 'Canaanites' to 'Candlemas.' This is an extension of one of the Calendar articles. It illustrates a characteristic of the Encyclopædia. Great topics are dealt with comprehensively in great articles or series of articles. But in order that nothing of importance may be passed over, a topic is occasionally selected out of the more comprehensive subject for separate and fuller treatment. Out of the Christian Calendar both 'Candlemas' and 'Christmas' have been chosen. The article on 'Candlemas' has been written by Mr. Thomas BARNES. On 'Christmas' there are two articles, one by Professor KIRSOPP LAKE of Leiden, the other by Professor LEHMANN of Berlin.

These articles are all contained within the first two hundred pages. Pass at once to the end. The last is the longest article in the volume. Its title is 'Confessions.' In some sixty pages Professor CURTIS of the University of Aberdeen has written an account of the Confessions of Christianity, the like of which is nowhere else to be found in any language. It is an article which,

if published separately, and in the way in which books are commonly published, would very likely cost all the price of this volume of the Encyclopædia.

Are the chapters of the Fourth Gospel arranged in their proper order? It is a question of the first importance. For if its contents are not in order, much of the labour that has been spent on its interpretation has been thrown away. It is therefore astonishing that so much ability and even ingenuity has been given to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and to the adjusting of its contents with those of the other three, and so little to the previous and decisive question of its arrangement.

It is true that as long ago as the fourteenth century a rearrangement of the chapters of the Fourth Gospel was suggested by Ludolphus de Saxonia in his *Vita Christi Evangelicis et scriptoribus orthodoxis excerpta*. And every editor of the life of Christ, as well as every author of a synopsis of the Gospels, has had to move his materials so as to obtain something like a consistent narrative. But it is only recently that the question has been seriously considered whether an early accident had befallen the sheets of the Fourth Gospel. It is only WENDT, and more fully SPITTA, and most fully Warburton LEWIS, who have thoroughly examined this Gospel for the express purpose of bringing its contents back to their original order.

Mr. Warburton LEWIS has examined the Fourth Gospel for this purpose and this purpose only. He has made known the result of his examination in a book published at the Cambridge University Press under the title of *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel* (2s. net). It is a small book. We wish that Mr. LEWIS had had the courage to make it larger. For there is much in it, and it is all of the utmost consequence, not only to the laborious study of the Gospels, but also to their ordinary use in worship. But it is so condensed and contracted as to become very difficult reading.

There is one chapter in the Gospel which has often been the occasion of suspicion. It is the fifth. For to the most superficial reader it is evident that the insertion of that chapter sends our Lord travelling about between Galilee and Judæa in an inconsequential manner. In the fourth chapter He is in Galilee, and the end of that chapter leads us to expect that He will remain some time there. But the fifth chapter finds Him in Jerusalem. It also leaves Him there. Yet in the sixth He is back again in Galilee, and as if He had not for some time been out of it.

Change the order of the fifth and sixth chapters and all the puzzle is at an end. Christ's return to Galilee in the fourth chapter (v. 43) is followed by a period of work there (as 4<sup>54</sup> leads us to expect), which is described in the sixth chapter, and comes to a crisis in the end of that chapter (6<sup>66</sup>), when many of His disciples withdraw from Him. Thereupon He leaves Galilee and goes up to Jerusalem, where we find Him throughout chapters 5 and 7.

Other advantages follow. The statement in 7<sup>1</sup> that He could no longer walk in Judæa is explained, whereas according to the end of the previous chapter He was not in Judæa, but in Galilee. Again, we are able to give a natural interpretation to 4<sup>85</sup>, 'Yet four months, and then cometh harvest.' For we now see that Jesus returned to Galilee in December, and the crisis which drove Him out of Galilee to Jerusalem, the desertion of many of His followers (6<sup>66</sup>), occurred four months later, just before the Passover. And, most important advantage of all, the 'feast' mentioned in the fifth chapter, and over which there has been so much controversy, finds its explanation at once in the subsequent Pentecost.

