

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'WE continue this war to the end,' says Sir Edward GREY, 'in order that it may be an end of war.' 'When the war is over,' says Professor Émile BOUTROUX, 'we must continue watchful and ready for action, for months and years, for centuries even.'

The two statements are not contradictory. To be ready for action is not to be engaged in war. Some say that the readier a nation is to go to war the less likely is it that it will have to go. The experience of the past may not bear that out. But in any case the prospect of having to continue 'watchful and ready for centuries even' is appalling.

Professor BOUTROUX is speaking of France. He has written a book on German philosophy as it affects German character. And it is because the German character, as German philosophy has made it, is what it is that he calls upon France to continue watchful and ready. But what France has to do, we shall have to do also. Professor BOUTROUX'S book has been translated into English. Its title is *Philosophy and War* (Constable; 4s. 6d. net). We had better read it.

It has been our hope that if Germany is well beaten the world will be delivered from the fear of war. Professor BOUTROUX does not share

that hope. Some things may follow a great defeat. There may be an uprising of Socialism. There may even be a change of government in Germany. But the thing which above all other things we have been hoping for will not come to pass. Militarism in Germany will not be discredited. For the Germans believe that they have a God-given mission to the human race, and that they are sent to fulfil it by force.

Three things are clear to the German mind—German culture is a blessing; God has elected Germany to bestow that blessing on the world; the only means of bestowing it is by force of arms. These things are not only clear to the German mind, they are parts of the German character. An overwhelming defeat will make many changes at once. But character cannot be changed in a day. It was on the eve of Jena, the most humiliating defeat that ever a great nation suffered, that the supremacy of German culture and the mission of the German nation began to be publicly proclaimed. What a military disaster brought to the birth, a military disaster will not cause to perish.

A reliable scholar (he was partly trained in Scotland), and an arresting lecturer, is the Rev. Henry Sloane COFFIN, Associate Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. When

he lectures, he handles themes that are worthy—Religion, the Bible, Jesus Christ, God, the Cross, the New Life, the Church, the Life Everlasting. He believes that on all these themes he has something to say that has not been said before. For there have been movements of thought of late, and every one of them has brought new knowledge. With these movements he has made himself familiar. To his volume of lectures, which goes by the title of *Some Christian Convictions* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net), he has prefixed an Introduction in which he names 'Some Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century which have affected Christian Beliefs.'

The first movement is *Romanticism*. Romanticism is a literary movement, but it was influenced by the religious revival of the German pietists and the English evangelicals. It was a release of the emotions. It brought men into touch with a spiritual Presence in nature. It baptized them with a new sense of wonder. 'It quickened the imagination, and sent writers, like Sir Walter Scott, to make the past live again on the pages of historical novels. Sights and sounds became symbols of an inner Reality. Nature was to Emerson "an everlasting hint." And to Carlyle, who never tires of repeating that "the Highest cannot be spoken in words," all visible things were emblems, the universe and man symbols of the ineffable God.'

What new knowledge of the things of God did Romanticism bring us? It taught us that religion is something more and something deeper than belief and conduct, that it is an experience of our whole nature and cannot be finally expressed in terms of the intellect. Again, it taught us that God is immanent in His world. He does not break in upon our system of things by an occasional burst of miracle; He is active in everything that occurs. It is not that we cease to marvel at the feeding of five thousand with a few small loaves, it is that we learn to marvel at the feeding of innumerable multitudes with the 'daily bread' which is given to us 'this day.'

The next movement is called *Humanitarianism*. 'Beginning in the Eighteenth Century with its struggle for the rights of man, this movement has gone on to our own day, setting free the slaves, reforming our prisons, protesting against war and cruelty, protecting women and children from economic exploitation, and devoting itself to all that renders human beings healthier and happier.'

How has Humanitarianism affected religion? Chiefly by antagonism. Men believed in the total depravity of the human race; the humanitarians taught the belief that something Christlike was in every man and would repay encouragement. Men believed that the wicked would be tormented everlastingly in hell; the humanitarians taught that the everlasting torment of the wicked was the everlasting defeat of God. Men insisted 'that the Bible was throughout the Word of God, and that the commands to slaughter Israel's enemies attributed to Him, and the prayers for vengeance uttered by vindictive psalmists, were true revelations of His mind; and Humanitarianism refused to worship in the heavens a character less good than it was trying to produce in men on earth.'

Another movement is *Physical Science*. This has been the most powerful and the most fruitful movement of all. It has given us the acceptance of the unity of life, and of the universality of law. Over all the universe there is reliable order. It holds true of 'the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus' as of the laws of physical uniformity. At first law seemed to be slavery. Now it is known to be the sphere of freedom and the guarantee of freedom.

