
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 *Aspects of the Way*, by Mr. A. D. Martin, of which there is a notice in another column, not the least penetrating of the studies is that on 'His Cup.' In a single sentence our Lord once referred both to His cup and to His baptism. Both of the references are figurative; but the figures are such that they give us at least a glimpse into the mind of Jesus on His passion. 'The cup that I drink, ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized.'

It was to James and John that Jesus spoke these words. In their ignorance they had asked that they might share the Master's glory. In His veiled way the Master told them that they who would reign with Him must first drink His cup and be baptized with His baptism. Sobered perhaps, but undismayed, they said, 'We are able'; and Jesus, who knew better than they what their words meant, acknowledged that they were able.

At the Last Supper a little more light was given. 'He took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank of it.' The Cup was His blood of the covenant, shed for many. A little later, in Gethsemane, the two disciples were to learn yet more about His Cup; or rather the three disciples; for now Peter was with them, and Peter too had said, 'I am able': 'If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee.'

What was the Cup of Jesus? We have learned afresh—Wernle for one has been our teacher—how deep in Old Testament scripture were the roots of Jesus' piety and Jesus' thought of God. What does 'the cup' mean in the Old Testament? At least three times out of four it means the cup of the wrath of God. This, then, it seems reasonable to infer, was the cup which Jesus put to His lips so reluctantly, from which He shrank so earnestly.

'The wrath of God' is a phrase with which Paul has made us familiar; but these anthropomorphisms have their danger. God's wrath is not the righteous indignation of an offended monarch. The God of whom we speak is He 'of whom, and through whom, and unto whom are all things.' The world is God's world; to sin is to go against the constitution of things. God's wrath is the reaction of the world against our way of life, the reaction most of all of that which is Divine in ourselves.

Mr. Martin aptly quotes the reply of Arthur Dimmesdale (in 'The Scarlet Letter') when Hester parried his question 'Hast thou found peace?' with the counter question 'Hast thou?' 'Were I an atheist, a man devoid of conscience, a wretch with coarse and brutal instincts, I might have found peace long ere now. Nay, I should never have lost it! But, as matters stand with my soul, whatever

of good capacity there originally was in me, all of God's gifts that were the choicest have become the ministers of spiritual torment. Hester, I am most miserable.'

But a man need not drink this cup alone. It is a commonplace that our sins involve in suffering innocent people whom we do not even know. The Old Testament rises to the strange thought that our sins have consequences even for God. 'Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins.' As Professor J. E. McFadyen has put it (on Is 43^{24}), instead of Israel serving God 'she had, by reason of her sins, made him serve her, her guilt imposing upon him the burden of punishing her by exile, and the task of restoring her again.'

Whatever the Cup of Jesus was, it was certainly not fear of physical death. Jesus had braved the wrath of man too often to be afraid now. A recent writer spoke of Jesus being 'trapped in Jerusalem.' Surely the whole story testifies that in one respect Jesus did not go as a lamb to the slaughter. He went deliberately, knowing what awaited Him. His Father had given Him the Cup to drink and He would drink it.

Even we, with our sensibilities blunted, as those of Jesus were not, by familiarity with life's lower levels, can see enough even in the immediate circumstances to account for His horror of the Cup. He may have cherished, almost till the last, the hope that the Temple would become once more God's house of prayer. Now He knew that the day was coming when stone would be torn from stone, knew that that was its fate because the guardians of the Temple had yielded to the temptation which Jesus had resisted so strenuously; they put the Jewish kingdom before God's kingdom.

The story of Jesus' relations with Judas is passed over almost in silence by the gospel tradition; we can guess that Judas' treachery played a large part in the filling up of the Cup. That the crowd should turn against Him was perhaps no great marvel to one who knew human nature in its surface moods as well as in the depths of its possibilities. The point at which we feel we have reached a region where our scales and measuring-rods cannot help us, is when we try to fathom what it meant to the pure spirit of Jesus, no longer merely to foresee, but to realize with all the bitterness of actual experience, that when God's Son enters the world and does the works of God, the world's answer is the thong and the jeer, the crown of thorns and the cross.

