

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE X.

NOTES.

LIBERTY'S LIMITATIONS.

A YOUNG Egyptian who offered to show us the streets of Cairo, boasted that they had more liberty in Turkey than we have in the United States. The boast, astonishing as it may seem, contains more than a half truth.

In Turkey there is no limit to the obstructions which vendors of various wares may place in the street. The people are at liberty to allow filth to accumulate to any degree in front of their houses. Porters and self-constituted guides may crowd around you without limit and impose their services upon you. But, dear as this liberty is to the Oriental heart, it is anything but conducive to the freedom of the great mass, not only of travelers, but of the people themselves. A friend of ours pays a beggar a *beslik* ("shilling") a month to let him and his friends alone when they appear upon the street; and the beggar comes around as regularly as the moon to receive his dues.

It is evident, however, that this excess of freedom outdoes itself, and becomes a despotism of the most burdensome kind. True liberty is secured only in combination with law. The liberty afforded to the people of drinking at every well, lets loose upon them the hard masters of pestilence and death. Freedom to the vendors of narcotics and intoxicating drinks leads to the bondage of the multitudes whose appetites are strong and whose self-control is weak.

The ignorance of Russia is largely due to the lack of a compulsory system of education. The freedom of the village communes to regulate their private affairs, and of the parents to keep their children out of school, continues the bondage

which ignorance imposes upon the nation. Even the dogs of Constantinople illustrate the principle in a most striking degree. These miserable creatures enjoy, as no other creatures do, the entire "freedom of the city." They block the sidewalks, lie in the middle of the street, and compel everybody to turn aside for them. Deprived of the discipline and restraint of civilization, they have become altogether the most forlorn and unhappy specimens that can be found anywhere in the animal kingdom. Their liberty has been their ruin.

THE DEAD HAND.

REPUBLICS need a constitution as much as monarchies do. A written constitution is a striking witness to the lack of confidence which the wisest men have in themselves. A constitution imposes the sober judgment of one generation upon the actions of succeeding generations, and acts in restraint of their liberties.

In the United States the Supreme Court is above all the legislative departments of the government. In vain does Congress endeavor to secure its object through the enactment of specific laws if the Supreme Court declares them unconstitutional.

It is curious to see how helplessly Congress is struggling to remedy many gross evils which find ready protection under the plain letter of the Constitution. It would seem desirable that Congress should be able to regulate railroad rates throughout the United States, but it is prevented from doing so, except in indirect ways, by the rights which were reserved to the States in the Constitution; while the means of amending the Constitution are so cumbersome that it is almost impossible to secure any further extensive changes.

It would seem desirable to abolish polygamy throughout the United States. But the "dead hand" of our Revolutionary fathers refused to delegate to the Central Government the regulation of marriages. So fearful are many of the States that the General Government might legalize marriages between blacks and whites, that it will probably be impossible, for centuries

to come, to persuade the required number of States to relinquish this right so as to make it possible to have uniform marriage and divorce laws throughout the Union.

In the sovereignty of her statehood, Utah may make such laws as she pleases concerning polygamy; or, at any rate, may, at her own sweet will, neglect to enforce any laws against polygamy which may stand upon her statute-books.

If it be said that this is still the rule of the majority, it is sufficient to call attention to the great inequality between the States of the Union. Nevada does not contain as much population as some of the smaller counties in many of the Eastern States; it would take fifty Delawares to equal New York or Pennsylvania in population. Yet these small States have the same representative power in the Senate that the larger ones do, and each one can present as effective opposition to a Constitutional amendment as the most populous of the larger States can do. And so the State of Connecticut, for instance, by a constitution adopted a hundred years ago, prevents any present equality of representation by giving to every township an equality in the Lower House. A township of twenty-five voters weighs as much in the Lower House as does a city of twenty-five thousand voters, while the Constitution cannot be changed except by the consent of these smaller units.

But these provisions, onerous as they may seem at times, are in reality among the greatest safeguards to our liberties; for they give us a chance to appeal from "Philip drunk to Philip sober." There is no danger more threatening to true liberty in republican governments than the reckless legislation of fickle temporary majorities, and there is no despotism more exasperating than that of an implacable and unchangeable majority. Such is the despotism wielded in Mohammedan and heathen countries. The Sultan can oppress Christians only as he has the vast Mohammedan population back of him. The boycott in the hands of Mohammedans and of trades unions is the most effective of all forms of despotism. A few individuals are helpless in any country against an overwhelming and persistent majority.

