

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

SHALL we ever again be able to preach the Pauline theology? The doctrine of Justification by Faith, for example. Has any one preached on Justification by Faith since the war began?

---

We may as well ask, Shall we ever again be able to preach? For we cannot preach religion without preaching theology. Theology *is* religion preached.

---

But we must preach theology with adaptation. We shall never again preach the theology of St. Paul as our fathers preached it. We must adapt it to our own generation. We may even have to be careful about the word 'Theology.' Professor William MORGAN, writing a book on what we used to call the 'Theology of St. Paul,' adds the word 'Religion,' and makes his title read *The Religion and Theology of Paul* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). For the theology that is only speculation about religion is dead. We must preach a living theology, a theology that is the preaching of religion.

---

And in adapting the preaching of the Pauline theology to our own time we must make ourselves acquainted with such discoveries as have been made in it. Justification by Faith was itself a discovery in Luther's day; and Professor MORGAN believes that it has vitality and significance still.

But the discovery of our day is the discovery of Pauline Mysticism.

---

How did our fathers speak about indwelling—the indwelling of the believer in Christ, or the indwelling of Christ in the believer? Never mind how they spoke about it. We, adapting the Pauline ideas about indwelling to our own day, speak about the Apostle's mysticism. The word not only catches on but carries with it all the truth. And if we were preaching a single sermon on St. Paul's mysticism we should find the three divisions ready to our hand. For there were three expressions, not two only, which St. Paul used to convey his conception of this mystical union—first, the believer in Christ; next, Christ in the believer; and thirdly, fellowship with Christ in His death and resurrection.

---

Professor MORGAN explains all three expressions, and with most welcome lucidity. But first of all he tells us what Mysticism is.

---

Like poetry, he says, Mysticism is hard to define. But 'we may take it that the goal which in all ages it has set before itself is union with God.' Now that is no definition as it stands. For all living religion strives after union with God. And if it is a religion that moves in ethical and personal relations, the union is understood to take

place in thought, feeling, and will. To be in union with God is to think God's thoughts, to love and hate what God loves and hates, to act as God acts. What is it that makes such a religion mystical?

It is this. The mystic regards the ethical and personal union as only preliminary to something deeper and more intimate. He 'contemplates God's eternal being as the real substance of his own soul, and his own upward aspirations and endeavours as the motions of the universal Spirit. In the highest moments of his religious life all personal and moral relations, all "my, mine, and me," are swallowed up in the rapturous consciousness of immediate contact with and absorption in the Deity. It is no longer himself that lives, but God. "If I am to know God directly," says Eckhart, "I must become completely He, and He I."

Is this the mysticism of St. Paul? It is not. St. Paul's mystical union is never with God; it is always with Christ. The idea of God as in the believer, or as the element of his life, 'hardly emerges.' You may say that, for St. Paul, Christ is equivalent to God. So He is. Nevertheless it is with Christ and not with God that St. Paul comes into mystical union. It is his soul and Christ that are no longer distinguishable. It is 'Christ in you' that is the 'hope of glory.' It is the man who is 'in Christ' that is 'a new creature.' It is fellowship with Christ in His death and resurrection (not predicable of God) that is the most original and the most fruitful of all the Pauline thoughts about mysticism.

The teachers of mankind are somewhat sharply divided at present into two classes, the worldly and the other-worldly. These words may both be used offensively. But they need not be. There are those who, without being absorbed with fashion and frivolity, believe that the object of all earnest endeavour should be the betterment of the con-

ditions of life here and now. And there are those who, without being indifferent to 'the social problem,' believe that the supreme effort should be directed towards making men partakers of the life eternal.

This difference of aim has become acute. It is openly and for the most part violently expressed, and that in every land. In a book which seems to come from Australia its acuteness is frankly recognized. The title of the book is *Human Ideals* (Fisher Unwin; 6s. net).

The author of the book, Mr. Frederick A. M. SPENCER, M.A., does not appear to have any professional interest in religion. The greater part of the book is occupied with that human ideal which we have called the worldly. He expresses it in this way: 'The evil that afflicts mankind must be exterminated, and the good must be increased. Civilization must be improved, and a better race evolved. All human effort is to be concentrated on producing an ever greater and nobler humanity. There is the satisfaction of thinking that our labours will bear fruit after we are dead, even perhaps in increasing measure into an indefinite future.'

But he is not satisfied with that ideal. He asks two questions of its advocates. 'What of the individual souls who pass away? And what satisfactory goal lies ahead of all this progress?' These two questions he leaves unanswered. He believes that they are unanswerable. Only the occasional and abnormal mind is satisfied, as was George Eliot's, with the immortality of those 'who live again in minds made better by their presence.' It is doubtful if any mind is content to sacrifice itself for a future of purely material prosperity.

