
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.

THERE are those to whom the most fascinating of all studies is Grammar. And something of the fascination of it is due to its dryness. Men have worked through the three monstrous volumes of Maetzner's *English Grammar*, sixteen hundred closely printed pages, and the immensity of their labour has not prevented them from enjoying it. Atlas bearing the world on his shoulders is a hero; if he enjoys his heroism it is because the burden is so unbearable.

But there is no heroism in the study of Grammar now. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by Professor James Hope MOULTON is as thorough as Maetzner. But it is written in a captivating English style. It scarcely matters whether we have already an interest in the Grammar of the Greek New Testament or not. It scarcely matters whether or not we have an interest in the New Testament. Taking this Grammar into our hands we perform no heroic act in reading it to the end.

This is the second volume, dealing with Accidence and Word-formation (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net). Or rather it is the first part of the second volume, and contains the Introduction, together with the sections on Sounds and Writing. It opens with a poem, a poem by the grammarian himself. Dr. MOULTON stands at the classroom door. He realizes that even for the study of Grammar imagination is necessary and the fear of God. This is the poem:

Lord, at Thy word opens yon door, inviting
  Teacher and taught to feast this hour with Thee;
Opens a Book where God in human writing
  Thinks His deep thoughts, and dead tongues live for me.

Too dread the task, too great the duty calling,
  Too heavy far the weight is laid on me!
O if mine own thought should on Thy words falling
  Mar the great message, and men hear not Thee!

Give me Thy voice to speak, Thine ear to listen,
  Give me Thy mind to grasp Thy mystery;
So shall my heart throb, and my glad eyes glisten,
  Rapt with the wonders Thou dost show to me.

After the poem comes the Introduction. And here we have the opportunity of saying that, if rarely was an editor entrusted with a more delicate task, rarely has an editor shown himself so worthy of the trust. The Rev. Wilbert Francis HOWARD, M.A., B.D., might be called perhaps, in theatrical language, an understudy of Dr. MOULTON. But if

that word suggests slavish imitation it does not apply. Wherever it was his business to reproduce Dr. MOULTON, he has done so with unvarying accuracy. But he has not been less successful when he had to fall back upon his own scholarship, inspired by the master's mind and method.

We understand when we come to the Introduction. 'Dr. Moulton,' says Mr. HOWARD, 'at once began to write the Introduction *currente calamo*, but some interruption disturbed him in the middle of a sentence when only two-thirds of the chapter had been written. The editor must, of course, assume sole responsibility for the remainder of the Introduction, but he believes that what he has supplied is a faithful representation of Dr. Moulton's opinion on the questions under discussion. He was so fortunate as to track down a paper (written with great care only eighteen months earlier than the date of the Introduction) of which large use is made in § 14 and from which a few sentences are quoted in later sections. Some further extracts from Dr. Moulton's contribution to *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (by kind permission of Messrs. Macmillan) and many jottings from Dr. Moulton's College and University lectures made it possible to complete the chapter according to the author's design.'

The last paragraph of the Introduction deals with the Apocalypse. Were the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel written by one and the same hand? The grammarian says No, and he says it with some emphasis. 'Not only does the Apocalypse display a greater freedom in copiousness of vocabulary and elaborate phraseology; it is simply defiant of the restraints of grammar.'

Is there any way of accounting for that difference? Many ways have been tried. The most hopeful way was Hort's. Hort argued for an early date. If the Apocalypse was written thirty years before the Fourth Gospel the author would have time to improve his Greek, and might be able to write the faultless grammar found there.

But even Hort's solution is set aside. As early as the third century Dionysius of Alexandria, to whom Greek was a native tongue, declared the difference between the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to be a difference not of degree but of kind.

Scholars to-day refuse the thirty years required by Hort. But even if they could grant them, they hold that no ingenuity is sufficient to bridge 'the chasm between the unchartered liberty of Revelation and the austere simplicity of the Gospel according to St. John.'

