
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.

BISHOP CHARLES GORE is still the most interesting personality in the Church of England. The Dean of St. Paul's makes a good second, but he lacks unexpectedness. We know where he is to-day, and we know that he will be there to-morrow—'exhorting us clergy not to suffer ourselves to become court chaplains to king Demos.' It is by what he says that Dean INGE astonishes us, Bishop GORE by what he is.

It is not with him as with husband and wife, who being twain have become one. He is one who has become twain. He is the most conservative bishop in the Church, and he is the most advanced. One day he clings desperately to a theory of the Ministry which all the scholars around him have abandoned. The next he delivers the Essex Hall Lecture.

The Essex Hall Lecture is a Unitarian foundation. It is delivered in a Unitarian place of worship, to an audience that is at least predominantly Unitarian. And it is applauded by its audience. 'The lecture by Bishop Gore,' says its Unitarian publisher, 'was warmly appreciated by the audience, and it is believed that a wider public will read it with interest.'

Dr. GORE is a traditionist on one subject; he is a revolutionist on all the rest. When he writes an 'Open Letter' for Dr. Headlam to read, he is a member of the most straitest sect of our religion. When he addresses himself to an audience in Essex Hall he declares that 'the method of the established church as we have known it in England seems to me the very antithesis of the method of Christ.'

The subject of the Essex Hall Lecture is *Christianity applied to the Life of Men and of Nations* (Lindsey Press; 2s. net). Dr. GORE believes that Christianity has got out of touch with the life of men and of nations. How has that come to pass? First of all, and chiefly, by the very desire of the Church to keep in touch with nations and with men. When Christianity became the religion of the respectable, hosts of unconverted persons claimed baptism. The Church baptized them, and they remained unconverted still. They were all in the Church now, but the Church they were within was outside Christianity.

Leave the Church out of account for the moment. Dr. GORE leaves it out. He has to do for the moment with Christianity. The men and women whom the Church baptized did not become Christians. For Christianity is a moral force, and the baptism of those men and women did not affect their moral life.

Christianity is a moral force. Bishop GORE speaks of it as a Life, a Way, and a Brotherhood. Now, that the hosts of the baptized were outside Christianity was evident, for they manifested no new life, they walked in no new way, they recognized no new brotherhood. And yet there they were, professing to be Christians. The result was compromise. Let us make the best of it. If we cannot get them to walk in a new way let us adapt Christianity to the way they walk. Let us conceive of it otherwise than as a Life, a Way, and a Brotherhood. And Christianity was made intellectual, authoritative, national.

First it was made intellectual—a matter of belief, not of life. The influence of Hellenic intellectualism hastened the process. 'The church used nobly the philosophy of Greece to enable it to express in intellectual terms the theology which it inherited from St. Paul and St. John—a theology, I believe, which is essentially Christian, grown upon the root of Hebrew prophecy and Christ's own teaching and person, and by no means borrowed from Hellenism. And for this formulation no doubt Greek philosophy supplied an admirable instrument and terminology. But the Hellenic spirit in Christianity became intoxicated by its own intellectualism. The intellectual formulæ of orthodoxy became to it so supremely important an element in religion that the religion itself became intellectualized. It became less and less a life and more and more a philosophy or a system of correct formulas. The dominant claim upon the Christian became the claim of orthodoxy.'

Next Christianity, which at first was called 'the Way,' that is, 'an authoritative direction how men ought to proceed who naturally "love life and would fain see good days," and who would fain escape the perils which beset life and attain "salvation,"' was made a matter of obedience to ecclesiastical authority. The Roman genius for government 'passed from the empire to the church. When Western Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries describe the empire as preparing the way for the church, they think of the church (and that tends to mean the church which acknowledges the sovereignty of Rome) as succeeding to the position of empire.' 'It is true that, within the monastic system, under the inspiration of reforms constantly renewed, beginning with that of the glorious St. Benedict, zeal for the true life was never forgotten. Nor even in the world outside was true Christianity ever out of sight. Nevertheless, on the whole the true "way of life" almost retires into the monasteries, and for men living in the rough world, inasmuch as real conversions are not apparently to be expected, very much that is not Christian is conceded, if only they will remain obedient children of the church. Obedience to ordinances takes the place of the following of the life.'