But neither does Mr. SPENCER accept the other-worldly ideal. This is how he expresses it. 'Happiness will be found in a state of being which souls reach through death. A lifetime in the

visible world is an individual's period of preparation for unending life in an unseen world. Pure and right living and the true faith in God are alone needed. All else—such as sufficiency of material goods, health, intellect, friendship, beauty—are really of no account; and the desire for even the normal constituents of earthly happiness is apt to distract from the one aim.

What answer does he give to that? He gives two answers. The first is that human society must become moral. It is not enough, he says, that one soul here and one there should be united to God, and, growing in the Divine life, should show themselves to be just and merciful as God is. We must secure the salvation of mankind. We must spend ourselves in the effort to make humanity as a whole bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.

Now, 'so long as there is poverty side by side with riches, so long as there are disease and pain and misery which might be remedied but are not, so long as circumstances are heedlessly allowed to narrow and stunt human lives, so long will society remain unfit for the Spirit of God.' 'We must secure that, if there is sufficient wealth, all families of honest people have enough of good food and healthy houses and decent clothes, that all have, so far as man can provide, large opportunity for science and literature and art, that there be no false dignity to mark off one human being from another, that the various positions and occupations shall be open to all according to abilities, and there be free intercourse and fellowship throughout the community. We have to constitute society through and through on the principle of loving our fellow-men as ourselves, so that mankind may progress towards immortality.'

The second answer is that 'a wide and rich development of mental life is required for the full development of spiritual life. We cannot allow man's innate longing for truth and beauty to be repressed in the name of a puritanical theory of

salvation. But great mental activity requires a certain standard of bodily health and vigour. Hence the necessity for that social progress which promotes the development of both minds and bodies. For they are to become the 'organs and instruments of spiritual life, which is the beginning of life eternal.'

'It is only through combining these two theories and methods of the evolution of man that justice is done to either. Let us boldly grasp the truth that the future of the race is the future of the individual. Death does not separate one from the other. The soul has to evolve, since it will live again in an evolved mankind. Mankind has to evolve, since it will comprise the evolved soul.'

What is the difference between the progress of civilization and the coming of the Kingdom? Is there any difference? In all proclamation of the Gospel is it not our object to carry the principles of the Kingdom into every part of social and national life, leavening it thereby till the whole lump is leavened? And when the whole lump is leavened, can we not say that the Kingdom of God has come?

No, says Canon GOUDGE. That is not how the Kingdom of God is to come. If the Kingdom of God were to come in that way, this war and the savagery attendant on it would be inexplicable. For if the Kingdom of God were to come by the slow and steady leavening of the meal of human society, such a war as this, or any war, would be a direct defiance of God's will and purpose. And it seems to Canon GOUDGE that to set this war directly against the will of God and make it wholly evil, is to deny to God the sovereignty of the world, and to make it quite impossible to believe that all things work together for good to them that love Him.

Canon GOUDGE does not deny that the Kingdom of God comes by a process of gradual ameliora-

tion. He denies that it comes by that alone. He has been studying the Apocalypse. He turns, as he thinks all Christians will turn to-day, with special interest to the Apocalypse. For events have happened, and continue to happen, which suggest serious questions as to the character and rule of God. And to these questions the Apocalypse, of all the books of the Bible, is the one most likely to furnish an answer.

Now, when he turns to the Apocalypse, what Canon GOUDGE finds is that the Kingdom of God is to come by judgment. He does not find that it is to come by judgment only. The Apocalypse does not stay the advancing tide of enlightenment. But its uppermost thought is the thought of judgment. And not of one judgment only, but of judgment after judgment, right up to the last judgment of all.

That is why Canon GOUDGE finds the study of the Apocalypse profitable to-day. And that is why he has published his pamphlet on *The Apocalypse and the Present Age* (S.P.C.K.; 3d. net). If we think that the Kingdom is to come only by the spread of Christian civilization, we have no doctrine or device by which to account for this war. We turn upon the Church. Is this all that the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments has done for the world in nineteen hundred years? We turn upon Christ Himself. Is this all that He has been able to accomplish with all the power that was given to Him in heaven and in earth?

A recent writer spoke of the names of Jesus in the New Testament and said that one of them was 'Lord of Hosts.' He blundered better than he knew. Jesus is Lord of Hosts also. He moves through the world by steady progress, by the evolution of Christian culture, where we will move with Him. Where we will not, He moves by judgment. And when judgment takes the form of war, even such a war as this, He sees to it that the experiences through which men pass shall form character for eternity. For His purpose is greater

than to 'build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land.' It is to build a Jerusalem that shall be both of this world and of that which is to come, a Jerusalem which shall be always coming down out of heaven and always returning thither again.

Let no one say his struggle naught availeth :

'All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist ;

Not its semblance, but itself ; no beauty, nor good, nor power

Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist

When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.

