
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.

Is it possible to be converted to evil as well as to good? If it is possible what should we call a conversion to evil? Perversion is another thing and will not do.

Professor James WARD believes that conversion to evil often occurs, but he does not give it a name. He does not even offer an example. For the only case he cites he goes to fiction. It is the case of the Duke of Gloucester in Shakespeare's *Richard III.*

'Unable, owing to his personal deformities and forbidding appearance, to take a leading part in the frivolous court life of the early years of his brother's reign, Gloucester ends his soliloquy in the first scene of the play with the resolve:

> And therefore—since I cannot prove a lover,
> To entertain these fair well-spoken days,—
> I am determined to prove a villain
> And hate the idle pleasures of these days.

So indeed he proved. "I am a villain" are almost his last words the night before his death on Bosworth Field.'

Is it a genuine case of conversion? It is not. It could not be. For conversion is the work of the Holy Spirit of God. And whatever you believe about the authorship of evil, you do not believe that the Holy Spirit has an active part in a man's moral suicide. The absence of the Holy Spirit, the quenching of the Holy Spirit—that may be the occasion, but not His presence and operation.

But does Professor WARD, as a psychologist believe in conversion at all? The question is worth asking. For in recent years we have been very circumspect in the use of that word, and the psychologists have been the cause of our circumspection.

He does believe in it.

Professor WARD has published a great book on psychology. In a preface, which is amusingly confessional, he tells the whole story of the way by which it has come to its present form. 'Just forty years ago, that is in 1878—when I began lecturing on Psychology—the plan of the book was laid down.' Some chapters were written and were either received or rejected by magazine editors. Six years later the editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* persuaded him to write the article on 'Psychology' for the ninth edition. 'I rashly sacrificed my book to the offer, and so, as it has turned out, destroyed one of the dreams of my life.'

'The article was begun late in 1884 and com-

pleted in 1885; then, in 1902, a supplementary article was prepared for the tenth edition of the *Encyclopædia*; and finally, in 1908, these with omissions and additions were hastily amalgamated into the new article of the present or eleventh edition. For here again circumstances were untoward. I had at first declined to undertake this, pointing out the advisability of an entirely new article, which at the time I was not disposed to attempt, and recommending a younger man well fitted to take my place. Some two years later, however, the obdurate editor with many compliments begged me to reconsider my decision, but telling me plainly that—in default of a revised article from me—he meant just to reprint the old ones as they were. Finding that his threat could be legally upheld, I yielded to his importunity. Thus the final article like the first one was done in a hurry.'

It was in 1894 that Professor WARD finally abandoned the dream of his life, the writing of an entirely new book on psychology. But the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* was greatly in demand and hard to obtain. 'In view of this demand I stipulated that I should be at liberty to use the articles as the basis for a new book. This permission was readily granted by the proprietors of the copyright; but on the understanding that the book should be about a third longer and not sold below a certain price.'

'Accordingly, in the spring of 1913, when arrangements for this book were made, my intention was to meet the general wish for a reissue of the *Encyclopædia* article and at the same time to satisfy the demands of the proprietors by enlarging it from material already more or less in shape. On the prescribed scale some three-quarters of the article were expanded within about a year, bringing the book down to the end of chapter xi. Owing to the exigencies of space, the sections of the article dealing with experience at the self-conscious and social level had been unduly compressed. Hence the remaining chapters (xii.–xviii.), forming almost a third of the book, are, with the exception of a few pages, entirely new; and the last two were no part of the original plan.'

That is the story. And this is the book. Verily a magnificent book and worthy of its outward appearance. Worthy also of being the first volume of a new series of books to be called 'The Cambridge Psychological Library.' Its own title is *Psychological Principles* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 21s. net).

It is at the very end of this book that Professor WARD declares his belief in conversion. He has been speaking of character, and he is led to ask the question whether in the formation of character such a thing as a crisis can ever occur. His answer is that a crisis occurs frequently. 'Crises,' he says, 'in the development of personality are the rule rather than the exception.' And of such crises the most notable instance is what 'is familiarly known in religious experience as conversion or "second birth."'

Professor WARD does not say that every religious crisis in life is a true conversion. As we have already seen, such a crisis may be a mere resolve, and may be a resolve to do ill, not well. More than that, the 'change of heart' is often deceptive and has only a temperamental origin. But 'sometimes at any rate it is genuine.'

