
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.

In the *International Journal of Ethics* for July there is an article by a 'neutral.' The author is a woman. Since the war began she has travelled in Germany and she has travelled in England. And in both these countries she has been impressed by one thing. Men and women will not be persuaded to believe that which they wish not to believe. 'Try to convince a German that the *Lusitania* was unarmed and carried no troops, or an Englishman that Allied submarines have sunk without warning unarmed merchant ships carrying women and children in the Sea of Marmora. You will see how fiercely the closed mind protects its own exclusiveness, attacking not only the unpleasant information but its innocent bearer.'

So this clever American woman, whose name is Gertrude Besse King, has returned home, satisfied that the only attitude for a philosophical mind is neutrality. She has returned home to the United States of America where she will find many who are neither pro-German nor pro-British, and to whom neutrality is the only right attitude. Bearing no unpleasant information, the innocent bearer will fear no injury.

And yet there are those in the United States of America who are disturbed about neutrality. They are disturbed because everything is known by its fruits, and the fruits of neutrality have not been good. In the American *Expositor* for September there is an article by a citizen of the United States, the Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, D.D., on 'The Moral Effect of the War upon America.' The article has the first place in the *Expositor*. This is the first sentence of it: 'Recent experiences in Europe may have led to over emphasis, but I am constrained to the feeling that the moral effect of this war upon America may be worse than upon any of the nations involved.'

Why does Dr. Macfarland say that? Because of neutrality. 'Among the belligerent peoples,' he says, 'there are compensatory influences for its awful tragedies. One witnesses examples of splendid bravery and self-sacrifice, the spirit of both patriotic devotion and Christian resignation on the part of widows and children, of allegiance to conscience, the willingness of the rich to share with the poor, the deepening of the religious sense, which in some cases has risen to a spiritual atmosphere far above the conflict, the sense of a sublime faith in the future, in some cases the discrediting of militarism, at times the spirit of intercession, and many other moral and spiritual elements which, perhaps, go far to counteract the demoralizing influences of human strife. Many or most of these elements are wanting in the moral atmosphere of our country.'

Of these elements he selects one for particular attention. It is the loss of compassion. 'We have become "used to it,"' he says, 'until the massacre of a nation has little more effect upon us than had the sinking of the *Titanic* with a thousand souls but four short years ago.'

And then comes this terrible paragraph: 'For Belgium and her three million destitute and starving people we have given seven cents per capita, while New Zealand, bearing its own war burdens as part of the British Empire, has given a dollar and a quarter per capita to Belgian relief. England, staggering under the war load, has received and cared for thousands of Belgian refugees, and given millions of pounds besides. It was thought that the United States, the only great nation untouched by the war, might furnish the food supplies for Belgium, but the Commission was obliged to ask food from the whole world to save Belgium from starvation. It must be remembered, also, that the gifts to Belgium from our country include the large contributions of the Rockefeller Foundation, so that the total of popular contributions is smaller than appears. For Servia, with her five millions of suffering peoples and her five thousand orphans, we have given less than three hundred thousand dollars, while the British Serbian Relief Committee three months ago had raised a million and a half pounds ($7,500,000), and France two million francs ($400,000). To the more than one million Armenians, whose story forms one of the darkest chapters in human history, we have given, covering the whole period, about one dollar for each sufferer. For the sufferers in Northern France little or nothing, and for Poland's millions of homeless, wandering peasants, mostly women and children, a total of something like two hundred thousand dollars.'

It is a terrible paragraph, we say. We could not have written it if we would; we would not have written it if we could. But as we read it we see that neutrality is not the bravest thing or the best.

Blow, bugles, blow! They brought us, for our dearth,
Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain.
Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.

The Swarthmore Lecture is delivered every year on the evening preceding the assembly of the Friends' Yearly Meeting. The lecturer for 1916 was Henry T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. Mr. HODGKIN was sometime missionary in West China. As the subject of lecture he chose *The Missionary Spirit and the Present Opportunity* (Headley; 1s. net).

The choice was natural. Was it not a little untimely? We are not interested in missions just now; we are interested in war. Have not the missionaries been told to hold their hand for a time? Have not some of them been interned? The proclamation of the grace of God in Christ—must it not wait until we have won the war?

But Mr. HODGKIN seems to think that his lecture will show us the way to win the war. He says nothing about interned missionaries or suspended missions. He speaks only of the possession of the missionary spirit. And he does so because he seems to think that the nations which have the missionary spirit and have it most abundantly are the nations which are most likely to end the war victoriously.

