

nothing to prevent the assignment of all the Jordan rivers of Crete, Asia Minor, Sarmatia, and Palestine, to a Hittite nomenclature, *if other evidence should point that way*. Only we must remember Mr. Andrew Lang's comments on Professor Sayce's statement that 'the Moschi seem to have spoken a language allied to that of the Cappadocians and

Hittites.' 'That is to say,' says Mr. Lang, 'it is not impossible that the language of the Moschi, about which next to nothing is known, may have been allied to that of the Cappadocians, about which we know next to nothing.' 'Where Professor Sayce is, the Hittites, if we may say so respectfully, are not very far off.'

In the Study.

The Beautiful Word 'Ransom.'

ONE of the first sermons in the new volume of the *Christian World Pulpit*—it is the 76th volume, containing the sermons from July to December, 1909 (James Clarke & Co. ; 4s. 6d.)—one of its first sermons is entitled 'The Servant-Redeemer.' The preacher is the Rev. Herbert Snell, B.A., and the text is Mt 20²⁸, 'Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

The Servant-Redeemer? Why must the Servant be a Redeemer, and why must the Redeemer be a Servant? That was the vision of Isaiah—'Behold my servant': 'and with his stripes we are healed.' It means that the redemption of man is to be accomplished by the instrumentality of God. Not against God's will; not simply with God's acquiescence; but in full harmony with God's purpose and under God's direction. The Redeemer is to be God's servant, the instrument of His hand, used by God for our healing. But redemption is the payment of a price. It is wounding; it is stripes. The servant must also be a sufferer. 'Suffering goodness,' says Mr. Snell, 'is an equivalent for the service of God.'

It is a mighty truth. How did Isaiah attain to it? Not by quiet thinking, but by the pressure of experience. 'Just as diamonds are generally discovered in the beds of rivers flowing through volcanic districts, the product of stupendous pressure during awful eruptions, so this gem originated in that wild chaotic period of Israel's history when she was the captive of tyranny and of idolatry, when empires clashed in conflict around her prison walls, and buried her destiny in hopeless débris.'

He came as a Servant. So every man of genius or of greatness comes as the servant of man. Did He come, like Plato, to serve to intellectual progress? Did He come, like Luther, for the reformation of doctrine? Did He come, like Cromwell, for political reconstruction? Did He come, like Shakespeare, for the culture of the imagination in poetic and dramatic ideals? He came as a Servant in order to redeem man. And for that end no one ever came but Himself.

But He was a Physician. He healed all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. He did not heal as a physician; He healed as a Redeemer. His service to the sick of the palsy was not 'Rise up and walk,' but 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'

But He came as a Teacher. Did they not say, 'Never man spake like this man.' He did not teach as a Rabbi, but as a Redeemer. 'The Sermon on the Mount, with its sublime precepts, its ravishing melody of language, would yet never have led captive the mind and heart of man but for the Cross. We all remember Holman Hunt's famous picture of the carpenter's shop in Nazareth with the mother of Jesus bending over the chest containing the gifts of the wise men, and the young carpenter stretching his arms above his head in weariness, while his shadow, the shadow of a cross, shows behind Him on the wall. If I get close to the Sermon on the Mount and examine it, I see there the shadow of the cross on every page.'

'He gave his life a ransom.' Ransom is a beautiful word. Mr. Snell says so. And that says much for Mr. Snell. By our words we shall be justified—by the words we speak, and also by the words we love. How are you drawn to the word 'blood,' for instance? How are you drawn to the

word 'ransom'? Mr. Snell says it is a beautiful word.

But he does not play with it. He seeks to discover its meaning. 'It was a word in ordinary and everyday use among the Hebrews. In every Jewish family, if the firstborn was a boy, the father "ransomed" him, when he was thirty days old, from the service of the sanctuary by paying five shekels to the priest. That money was "ransom." It permitted him to follow that trade or profession to which opportunity or natural bent inclined him.'

Mr. Snell gives this illustration :

'In George Eliot's *Romola*, Baldassarre, the slave, gave gems to his adopted son, Tito Melema, that he might ransom him. But that young man, wishing to live a life of pleasure, and make for himself a secure nest in the world, preferred to sell the gems for his own profit. On one occasion, Bardo, Romola's blind father, asked to be allowed to handle them, but Tito said, "They are in the safe keeping of a goldsmith, who has strong and safe places for such things: he estimates them as worth at least 500 ducats." "Ah, then, they are fine gems," said Bardo, "500 ducats! Ah! more than a man's ransom." It was a mere phrase of common parlance, at a time when men were often being ransomed from slavery or imprisonment, but it smote like a knife on Tito's conscience, for they were a man's ransom, though he did not intend to use them as such.'

Jesus Christ came into the world bringing with Him priceless gems, all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. In Him was all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. But He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. He poured out His wealth in the redeeming of sinful men. He spent His jewels on our ransom.

