

# 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.

THE mystic is having a hard time. It is true that Miss UNDERHILL, the high priestess of mysticism in our midst, has published another large book, to make out not only that it is, but also that it is a rewarder of them that diligently seek it. But on the other hand four books have been published at the very same time, in each of which it is discussed with some fulness, and in each of which it is found to be only vanity and vexation of spirit.

The four books are DENNEY'S *Letters*, GARVIE'S *Christian Preacher*, Robert MACKINTOSH'S *Theories of Atonement*, and John LAIRD'S *Study in Realism*.

The first three are theologians, but the last is a philosopher. And the philosopher is more antagonistic than the theologians. Mr. LAIRD is Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the Queen's University of Belfast. He has written a book on that philosophical theory in which he believes and of which he is a most doughty defender. He calls it *A Study in Realism* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 8vo, pp. xii, 228; 14s. net). If he is a doughty, he is also a delightful defender. For he has a fine free gift of humour. Being a realist and a humorist he is not likely to be found among the mystics.

The first, and most provoking, thing about mysticism, as he encounters it, is that nobody

can tell us what it is. "Mysticism" itself, he says, 'is a vague word, and it is commonly used to describe so much that it describes very little in particular. To some it means the medicine-man and his wizard progeny, the *orendo* of the Iroquois, and the levitations of ecstatic Moslems; to others the strange visions of ascetic vestals, the *umbra viventis luminis* of St. Hildegard of Bingen, or the bridal passion of Mechthild of Magdeburg; and to a third party it means the Zohar, the Kabbala, and the Rosicrucians. Psychologists discuss the stigmata of hysterical ecstasy, and the psychophysics of the trance, or smudge the symbolism of a celibate's dream with a prurient finger. Others, again, regard mystical literature as a record of abnormal experience, curious perhaps, but curiously regular since it shows well-marked periods of spiritual growth whose stages correspond very closely, not only between Catholic and Protestant, man and woman, mediæval and modern, but also between Orient and Occident.'

But all that is psychological. Professor LAIRD is a philosopher. Does mysticism claim to be a philosophy? It does. Professor LAIRD quotes Dean Inge, who quotes Coventry Patmore: 'Mysticism is the pursuit of ultimate, objective truth, or it is nothing. "What the world calls mysticism," says Coventry Patmore, "is the science of ultimates, the science of self-evident reality."

. Thus it soon became clear to me that mysticism involves a philosophy and at bottom is a philosophy.'

Miss UNDERHILL denies that mysticism is a philosophy: 'Mysticism is not an opinion; it is not a philosophy.' But then Miss UNDERHILL also quotes Coventry Patmore, and quotes him with approval. She quotes the very same passage quoted by the Dean of St. Paul's, and makes it the motto for the first part of her book.

What is a philosophical mystic? It is a mystic who finds that his mysticism is an instrument of knowledge. Philosophical mystics may be mystics first of all. 'They may claim esoteric knowledge because of the thoroughness of their purification, they may empty their mind to find the Godhead in it, and they may be contemplative to the point of quietism.' But they 'are not content with that, for they find knowledge . . . where the others find only a wonderful sweetness and a garment of rapture.'

Now the peculiarity of the knowledge which mysticism imparts is this. It is knowledge of oneself and it is knowledge of God, and it is knowledge of both at one and the same time. It is in knowing God that the philosophical mystic knows himself: it is in knowing himself that he knows God, and these are not two moments in the acquisition of knowledge but one.

This is how Plotinus puts it: 'He who sees himself, when he sees, will see himself as a simple being, will be united to himself as such, will feel himself become such. We ought not even to say that he will see, but he will be that which he sees, if indeed it is possible any longer to distinguish seer and seen, and not boldly to affirm that the two are one. In this state the seer does not see, or distinguish, or imagine two things; he becomes another, he ceases to be himself and to belong to himself. He belongs to God and is one with Him, like two concentric circles; they are one when they

coincide, and two only when they are separated. It is only in this sense that the Soul is other than God. Therefore this vision is hard to describe. For how can one describe, as other than oneself, that which, when one saw it, seemed to be one with oneself?'

