

# 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.

It is now quite evident that we are on the eve of another great controversy. Throughout the whole length of the last generation controversy raged round the Old Testament. That it would pass into the New was inevitable. But the direction in which it would move was by no means clear. It has taken the most dangerous road that was open to it.

---

In the Old Testament the controversy was over dates and documents. The average man was interested, for he loves to watch 'a clean fight.' But he was not alarmed. And when it passed into the New Testament, and the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel or of the Epistle to the Ephesians was challenged, he was less disturbed than ever. He had come to see that these were not vital issues.

---

The controversy that is upon us has to do with the New Testament, but not with its dates or its documents. The first great controversy of all was over the Person of Christ. It must have been a thrilling time to live in. It takes no prophet to say that the next great controversy will be over the Person of Christ also, and that the rising generation will pass through an experience not less exciting.

---

What are the signs of its coming? They are  
VOL. XXXI.—No. 9.—JUNE 1920.

many. But there is one sign of more significance than all the rest. It is that men of undeniable interest in Christ, men of theological training and Church loyalty, are seeking 'a way out of the Trinitarian difficulty.' They have various ways of seeking it. Some of them simply ignore the deity and write with a captivating beauty of language on the humanity of our Lord. Some are bolder and believe that they can discover a middle way.

---

Of the latter a good example is Mr. F. W. WESTAWAY.

---

Mr. WESTAWAY has written a book on *Science and Theology* (Blackie & Son; 15s. net). The book is as comprehensive as its title. More comprehensive. For it is an introduction to the study of Philosophy as well as of Science and Theology. It is, moreover, a remarkably well-informed introduction to all these disciplines. And its limpid clearness is an irresistible attraction. In the end of that book Mr. WESTAWAY sets forth his conception of the Person of our Lord.

---

Mr. WESTAWAY is not a Unitarian. There is the old Unitarianism of Channing, and there is the new Unitarianism of Martineau and Professor Jacks. But Mr. WESTAWAY is not a Unitarian after either of these Unitarianisms. He sees, or

he believes that he sees, something in Christ that made Him—well, if not more than man, at any rate more than any other man—more than any man has been or is ever likely to be.

Is he a Trinitarian then? No, he is not a Trinitarian. He is not fond of the word. He is less fond of the thought. It is probably his dislike to the idea of 'three Persons in one God' that has sent him off. So he looks for a middle way and believes that he has found it.

At first there is nothing which Professor Jacks would not subscribe to. 'Though born of human parents, Jesus was endowed with a unique moral and spiritual personality, a spiritual personality of so high an order that His religious insight and moral goodness have had no equal in history. Unlike ordinary men, whose worldly outlook offers a persistent opposition to the influence of the Divine Spirit, Jesus represented the highest moral perfection of manhood, and in Him therefore the immanent God dwelt more fully and completely than in any other man. Just as His teaching was that of a prophet so His religious experience was that of a saint. He won His perfect holiness, as others have done in lesser degree, through the experience of moral weakness faced and overcome. A religious faith which finds in Him the supreme revelation of God is, therefore, fully justified.'

Professor Jacks, we say, would agree. But would he agree with this? 'The divinity of our Lord is no longer regarded as an historical fact proved by historical evidence, but as an hypothesis about the religious significance of the historical Person Jesus. We are convinced, though we cannot prove that the divine Logos dwelt in the historical Person Jesus, who thus became the Christ. The conviction seems to have its origin in our reflection upon the known facts, and it finds strong confirmation in the collective personal religious experience of the last 1900 years. Hence although Jesus was a man, the Christ is rightly worshipped as Divine.'

It looks at first as if this were the old severance between the Jesus of history and the Christ of worship—a severance made so much of ten years ago, and to so little purpose. But it is more than that. Mr. WESTAWAY accepts the Incarnation. He accepts it as a miracle. He says it is not a biological but a psychological miracle. But it is a miracle, 'even a stupendous miracle.' And then he says: 'The moral perfection of one Man was miraculously brought about by the indwelling Spirit of God.'