The question remains, Why did the author of the Book of Revelation write such irregular and even ungrammatical Greek? Some answer, Because he thought in Semitic and had to translate his thoughts into Greek. But Dr. MOULTON is not satisfied with that answer. 'After all,' he says, 'the author was capable of writing a vigorous though irregular Greek with a very free pen and, as Dean Armitage Robinson has pointed out, "the Greek in which he expressed himself was more like the Greek of the Egyptian papyri and of inscriptions found in various parts of the Græco-Roman world." The very blunders in concord do not imply ignorance in the ordinary sense; "it is familiarity with a relaxed standard of speech, such as we find often enough in the professional letter-writers who indited the petitions and private correspondence of the peasants of the Fayûm." Perhaps it was but fitting that the weird melodies and daring harmonies in which the seer of Patmos gave utterance to the things which he had seen "which must shortly come to pass," should speak to us now in the haunting cadences of Jewish apocalyptic, and again in the popular idiom of the Græco-Roman world.'

The Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL, M.A., formerly minister of the City Temple, now Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster, has been for a year contributing short articles to the *Church Family Newspaper*. These articles he has now gathered into a volume,

which is published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate under the title of *Problems of Life* (7s. net).

Mr. CAMPBELL is at once an idealist and a realist. The problems he handles are everyday problems, and in the handling of them he never loses touch with life. But he lifts every problem into the light of the eternal. His realism and his idealism are inseparable. They are not acts of the mind which succeed one another or which proceed together side by side. They are not even different acts of one inseparable mental process. So utterly are they interfused that we look (but look in vain) for some word, some higher and fuller word, which shall express their inseparable oneness.

Mr. CAMPBELL is not an expositor. When he turns to Scripture for an illustration he often misunderstands and misappropriates. And he is not a theologian. The distinctions and deductions which he makes, and which with the obliquity of genius he regards as vitally important, are weak enough to make his chosen title of 'The New Theology' a theological byword. His absorbing interest in life, in the very life which we are now living, and his power of penetrating that life, every corner and cranny of it, with the realizable ideals of Christ, give him a peculiar right to be heard when he speaks in such short papers as those which this volume contains.

He has republished the papers, he tells us, exactly as they originally appeared *though in slightly different order*. Notice the last phrase. The italics are ours, not Mr. CAMPBELL'S. Mr. CAMPBELL sees nothing significant in it. Yet it is both characteristic and confusing. It shows how little he cares for systematic theology, or any other systematic thing. In the middle of the book he quotes a letter from a clergyman, beginning, 'I am greatly interested in the Life Problems you bring before the readers of the *Church Family Newspaper* week by week. The one on the Communion of Saints, June 21st, has a special attraction.' Yet the article on the Communion of Saints is not found by the reader of the book until he has gone on to the very end of it.

In that article on the Communion of Saints Mr. CAMPBELL pleads for the practice of prayer for the dead. It is a practice, he believes, which the war has greatly encouraged. Even members of the Free Churches have begun to advocate it. 'Recently a prominent Nonconformist theologian, whose utterances are regarded as unimpeachably orthodox and authoritative by the denomination to which he belongs, has given to the world a treatise in which he boldly advocates a return to the ancient Christian custom of offering intercession, not only on behalf of those dear to us still in the flesh, but of those who have passed ahead of us into the life beyond death.'

No doubt that is significant, and we owe it to the war. But *timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes.* There are gift-horses which we *must* look in the mouth, because of the giver. Such a giver is war. It does not follow if he has been driven to it by the war that 'a prominent Nonconformist theologian' is right in advocating prayer for the dead. The editor of one of our religious newspapers wrote to a prominent Presbyterian theologian recently and asked him what was the attitude to prayer for the dead of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. His reply was that, so far as he was aware, the Presbyterian Church had never even raised the question. It is not probable that that which centuries of peace and war had not found worthy of discussion should now at last become a necessity of daily practice.

But the practice of prayer for the dead does not stand alone. To Mr. CAMPBELL it is part of the Communion of Saints. He cannot conceive the Communion of Saints as complete without it. 'The Communion of Saints is that active fellowship which exists between all the members of Christ's body, the Church, in this world and worlds beyond.' And how can that fellowship exist if the members of Christ's body do not pray for one another?

Now there is little doubt that the advocate of prayer of the living for the dead advocates also prayer of the dead for the living. And thus prayer for the dead is a necessary part of the doctrine or the practice of the Communion of Saints. Yet the reasonableness of prayer for the dead rests, not on the Communion of Saints, but on a special and peculiar theory of the state of the departed.

It rests on the theory that the souls of believers are after death exactly as they were before it. That theory is held by Mr. CAMPBELL and, so far as we know, by every other person who practises prayer for the dead. It is a theory which has never been held by Presbyterians. It may be, as Dr. Denney once said, that the Westminster divines uttered more than they could prove when they said that the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, but it is a belief which has in it more countenance from Scripture and more faith in God than any theory of gradual progress.