Physical science has given us other things besides that, though that is the greatest thing. It has given us the conception of development, and encouraged us to apply it in ethics and religion just as in 'the origin of species.' It has enlarged our thought of God. God is great, we now know, as we never dreamed of greatness before.

Closely following the work done by physical science came the *Critical Study of the Bible*. The result has been the 'discovery of the composite character of many books, the rearrangement of the Biblical literature in the probable order of its writing, and the use of the documents as historical sources, not so much for the periods they profess to describe, as for those in and for which they were written.'

What are the gains? These three: 'First there is the conception of revelation as progressive—a mode of thought that falls in with the idea of development or evolution.' Next there is 'the distinction between the Bible as literature, with the history, science, ethics, and theology of its age, and the religious experience of which it is the record, and in which we find the Self-disclosure of God.' And, third, there is the gain of a historical in place of a theological and mainly speculative Christ.

Once more, progress in religious knowledge has been won from *Psychology*. When psychologists began to turn their attention to religion they greatly altered the methods of Sunday School education; they directed the preacher to new and more effective methods of appeal; they tested the value of the materials employed in public worship. And they brought certain new elements into Christian thought.

Dr. COFFIN names two new gains. First came the surprise that such an experience as the new birth may be reduced to regularity and law, in spite of the word 'the wind bloweth where it listeth.' Next came the greater surprise that the new birth is nevertheless a fact of individual experience. A psychological literary critic, SAINTE BEUVE, writes: 'You may not cease to be a skeptic after reading Pascal; but you must cease to treat believers with contempt.' Finally, and most surprisingly of all, came the assurance that man may not only 'will to live,' but that he may also 'will to believe.'

Yet another movement is the study of *Comparative Religion*. The influence of the study of Comparative Religion is only slightly felt yet; it will be felt powerfully by and by. Is there anything that it has done already?

It has given us 'a much clearer apprehension of what is distinctive in Christianity, and a much more intelligent understanding of the completeness of its answer to religious needs which were partially met by other faiths.' It has also given us 'a new attitude towards the missionary problem, so that Christians go not to destroy but to fulfil, to recognize that in the existing religious experience of any people, however crude, God has already made some disclosure of Himself, that in the leaders and sages of their faith He has written a sort of Old Testament to which the Christian gospel is to be added, that men may come to their full selves as children of God in Jesus Christ.'

The last of all the great gains have come from the *Social Movement*. To the Social Movement Professor COFFIN attributes a new interest in religion; the discovery, or at least the conviction, that religion is essentially social; the value of Church membership, as the most immediate and extensive way of realizing the social character of religion; and a new credible interpretation of certain Christian doctrines.

Of the Christian doctrines newly and more credibly interpreted the chief is the Atonement. No longer is the doctrine of the Atonement expressed in the language of pure substitution. He who gives His life is one of us. He suffers for His own kith and kin. He suffers as their representative. 'Partaker of the human name,' He carries the human race with Him, in Him, down to the death; He carries them with Him again from the dead. And the share of each one in the Atonement is his by faith, not in an act accomplished, but in a Brother who accomplished it.

Dr. Hastings RASHDALL delivered the Haskell Lectures in the Theological Seminary of Oberlin College, during the autumn of 1913. He has now published them, with the title of *Conscience and Christ* (Duckworth; 5s. net).

The title is appropriate to the present time. So also are the lectures, though they were delivered before the war broke out. For the question which Dr. RASHDALL discusses is how far Christ is to be taken as authority for the modern conscience.

The question has scarcely been raised yet. For it is a remarkable fact that with all their perplexity over the 'conscientious objector,' the tribunals have rarely if ever raised the question of Christ's authority over the conscience. Some of them have accepted it. The most of them have ignored it. But if they could have challenged it, their position would certainly have been stronger—for the moment.

But we may depend upon it that their perplexity will yet lead some members of these tribunals to consider whether the authority of Christ has the determining word. And we had better be prepared for it. For as soon as these men of the world look round them they will find plenty of literature in which the moral authority of Christ is rejected. Dr. RASHDALL is no advocate of authority in morals or religion, in Church or in State. If Christ has moral authority for him it must be because His teaching is morally sound and workable. What has he to say about the moral teaching of Christ?

He has read the literature, and he has gathered together all the objections to the moral teaching of Christ which he can find.

