

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR DRIVER has written a new Commentary on the Book of Genesis. It is published by Messrs. Methuen in the series of 'Westminster Commentaries' edited by Dr. Walter Lock. It is an English commentary, and it is characteristically English. The type is large and the margins ample. Into the same space a German publisher would have crammed four or five times the material. But the English way is the best way. Like all Dr. Driver's work, this Commentary supersedes everything on Genesis that has gone before it.

It is a generous book. The previous editors of Genesis are appreciated. In this also it differs from some German literature. And all that has been written touching Genesis, however obscure the writer or the organ of publication, seems to be known and appreciated. The generosity is the more marked and valuable that no pity is allowed to cover the culpability of work which is unscholarly or misleading.

At the very beginning of his Commentary Dr. Driver has to consider the antiquity of man upon the earth. The subject is one of intense interest. But it is not for the interest of it that Dr. Driver discusses it, but for its bearing on the interpretation of Genesis. Perhaps some of its interest arises from its bearing upon the interpretation of

Genesis. For it is well known that archæologists have recently been assigning a far greater antiquity to man than the Book of Genesis seems to know of. And it is felt that on that point alone may turn the question whether we can attribute to the Old Testament a literal historical value throughout.

What do the archæologists say about it? Dr. Driver first quotes Professor R. W. Rogers—'a most cautious and guarded American Assyriologist'—on Assyria. 'If we call up before us,' says Professor Rogers, 'the land of Babylonia, and transport ourselves backward until we reach the period of more than 4000 years before Christ, we shall be able to discern here and there signs of life, society, and government in certain cities. Civilization has already reached a high point, the arts of life are well advanced, and men are able to write down their thoughts and deeds in intelligible language and in permanent form. All these presuppose a long period of development running back through millenniums of unrecorded time.'

The Egyptologists agree. Dr. Budge assigns the date of Menes to 4400 B.C., Professor Flinders Petrie to 4777 B.C. Now Menes' tomb was unearthed in 1897, and the objects of art it contained show that already the civilization of Egypt was far advanced. More than that, the researches of Petrie, Amélineau, and de Morgan have brought

to light the remains of a race that preceded the dynasty of Menes, a race probably of Libyan origin, which differed from that hitherto known as the Egyptian race both in physical character and in civilization. They worked in flint, and shaped it into weapons, tools, and implements of all kinds. These flint implements of theirs belong to the Neolithic age, an age which Sir John Evans concludes came to an end in Egypt about 5000 years before Christ. The perfection of workmanship of the flaked and fluted flint knives would seem to indicate that this age must have begun in Egypt long before.

The evidence of language and of race carries us still farther back. We possess inscriptions much older than the date of the Confusion of Tongues, written in three entirely distinct languages, Sumerian, Babylonian, and Egyptian. One of these languages, the Babylonian, already has the form it exhibits 3000 years later. That is to say, it already shows signs of 'advanced phonetic degeneration,' and differs from Hebrew, Aramaic, and other Semitic languages almost exactly as it does in its best known period. For this point Dr. Driver refers to Professor M'Curdy's article on the RELIGION OF THE SEMITES in the forthcoming Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. How far back then must we go before we reach the time when the common ancestors of all the Semitic peoples lived together and spoke a common language? And if we must go far back for that, how much farther back must we go to find the ancestors of the Semites and the Aryans living together and using the same language?

Professor Driver proceeds. He gathers the evidence of Ethnology and of Geology. Ethnology asks how long it took the Egyptian and the Negro to differ, as they do on the Egyptian monuments 4000 years ago. The Negro and the Bushman have been living for a long time under the very same conditions of sun and rain, and they have not approached one another or varied from their proper type an appreciable quantity. Geology says

that the relics of human workmanship found in the Pleistocene period, along with the remains of extinct mammals, carry the men who could carve and draw back beyond the present time—well, upon the most moderate estimate, at least 20,000 years.

What are we to do with the Biblical Chronology? What a mercy it is that the date of the Creation, 4004 B.C., is found in the margin and not in the text of our Bibles. What are we to do? Get a Bible without a margin. But that will not serve us. For Archbishop Ussher, who was so foolish as to place that date in the margin, did the best that scholarship could do in his day. And even yet it cannot be denied that his calculations are correct. It is the Bible itself that is at fault, if there is a fault. And Professor Driver has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that 'the writers to whom we owe the first eleven chapters of Genesis, *report faithfully what was currently believed among the Hebrews* respecting the early history of mankind, at the same time making their narratives the vehicle of many moral and spiritual lessons, yet there was much which they *did not know, and could not take cognizance of*; these chapters, consequently, we are obliged to conclude, incomparable as they are in other respects, contain no account of the *real* beginnings either of the earth itself, or of man and human civilization upon it.'

