

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 *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 Doctrine of Prayer is engaging attention as it never did before. This is one of the results of the war. But before the war began, the mind of the Editor of this magazine was drawn to the subject. It seemed to him that much of the neglect of Prayer, which was then so evident, was due to ignorance. He resolved to edit a volume on the Christian Doctrine of Prayer to serve as the basis of Sunday or weekday evening addresses or Bible Class lectures. The volume is now ready. Not a few men make their arrangements for next winter's work early in the summer. Perhaps they will look at this book. They will find the subject of Prayer, for the understanding of which so many hearts and minds are ready, set forth clearly and fully, in touch with modern thought, and well illustrated from modern literature.

There is a chapter on Prayer in Dr. J. R. ILLINGWORTH'S new volume. His subject is *The Gospel Miracles* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). But there is much more in the book than that title would lead one to look for. There is not a little philosophy. For Dr. ILLINGWORTH'S mind is essentially philosophical. He loves to handle facts, but he loves better to draw conclusions from them. He discusses the miracles in the Gospels, but at much greater length he discusses miracle. And it is quite appropriate to his whole

manner that he should devote a chapter to the Christian doctrine of Prayer.

Dr. ILLINGWORTH recognizes the difficulty of discussing prayer. No doubt he recognizes also the difficulty of believing in it. But we are well on the way to overcoming the scientific and even the philosophical difficulties that have gathered round the belief in prayer. The difficulty of discussing it we shall never be able to overcome.

For not only is prayer apt to escape from under discussion, but, besides that, we have not the evidence for a satisfactory discussion in our hands. The man of science gathers his facts, compares them with other facts, classifies them, and draws his legitimate conclusions. The man of prayer has only the facts of his own personal experience to work with. These are to him convincing enough, but he cannot spread them out in the sight of other men in order to convince them. In every attempt at a declaration of what prayer has been in a man's life much is lost of the meaning and power of it. The very attempt is hard to make. For the life of prayer is a hidden life. Those who are ready to criticize its efficacy are those who do not pray. They are therefore unable to understand its efficacy. There is no doubt that much can be said in favour of prayer, and never more than at the present time; and Dr.

ILLINGWORTH proceeds to say it. But it is right to admit at the outset that no argument for prayer will convince a man who does not pray.

Perhaps the commonest conception of Prayer is that it is a crutch. This conception has been the occasion of much mock heroic literature. For the acceptance of such literature Emerson is chiefly responsible. But even those who have too much of the mind of Christ to come under Emerson's influence are sometimes carried away by the idea that the best use of prayer is to ask God to make us independent of prayer. 'Prayer,' says Emerson, 'that craves a particular commodity, anything less than all good, is vicious. Prayer is the contemplation of the facts of life from the highest point of view. It is the soliloquy of a beholding and jubilant soul. It is the spirit of God pronouncing his works good. But prayer, as a means to effect a private end, is meanness and theft. It pre-supposes dualism, and not unity in nature and consciousness. As soon as the man is at one with God he will not beg. He will then see prayer in all action. The prayer of the farmer kneeling in his field to weed it, the prayer of the rower kneeling with the stroke of his oar, are prayers heard throughout nature.'

Prayer is regarded as a crutch by those also who resort to it only in times of dire distress. This is wholly at variance with Christ's precept and Christ's example. Christ lived by prayer and He intended His followers to live by it. He taught His disciples to look upon the Spirit and all the gifts of the Spirit as to be had for the asking, and only for the asking. No doubt there are good gifts of God that come to us without prayer. He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and also on the unjust. But even temporal gifts like these are to be asked for. Why? That when we receive them we may appreciate them and turn them to their most profitable use.

There is an article in *The Harvard Theological Review* for April on 'Religious Reserve.' It is not a pleasant article. The author, a Unitarian minister of the name of Edward F. HAYWARD, is too conscious of his own superiority. Almost an unbeliever himself, he has nothing but scorn for those who speak as if they had some assurance of God, or some intimate experience of His love in their lives.

He has seen preachers, he says, who spoke on Sunday as if they knew something about God, and on Monday were attracted by 'the modesty and restfulness of agnosticism.' He quotes with satisfaction the saying of Goethe: 'With the people, and especially with the clergymen, who have Him daily on their tongues, God becomes a phrase, a mere name, which they utter without any accompanying idea. But if they were penetrated by His greatness they would rather be dumb, and for very reverence would not name Him.'

The article is as ill-timed as it is unpleasant. We need no warning at present to be reserved in our religious conversation. We are much too reserved. What we need to be told by such a writer as the author of this article is simply not to run beyond experience in our speech. But that is not in his thoughts. It seems to him that God should be kept at so respectful a distance that no speech of what He is or what He has done for us could ever be possible.