The first objection is that it lays exaggerated emphasis on the value of self-sacrifice. Well, Dr. RASHDALL believes that self-sacrifice *has* been exaggerated. It was exaggerated by Tolstoi. When Tolstoi counted it inconsistent with Christian principles to refuse relief under any circum-

stances to a beggar, he carried the principle of self-sacrifice too far.

What, then, is the rule? The rule, says Dr. RASHDALL, is 'Love your neighbour as yourself'—not more than yourself. That was the rule of Christ, and He obeyed it. 'I do not deny that there may have been occasions when our Lord might have said "Give" when a wider consideration of social consequences would induce us to say "Withhold"; but I do not think there is any precept of His which is inconsistent with the interpretation which I have attempted to put upon them when they are understood with the same allowance for possible exceptions or complementary principles which we should make in interpreting any other moral teacher of any age or country.'

The next objection is that Christ's principles of non-resistance, submissiveness, meekness are inconsistent with manly self-respect. Dr. RASHDALL does not believe that these principles are for all men or for all occasions. Jesus was addressing His own followers, and He was referring to their conduct as private individuals towards one another. Non-resistance has stood the test of time. It has done more for human progress than any application of force. Meekness has been more mighty than self-assertion. But Dr. RASHDALL does not believe that Christ excluded the possibility of cases in which some kind of resentment is best, both for the individual himself and in the interests of society.

'Sometimes literal forgiveness, in the sense of remission of penalty, will be best; sometimes resentment; at other times some combination of the two. Resentment may take a great variety of forms: it may be a rebuke, a protest, the mere showing that we are hurt, renunciation of friendship or diminution of intimacy or a change of manner. At other times the protection of society may make self-defence a duty, and self-defence may sometimes take the form of giving blow for blow, though in

a civilized and orderly society for obvious reasons no one should take the law into his own hands (to use the common phrase) except for some very good reason, and on very exceptional occasions. At other times the resentment that is called for will take the form of legal prosecution. In no case, be it remembered, is the duty of forgiveness entirely abrogated by the duty of resentment.'

The third criticism of Christ's teaching which Dr. RASHDALL notices has to do with the possession of property. He teaches, it is said, a kind of Communism or complete renunciation in the matter of worldly goods. The criticism is founded chiefly on the words: 'If thou wouldest be perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor' (Mt 19²¹).

Now here, as before, it must not be forgotten that Christ was speaking to His own. And not only was He speaking to His own, He was speaking in reference to special circumstances in which they would be placed. 'He did not mean merely that they should accept His teaching and endeavour to practise it in their lives. He was calling upon certain of His disciples to devote themselves to His great missionary enterprise, to join Him in going about the world to preach the coming of the Kingdom.' It was manifest to Him, and it would soon be manifest to them, that under these circumstances wealth would be no help but a hindrance. Going, as He bade them, with nothing for their journey save a staff only, no bread, no wallet, no money in their purse, they acknowledged not only that they had lacked nothing, but that they had been most amazingly prosperous.

The call upon the rich young ruler to sell all that he had and give to the poor was not a call to the world to have nothing to do with 'filthy lucre.' It was a call to this young man to show that he loved Christ sufficiently to enable him to take his place among the missionaries of the Kingdom.

The last word under which Christ's teaching has been rejected is Asceticism. Dr. RASHDALL cannot understand it. Christ never taught asceticism and never practised it. John the Baptist, perhaps, but not Jesus. The hardships which He endured and enjoined upon others were the hardships that were incidental to His mission and His work: their motive was simply love of His fellow-men. There is not the slightest trace of the idea that self-inflicted suffering is well-pleasing to God, or that it possesses any expiatory virtue for the doing away of sin, or that all innocent enjoyment is wrong. There is not even any encouragement of voluntary suffering, in the shape, for instance, of fasting, as a means of disciplining or strengthening character.

There is not the least likelihood that any swift transformation will take place after the war in our public worship. There is great enough demand for it. And there is great enough need for it. But the change that comes will come gradually—here a little 'give,' and there a little 'take.' The war may alter our forms of public worship so greatly that the next generation, or the generation after, will wonder that there was any church-going at all in our day. But it will be done so imperceptibly that few of us will ever be able to say, Lo, here! or lo there!

Why should the war demand any change? Because 'the men at the front' say that they wish to go to church but cannot go to church as it now is. That is one reason. Another reason is that other men and good citizens, as well as the men at the front, have ceased to go to church. Let us hear what Canon STREETER has to say.