It is true that Mr. HODGKIN is a Quaker. And being a Quaker he conceives it to be his duty to abstain from war. But that does not prevent him from seeing that there are worse things on earth than war. It does not prevent him from seeing that God may make use of war, although it is a bad thing, to get rid of things that are worse.

Now if God uses war in order to get rid of things

that are worse than war, He will see to it that those nations win the war who, as the result of it, will put away these things from their midst. And the nations that are most likely to put away these things from their midst are the nations who have most of the missionary spirit.

What are the things that have to be put away? The first thing that Mr. HODGKIN mentions is the habit of shelving God. This habit has grown upon us. It began when we first allowed scientific investigators to say that nature does not need a God. It began with the discovery of Evolution. When Evolution was discovered it was said that matter has within itself the faculty of steadily beating its own best record. It needs no impulse from Spirit. Then the approach of God, even to man, was spoken of as 'interference.' And it was said, with scornful confidence, that there is no use for a God who interferes with the order of nature.

We must get rid of the habit of shelving God. The war must help us to get rid of it. We must believe once again that God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. We must believe in prayer. We had come to look upon prayer as a possibly commendable act of devotion for those who were inclined that way. But we hesitated to ask for anything in prayer, lest we should upset the 'laws of nature.'

Mr. HODGKIN seems to think that it would be better to blaspheme God than to shelve Him. Now the war in its progress has been the occasion of much rough language about God. And it does not seem that the Christian conscience altogether condemns it. Perhaps we all agree already that it is better to use strong language when speaking about God than never to speak or think of Him at all.

Another thing which we have to put away is selfish and merciless competition. Mr. HODGKIN does not altogether refuse a place to competition. He is aware that there is an injunction laid on us to provoke one another to love and to good works. For there is a rivalry that is good and there is a rivalry that is evil. The rivalry that is evil seeks our own prosperity at the expense of our neighbour's; the rivalry that is good finds the prosperity of one in the prosperity of all.

Is the war to bring us back to the rivalry of love and good works? It has brought us back already. Who are they who have done most for the countries that have suffered in the war? It is the nations that are bearing the burden of it. There is a deep pit dug between the forces that are opposed to one another, a pit filled with hatred and revenge, which it will take a long time to fill up. But a great discovery has been made by those nations which are fighting on the same side. It is the discovery that co-operation is better than individual action. It is the discovery that through prayer and self-sacrifice this whole world may be bound by gold chains about the feet of God. And that discovery will remain with us when the enmity between the contending powers has passed away.

There is another thing which the nations that possess the missionary spirit must put away. It is their security. For it is not self-indulgence that is destroying the nations, it is security. 'When Christ demanded the great surrender from the rich young man, He was in reality calling him not so much into a life of poverty as into one of adventure. What He saw was a man utterly secure in his habitual observance of the law and in his well-appointed, comfortable home. "How hard it is," He said, "for them that trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God." How hard it is, we might add, for them that have riches not to trust in them. All unconsciously the sense of security wraps us round. We pass day after day in a well-ordered routine, never feeling any need to pray for our daily bread. We scarcely ever face a situation in which we should be utterly helpless without God. The more sure we are of drawing our dividends, the less do we need to draw on the divine resources.

And so we go on complacently until the unexpected suddenly happens, as this war happened; the Son of Man comes like a thief in the night; our sense of security is shattered, our possessions gone, and, facing the great Disturber of our peace, we find ourselves naked and ashamed.'

Will the war help us out of our sense of security? It has done so already. If it has done anything at all for us it has done that. It has done that for nearly all of us. It sent us out on an adventure at once, though it took us some time to find out how tremendous an adventure it was.

Are we to settle down in security again when the war is over? That will be difficult. God will see to it that it is made difficult. If the war has come upon us in order that we may put away from us the things that are worse than war, the war will not come to an end until we are ready to put away security. For war is too evil in itself to be used of God for little good.

A notable book has been published under the title of *The Divine Aspect of History* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2 vols., 36s. net). It is notable on account of the publishing house which issues it. It is notable on account of its author, who bears the name of John Rickards MOZLEY, and calls John Henry Newman uncle. And it is notable in itself.

The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel is a history of the world. It is a history of the world by one who stands beside God and looks down upon it. This also is a history of the world. But it is a history of the world by one who keeps pace with God at work within it. He is therefore a believer in the Supernatural. He is so whole-hearted a believer in the Supernatural that for him there is no natural. God is in all life. Men have not seen God always in their life; or when they recorded their experiences they have not always given God His place in them, so that there is history without the recognition of God. Mr. MOZLEY sets such history aside. He is concerned with the history, whether of Babylonia and Persia, or Greece and Rome, or Israel and Christianity, which recognizes that men live and move and have their being in God.