There is an article of another kind in *The Times* for April 6. Its author is Mr. E. A. BURROUGHS, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford.

What Mr. BURROUGHS finds at the present time is 'a persistent vein of scepticism in all our faith.' We do not deny the existence of God. 'We claim that there is a Fact which is the crucial factor in the present situation'—the present situation being due to the war. We give a place to God in our scheme of existence, but it is a modest place with a shadowy meaning. And so our belief 'falls

short of dynamic value, and hardly issues in outward life.'

It is therefore not for greater reserve about God that Mr. BURROUGHS pleads; it is for greater assurance and franker speech.

First it is for greater assurance. He would have us 'believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' To believe so is to be consistent. For already we know that the spiritual is the real and the permanent. It is our knowledge of this that seems to make life possible. Already we are living by faith—far more of us than recognize it. Already we endure as seeing that which is invisible. 'If 19th-century materialism were not already dead the war would certainly have killed it.' And yet we hesitate and halt between two opinions.

Mr. BURROUGHS calls for consistency—'that hardest of graces for Britons to acquire.' If we believe, why do we not obtain the benefit of our belief? We must give the unseen things their place and value. We have not shaken ourselves quite clear of materialism. Having driven it out in the name of physical science, we have let it in again in the name of psychology. Conversion is a matter of psychological experiment. But, says Mr. BURROUGHS, 'because there may be a psychological explanation of conversion, it does not follow that there is no theological cause. The tappings of the wireless "receiver" may no doubt be explained as due to electrical disturbances in the immediate neighbourhood of the ship's mast; but that is not the whole explanation, nor the significant part of it.'

What Mr. BURROUGHS pleads for, therefore, in the present situation is the disuse of vague and distant phrases like 'the spiritual factor.' Let us boldly substitute the conception of a personal God, and act accordingly. 'We have to learn from our enemies. We may not approve their concep-

tion of God, nor like their ways of expressing their trust in Him. But the fact remains that in Germany the churches are full, while here they are—well, also "as usual." And the Kaiser's recognitions of God are perhaps a thing which our Press and politicians might occasionally imitate instead of deriding. If we think God in any way counts in the war, we might at least not seem to wish to forget it.'

That then is the first thing, we must be surer of God and give Him a larger place in our lives. The other thing is that we must speak more frequently about Him. Therein lies salvation for ourselves as for others. For it is 'if thou shalt confess with thy mouth,' as well as 'believe in thine heart' that 'thou shalt be saved.'

Is it not possible? Is our British reserve an immovable wall? We are doing it already in a way that is closely related. Very finely Mr. BURROUGHS says: 'Trouble has been bringing many of us nearer to one another, and showing us how alike we all are in the deepest things. And to be able to talk a little about them has brought, to many reserved people, a great enrichment of life. We have felt at work in us the process which St. Paul calls "the mutual building of each into each." That way, we all recognize, lies the true path of human progress, whether we think of the Eternal Goal at the end of it as "the Brotherhood of Man" or "the building up of the Body of Christ." Could we not be more consistent here also, and more often, and as a duty, give one another the benefit of our faith as well as of our doubts? True corporate life and feeling, whether inside or outside what we call "the Churches," can only be built on the freest interchange of personality between individuals, deliberately surrendering their right to spiritual isolation, and admitting to one another their common indebtedness and devotion to the common source of their spiritual life.'

What do we wait for? We wait for a lead. Where is the lead to come from? From the

clergy, perhaps. But writing in *The Times*, Mr. BURROUGHS writes to the laity. He bids them wait for no lead. 'Every man in Christ is by rights "a man under authority, having soldiers under him"; and the *raison d'être* of a Christian is to be a leader of men. Every one of us, however humble, is called to give a lead in his own surroundings. In family and business life, in the small problems of personal action, in the casual intercourse of the street or the train, the spiritual man will find abundant opportunity of disclosing his own standards, his own perspective, and making others conscious of the light by which he lives. Only he must subdue his horror of "giving himself away": to do so is half the battle of leadership.

Pour forth and bravely do your part,
O knights of the unshielded heart!
Forth and for ever forward!—out
From prudent turret and redoubt!

What is the value of 'belief' in the New Testament? Take an example. In Acts 13¹² we are told that Sergius Paulus, the Proconsul of Cyprus, 'when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord.' Does that mean that Sergius Paulus was converted? Does it mean that he became a Christian?