Bishop Butler is reported to have been startled at one time by the suggestion, that nations, like individuals, may become insane. There are many illustrations going to show that this suggestion often becomes a reality. The public sentiment of nations is frequently swept along as by an invisible ocean current. The Jews were insane at the time of the crucifixion of Christ. The French people were raving maniacs in the time of Danton and Robespierre. It is to be feared that Russia is in the throes of a similar insanity, in which the Goddess of Liberty is exalted so high as to dethrone all law and order.

No: it will not do for any people to dispense with a constitution. Nations, like steam engines, need a balance wheel. If full sway is given to every outburst of national feeling, the whole fabric of government will be shaken to pieces, as a wheel bursts when suffered to revolve with too great velocity. Evidently it is the conservative forces in church and state which now need to be most strengthened and emphasized. We are not so likely to suffer from the repression of "dead hand" as from the recklessness of irreverent leaders and the aimless wanderings of blind guides. Happy is the church, and happy is the state, where the wisdom of past generations is not ignored, but made the vantage-ground for future progress, where the good of all the past is conserved, and the evil only discarded.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

Rome, Italy, November, 1905.

BRITISH THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

STUDENTS of philosophy everywhere will be grateful to Professor James Ward, of Cambridge, for editing the volume of "Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant,"¹ by the late Professor H. Sidgwick, Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge.

The volume is made up of (1) twelve lectures on "the metaphysics of Kant"; (2) three lectures on "the metaphysics of T. H. Green"; (3) two lectures on "the philosophy of Mr.

¹London: Macmillan and Co. Pp. x, 475. 1905. Price, 10s. net.

Herbert Spencer"; and (4) five essays (from *Mind* and from the *Journal of Philology*). Professor Ward tells us, in the Preface, that the author felt the lectures on Kant "tolerably complete," but the study on Green "not in the form required for a book."

The lectures on Kant begin with "the Critical Standpoint." In a very interesting way, Sidgwick discusses Kant's inquiry into the possibility of a Metaphysic. He thinks Kant's answer "simple" and "clear." Metaphysics has not the characteristics of Science—has not "universal and permanent approval," and has not the "continually advancing" character of "every other science." Sidgwick seems to agree with Kant as to the humble and longing attitude of Philosophy in relation to the "uncontested" and "progressive" character of the knowledge of the sciences. Now, this is an excellent chapter, and finely does Sidgwick set out before us the limitations of Kant, but I do not pretend to think so meanly of metaphysics as science as Professor Sidgwick appears to do. It is possible for philosophy—or metaphysic—to be needlessly humble, and to get no profit for its pains. Why was Sidgwick not bolder by far in his claims for scientific metaphysics? Metaphysics is a theoretic discipline like other sciences, and, so far as it is science, does not conduct us beyond experience. Intensively, no doubt, metaphysics may conduct us beyond experience, but then what right has anybody to lay narrower pretensions on metaphysics than on the other sciences? The metaphysic of experience, in its possibility, necessity, and reality, must be scientifically comprehended, for that is the very end of metaphysical science. And as there is "uncontested" knowledge here, so is there "progressive" knowledge also, the whole history of philosophy being witness to a really significant progress or development. The superiority of metaphysics to the concrete sciences is, that, whereas they are content with notions relatively perfect, metaphysic would bring reality up to absolute conceptions. There is so much to be said for metaphysics as also science—divided from the other sciences not in method, but only in the universality of its task—that this science—and

crown, for that matter, of all the sciences—as being the inquiry after the Real, and embracing the world as totality, should have had some stronger tone adopted for it by Professor Sidgwick.

