
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

those constantly recurring words in the books of the Law, "And the Lord said unto Moses," are not to be reduced to a mere liturgical formula, but to be accepted as meaning what they say. Deny this, however, directly or inferentially,—imagine the writer of the Exile using the convenient form of words to introduce what he might have thought Moses would have said if the circumstances had ever come before him: in a word, adopt the current theory of the Priestly Code, as it has been set forth in a preceding address, and we find ourselves far in the realm of the unthinkable. That the "idealisations" of the pious Jew of the Exile should be so spoken of by Him, "through Whom came grace and truth,"[1] must seem, at any rate to all plain believers in God's Holy Word, as beyond the possibilities of our conception. For it to be possible to entertain such a conception, we must first conceive the idealiser to have been inspired to write as he did write; but an inspiration that can be compatible with continually attributing to God utterances and enactments alleged to have been made to Moses, when they were due only to an interested writer, who was making use of the great Lawgiver's name, is an inspiration that is outside all reasonable and reverent consideration.

We contend, then, that the assumptions involved in the Analytical view relating to the origin of the Priestly Code are not consistent with the solemn declarations of our Lord in reference to the Mosaic law, which we have just been considering. If the Analytical view is to be maintained, much more than the jot and tittle will have to be surrendered to the ever-increasing demands of modern analysis.

[1] John i. 17.

Our Debt to German Theology.

By Rev. Professor J. S. Banks, Headingley College.

IV.

Let us now indicate some of the directions which theological study is now taking in Germany. One touches the beginnings of Christian doctrine. If there is any age that deserves to be called the dark age of Christian history, it is the second century. And yet it is just then that Christianity makes the transition from inspired to uninspired guidance. Then the New Testament comes to recognition, and the outlines of the form which doctrine is to take are being drawn. What were the conditions under which the work was done? This is one of the questions which our day is seeking to answer by collecting and analysing all that remains to us of the Christian writings of that time. Dr. Harnack, of Berlin, is the leader in the inquiry. In his great work on the growth of Dogma, he gives us what he conceives to have been the course which events took. In substance it is the same that is advocated with less apparatus of learning in Dr. Hatch's volume, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages on the Christian Church.* Pfleiderer takes the same line with important divergences.[1] "The Hellenising of the Gospel" plays a great part in the theory. Undoubtedly there is an element of truth in the theory represented by this suggestive phrase, just as there was in Baur's exploded theory of Paulinism and Petrinism. The human expression of revelation must be coloured by the mental and moral atmosphere of the countries in which it appears. Judaism is no less an example of this truth than Christianity. But Harnack and Hatch seem to give the impression that the content as well as the form of Christianity is largely Greek. For example, the entire system of Gnosticism is brought within the line of Christian development. Marcion, Valentinus, and other Gnostic teachers, are supposed to have had almost as much to do with the shaping of Christian faith as, say, Origen, Tertullian, Athanasius. If so, Church History has certainly done great injustice to the former. Gnosticism has generally been regarded as outside the Christian line, influencing and borrowing from Christianity as every heresy did, but still itself non-Christian. Now, as matter of fact, which of the characteristic features of Gnosticism passed into the Christian Creed? Its doctrine of creation belonging to the darkness, the emptiness which stands over against the light, the celestial fulness?

[1] In his *Urchristenthum.*

Its doctrine of emanations and æons as applied to Christ? Its exaltation of knowledge above faith? A theory that maintains such positions is certainly not lacking in boldness. As well contend that the first article of the Apostle's Creed teaches Gnostic doctrine.

A writer, whose teaching is exciting much discussion in Germany, is Ritschl, who died but a short time ago, and whose school includes some able men. The great Christian doctrines undergo a complete transformation at his hands. The names only remain the same. Sin is reduced to ignorance, forgiveness is our recognition of God's unchangeable favour, atonement in the sense of expiation is rejected. Salvation is God's gift to the Church, not to the individual; church membership is the title to it. The only attribute in God is love; right or justice is an appendix of love. At first sight, Ritschl seems to forbid all metaphysics in theology. But it is not so. He has a very pronounced system of metaphysics of his own, his ground being the Kantian distinction between the speculative and the practical reason. He only rejects the metaphysics of Church doctrine. In appearance his system is intensely biblical, the Old and New Testament supplying his material. Yet he has no doctrine of inspiration; that would be metaphysics. His teaching about Christ is exceedingly enigmatic. He calls Christ "Divine," and speaks of Him as Redeemer and Saviour. Yet it is certain that these terms mean something different in his system from what they do with us. A writer, who has evidently read Ritschl closely, says: "Ritschl is resolutely ambiguous in his doctrine of Christ's person. And, so far as we can break down his guard, we find that, in spite of the use of the Divine name as applied to Christ, the school of Ritschl really regard Christ as a uniquely endowed man—and no more."[1] Ritschl rejects the notion of direct intercourse and fellowship with God on the part of the individual. This doctrine which forms the core of living Christianity in every Church without exception is discredited as Pietism, fanatical subjectivism, and the like. It is not likely that teaching which empties every doctrine of its old meaning will ever take deep root. We may safely leave it to be dealt with by the robust German intellect.[2]

[1] Mackintosh, *Essays towards a New Theology*, p. 139.