Mr. RACKHAM, who is the author of the best English Commentary on the Acts, says it does not. For to him 'it seems incredible that at this date a Roman proconsul could have been converted.' He does not mean that it was beyond the power of God to convert a proconsul. But it would have made such a stir that all the world was bound to hear of it. The Dean of WINCHESTER agrees. Dean FURNEAUX is the author of the latest Commentary on the Acts, and it runs Mr. RACKHAM's hard for the first place. Dr. FURNEAUX agrees. 'The conversion of a Proconsul,' he says, 'would have been an event of the first importance; such as we should expect to find recorded even by

secular historians, since it would almost certainly have necessitated the resignation of his office which involved official patronage of idolatrous worship.'

Sir W. M. RAMSAY discusses the question in his new book, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s.).

He is at one with Mr. RACKHAM and the Dean of WINCHESTER. To believe, he says, is not necessarily to be converted and become a Christian. The case of Simon Magus is almost conclusive evidence that sometimes it means no more than intellectual assent. In the language of St. Luke there are three stages in the process called salvation. First there is belief. After belief comes 'turning to the Lord,' of which the seal is baptism. The last stage is the settled Christian life.

Now it usually happens that St. Luke names only the first of these stages. He takes it for granted that the other two will follow. But he knew that the second and third stages might not follow, and so sometimes he adds them or at least one of them. Accordingly, Sir W. M. RAMSAY thinks that the state of mind called believing sometimes advances no further than intellectual assent and emotional impression; and it would not be safe to assert that belief always was followed even by baptism.

There is no probability that the Proconsul was baptized. If he had been baptized St. Luke would have been sure to mention it, for he pays great regard to the attitude of the Romans to the new religion. In the same way it is said of those to whom St. Paul preached in Athens that 'certain men also clave to him and believed, among whom was Dionysius the Areopagite and Damaris.' No baptism seems to have been administered, and no Church was founded. The effect produced on a few persons may have been genuine and deep, but the Apostle did not remain to follow it up, and

Sir W. M. RAMSAY believes that no real conversions were made in Athens.

From these cases, then, and from all that is said in the New Testament, the conclusion seems unavoidable that Sergius Paulus did not become a Christian. But, outside the New Testament, evidence has been found which persuades Sir W. M. RAMSAY that the conclusion is wrong.

The evidence is obtained from inscriptions. First there is an inscription which was discovered in Pisidian Antioch after the systematic excavation of that city began in 1912. In that inscription there occurs the name of Lucius Sergius Paullus the younger. It was at once perceived by Sir W. M. RAMSAY, and it has since been admitted by other scholars, that Lucius Sergius Paullus the younger is the son of Sergius Paulus the Cyprus Proconsul in the Book of Acts.

Next there is an inscription which has been published for nearly thirty years but hitherto has been totally misunderstood. This inscription occupies the whole of a large block of limestone which was set up in Antioch in honour of a distinguished citizen and his wife. The block is broken, only the second part of the lady's name was at first read, and no one thought anything about it. But in 1913 the other part was discovered and now the whole name can be read. The name is Sergia Paulla.

What does it signify? It signifies that L. Sergius Paullus, the son of Sergius Paulus the Proconsul of Cyprus, was governor of Galatia, and that during his office his sister was married to this citizen of Antioch. Now it is quite certain, from his position as governor of Galatia, that L. Sergius Paullus the younger was a pagan. It is nearly as certain that his sister was a Christian.

For this inscription was erected by her oldest son, and it is in Greek. That is a degeneration which at this early age would have been impossible

for a Roman and a pagan. But if Sergia Paulla's son was a Christian, it was natural and almost inevitable that he should write in Greek. Sir W. M. RAMSAY'S conclusion is that he learned his Christianity from his mother, and that his mother learned it from her father, the Sergius Paulus of the narrative in the Acts.

Mr. Arnold J. TOYNEE has written a book on *Nationality and the War* (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). Its title gives little indication of its contents. It is an elaborate forecast of the changes that are to take place on the map of the world when the war is over. They who will have the making of these changes must take account of the great fact of Nationality.. That is the explanation of the title.

Who will have the making of the changes on the map of the world? Mr. TOYNEE believes it will be ourselves and our Allies. But he is cautious and very considerate. He does not say that this and that will take place 'when we win.' He says 'if we win.' For he has a much clearer conception of the work that has to be done before we win than the confident comfortable reader of the British daily press. He believes that we will win. He wrote in January. If he were writing now he would express himself more emphatically. But all he writes he writes on the understanding that when the war is over victory will be with Britain and her Allies. The changes on the map will have to be made by them.