Well, that may do for a Hegelian or any other variety of idealist, but not for Professor LAIRD. And when he carries his objection into the heart of the matter he carries us with him. For the heart of the matter is love. To know God is to love God, or it is nothing. Now it is true that 'love looks for harmony; it is careless of itself; it seeks its other. Yet it stops short of absorption, and that is its salvation. If a lover became his beloved, or if creaturely devotion became divinity, the excellence of the lover would be lost and only the excellence of his beloved remain. It is better to think that love achieves its perfection, not by relinquishing a lover's existence, but by attaining a complementary being in which neither the lover nor his beloved is absorbed.'

It sometimes happens, and more frequently than philosophers think, that the first step in a new movement of thought is taken in a sermon. Such a step appears to be taken by Professor C. F. BURNEY in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford, and now published at the Oxford University Press, under the title of *The Old Testament Conception of Atonement fulfilled by Christ* (8vo, pp. 20; 1s net).

The sermon is a criticism of the Bampton Lectures of Dean RASHDALL. But before the criticism of Dr. RASHDALL'S false doctrine of the Atonement comes the statement of the true doctrine. So clearly and convincingly does it come that, when the book is directly referred to at last, all that Dr. BURNEY feels called upon to say is this: 'I have thought it best, before alluding to Dr. Rashdall's views, to develop the conception of the Suffering Servant as we find it in Deutero-

Isaiah, and as it is taken up by our Lord in the Gospel-records, and I think that I may leave it at that. I believe that few will hesitate in deciding which view has the greater approximation to truth.'

The question is, whether or not Jesus recognized His own portrait when He read the chapters in Isaiah which describe the Suffering Servant of the Lord. In the suffering death and resurrection of the Servant, did He or did He not find *foretold*, in prophetic language, His own suffering, death, and resurrection?

Dr. RASHDALL says that He did not. How does he know? Because the Jews of His day did not associate the Suffering Servant of Isaiah with the Messiah. To which Dr. BURNEY answers, first, it is true that the Jews did not; but, secondly, what the Jews could not do Jesus was capable of doing. 'The fact that the conception of the Servant was not identified with the Messiah by the Jews of our Lord's time is treated as an argument against our Lord's having so regarded it. Dr. Rashdall does not, apparently, allow our Lord any independence of thought in interpreting the Old Testament.'

The reason why Dr. RASHDALL will not allow that Jesus identified Himself with the Suffering Servant is this. The Suffering Servant was made a guilt-offering for the sins of others. That is the culminating feature in the conception. Dr. BURNEY calls it so. Dr. RASHDALL admits it to be so. But Dr. RASHDALL does not admit that Jesus was a guilt-offering, or ever supposed that He was.

He does not deny that the writers of the New Testament thought so. St. Paul thought so, and is the greatest sinner of them all in Dr. RASHDALL'S eyes, because he said so most emphatically. He does not, however, accuse St. Paul of being its inventor. He 'gives full weight to his statement in I Corinthians, "I delivered unto you first of all

that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." It was already,' he says, 'an article of the Church's creed when the Apostle of the Gentiles was baptized into it. It was due neither to theorizing nor to the visions of St. Paul. It resulted from the reflection of the Church in the interval which elapsed between the Crucifixion and St. Paul's conversion—a period which cannot have been more than a very few years.'

Now it is to Dr. BURNEY inconceivable that within 'a very few years'—Dr. RASHDALL'S own computation—so momentous an addition could have been made by the disciples, of their own initiative, to the teaching of their Lord. And if it was not only an addition to but a serious departure from His teaching, as Dr. RASHDALL holds, it is more inconceivable than ever. Jesus had promised that they should receive the Spirit to guide them into all the truth. They did receive the Spirit, but they were led, according to Dr. RASHDALL, into most mischievous error.