But it survives there as well as here—there ready to come down. Eternity will affirm it, because eternity affirms it already :

The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,

The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,

Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard ;

Enough that He heard it once : we shall hear it by-and-by.'

When the editor of this journal was invited to undertake the editorship of a new Dictionary of the Bible he went to Oxford and Cambridge to consult the leading scholars there. For he knew that unless Sanday and Driver, Swete and Ryle, approved, and were willing to become contributors, it would be his duty to decline the invitation. Dr. Driver approved, and offered not only to become a contributor but to read all the Old Testament articles. Dr. Sanday hesitated.

Proceeding to Cambridge, not quite sure that he had not better proceed home, the editor was met most unexpectedly by Professor Ryle. Dr.

Sanday had sent him a telegram, telling him to get the best of the Cambridge men to become contributors to the proposed Dictionary, and to undertake some of the work himself. A letter followed. Dr. Sanday had hesitated because the most promising of the younger men in Oxford were engaged in research work under his direction, and he feared that this other work would occupy too much of their time and interest. He now saw that it was his duty as it was his pleasure to encourage the undertaking. He offered to write the article 'Jesus Christ.'

That was the Oxford surprise. The Cambridge surprise followed immediately after. Professor Ryle (we speak, of course, of the now Dean of Westminster) gave priceless advice regarding men. As he passed from name to name he came upon the name of Professor Gwatkin.

Everybody in Cambridge knew that when Dr. Creighton was elected to the Dixie Chair of Ecclesiastical History, Dr. Gwatkin was greatly disappointed. But the story of his most magnanimous behaviour was not well known until the life of Dr. Creighton was published many years after. Meantime, however, Dr. Creighton had been made a bishop, and no one had contested Dr. Gwatkin's claim to the Chair. When Professor Ryle came to his name, he said, 'You need not trouble with Gwatkin; he is occupied with a book and will not work for you.' He had declined to contribute to the Cambridge *Companion to the Bible*.

He was called upon, however. Not with the expectation of his undertaking any articles for the Dictionary. But he might give advice. And in any case he was a man to be consulted.

His study was half occupied with theology and half with something scientific, which he afterwards showed to be snails! A kettle was boiling vigorously on a side-table. He came in, and the plan of the new Dictionary was explained to him.

'Go on,' he said, 'it's most interesting—but stay till I smother that noisy fellow in the corner.' 'Well, what do you want me to do?' He was wanted to write all the articles on the Christian Ministry. He undertook them all, and wrote them. Every article was sent up to time, and every article was a Dictionary model—full, concise, accurate, and expressed in faultless English.

Nor did Dr. GWATKIN ever refuse to do any work that he was afterwards invited to do. He wrote some articles for the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*—'Persecution,' 'Protestantism,' 'Reformation,'—great articles, articles which no one but he could have written. The last was finished and despatched a fortnight before his death.

He died on the 14th of November 1916, his death being due to a motor accident.

Among Professor GWATKIN'S contributions to literature is a volume of sermons, in the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, entitled *The Eye for Spiritual Things*. He had prepared another volume which, under the care of his widow, has just been issued in the same series. Its title is *The Sacrifice of Thankfulness* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). All that has here been said is intended as introduction to that volume.

For Dr. GWATKIN was all his life a surprise, and every work he published was a surprise. How many men there must have been to whom the Gifford Lectures on *The Knowledge of God* came as one of the most thankful surprises of their life. He was always doing the impossible thing, from the time that he took four Triposes—Mathematics, Classics, Moral Sciences, and Theology, and won a First Class in every one of them—to the time when he wrote the surprising sermons which fill this volume.

The sermons are very short—an average of six pages each. Yet they say all that has to be said

on their subject, and not only engage but imprison the attention. For all is amazingly fresh, and not a word is added or out of place.

The first sermon gives the book its title—'Thankfulness the True Sacrifice.' The text is Rom. 12<sup>1</sup>: 'I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.' The first sentence is such an arresting statement as the first sentence of a sermon should always be: 'Even the visions of St. John scarcely look so far into the glorious future as the Epistle to the Romans which is now before us.' And it is true—as the first sentence must always be, else it had better not be arresting. Then the preacher proceeds.

'The verse I have read is St. Paul's conclusion from a vast review of the history of mankind from first to last. Through the hollow splendour of the world of failure round him the Apostle's keen eyes glance backward to the old sin which had been the ruin of human life, then forward to the time beyond time when there shall be no more sin and death, but the whole creation shall share in the glorious liberty of the children of God. Even the stubborn unbelief of Israel shall one day be made to help His glorious purpose of having mercy on all men. Then bursts out a song of triumph: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! . . . I beseech you *therefore*, brethren, by God's compassions,—by all the tender mercies he has shown to them of old, and by the mighty salvation he has raised up now for us and all men,—that ye offer your bodies, by means of which all your works are done, both good and bad, as a living sacrifice,—living, and therefore holy and well-pleasing to God,—for just this is the worship reasonably to be expected from men redeemed like you."