Meantime Britain and her Allies have to win. Why forecast the future? Because, says Mr. TOYNEE, that is our duty and we dare not shirk it. It is our duty now: we dare not postpone it. If we wait until that day when we read in the newspaper that the war is over, we shall find that we have made a serious and irreparable mistake. For we shall be only at the beginning of our real task. The reconstruction of the map of the World in many places, of the map of Europe in nearly every place, will still be in our hands. Our policy,

after hostilities, will be decided by our own Government *relying for its authority on the country behind it*. And the country will not be able to use wisely the immense power of decision which will fall upon it.

Mr. TOYNBEE does not expect that every man 'who has a vote' will make himself acquainted with the past history and the present condition of every country in Europe. There are men like himself to whom much of the ground is familiar, but they are few. What he expects of the British voter is that he would acquaint himself with the great principles which must guide the Government in its decisions, and with as much as he can of the way in which these principles ought to be applied in every particular case. Both are set forth in this book, the principles in a short introductory chapter, the application in the rest of its five hundred pages.

The greatest principle of all, the great fact which has to be taken account of in the settlement of every problem that arises after the war, is Nationality. But before we consider what Nationality is, we must come to some decision on two matters of ethical interest. We must decide whether we are to be moved by the desire for revenge, and we must decide whether we are to be moved by the instinct of plunder.

Are we to be moved by the desire for revenge? We answer, Yes. We are making that answer every day. At the very beginning of the war, a certain French word was unfortunately translated by the English word 'revenge,' though it does not mean revenge. That gave us encouragement. Then came the atrocities in Belgium, in Flanders, in Poland, and the outrages on the English coast. Yet Mr. TOYNBEE tells us that if we make our decisions after the war in the spirit of revenge, we shall lose that very thing for which we have gone to war—the end of war. For 'if we beat Germany and then humiliate her, she will never rest,' he says, 'till she has "redeemed her honour," by

humiliating us more cruelly in turn. Instead of being free to return to our own pressing business, we shall have to be constantly on the watch against her. Two great nations will sit idle, weapon in hand, like two Afghans in their loopholed towers when the blood feud is between them; and we shall have sacrificed deliberately and to an ever-increasing extent, for the blood feud grows by geometrical progression, the very freedom for which we are now giving our lives.'

Are we to be moved by the instinct of plunder? Again we answer, Yes. We are making *that* answer every day. And have we not reason? Mr. TOYNBEE knows that we have reason. Yet he asks us to consider. Modern wealth is international. That is its characteristic feature. 'Economic gain and loss,' he says, 'is shared by the whole world, and the shifting of the economic balance does not correspond to the moves in the game of diplomats and armies. Germany's economic growth has been a phenomenon quite independent of her political ambitions, and Germany's economic ruin would compromise something far greater than Germany's political future—the whole world's prosperity. British wealth, among the rest, would be dealt a deadly wound by Germany's economic death, and it would be idle to pump Germany's last life-blood into our veins, if we were automatically draining them of our own blood in the process.'

That issue is enough. It is not the only issue, but it is enough. Mr. TOYNBEE passes to Nationality. In the great regrouping that is to take place, a regrouping which we earnestly hope will have some permanence, respect must be had to the claims of Nationality.

Now Nationality is not easy to define. 'Like all great forces in human life, it is nothing material or mechanical, but a subjective psychological feeling in living people. This feeling can be kindled by the presence of one or several of a series of factors: a common country, especially if it is a

well-defined physical region, like an island, a river basin, or a mountain mass; a common language, especially if it has given birth to a literature; a common religion; and that much more impalpable force, a common tradition or sense of memories shared from the past.'

But these definitions do not all apply to every nation. Perhaps they do not all apply to any nation in the Earth. 'Great Britain is a nation by geography and tradition. Ireland is an island smaller still and more compact, and is further unified by the almost complete predominance of the same English language, for the Keltic speech is incomparably less vigorous here than in Wales; yet the absence of common tradition combines with religious differences to divide the country into two nationalities, at present sharply distinct from one another and none the less hostile because their national psychology is strikingly the same. Germany is divided by religion in precisely the same way as Ireland, her common tradition is hardly stronger, and her geographical boundaries quite vague: yet she has built up her present concentrated national feeling in three generations. Italy has geography, language and tradition to bind her together, and yet a more vivid tradition is able to separate the Ticinese from his neighbours, and bind him to people of alien speech and religion beyond a great mountain range. The Armenian nationality does not occupy a continuous territory, but lives by language and religion. The Jews speak the language of the country where they sojourn, but religion and tradition hold them together. The agnostic Jew accepts not only the language but all the other customs of his adopted countrymen, but tradition by itself is too strong for him: he remains a Jew and cannot be assimilated.'

