

# 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.

A BOOK has been issued from the Swarthmore Press with the title of *A Conflict of Opinion* (6s. net). It contains, as the title-page tells us, 'A Discussion on the Failure of the Church.' There have been many discussions on 'the Failure of the Church.' Even the Bishops have been choosing 'the Failure of the Church' as the subject of their Visitation Charges. But this is different from all the rest. The author is Mr. ARTHUR PONSONBY, formerly Member of Parliament for the Stirling Burghs.

It is a discussion between a Parson and a Doctor. The Parson is a well-informed, conscientious, progressive Churchman. The Doctor is greatly respected: 'I know all about your work; how you have devoted your life to it, not with a view to riches and fame which lay easily within your grasp, but simply out of the most exalted desire for service—a service I know you have often rendered while refusing any remuneration whatever for it.' And he is religious. But he does not go to church.

Why does he not go to church? The Parson calls upon him. 'I have called to see you because, although we have exchanged formal visits, I have now been three months in the parish, and I notice you do not attend the services in our church.' It is not a hopeful beginning. But the discussion is renewed next day. It goes on for a week. At

the end a concession is made by the Doctor. 'Good-bye. . . . Look here. I shall slip in by the South porch into that back pew just for the sermon.'

There are many objections to attendance at 'the services in our church.' But most of them are frivolous and easily overcome. Three remain. They are all theological. The Doctor does not believe in miracle, atonement, or original sin.

Mr. PONSONBY'S Doctor is the average educated layman. That is the educated layman's attitude, at least if he has had a scientific education. He accepts Matthew Arnold's dictum: 'Miracles do not occur.' They never did occur. The order of nature has always been what it is now. Miracles cannot occur. But why should he reject the Atonement? There are laymen, like the late Professor Silvanus Thompson, who detest the very thought of an atonement. It is their sense of justice, they say, that makes them detest it. No man has any business to ask another man to take his punishment. If he is a man he will take it himself. Mr. PONSONBY'S Doctor rejects miracle and atonement for the same reasons as other laymen reject them. He dislikes the doctrine of original sin for a reason of his own.

'THE DOCTOR: The doctrine that we are born

in sin is the keynote of dogmatic Christianity because it gives us the reason of the purpose and design of God, and for His intervention through Jesus Christ for our salvation. My entire repudiation of that idea necessarily prevents me from having any belief in the circumstances which arose, according to the teaching of the Church, out of it. Now I am inclined to think—no, I will be more positive here—I firmly believe that in man, as he is constituted, there exists a spiritual element. That is to say, after taking into account all the component parts of our nature which can be scientifically capable of reduction to physical elements, everything would not be accounted for; there would still remain some unknown quantity. As to whether this is consciousness vitality or individuality cannot be determined, as to whether it can be detached from the physical and have existence apart from it we cannot say.'

---

'THE PARSON: The soul in fact.'

---

'THE DOCTOR: Perhaps it may be simpler to call it that. But our definitions would not coincide. I believe this essence to be nothing short of the spirit of perfection, which is in us when we are born, making us the very opposite of children of wrath, and which, when we die, is untainted, unpolluted, as absolutely perfect as ever.'

---

'THE PARSON: You mean to say the soul is not contaminated by sin. Do you mean to imply that the soul is not injured by a gross and sinful life?'

---

'THE DOCTOR: That is precisely my point, and that is where we shall find another important difference between us. Let me take an extreme instance, in order to illustrate what I mean. I saw in the newspaper the other day the case of a woman of twenty-seven, who had been sentenced forty-two times for theft, assault, drunkenness, and attempted suicide. I will not enlarge upon the social and economic conditions or on our prison and reformatory systems which make that sort of thing possible. I only want to point out that

when that unfortunate woman dies the soul that may still be in her will be as perfect as when she was born.'

---

It is the successful preacher who is invited to deliver lectures on preaching. The unsuccessful should once in a way have an invitation. He knows things which are hidden from the wise and prudent. He *is* something which it never entered the heart of the successful preacher to conceive.

---

But meantime we must be content with the successful preacher. The Rev. J. R. GILLIES, D.D., is one of the most successful. He was invited by the Authorities of the Assembly's College, Belfast, to lecture on the Christian Ministry. He has now published the lectures as they were delivered. The title is *The Ministry of Reconciliation* (A. & C. Black; 5s. net).