Canon B. H. STREETER is one of the authors of a book entitled *Concerning Prayer* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). It is a book containing fourteen essays, which—some closely, some rather remotely—have all to do with prayer. It is not by any means an ideal exposition of the theory or the practice of prayer. The simple worshipper will soon find

himself in the dry and barren wilderness of philosophical speculation. But he must be brought back to the title. *Concerning Prayer* is the title, and concerning prayer there is a most unusual amount of thought in the book—fresh, helpful, suggestive thought. One or two of the essays have been written by Canon STREETER. In the essay entitled 'Worship' he speaks about going to church.

'It used to be taken for granted,' he says, 'that a man or a woman who is endeavouring to live a moral life would, as a matter of course, go to some place of worship at least once on a Sunday, and some of the old-fashioned church-going was accordingly of a more or less hypocritical character. People who cared only for appearances went to church because they wanted to be thought respectable. That is no longer the case—but why? For the simple reason that so many of those who are really trying to live well, and who do not care for appearances, have ceased to go. In morals and religion those who care for reality are the first to abandon any practice or observance from which they do not derive spiritual nutriment: twenty years later those who wish to be thought to care follow their lead.'

But that does not seem to be a cause; it seems to be only a fashion. *Why* have 'those who care for reality' abandoned the habit of attending public worship? Canon STREETER tells us that people of all kinds have ceased to attend public worship because they will no longer submit to being bored. 'They have come to regard public worship, which is the most conspicuous external symbol of religion, as a tedious and unnecessary discipline rather than as a natural expression and satisfaction of religious needs.'

What are we to do, then? Canon STREETER suggests that we might study Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Out of that 'and other well-known works' we might obtain a Philosophy and a Psychology of public worship. But how will that meet the

demands of the men at the front and of those other persons who 'care for reality'? It will not meet them at all. Canon STREETER sees that it will not. 'What is wanted is a way of approaching the subject which, without neglecting the thought and experience of the past, will take a less departmental, a less apologetic, a more comprehensive, and a more scientific view of the whole problem.'

Canon STREETER offers 'some First Principles.' And the first 'First Principle' is this. In our public worship we must cease obtruding our sinfulness before God and man. We have too much to say in public about our sins. We must stop that. And as a corollary we must cease imploring God's forgiveness. He is quite willing to forgive. We do not need to beseech Him and entreat Him so earnestly and so often. We must give up the idea that God has any reluctance whatever to forgive us our sins, and simply take His readiness to forgive as forgiveness.

What do you think of that? At first sight it has a suspicious resemblance to Sir Oliver LODGE's remark that the men and women of our day have ceased to worry about their sins. If it is so, God help the men and women of our day. But Canon STREETER does not mean that. What he means is that we ought to accept God's word more frankly and more faithfully than we do. He is a God who delights in pardon. If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. The very confession of them may be overdone *in public*—it *is* overdone in nearly all our liturgies. And the prayer for the forgiveness of them may be so long and so agonizing that it gives the impression of a God from whom pardon must be wrung as the widow wrung her right from the unjust judge, by sheer wearying.

The second 'First Principle' is that in all our public worship the minister or priest, the preacher or evangelist, must keep himself more out of sight. 'It is not their business to say, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" but merely to open

the ears of men to the Divine voice which says, "Come ye to the waters," and to direct the eyes of the thirsty towards the rushing stream, leaving it to them spontaneously to drink. Paul may plant, Apollos may water, but it is God who gives the increase; and the increase is a free spontaneous growth of the individual soul into receptivity and responsiveness towards the Divine. Personality and individuality are to be guided and stimulated, not crushed or dominated, whether it be by the boisterous intrusion of the forceful personality of an evangelistic tub-thumper or by the rigid discipline of a too cut-and-dried system of doctrine or a rigid scheme of devotion. Preacher and priest should take as their model the kindergarten teacher, not the Prussian drill-sergeant.'

But the third of Canon STREETER'S 'First Principles' is his real contribution. Public worship must be common worship. It must be the worship of a community. No one must be allowed to say that he or she can enjoy alone and outside that which can be enjoyed within the sanctuary and in the felt fact of the communion of Saints. Now this must be brought about. It does not come of itself. 'When a multitude is swayed by a wave of contrition, supplication, or thankfulness, every individual in it has his own perception, feeling, and capacity indefinitely enhanced. But, on the other hand, when the majority are listless or inattentive, it is doubly difficult for the minority to make their own prayers or praises a reality. No student of the psychology of attention is surprised to find that experience teaches that a congregation which is "bored" simply *cannot* worship.'

How is congregational boredom to be prevented? The 'short bright service' has been tried. Canon STREETER does not ridicule 'the short bright service.' He admits that 'in too many cases it has only succeeded in being short and bright, not in being also a serious religious service. Failures and imperfect successes, however, are inevitable in the earlier stages of every movement, and it is undoubtedly true that many individuals,

by trying experiments and working by rule of thumb methods, have evolved various types of occasional services which in their hands have proved to be extraordinarily successful.'