What is the test? You expect Professor WARD to say the man's moral life. But he does not say so. For he is a psychologist. And as a psychologist he takes account of much more than a man's outward conduct. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' No doubt. And conduct is the most obvious fruit and will always be the popular test of the sincerity of a man's claim to conversion. But the claim is to far more than acts that are in accordance with the moral law. It is a claim to be above law. And that claim, says Professor WARD, is justly made.

'They *were* superior to the weakness of the flesh, the fear of men and the temporal anxieties that hold so many in bondage, leading perhaps to the "self-loathing and self-despair" from which this new "birth" is the deliverance. Thus, for these religious geniuses at any rate, "the divided self" ceased to be, and the inner peace and unity they professed to have found, appeared in its stead. With a single eye and a single aim their whole being seemed full of light and joy. At one in mind and will with the ground of all reality and the source of all good, as they conceived it, what had they to fear, whoever might be against them? They stood fast, strenuously devoted through life and faithful in death to the widest, deepest and highest that they knew, or indeed—when all is said and done—that it has entered into the heart of man to conceive.'

It may be said that the God-consciousness which they trust to is not verifiable. It is after all not knowledge. It is only faith. Professor WARD maintains, and he says he must maintain it emphatically, that that makes no difference. As a psychologist he holds that that to which men attain by faith is higher than that to which they attain by knowledge. 'Reaching by subjective selection [he speaks as a psychologist] to the supreme in the scale of values, we must regard them as so far attaining to the highest rank as personalities; their world was circumscribed by no selfish interests, since they loved God, in whom and by whom and for whom were all things.'

The great demand of the day is for adaptation. The ancient faith must be made to fit the modern mind. But what if the modern mind is mistaken? Then the effort to make the ancient faith fit it will end in accommodation. And adaptation is right, but accommodation is wrong.

The modern mind is represented by Canon GLAZEBROOK. You might say it is officially represented by him. For he is Chairman of the Council of the Churchmen's Union, and was chosen to write the first of a series of books to be called 'The Modern Churchman's Library.' He wrote the book entitled *The Faith of a Modern Churchman.*

Four statements of the ancient faith are unacceptable to Canon GLAZEBROOK as they stand. Take them from the Apostles' Creed. They are: (1) He descended into hell; (2) He ascended into heaven; (3) And sitteth at the right hand of God; (4) The resurrection of the flesh. Canon GLAZEBROOK demands that each of these statements should be made to fit his modern mind. The Right Rev. Frederic Henry CHASE, Bishop of Ely, says that his demand is not adaptation but accommodation.

The Bishop of Ely has written a book about it. The title is *Belief and Creed* (Macmillan; 3s. net). First of all he sent a letter to Canon GLAZEBROOK and published it. Dr. GLAZEBROOK replied in the *Times*. This book reprints both letters and then discusses the whole subject.

Everything turns on the question whether the four clauses of the Creed already quoted are to be interpreted literally or symbolically. Do they represent historical facts, or do they represent spiritual ideas thrown into a historical form? Canon GLAZEBROOK would say they were once understood literally; now they can only be understood symbolically.

Take the clause, 'Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.' The Bishop of Ely says that 'beyond all dispute these words are a categorical affirmation that our Lord, without the intervention of a human father, was born of a Virgin.' Canon GLAZEBROOK says that they express no more than the fact of the Incarnation. Or take the clause, 'The third day he rose again from the dead.' This, says Dr. CHASE, admittedly means that the body of the Lord was raised from the dead on the third day after death.

Canon Glazebrook admits the meaning but denies the fact. He finds in the clause a symbolical representation of a spiritual truth, the truth that 'the Lord survived death, and that in the hour of His death His spirit, clothed in a spiritual body, went to God.'

The books which have been written since the war began on the fate of the men who have fallen have been very many. It is not surprising. For, besides the desire to find comfort for those who mourn, and strength for those who are weak in faith, there is the sense that our whole doctrine of salvation is in the furnace.

Our doctrine is that salvation is by faith in Christ. We may not be asked the question in the exact words of the Philippian jailer, 'Sirs, what must I do to be saved?' but we have no other answer to give than the answer which was given to him, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' Now we know that of the men who fell only an insignificant fraction could with any truth be said to have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ. What has become of the rest? And what has become of our theology?

The matter has now begun to trouble America. It is the surest of all signs that America also has been in the furnace. A book has been written about *God in a World at War* by Dr. Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University (Allen & Unwin; 1s. 6d. net), in which the great simple issues are discussed with American plainness of speech.

