
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

IN MEMORIAM

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

DIED 15TH OCTOBER 1922

THE proofs of this number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES were found lying upon Dr. Hastings' study table after God had 'laid His hand upon his heart and healed it for ever.' He leaves behind him a noble example of self-sacrificing work. A notable career has ended, and a wonderful record has closed. But his work will live after him. We cannot allow this issue to go to press without briefly expressing our deep affection for a beloved friend with whom we have been associated in all his work for so many years.

T. & T. CLARK.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'I WAS impressed with the grave necessity of demonstrating our will-to-peace as men demonstrated their will-to-war. The speeches made in our Conference, and still more the private conversations of the delegates, disclosed vast ranges of peace sentiment which never find expression. Behind Governments and politicians, behind diplomatists and militarists, there is a great silent world of men and women yearning for peace. Delegates from every land spoke about it. Dr. Deissmann said that the dumb masses in Germany were seeking for peace. Dr. Monod said that the French folk were wearily longing for peace—"the men in our universities as well as the peasants in our fields." Delegates from Greece said that their people were hungry for peace. Americans and Englishmen spoke of their nations' passion for peace. The peoples are not numb; they are only dumb. They do not lack heart, they are only in want of a voice. They cannot demonstrate their desires. They cannot speak so as to make Governments hear and heed. They need an organ of expression, and where can they find an organ except in the Church of the Living God? What is the Church for but to be a mouth for the dumb, an instrument to utter the silent yearnings of the purest and the best in every land? Has the Church of Christ the needful life and initiative? Has she the spirit of courage and venture? Or is she dumb because she is numb? Has she health and vigour enough to gather together all that is holy and wholesome in the world, and demonstrate it in an audible judgment which will be like a voice from the throne of God? Is the Church of Christ ready to organise the forces of redemption? "Like a mighty army moves the Church of God." Is that to be a radiant reality or only an idle dream?'

The man who writes so, and ends by asking that question, is a preacher, the Rev. J. H. JOWETT, D.D. It is by preaching first of all that his question is to be answered.

Dr. JOWETT has given in *The British Weekly* his impressions of the Conference held at Copenhagen. He had other impressions, but none that made so deep a mark as this. This is the subject that remained with him after the Conference was over. This is the subject that is with him still. And always the conclusion is that the great need of the

moment is instruction in the principles of peace, and that the pulpit is the place for it.

He quotes the words of two Prime Ministers. In conversation, soon after the Genoa Conference, Mr. Lloyd George 'declared his conviction that what was wanted in these Conferences was a different atmosphere, a more imperative sense of moral ideal, and a driving power which would give the moral ideal its rightful constraints and sovereignty.' And then he added: 'We have not had the requisite religious force behind us, and it is for the Churches to supply it.'

The other is the Prime Minister of Japan. 'The Premier of Japan is not a professing Christian, but this was his judgment as he reviewed the verbal decisions of the Conference: "We must now look to the leaders of religion."' 'What,' asks Dr. JOWETT, 'is the response of the leaders of religion to the Prime Ministers of Britain and Japan?' The leaders of religion are the ministers of the gospel throughout the world. Their response is to make Peace the chief topic of their preaching, and the chief concern of their prayer, throughout the coming winter.

Now it happens that, long before the Genoa and the Copenhagen Conferences were held, the conviction came to us that Peace must be preached beyond everything else, and a volume was prepared to serve as the basis of discourse. One of the volumes of the 'Great Christian Doctrine' series, it is nevertheless not at all theological but altogether practical. The whole Biblical doctrine of Peace is discussed in it—the Peace of God and the Peace of Christ, Peace with God, with Conscience, and with Men, and, above all, the question of Peace or War. A fresh exposition is given of the principles underlying the Sermon on the Mount, leading to an interpretation of the Non-resistance sentences. And at every step the truth is made clear and sent home by new and carefully chosen illustrations.

The Conference at Cambridge in 1921 of the Modernists has been the occasion of much spilling of ink, as the newspapers express it. Another fairly large volume is just out, its author the Rev. Arthur C. CHAMPNEYS, M.A., and its title *A Different Gospel* (Bell; 3s. 6d. net).