That last sentence is important. For the line that seems likely to be taken by those who deny the divinity of our Lord and yet refuse to be counted among the Unitarians is just that line. He was man and only man, but the Spirit of God was His in such a measure that He became—not more than man, they stop just short of that—but more than all other men. And so the question is: Will the man Jesus, because of the power of the Spirit resting on Him, be able to save to the uttermost?

Of all the volumes of essays edited by Canon STREETER the most disappointing was the last. The first volume, entitled *Foundations*, was certainly disturbing enough, for it seemed to leave no sure foundation whether for faith or for conduct. But disturbance was in the air and we accepted it. More difficult to receive was the volume on Prayer. To be told that Prayer is merely a pleasant emotion was a disappointment to the sinner, who still hoped that 'a bit of prayer' would do him good; it was absurdity to the saint, who knew by daily experience that God is a hearer and answerer. But the volume on the Spirit denied the very existence of the Holy Spirit and offered no compensation.

The volumes are understood to have had a considerable circulation. What influence have they had? Much more, it is probable, than they deserve to have. For it is very easy to forget that they are philosophical and not religious books.

With only a rare exception their writers' aim is not to interpret religious experience, but to bring experience to the test of reason. The value of religious experience is determined for them by its appeal to the intellect, and that intellect their own.

The result is failure. It is failure in every case. But it is most manifestly failure in the volume on the Spirit. For the doctrine of the Spirit is a doctrine of religious experience. It is not a doctrine of science or philosophy. The first and fullest record of its experience is in Scripture. But the Scripture record is first verified and then enlarged by the experience of modern life. Every sincere Christian has his own verification and enlargement. In the Christian community the doctrine of the Holy Spirit obtains its furthest reach and its fullest assurance.

The intellect is engaged with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is engaged both with its verification and with its amplification. For the promise is that He shall lead us into all truth, and truth is unattainable without the co-operation of the intellect. But there is no surer path to failure than to make 'what is reasonable,' that is to say, the intellect alone, the sole test of truth.

That there are three Persons in the Godhead and yet but one God is not 'reasonable.' Even after you have defined the word Person as carefully as language can define it, you do not make it acceptable to the intellect alone. Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON, writing in this book, says accordingly that to speak of the work of the Holy Spirit is simply to speak of the work of God, who is a Spirit. And as a philosopher no other explanation is open to him, if even that is open. But his words are utterly futile to a Christian who has 'received the Holy Ghost since he believed.'

The difference between the philosopher and the follower of Christ is well seen in a small volume on *The Power of the Spirit* which has been written

by the Rev. F. Stuart GARDINER, M.A., and has been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (3s.).

Mr. GARDINER gives full value to the place of the intellect. An outstanding merit of his book is its recognition of the reason as entitled to a voice in determining the value of the religious experience of the Holy Spirit. The chapter on the Distinctions in the Being of God is a chapter of philosophy. But the material on which the philosopher works is found in the Bible. Mr. GARDINER always begins there. And when he comes to the verification of the Scripture he appeals to a jury of more than one human faculty.

'God first manifested Himself as the Creator and source of all things, the father of men. Then He manifested Himself as the Redeeming Son, the Saviour. And, finally, He manifested Himself as the indwelling, regenerating, sanctifying Spirit, ever with us. "Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands or feet." And because there were these three modes of manifestation, it has been inferred that a ground for them must exist in the Being of God Himself, and that there is a threefoldness in God's essential nature. And this is made known to us in Scripture. In the Fourth Gospel, for instance, Christ asserts His pre-existence. "Before Abraham was, I am," "Glorify thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee, before the world was." John tells us, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God." The Word was the medium of God's Creation. "All things were made by Him." In the years of time, the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among men, and they beheld "the glory of the only-begotten of the Father."'