---

The whole course of lectures was divided into three parts. These parts the lecturer himself calls 'Mainly Historical,' 'Wholly Practical,' and 'Mainly Doctrinal.' What is left? Nothing is left except detail. The whole field of a minister's life and work is carefully mapped out and explored. It is the hand of a master in Israel. Experience, the experience of a long, varied, and always successful pastorate, spreads itself out before us. We see how God's work in a parish has been done, is being done, and may again be done, and we are moved to thankful following. And then, quite unexpectedly, we find that this successful preacher has a keen appreciation of failure.

---

It is the failure of our Lord. We dislike the word failure as applied to Christ. We resent its assumption. We deny its application. Yet there is a sense in which it may be used legitimately. It is when the success is in the failure, as it so often is, and as it was supremely—even of the eternal purpose of God—in Christ Jesus.

---

It is the failure of the Cross. It is the failure of the desire to come down from the Cross. It is

the failure of the agonizing effort to escape the Cross altogether. But most of all, and most momentous of all, it is the failure to retain the Father's fellowship while He hung upon the cross.

He did not retain it. Or was it only that He thought He did not retain it? Says Dr. GILLIES: 'I remember how I sat late one night in earnest converse with a friend. We were both preachers; our theme the Gospel, with atonement as its heart, and these great words as the crux of all. My friend, so far as I understood him, held by what is called the Moral Theory of the atonement. Without doubt, Jesus was for him Saviour and Son of God. With a fine passion, the more admirable because of the restraint with which it was expressed, he spoke of the inspiration, the new ideal, the sense of power which had come to him through Jesus Christ. I knew well how true it was—made good by years of hard and fruitful work in a poor parish in London. But he confessed that he had no explanation of these words save this: that, as earth-born mists obscure the light even of the sun, as the best and brightest of us is liable to fits of depression, so Jesus at that hour,—I hesitate to say it, but I think this was what he meant,—Jesus fancied Himself forsaken.'

'I could not then,' says Dr. GILLIES, 'accept that view; I cannot now. I make no claim to omniscience for Jesus. I have no sympathy with those who catch at His *obiter dicta* and exploit them as if they were meant to foreclose the way of scientific or critical research. But that at the centre of His moral being, at the very point from which depends the salvation of the world, He was the victim of a pathetic delusion, I did not and cannot believe. I feel certain that His experience as here recorded was not only subjectively genuine, but based on objective fact.'

Now, a man may 'feel certain' about a matter without being able to give reasons for his feeling. But Dr. GILLIES gives reasons. He finds them in his study of the development of Jesus as the God-

man. That development was in two directions. It was expansive and it was intensive.

First it was expansive. 'As a child, He wakened up to consciousness in an earthly home. The sanctities of domestic life opened out into the wider life of the nation. That again, like a garment that is outgrown, rends and leaves Him face to face with the broadly human. "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." There speaks One whose consciousness transcends the limits of space and time imposed on us, and identifies Him with the race.'

That is the expansive development. But at the same time Jesus developed intensively. 'Very early within the Temple, later in baptism and in many still hours of communion with the unseen, He fathoms the depths of His own mysterious personality. His life's breath, to quote the prophet's words, is in the fear of the Lord. "Every fibre of His being winds itself about God with an ineffable, sickening, fainting desire."'

'Along these two lines He moves *pari passu*; loving the world ever more as He loves the Father more, and in the holy love of the One seeing the infinite possibilities of the other; yet conscious of the growing distance between them. And now, as He hangs upon the cross, He sees, on the one side, a world hating goodness and, on the other, God hating sin, and knows Himself the mean term between these two, loving both. The mean term in this case is no arithmetical symbol but a human soul, strained to the breaking-point, yet patient, resolute, and in the end triumphant, in a love that cleaves with equal intensity and by the same necessity of nature to the world and God.'

Familiarity does not always breed contempt. Sometimes it breeds indifference. No one can repeat the Lord's Prayer and despise it. Many a one repeats it and remains indifferent to it.

And if there is one petition more disregarded than another it is the first: 'Hallowed be thy name.'

The word with which it opens is unfortunate. It is an accurate translation of the Greek, but it is not English. Constantly as we use it in repeating the Prayer, we have never been able to make a place for it in the English tongue. Every teacher has to explain it to the pupil, every commentator has to explain it to the teacher.