The ground is carefully covered, few spots in the Modernist feast being left unexposed. But the author will forgive us if we say that the single page preface is worth the whole book. The preface has been written by F. A. DIXEY, M.D., F.R.S., Fellow of Wadham College, and Curator of Hope Collections in the University of Oxford.

Dr. DIXEY sees that behind all the efforts of Modernism to offer us another gospel lies a fallacy. It is the fallacy that miracles do not occur. If the Modernist could believe in miracles he could accept Jesus Christ as He is offered to us in the Gospels. But he cannot believe in miracles.

Why not? Because the laws of nature are uniform and admit of no such interruption. That is the position in a sentence. That is the fundamental article of the Modernist creed. From that all the rest comes forth.

But in making that the fundamental article of their creed the Modernists are out of date. They are a whole generation too old. In the end of the nineteenth century it was possible to hold that the laws of nature are unalterable. It is not possible in the twentieth. It is known now that there are no such things as laws belonging to nature. These so-called laws are our own invention. They are for convenience of speech. And they mean no more than that the universe is a cosmos, an orderly system, which we can depend upon for the work we have to do.

To say that these laws admit of no interruption is to assume a knowledge of the universe which we do not possess. Says Dr. DIXEY: 'Natural science is perfectly justified in saying that many of the recorded occurrences in the New Testament cannot

be brought under the operation of any of the ascertained uniformities of natural process ; but in order to meet these records with a blank denial, it is necessary to make the assumption that our knowledge of cause and effect, admittedly imperfect in the past, is at the present day complete and unalterable.'

And every new day offers new proof that it is not. Is telepathy a fact? Science cannot say yet. To-morrow it may be able to say. Hypnotism is a fact. Yesterday it was denied, and on this very ground that it contradicted the laws of nature.

What, then, are we to do with the miracles? We are to take them on their evidence, just as we take everything else. 'Whether they actually occur,' says Dr. DIXEY, 'is purely a matter of evidence.' And he adds this significant sentence: 'In considering the credibility of the witnesses of alleged miraculous events, it should be remembered that in the history of human experience it has frequently happened that phenomena have been observed which the then existing knowledge of natural "law" was unable to explain.'

In the year 1909 there was celebrated in Cambridge the centenary of the birth of Charles Darwin, and the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*. An invitation was addressed to the Catholic University of Louvain to send a representative. The University decided to accept the invitation, and sent Canon DORLODOT, D.D., D.Sc., the Director of its Geological Institute.

Canon DORLODOT went with a will. And enjoyed himself. Even yet he thrills with pleasure as he remembers the moment when his name was called by the Chancellor of Cambridge University. 'Each name was naturally greeted with applause ; but the clapping was redoubled when the Registrar of the University announced "The delegate of the Catholic University of Louvain." The élite of English Catholics were equally pleased. I was informed that my address sounded just the right note in the opinion of all the Catholics present, and was subsequently given publicity in the *Tablet*.'

But very different was his reception when he returned to Belgium. In Catholic communities the name of Darwin is not held in honour. No proposal is ever likely to be made for his canonization. Have not his books been on the Index all these years? His *Origin of Species* is bad enough, but his *Descent of Man!* No Catholic can forget that Darwin is supposed to have held that man is descended from the monkey. Canon DORLODOT at a celebration of the centenary of the birth of Darwin? He might as well (as he now ruefully says) have celebrated a centenary of the birth of Luther.

So Canon DORLODOT called a 'Conference'—several 'Conferences'—and proceeded to answer for his presence in Cambridge. His answer has now been translated into English by the Rev. Ernest MESSENGER under the title of *Darwinism and Catholic Thought* (Burns, Oates & Washbourne ; 6s. net).

What is it that hinders a Protestant from declaring his belief in Darwinism? Is there anything that hinders? That which stands in the Catholic's way is very definite and very dreadful. It is, first of all, Tradition ; next, it is the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* of Pope Leo XIII. ; and, finally, it is the Biblical Commission of Pius X. All these obstacles had to be overcome by Canon DORLODOT, and he overcame them all.

