
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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE difficulty of discovering a theory of the Atonement that shall command general assent is very great. But however great the difficulty is, we know that we must have a theory of the Atonement. We cannot think without it. We cannot hope and we cannot pray without it. It is not enough to know that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. It is necessary to bring His death and our sins into contact by some working theory of the Atonement.

Now, in the search for the truth of things it is well, we are told, to see ourselves as others see us. It is also well to see others as they see themselves. The Jews do not believe that Christ died for our sins. Yet the Jews are sinners like as we are. How do they believe that they can get rid of their sins? The very word atonement has come from them. The Day of Atonement is still observed by them. What is the Jewish doctrine of atonement?

The answer to the question will be found in a volume which has been published by Dr. Hermann Adler, Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire, under the title of *Anglo-Jewish Memories* (Routledge; 5s. net). It is a volume of sermons. Some of the sermons were preached on memorable occasions, such as the centenary of Sir Moses Montefiore, Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, the Russo-Jewish Martyrs, and so the title of 'Memories' has been given to the book. But the sermons are not all memorial. Some of them are exegetical or doctrinal. The sermon on the Jewish doctrine of atonement is an exposition of the way in which the modern Jew understands that he obtains the forgiveness of sin.

Well, whatever else Dr. Adler's exposition possesses, it possesses the first of all the virtues of an exposition. It is intelligible. The doctrine of atonement is described within eight pages of printing, and yet the meaning of it is quite unmistakable. How is it that Dr. Adler succeeds where the Christian expositor so frequently and so signally comes to grief? The explanation is easy. He has no doctrine of the atonement to expound. For the modern Jew, says the Chief Rabbi, there is no atonement. He is a sinner like the Gentile and needs forgiveness. He believes that he obtains forgiveness simply by repentance.

Does the Chief Rabbi not believe in the Old Testament? He does. But he does not believe that there is atonement in the Old Testament. Dr. Adler is courageous enough to begin his sermon with a reference to that memorable incident, as he himself calls it, which is recorded in the thirty-second chapter of Exodus. The wrath of the Almighty was roused against His

people Israel, because they had made themselves an idol of gold, and worshipped it. Moses, deeply moved, cries to the people, 'Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin' (Ex 32^{30}). What does Moses mean? Does he not mean that he is ready to sacrifice himself for his nation? Dr. Adler has no doubt that he means that. He even quotes the prayer which Moses prayed to God: 'Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written' (vv.$^{31, 32}$). It is the unmistakable offer of vicarious atonement. And Dr. Adler does not deny it. But he holds that the offer of atonement is one thing, and the acceptance of it another. The Lord did not accept the atonement of Moses. 'Whosoever hath sinned against me,' He said, 'him will I blot out of my book.' In that answer to Moses, Dr. Adler finds the answer to every one who says that there is a doctrine of the atonement in the Old Testament.

But the Old Testament is full of sacrifice. If 'our own sincere repentance suffices to achieve for us Divine forgiveness,' for what purpose were the morning and evening sacrifices offered in the Temple court? On this also the Chief Rabbi is quite explicit. They were not offered for atonement. There was no thought of atonement in them. A man who sinned had to repent of his sin. Then he brought his trespass offering to the Lord. 'The only value and efficacy of the offering consisted in this, that it proved the sacrificer to be repentant; it was an outward test and sign of his sincerity.'

And this, says Dr. Adler, and this only, is the meaning of the entire service in the Temple on the Day of Atonement. The high priest laid his hand on the head of the animal about to be sacrificed. He confessed successively his own sin, the trespasses of his household, and the transgressions of the house of Israel. Other rites were then observed, such as the sending of the scapegoat into the wilderness. But none of these things had any value in themselves; their value consisted entirely in the impression which they made upon the beholder. In the words of Maimonides, which Dr. Adler quotes with approval: 'All these rites were calculated to impress the soul of the worshippers and to stimulate them to repentance.'