There is a remarkable article in the *American Journal of Theology* for January, on the 'Religious Situation in France.' The writer's name is withheld at his request. The article is signed A. G. B.

The article is remarkable for its frank condemnation of the present Government, its frank condemnation of the party most strongly opposed to the Government, and its frank use of the names of the men who are prominent in the struggle.

There are three parties in France. There is, first the agnostic, militant, anti-religious party. Its

leaders are François de Pressensé, deputy from Lyons; Lintilhac, deputy from the Cantal; G. A. Hubbard, deputy from Paris; Dantresme, general secretary of the Prefecture of Bouches du Rhône; Charbonnel and Guineaudau, formerly Roman Catholic priests. Its chief newspapers are *La Raison*, *L'Action*, and *La petite République*. Its aim is the extinction of Religion in every shape and form. 'It is necessary,' said M. Dantresme, in his chairman's address at the distribution of prizes at the Lycée of Marseilles, on the 31st of July, 'it is necessary to draw all superstitious prejudices out of the mind of the younger generations. We want a system of education cleared from that Christian humility which lowers man by the besetting thought of sin, and renders him a quaking and credulous slave. The future will be ruled, not by faith, but by science, which makes the conscience free. If the evolution of the human mind proceeds without religion, so much the better.'

Accordingly, F. de Pressensé has drafted a Bill to do away with all religion. It begins with disestablishing the four churches that at present enjoy the advantages of establishment in France—the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Jewish Churches. And then it proceeds to pursue them with civil disabilities in no fewer than eighteen particulars. And when, with the help of the present Government, it has accomplished the utter extinction of religion, this party will proceed to make arrangement for its restoration! There are to be certain free-thinking ceremonies which will take the place of the sacraments and services of the Christian Church—there is to be an initiation of children corresponding to Baptism or Confirmation, and there is to be an occasional 'Feast of Reason' to take the place of the Eucharist.

The agnostic party is all for freedom of conscience and of action—in theory. In practice it has proved its sincerity in this way. On the 11th of June the customary Fête-Dieu was to have taken place in Paris, but *La Raison* and *L'Action* cried

out against it as an obstruction to the streets, and the Government prohibited it. On the 2nd of August they themselves organized a grand procession of agnostics, and marched past the statue of Étienne Dolet, the Government sending a strong body of police to see that they were not molested.

In direct opposition to the anti-religious party is the Ultramontane Catholic party. Its enemies are in power at present, and it is actually suffering much persecution. But give it power again and this writer believes its ways will be as arbitrary and as unjust as those of the party now in the ascendant. For its professed object is to subordinate all secular institutions to the Church, and subject all other denominations to the control of the Roman authority. But the best proof of its identity in spirit with the agnostic party is its attitude towards the anti-Semitic movement in Algeria, and the Dreyfus case at home.

There is a third party. This writer calls it the Liberal party. It adopts a middle way. Its way is not a mediating way, however. It is as keenly opposed to both the agnostics and the ultramontanes as they are opposed to one another; and it secures the equal dislike of both. Its aim is to give every religion and every man equal rights in the land. Its newspapers are *Les Débats*, *Le Temps*, *Le Figaro*, and *Le Siècle*; and it is strongly supported by the *Revue des deux Mondes*. Its leaders are of every shade of religion or of none—Roman Catholics like Georges Picot, Ribot, and Anatole Leroy Beaulieu; Protestants like Gabriel Monod and A. Lods; agnostics like De Lanessan and Waldeck-Rousseau; and even Jews like Henri Michel and Théodore Reinach. The time is at hand, our anonymous author believes, when the Liberal party will be in a majority in the Government.

Who is Dr. Paul Carus? We can answer that. He is the editor of *The Monist*, a quarterly

magazine 'devoted to the Philosophy of Science,' and of *The Open Court*, an illustrated monthly magazine, 'devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea'; and he is managing director and inspirer of the Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago. But Dr. Paul Carus is also a theological philosopher. Where does he stand? That question is not so easy to answer.