He draws attention to 'one striking phrase.' What is 'a living sacrifice'? 'Our first idea of

sacrifice is the killing of victims; and, in fact, the Jewish temple was a great slaughter-house of sheep and oxen, and the smoke of the offerings for sin went up to heaven continually from the altar of burnt-offering. It was more like a butcher's shop than a church. But if these sacrifices for sin were the most conspicuous of the offerings, there were others also where no blood was shed. These were not offerings for sin, and could not be, for without shedding of blood is no remission; so that they were offerings of thanksgiving. Therefore a living sacrifice is a sacrifice of thanksgiving.'

'As everything turns on this, I will give you another proof of it. Whatever might be the meaning of the Jewish sacrifices, it came to an end when the veil of the temple was rent in twain. The gospel knows of only one offering for sin—the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sin of the whole world which our Lord has offered once for all. We have no altar but the cross of Christ, no sacrifice for sin but the one true sacrifice on Golgotha. Thus there are no sacrifices left for sinners like us to offer but the spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving; but the Lord has made all of us priests to offer these.'

'It follows that the Christian life is essentially a life of thanksgiving. True, it is a sacrifice. We have to offer ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be used and consumed according to our Father's loving will. Not our way but His, whether He lift us to the throne or on the cross. Be this world's trials what they may, we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. Be our sins and failures what they may, we are not to brood over them with morbid remorse, but to thank God and take courage, and go forward in the spirit of hope. Rejoice evermore; pray without ceasing; in everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you.'

So 'Christian life is not the melancholy thing which men so often make it. The gifts of God

are not mere traps to catch us in. "Touch not, taste not, handle not," are commandments of men, which have indeed a show of wisdom and humility, but are of no value at all to check the carnal nature. All things are ours, if we are Christ's. All things are given us for enjoyment, if only they are sanctified with prayer and thanksgiving. We are not called to any sort or kind of abstinence or fasting, except from murmuring and sin. Every pleasure we can find in life is freely ours, if only we can be truly thankful for it to our Heavenly Father.'

Is not this a surprise of preaching? Again we say that a preaching surprise which is only a surprise is less than nothing. But this is a surprise of truth. It is the teaching of St. Paul. 'There were Colossians and Ephesians in his time who thought it dangerous, and some will think so still. Must we not have laws and rules to tell us what is right and wrong, and act according to them? I answer that laws and rules have their use, but that we shall not find it out unless we set the spirit of thankfulness above them. Pharisees of all ages have tried another way of working laws and rules; and we know what it comes to. But by thankfulness I do not mean the Pharisee's thankfulness, that he is not as other men, or even as this publican. Nor do I mean the swindler's thankfulness: "Blessed be the Lord, for I am rich, and perhaps very charitable with my ill-gotten wealth." Words like these are mere selfishness, however they may sound like words of thankfulness. True thankfulness is from heaven, heavenly. It lights our souls with righteousness and peace and joy, and fills our hearts with love of God and of the sons of God for whom Christ's blood was shed.'

And it is truth that is as good as it is true. For 'consider what a guide of life this is. They know little of their own hearts or of the mind of Christ who look to laws and rules as their highest guide. The spirit of thankfulness is the sword of

God dividing right and wrong. Laws and rules may guide our outward actions, or more likely they will not even do that; but the spirit of thankfulness is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. If you have any doubt of the matter, try it for yourself. Take something which you know to be wrong, or something which you are making believe to be right; some unfair advantage over your neighbour, or something which is doing him harm; or something which is doing yourself harm in body or soul; or, if you like, something which is perfectly innocent, except that you are too fond of it. Take one of these, and try if you can receive it as God's gift, and truly thank Him for it. You will very soon find out that thankfulness is a test which searches far beyond the reach of laws and rules. Of course it is possible for you to deal deceitfully; but if you are indeed thankful, the rest of your duty will take care of itself. How can a man be anything else than pure and true and loving so long as his heart is overflowing with thankfulness for the gift of life in Christ?

'This, then, is the Christian life. It is a sacrifice as wholly devoted to God as any burnt-offering; but it is the living sacrifice of thanksgiving. This is the true communion with God. There was always something of wrath and torment in those lower sacrifices for sin which witness to our broken peace; but this is the sacrifice of perfect love, the sacrifice which is holy and well-pleasing to God. It is the Lord who humbled Himself to offer sacrifice for sin; and our work is to rejoice and be thankful for it evermore. Even the Jewish rabbis could rise above their beggarly elements when they said, All sacrifice has an end in the world to come, but the sacrifice of thanksgiving has no end. This is the proper sacrifice of the Church triumphant; and the meanest of us here is called of God to offer it along with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks to God through Jesus Christ our Lord.'