And it is not confined to Presbyterians. It is not confined to the Free Churches. The clergyman who writes to Mr. CAMPBELL about his article on the Communion of Saints finds this very fault with it, that it ignores the perfection of holiness reached by the believer at death. 'I quite believe,' he says, 'in fellowship with our dear departed ones, but distinguish between fellowship and prayers for them. Though there can be no doubt that we carry with us the characters we have formed here, yet I take it that those who are resting on the atonement of Christ, and are in living union with Him here, will find, when they pass within the veil, and see Him as He is, that the shadows which obscured their vision will flee away, and there will be a wonderful expansion of their trust and admiration and love for Him. The sight will be glorious. The unveiling of that glorious scene which will meet our gaze must make a marvellous impression upon us. We shall be filled to our utmost capacity with admiration, which will increase as our capacity expands.'

'Under these glorious surroundings,' says this clergyman, 'I cannot conceive of the Christian needing our poor prayers.' And then he expresses his belief that even before death, or let us say at the very moment of death, the believer may enjoy the sanctifying vision of Christ. Such an enjoyment is sometimes seen by those who are present at such a death-bed, and it becomes an unanswerable argument to them of the truth of the Westminster divines' daring definition. Let us quote again from this clergyman's letter to Mr. CAMPBELL.

'When my dear mother passed away I was holding her hand, and was almost entirely drawn after her; the nurses had to carry and lay me on a bed, where I remained for nearly two hours before coming to myself again, yet during that time the sight which I beheld was magnificent, and I found myself saying again and again, Oh, how beautiful! Oh, how beautiful! The light was far more brilliant than the noonday sun. I quite understood St. John saying, "They had no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."'

The son shared in the vision of the mother. That is the Communion of Saints. And there was no need, there was not even room, for prayer. His conclusion is that for those who depart to be with Christ 'all doubt and sinful propensity and imperfection will flee away, and we shall be lost in wonder, love, and praise.'

What does Mr. CAMPBELL say to it? With that engaging frankness which never forsakes him, he acknowledges the rebuke. He had thought only of prayer. He had forgotten the place of praise for the dead. But then he adds: 'All one would venture to say in modification of the view thus earnestly presented, is that after all not everyone who passes from this side of life to the other is ready for the wondrous unveiling of the glory which is the inheritance of the saints in light; not everyone is as this clergyman's mother. There

are those who die believing who perhaps need to be spared the heavenly vision for a time, so strong are the attractions of earth. May we not pray for these? May we not continue to help them by our love and solicitude as we did before, "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ"?'

We said that the Westminster divines knew more of the Scriptures and the power of God. How much more is made manifest by that strange sentence, 'there are those who die believing who perhaps need to be spared the heavenly vision for a time, so strong are the attractions of earth.' Here it is the vision of Christ that counteracts the attractions of earth—'looking away unto Jesus.' How can it be otherwise there, where we shall see Him as He is?

Many changes have been made by the war in the thoughts of men to God and the things of God, but the most manifest change, and the most momentous for theology, is the acceptance of the principle of Atonement. It is widespread as well as decisive. You come upon it in the chaplains' anecdotes of the men; you discover it as the inspiration of some of the most recent poetry; you recognize it as the supreme motive and sustaining interest of many of the new essays and romances. That one may be called upon to die for another, and may deliberately die, is now a common belief, for it has been a common experience.

That is a victory for theology. It proves that theology has been and is in touch with life. Not one of its fundamental doctrines was more violently repudiated, not one was supposed to be more generally discredited, before the war began. When the war began man after man set his face to go up to his Jerusalem, the Jerusalem of agony and death, on behalf of his fellow-men. It is much more than a victory for theology. It is a victory for God.

But it is not the final victory. Great as is the gain for the gospel that the principle of Atonement should be generally accepted, the acceptance of the principle of Atonement is not belief in the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ for the sin of the world. That doctrine involves three things, of which the fact that one may have to suffer for another is only the first. The other two are that by the suffering of Christ man is reconciled to God, and that by the same suffering God is reconciled to man.

Now while every theologian accepts the principle of Atonement, and while most theologians hold that by the death of Christ man is reconciled to God, there are not a few who deny that God is reconciled to man.