Professor Macintosh makes no claim for the soldier's religion. He calls it 'trench-religion,' and he has no more respect for 'trench-religion' than he has for 'death-bed repentance.' 'It sometimes has a discernibly permanent effect; but, speaking generally, it tends to disappear when the danger is over. It is a well-known fact that when troops are expecting, in the course of a few hours, to go into action, it is not a difficult thing to get them, almost to a man, to partake of the sacraments of the Church. But the writer can say from his own observation in a camp made up of veterans who had been for some months — in hospital, convalescent home, and command depot —away from the front lines, that the number of men remaining for the Communion service after "Church parade" was commonly not more than from two to five per cent. of the total number present. And this characteristically frank confession was made by an officer: "When I was in the trenches, I prayed like a good one; but a week later, when I was back in billets, I didn't care a damn for religion."'

Professor Macintosh agrees with others in declaring that the ordinary attitude of the soldier to religion is fatalism—'the well-known fatalism of the trenches.' 'Realizing how little any one at "the real front" can do, through prayer or in any other way, to guarantee his immunity from death, he finds comfort in the thought that the time and manner of his death are settled beforehand. And so, with the thought, "What's the use of worrying?" he learns to do his daily duty with a fine scorn of the constant menace of death.'

And Dr. Macintosh prefers this attitude. 'It is often the soldier's way, crude and inadequate though it may be, of expressing his self-commitment to an overruling providence. It may even be the soldier's "camouflage" for a faith that might have been expressed in the familiar words, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." In any case, there are many—and I have found chaplains among them—who feel that it is the only thing that makes life tolerable at the front.'

But it is not satisfactory. It is not enough for the soldier and it is not enough for our theology. For one thing, it throws the emphasis on the time of the death, not on the manner of it. But it matters little '*when* one dies, as compared with *how* one dies. It is the truth that through self-surrender to God and dependence upon Him

one can become inwardly or spiritually prepared for whatever duty he may have to do and whatever danger he may be called upon to face.'

This attitude has not been unknown. It was well expressed by a young Canadian soldier, Ernest Garside Black, before he went into action in the great battle of the Somme in 1916:

O God of Battles, now that time has come
Which in the prègnant months in camp has been
The goal of everything, my hope, my fear,
The peril of the thing as yet unseen:

That fear and wounds and death may pass me by,
Is not the boon, O Lord, for which I pray;
For having put the rim within my lips,
I do not ask to put the cup away.

But grant the heart that Thou hast given me
May in the hour of peril never fail,
And that my will to serve and do my part
May ever o'er my will to live prevail.

Thou knowest, Lord, my soul doth not fear death,
Although my body craves to live its span;
Help me to grapple with my body's fear,
And grant, O Lord, that I may play the man.

This opens the way to Professor MACINTOSH'S solution. He holds that the soldier is a son of God. He does not say unequivocally that all the soldiers are sons of God. He uses the words, 'these brave lads in the trenches.' But certainly he suggests no exception. 'These brave lads in the trenches,' he says, 'are all of them well-beloved sons of God. When one has watched the soldiers marching up to the trenches, stern and thoughtful, looking straight ahead through the gathering night to the unknown that awaits them; when one has seen them with the guns and on the fire-step; when one has seen them returning from the trenches, as the writer saw them by the thousand in the great battle of the Somme, for example, some of them from two days' fighting, in which a trench had been captured from the enemy, consolidated and held against heavy shell fire and three counter-attacks; when one has looked upon the sublime spectacle of these rain-soaked, mud-beplastered men from the field of battle, haggard and ready to drop from exhaustion, but ready to help one another, considerate, grateful for the least word or act of kindness, uncomplaining and cheery, with an air of spiritual content about them; or when one has seen the freshly wounded in the dressing stations bearing their pain and their ghastly mutilations with quiet fortitude, and when one reflects that it is the chastisement of our peace that has been laid upon them, and that with their stripes we are healed, one cannot escape the conviction that out of the world's groaning and travailing in pain there has come a revealing of the sons of God. If these gallant soldier-lads are not sons of God, there are no sons of God among us.'

But Professor MACINTOSH knows very well that such a doctrine of sonship is very different from the New Testament doctrine. He tries to save himself and his doctrine immediately. He says: 'There is much that is far from perfect in them, no doubt; they are sinful sons of men, and many of them will have to suffer the bitter consequences of their sins. They need the regenerating power of God, like the rest of us; they need to become consciously, and by their own free decision, sons of God in a fuller and more intimate sense of the term. But after one has come to know them as they are, at their best and at their worst, one does not wonder any more that God should love sinners. In spite of everything they are already, in a very real sense of the word, God's sons; and His likeness can be seen in their faces, marred with the grime and blood of battle for a just and holy cause.'