Was He ever tempted to use them for Himself? Yes, that is the meaning of the battle in the wilderness. 'If thou art the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread'—spend thy jewels to satisfy thy hunger. 'If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down'—give them for admiration and personal éclat. 'If thou wilt fall down and worship me, all shall be thine'—barter them for the empire of the world. But He said no. No, He said, I cannot; they are ransom. 'The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'

'Give the world all credit for the noble impulses

that now and again run through the arteries of its moral life, but what does the world need to-day, to lift the burden of its misery, so much as Christ's redeeming love?

'Oft when the Word is on me to deliver, lifts the illusion, and the truth lies bare;

Only like souls I see the folk thereunder, bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,—

Hearing their one hope with an aching wonder, sadly contented in a show of things:—

Then with a rush the intolerable craving shivers throughout me like a trumpet call,

Oh, to save these! to perish for their saving, Die for their life, be offered for them all!

Two Studies in Ritschlianism.

A new book on Ritschlianism is a blessing. Two new books are an embarrassment. They are both by Cambridge men. They are identical in size and in price. It is only a careful reading, first of one and then of the other, that brings out their difference and shows it necessary to read them both. Look at them separately.

Mr. John Kenneth Mozley, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, has given to his volume the simple title of *Ritschlianism* (Nisbet; 5s. net). He has dedicated it to Professor Herrmann of Marburg, 'in gratitude for much personal kindness received, and in recognition of all that he has done to establish the true meaning and significance of Christian Faith.' We judge accordingly that the book is to be sympathetic to the Ritschlians, and we judge rightly. It is also sympathetic to Ritschlianism, though not so sympathetic.

That is the very point of view which Mr. Mozley takes up. Ritschl and his followers deserve utmost gratitude for their good intention. They realized the existence of a situation that was critical for Christianity, and they honestly attempted to meet it and supply what was needed. The gravity of that situation is not yet fully understood, and consequently Ritschlianism has been judged too exclusively on its own merits, as if it were a defence of Christianity without date or country, and so it has been found wanting. But when the Church comes to realize that there was in Ritschl's day a considerable body of thinking men who were divorced from Christianity because of the intellectual difficulties it presented, she will recognize

the honesty and ability of the Ritschlian attempt to meet that serious situation, and will be more patient of its partial failure.

For it has partly failed. Mr. Mozley takes up the great characteristic questions one by one and expounds them—the Ritschlian attitude to Philosophy, Religion and the Idea of God, Revelation, the Value-Judgments, Faith, Communion with God. The exposition is also a criticism. And then he sums up the matter in one concluding chapter, and weighs Ritschlianism in the balance.

First of all, what has Ritschlianism done to commend Christianity to the unbeliever? What is its contribution to Apologetic? For a moment the separation of theology from philosophy seems a great gain. It did seem so for a moment. But what was the result? The philosopher (and in a degree the scientist) simply found himself outside. The apology proved to be addressed only to the believer, who, being a believer, did not need an apology. 'The duty of Christian Apologetic,' says Mr. Mozley, 'is twofold—to show that the facts with which the origin of Christianity is bound up are true facts and not inventions; and secondly, to demonstrate the inherent reasonableness of the Christian religion, and its relation to the presentations of reasons from other quarters. The Ritschlians have not carried out these tasks, though, perhaps, an exception should be made in the case of Harnack, who is at once sympathetic in his attitude towards other religions, and keenly interested in the evangelistic mission of the Church.'

Next, what has Ritschlianism done for Christian piety? It has separated piety from sentimentalism. And that is a great good. For 'Jesusolatry,' as Hort called it, is a danger to which 'Catholics' and 'Evangelicals' are equally liable. This form of religiousness was closely studied by the Ritschlians, and they opposed it by restoring the New Testament conception of faith, and giving it the supremacy over love, laying stress on the unity and redeeming might of the Person of Jesus Christ, and teaching that religion is concerned with the performance of duties in this world and not with states of feeling. But the Ritschlians went wrong when they went so far as to denounce all mysticism and deny the claim of any man to have communion with the exalted Christ.

Lastly, what has been the contribution of Ritschl to systematic theology? He views Christian doctrine from the point of view of the two foci—

Justification by Faith and the Kingdom of God. And the estimate we make of these two centres will depend on what we are. To the Lutheran—such a Lutheran as Ritschl—the weight he hangs on Justification by Faith will not seem excessive. To the Christian social reformer, it will not seem possible to make too much of the idea of the Kingdom of God.

But the Ritschlian contribution to theology is judged not on these great central ideas so much as on its separate parts. What is its doctrine of Christ? Here there has been much dispute among its critics. Mr. Mozley sees that Ritschl could not possibly have constructed a satisfactory doctrine of the Godhead of Christ because he rejected the category of substance. But he says, 'Even if *we* feel that the neglect of this category amounts logically to a denial of Christ's substantial Deity, we ought not to impute this to the Ritschlians. To speak of Ritschl, Herrmann, and Kaftan as Unitarians is a real abuse of language.'