In the Cup that Jesus drank during those last hours there was one element peculiarly perplexing and distressing, an experience that has dismayed others who have tried to live their lives in the spirit in which He lived His. When Moses first began to work for the redemption of his people, the disheartening thing was not so much that his efforts failed, but that his very attempt to alleviate their lot resulted only in increasing their burdens. Besides doing their day's 'darg' of bricks as before, they now had to find their own materials as well.

When David Livingstone began to try to heal the open sore of Africa, the first result of his labour was to facilitate the operations of the slave-dealers. The missionaries who went out to support Livingstone drooped and died; the slave-dealers drove their prisoners down those very roads which Livingstone had hoped would be pathways to the redemption of the bondsmen.

If the work of Jesus produced a Peter, a John, a Magdalene, it provided a stage also for a Herod, a Pilate, a Caiaphas. 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin.' But for Jesus, Judas might have lived a respectable life and died a commonplace death. Is there not something of this feeling in the curious explanation of the parable method that Mark puts into the mouth of Jesus? 'For the outsiders everything is put in parabolic form, so that they may see without perceiving, and hear without understanding, in case they turn and find forgiveness.' Verily the waters of a full cup were wrung out to Him.

Thus did Jesus at the end of His ministry stand on one side with sinful men over against the holy God; even as at the beginning of His ministry He joined the multitudes that went to the baptism of John for the remission of sins. Hence the cry from the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'

Did Jesus Himself realize at that moment that in His dereliction, when He felt that God was hiding His face, He was Himself the supreme revelation of God who bears our sins on His heart? The writer to the Hebrews found a kind of foreshadowing of the sacrifice of Jesus in the slaughter of helpless animals. Its true Old Testament analogue is in the cry of sacrificial father-love, 'Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!' The cup of Jesus has now become

the Holy Cup
With all its wreathen steps of passion-flowers
And quivering sparkles of the ruby stars.

Last year Professor J. M. SHAW delivered six Lectures at the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh. These have now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (for review see 'Literature'). The Lectures all deserve the most careful attention. The subject of the second Lecture is 'Fatherhood and Prayer.' Professor SHAW is very well aware that true prayer is more than petition, but in this lecture he confines himself to petitionary prayer, and deals with the possibility and the reasonableness of asking not only for spiritual benefits but also material ones in a world which is 'governed by law.'

How can petitionary prayer be efficacious if we are living under a system of law which is really a rigid, closed, mechanical system bound together by the iron bands of natural law? If this were a true description of the world, Professor SHAW agrees that petitionary prayer could not be efficacious in any real sense, although it might have a subjective influence. But it is not a true description.

Modern scientific and philosophical thought is increasingly realizing and insisting that nature is rather a living, moving, growing organism, existing only in a spiritual context and controlled and energized for spiritual ends. What is meant, then, by 'uniformity of nature' is that the world is governed according to law in the sense that the same cause is found to be uniformly followed by the same effect. 'In a more definite Christian phraseology, the principle of the uniformity of nature is the expression of the stability of God's method working in nature.' 'It is the very "grammar of the love of God," not the operation of an external mechanical necessity to be accepted with resignation.'

But there is a further point to be borne in mind. It is that 'this system of law which we speak of as nature is not all one homogeneous piece. There are different strata, different grades or levels in it, each subject to laws proper to its own order, and descriptive of its own distinctive or characteristic modes of behaviour or procedure. Three chief grades or levels in this system are usually distinguished.' They are the inorganic, the organic, and, third, the order of intelligence. In this scale of orders each lower order is 'not a rigid, closed or self-contained system but is open to control or modification, because utilization, by the order or orders above.' The system of nature is not subjection to the ends of personality, and the evidence of that, as Carlyle observed, is that I can freely stretch out my hand. The system of laws which we speak of as our bodies we utilize freely for personal ends, and the very condition of our being able to use them is that they are stable and uniform.

And so the more we learn or discover the laws of nature, the more controllable nature becomes to the ends of personal will. To illustrate. 'An ocean liner with hundreds of lives on board is in imminent peril in mid-Atlantic, rendered helpless and out of control by the angry storm. Once that liner must have been left to its own helplessness, or to the limited resources of its own provision. But through

the discovery in recent days of more of the system of nature's laws, the mind of man has learned to manipulate natural forces in a new way, so that now appeal for help can be sent out by "wireless," across the distances, in answer to which appeal great ships change their courses and hurry to the place of danger.'