Thus does Mr. GARDINER go to the Bible for the source of his knowledge of the Holy Spirit. But at once he turns and asks what the intellect has to say to it. The intellect sees a distinction. There is God, and God with God. 'The office of the latter is utterance, forthgoing, action. Thus there is a duality in God. The unique nature and

mission of Christ are thus traced to something in the being of God. But Christ and the Holy Spirit are so related that both must be essentially within or essentially without the Godhead. God lives as the Father, God Original. He lives as God uttered, the Word. God going forth is related to God Original, as your word is to your mind. The third element is the unifying Spirit, the common life of the Father and the Eternal Word. If God creates, He will act as God going forth, and so all things come into being through the Word. If He enters into a race of created beings like ourselves in order to restore them to Himself, He will do so by His Spirit. Yet all such works of Word and Spirit are essentially works of God the Father, and neither of them work apart from Him, nor are even to be thought of as separate from Him. They are ever one with Him. This conception of the Trinity avoids separating God into parts. Neither the Son nor the Spirit is a section of the Godhead. No one of the three has attributes that the others do not possess. The Father is Eternal Love. The Son is Eternal Love. The Spirit is Eternal Love. Such a conception of the Trinity in Unity does not confound the Reason. It suggests a wealth of being in God, a social element in the nature of God, which is more congenial to our thinking than the cold, remote unity suggested by Deism.'

Then comes the verification in experience. 'This conception of the Trinity is confirmed by the spiritual experience of the Church, and by the manner in which it fits in with the Grand Economy of Redemption revealed in the gospel. Without such a threefoldness in God, the redemption of man would have been impossible. But when we conceive of there being such a distinction in the Being of God as has been suggested, we can at least dimly understand how the Eternal Father gave His Son for the redemption of the world, how the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, how He bore our sins in His own body on the Tree, and how the Holy Spirit of God goes forth to dwell in man, to regenerate him, to enable him

to make his own redeeming work of the Saviour, so that it shall become effectual for him, and thus restore the broken fellowship between God and man. For God the Holy Spirit is God going forth to dwell in man, and make him once more a son of God.'

'Between the consistent religion of dogmatism and the consistent religion of liberty, between the marvellously perfect system of Rome and the entire freedom from system which calls itself Unitarianism, I see no choice.'

That was said by the Rev. Charles Hargrove when he began his ministry in Leeds. His biography (it includes an autobiography of the first half of his life) has been written by Dr. L. P. JACKS, Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, and Editor of *The Hibbert Journal*. It is the biography of one who was brought up in Plymouth Brethrenism, became (and remained for ten years) a Roman Catholic, and then ministered for a quarter of a century to a Unitarian congregation. Dr. JACKS calls the book *From Authority to Freedom* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d. net).

It is to the title of the book that we wish to direct attention. For that title means that Dr. JACKS agrees with Mr. Hargrove. It means that Plymouth Brethrenism is reliance on the infallibility of the Bible, and Roman Catholicism is reliance on the infallibility of the Pope, and after those two infallibilities there is no possible position but Unitarianism. Is that so?

It is not so. There are those who reject every form of external infallibility as the guide of life and yet deny emphatically what Professor JACKS says, that 'henceforward' a man has 'to find his way as best he can, with none to guide him but his own conscience and the stars.'

When Robertson SMITH was brought before his peers and charged with rejecting the infallible authority of Scripture he did not deny it. What

did he do? Did he fall back on the infallible authority of the Pope? It never even occurred to him. Did he then admit that he had no guide to God or the conduct of life but his own conscience and the stars? He did not. He invited his accusers to read the history of the Reformation. And he said that from the days of Melancthon until now the true Protestant position was none of these three, but a fourth position, very much more reliable and enduring.

He could not believe in the absolute external authority of the Bible or the Pope, for he believed that the faculties which God had given him, and for the exercise of which he was to be held responsible, were to be used freely and fully. But just as little could he believe that he was left to the sole guidance of his conscience. For he had the unfaltering assurance that in every judgment he formed, and in every decision he made, he was under the direction of the Holy Spirit of God.