Dr. BURNEY concludes that the writers of the New Testament were taught by Jesus Himself to see the things that happened to Him foretold by the Old Testament prophet. From which two things follow.

One thing is that the New Testament writers were in harmony with Jesus Himself in regarding His death as a guilt-offering for sin. The other is that Jesus regarded the Old Testament prophets as being able to foretell the future.

This is the step forward which Professor BURNEY has taken. At first it seems to be a step backward. For the predictive element in prophecy was clearly recognized long ago. It was so clearly recognized that it was looked upon as the only element. Prophecy was simply prediction. Then came the discovery that the prophet spoke first of all to his own people and his own time. It was a discovery which gave relief and made for progress.

And now for some time the prophet has been looked upon as knowing no more about the future than any shrewd statesman may always know. When Dr. BURNKY sets a question to ordination candidates on the character of Old Testament prophecy, the great majority of answers begin with some form of the statement that the prophets were *forth-tellers* rather than *fore-tellers*.

But in the Old Testament itself the test of prophetic inspiration is not forth-telling but fore-telling. In the Book of Deuteronomy the true prophet is distinguished from the false by the simple test of the fulfilment of his prophecy. The prophet who speaks presumptuously, that is to say, not under divine inspiration, is the prophet whose prediction is not fulfilled. And the very prophet who conceived the Suffering Servant of the Lord, and thereby rose to the highest height of inspiration, decides the controversy between the God of Israel and all other gods upon the issue of a prediction—the prediction of the coming of Cyrus as a conqueror and deliverer.

Professor BURNKY calls upon the student of the New Testament and of theology to recognize the predictive element in prophecy. No one doubts that the writers of the New Testament recognized it. He does not doubt that Jesus also recognized it. And if it is admitted that Jesus recognized it, then it will be admitted that He knew Himself to be fulfilling Scripture, not in the vague general way of fulfilment allowed by writers like Dean RASHDALL, but in definite act and even detail. It will be admitted that He knew that the chastisement of our peace was laid upon Him, and that with His stripes we are healed.

What was the whole duty of a Jew? Micah tells us. It was to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God. What is the whole duty of a Christian? It is to know God, to worship Him, and to do His will.

The Jews whom Jesus had to do with had forgotten Micah. They did not do justly, they did not love mercy, they did not walk humbly with their God. Have Christians as entirely forgotten their Christianity? Not so entirely. Greek Christians have laid emphasis on the knowledge of God, identifying religion with theology and searching eagerly after exactness of definition. Latin Christians have regarded personal devotion and reverential worship as solely essential. English Christians have made conduct, not merely three-fourths, as Matthew Arnold said, but the whole substance of Christianity.

But knowledge, worship, conduct—that is the complete round of Christian life, and that is the order of entrance. So says the Ven. John WAKEFORD, B.D., Archdeacon of Lincoln. Archdeacon WAKEFORD is the author of a book on pastoral theology. *The Word and the World*, he calls it (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). It is a book which was missed on its publication, but now has been discovered. Knowledge, worship, conduct—that, says the Archdeacon, is the strictly correct order; and he notices in passing that it is the order of the wise men of the East: 'When they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and they fell down and worshipped him, and when they had opened their treasures they offered him gifts.'

It is the order asserted also by an unnamed but singularly attractive young man whose story is told in the Fourth Gospel. The ninth chapter of that Gospel begins with the words: 'And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth.' Then follows the story. It occupies the whole long chapter.

Three types of manhood are seen in it—the three types between whom society is always distributed. First there are the 'Jews,' who could not see the right because their own interests stood in the way. Next there are the parents of the blind man, who saw the right but had not courage

to do it—'these things said his parents, because they feared the Jews.' Lastly, there is the blind man himself, who saw the right and did it, though it cost him something—'and they cast him out.'

He was a thinking man.