If it is true, then, that man is able more and more with advancing knowledge of nature's laws to use them for ends of personal value, can we set any limits to the sphere of God's working in answer to prayer? 'Who would be so rash as to attempt to set bounds to the possibilities of the working of Him who in His activities in the world is limited, not by any obstacles or hindrances outside of Himself, as man is, but only by such conditions as proceed from His own character as wise and holy Love, and whom, therefore, we call our Almighty Heavenly Father?'

But there is a further point. Prayer is not only possible in a world of law but it is rationally necessary. 'That God, being the God He is, namely, our Heavenly Father who has created the universe at the first and controls and governs it chiefly for moral and spiritual ends with His children, has provided in His universe of law a place for prayer, and further makes the bestowal of His blessings on ourselves and others dependent on prayer—this, when we consider it, so far from being arbitrary or strange, is in line with God's method everywhere. It is, indeed, itself a case of law.' It is one illustration of a law of God's working that God, being essentially and centrally Father, conditions the bestowal of His blessings on the co-operation with Him of His children. This is true in the field of scientific discovery. God 'does not blazon His truth on the skies, so that man has only to open his eyes to see it. Only when men give themselves to intellectual labour and toil is God given a chance to bestow His blessings of truth on the world for our own and others' good.'

'Just as in the natural world unless men work, and as in the intellectual world unless men think, God cannot bestow His gifts: so in the moral and spiritual world unless men pray, God is not given the opportunity for the bestowal of His chiefest blessings on men.'

And if we ask why this is so, the answer is that God's chief concern is the development of character. If in the intellectual world God were to bestow His gifts of truth without our having to exercise our brains, where were the opportunity for the development of the intellectual side of our being?

So then to the question, 'Can prayer count in a world of law?' Professor Shaw's reasoned reply is: 'Yes, prayer can and does count, just because the world in which we live is a world of law, and because Love, Father-love, is "creation's final law." Because this is so, as Dora Greenwell says in one of her Essays, "Prayer is itself one of these laws, upon whose working God has determined that a certain result shall follow."'

The New Psychology has made rapid strides of recent years, and its application to Religion has been fruitfully discussed in Principal Selbie's 'Psychology of Religion.' It was inevitable that its methods and discoveries should be tested upon the field of Biblical religion. Suggestive contributions to this discussion have been made by Joyce in 'The Inspiration of Prophecy,' and more recently by Principal H. Wheeler Robinson in an article on 'The Psychology and Metaphysic of "Thus saith Yahweh"' in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* for 1923. Now comes a book, small indeed, but full of matter, by Major J. W. Povah, B.D., on *The New Psychology and the Bible* (Longmans; 1s.).

It is an unconventional book, racily written and abounding in fresh things, pictorially put. The very first page, for example, strikingly compares the body—flesh animated by spirit—to the Indian

'dust devil,' the spiral column of dust whirled along by the wind, which collapses into its pristine indistinguishable dust the moment the wind drops. The spirit of Yahweh, by which man is animated, is, like the wind, the mysterious, miraculous, capricious, incalculable thing.

It is also the abnormal thing. The desert dust in repose represents normality; it is the wind that disturbs this and creates the unanticipated thing. So 'every striking psychological abnormality is associated with the Ruach and ascribed to the direct action of Yahweh.' When the normal man becomes abnormal, like Samson with his amazing feats of strength, like Gideon or Jephthah with their gifts of courage and leadership, like Samuel's 'Mad Mullahs' with their religious frenzy, or like Sennacherib when he lost his nerve before Jerusalem, it is because the Spirit of Yahweh has leaped upon him or taken possession of him.

Thus 'What we call the incalculable outcroppings of the unconscious—whether outcroppings of goodness or wickedness, of sanity or insanity, of morale or panic—are all ascribed to the Ruach of Yahweh.' But clearly here there is a peril for religion pure and undefiled. Are all 'inspirations' of equal value? Is Elijah when he massacres his opponents in cold blood, and is Elisha when he instigates a blood-thirsty revolution, as 'inspired' as in those other acts of their career of which the modern conscience approves?