We have reached the beginning of chapter the seventh. And we have seen that the situation there fits admirably into the situation at the end of chapter the fifth. But we have not gone far into the seventh chapter itself when we come upon a section which is obviously out of place. This

is the section 7<sup>15-24</sup>. So obviously out of place is it here, and so evidently would it be in its proper place if it stood at the end of the fifth chapter, that not only SPITTA and LEWIS make the change, but also BURTON and MOFFATT and WENDT.

This is a good case to test the whole proceeding by. First let us see that 7<sup>25</sup> follows naturally after 7<sup>14</sup>. Then let us see if 7<sup>15-24</sup> will fit in easily at the end of the fifth chapter. Mr. Warburton LEWIS has his arguments, and they seem conclusive. But it is better for every man to work the problem out for himself.

The question rises, however: How did this displacement take place? Mr. LEWIS has no better explanation to offer than that which has been suggested by SPITTA, that the Gospel was written on leaves, and before the leaves were gummed together they got disarranged. One interesting result, however, is obtained. If the passage 7<sup>15-24</sup> was a single leaf, then chapter 6 contains just seven such leaves. Mr. LEWIS comes to the conclusion afterwards that the leaf was less than that. He believes that 7<sup>15-24</sup> filled two leaves. And this unit of measurement (which would be 9½ lines of WESTCOTT and HORT) is used by him to test the accuracy of other attempts which he makes at rearrangement. When he has examined the whole Gospel, he concludes that the arrangement of its parts before the accident occurred was as follows:—1 to 2<sup>12</sup>; 3<sup>22-30</sup>, 2<sup>13</sup> to 3<sup>21</sup>; 3<sup>31-36</sup>; 4; 6; 5, 7<sup>15-24</sup>, 8<sup>12-20</sup>; 7<sup>1-14</sup>, 7<sup>25-52</sup>, 8<sup>21-59</sup>; 9 to 12; 13<sup>1-32</sup>; 15, 16; 13<sup>33</sup> to 14; 17; 18 to 20; 21.

In a recent number of the *Sunday School Times* of Philadelphia there is an article by Professor G. A. Johnston Ross on the question, 'Why we need to go to Church.'

Churchgoing, says Professor Ross, has been abandoned by persons who desire to escape the call to serious thinking. They go to places 'where

their superficialities and inanities will be uninvaded.' And the Church may derive benefit from their departure. There is a more serious loss than that.

There are to-day, says Professor Ross, earnest thoughtful men who abandon the fellowship of the Church, not because they wish to throw off religion, but because they wish to retain it. They have begun, in accordance with the spirit of the age, to build up for themselves an interpretation of life, working not with superimposed schemes, but with the facts they see. They do not claim to have arrived at final results in these, perhaps more or less desultory, attempts at an interpretation. But they have begun to see some things. And what they have begun to see will not express itself readily in the language of the Churches, and yet it seems greatly more real than that language appears to be. Now it is imperative to men in the present day that they come into contact in their thought with reality. And so men are abandoning the Church because its worship and its thought appear unreal.

Are these men right? Professor Ross does not think so. He believes that they have failed to realize what corporate worship is, and what it can do for them. And he believes that the Churches are partly to blame. We have dwelt too exclusively, he thinks, on the individual's attitude to religion. The social character of even the Lord's Supper has been, he believes, too much obscured in the evangelical Churches. And he says: 'Had men been taught the wonder and the pathos and the dignity of social worship—had that worship been always conducted in the spirit not merely of decorum but of awe, I cannot believe that thoughtful men in such numbers would have withdrawn from it.'

For there is individual worship and there is social worship. The heart of the individual worshipper cries out for the living God. But that craving does not originate in the heart. It is the

response of the human to the divine desire. 'Thou wouldst not seek God,' says Pascal, 'if thou hadst not already found Him.' But Professor Johnston Ross amends Pascal, and says, surely rather, 'if God had not already found thee.' Worship is the resultant, not alone of our craving for God, but of God's craving for us. It is not our unpunctuated monologue; it is, between us and God, reciprocal and responsive dialogue.