Nor was there anything else in the intercession of the high priest. If the intercession of the high priest had been able to procure for the people the forgiveness of their sins, the Day of Atonement would not have been the holiday that it was. It would have been an ordinary day of labour. The people would have been content to leave the high priest to purchase their forgiveness, and they would have remained at home to pursue their ordinary occupation. But the Day of Atonement was a day which had to be observed by the whole house of Israel. And this was done, says Dr. Adler, 'to impress the truth upon them that we have no mediator to save us from the effects of our sins but our own repentance and our own amendment, and that we have naught to help us but the infinite mercy of our Creator.'

One thing remains. To the Chief Rabbi it is evidently the principal thing. He expresses it in the form of an objection to the doctrine of simple forgiveness which he is expounding, an objection on the part of his hearers. 'If it be true,' he imagines them saying to him, 'that you rely exclusively upon the Divine mercy and your own actions, how is it that you refer again and again in your prayers to the merits of your fathers, and to the covenant the Lord made with the patriarchs? How is it that in your litany you implore the Lord to have compassion upon you "for the sake of those who were slain for His holy name, and who went through fire and water to sanctify Him"'?

The objection raises the whole question of the efficacy of prayer. And again Dr. Adler's answer

is intelligible. Prayer has no efficacy beyond the impression it makes on our own minds. To use Dr. Adler's own unmistakable language, prayer is simply a 'self-preached sermon.' Do the Jews beseech the Lord to remember the merits of the patriarchs? The purpose is to remind themselves of the pious deeds of their ancestors, that they may strive to tread in their footsteps. Do they pray that they may be saved for the sake of those who went through fire and water for the sanctification of His holy name? 'The purpose of our prayer,' says the Chief Rabbi, 'is to kindle in our hearts a spark of the devotion and enthusiasm which fired the hearts of the martyrs of old.'

At the Chicago University Press, a handsome volume has been published on *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future* (Fisher Unwin; 13s. 6d. net). The author of the volume is the Rev. Henry Burton Sharman, Ph.D., Instructor in New Testament History and Literature in the University of Chicago.

It is evident from the title that Dr. Sharman is not simply offering us another solution of the Synoptic Problem. He believes that the Synoptic Problem is already solved. On December 15, 1904, there appeared *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem*, by Professor E. D. Burton of Chicago. Dr. Sharman had then completed his own book and the MS. was ready for press. But when he read Professor Burton's book, he sat down and almost entirely rewrote his MS. For he saw that, for him at least, the Synoptic Problem was solved.

Professor Burton's solution is a simple one. It is surprisingly simple for such a complicated subject. These are the essential points in it. First, the present St. Mark, or a document generally identical with it, was employed as the source of both the First and the Third Gospels. Next, besides St. Mark's Gospel, Matthew and Luke both possessed in common a document which contained substantially the material standing in Lk $3^{7-15.\ 17.\ 18}$ $4^{2b-13\,(14.\ 15).\ 16-30}$ 5^{1-11} 6^{20-49} 7^{1}–8^{3}. This document is referred to as G; its incidents took place in Galilee. Thirdly, Matthew and Luke used another document which is to be called P, because the locality of its occurrences was Perea. Its contents are found in Lk 9^{51} 18^{14} 19^{1-28}. Last of all, Matthew had a document not employed by Luke, chiefly or wholly made up of discourses. It is presumably the Logia of Matthew, spoken of by Papias. Professor Burton's designation for it is M. Besides these there must have been some additional sources, some of which were used by Matthew and some by Luke, from which would be derived the Infancy narratives and the additions found in St. Matthew and St. Luke respectively to Mark's account of the Passion and Resurrection history. For so complicated a problem, we say, this is a remarkably simple solution. And, as it is independently worked out by Dr. Sharman in this volume, it works out very well. There is one very important passage, however, for which Dr. Sharman does not find it sufficient.