The prophetic historians J and E felt the difficulty, and they partially solved it by recognizing degrees of inspiration. In the famous passage Nu 12^{6-8} a distinction is drawn between the fragmentary methods of dream and vision and 'the constant intercourse, the constantly renewed conversation,' which such a one as Moses may have, 'mouth to mouth,' with Yahweh. Micaiah ben-Imlah goes further and distinguishes between true and false inspiration (1 K 22). The false prophets are indeed inspired, but Yahweh Himself has deceived them. It is a terrible theology, yet the psychology it implies marks an advance. 'Not all the out-cropping of the unconscious, not all that passes for inspiration, is true.' And a further advance is made in the story of Elijah (1 K 19), which suggests that the violent outcroppings of the unconscious may not be inspirations at all, for it is in 'the sound of a low whisper' that Yahweh speaks to those who really listen to Him.

But here, as in so many other matters, the supreme advance is made by the literary prophets. Amos draws a clear and sharp distinction between the genuine inspiration of Yahweh and inspiration falsely so called ($3^{7f.}$ $7^{14f.}$), and this advance in psychology is accompanied by a corresponding advance in Ethics and Theology.

It is upon Hosea, however, that Major POVAH spends his main strength. Only a month or two ago he gave us a fresh translation of that prophet, which was published by the National Adult School Union, and in terms of the New Psychology he has given us a strikingly modern interpretation of Hosea's mind, which more than justifies him in describing Hosea as 'a great psychologist.' Here, as in much else, he anticipates Jeremiah.

Major POVAH rightly begins by calling attention to 'the immense importance which Hosea attaches to the sex instinct.' That is surely very modern. Hosea is a great psychologist because he is a great lover. His call, his apprehension of Yahweh's character, his description of the national apostasy, are all expressed in terms of this fundamental instinct. This instinct is no more to be despised as unworthy or irrelevant to the higher life than any other instinct: what it needs is not suppression but sublimation, whether in the case of Gomer or Israel or ourselves. 'For genuine Hebrew thought does not suspect the instincts. The instincts are the gift of Yahweh.' Earlier in the discussion Major POVAH had suggestively transformed the phrase 'a living soul' into 'an animal with instincts.'

It is not man's instincts that are wrong, it is his intellect—of which, to the Hebrew, the heart is the seat. The people are stupid, they 'do not know Yahweh' (5^4). But whose fault is that? It is their own; for the clause immediately before this runs, 'they are obsessed by lust for fornication.' Thus their failure is at bottom moral rather than intellectual; and it is in the effort to explain that here we are not really caught in a circular argument that Major POVAH says some of the most arresting things in his book.

Starting from the remarkable passage, 'Ephraim's iniquity is bound up, his error is hidden,' he explains that this is exactly what the New Psychology would call a 'buried complex.' The sin is 'repressed' and hidden from consciousness, and it can never be healed until it is brought out and faced. The trouble with Ephraim is that, 'like Peter Pan, he won't grow up.' The ultimate iniquity is the refusal to face the living God—'Let not God speak with us, lest we die.' This is also the supreme folly, for God is the great reality. To repress the thought of Him is to stumble at every step on the path of life. Hosea's treatment of this idea of 'stumbling over one's iniquity' (5^5), in which he anticipates the very words of Jung in his 'Psychology of the Unconscious,' stamps him as a master psychologist. Until the thing repressed into unconsciousness is brought out and faced, it remains there a perpetual stumbling-block over which one inevitably trips.

So the 'buried complex' must be resolved, and for this 'man needs a psychotherapist.' Here follows a brief but suggestive discussion of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, who 'bears away the error of many by enabling them to face it.' 'It is clear that to the author of the "Servant Songs" man needs something to be done for him which he cannot do for himself.' This something is thus described by Major POVAH: 'By bearing our perversions, the Servant of Yahweh cures our complex.' If this sounds almost distressingly modern, it at least helps us to understand the psychological as well as the ethical insight of the Hebrew prophets. They at any rate faced reality, if men ever did. And so it is not perhaps too much to claim for the New Psychology that it has 'rediscovered the gospel.'