But he has really thrown the doctrine of salvation by faith away. And he sees it. He goes

back to the Gospels. He goes to the parables. 'There is a parable of two sons, both of whom were bidden by their father to go and work in the vineyard. One of them replied, "I go, sir," but he went not. The other said, "I will not," but he afterwards repented and went. Performance without profession *versus* profession without performance. After all it is performance that counts. There are some who, in those far-off days before the war, professed to be in a special relation of sonship to God, and promised to be obedient to His will. And then the time of testing came, and they "went not." But these others, many of them, in those bygone days never ventured much in the way of profession or promise. But when the time for devoting their lives to the sacred Cause arrived, they responded to the call and "went." Of the two sorts of "sons," which were the ones who *did* the will of their father?'

So then it is not 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.' It is 'Inasmuch as ye did it. . . . Come, ye blessed of my Father.' Or are these two one?

The attitude of Science to Religion we know; what is the attitude of Philosophy? Turn to the Gifford lecturer.

The latest Gifford lecturer to publish his lectures is the Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, W. R. SORLEY, Litt.D., LL.D. The lectures were delivered in Aberdeen in 1914 and 1915. Their title as published is *Moral Values and the Idea of God* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 16s. net).

The title brings God and man together. Now in the coincidence of God and man the first question of importance is the question of human freedom. It is also the last. For if we see our way to a restful doctrine of freewill we see all that we need to see on earth. We can really 'tell what God and man is.'

We believe that we are free. We act upon the belief. When a rumour comes (as it used to come from the trenches) that we are the toys of chance or fate, we receive a disagreeable shock of surprise. And we protest. For if we are not free, there is no morality. And if there is no morality, it were better simply not to be.

We believe that we are free. But is it merely a popular working belief? What does Philosophy say? The latest philosophy is with us. 'If there is no freedom in man's volition, and each act is rigidly determined by his inherited disposition and his environment, then it is plain that every act of man is really caused by that being who is the author at once of his nature and of the world in which he lives. To his Creator, and only to his Creator, it ought to be imputed. And, if this is so, we are left without any kind of hypothesis by which to explain the preference of the worse to the better course, or to render that preference consistent with the goodness of God.'

That is Professor SORLEY. And it is a real freedom that he offers us. It is a freedom which accounts for the actual choice of evil when good might have been chosen.

That is so far well. It is well for man. But what of God? If man can do evil and God is not the author of it, things must occur in the universe which are not due to God's will. Professor SORLEY grants it. Then God has chosen to limit Himself? Professor SORLEY grants it again. But he will not allow that that means a finite God. For it seems to him that the God who created free beings, and so limited Himself, is a God of a higher range of power and perfection than a God who might have created beings whose 'every thought and action are pre-determined by their Creator.'

Is there any limit to man's freedom? There is. It is incredible that God should limit Himself in creating a being who is limitless. The freedom

of man's will is limited on two sides. It is limited on the side of nature and it is limited on the side of God.

First it is limited on the side of nature. And that both by heredity and by environment. The range of selection open to a man 'is limited by the experience which gives content to his life, as well as by the inherited tendencies which are his from the beginning of his career. These afford ample opportunity for freedom in the development of his activity, but not unrestricted openings for any and every kind of life. A man cannot at will choose to be a mathematician, an artist, a statesman, or even a millionaire. But there is one form of activity which is never closed, and that is the realization of moral values: one choice before every man, the choice of good or evil.'

But the more important limitation is from the side of God. Man is limited by God's purpose. For God has a purpose for the Universe; and the life of man, of every man, falls within it. Do not imagine that God is content to wait and see. He sees the end from the beginning, and the end that He foresees He accomplishes. He accomplishes it through men. And men, exercising their freedom of choice, so exercise it that the eternal purpose of God is not thwarted.

Here then we have this curious situation. God is continually working out His purpose for the world (including every man in it), a purpose finally fulfilled; and at the same time every man in the world is exercising his actual freedom of choice, sometimes in harmony with and sometimes in opposition to the will of God. It follows that the evil choice must serve God's purpose and not the good choice alone. How can that be?

We see at once how it can be when we remember that the struggle with evil, the fall and rise again, is the very method whereby man climbs to his manhood. Listen to the language of the philosopher: 'The struggle and pain of the world are the lot of the good as well as of the evil. But if they can be turned to the increase and refinement of goodness, to the lessening and conquest of evil, then their existence is not an insuperable obstacle to the ethical view of reality; it may even be regarded as an essential condition of such a view. Account for it how we may, the fact remains that the heroes and saints of history have passed through much tribulation, and that man is made perfect only by suffering;

> But he that creeps from cradle on to grave,
> Unskill'd save in the velvet course of fortune,
> Hath miss'd the discipline of noble hearts.'