Besides being Hellenized and Romanized the church was Nationalized. Brotherhood was changed into Patriotism. 'This was a special product of the Reformation. The idea of a visible catholic unity, which kept the religious life of each nation in touch with a larger whole, was perforce weakened or abandoned in those nations which rejected the Roman obedience and were by the Roman authority condemned and excommunicated. For them the formative idea became that of the national church, and nowhere has that been seen in greater force than in our own country.'

And it is plain that to Dr. GORE the Nationalization of the Church is more mischievous than its Hellenization or its Romanization. For 'the whole social system of the country—"the rich man in his castle, the poor man at the gate"—the whole industrial system with all its notorious and grinding injustice, the whole legal and penal system with all its preference for the claims of property to the claims of personality—all was accepted as the national system.' And all that is clean contrary to the mind of Christ. 'How can it be believed that such a method could commend itself to One who dared to go forward with His full moral claim—who dared to proclaim and insist upon the true

life—even though He saw clearly that the nation He loved would not accept it, and were manifestly being made worse by having it so clearly set before them?'

It is then that Bishop GORE says: 'The method of the established church as we have known it in England seems to me the very antithesis of the method of Christ.'

Is the matter of English style anything to a preacher? Let us look into it some day. But for the moment it is enough to know that another book has been published by a master therein; and, preacher or hearer, there is surely none who will say that its English style is of little account to it.

Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH is the author. The book is *On the Art of Reading* (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net). Three of the lectures deal with the Reading of the Bible. And these lectures raise a question.

Is it of any moment what we teach to the children about the Bible so long as we teach the Bible? Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH is most insistent that we should teach the Bible. It is to encourage us to teach the Bible to our children and to encourage the Universities to teach the Bible to their students—even by including the Book of Job among the books set for examination—it is for that very purpose that he delivers his lectures. But—and here is the amazing matter—he is not at all concerned to know that what we teach about the Bible is true or false.

'Nor shall I ask you,' he says, 'to sentimentalise overmuch upon the harm done to a child by teaching him that the bloodthirsty jealous Jehovah of the Book of Joshua is as venerable (being one and the same unalterably, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning") as the Father, "the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy," revealed to us in the Gospel, invoked for us at the Eucharist.'

And as if that were in need of fuller exposition—as it is—he proceeds: 'But over this business of teaching the Book of Joshua to children I am in some doubt. A few years ago an Education Committee, of which I happened to be Chairman, sent ministers of religion about, two by two, to test the religious instruction given in Elementary Schools. Of the two who worked around my immediate neighbourhood, one was a young priest of the Church of England, a medievalist with an ardent passion for ritual; the other a gentle Congregational minister, a mere holy and humble man of heart. They became great friends in the course of these expeditions, and they brought back this report: "It is positively wicked to let these children grow up being taught that there is no difference in value between Joshua and St. Matthew: that the God of the Lord's Prayer is the same who commanded the massacre of Ai."'

It seems reasonable. What does Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH say? He says: 'Well, perhaps it is. Seeing how bloodthirsty old men can be in these days, one is tempted to think that they can hardly be caught too young and taught decency, if not mansuetude. But I do not remember, as a child, feeling any horror about it, or any difficulty in reconciling the two concepts. Children *are* a bit bloodthirsty, and I observe that two volumes of the late Captain Mayne Reid — *The Rifle Rangers* and *The Scalp Hunters*—have just found their way into *The World's Classics* and are advertised alongside of Ruskin's *Sesame and Lilies* and the *De Imitatione Christi*. I leave you to think this out; adding but this for a suggestion: that as the Hebrew outgrew his primitive tribal beliefs, so the bettering mind of man casts off the old clouts of primitive doctrine, he being in fact better than his religion.'