What, then, of the Atonement? Ritschl's doctrine of the Atonement, says Mr. Mozley, is more genuinely Socinian than his doctrine of Christ's Deity. But that is not the criticism which we usually hear. For 'it is a curious fact,' Mr. Mozley continues, 'that there are many thinkers who would pride themselves on their orthodoxy and attachment to Catholic principles, and shrink with horror from Socinianism where it touches the doctrine of the Incarnation, who yet view with favour an application of thoroughly Socinian and rationalistic principles to the doctrine of the Atonement. But it was the Atonement and not the Incarnation which Socinianism first assailed. This attitude, so surprising in convinced Christians, is due to the belief that the Incarnation stands by itself, and that the Atonement is a mere corollary from it; whereas the true Christian method, and unquestionably the method of the New Testament, is to place the Cross in the forefront, and pass on from that to an assertion of the Divinity of Him who suffered on Calvary. It cannot be said too often that the Cross, not the manger, Calvary, not Bethlehem, is the heart of the New Testament. In England the influence of Dr. Westcott from Cambridge and of the Anglo-Catholic successors of the Tractarians from Oxford combined has tended in the opposite

direction. In the writer's judgment it is a perilous course to throw the doctrine of propitiatory Atonement to the wolves of Rationalism, while yet retaining the belief that the Incarnation can be preserved in its integrity: and it is a course against which the New Testament, as he reads it, stands opposed. We are indeed told that it is the fact of the Atonement which matters, and not theories about it; but if the saying that "Christ died for our sins" is not to be simply a shibboleth, it is impossible to refrain from asking what such an idea implies. In all effective preaching this truth that "Christ died for our sins" has been anything but an idea without positive content; and wherever the Christian Gospel has been most effective, the content of that idea has been the substitution of Christ for us in His sufferings and death.

The title which Mr. Ernest A. Edghill, M.A., sometime Scholar of King's College, Cambridge, has given to his study of Ritschlianism is *Faith and Fact* (Macmillan; 5s. net). It is a more elementary book than Mr. Mozley's, and begins nearer the beginning. Mr. Edghill believes, and there is no doubt that he is right in believing, that Ritschlianism will never be understood except by those who come to the study of it from a knowledge of the philosophical atmosphere in which Ritschl found himself. Accordingly he devotes two chapters to an exposition of immediately preceding philosophical speculation, the first chapter being on Kant, Lange, and Lotze, the second on Schleiermacher and the Romantic School. These preliminary chapters are well written and may be read by any one with refreshing.

There follows the exposition of Ritschlianism. It is at once an exposition and a criticism. Mr. Edghill is not intensely interested in the Ritschlians. He judges the system apart from the men. But he does not judge it unsympathetically. Although for the system as a whole his judgment is condemnation, for he finds it 'impossible to accept Ritschlianism as any adequate substitute for the traditional faith of Christendom,' yet he has a good word to say for nearly every one of its

separate elements, and so good a word for some of them that he is willing to accept them as they stand.

Mr. Edghill has, as we have said, a keen sense of the necessity of understanding the philosophical situation into which Ritschlianism was born. He has not so keen an apprehension of the nearer theological situation. No man can possibly understand Ritschlianism who does not recognize it as the offspring and heir of the Reformation. No man can possibly appreciate Ritschl himself who does not appreciate the Reformers. But Mr. Edghill has no interest in the Reformation. The Reformers are nothing to him. Ritschlianism, he says, claims to be the true evangelical theology. It is 'a claim we are not prepared to admit or to deny.' He is aware that Ritschl and his followers try to make clear, 'often at excessive pains,' that they are only developing Lutheran ideas. He admits that on the whole they do not make out a bad case for themselves. 'However,' he says, 'this is a question best left to those who are most qualified to deal with it, or who feel themselves chiefly concerned in the matter.' And he adds: 'The present writer is unconscious of any such vital interest, nor does he possess the necessary qualifications to decide whether the "plerophorie," with which the Ritschlians vindicate the Lutheran character for their theology is or is not justified.'

But these frank admissions must not be allowed to prejudice one against the book. There is no doubt that Mr. Edghill, like Professor Orr, estimates the value of Ritschlianism according to its conformity to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, although his idea of what the doctrine of the Catholic Church is, differs considerably from Dr. Orr's idea. Mr. Mozley, on the other hand, like Dr. Garvie, estimates its worth according to what it has done for the recovery of Christianity in our day, and the appeal it makes to the modern mind. Both estimates are necessary. It is for this reason that we say Mr. Edghill's book should be read even by those who have read Mr. Mozley's.