But more unfortunate is the word with which it ends: 'Hallowed be thy name.' What name? What answer does the teacher make? No answer. For the teacher has gone to the commentator, and the commentator has no answer to give.

If you turn to the latest and the best of the commentators you will find that they have no answer to give. What name? They do not seem ever to have heard the question. One says, 'Name represents God'; one, 'the name of God is "whatsoever there is whereby he makes himself known"' (quoting from the *Westminster Catechism*); and one does not mention the word at all.

But we ask, What name? For there is no doubt whatever that to the Jews, and that is to every person to whom the Prayer was given, God had a name. They might count it too sacred for accurate pronunciation. But they pronounced it somehow. And when they heard Jesus say, 'Hallowed be thy name,' they could only understand that the name of God was hallowed when God was hallowed by name.

Was the name *Jehovah*, then? One commentator says so. It is Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander of Princeton. He is somewhat old now, but he is worth beginning with. '*Name*,' says Dr. Alexander, 'is not to be diluted or explained away, as meaning everything by which God is made known to his creatures, but to be primarily taken in its proper sense of title, appellation, with particular

allusion to the name *Jehovah*, by which he was distinguished from all false gods and described not only as a self-existent and eternal being (which that name denotes), but also as the God who was in covenant with Israel, the God of revelation and the God of grace, or in New Testament language, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

But we have not held to the name *Jehovah*. It is not that we have wavered about the spelling. The Jews were the cause of that. It is that we have passed away from the conception. And Christ Himself was the cause of that. *Jehovah* is the name of the national God of Israel; and Dr. Marcus Dods is right when he says: 'We cannot imagine Jesus as meaning merely that the national God of Israel may be duly honoured within the bounds of His own people.'

What name, then? Why not the name of 'Father'? 'Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name'—the two words seem to come very closely together. Luke brings them even closer: 'Father, Hallowed be thy name.' And yet few are the commentators who suggest that the name is Father. For Father never was a name for God.

But if the disciples were not to think of that name, the name *Jehovah*, with which they were familiar, if the name of God to be hallowed is to be a Christian name, is it possible that the name the Christian is to hallow is the name of Jesus Himself? We think at once of St. Paul's great passage in the Epistle to the Philippians: 'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow.'

Now it is significant that in commenting on that passage scarcely a commentator is content to say that the name is the nature or the attributes of Jesus. They see there that a name is necessary. But they are not content with 'Jesus.' Nor are they content with 'Jesus Christ.' Remembering

that the word 'Lord' is used in the New Testament as the equivalent of the name 'Jehovah' in the Old, they understand the name in which every knee is to bow to be the name of *Lord*. And it is at least possible that that same name of Lord, applied to Jesus and standing as the equivalent of the Old Testament Jehovah, is the name, for the hallowing of which He taught His disciples to pray.

---

Is it not satisfactory? Then another suggestion has been made. But there is a tale to tell about that.

---

'There was rejoicing on the estate of one of the landowners of Polish Russia in the early thirties, for the son of the home had just returned from a far-away university. He was welcomed warmly, and father and son drove together the next morning to the village church to attend Mass and return thanks. During the service the reading of the Paternoster struck the youth as it had never done before. The rest of the hour was as good as lost to him—no, not lost, for in that moment he began to live.'

---

It was August CIESZKOWSKI (pronounced Cheshkoffski). The son of a Polish Count, he had been sent as a student to Berlin, where he arrived just after the voice of the mighty Hegel had ceased to sound in the halls of learning. 'The Hegelian philosophy of history, with its famous syllogism of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, was virtual master of men's thinking. But the young Slav's nature revolted at many of its conclusions. As a devout Catholic he found it heathen, since it did not give the central place in history to Jesus Christ, and thus failed rightly to understand what the synthesis, the third age of the world, involved. As a Pole he refused to accept the "Delivered Germany" of the post-Napoleonic era, as the expression of this synthesis at all.'

---

In 1838 he took his doctor's degree in Heidelberg. He published some volumes. But fifty

years later he told his son that all he had written was 'one and only one—OUR FATHER.' His great work was on the Lord's Prayer. 'His plan compassed a work in nine volumes: of which one should deal with each of the petitions, one with the invocation, and one provide a general introduction on the subject of Providence in history.' When he died in 1894, at the age of eighty, only four of these volumes were completed.