And as if that were not perverse and pernicious enough, he proceeds with an example: 'You have

all heard preachers trying to show that Jacob was a better fellow than Esau somehow. You have all, I hope, rejected every such explanation. Esau was a gentleman: Jacob was not. The mind of a young man meets that wall, and there is no passing it.'

So, the young man who prefers Esau to Jacob, as undoubtedly most young men do, shows thereby that he is better than his religion. For, 'later, the mind of the youth perceives that the writer of Jacob's history has a tribal mind and supposes throughout that for the advancement of his tribe many things are permissible and even admirable which a later and urbaner mind rejects as detestably sharp practice.'

Now in the first place, it is not proper for any teacher under any circumstances to teach any one that which is not true. The manner of the teaching is to be left to the wisdom of the teacher. But the matter is above and beyond compromise. If God is not the God of the Book of Joshua, but of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, it is the God of St. Matthew's Gospel that the child must be taught to know.

And in the second place, it is not the case that the preference of Jacob over Esau—a preference upheld by the New Testament—is due to the historian's interest in the preservation of the tribe. As the child grows into manhood he discovers that he was in error when he preferred Esau to Jacob. For he discovers that with all his natural good qualities Esau was never more than 'a country gentleman.' Place him before Pharaoh. Before Pharaoh Jacob is a great man—the superior of the great Pharaoh himself, and acknowledged by Pharaoh so to be. Esau? Would Pharaoh have considered it worth while giving an audience to Esau? Would he have counted the words which proceeded out of his mouth worth listening to? No doubt Esau might have given him points about the rearing of chariot horses; but Jacob blessed Pharaoh, and Pharaoh went out from his presence a better man.

There are few men who are more anxious for Reunion than the Right Reverend G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. There are few men with whom other men are more anxious to unite. What is the hindrance? What lies between them? Dr. WALPOLE himself seems to see two things—misunderstanding as to the meaning of the Church, and misunderstanding as to the meaning of the Ministry.

Dr. WALPOLE believes that those with whom he would be glad to unite have an inadequate conception both of the Church and of the Ministry, and because of its inadequacy they will not unite with him. He has written a book to prove it—*Prophets and Priests* (Scott; 3s. net). The book is appropriately bound in white, for the author of it is 'blameless and harmless, a son of God without rebuke.'

The BISHOP OF EDINBURGH believes that 'the interesting movements towards Reunion which we have lately seen from Mansfield College and the Anglican Fellowship have taken the wrong road. Beginning with the "minimum of a Church" they have tried to find sufficient agreement to enable them to work towards the fuller conception of the Catholic Church after which all are yearning.' He thinks that 'that is inevitable when a number of the best men of all Churches gather round a common table in mutual fellowship. They naturally desire "to recognize the fact that the several denominations to which they severally belong are equally corporate groups within the One Church, and that the efficacy of their ministrations is verified in the history of the Church," and then having acknowledged this, they hope they have found a fundamental basis towards the realization of the Reunited Church.'

'But this emphasis on "corporate groups," instead of on the One Church, this assertion of the efficacy of separate ministrations rather than of the ministry of the Whole Body, is not only confusing but lays stress on just those features of the

discussion which we ought in the first place to try and forget.' Dr. WALPOLE holds that 'it is better at the start not to think of "the Churches," but of the One Church; nor of "denominations," but of the One Name; to lose sight for the moment of "our Church," and to think of *the* Church.'

At the start. 'At a later stage, when we have agreed more or less as to the essential characteristics of the great Church of God, then we may see how those truths for which we have stood find a place in it. It is a rule in penitence to find an ideal standard—naturally that set by our Lord—and to continue looking at it till we realize our sinfulness. Let us all so learn the guilt of our divisions by fixing our eyes on that Church which Christ loved and for which He gave Himself. That in my belief,' says Dr. WALPOLE, 'is much more likely to lead to real sorrow over our disunion than looking at one another and seeing how we may palliate by specious explanations the destructive schisms that have rent the Body of Christ.'