He is so thorough a believer in the Supernatural that he does not believe in miracle. He means by miracle what most of us mean by it—an occasional entrance of God, or the power of God, into life, beyond His ordinary working. Mr. MOZLEY does not believe that God ever enters, or ever has entered, into life in that way. He has had no need. He is always in life.

It is true that some of the documents in which Mr. MOZLEY finds his history in its divine aspect contain the record of miracles wrought by God or by the power of God. And the very best of these records, the four Gospels, contain the greatest number of miracles. He is not a little puzzled to find it so. He is still more puzzled to know how to get rid of the miracles and retain the Gospels.

For as soon as the miracle is removed the narrative in which it is embedded hangs in the air. Nevertheless Mr. MOZLEY believes that all the miracles can be got rid of, except the miracles of healing. And the miracles of healing need not be called miracles. Jesus had exceptional psychical power, or people then were exceptionally susceptible to psychical influence. Did He not always demand faith before He healed? Is it not said that 'He could do no miracle there because of their unbelief'? And what is faith but psychical susceptibility?

Is the raising of the dead a miracle of healing? Mr. MOZLEY does not think so. It is true that Jesus mentioned the raising of the dead along with miracles of healing in His reply to the messengers of John the Baptist. 'Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers

are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me' (Mt 11^{4-6}). Mr. MOZLEY is much impressed by that passage. It is 'the most remarkable assertion by Jesus of his own deeds which the three earlier gospels contain.' And he points out, very properly, that in that passage Jesus lays stress, not on the wonder of His works, but on their beneficence. That is clear from the clause in which the affirmation of His deeds culminates: 'the poor have the gospel preached to them.' But the raising of the dead is a difficulty. If it did not occur, why is it thrown in along with things which did occur? Mr. MOZLEY concludes that in that example Jesus was speaking metaphorically. He quotes the words 'Let the dead bury their dead' to show that He did sometimes speak metaphorically of the dead. And so He did. But He spoke metaphorically also of the blind and the deaf.

Since Mr. MOZLEY does not believe that Jesus raised any one from the dead, we shall not expect him to believe that He rose from the dead Himself. But if we come to that conclusion hurriedly we may do him a serious injustice. It is quite true that he does not believe in the resurrection of the body of Jesus from the dead, but he does believe in the resurrection of His soul.

How does Mr. MOZLEY show that Jesus did not rise from the dead in the body? By showing that the resurrection narratives in the Gospels are inconsistent. But he says at once, 'My object in doing so is not to deny the truth or the importance of the belief expressed in the words, "Christ is risen," but to show that the event thus indicated belonged to the spiritual world and not to the world discerned by our ordinary senses; from which it will follow that the resurrection, when rightly understood, was not a miracle, but that it implies a new kind of perception on our part, the perception of a world higher than the world of sense.'

This is not quite easy to understand. How is the perception of a world higher than the world of sense a new kind of perception on our part? Mr. MOZLEY seems to mean that it was by His resurrection—His spiritual resurrection—that Jesus brought life and immortality to light. He rose in spirit and remained alive. In the spiritual state He was able to communicate with those whom He left behind upon the earth. He communicated so with Saul of Tarsus. That communication gave His followers the certainty of a spiritual world 'higher than the world of sense.'

And that spiritual communion which the risen Lord now established between Himself and His followers on earth is the source of all the strength which belief in the Resurrection gave to the early Church. The resurrection of the body would have been nothing. As soon as the Church adopted that incredible dogma, says Mr. MOZLEY, weakness set in. The uniqueness and the power of Jesus consist in this that He first, and He only, rose from the dead and continued to live, a spiritual presence in heaven, able to communicate with His disciples on earth and to strengthen them to overcome the world.

Mr. MOZLEY does not believe in miracle, and therefore he does not believe in the bodily resurrection of Jesus. He does not believe in miracle, and therefore he does not believe that Jesus was more than man. But if He was the first to rise from the dead in spirit, and by rising was able to 'shed forth this which ye now see and hear,' He must have been a most remarkable man. What does Mr. MOZLEY say about Him? He says, 'He was the man who first received, as his own proper inheritance, the Divine Spirit and Power in its fullness; and those who receive it after him have been helped by him either through his direct influence upon them, or by influences indirectly due to him; or, if they have stood altogether outside his influence (as is generally the case with Mohammedans), they have been unable to bring their goodness to permanent and ever-

increasing fruitage. The progress of mankind is founded on him in a unique sense. This makes him greater than his fellow-men; but it does not make him outside the range of comparison with them.'

