

THE RELIGIONS AND MORALS OF THE WORLD.*

Every new volume of the "Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics" lays the theologian and the ethical teacher, as well as the general reader, under fresh obligations, and adds to the reputation of its resourceful editor. Dr. Hastings is carrying out his ambitious plan with a marked degree of success. The international character of the work is not allowed to suffer from the war. Even the volumes published since the outbreak of hostilities contain many valuable articles by German and Austrian scholars; the French, Russian, and Japanese savants, like the Dutch and Scandinavian, were selected years ago because of eminence in their respective fields; some important articles have been entrusted to American theologians and philosophers, and an American scholar, Dr. Louis H. Gray, has been made assistant editor. Among the contributors are Jews and Gentiles, Christians (Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox as well as Protestants) and independents. It is well to be reminded at the present time that such a coöperation of scientific investigators, regardless of race, nationality, and religious affiliation, is the normal thing and altogether necessary for the best results.

* *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. Edited by James Hastings, with the assistance of John A. Selbie and Louis H. Gray. Volumes II. VIII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Per vol., \$7.

The outstanding features of this encyclopædia are the numerous articles on primitive religions and less known countries and peoples, and the highly composite articles on important religious and ethical ideas, customs, and institutions. Much attention has been given in recent years to the social conditions of peoples still remaining on comparatively low stages of development in various parts of the world. Excellent summaries of the results, so far as religion and morals are concerned, will be found in the articles on Australia (by Thomas), Australasia (by Keane), Buriats (by Klementz), Indo-China (by Cabaton), Indonesians (by Frazer), Dravidians (by Crooke and Frazer), Hottentots (by Hartland), the various tribes of American Indians (by Gray), and many others. There are especially rich contributions to our knowledge of India. In his article on Ethnology, Dr. Keane concludes that "man gradually spread from his Indo-Malaysian home to the uttermost confines of the habitable globe," and that "the main divisions of mankind may be regarded as being descended in their several zones from four undifferentiated Pleistocene ancestral groups." The four races are the White, Black, Yellow, and Red, with their cradle lands respectively in North Africa, South Africa, the Tibetan plateau, and the Americas. The classification of known peoples is useful, though incomplete (Sumerians, Elamites, and others are omitted), tentative, and dubious. Scholars will not readily agree with Dr. Keane that the Philistines were Semites, the Pelasgians Hamites, the so-called Dravidian peoples Caucasians, and the Cro Magnon race neolithic. Biological and ethical evolution is excellently treated by Drs. Punnett and Clodd. Among the numerous achievements hoped for from ethical evolution, the abolition of war is not mentioned. On this terrible and inexcusable form of barbarism the religious and ethical systems described in these volumes are strangely silent. The Friends, we are told, condemn it, and the Ethical Movement seeks its suppression by an international organization. The trifling article on Internationality does not touch upon it, and there is no treatment of Cosmopolitanism.

The composite articles on ideas and institutions are often exceedingly valuable, each subdivision being treated by some eminent specialist. In many instances it would be difficult to find anywhere else a more authoritative and comprehensive discussion. Different conceptions of their task by the various writers could scarcely be avoided, and the character of the only available sources is

sometimes responsible for a disappointing result. Under Ethics we have a bright picture of the ancient Germans, while the Celts present a very gruesome aspect. In the former case the virtues were used for classification, in the latter the vices; and the one-sidedness of Tacitus is as evident as that of Cicero or Cæsar, though it had a different cause. One writer gives a description, from fragmentary sources, of the moral characteristics of a pagan nation, another his idealistic conception of what constitutes Jewish or Christian ethics. In a number of articles of this type there is a regrettable lack of comprehensiveness. Thus, under the caption of Drama, much curious and interesting information is given concerning this form of poetry among native Americans, Arabs, Chinese, Japanese, Jews, Persians, and Polynesians, and there are good descriptions of the Greek, Indian, and Roman drama. But the reader finds to his amazement that there is no discussion of French, Spanish, Italian, English, German, or Scandinavian drama. A separate article is indeed devoted to Ibsen; but there are none on Molière, Corneille, Metastasio, Holberg, Echegaray, Hauptmann, or Maeterlinck. Similarly, the article on Literature deals with the writings of Babylonians and Egyptians, American Indians and Dravidians, Chinese, Brahmins, and Parsis; but there is no attempt to appreciate from the standpoint of religion and ethics the great literatures of European peoples in recent times. The great article on Education describes and discusses everything within its scope except the systems of higher and lower education in Europe and America in the last centuries. The *præceptor Germanæ* is not mentioned, and there is no article on Melancthon. Japanese marriage is described, but not Chinese.