It is the passage which contains that great controversy of the Christian Church, about St. Peter and the Keys. The controversy has been between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Church. Is Dr. Sharman a Protestant or a Roman Catholic? We cannot tell. Dr. Sharman drops no hint. No doubt he has some Church connexion, and in that connexion he may be a keen enough controversialist. Here he is no controversialist. His discussion lies within the range of Synoptic criticism. If the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels is pursuing reliable methods, and there is neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant scholar who will deny that, this long continued controversy is seemingly at an end.

The passage in question is found in St. Matthew's Gospel only. Its place is Mt 16^{17-19}. The first question to ask about it, therefore, is, Where did it come from? It did not come from St. Mark, else St. Mark would have it. It did not come from the Galilean document (G), or from the

Perean (P), otherwise St. Luke would at least be likely to have it. Professor Burton thinks that it came from M, that is to say, from that collection of discourses which are usually referred to as the Logia of Matthew. But here Dr. Sharman departs from Professor Burton.

Dr. Sharman does not think that Mt 16^{17-19} could have come from the Logia, because the passage cannot stand alone. When separated from its context it is not intelligible. In order that we may understand the situation, Dr. Sharman prints the passage together with its context, and alongside of it he prints the parallels, so far as they go, from St. Mark and St. Luke.

Mt $16^{13.\ 20}$.	Mk 8^{27-30}.	Lk 9^{18-21}.
A. Now when Jesus came into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Who do men say that the Son of Man is? And they said, Some *say* John the Baptist; some Elijah: and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.	A. And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi: and in the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that I am? And they told him, saying, John the Baptist: and others, Elijah; but others, One of the prophets. And he asked them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ.	A. And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, Who do the multitudes say that I am? And they answering said, John the Baptist; but others *say*, Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again. And he said unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Peter answering said, The Christ of God.
B. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.		
C. Then charged he the disciples that they should tell no man that he was the Christ.	C. And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.	C. But he charged them, and commanded *them* to tell this to no man.

Now it needs no more than a glance at these parallels to perceive two things. The first is that Mt 16^{17-19}, here marked by the letter B, can be removed from its place leaving the narrative to read quite intelligibly. The second thing is that when it is removed the passage itself does not read intelligibly. Dr. Sharman concludes that the passage formed no part of the original narrative, but was drawn either by St. Matthew himself or by some subsequent editor from some extraordinary and at present unknown document, a document that must be distinguished from the four sources commonly used by St. Matthew—Mark's Gospel, the Galilean and Perean documents, and the Logia.

We have already seen why the passage did not belong to St. Mark's Gospel, nor to the Galilean or Perean documents. But why could it not have belonged to the Logia? Simply because the Logia contained genuine Sayings of Jesus, and this document is not a genuine Saying. Dr. Sharman proceeds to give his reasons for believing firmly that the passage is not genuine.

First of all, the thought of the passage is in direct opposition to the teaching of Jesus about rank. There is no doubt of the mind of Christ

on rank and power and recognition. He has left a wealth of teaching on the subject, probably exceeding in volume His instructions on any other single feature of His whole range of view. '*Thou* art Peter'; 'I will give to *thee* the keys'—these two statements are in flat contradiction to it.

But these statements are entirely in harmony with the known historical development of the Christian community. That development proceeded along the lines of human ambition. There were no words of Jesus commending, there were many words condemning, the progress of the Church towards rank and power. In spite of all that, history tells us that the direction of its progress is well described in 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church,' and 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

Next, the passage introduces a name for the Christian community unused by Jesus, and a conception of it as an organization unfamiliar to Him. 'Unused by Jesus,' for the other occurrence of the word 'Church' in the Gospels (Mt 18^{17}), Dr. Sharman rejects on wholly independent grounds.

Nor is it in the position assigned to St. Peter that the passage stands at variance with the rest of the Gospel narrative. It is equally at variance with the position assumed by our Lord Himself. 'I will give unto thee'—where in all the Gospels does He say anything akin to that? Elsewhere He says (Mk $10^{39.\ 40}$), 'It is not mine to give.'