The discussion of Space and Time is marked by the acuteness and excellence to be expected of the distinguished author, and forms one of the best discussions of the subject we have at any time read. Finely does Professor Sidgwick set out his divergences from the “most original, penetrating, ingenious, and laboriously systematic” Kant, for clear and strong are the reasons he adduces for his conviction that this same Kant is “a profoundly inconsistent thinker, profoundly unaware of his own inconsistency”—a judgment that should prove worthy of all acceptance by those who have made much study of Kant’s most interesting inconsistencies. The question as to whether Space and Time are to be regarded as belonging only to the percipient mind is well argued by Sidgwick, who begins by showing the seriousness of the problem—the momentous issues involved, which it is doubtful if Kant fully realized. After Kant’s “confusions of thought” are disposed of, Sidgwick believes his conclusions will be found “clearly inadequate.” The argument is too long to be here summarized or reviewed, and it must suffice to say, it will be found of extreme interest by all who are concerned with the discussion or solution of these important problems. Sidgwick is as critical and sanely balanced, in respect of Kant’s expositors, as one could wish, and that is high praise.

On the Kantian schematism of the Categories, Sidgwick again writes with critical vigor and strength, laying bare “the fallacious results of this mistaken system-making.” On substance, causality, community, and modality, Professor Sidgwick treats, in brief but interesting and keenly logical fashion. Then, in four separate chapters, our author handles Kant’s Transcendental Dialectic, Rational Psychology, the Mathematical Antinomies, and the Dynamical Antinomies. Thus, in the twelfth chapter, we are brought up to Rational Theology, on which there is but space to say a word. In his usual

interesting and ably critical way, Sidgwick follows Kant's treatment of the theological proofs. But it is not one of the best chapters in the book, though the theme is so important, and it is by no means the best treatment of the subject that has appeared. It overlooks far too many of the weak points in Kant's armor, and it wastes strength on points like the hundred-dollars argument that had been better expended elsewhere. One must hold that, for critical treatment of this part of Kant, theological writers are more to be praised, for thorough skill and acumen, than are professional philosophers. *Suum cuique*. Space-limits forbid my following, in the same way, the treatment of Spencer and Green. I must be content to refer philosophical readers to the work itself, which no one interested in philosophical problems can afford to do without. The work, in whole, constitutes an extremely valuable and altogether welcome contribution to philosophical thought, and will help enhance and perpetuate the name and fame of its distinguished author.

It should be added that the pleasure of reading this work is greatly increased by the exceedingly beautiful type, and admirable get-up of the work, on the part of the great publishing firm by which it is issued.

Of religious geniuses we have in Scotland but one, and that one is Dr. Matheson. In "The Representative Men of the New Testament" by George Matheson, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.,¹ we have the third volume of a series dealing with the Representative Men of the Bible, as only Dr. Matheson can. Hardly anything could conceivably do more to deepen interest in biblical study than these vital and suggestive works by a great individuality. Into this latest product of his pen, Dr. Matheson has poured not a little of his own striking individuality. They have every quality which has gone to make the author's name famous. It would be a superficial blunder to suppose that these are merely popular studies: it would say little for the judgment of any one who could not readily perceive how much more they are than that. Far more study,

¹ London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. viii, 367. Price, 6s.

thought, and critical knowledge are required for the production of such work than lie upon the surface.

To the present reviewer, the very value of such work lies just in this, that behind all the play of fancy, and poetic imagery, and suggestive thought, and striking delineation of character, that meet us, there is the ever-present background of the mental depth and resource of one who, for many years, stood forth as one of our most deeply cultured theologians, historians, and exegetes, and who, in giving us these rare and beautiful studies, is doing so out of a wondrous reserve power. These New Testament studies are most fascinating and rewarding, and will certainly enhance the interest already existing in Dr. Matheson's work. Where all is so good, it is difficult to sample the work. But one or two brief specimens may be given. In the very fine chapter on the Baptist entitled "John the Expanded," it is at one place said:—

"What he required was not enlightenment; it was expansion. Strange as it may seem, I hold that what all religious youth requires is not enlightenment but expansion."

"It is too intense to be broad; it settles on a branch and dwells there. It sees the fire burning in a single bush; it hears the voice calling from only one tree. Its wings may be expected to-morrow, but its weights are for to-day. Its path is a narrow path, its view is a limited view; it sees through a glass darkly and it thinks it sees in full."

"There are, in my opinion, two characteristics of the narrowness of religious youth, and they are both found in this figure of the Baptist. The first I would describe as the inability to wait, in other words, a tendency to see the future without intermediate view. This man points to his Christ and cries, 'His fan is in his hand!'—ready to be used. Youth habitually scorns the intermediate. It is commonly reckoned a proof of its expansiveness. In truth it is the reverse; it is its inability to fix the eye on any point but one."