What is Darwinism? Canon DORLODOT sums it up in two propositions. First, 'the primary origin of living beings is the result of a special influence on the part of the Creator, who infused life into one or a few elementary organisms.' And next, 'these organisms, by evolving in the course of ages, have given rise to all the organic species which exist at the present time, as well as those which have come down to us only in the fossil state.'

Opposed to those two 'fairly moderate' pro-

positions there are extreme opinions, one on either side. There is 'the theory known as Absolute Evolution, and the theory known as Creationism or Fixism. The theory of Absolute Evolution denies the special intervention of God, even in the origin of life: it attributes the first origin of living beings to a natural evolution of inorganic matter, which became organised and ultimately living matter by the simple action of forces, or, better still, of powers inherent in matter, or which at least were inherent in it in days gone by. The Creationist theory, on the other hand, admits a special intervention of God at the beginning of each one of the groups which we now call species.'

Now if Canon DORLODOT had been an ordinary controversialist, he would have shown that the two extreme opinions are wrong, and the middle opinion right. But that was not his purpose. He himself is a believer in Absolute Evolution. He does not hold that God's hand is to be discovered anywhere in all the long line of evolution—not at the place where a new species is found, not even at the beginning where all the start was made. He had to persuade his Catholic hearers that Absolute Evolution is the Catholic doctrine. And he did it. Over Tradition, over the Papal Encyclical, over the Biblical Commission—he rode right over them all and came home triumphant.

His chief difficulty was with the six days of creation. He rejected with contempt the modern notion that the six days are six periods of time. Well, then, if they are six days they are six days, said Tradition, Encyclical, and Commission. Not so, said Canon DORLODOT, they are nothing. For first of all, 'we must reject *a priori* any interpretation which would make a text of Holy Writ a Divine instruction upon a subject belonging to the physical or natural sciences'—and of course he proved to his hearers that Tradition, Encyclical, and Commission were with him there. And in the next place, 'when the sacred writers describe natural objects, we must understand them sometimes in a figurative sense, and at other times we must simply bear in mind that they are speaking the language of the men of their time, language which corresponds more often to the sensible appearances than to the inmost nature of things'—and again he showed that he had all the authorities on his side. Then triumphantly: 'It is by means of these rules of interpretation that we must seek the explanation of the apparent contradictions between the language of Holy Scripture and that of modern science.' And his Catholic hearers had committed themselves to the statement that Genesis and Science are in contradiction, and that, when they are in contradiction, Genesis must go.

Within the domain of Biblical theology we do not see any book more frequently quoted by progressive scholars than Professor E. F. SCOTT's volume on the Fourth Gospel. The interpretation of that Gospel seems to have taken a new departure from it.

Professor SCOTT has now written another book. His mind has been drawn to *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Doctrine and Significance* (T. & T. Clark; 8s.). So are the minds of many scholars drawn to-day. It is a modern attraction. Last generation may be said to have discovered the Epistle to the Hebrews. This generation may obtain the credit of having interpreted it. After centuries of neglect, even of deliberate disregard, this great Epistle is at last coming to its own.

The disregard of the Epistle to the Hebrews was due to suspicion of its theology. For its theology is its own. It is neither Pauline nor Johannine, it is neither Petrine nor Jacobine. Now the attraction of Professor SCOTT's book on the Fourth Gospel lay most of all in the way it brought out the distinctiveness of the Johannine theology. It may therefore be expected that he will not miss the distinctiveness—he is almost prepared to call it the eccentricity—of the theology of this unique Epistle.

It is distinctive in its very conception of religion.

What is religion? The writer of the Epistle—by the way, Dr. SCOTT does not know his name, and does not care to know. 'The church,' he says, 'had many leaders and teachers, and among them men of conspicuous gifts, of whom no record has come to us. The writer of Hebrews, it is fairly certain, was one of those forgotten teachers, and the search for his name is labour wasted.'