Once more, there is a little matter of style and language not to be lost sight of, though not to be felt equally by everybody. First, there is the curious 'interchange of courtesies'—'Thou art the Christ,' 'And I in turn (κἀγώ) say unto thee, that thou art Peter.' And then the more unexpected play of words, in the name Peter and the Rock (πέτρος and πέτρα).

But the strongest of all objections remains. Cæsarea Philippi was the place, and this was the occasion, of the great confession. On that confession the convictions of the disciples were crystallized, and their attachment to Jesus secured. That He should have warned them against telling any outsider that He was the Christ was inevitable and full of meaning for the future. That He should have set one of them on high amongst themselves is incredible.

In the controversy about the supernatural the Roman Catholic Church has an advantage. Matthew Arnold settled the controversy by simply saying miracles do not occur. By saying miracles do not occur he meant to say that they never did occur. But the Roman Catholic teaches that they occur still. And thereby he has a distinct advantage over Matthew Arnold and every other Protestant.

Is it possible for a Protestant to obtain this advantage? The Rev. Percy Dearmer, Vicar of St. Mary's the Virgin, is a Protestant. He may not himself prefer that designation to every other, but at least he is not a Roman Catholic. He has just published a volume called *Body and Soul* (Pitman; 6s. net). It is 'An Enquiry into the Effects of Religion upon Health, with a Description of Christian Works of Healing from the New Testament to the Present Day.' Mr. Dearmer believes that miracles do still occur.

Protestant theologians, he says, have assumed that miracles ceased with the Apostles. All the later miracles in the Church were superstitions. Or if they did not cease with the Apostles, then they ceased with the establishment of Christianity under Constantine. This, says Mr. Dearmer, would be 'a terrific argument in favour of Disestablishment.' And even although it was held by the great body of old English divines, including Dodwell and Tillotson, he will not have it. He says that at the present day we can hardly understand how miracles could have been confined to

a special age. What we can understand is their being confined to particular people in every age. For that, he says, is exactly what our Lord foretold.

Our Lord promised to be with His Church always. He promised the Spirit for all time. He promised that the works which He Himself did, His disciples should do also, and that they should do even greater works. Mr. Dearmer cannot understand how these works can possibly have been confined to the Twelve.

He casts his eye along the history of the Church. He comes to St. Francis of Assisi. He comes much nearer our own time than St. Francis of Assisi. He comes to Lourdes. He has no doubt whatever that miracles have taken place at Lourdes for the last fifty years, and that they are taking place there now. But the best example that he finds for his purpose is undoubtedly the example of St. Francis of Assisi and the stigmata.

Mr. Dearmer has himself passed through a mental revolution on the stigmata. Which of us, he says, was not brought up in the atmosphere that made him regard the stigmata of St. Francis as an instance of the picturesque mendacity of the Middle Ages? 'I well remember myself reading twenty years ago with astonished incredulity the statement in Mrs. Oliphant's *Life of St. Francis* that his stigmatization was one of the best attested things in history. So much the worse for history, I thought.' But now? Now Mr. Dearmer believes heartily in the stigmata. 'It is no longer a matter of historical evidence, but an admitted fact of scientific investigation.'

Has Mr. Dearmer any explanation to offer of the stigmata? He has. And that is just where the weakness of his argument lies. For as soon as you have explained a miracle it ceases to be a miracle. Mr. Dearmer explains the stigmata of St. Francis as due to the action of the mind upon the body. Just as a common act of thought may produce the familiar physical result of blushing, so concentration of thought, if it is only intense enough, may produce the unfamiliar physical result of stigmatization. That is his argument. For he says, 'If the conscious mind is in connexion with the vaso-motor system, there is nothing improbable in the fact that a man by thinking intensely about the wounds of Christ should come to have a physical representation of those wounds upon his body.'

'And greater works than these shall he do.' If the words were not addressed to the Apostles only, but after them to the Church, has the Church been able to do them? If it has, where are we to find them in the history of the Church? At Assisi? At Lourdes? Dr. P. T. Forsyth does not once look to Assisi or to Lourdes.