That being so, we must judge each case on its own merits. National problems hitherto remote and uninteresting to us, must be taken up in earnest, that we may get as near to the truth concerning them as we possibly can. We must listen to the wishes of the different populations. We

must consider how far we can reconcile their wishes with one another and with geography. We must, as far as in us lies, come to the conference at the end of the war—which, says Mr. TOYNBEE, is so much more important than the war itself—with a clear idea of the alternative solutions, and a mature judgment upon their relative merits.

One example will be enough. Let it be Poland.

The nation of the Poles is at present partitioned between three empires, Germany, Austria, and Russia. The peaceful maintenance of the *status quo* in Europe meant for the Poles the perpetuation of this calamity for an indefinite period, perhaps for ever. The outbreak of war, the common disaster of their taskmasters, kindled for them a glimmer of fresh hope.

What can the Poles hope to gain from the war? Their highest hope can be no more than the creation of a united national state, enjoying internal autonomy but incorporated in a larger political organization. And the question is whether that larger organization is to be Russia, Austria, or Germany. Each of these Powers would be glad to make concessions to the Poles already subject to it in order to attract within its border upon the same terms the remaining sections of the nation.

Russia has made a great offer already. But Russia is the traditional enemy of the Polish nation. 'The two peoples have been rival leaders of the Slavonic world. Poland drew her culture from the Latin West, and her peasantry remained staunch to the Catholic Church during the crisis of the Reformation: Russia took upon herself the inheritance of the Byzantine Empire. Since 1814 more than half Poland's territory and population, including the national capital, Warsaw, has been incorporated in the Russian Empire. Accordingly, the national revolts of 1831 and 1863 were directed primarily, and in effect solely, against Russian rule, and in the concerted repression which they provoked from the three powers, the Russian Govern-

ment has taken the lead. The most cruel symbol of Poland's humiliation is the flaunting Orthodox Cathedral planted in the chief public square of Warsaw.'

Austria-Hungary, the 'ramshackle empire,' has been unable, perhaps it has been unwilling, to take the place of prime oppressor. Its true policy has been to become a 'happy family,' in which various nationalities should live and let live side by side. And the Poles have had exceptional favour. 'In 1869 the province of Galicia, Austria's share in the Polish spoils, was granted a far-reaching measure of Home Rule, and Polish was declared the normal language of its administration and higher education.'

These concessions have made the Austrian Poles the most loyal citizens of the Empire. The Polish members of the Austrian Reichsrath are looked upon as the 'government party.' On them the ministry can always rely for the voting of supplies and the passing of army bills. When the Russians invaded Galicia the Polish population rose *en masse* against them. They have certainly

not abandoned the hope of national reunion, but they look for it not within the Russian, but within the Austrian Empire.

But Germany has to be reckoned with. And the Germans have treated the Poles within their borders so badly that if to a reunited Poland the alternative were offered of Russia or Austro-Germany, they would undoubtedly say Russia. The Poles love not Russia, but they love Germany less. Now they already see that in the present alliance between Germany and Austria the predominant partner is Germany. If Germany and Austria win the war, it will be Germany's and not Austria's policy that will be imposed on Europe in general and on Poland in particular. The Poles shudder to think what that will mean. In the progress of the war Poles and Russians are being fused together in feeling by the fire of a common hate. Mr. TOYNBEE firmly believes that when we and our Allies win, the erection of a reunited Poland within the Russian Empire is almost assured. The Polish subjects of Germany will vote to a man for liberation from her dominion, and they will carry the Austrian Poles with them.

The Study of Theology.

BY ALBAN G. WIDGERY, M.A.(CAMB.), UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

A CAREFUL study of the history of particular sciences such as mathematics, physics, biology, and history leads to the conclusion that, apart from any consideration of the ease or difficulty of the research in any case, those sciences have made the greatest and most rapid progress which have been prosecuted by appropriate methods and untrammelled by external authority. The liberty of the student is not to be confused with caprice, although at the inception of every science many hypotheses have been in the highest degree arbitrary. The demand for liberty, which is now satisfied in almost every branch of research, is simply to follow reason and experience wherever they may lead. Freedom soon becomes distinguished from caprice in that individuals recognize

the necessity of co-operation and of the advantage of working according to methods especially appropriate to the subject under investigation. Freedom modified by method, and method made more or less elastic through freedom, have enabled advance which would otherwise have been impossible. Freedom is an attitude of mind, positive in relation to reason, negative in relation to any external power. Method is the mode of scientific procedure dependent upon the nature of the data which are being considered and the aim to be realized.

In the Western world research in all its branches was for long under the control of the ecclesiastical powers. This may be admitted without the necessity of denying what the Church did for