---

In 1917 the present Count CIESZKOWSKI heard that an Oxford scholar, caught by the war in Silesia, was studying his father's work. He made the journey across Poland to see him. He encouraged Mr. William John ROSE, M.A., to prepare an English edition of 'Our Father.' It is published by the Student Christian Movement under the title of *The Desire of all Nations* (10s. 6d. net).

---

The volume, we gather, contains most of the Introduction on the subject of Providence in History, and a selection from the writings on the Prayer itself. The Introduction demands our attention first.

---

The history of the world is divided into three eras. The first era extended to the Incarnation; the second has extended to the present day; the third era begins now and will continue into the unforeseen future. The first era was the era of the first Adam, that is to say, it was a period of the human family in a state of nature. In the second era it was revealed to man that he is born of God and that he is his neighbour's brother. In the third era we shall realize that which has been only an ideal in the second, and shall pass to a higher conception of life.

---

This is not all new. Long ago F. W. Robertson familiarized us with the idea of three eras, though he made the second end with the Ascension. It is also a little indefinite. But let us proceed.

---

We need not delay over the first era. Its life was external. Men were members of a society or

a state, and under the direction of an external law. In the second, the Christian era, the law was internal, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and the man was a man, with an individuality of his own and a relationship of personal moral obligation to God and his neighbour. It was all well in ideal—it was far from well in fact. So far was mankind from attaining to the ideal of love to God and love to man, and so much suffering came from the failure, that the idea was welcomed of another world than this, a world in which not only would wrong be righted, but every one would be able to fulfil his ideal of love.

Thus it came to pass that while the pre-Christian era was worldly, the Christian era was other-worldly. The third era will be worldly again. Its interests will be here and now. It will be able to realize its ideals so fully that there will be no felt need for another world of retribution and redress. More than that, God will be omnipresent, a fully recognized presence everywhere, and the recognition of His presence everywhere will make all men brothers. In His light they will see light.

Two things will be the sign that the third age of the world has begun. One is universal peace. The desire for universal peace has come. 'Everyone has "seen peace that it is good, and the land that it is pleasant," as Jacob said. Mankind as a whole not only desires peace, but also a lasting peace, established on an eternal, Divine basis, and not dependent on the gold-bars of the rulers' treasuries. Where voices have until now been raised proclaiming a mere possibility, to-day we have come to the belief in the Necessity of Peace!'

The other is universal action. 'Providence is showing man to-day that it rests with himself to do away with this gulf existing between what is and what ought to be; that resignation is not the last word of the spirit, but that in man Himself there lurks a further and higher power, meant to save him, and competent to bridge anew that lamentable abyss. This power, this faculty of

faculties, is the Will—the summit of the spirit. The Will unites feeling with knowledge, and weds being to thought. From this union Action is born—the Lord of the Third World.'

These are the signs. What is the Power? Now we come to the Lord's Prayer and its first petition. When Count CIESZKOWSKI repeated the Paternoster that day in the church at home he saw that it was not a prayer for the time then passing, but for the time to come. He saw that at best it was only an ideal for the Christian era; its fulfilment could not be until the third era of the world had begun. For a power is needed to fulfil it. That power is the Holy Spirit.

Now the Holy Spirit was not given until Christ was glorified. And when was Christ glorified? Not at the end of the forty days. Not at the Ascension, when He sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high. For still He maintained His presence in the world. It was a presence in spirit, no doubt, but He could appear to Saul of Tarsus. It was a presence everywhere throughout the world where two or three were gathered in His name. And all the while men prayed the prayer, 'Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.' They prayed in faith but without fulfilment. Then when the fullness of time had once more come, the Holy Spirit came in power that the Prayer might be fulfilled.

And this is the name that is to be hallowed. For there is nothing higher than spirit. 'God is Spirit' is the highest revelation that has been made of Him. But Spirit has to be differentiated. There are different planes of spirits. What sort of spirit is God? The answer is that He is a spirit that has to be hallowed. He is a *Holy Spirit*. Whatever the disciples of Jesus understood, this is what He meant them to understand when He taught them to pray, 'Hallowed be thy name.' And this is what we are to understand. Hallowed be thy name, thy new name of Holy Spirit.