Yet the works have been done. Greater works have been done in the Church than all that Christ was able to do upon earth. But Dr. Forsyth finds them 'in the new creation by the Word, in the growth of faith, in the miracles of love, service, and sacrifice, in the spread of the Church, in the overthrow of paganism, in the making of a new Europe, in the rise of a new ethic and civilization, in the huge revolution in the core of society, in the inversion and conversion of moral values.'

Dr. Forsyth has written an article, which appears in the *London Quarterly Review* for July, on the 'Evidential Value of Miracles.' He does not think that miracles have much evidential value now. He quotes the saying, 'Miracles, which were once the foundation of Apologetic, became in time its crutch; and now they have become its crux.' And he quotes it sympathetically. He has even some sympathy with the saying of Rousseau: 'Get rid of your miracles, and the world will fall at Christ's feet.' For it is the saying of the modern mind, and he cannot shut his ears to it. He has no intention of getting rid of the miracles. But all the same he is keenly alive to the difficulties presented by the miracles to the mind of the

present day. He asks himself, as Mr. Dearmer does, what is to be done with them. Mr. Dearmer says, multiply their number. Find them at Assisi and at Lourdes. Dr. Forsyth says, leave them behind. There are no such miracles now. The gospel miracles as evidence served their day. They served their day as evidence, and ceased to be. Carry them with you as evidence now, and they will do more to embarrass faith than to support it.

'And greater works than these shall he do.' Where are we to find them? Mr. Dearmer says at Lourdes and Assisi. Dr. Forsyth says in the conversion of Constantine, in the theses-nailing of Luther, in the night-shelters and farm-colonies of the Salvation Army. But there is a third answer this month.

In the *Contemporary Review* for July there is an article on 'Our Unrealized Divine Sonship.' The author, Mr. E. Wake Cook, has this very promise in his mind. Greater works—it is just these greater works that are unrealized. He does not look to Lourdes. He does not consider Luther. He holds that nothing worth speaking of as 'greater works' has yet been done. But he believes in the promise as heartily as Mr. Dearmer or Dr. Forsyth. He believes that the greater works are yet to come. They will come as soon as we have discovered Andrew Jackson Davis.

For the greater works which Jesus promised are not merely such works of bodily healing as Mr. Dearmer is content to believe in. Nor are they solely works of moral progress, such as Dr. Forsyth rejoices to recall. They are works in which body and soul go together. And they are works of the future. There will be healings, for the soul will gain incredible control of the body; and there will be the discovery of senses in the soul, senses which will reveal realities of existence yet undreamt of, and an entrance into worlds of goodness and of service which have not yet come within the horizon of our most exalted prayers.

Now the hope of all this is Dr. Andrew Jackson Davis. Sixty years ago Andrew Jackson Davis, M.D. (he was no M.D. then, but a young man just out of his teens, who had had only five months' schooling), wrote a book on *The Principles of Nature: Her Divine Revelations.* In that book he treated first of the visible universe. He analyzed our social conditions and offered remedies for their defects, 'better adapted to human nature than the so-called "scientific" schemes of the Socialists.' And then he described a spiritual universe 'of unspeakable grandeur as the higher stage of the vast scheme of evolution everywhere in operation.' It was at once a higher and an after life, 'the most scientific, consistent, and convincing ever promulgated.'

And how did the uneducated young man accomplish all this? By calling upon his subconscious self. It was a triumph of psychology. He was in a trance. His spiritual faculties were liberated from the prison of his body by mesmerism. And in that new liberty he made the discoveries which were embodied in his book. In trance he dictated, in daily lectures extending over thirteen months, this great book which gives 'a history and a philosophy of the cosmos, the whole range of material and spiritual existence.'

Dr. Davis is now over eighty. Mr. Cook calls upon us to investigate his case ere it be too late. For, says he, the experience of the Ploughkeepsie Seer shows 'the vast range of faculty latent in each of us,' and is the hope and assurance that we shall yet actually do 'greater works than these.'