Dr. WALPOLE does not think that the word Church has a plural. It is true that a plural is used in the New Testament when it is necessary to speak of the various congregations of Christ's people. So John wrote to the seven churches which are in Asia. But, properly speaking, there is but one Church. And the BISHOP OF EDINBURGH would be glad if men would everywhere agree to speak no more of 'the Churches' when they mean Christian bodies that are out of fellowship with one another. Let every Christian body recognize the unity, and in that unity the comprehensiveness of the Church, and then it will find its own place and fulfil its own function in the Body of Christ.

But the greater obstacle to Reunion, in Dr. WALPOLE'S belief, is an inadequate conception of the Ministry.

He has been reading Dr. John KELMAN'S Yale Lectures on *Preaching*. He is pleased to find a whole chapter of that book given to 'The Preacher as Priest.' With much of the chapter he is in hearty agreement. But he discovers two deficiencies. Dr. KELMAN does not recognize the priesthood of the whole Church, and he does not believe in the power of the priest to forgive sins.

Dr. KELMAN 'rightly urges that public prayer is a function of the priest in which the minister offers prayer not for himself but for the people.' But how does he offer prayer for the people? By praying, 'not for what he himself desires, or for things that interest himself, but to break the silence of those that find themselves distressed with the silence of their souls.' And that is all well and good. But to the BISHOP OF EDINBURGH it is not enough. Besides being the vocal organ of the particular congregation in the expression of their own wants, the minister should be their mouthpiece in the expression of the needs of the Universal Church. He is not there for himself alone. He is not there only for himself and the congregation. He is there for the sake of the Church of God, leading a great act of worship in which the whole Body of Christ is concerned.

But while Dr. KELMAN merely omits the representative office of the priest, he deliberately denies his power to forgive sin. 'He is emphatic here,' says Dr. WALPOLE. And then he quotes: 'The power of absolution is in our belief one which was never delegated by Christ to any of His ministers, and our hope of salvation is bound up with the assurance that He has retained it for Himself.'

But Dr. WALPOLE declares that he does not believe, and he supposes that no one else believes, that Christ has parted with the privilege of forgiving sins, or that He gives it to any minister apart from the Body. The question is whether He exercises this high office, now through His mystical Body, as then through His earthly Body. 'The priest in absolution,' he holds, 'is not a separate unit endowed with divine prerogative, using the great words the Church gives him, "By His

authority committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," as though they were his own, but the mouthpiece of the whole Body. All the faithful throughout the world are gathered around him and through him exercising that power which their great Head lodged with them. It is a universal, not an individual absolution that is given to the sinner.' And so it comes to pass that here also 'the representative office of the priest has to be recognized. For the absolution must be conveyed to the person seeking it by one who can in a marked way represent the whole Church for that purpose.'

There is not a more remarkable feature of our time than the respect that is paid to religion. We see it among students of science. Science, as the late Dr. Neville Figgis said in the introduction to his Paddock Lectures, 'has awakened to religion as a human fact. Religion as an integral element in human life is taken for granted. Religious phenomena are studied, classified and analysed; and a mass of formulated knowledge now exists which serves at least to throw light on their origin and early development, beyond anything that would have been held likely fifty years ago.'

We see it quite as clearly among students of philosophy. The Gifford Lectures, delivered nearly always of late years by philosophers, might as appropriately have been delivered by theologians. There is no longer an apology offered for so much religion and so little philosophy. There is scarcely even a sense of transition in passing from the one to the other. It looks as if modern philosophy had either abandoned the search for truth in favour of the search for God, or had discovered, to its own astonishment, that God and truth are one. The labouring man may still avoid the Church, but the learned are already on their way to it. And what learning is doing to-day labour will do to-morrow.

The latest sign, and it is very significant, is the issue of a small book on religion by Professor Bernard BOSANQUET. Professor BOSANQUET is perhaps the only whole-hearted Hegelian now left to us. He is especially associated in our minds with that theory of the State which Hegel made popular in Germany, and which in some men's judgments was the making of that temper of mind which was the making of the War. He is nearly the last of the philosophers from whom we should have looked for a book on religion. But there it is, with the unblushing title *What Religion is* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net), and with the unqualified assertion that 'religion is the only thing that makes life worth living.'