The writer of the Epistle, whoever he was, or she, does not open his argument with a definition of religion, after the manner of a modern theologian. 'With abstract analysis of this kind ancient thought did not concern itself. Nevertheless there is everywhere present to his mind a definite idea of what religion means, and by this idea his whole argument is tacitly determined. It is summed up in the phrase which meets us continually in the Epistle—"to draw near to God."'

Now that conception of religion is not Pauline, nor is it Johannine. It is not the conception of the Synoptic Gospels. In the Synoptic teaching, 'Jesus seeks to awaken in men such a confidence in the heavenly Father that they draw near to Him—surrendering themselves, in joyful obedience, to His will. For Paul the one end of religion is fellowship with God; and in the love of Christ, from which nothing can separate us, he finds the assurance of this fellowship. A similar view is set forth in the Johannine writings, although the communion with God is there conceived in a more metaphysical fashion, as a participation in the divine nature. But in Hebrews we hear nothing of fellowship with God, much less of actual union with Him; for it is assumed that God must always remain apart, "the Majesty in the heavens." Our attitude, even when we draw nearest to the throne of grace, cannot be other than one of "reverence and godly fear." The approach to God in which religion consists, is regarded, in this Epistle, as an act of *worship*, and is described in the language of Old Testament ritual.'

Is it, then, taken over from the Old Testament? It is taken over with a difference. And the difference is vital. In the Old Testament God is the sovereign Lord, and the attitude of the worshipper is an attitude of awe and homage. Then this attitude passes into confidence, confidence that the worshipper, because he is a worshipper, has a right to God's protection. The Psalmists become aware 'that amidst all changes and troubles they have an ever-present help. They attain to a condition of soul in which there is no longer any thought of the benefits they may receive from God, since the approach to Him is itself the fulness of life and joy.'

'The writer of Hebrews sets out from this Old Testament conception of religion as worship. But where the Old Testament simply accepts the fact that in the approach to God we obtain the supreme blessing, he connects this fact with another, which to his mind explains it. By drawing near to God as His people we draw near, at the same time, to the heavenly world. Our lives are no longer bound up with the visible and changing things, but are firmly anchored to the eternal realities. These two ideas of access to God and access to the higher world are everywhere united in the Epistle, and are both included in the conception of worship. To come into God's presence is to pass through the veil—to rise out of the sphere of change and illusion and find our true home among the things that cannot be shaken.'

'From this it follows that worship does not consist in certain acts of homage, performed at stated intervals, but in the abiding condition of those whom God has accepted as His people. As Paul conceived of the Christian life as an uninterrupted fellowship with God in Christ, so this writer thinks of it as a continual act of worship. Through our great High Priest we have been enabled to draw near to God, and by so doing to identify ourselves with the higher world. Worship has its sign and outcome in that spirit of faith whereby we apprehend the things not seen.'

This conception of the unseen is a feature of the

Epistle to the Hebrews which is so pervasive and so fruitful that it alone gives the Epistle distinction. For it is not simply a realization, however vivid, of the future world. The contrast between the seen and the unseen is spatial rather than temporal. But neither is it spatial, if that word suggests the notion of locality. It may be that St. Paul could not think of 'the heavenlies' without the thought of a habitation in space. The writer of this Epistle is not embarrassed in that way. In the unseen, which is also the eternal, that which is imperfect here and now has become perfect. And that perfection is realized, not only in the Christian High Priest, but in Christians, in the very Christians whom the writer was acquainted with, and in the writer himself. For its attainment is through faith. And faith is the realization of the things which every worshipper of God hopes for; it is the present possession of the things that are unseen and eternal.

The enmity between Edom and Israel was of long standing and very bitter. It began, in folklore if not in fact, with a quarrel between Esau and Jacob in their mother's womb. The difference between the two, as they grew to manhood, was very marked both in body and in mind; and many stories were told, intensely interesting as we read them even now, of their rivalry. Strange to say, these stories, though coming to us from the Israelites, make Jacob the transgressor, with more than a taste of meanness, and Esau the sufferer, with more than a touch of magnanimity.