'Two parsons were talking earnestly together close beside me. They were discussing an excellent layman, whom they both admired for his great qualities and his blameless life. "But is he a Christian?" said the first. "Well," said my other neighbour, "it all depends upon what you mean by a Christian." "I mean," said the first speaker, with a slight touch of indignation in his tone, "*does he believe in the divinity of Christ?*" It turned out apparently that the admirable layman had expressly said that he did not, but that he believed Jesus Christ to have been the most perfect man who had ever lived. So it was agreed that he could not be a Christian. And this is not an uncommon attitude of mind among the best of our laity.'

So begins an article on 'The Divinity of Christ —What does it Mean?' The article lies hidden in the heart of a book with the title of *Faith or Fear?* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d.), if anything can be said to be hidden in a book which maintains a fresh attitude to Christian doctrine throughout, and is so timely. It is a book to which certain members of the Church of England have contributed articles. They are not in all cases known to one another, or even to the editor. But every one of them has been driven by the war to think out a new way of commending Christ. For with all their catholicity they are assured that the Church is failing. And she is failing simply because she is no longer bearing witness to the living Christ, the Redeemer and Saviour of men. The editor of the book is the Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, Vicar of St. Peter's in Thanet. The author of the article on 'The Divinity of Christ' is the Rev. Harold ANSON, Rector of Birch-in-Rusholme, Manchester.

It is the editor who says that the Church is ailing, and why. But Mr. ANSON agrees. And not only does he agree that the Church is no longer bearing witness to the living Christ, he even holds that she no longer understands who the living Christ is.

He observes a growing tendency to separate the Godhead from the Manhood in Christ. First there are those who take the Manhood and leave the Godhead alone. 'They feel that, if they admit that He is God, they deprive Him of reality and make Him inhuman. It appears to them that the parsons want to rob them of the real, genuine, brotherly, flesh and blood man, whom they can understand, and who understands them, and to substitute for Him a sort of demigod, who is neither exactly God nor wholly man, whose psychology is quite incomprehensible, who acts, now as God, now as man, who cannot really be any example to us, because He can always summon to His aid resources which lie outside our scope, and who bears no sort of real relation to mankind as we know it to-day. For such a being they have no use.'

Then there are those who are very zealous for the Godhead. They are mostly, Mr. ANSON thinks, those who have some official position in the Church, whether in the pulpit or in the Sunday School. Their theology is the theology of the stained-glass window. Their idea is that 'by some necessary and inevitable process (usually connected with the Miraculous Birth) the son of Mary was, magically as it were, and in a moment, lifted out of all those limitations which we associate with humanity, except in so far as He chose to assume voluntarily certain humiliating experiences, just as the wealthy West-ender bent on "slumming" assumes a temporary and dramatic poverty in unclean surroundings prior to returning to a life of comfort and ease.'

Now Mr. ANSON does not believe that the truth about the person of Christ can be gained by simply combining this Man and this God into a single

composite Being, to be called the God-Man. It is doubtful if such a composite Being is thinkable. It is certain that He is not the Christian Christ. Far more near to the Christian conception of Christ, if we could reach it, would be the thought of one who could not be the perfect man without being also God, and who could not be the perfect God without being also man. For the terms God and man are not antithetical, but complementary.

Mr. ANSON tells us that to many laymen the Christ whom the clergy preach is one who condescended to patronize men. He simulated, or even genuinely experienced, an interest and share in the ordinary trials of life. But it was 'nothing more than the amiable adventures of the slumming ladies who make excursions among a class to which they do not belong, and whose point of view must always be wholly alien and unreal to the class which they set out to reform. Their feeling about such a Christ as the Church appears to propound is exactly that of the Labour Party towards the proposals of their middle-class sympathizers: it is very kind of them to be interested, but they prefer to work out their own problems with the help of leaders who belong to their own class.'

But the true Christ is just a leader who belongs to our own class. The true Christ is a true man. There is that in man which comes to its fulfilment only when it is one with God; and there is that in God—we call it Sonship—which comes to its fulfilment only when it is one with man. To make this oneness possible for all men, He came: 'that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us.' The Incarnation united God with man: the Redemption united man with God. And so close is the affinity between God and man that the Son of God who first formed the union could have had no divided consciousness. His acts are not to be parcelled out between His Godhead and His manhood. He did not walk on the water as a God and rest on the well as a man. Just as we now find no difficulty, but a great relief, in knowing that God is capable of suffering, so we may find a great deliverance in knowing that to humanity nothing is impossible.