But this struggle cannot go on for ever. Pain and anguish are not the eternal purpose of God for man. What will the end be? The end must be peace with God and joy in the holy spirit of God. And that is secured for the struggling sinner (as well as for the struggling saint) by the presence of God in all the struggle and the offer of His grace.

The offer of His grace. Is that not purely a theological phrase? Professor SORLEY is not ashamed to use it. For his conception of God includes the Presence of God always, and the Presence of God means His help in every time of need. But it is help and not absorption; it is an offer and not coercion. 'In meeting and welcoming the divine grace man's spirit is not passive but responsive; and the divine influence comes as a gift and not by compulsion. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," said the Master. Entry is craved, not forced. And there is a secret shrine prepared for His advent:

> This sanctuary of my soul
> Unwitting I keep white and whole,
> Unlatched and lit, if Thou shouldst care
> To enter or to tarry there.'

Is this a clumsy way of reaching the end? It is God's way, and therefore not clumsy. For all God's ways are pleasantness. And it is the way of manhood. How otherwise should we be men?

I searched awhile the earth and skies
To learn that secret thing which lies
Untold in tender creatures' eyes,
That wonder on itself intent,
That expectation which is pent
With memory sad and innocent.

That fearful pity, that most fair
Exceeding pathos of love's care,
That beauty deeper than despair;
And oft I answered as I sought,
'Would God by gentle means had wrought
For perfect beauty of His thought!'

If He had power and command
To make the beauty that He planned
At once without this heavy hand,
Why thus by process long and slow
With warp of pain and woof of woe
Weaves He life's piecey fabric so?

Yet in the lovely fragments left
Littered upon the broken weft,
In beauty beautifully bereft,
I saw with still entrancèd soul,
Like one who sees fresh dreams unroll,
More than perfection of the whole!

The dule and sadness of our lot
Like passing clouds I had forgot.
Even God's wrath I heeded not.
But in an ecstasy I cried,
'Beauty hath more than justified
What means soe'er He hath applied!'

The Kingdom of God in the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

By the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A., St. John's Hall, Highbury.

The Kingdom of God (or 'of Heaven') was the great subject of our Lord's teaching. In fact all His teaching may be considered to deal with some aspect of the Kingdom, which is often given as its general theme—*e.g.* Mt 4^{23}, and esp. in Lk 4^{43} 8^{1} 9^{11}, so Ac 1^{3}. It is not easy to find some general conception which will cover all these aspects, for the Kingdom is not merely inward, not merely eschatological, not merely ecclesiastical. But probably the starting-point of all is the Sovereignty or Rule of God, whether recognized by the individual, or shown in history, or realized in a community; whether now present and at work, or on its final full display.

It is of some interest to see how the Ante-Nicene Fathers understood the phrase.

Origen sees clearly that 'Kingdom of God' and 'Kingdom of Heaven' are synonymous (Frag. on Jn 3^{5}). 'The Kingdom of God means the constitution (*κατάστασις*) of those who live orderly according to His laws. But this will have its abode in an appropriate place, I mean in heaven. But since here it is called "Kingdom of God," but in Matthew "Kingdom of Heaven," we must say that Matthew has named it from its subjects or the place in which they are, but John and Luke from its King, God. So when we speak of the Kingdom of the Romans we designate it through its subjects and from its place in the world.'

He is inclined to lay more stress than other Fathers do on its aspect of the rule of God in the individual Christian; and the thought that the Kingdom is Christ Himself, though shared with others, is found most in him. So on Mt 3^{2} (Cramer's Catena) 'we find John the first to mention "the Kingdom of Heaven," which is Christ'; on 4^{17} (Possinus' Catena) 'The Kingdom of Heaven is Christ and a virtuous life.' In his Commentary on this Gospel, tome xiv. 7, on 18^{23} he says: 'The Son of God is the Kingdom of Heaven. As He is Wisdom itself, Righteousness itself, and Truth itself, so also the Kingdom itself. The Kingdom is of all the things above which are called "heavens."' In Mt 5^{3}: "theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven" may mean "Christ is theirs." He reigns in every thought of the man over whom sin no longer reigns; He reigns as Righteousness and Wisdom and Strength and the other virtues, over