"His conception of the Messiah is beautiful beyond his time; but his conception of the Messiah's fan is premature. When the hills look too near, there will be rain. I am afraid this great revival preacher is preparing for himself a harvest of tears. It is grandly exciting, no doubt, to see the masses vibrating to the message that the fan is already in the hand. But the fan is in reality not yet within the grasp of the Christ. To the eye of the Baptist

the hills look wonderfully near, but the deception will ere long reveal itself."

"But there is a second characteristic of religious youth, and it also is exemplified in this great revival preacher. Religious youth is distinctly uncompromising. It never admits the possibility of any shades of opinion."

"The preacher on the banks of Jordan revealed in pronounced colours this uncompromising spirit of youth. He denied the intermediate shades between night and day. Not only was the Messiah's fan already in the hand; it was to be used drastically. 'He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.'"

"With all its intolerance, with all its uncompromisingness, with all its repelling severity, there is something in this figure transcendently grand."

"The man speaks with conviction; and his conviction is his power. Alone of all the world he has seen the King in His moral beauty—has recognized that lamblike whiteness is better than imperial purple."

"What is it that the Baptist lacks throughout? It is expansion. His taint is narrowness. His ideal of Christ was magnificent, unique among His contemporaries. But he insisted that this ideal should become the immediate possession of the world. He had no place for the wavering, no provision for the stunted, no tenderness for the specially tempted. What this man needed was charity—a deeper sympathy with the infirmities of man."

"But touch him where he is strong, shake him where he has been immovable, and you open the first inlet for the entrance of human charity. The shaking of John's faith was a process preparatory to his spiritual expansion."

We have taken these specimens from one chapter: any other chapter will furnish things equally good. The chapters include such subjects as "John the Self-surrendered," "Nathanael the Invigorated," "Philip the Disillusioned," "Matthew the Exalted," "Zaccheus the Conscious-struck," "Mark the Steadied," "Paul the Illuminated," etc. Ministers and laymen alike will find the volume one of rich helpfulness and stimulus in their study of the men of the New Testament, and to the notice of all such the book may be cordially and confidently commended. The name of the publishers is a guarantee of the excellence of the printing and general get-up of the volume.

THE TRUE VOCATION OF THE PULPIT.

ON both sides of the Atlantic there is a grievously wide-spread tendency to degrade the Christian pulpit by using it as a vehicle for the furtherance of political issues and party ends. I am not going to discuss a single one of the specious arguments adduced for this lowering procedure: one knows them all, has heard them times without number: what I am going to say is said in full knowledge and consideration of them. It is high time that those ministers of Christ who are under temptation to bring political controversies within the range of the pulpit should consider their ensnaring influence. In a thousand instances one has seen their disastrous effect on pulpit influence,—the loss of judgment, of moderation, of impartiality, of spiritual independence, balance, and wholeness of mind. The loss of spiritual force is inevitable, as the pulpit thus subserves the political temper and atmosphere: not in the political region does the preacher of spiritual force come to his highest. He simply cannot do so *there*: he is very limited in spiritual insight and horizon, if he does not see that his true and full inward expansion cannot be realized there; and why, then, should he give himself to that which is less than the highest? It is nothing to the purpose to point to men who have been pulpit forces and yet dabbled or dealt with the affairs of the politicians: how much greater had been their power, if a higher and more spiritual leverage had been their quest? Safe it is to say they have never been the *prime* spiritual forces of the Christian pulpit, whose deepest power never lies that way. What man, then, wise and spiritual, would willingly be involved in the loss of spiritual dignity and lowering of spiritual tone involved in so much bartering of true strength for winning of support on ephemeral questions and procuring majorities for superficial politicians?

“He would not sell those pure ambrosial weeds
With the rank vapours of this sin-worn mould.”