There is an answer in the *Princeton Theological Review* for January. It is the work of Dr. H. C. Minton, and it is in the form of a review of two volumes published by Dr. Carus in 1903. The volumes are *Fundamental Problems*, or the Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge, and *The Surd of Metaphysics*, an Inquiry into the question, Are there Things-in-Themselves? Dr. Minton knows the other books which Dr. Paul Carus has published. They are voluminous, but they are 'either an explication or an application' of the philosophical principles set forth in these two volumes. These two volumes give a satisfactory account of Dr. Carus' philosophy. Here, says Dr. Minton, we have in a nutshell the Philosophy of the Open Court.

Now the Philosophy of the Open Court is worth some attention. Dr. Paul Carus 'is a man of no merely amateur accomplishments in the arena of dialectical thought and discussion. He has convictions of his own, and he is not wanting in courage or ability to enforce them. He disclaims originality, or, more accurately, he affirms his endeavour to avoid it. In this, whatever his own modesty may lead him to declare, it will hardly be unjust to charge him, with some measure of failure. It may be more surprising to the savants of the opening century, that a new and somewhat original philosophy should come out of the utilitarian and mammon-worshipping city of Chicago than it was to them of the old time that any good thing should come out of Nazareth; but in both instances the thing which surprises is the thing which comes to pass.'

The philosophy of Dr. Paul Carus goes by the name of Monism. He has chosen this title himself. He knows that it is not a new title. He knows that Spinoza chose it before him. He knows also that there is the risk of confusion between his Monism and that of Spinoza, for they are not the same. Yet he has chosen the name of Monism. For he believes that his philosophy, and his alone is entitled to that name. Spinoza's doctrine is a pseudo-Monism. It is merely Henism, and by that name it ought to be called.

Spinoza held the doctrine of one substance in the universe. That, says Dr. Paul Carus is Henism. Dr. Carus is Hegelian enough to recognize two substances. But he rises above Hegelianism as he rises above Spinozism. He affirms that neither spirit nor matter has existence. Both are forms of abstract thought. Both are lost in that higher unity which only has being, that Cosmos or Existence which in the most absolute sense is all and in all.

There are no differences of kind in this All-Existence. There is no natural and supernatural. There is no Creator and created. There is no Divine and human. All is Nature, and all Nature is alive. Haeckel says that all Nature has intelligence, has a soul to see: that is merely panpsychism. Dr. Carus says far more than that. All Nature is alive, he says, or at least it has the capacity to live. This part of his philosophy he calls 'panbiotism.' There may be organic life and inorganic life. It may be that the former was developed out of the latter. But life is an inherent fundamental property of matter. 'Christ's words, are literally true, when he says, God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.'

It was not Christ, it was John the Baptist, who used these words. But we may let that pass.

The philosophy of the Open Court is a positive philosophy. But again its positivism is not the positivism of Auguste Comte. It is positive in

the simple and primitive sense that it is based on positive fact. There is no proper intuition or *à priori* in it. All is science, all is of experience, all rests on the proved continuity of Nature. It is true that nature has not yet been universally ransacked and every appearance brought within the scope of law and order. But enough has been done to guess the rest. The unity of Nature is accepted in the philosophy of Monism as a scientifically proved and universally established fact. It is the telescope of the French philosopher sweeping a wider heaven and finding no God. Dr. Paul Carus comes back with his telescope, his microscope, and every instrument that science has ever invented, and he says 'One.' There is no matter and there is no spirit; there is cosmos alone, the great All-One.

Dr. Minton asks the question, Is this new Occidental Philosophy pagan or Christian? He need not ask it. Dr. Paul Carus plainly declares he is no Christian. He accepts the ethics of Christ. The Cosmos cannot give him better ethics or more workable. But the ethics of Christ, he says, are not the ethics of Christianity. Christ did not, Christianity does, disregard the order of the universe and the findings of science. Now 'the surrender of science is the way to perdition.' And, however reluctantly, Dr. Carus is obliged to break with Christianity out and out, for there is no supernatural and there is no God. 'By God,' he says, 'we understand the order of the world that makes harmony, evolution, aspiration, and morality possible.' It is not that he denies the personality of God. God is a person and more. He is all that a person is, and he is more than a person can ever be. He is the All-in-all. He is spirit and matter combined, and not merely combined, but lost in a higher reality. He is Cosmos. We may call the All-One God if we like. But to speak of the Cosmos as God is to use the language of poetry. We may compare it to a father and with Christ call it 'Our Father,' but we only mean what we mean when we speak of Mother Nature. And as there is no God, there is of course no worship. 'We

do not call the "All" God in order to bow down into the dust and adore it. We regard adoration as a pagan custom, which, it is a pity, survived into Christianity.'