But this is individual worship only. What is corporate worship? What is the worship of the whole Church? It is not merely divine communication and human response: it is ordered and varied divine communication, it is ordered and varied human response. 'When one joins a group of worshippers,' says Dr. Ross, 'one enters to take one's part in the ordered response of the Church universal to the outgoing of the heart of God; one enters a region where heaven dips down to earth, while earth lifts up "blind hands" to heaven; one is at the meeting-place of the two orders, the temporal and the eternal; one is standing with one's fellows before the rending veil.'

And there are other gains to be got from corporate worship. There is outlook. There is 'the restfulness of its wide horizons.' The daily work of most of us is done within a very narrow sphere of interest and enterprise. In the fellowship of the Church we have a unique opportunity of emerging from these limitations.

The solitary worshipper replies that it is precisely this wide outlook that he desires. For this he deserts the Church. This emancipation, he says, this sense of spacious liberty, he cannot obtain in the Church, and he seeks it in the open field, in communion with nature. Professor Ross answers profoundly, that no man can enter into the fullest liberty if he is alone with nature and the God of nature. An essential element in the vision of far horizons is the presence of a body of aspirant life. It is 'with all saints,' not with nature, that we

comprehend the love of God. It is where two or three are gathered together to search into His Name, that He is in the midst.

And another gain to be obtained from corporate worship is quiet of spirit. Who has not known perplexities drop away, who has not seen problems solved, in the contemplation and experience of the fellowship of the Church? Moods that have distressed us have been dispelled by merely seeing them reflected in the experience of fellow-worshippers, whether of our own or of other ages.

Controversies which have vexed us have been settled in the light of the broad plain moralities of the Gospel. Exaggerations of view have been checked by the thought of the manifold variety of catholic Christian experience. Forgotten factors in difficult questions have come to light as we have learned to look at life from the point of view of God's residence in the collective body of His redeemed. We have repeated the Psalmist's experience: 'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me, till I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I.'

## The History of Religions, and its Introduction into the German Universities.

BY THE REV. LOUIS H. JORDAN, B.D., OXFORD.

THE recent establishment of a new University chair marks the inauguration in Germany of a notable academic departure. Surprisingly little attention seems to have been paid, either in Great Britain or America, to the taking of a step which is profoundly significant, and to the radical reversal of procedure which it registers and portends. It is curious that an event so important in itself, and more important still because of its inevitable consequences, should not have been made more generally known.

The honour of founding in Germany the first chair devoted to the study of the History of Religions, and of assigning it a place in the authorized curriculum of a Faculty of Theology, belongs to the University of Berlin. Strictly speaking, it is more accurate to say that this honour belongs to a little group of men who, not discouraged by numerous previous defeats, have at last carried the day. Nay, more: it is infinitely to their credit that they have won their victory in the council-chamber of the most representative seat of learning in the whole empire.

Germany has long been distinguished for the comparative indifference with which her leading teachers, and especially her theological teachers, have treated the investigations which scholars of other countries have been pursuing in this

département. Professor Harnack, on the other hand, has led an aggressive opposition: he has been persistently and unreservedly outspoken in his objections and criticisms. Again and again he has maintained that the student of theology has already to bestow his attention upon too large a number of subjects, and that the study of the General History of Religions presents features of special difficulty with which, if he be wise, he will not needlessly intermeddle. Until quite recently, these views have been held, more or less rigidly, by the chief representatives of all the Theological Faculties in Germany. Even by teachers of the Philosophical Faculties, who devote an exceptional amount of time to the elucidation of the Philosophy of Religion, the prior study of the History of Religions has been strangely neglected. Occasional classes have indeed been organized, and a few Dozenten have announced brief courses of lectures on this theme; but the number of students who have presented themselves for enrolment has been distinctly disappointing, and the effort has usually been abandoned before very long.

Happily some enthusiastic souls—aware of what was being accomplished elsewhere in this field, and persuaded that perseverance would yet obtain its reward—have refused to be discouraged. For many years, Professors Wellhausen of Göttingen,