But historically the enmity took definite shape when the Israelites reached the borders of Edom on their way to Canaan. They asked permission to pass through the Edomite country and were refused. They never forgot that refusal. Other acts of hostility must have passed between them in the course of their history, for even the Philistines, with whom the Israelites waged a long conflict for their very existence, were never hated as the Edomites were. But the climax came when Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem and carried the Jews captive to Babylon. The Edomites assisted the Babylonians and urged them to raze Jerusalem to the ground. Then they stood by the way as the Israelites passed to the land of their captivity, rejoiced openly and insultingly over their calamity, and caught and killed any one who attempted to escape.

The enmity was of long standing. Amos says: 'His anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever.' But the last act was beyond forgiveness. On the Edomites falls the only curse in all the prophecies of Jeremiah. Against the Edomites Ezekiel utters the fiercest of his threats. The Book of Obadiah is nothing but a prophecy of the doom prepared for the hated nation. The poet of Ps 137 united the Babylonian tyrant and the Edomite traitor in one imprecation, so terrible in its vindictiveness that we shudder as we repeat it now. But the most awe-inspiring of all the prophecies or poems is the vision which Isaiah saw, of the avenger of Israel's wrongs returning from the slaughter of the Edomites, and boasting that he had trod them in his anger and trampled them in his fury and that their blood had stained his raiment.

The passage is Is 63^{1-6}. It is the passage appointed to be read for the Epistle in the morning's service of Monday in Holy Week. What can a preacher do with it? For its meaning is unmistakable. Isaiah sees in vision a warrior, haughty and remorseless, returning from the slaughter of the Edomites. He is the avenger of Israel's wrongs. He boasts that he has trodden them in his anger and trampled them in his fury. The prophet asks the meaning of his dyed garments and his glorious apparel. The raiment is dyed with the Edomites' blood. There is no thought of concealment. 'Their life-blood has been sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment.' It is a vision of utter and unrelenting vengeance. What is the preacher to do with it?

He may preach the gospel of the grace of God with it. For out of it come two great principles of God's

working in the world, the two principles that explain all the anomalies of the world and vindicate the ways of God with men.

The first principle is this: *Every wrong that has ever been done upon earth shall be righted.*

Isaiah saw that. That is why he had this vision. All the prophets saw it. It is the faith that made them prophets. We bandy words about their foretelling, or their forth-telling, and we miss the very meaning of their existence. Their foretelling was forth-telling, and their forth-telling was foretelling always, for both were covered by their faith in God, the righteous God, the God who sees that righteousness is done. There were two facts which the prophets of Israel were sure of—one that God is absolutely just, the other that He is able to make His justice prevail. With these two facts they interpreted every event as it occurred, saw into the future, and had boundless confidence in God.

The Lord executeth righteous acts,
And judgments for all that are oppressed.
He made known his ways unto Moses,
His doings unto the children of Israel.

He made known His ways and His doings by the mouth of His servants the prophets. In prophetic vision Isaiah saw Israel's avenger return from the destruction of the Edomites, when no such destruction had yet taken place, because he knew that every wrong done under heaven is righted.

It was a great discovery. Have we made it? Have we even accepted it from the Hebrew prophet? Who can believe that we have accepted it who remembers the things which were said when the War began? Either God is not just or He has not the power to make His justice prevail—those were the things that were said. And they are said to this day. The end of the War, though it was in power and righteousness, did by no means bring us belief in the righteousness and the power of God. The popular belief at the moment seems to be that God is well-meaning but weak. Let us get back to the prophets. Let us get back to St. Paul. 'God is not mocked,' said St. Paul, 'for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap'—there is His righteousness. And again: 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God'—there is His power. We laugh now at Browning's

God's in His heaven,
All's right with the world.

But that is the very discovery that gives the Hebrew prophets their unique place in the history of the world.