Always his downcast eye  
Was laughing silently,  
As he found some jubilee in thinking;  
For his one thought was God,  
In that one thought he abode,  
For ever in that thought more deeply sinking.

And in his thinking he had come to two convictions. First, he had come to the conviction that behind every good deed done the power of God is to be seen: 'If this man were not of God he could do nothing.' And then he had come to the conviction that God is not at the call of every man even when he would like to do good—it depends on the man: 'Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth.'

It is Archdeacon WAKEFORD'S three, and in his order. The knowledge of God is taken for granted. Every Israelite had that. Then follow the worship and the doing of God's will.

And it is the whole theory of prayer—the whole theory in a sentence. We pray and receive no answer. Why? It is not in God. 'Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear.' It is in us. But how is it in us? Is it because we do not adopt the proper posture, do not use the proper words, do not ask the proper things? It is not. God can pardon an apparently irreverent posture; He can translate uncouth and even incoherent language; He can answer with the right things even when we ask amiss. If we receive no answer to our prayers it is because of what we are.

'Now we know,' says this thinker, 'that God

heareth not sinners.' What evidence is there? There is the irresistible evidence of our Lord's way when He was on earth. For we may be sure that if Jesus refused to answer a man on earth, God will refuse to answer that man in heaven. Now there were three men whom Jesus refused to answer. They were His judges. When He was betrayed by Judas He was brought before Caiaphas. Caiaphas sent Him to Pilate. Pilate sent Him to Herod. Each of the three asked a question; to each of them He deliberately 'held his peace, and answered nothing.'

Take Pilate first. Pilate was an irreligious man. We see that clearly enough in an event which is referred to by Jesus, an event which probably took place at the Passover. The Galileans were in Jerusalem in great numbers. Some disturbance arose in the Temple. Pilate sent his soldiers with orders to hack their way through. Some of the Galileans were slain as they offered sacrifice, and their blood mingled with the sacrifices. We can see from our Lord's reference that the deed made a deep impression. Only an irreligious man could have done it.

But there is another and a clearer proof of Pilate's irreligiousness. When Jesus was before him the word 'truth' was used. Pilate turned sharply, scornfully: 'What is truth?' he said. Now the man who denies truth denies goodness, and the man who denies goodness denies God.

But if Pilate was irreligious he was superstitious. For God made man for Himself, and there is no rest for him till he finds it there. While Pilate sat on the judgment seat a message came to him from his wife. 'Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.' It is a situation of inimitable absurdity. But Pilate's wife knew that though her husband feared not God nor regarded man, his judgment could be determined by a dream. And so when Pilate heard

that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God, 'he was the more afraid, and went into the judgment hall and said: Whence art thou? *But Jesus gave him no answer.*'

Take Caiaphas next. Unlike Pilate, Caiaphas was a religious man. He was High Priest of the most religious race which the world has ever seen. On his forehead he wore a golden plate with the inscription, 'Holiness to the Lord.' Once every year the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies, he alone, with the blood of sprinkling, and the people waited his return with painful expectancy. When he emerged from the awful place he blessed them in the name of the God of Israel and sent them home with a sense of forgiveness. Yes, Caiaphas was a religious man.

But Caiaphas was a hypocrite. One day there came to him the startling news that at a village a few miles out of Jerusalem a man had been raised from the dead. Caiaphas called together the Council. For something must be done. If this sort of thing went on the people would certainly take Jesus and make Him their king, and the Romans would call Caiaphas and all the Council to account for it. It was a stormy meeting. Some proposed one thing and some another. Nicodemus was there protesting. Caiaphas rose: 'Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for you, that one man should die.' He knew his mind; he was astute enough (as the best text tells us) to say 'it is expedient for you.' But he was thinking all the while of himself.