Professor JACKS says that a man is left to the guidance of his own conscience and the stars. What he means by 'the stars' it is not easy to say. But certainly he does not mean what Robertson SMITH meant when he spoke of the Holy Spirit. He cannot mean that. For to him there is no Holy Spirit. And it is just there that Mr. Hargrove and he make their mistake. They believe in God. They believe in the Spirit of God. They believe that God as a Spirit is immanent in the world. But they do not believe that the Holy Spirit is personally present at every act of Christ's faithful followers. To them such words as 'the Spirit of God maketh the reading but especially the preaching of the Word effectual' have no real meaning.

Professor JACKS is free to criticise the Old and New Testaments. So was Professor Robertson SMITH. But there is criticism and criticism. When Professor Robertson SMITH read in the Book of Acts, 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us,' he accepted the statement, for it was

true to his own experience. When Professor JACKS reads it he has to turn 'the Holy Spirit' into 'the stars.'

Science and Theology have been making unmistakable approach to one another. Can they meet? The Rev. D. C. MACINTOSH, Ph.D., Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University, makes them meet. He has written a book to prove that the old antagonism is at an end. He believes it to be at an end for everybody and for ever. He calls the book *Theology as an Empirical Science* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

Professor MACINTOSH brings Science and Theology together by demanding concessions from both. From Science he demands very little—simply the surrender of that blessed word Agnosticism. The scientific man who would become a theologian must believe in God. That is all. From Theology he demands much more.

He demands the surrender of all the facts and doctrines which gave Christianity its birth and in all the centuries have been its life. If you are to bring to an end this strife with men of science, he says to the follower of Christ, you must interpret Christ as He has never been interpreted before, except by those who are not His followers and do not desire to be.

You must surrender the Divinity of Christ. You will still be allowed to speak of it as if there were some reality in it. You will be allowed to speak of it in this way: 'It is when we interpret the personality and life of Jesus with special reference to his own experimental religion that we get what is perhaps the most fruitful view of his divine character. He was a man of deep personal religion; he had learned to depend upon God, and not in vain, for that reinforcement of the moral will which critical experimental religion finds to be the sort of "special providence" or "answer to prayer" which can be depended upon as the divine

response to the human religious adjustment. And in the light of what is empirically known of the value of moral experimental religion in general, the assertion is justified that the achievements of Jesus in the spiritual life and in his work for the world were decidedly enhanced through his dependence upon God for support and uplift in the life of the spirit. That is, more and more the divine power for the spiritual life became immanent within the life of Jesus, in response to his opening up of his life to God.'

You will be allowed much more in the same manner of speech—almost as much as you please. You will be allowed to say that there was a 'unique degree of divine quality in the character of this man,' though you will have to guard your meaning by adding that 'the divinity of Jesus was much more an achievement of his religious experience than a native endowment, however fortunate in his heredity he may have been.' But you will certainly not be allowed to say that 'the Word became flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.'

Is reconciliation with Science worth the price? That is not all the price that has to be paid for it.

You will have to give up the Atonement. You may still speak of an 'at-one-ment,' using hyphens and discarding the capital. You may speak of 'the atoning and saving work of the historic Jesus,' and of 'what has been and is being accomplished as a result of his self-sacrificing labours and the early death in which they culminated.' You may say that He saves, 'not simply by moral and religious teaching and example, but by revealing God.' You may even say that 'in the life and death of Jesus, then, in his activity and suffering, we see the divine—unselfishly loving man, working for his well-being, suffering in his affliction and burdened by his sin.' But in saying all that you must be warned that 'we have gone about as far as we can in the consideration of this topic without passing

over from the realm of empirical data into that of theory.'

Perhaps that is not Atonement? Why should it be? If a man can save himself—if, for example, a soldier, whatever his belief or life, can save himself by his patriotism—where is the necessity for Atonement? 'The question is often raised whether some great, heroic act of self-sacrifice for the good of others, such as that of the soldier on the field of battle on behalf of a righteous cause, would not "atone for" the sins of the previous life. To this the answer ought now to be obvious. There is no atonement, in the sense of expiation, save repentance and its consequences, ceasing to do evil and learning to do well. The brave self-sacrificing act, however, *is* "doing well," and it means much for the character of the individual, and so for God's judgment of him. But as an act it means no more (except for later experiences of suffering and the like) that it led to his death, than if he had expected to give his life, but had "fortunately" escaped. And certainly not all who have expected to be killed in battle show by their later lives that they were truly reconciled to God.'