[2] See pamphlet by Frank, *Zur Theologie A. Ritschl's*.

Another field in which German thought has tried to advance is the doctrine of the Incarnation. The faith of the Church as to the Lord's person was settled with the adoption of the early creeds. Since then thought on the subject has stood still. The controversies of the Reformation turned on other points. But recently a school of German divines — including Ebrard, Gess, Thomasius, Martensen — has endeavoured to carry the development further. Taking St. Paul's phrase, "emptied himself" (Phil. ii. 7), as the starting-point, they have tried to define the mode of this self-emptying. Differing in some respects, they still hold in common that the Eternal Son, in becoming incarnate, renounced for a time "the form of God," in which He had existed from all eternity, and restricted Himself within the dimensions of human nature. His humiliation lay in His being a mere man, His exaltation in resuming the divine form at the Ascension. Yet scarcely a "mere" man, else the resumption of divinity by a "mere" man deepens the mystery. The speculation is not without attractions. It explains certain passages in the Saviour's life perfectly — His prayers, His ignorance of some things, His habitual dependence on the divine will. A question often raised is whether Christ wrought miracles by His power as God or by power delegated to Him. The Kenotist school, of course, take the latter position. Dr. Laidlaw, in his *Exposition of the Miracles*, says (p. 72): "A large array of passages plainly favour the idea of a resident indwelling power on which He draws at will. Other passages, not so numerous, yet clearly enough suggest the idea of a power not indwelling, but transcendent, called into play by the prayers and faith of Jesus. We must conclude that the two ways of regarding these works as wrought by faith and yet wrought by an indwelling power are not mutually exclusive, but rather mutually complementary." Laidlaw's final view is that the miracles were wrought by Christ, not as the Divine Son, but as the Second Adam, possessing in perfection control over nature which unfallen man would have possessed in part. We cannot further discuss the subject. It is a fascinating one to all who regard the Incarnation as the central fact in God's government of the world. St. Paul's phrase may hold the secret, but he has not explained it, and we cannot. Our theories are mere guesses. The Kenotist divines hold by Scripture and the

early creeds; their discussions are full of suggestion. Whether they make good their position or not, they do splendid service in fixing our gaze on the person and work of the Redeemer. Dr. Bruce's work on *The Humiliation of Christ* is the best English exposition of their teaching (Lect. IV.).

The Germans have set a noble example to other Churches of devotion to the higher walks of sacred learning, and the example has not been without influence. In some quarters there is a strange prejudice, not merely against the higher theology, but against theology altogether. We say "strange," because if theology is to our knowledge of spiritual things what science is to our knowledge of the physical world and philosophy to our knowledge of the mental world, we might as well discard science and philosophy. The very fact that heretics always denounce theology as the root of all the evils of the Church, may perhaps suggest that it renders no mean service in exposing error. We can no more help being theologians than we can help being philosophers. Those who denounce systems of metaphysics and dogma have systems of their own, as we have already seen. The only question for us is whether we will have a true theology or not. A Church that should discourage or neglect theological study, or limit its aims to the satisfaction of practical needs, would lose hold on the highest intelligence of the day. Plato and Bacon, Newton and Butler are not "popular" teachers, as Spenser and Milton, Wordsworth and Browning are scarcely "popular" poets, but they make teachers and poets. The few who in every Church devote themselves to the work of research do incalculable good in keeping up a high standard of knowledge. Roman Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregational—all recognise this fact. Of scholars, as well as of pastors and evangelists, may "the bright succession run through the last courses of the sun."

In Memoriam

FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.

By the Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D., Aberdeen.

Nothing but the request of one of his dearest and most universally honoured friends could tempt me to break, by any words of mine, the deep silence that now reigns around the grave of my beloved friend, Dr. Hort, in the Mill Road Cemetery, Cambridge. Dr. Hort was one who never sought the applause of men; and had he expressed any wish as to the manner in which his memory should be regarded by the world, he would have simply said, Let me rest in peace. He would have clung to the thought that he would be remembered with tender and loving affection by a few, and that in their hearts he would hold a place which could never be lost either through length of time or change of circumstances. He loved his friends with an intensity of affection of which only natures as true and simple as his are capable, and it was in their answer of love to love that he rejoiced. Not that he despised the world, or that there was the slightest trace of cynicism in the feelings with which he regarded it. He thought of it with respect, and confidence, and hope. But his own heart needed more than it was in the power of the world to give, and his own wish would have been only to live on in the hearts of those nearest and dearest to him, and of those friends towards whom his affection brimmed over like a too full cup, and to whom he had knitted himself, as they were knitted to him, by bands of steel. I feel also that I cannot speak of him as he ought to be spoken of, for no words will convey to men in general a correct impression of what he was, or can even contain the meaning which those who were most intimate with him would desire them to bear. Yet it is right that something should be said of him whom we have lost, partly perhaps because the utterance of the mouth gives the heart relief, mainly because the recalling what he was may stimulate ourselves and others to try to be more like him.

The facts of his life are few, and may be told in a single sentence or two. He was born at Dublin