Now, as soon as we see that Godhead and manhood are complementary, we see how we may reach a simple thinkable conception of the Person of Christ. Is He man? Then what is man? Man at his best and highest is the Lord Jesus Christ. Is He God? Then what is God? God is simply the highest and best that we can conceive of man, and that again is the Lord Jesus Christ. To separate the God from the Man in Christ, and say this He did as God and that as Man, is to do violence, not only to Christ, but to our own thinking. For we cannot think of Christ (if we think of Him truly) without thinking of God; and we cannot think of God (if we think of Him truly) without thinking of Christ.

We do think of God without thinking of Christ. We think of Him as in deliberate opposition to Christ. We think of Him still, if not so crudely as before, as One who exacts penalties which are remitted only at Christ's intercession. We do think also of Christ without thinking of God. This is the peculiar error of the thought of our day. For we are much given to thinking of Christ as just one of ourselves, even demanding that He be preached as just one of ourselves. And the immediate consequence is the discovery, as we suppose, that He was not quite perfect, and therefore not altogether such as God is, though it is from Him that we have our knowledge of God.

What is the greatest thing in the world? 'Love,' said Professor Henry DRUMMOND, and used winning words in saying it. 'Righteousness,' says Principal P. T. FORSYTH, and says it in language that is stern and uncompromising.

Dr. FORSYTH has written a book about the war. He calls it *The Christian Ethic of War* (Longmans; 6s. net). Why has he written it? Not because he

is a writer of books, but because he feels that the teaching of Christ, and every form of sound Christian doctrine, demand of us that we should go to war. He feels this so strongly that—we must not say he cannot find language strong enough to express his feelings. Dr. FORSYTH always finds language that is strong enough, however strong his feelings are. He feels it so strongly that he uses language of those who think they should not go to war which no military representative on any tribunal need ever hope to surpass.

Why, he asks, do Christian men hesitate to go to war? Their answer is, Because Christ taught them to forgive their enemies, not to go to war with them. Did He? Then why did He not forgive His own enemies? Dr. FORSYTH is not forgetting the prayer on the Cross: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' It is a beautiful prayer. Dr. FORSYTH is not oblivious of the beauty of it. But it was not answered. Wait till the seventieth year from the birth of Christ and you will see if it was answered. Three times Dr. FORSYTH refers to that year 70 A.D. and the destruction of Jerusalem. And every time he says it was God's judgment on the Jews for the Cross of Christ.

But again the pacifist answers, and says that Christ taught us to love our enemies and not to go to war with them. To which Dr. FORSYTH replies with emphasis that He taught the love of enemies to His own followers as followers, not to rulers and magistrates. 'Love,' he says, 'has its place rather within the Church than between societies like nation and nation.'

What rules between societies like nation and nation is not love, but righteousness. Is that a little startling? Once at least Dr. FORSYTH has a suspicion that it may seem so. Therefore he puts it in this way: 'It is not at last a question of *love* between men over against *righteousness* between men, but of the love and righteousness between holy God and evil man, between love as communion where it meets love and love as saving judgment where it does not. It is the difference between a mystic communion of love and a righteous kingdom of love. It is a question of the application and exercise of God's love; which exercise is one thing without a Church of the regenerate, and another thing as righteous discipline and judgment-grace towards a yet unregenerate world. The salvation of God is, to those who are but in a relation of law, righteousness; but to those who are joined in Gospel it is love. In the one it is law, judgment, war; to the others joy and peace in the Holy Ghost. But always love and always holy at any cost to life or limb.'

But Dr. FORSYTH will startle us yet more. He challenges our interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. He challenges any interpretation that comes to the Sermon on the Mount before it has come to the Cross. The Sermon on the Mount says, 'Resist not evil'; but what does the Cross say? We did think that the Cross said the same, if it said anything at all. Dr. FORSYTH will not allow us to think so any more. For again we notice that the Cross is not to be understood till we include the destruction of Jerusalem. Did Jesus at the Cross reject the help of the Father's legions of angels? When the time came for the judgment of God on Jerusalem, 'He summoned the legions it did not suit Him to ask for to avert the Cross.'

The religion of the Sermon on the Mount (as usually understood) and the religion of the Cross, he says, are two different religions. The one is represented by the 23rd Psalm, the other by the 51st. The one type Dr. FORSYTH calls anthropocentric religion. For the prime interest of the 23rd Psalm is man, with God to help him. It ends in subjective humanism, with God squeezed out. The other type is theocentric. The prime interest of the 51st Psalm is God, with man to worship and serve Him absolutely. Its mysticism is objective and moral, and it ends in the Kingdom of God.