It is a book which will be read by the student of the New Testament with curiosity. There is in it an unhesitating acceptance of the most familiar New Testament teaching. The 'central knot and need of all religion' is best expressed in the words, 'What must I do to be saved?' And 'there is a traditional phrase intended to sum up the whole point and meaning of religion; and it utters all those characteristics we have insisted on quite simply and plainly. It is the old expression "Justification by Faith."' There is even some elaboration of the thesis that faith is not opposed to works, but only to sight.

But at the same time, and occasionally in the same sentence, there is the most astonishing contradiction of the teaching of the New Testament. Every man on earth is credited with religion. 'No man is so poor, I believe, as not to have a religion, though he may not, in every case, have found out where it lies.' And this is all that any man requires—to be shown where his religion lies. Professor BOSANQUET recognizes salvation as the central need of all men. He even discusses the question, 'Salvation from what?' and finds that to say 'from sin' is something like it. But this philosopher is a philosopher still: the one thing that a man needs to be saved from is ignorance, ignorance of the fact that he is really a religious man.

Professor BOSANQUET accepts 'the old expression Justification by Faith.' But justification is discovered to be simply a man's recognition of his own religiousness. And faith is the instrument of the recognition. You have a religion, he says to every man; find out where it lies; you find that out by faith, and when you have found it out you are justified.

Now all this is in fundamental opposition to the New Testament. The New Testament agrees with Professor BOSANQUET that true religion is harmony with God. But it asserts emphatically, so emphatically that it is the very reason for its existence as a New Testament, that no man is of himself in harmony with God. The New Testament is the record of God's way of bringing men into harmony. It generally assumes, but sometimes asserts, the disharmony between men and God and its unexceptionable universality. Its newness lies in this, that Christ came into the world to save sinners.

Professor BOSANQUET does not need Christ. He does not recognize Him. The name does not occur in his book.

Clearly, then, the respect that is now paid to religion is good but not altogether good. It is good in that it is a denial of the assertion that man's chief end is to glorify matter. And the first enemy that has to be destroyed is always materialism. It is good also in that it compels us to recognize the value of every answer that has ever been made to the question, What must I do to be saved?

But it is not altogether good. For it suggests sometimes that one answer to that question is just as good as another, and that is a flat and fundamental denial of all that the New Testament stands for.

James Iverach.

BY THE REVEREND DONALD MACKENZIE, M.A., TAIN.

THE very fact that Principal Iverach—now in his eighty-first year—is still with us makes it somewhat difficult to try to evaluate his services to the cause of Christian truth and philosophical theology. An old pupil, who is glad to acknowledge the Principal's influence in the clarifying and guiding of his own mental life, feels, however, the task imposed on him by the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to be an act of piety as well as of justice.

James Iverach was born in Caithness in the north of Scotland in 1839, and lived there until in his twentieth year he entered the University of Edinburgh. Caithness is a county of treeless expanses, garrisoned on the west by the Highland hills, and girt on north and east by the inviolate sea. It is a land of cold soil, but of warm soul. The subjectivity and subtlety of the Celtic nature mingle with the solidity and sobriety of the Saxon —Iverach is an anglicized form of Maciver. Few counties in Scotland have given a larger number of noteworthy men to Church and State, and James Iverach, by nature's endowment and upbringing in the northern county's searching climate, has had Juvenal's prayer for a healthy mind in a healthy body granted to him. Like Saul, the son of Kish, he is head and shoulders above his fellows, massive in proportion to his stature. His old students often felt as if there was a resemblance between body and soul—as if his physique was his psyche objectified, according to the view of Aristotle that a soul is the energy (entelechy) of an organized living body. His slow and stately step—the body moving as a whole—reflects his deliberate and safe thinking. He is undoubtedly, as Dr. Chalmers would say, 'a man of wecht' in more senses than one. The grit and braininess so characteristic of many of Caithness' sons are his in a conspicuous degree. His very longevity with its unimpaired vigour has carried him far, and helped him to attain slowly but justly to the high position he occupies.

The religious atmosphere of his youth was that