The second principle is this: The wrong is righted, *not by the suffering of the wrong-doer, but of the wronged.*

Did Isaiah see that? The conqueror in Isaiah's vision returned from Edom with the blood of the Edomites sprinkled on his garments. But in the vision of Christ the conqueror returns and the blood that stains his raiment is his own blood.

'If a man smite thee on the right cheek,' what then? There are three ways of it. 'I will smite him back'—that is one way. That is the pre-prophetic way. 'God will smite him'—that is another way. That is the prophetic way. The third way is 'Turn to him the other also.' That is Christ's way.

Which of the ways is likely to prevail? The pre-prophetic way has been tried from the beginning; has it ever won? It is the way that is tried by most men and nations still: is there any sign of its winning? The second way, the prophetic way, is right, but it needs interpretation. It *is* God's way; but not as Isaiah understood it. The only way that has won and will win is the way of Christ.

When the Boxer riots took place in China an expedition was sent to punish the Chinese. The great nations of Europe were represented in the army; a German general was in command. The Missionaries protested against it. They wanted no revenge. The Kaiser gave orders to his general

that no mercy was to be shown. Which way is the winning way, the Kaiser's or the Missionaries'?

The Israelites themselves found the winning way. They found it when they became followers of Christ. Until Christ came there was no forgiveness for the Edomites. The Romans sent an Edomite to rule in Judea, and Herod the Great did all that man could do to conciliate the Jews. He married a daughter of their race. He built a Temple—for magnificence the wonder of the world. But they hated him still, and all the Herods that came after him. Then one of these Jews, exiled to the isle that is called Patmos, had a vision. It was a vision of vengeance over the Edomites, like Isaiah's. But in place of the proud conqueror, his raiment stained with the life-blood of his enemies, what John saw was a lamb as it had been slain.

When is this victory won? It is won when the wrong-doer sees himself in the wronged.

The ranks are crowded tier on tier,
  And midst them in my place am I,
As oft before; we talk and jeer,
  Waiting to see yon captive die,
Who in the arena stands alone;
  He turns his face—I see my own!

'Tis I that wait the roar and rush
  When bars are raised; 'tis I that fall
Upon my knees, amid the hush
  Of cruel tongues, on Christ to call;
Upon whose parted lips the while
  There breaks a glad triumphant smile.

So it was with Saul of Tarsus. First came Jesus and identified Himself with those to whom Saul was doing wrong. 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' And then Saul identified himself with Jesus, 'I am crucified with Christ.' The victory was complete.

George Adam Smith.

By William L. Davidson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Aberdeen.

It is a great thing for any University to have as its head a man of learning whose fame as a scholar is widely known throughout the world. Aberdeen University is specially favoured in this respect in its Principal and Vice-Chancellor, Sir George Adam Smith, whose writings in Biblical Criticism are standard works in America as well as throughout Europe. His exhaustive treatise on Isaiah attracted many of us years ago when it first made its appearance, while he was minister of what was then Queen's Cross Free Church, Aberdeen, and the outstanding preacher of the day. Not only lucidity of style, mastery of thought, and critical acumen distinguish this solid and inspiring work, but also rare open-mindedness and liberality of view.

The personality of Sir George Adam Smith is a very complex one, and it is not easy to do justice to the characterization of it. What attracts the attention of one who first comes in contact with him is his geniality and alertness, and his keen interest in any subject that may be brought before him for consideration. He is essentially an active man, alive at every point, in mind and in body, and not sparing himself when duty calls or help has to be given. His range of intellectual interest is practically unbounded. And, as the width of his sympathy is great, so also is the range of his acquirements. As a scholar, he occupies a front position in Hebrew learning, with which we naturally associate his name, and to which his students of former years in the United Free College of Glasgow bear grateful witness; but he is also a distinguished classicist, and has wide sympathy with philosophy and cognate studies. Of his many published works, two have long ago attained the position of classics—*The Book of Isaiah* (in two volumes), and *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, the latter of which achieved a new edition every year for seven years after its publication in 1901. To these must be added his *Deuteronomy* (1918), and *The Early Poetry of Israel*, which reproduces the substance of his