We have not yet got all its meaning out of the Transfiguration. We have not yet got much out of it. And what are we? The Church of Christ has not yet got much out of it. The Rev. A. T. Fryer, making one more effort in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January to get something out of the Transfiguration, points out that it has very little place 'in the consciousness and liturgical system of the Church.'

One thing has always been seen in the Transfiguration. It has always been seen that Moses represented the Law and Elijah the Prophets. Mr. Fryer begins with that. He thinks, however, that it would be nearer the purpose if we said that Moses represented the priesthood. He was the founder of the Aaronic priesthood, he consecrated the first high priest of that order, and Aaron was simply appointed to be his mouth-power or word. Mr. Fryer does not deny the force of finding in Moses the representative of the Law, of which Christ's 'exodus' was to be the fulfilment and passing. But if Moses is also, and chiefly, recognized as the representative of the priesthood, then he thinks the presence of Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration is fruitful of meaning to Christ Himself, to the disciples, and to us.

For there is no other occasion but this on which Christ was consecrated to be our Prophet and our Priest. Such consecration was necessary. On Calvary He would accomplish the act which would prove Him a priest forever and make us priests in Him, the act which would prove Him a prophet forever and make us prophets in Him. And so they spoke of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. But He has to be set apart for that act, and this was the occasion of His ordination. Moses was present to see the meaning

of that glorious vesture in which he had arrayed his mouthpiece, and the meaning of all that bloodshedding of countless lambs. Elijah was there to see the reality of which his own prophetic activity had been a shadow, the beginning of that school of prophets which should outnumber his largest dream. The disciples were there that they might hear of His exodus, in which the priestly and prophetic offices would be accomplished, and understand that the ignominious manner of their accomplishment took nothing from their grandeur and eternal power. And Christ Himself was there, the centre of the ceremony, the Priest who is to be also the Victim, the Prophet who in His Sacrifice is to reveal to men the will of God.

There are many things to see in the Transfiguration: this is what Mr. Fryer would have us see. He does not forget the Kingly office of Christ, but that comes after. First He is made a Priest and a Prophet. By the presence of Moses and Elijah He receives all that the priest and the prophet have been in the past; by the presence of the disciples He passes on the priesthood and the prophecy to the future. The disciples representing the future have their share in His consecration, as well as Moses and Elijah who represent the past. For He is consecrated, not by outward ceremony, but by the acceptance of the Father's will. The word of consecration is, 'This is My beloved Son.' And the acceptance of the Father's will is Calvary, in which lay all the hopes of the priests and prophets of the past, all the assurance of the priests and the prophets that are yet to come.

The disciples, we say, had to be there as well as Moses and Elijah. For as Moses was a true

priest and Elijah a true prophet, so they are to be true prophets and priests unto God. And it is not without its purpose that three disciples were taken with Him into the Mount, while only two saints descended from heaven upon it. The two stood for the priestly and the prophetic offices, the one for the one, the other for the other. But henceforth the priestly and the prophetic are to be combined in one Person, Jesus Christ, and in every one of His followers in Him. Three is the number of representation. Peter is to receive the double office, and so are James and John. And three mean thirty times three, even the whole number of the followers of the Lamb.

When did the followers of our Lord receive the office of priest and the office of prophet? At the Resurrection the one; at Pentecost the other. When the veil of the temple was rent in twain the way of access was open to all. And when the tongues of fire sat on the head of each of the followers of Christ who were assembled together on the day of Pentecost, they received the gift of prophecy.

Now the important thing is that the way was made open for *all* into the Holiest, and that the tongue of fire sat upon the head of *each of them*. It was the business of the priest in the preparatory dispensation to present the people's prayers to God; it was the business of the prophet to take back His answer. Now every follower is to be a priest and a prophet. Every follower is to present his own desires and receive an answer for himself. 'Enviest thou for my sake,' said Moses at the tabernacle in the wilderness; 'would God that all the Lord's people were prophets.' He came down upon the Mount of the Transfiguration to see his desire fulfilled.