In short, Canon STREETER recommends, as his last and best recommendation, just the short bright service. So, he says, does every man who has to listen more than to preach. This is his contribution. If the results of recent practical experiments in the holding of short bright services 'could be brought into conscious and explicit relation to the study both of the psychology of attention and of the philosophy of the nature of worship, we might hope to establish certain general principles which would guide the Church as a whole towards very necessary reforms.'

Now there may be no limit to the brightness of the service, but surely there must be some limit to its shortness. The limit is determined by the acts that have to be got into it.

It must contain certain acts of prayer. And in these acts there must be the utmost possible variety. Adoration, confession, petition, intercession, thanksgiving—all must find a place. And that all may find a place each must be very short. 'He that attempts to pray too long ceases to pray at all. What is wanted, as St. Augustine pointed out, is not length but intensity: *non multa locutio sed multa precatio.*'

And there must be room for silence. This is a new demand. Canon STREETER makes it emphatically. 'The explicit recognition of the value of silence is the great contribution to religion of the Society of Friends, and in an age of rush and tumble many feel strongly drawn to the infinite quietness and simplicity of the Quaker Meeting.' Canon STREETER does not commend the Quaker Meeting to imitation altogether, at least not yet. 'It would be disastrous suddenly to spring long intervals of silence upon a congregation not familiar with its use.' But 'intervals of silence in which

individuals can think specially of their own or their friends' needs, or in which the whole body is invited simply to wait upon God, are a vital necessity.'

Again, there must be room for Symbolism. What is Symbolism? It is the repetition of certain words which are symbolic, and it is the repetition of certain symbolic acts. Symbolic words are, for example, the Lord's Prayer. Others are the statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, by which we suppose Canon STREETER means that we ought occasionally to repeat some creed. Symbolic acts are such as the Holy Communion.

Last of all, there must be room for preaching. Canon STREETER would not leave *much* room for preaching. He does not deny that good preaching will fill a church more speedily than anything else. Still he thinks that in the ordinary service there is too much talking and too little opportunity for quiet and meditation. He does not demand much space for preaching, but he would have it occupied well. And that it may be well occupied he strongly urges the advantage of courses of sermons over 'isolated efforts.' 'A connected series on any subject by a man of quite moderate ability will make far more permanent impression than an equal number of isolated sermons by a brilliant speaker.'

'The Things which Jesus did.'

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. JAMES HOPE MOULTON, D.LIT., D.D., D.C.L., UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

'There are a great many other things that Jesus did—so many that if these are all written down I think the whole world will not be large enough to hold the books as they are written.'—Jn 21²⁵.

'THIS is, of course, a specimen of Eastern extravagance,' we begin to say. If it is, there is plenty with which to compare it in the Bible. Some people forget that the Book was written in the style as well as in the language of the country that gave it birth. The Jews liked forcible and vivid pictures, and never thought it overdone when the colours were what we should call much too strong. Jesus Himself spoke in their style, and we have to translate His style into our own, just as much as we must translate His language into English or Urdu, if we wish to know what He meant. He wanted to describe an utter impossibility—to man, though not to God. He compared it to putting a camel through a needle's eye. We should have been content with a 'cable.' He describes a man offering to help his brother to get a speck of dust out of his eye, and all the time he has a great baulk of timber in his own! For our style a 'splinter' would have been quite enough. He tells us that if we had faith as big as a mustard seed we could order a mountain to uproot itself and be replanted in the sea. We should have composed a tame

sentence to the effect that 'Faith can remove any obstacle, however great.'

Is this verse an example of the same kind? Let us look and see.

It does not need much thought to realize that we have only a very brief life of Jesus in these four little Books which we call the 'Good News.' As they stand, they could all be printed in one issue of some of our big Western newspapers. And there are so many duplicates—things told over again in two of the Gospels, in three, or even all four. Set this against the fullness of that life, as the Gospels themselves describe it. We hear of days when He was too busy to snatch a meal. From dawn till sunset He was teaching His disciples, teaching the crowd, talking to some single soul that needed Him, healing diseases of body and mind. And when the long day was over He often took His rest in hours of prayer. Nor was this all. What about those thirty years of which we have only one story—the years when He was a baby, a school-boy, a carpenter working in Joseph's shop, among villagers who never dreamt what He was? Was all this not worth telling? Why, the full story of one ordinary day out of those thirty quiet years would help you and me to live for God and man better than all the philosophy ever written. If a