One of them is the late Dr. James DRUMMOND, once Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. Dr. DRUMMOND was a Unitarian. And it has to be said at once that it is impossible for a Unitarian to believe that by the death of Christ God is reconciled to man. For that involves the very doctrine of the Person of Christ against which Unitarianism is a standing protest. One man may die for another, one man may die for a multitude of other men, and the effect of his death may be so great and widespread as to become their repentance and reconciliation. But no mere man can undo the wrong that man has done to God. As the Psalmist says, 'None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.'

Before his death Dr. DRUMMOND had prepared for publication a volume of essays on the theology of St. Paul. The volume has now been published. Its title is *Pauline Meditations* (Lindsey Press; 7s. 6d. net). In that volume (most interesting throughout, and most acceptable in almost every part) Dr. DRUMMOND deals with the Pauline

teaching on Reconciliation. He is quite convinced, and assumes in all his exposition that 'it is man who must be reconciled to God, and not God to man.'

Well, the best way to test the adequacy of this position is to see how much, according to this careful and candid theologian, is involved in the reconciliation of man to God. Two things are involved.

First, in order to reconcile man to God, 'Christ brought home to men with unexampled clearness the reality and beauty of a life in harmony with God.' Looking upon such a life, 'we come to see and understand God's will concerning us, to feel in our own breasts the aspirations of that sonship of which we had been unconscious, and to acknowledge that the heavenly Father is the end, as he is the source, of our being. If we have ears to hear, Christ calls us to the communion in which he himself dwells, and shows us how friendship with God is the secret of eternal peace. Thus to see and know that the will of the Holy One is absolutely good, and that a life in conformity with that will is the highest which men or angels can attain, is the first step towards reconciliation.'

Knowledge, then, knowledge of God as seen in the face of Jesus Christ, that is the first step towards reconciliation. But 'there is a power mightier than knowledge. Knowledge may pass away, and fade out of the memory, or its sublime visions may remain cold and impalpable while passion flings its glowing pleasures at our feet, or with tight embrace drags us whither we would not. What power will go down into the deep, and break the spell of passion, and breathe a Divine order over our desires and impulses? It is love, love to him who has first loved us, and who, when we no longer resist, gives us of his own Spirit. Christ was more than a noble example who points the way heavenward for those who choose to follow him. This indeed he was, if at least we consider the example as residing not in the outward moulding of his life, but in the spirit which lay at its centre. But an example appeals only to our admiration, and leaves our love untouched; and if we pause in this view, we fail to give any adequate response to the Christian feeling, and deprive the gospel of its most moving power. We may admire that which transcends our capacity for imitation, and an example which is too far above us may depress rather than exalt. It is the love of Christ that constrains men. In his history he does not appear before us living in a sublime solitude, and enshrining within himself a distant and cold ideal. But he is down among the sinful and the lost, teaching them, pleading with them, suffering for them, and showing a sympathy and love so strange, so sweet, so thrilling, that hearts given over to despair beat with new hope, and feel as though the Divine life had chosen them, and gathered them up into itself. This impression, so powerful while, as a minister of love, he went about doing good, was deepened, as in every case of martyrdom, by that torturing death in which, in order to reconcile the world to God, he gave all that he could—himself. And so, when he was gone, his memory lingered as a vision of heavenly peace. It seemed as though God had besought men through him; for this wondrous graciousness and beauty, this entreating, suffering love, must have come straight from the Father in whose name he spoke. It is here that the great moral power of Christianity resides. It is a seeking of the lower by the higher. It is a coming down of the Divine holiness among sinful men, in order to win them and inspire them. It is an offering of love to the soul, wakening that answering love which glows into the consciousness of sonship, and is the sustaining power of spiritual life.'

We have quoted the whole paragraph. It is a good example of the beauty of Dr. DRUMMOND'S writing—writing, we must add, which is a reflexion from the beauty of his character. More than that, it is the last word on the moral value of the death of Christ. But is it enough?

It is not enough. For it is not operative enough. The knowledge of God seen in the life of Christ and the love of God shown in the death of Christ have not been found sufficient even to reconcile men to God. The history of Christianity in all its revivals and reformations speaks to us with unbroken witness and says that one thing more is needed even to move men to repentance, a movement which no one denies to be the first step to reconciliation.