And he did get Jesus put to death. When He was betrayed by Judas they brought Him before Caiaphas. They had their witnesses. But the witnesses did not agree. 'And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee? *But he held his peace, and answered nothing.*'

Take Herod third. Unlike Pilate, Herod was

a religious man; and unlike Caiaphas, he was truly religious. The Herods were all religious. Had they not been so they could not have held their place amongst the Jews, for they were Edomites. Herod the Great enlarged and beautified the Temple in Jerusalem and made it one of the wonders of the world. Herod Agrippa was almost persuaded to be a Christian. And the Herod we have now to do with, Herod Antipas, was so much interested in religion that when he invited John the Baptist to his palace, he gave him a chapel to preach in, went often to hear him preach, heard him gladly, and did many things which John bade him do—a very good test of the reality of a man's religion.

But there was one thing which he would not do. He was guilty of one open and outrageous sin, and he would not give it up. And because he would not give it up, that one sin slew Herod's religious life. Because he would not give up that one sin there came a day when he was driven to issue an order to the executioner, and the head of John the Baptist was brought to him bleeding on a plate.

Then came the Passover, and Herod went up to Jerusalem. Pilate heard that Jesus belonged to Galilee, over which Herod had jurisdiction; and he sent Him to Herod. For a long time Herod had desired to see Jesus. He had been told about Him. When he was first told about Him and about the miracles which He did, Herod had said an amazing thing. 'It is not another preacher,' he said; 'it is John whom I beheaded, he is risen from the dead.' For an outraged conscience will sometimes avenge itself, making a fool of the man who outrages it.

And now Jesus was coming. Perhaps He would speak as John had spoken, and Herod would thrill under his words as he had done in those earlier, happier days. Perhaps He would work a miracle—for Jesus could work miracles, John never could do that—perhaps He would

work such a miracle as would make Herod a religious man again though he kept his sin. Jesus came; Herod 'questioned him in many words.' *But He answered him nothing.*

For God heareth not sinners. But if any man (or woman) be a worshipper of God, and doeth His will, him He heareth. These two things are necessary—worship and conduct. And knowledge is necessary.

There is another case of silence. Jesus withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon. And behold, a Canaanitish woman came out from those borders, and cried, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. *But He answered her never a word.*

What a stone of stumbling it has been. Dr. John HUTTON takes it to be due to the ignorance of the disciples. He had to teach them that God is no respecter of persons. Well, He had, and

He taught them. But the woman must not be forgotten.

Why did He not answer her? Because she lacked knowledge. She wanted bodily healing, and she wanted it for another. He will heal the daughter, but He will also heal the mother, and that as soon as she is able to receive the healing. If He heals the daughter at once the mother may be content to go. Once He healed ten lepers and let them go. Only one of them returned to thank Him for it.

See how the knowledge came to her. It came along with faith. It came as faith. Her earnest desire for the healing of her daughter made her importunate. And such importunity has a double power. It prevails with God to give, and it opens the soul to receive. The knowledge came with the faith, came in leaps and bounds; and when she was able to receive the fulness of the gift, 'O woman,' He said, 'great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'

## William Sanday and his Work.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

### Second Paper.

DR. SANDAY'S second work, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (Macmillan, 1876), has for its second title *An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work entitled 'Supernatural Religion.'* It was written at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, and therefore of necessity is of a controversial character. This did not make the production of it more pleasing to the writer; but to some extent this characteristic makes it more valuable to the reader, if he cares to know how such a work may be written with as little as possible of the controversial spirit, and as much as possible of consideration towards a provoking, and sometimes unfair, opponent. The opponent had sent Sanday a copy of the sixth edition of his work, a

courtesy which is duly acknowledged in the Introduction to the dissection of it.

Of this second work Sanday said in October 1909 that he had forgotten very much of what was in it, but he 'suspected that it would be found to contain the germ of most that he had been able to offer in the way of critical method ever since.' This is very true. If those who have been familiar with the subject for some years were to read Sanday's book now for the first time, they might here and there become rather impatient, and wonder why he spent so much time and trouble in prolonged investigations of points about which nearly every one whose opinion is of weight is agreed. Yes, they are agreed now; but there was