Such perplexing gaps are noticeable also in the religious field. In reviewing the first volume (THE DIAL, Nov. 16, 1909), the present writer expressed the hope that there would be more separate articles on the leading gods. The general plan does not seem to have permitted this. By comparison, the goddesses fare better. There are articles on Cybele, Ishtar, Isis, Matronæ, Mother-goddesses; there are none on Marduk, Assur, Horus, Chemosh, or even Yahwe. Originally there seems to have been a purpose to devote an article to the god of the Hebrews. In Volume VI. (p. 254) there is a reference to Jahweh (the *J* to be pronounced in German fashion) for the occurrence of the name in Babylonian documents. Under the title Jahweh there is only a reference to Israel, where these documents are not mentioned, and there is no com-

prehensive discussion of the name. It is in vain to look for Moses, for there is no article on this personage, scarcely touched upon at all in the discussion of Israel. Ancient Israel has been strangely neglected in this encyclopedia. There are no articles on Amos or Hosea, Isaiah or Jeremiah. One of the great masterpieces of the world's literature, Job, is nowhere discussed. The Old Testament, under the heading "Bible," was assigned to a distinguished New Testament scholar, Dr. Sanday, who thinks it probable that the nucleus of the Pentateuch was committed to writing by Moses, "whose figure must exceed that of the grandest of the later prophets"; he gives a few lines to these, mentions Job, and discusses at great length questions of canonicity and inspiration. While every holy city of India seems to be remembered, Jerusalem is forgotten; Bethlehem and Hebron are not to be compared with Kapilavastu and Hardwar. One would have been grateful for descriptions of Kerbelâ and Kairawan, along with those on Mecca and Medina.

Dr. W. T. Davison describes the "Biblical and Christian God" from the standpoint of an almost unwavering orthodoxy. There are a few pathetic touches of modernism. "It may not lightly be taken for granted," he says, "that the God of Noah, of Abraham, of Moses, was identical in all respects with the God of the Jahwistic writer of 850 B. C., or of the Priestly Code after the Exile." The theological opinions of the mythical hero of the flood are compared with those of the hypothetical authors conjured up by the reigning critical dynasty! "If Matt. xxviii, 19, contains the exact words of the Saviour," he observes, "He did before His ascension virtually lay down this doctrine" (of the Trinity). Are we to infer that, if they are not, neither Jesus nor the evangelists knew, or thought it worth while to reveal, the secret finally confided to the wrangling bishops of Nicaea? Andrew Lang's spirited contention for the Australian All-Father (God, Primitive and Savage) should be compared with Söderblom's more balanced conception in *Gudstrons uppkomst* (Upsala, 1914). Wiedemann's description of Amenhotep IV. (God, Egyptian) is important, as it shows how little ground there is for regarding him as "the first monotheist in history."

An American theologian, Dr. W. D. Mackenzie, was entrusted with the article on Jesus Christ. It is learned, thoughtful, and well arranged; it presents the growth of Christology in an admirable manner, and, in spite of a strong conservative bias, manifestly seeks to meet modern criticism on its own

ground. From the author's standpoint, however, this latter is not an easy thing. Where the fundamental conceptions are so different it cannot but be extremely difficult to realize the historic problems and to appreciate the full force of philological and exegetical arguments. Thaumaturgic powers, sinlessness, a Messianic consciousness based on metaphysical uniqueness, virgin birth, resurrection, and ascension are readily assumed by one who is able to conceive of Jesus as a god walking on earth in order to discover by personal experience and "to taste what it is to be a man"; while the scholar whose chief interest is to find out, by ordinary historic methods, by textual and literary criticism, and by retroversion of the sayings recorded in Greek into the Aramaic vernacular of Jesus, what manner of man he was, what were his ideas and ideals, and what is the moral value of his contributions to the life of the race, as naturally comes to take it as a matter of course that the prophet of Nazareth was a human being, and not something else. When the character of the sources is considered, it is no more remarkable that "liberal" interpreters should differ in details, or even in the general estimate, than it is in the case of many other subjects of historic investigation. The curious alliance of orthodoxy with the ill-founded scepticism of Smith and Drews is not likely to stop the scientific quest for the real Jesus of history. Writing on the Gospels, Dr. Burkitt dates Mark 65-70 A. D., Matthew 80-100 A. D., Luke 100 A. D., and John 100-110 A. D. He clearly shows what must be thought concerning the historic worth of the Fourth Gospel; as is common at the present time, he exaggerates the age and significance of Mark. Dr. Sanday, in his article on the Bible, identifies the synoptic source sought by modern scholars with the Matthaean Logia of Papias. He does not mention that Papias only knew of an Aramaic work of Matthew, now lost, and that many scholars have regarded a translation of this work as the nucleus of our Greek Matthew.