The somewhat melancholy fact remains that there is not one of our churches or denominations which does not all too read-

ily yield itself to the domination of political considerations. Sad, indeed, that they so little realize their primary and fundamental character to be spiritual! But, if that spiritual character cannot be perfectly realized, he only is wise who keeps himself and his pulpit at least as clear as may be of the tainted influences of the political atmosphere. Never in life will he repent of doing so, but he may find a large place for repentance the other way. Shall our interests, our preferment, our popularity, suffer by this spiritual superiority to, or aloofness from, *quasi* political advocacies? Well, the answer is easy, A thousand times let them suffer, and let us keep silence. When silence means spiritual patience, force, and strength, it is better to be silent. The high principles and eternal truths of the gospel,—let these content us. Have we done such justice to them that we can waste the time of the Christian pulpit on passing issues and debatable methods or ends? There is probably no deeper need of our time than an awakened sense of pulpit responsibility in this connection. Not the mere questions of this or that majority on this or that ephemeral issue is our concern, but the creation of spiritual character in all men, and the fearless and determined insistence that all men shall realize the just and the true. These are the ends to which our pulpit strength must be bent, without a shade of political bias, trend, or interest. The sovereignty of spiritual ideas is that which the pulpit must, at all hazards, maintain; and why should any of us degrade the highest of vocations? I am not arguing; I know no controversy; I am only presenting a personal view,—the view of a convinced mind, claiming only personal liberty to express an individual conviction. God knows, the religious languor and spiritual torpor of certain classes, and of large masses, of men, might well suffice to bind the pulpits of to-day to their God-given tasks of spiritual character, leaving to those to whom it may belong, the task of hod-carriers to self-seeking politicians. Let us recall the words of one who bore illustrious name in historical theology in Europe, “Let Christianity return to the desert, that, re-ascending to its Divine origin, from thence it may advance towards

society, armed with truth alone, with no other introducer than itself, with no other letter of recommendation than the eternal Gospel, and claiming from human societies only the common right which, without doubt, it is bound to claim; then will be seen what it is; in that condition it will be able to measure itself with the century, and will retake from the depths of its exile (for thus it calls its proud solitude) the direction of human affairs and the government of the future."

THE ECCLESIASTICAL SITUATION IN SCOTLAND.

SINCE my article on the above subject, events have traveled far, and it may be well to give some supplementary notes on the lines of further development. *First*, there has been approach to Parliament, the fountal source of law. While not in any formal way setting aside the legal decision of the House of Lords, Parliament yet found the circumstances of the case to be so unprecedented and abnormal that very special measures must be taken. Accordingly, we have had, *secondly*, the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the facts, as, presumably, a basis for legislation. The Royal Commission appointed did so inquire, in careful and impartial manner, and, while manifestly desirous to interfere as little as might be with the decision of the House of Lords, made highly important practical recommendations. Then, *thirdly*, there has been the passing by Parliament of the Churches (Scotland) Bill, whereby there is to be a fair and equitable division between these two churches—the United Free Church and the Free (or Minority) Church—of the funds and property which have been under dispute. *Fourthly*, and finally, there has been appointed an Executive Commission, charged with the practical carrying out of the fair and equitable division already referred to, or, in more official phraseology, "for the allocation of property between the Free Church and the United Free Church of Scotland." Thus we are within sight of a peaceful and, it may be hoped, reasonably satisfactory issue to all the ecclesiastical turmoil and bad blood that recent times have seen. None but will rejoice that so reasonably satisfactory a practical ending seems

near. Both religion and morality have suffered much, and on all sides there is "much to forget." The whole controversy has shown how "much" there is to "learn," for it could have been saved. But that fact is gladly forgotten in the joy of the ending. Both churches deserved, and received, a large measure of sympathy, though different in kind. It has been a most important time for the religious future of Scotland, for the Churches Bill now passed allows the Scottish churches (the Established Church as well as these others) to revise and adjust their creeds from time to time without entailing loss of their funds or property. Only the future can show what this may be destined to mean, but one may hope it will work out as freedom, progress, spiritual faithfulness, and power. At the time of writing, the two churches concerned have agreed to meet in conference with a view to mutual agreements and understandings, which would simplify and shorten the labors of the Executive Commission. There can be no doubt that the Commission will ratify such understandings or agreements, and we may hope that pacific solutions will shortly be found on all the questions involved. Thus the ecclesiastical sky begins again to grow clear, and all men hope it will soon be bright. Now one may hope for some nearer approach to that frame of mind foreshadowed in the poet's words—

"But rise; let us no more contend, nor blame
Each other, blamed enough elsewhere; but strive
In offices of love, how we may lighten
Each other's burden, in our share of woe."

Kilmarnock, Scotland.

JAMES LINDSAY.

[NOTE.—These expected conferences were found, after the above was written, to have fallen through.—J.L.]