A most interesting little book has been written by the Rev. W. Emery BARNES, D.D., on *Early Christians at Prayer*, 1–400 A.D., with a chapter on 'Early Prayers for the Departed' (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net). The chief aim of the book is to give specimen Christian prayers uttered under various conditions and needs. There are chapters on 'Prayer in the Old Testament' and 'Prayer in the New Testament,' early liturgical prayers, prayers in face of persecution, prayers of great Christian teachers, and 'Early Christian Teaching concerning Prayer.' Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Origen, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen are all represented. There is a great deal of sound scholarship in the book, and many enlightening reflections on the nature of prayer, and the book as a whole illustrates in a striking way the course of God's progressive education of man.

One of the most interesting chapters is on the Lord's Prayer. At the present time it has become pre-eminently a form for public use. In the Book of Common Prayer it occurs sixteen or seventeen times. But in the earliest days it stood in a different position. The first disciples still used the Temple prayers in their public devotions. 'They continued stedfastly with one accord in the Temple . . . praising God.' But they desired to be taught by Jesus to pray as He prayed, as it was the way of religious seekers in the East to follow closely the religious practices of their leader.

St. Luke tells us how the prayer was originally given. It is true the First Gospel gives it as part of the Sermon on the Mount. But it is unlikely that so intimate a devotion would first be recited

and cried aloud on a hillside to thousands of listeners. And we know that while Luke narrates the actual occasions of our Lord's teaching, Matthew tends to group the teachings irrespective of occasion. Matthew inserts the *Paternoster* as an illustration of the point Jesus is making about avoiding many words in prayer. The prayer which Jesus taught, then, was of a private character. It is, indeed, social: 'After this manner pray ye,' but that means 'Pray ye, each one of you, after this manner.'

The prayer has come down to us in two recensions. At first the difference between the two seems large, but this is hardly the case in fact. The additions in Matthew are explanations and are not unwanted. The prayer in Luke's version cries out for some expansion. *E.g.* the startling petition 'Bring us not into temptation' refuses to be left standing alone as Luke leaves it. We may pray that our life's road may not run through the valley of Temptation, but we need to pray also that when we are in the valley we may be delivered from Apollyon. And in Matthew we have this necessary addition.

It may be asked: What, then, is the value of the shorter version? The answer is twofold. For one thing, the existence of two versions shows us that our Lord does not tie us to one form of words. He gave us in the *Paternoster* a spirit that can be expressed in more than one form. The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. Further, the Lord's Prayer is surely meant to be the centre, not the circumference, of our devotions. In Luke's form we have the bare centre, in Matthew's it is already reaching outwards to include the fuller thoughts to which it must needs give occasion. This fullness of meaning can only be learned by experience, and the prayer must be used for a lifetime to have its rich content understood.

The structure of the prayer is suggestive. There are two sections, each characterized by the use of its own pronoun. In the first section the pronoun is 'thy': thy name, thy kingdom, thy will. In the second the pronoun is 'us': give us, forgive us, lead us, deliver us. This contrast is illuminating. In the second section we ask boons for ourselves. Such petitions are allowed by the Divine Teacher as a necessary part of prayer. But since it is God our Father with whom we have to do, asking does not come first, at least in the pattern Christian prayer. For us submission and adoration must come before asking.

Indeed, submission is the leading note in both sections of the prayer. There is complete submission in the petition 'thy kingdom come,' the submission of a subject to a king. The same attitude is found in the petition for bread: 'Give us to-day *our loaf*.' It is a request for a minimum, just for the satisfying of the elementary need of man. The words will not stretch to cover any desire for luxuries or for wealth. Jerome translates the epithet in the phrase just given 'supersubstantial bread.' But that is impossible. The general sense of it is 'the usual bread.' The special sense may be 'bread for the day which is just beginning,' or, 'bread which falleth to us in the circumstances in which we are.' We ask for the loaf which is our portion for the day, leaving it to our Father to add more, if He will.

The same note of submission is found in the next clause: 'Forgive us our debts.' We come as debtors to God, not having wherewith to pay. And still more in the clause: 'Bring us not into temptation.' Here is the confession that we are not our own guides. We are led through life. This deep submission of man to God is alien from much of the religious thought of the present day which emphasizes the immanence of God in Nature and in man. But the nearness of God does not exclude His greatness. The Lord's Prayer allows both. Before we finish the prayer we learn that we are in the presence not of 'Our Father' only, but of One who is both God and Father.