An instructive sketch of the sixteen branches of the Greek Orthodox Church is given by Dr. Troitsky; it contains, however, no description of its leading theologians or spiritual life. There are no articles on Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Clement of Rome, Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, or the Apostolic Fathers in general; although Basilides, Marcion, and Montanus are remembered. Dr. Scott thinks it possible to reconstruct the earlier type of Gnosticism, before the great systems, from our third century works, and regards the Hermetic literature as

"our chief existing record of pre-Christian gnosticism"; while Dr. Stock (writing on Hermes Trismegistus) concludes that "these works were composed between A. D. 313 and 330." Dr. Scott does not mention the pagan gnosticism of the Mandaeans, treated in a masterly manner by Dr. Brandt. In his eulogy of Luther, Dr. Jacobs glosses over both the serious faults of the great reformer and his peculiar attitude to the canon of Scripture. Dr. Orr, in his apologetic way, frees Calvin from all responsibility for the judicial murder of Servetus, and makes no mention of his attitude of Castellio. Flacius is deemed more worthy of an article than Melancthon; his importance as an exegete is overestimated. Denek and Franek, like Castellio, are passed over in silence; but there is an article on Enthusiasts, reminding one of the *Pantheon Anabaptisticum*, where the heresies of some of their less clear-headed friends are recorded; and the catalogue is continued down to date, without omission of Mohammed, who is treated after the manner of Marraccio. Thus it happens that Frank Sanford and "Elijah" Dowie are introduced where there is no place for Finney and Moody, Channing, Beecher, and Phillips Brooks, any more than for Bourdaloue, Bossuet, and Fénelon, or Lamennais and Mazzini. One phase of American theology is interestingly described in Dr. Warfield's article on Jonathan Edwards, and a graceful tribute is paid to Emerson by Dr. J. M. E. Ross, a Presbyterian minister.

The various aspects of Buddhism are, as a rule, presented with ample knowledge and good judgment; but Dr. Geden's statement (God, Buddhist) concerning Gautama that "in all probability he himself shared the ordinary views of his contemporaries as regards the being and nature of God" is a sheer assumption, without any foundation in our oldest sources, and contrary to the general tenor of his teaching. Dr. Margoliouth's treatment of Mohammed is characterized by great learning, keen criticism, and an almost total lack of sympathy. He proceeds on "the theory that Islam is primarily a political adventure," and maintains that "it is impossible to find any doctrine which he is not prepared to abandon in order to secure a political end,"—even "the unity of God and his claim to the title of Prophet." On a fairer interpretation, the instances which Dr. Margoliouth probably has in mind do not bear out this charge, and may even be cited as evidences of Mohammed's sincerity. Unfortunately, we know much less of the "warner" of Mecca than of the civil and religious ruler

of Medina; but what we know does not warrant our questioning a genuine spiritual experience and high moral aims in the earlier period, however we may regret the many errors of his later life. Without a recognition of this the religion he founded cannot be understood. Dr. Margoliouth's conception of the Harranians is noteworthy, if not altogether free from objections. Dr. Weir's reference to the "Christian Sabians" (Mohammedanism) is inexplicable. Dr. Farnell's description of Greek Religion is a model of its kind.

As regards Logos, Dr. Inge's statement that "the authors of the Septuagint use it to translate the Hebrew Memra" is wrong and misleading; the Memra of the Aramaic Targums is not found in the Hebrew Bible, and the Greek version does not show the slightest trace of the Logos speculation. Dr. Gilbert thinks that the importance of the Kingdom of God in the thought of Jesus can be gauged by the comparatively rare occurrence of the term in the so-called Logia or Q, where it is found only eight times against seventeen in Matthew. Can the naïve faith in a purely hypothetical document, made in Germany the other day, go further than this? Discoursing on the important topic of Immortality, Dr. Mellone leaves out as irrelevant the inquiry as to the origin and development of the idea, steers clear of spirit-rappings as well as resurrections, does not trouble himself about the souls of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, his ancestors, or his descendants in the embryonic state, rejects conditional immortality, is not satisfied with posthumous influence, ignores hell, and declares in favor of an eternal developing and perfecting of every human personality.

Typographical errors are extremely rare in these new volumes. "Xousares" should be "Dousares" (Vol. VI., p. 421); the Mandaic word for Sunday is correctly given in Syriac letters, but wrongly transliterated (Vol. VIII., p. 389). In the case of "Jahillya" for "Jahiliya," the worst is not the spelling; Fallaize has misunderstood Robertson Smith's translation of a passage from the *Kitab al Aghani*. "Jahiliya" is not a place-name, it means "ignorance," and refers to the period before Mohammed. The Mohammedan era still continues to be employed in various articles, often without reduction of the dates; writers on Roman history have ceased dating events *ab urbe condita*.

It is to be hoped that a general index to the complete work will be added, like that in "The Encyclopædia Britannica," as there is no adequate system of cross-references.

A somewhat careful reading of these seven volumes, each of which contains about a million words, has left upon the mind of the reviewer two strong impressions. It is a treasury of well sifted information for which every student must be grateful. In it Christianity is presented side by side with the other religions, and religion is placed in its larger social setting. On the other hand, the apologetic manner in which topics related to Christianity are treated contrasts painfully with the scientific spirit characteristic of practically all other departments of the great work.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.