Is that all the price we have to pay? We have to give up the Resurrection. We have to give up all the miracles. The Resurrection goes the way of all the rest. For 'we shall find that the problem of evil is exceedingly difficult to solve, or indeed impossible of solution, if we admit the even occasional occurrences of miracles of this sort.' Of what sort? 'Arbitrary, exceptional, unmediated and therefore unpredictable "miracles"—as if there were miracles of any other sort! We shall have to agree with Hegel that 'whether at the marriage at Cana the guests got a little more wine or a little less is a matter of absolutely no importance; nor is it any more essential to determine whether or not the man who had the withered hand was healed; for millions of men go about with withered and crippled limbs, whose limbs no man heals.' In short, we shall have to meet the man of science with his chemical objection to the turning of water

into wine, and say that, 'in view of recent events, any such miracle as that of Cana is *religiously* incredible.'

The Resurrection? It is just as incredible to Professor MACINTOSH as the spirit-rappings and table-turnings of the modern Spiritualist. They stand or fall together. 'The appearances and messages ascribed in the New Testament to the "risen Christ" are, psychologically speaking, essentially similar to those of modern spiritism and psychical research. Ecclesiastical tradition of long standing, and especially the great worth of the personality of Jesus and of the spiritual outlook associated with the "Resurrection," impart to this instance a dignity and impressiveness which even the most convincing modern instances of the phenomenon largely lack; but in the end both may be expected to stand or fall together.'

And, no doubt, if Jesus is the 'divine man' of the Dwight Professor, the difference is only one of degree—though even that, the degree being on his own showing so considerable, might have led him to leave the comparison alone. But if the Christ is not a degree better than a modern medium, but the only-begotten Son of God, come to dwell among us in order to bear the sin of the world and reconcile us to God, then we can understand that the miracles which He did were the natural acts of His Divine Person, and that even the Resurrection from the dead, with the subsequent appearances and messages, have nothing to do with the actions of 'discarnate spirits.'

Have we given up everything at last? No. We must give up God. For now it seems that in asking the man of Science to believe in God, we do not ask him to believe in the God made known to us by Jesus Christ. 'God is a spirit,' said Jesus. The man of Science has no intercourse with spirits. So Professor MACINTOSH provides God with a body.

He does not say that God is *not* a Spirit. He does not contradict one single fact upon which the Church of Christ is founded. He merely takes away the value of it. God is a spirit still, but the scientific observer is out with his telescope. He sweeps the heavens. He finds no trace of spirits. But he finds the heavens themselves? That is the body of God, says the accommodating theologian. That is the God you are invited to believe in.

Let us hear his words. 'Must we think of God as incorporeal? It would be absolutely unsatisfactory, of course—fatal, even, to the best type of experimental religion—to think of God in merely corporeal terms. But might not God be spiritual and also in a sense corporeal, somewhat as man, who is spiritual, is also in a sense corporeal? In other words, may not God *be* Spirit, and yet *have* a body? What this is meant to suggest is not the crude anthropomorphism of primitive forms of religious thought (or of present-day Mormonism), but rather the idea that the physical universe may perhaps be related to the divine Spirit somewhat as the human body is related to the human spirit.'

## Ⓐ Labour View of Christianity.

BY F. HERBERT STEAD, M.A., WARDEN OF THE ROBERT BROWNING SETTLEMENT,  
WALWORTH.

I AM asked to give a Labour view of Christianity. I shall best meet the wishes of my readers if I endeavour to put together what those who have the best right to speak in the name of the working

classes of Great Britain have actually said on the subject.

The chief reservoir from which I draw is the series of volumes containing the proceedings at six