About the same time as Dr. DRUMMOND was gathering together his lectures on the Pauline theology a clergyman of the Church of England was thinking out a book on the Atonement. The Rev. P. L. SNOWDEN, Vicar of Hepworth, near Huddersfield, had undertaken, at the beginning of the war, the first form of national service that came to hand. A band of tree-fellers were at work near York and he joined them. 'After a couple of weeks' practice the labour of cross-cutting became sufficiently easy and mechanical to allow one to work out minor problems in the subject which had first aroused my interest twenty years previously when getting up Dr. DALE'S great book on the Atonement for my Priest's examination. The dinner-hour, spent sitting in the sunshine on a carpet of pine-needles with one's back to a log or tree-trunk, afforded opportunity for putting one's working thoughts into the form of rough notes; and the unoccupied hours of long summer evenings spent in the pleasant cottage of the farm labourer, a true gentleman of the soil, with whom I lodged, enabled me to elaborate and arrange the day's notes.'

When the book was ready he issued it with the title of *The Atonement and Ourselves* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). For it was beaten out of the necessities of his own religious life and his intimate acquaintance with the lives of others.

Now it was altogether likely that a book with such an origin should be strong to represent the moral influence of the example of Christ. But it is written for the very purpose of showing that the example of the life of Christ and the love of Christ in His death are inadequate to reconcile us to God, and that, even if they were adequate, the fundamental thing in the Atonement is not our reconciliation to God but God's reconciliation to us. The author goes so far as to say that even if we were reconciled to God and reclaimed, there is still something in God to be reckoned with. 'It is, therefore,' he says, 'one chief object of this book to oppose the theory that remedial motives are the only ones which can inspire true justice, and to claim for Divine Holiness that it has other duties and objects in view in addition to the reclamation of the sinner.'

Mr. SNOWDEN goes back to history. All the great movements of the past have been inspired by the Cross. And by the Cross he does not understand a great or the greatest example of self-sacrificing love, but an act of mediatorial redemption. 'They have all,' he says, 'been inspired by the Cross, from the time that the greatest missionary determined to know nothing among his converts but "Jesus, and Him crucified" (1 Co 2^2), and revealed the source of the inspiration which gave him power in his cry: "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal 4^{14}).'

Again, 'this same concentration upon the Cross as the means of salvation from sin is found also in the case of St. Francis of Assisi, the great revivalist of the thirteenth century. We read how, in intense spiritual conflicts, "seized with a real horror for the disorders of his youth, he would implore mercy," until at last, after some years of struggle, at the foot of the crucifix of St. Damien, he found the peace and acceptance by God he longed for; and how, later, even his very body was marked with the stigmata of the Cross as evidence of the nature and intensity of the conviction which drove him to his labours, and made them so marvellously fruitful. The Crusades were not, it is true, altogether or even mainly spiritual undertakings,

but certainly religious feeling had a great deal to do with these vast movements, and the cross the crusaders bore on their shoulders expressed what was the most solemn and deepest motive inspiring them.'

And again, 'In the Reformation we find the same force at work in its central figure, Luther. The dominant thought in his mind was that which "is perhaps the most awful and imperious creation of Christianity—the sense of sin." "I tormented myself to death," he said, "to make my peace with God, but I was in darkness, and found it not." The light came with the realization that forgiveness could only be found through faith in the crucified Christ, and it was no chance collision, but the natural result of this deep conviction of the need and true source of salvation which drove him to kindle the flame of the Reformation by his public denunciation of Tetzel's sale of pardons.'

The instances are notorious, and they are representative. The more recent cases are in entire agreement. 'In our own land and in more recent times the Evangelical movements were inspired by the same motive. The awful consequences of sin and the love of God manifested in the salvation provided by the Cross were the two great thoughts animating the Evangelical revivalists; while later, in the Oxford Movement, which was ostensibly more concerned with questions relating to the outward organization of the Church, the title of one of Newman's sermons, "The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World," is in itself a sufficient indication of the place which the Atonement filled in the spiritual life of its leaders, and explains their emphasis on the doctrine of penance.'

If, then, we are to take advantage of the present opportunity, if we are to recognize the hand of God in that strange providence which has given the doctrine of Atonement the very first place in the thoughts of men, we must make it clear that what Christ accomplished in His death was not merely to move men to repentance and faith in God, as the condition of their being reconciled to Him, but, in the words of the late Dr. Denney, 'to do a work as Reconciler which tells upon God as well as upon the sinful.'

Praying for the Erring.

By the Rev. B. B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Didactic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary.

'If any one observe his brother sinning (sin not to death), he shall ask, and He will give life to him (to those sinning not to death). There is sin to death—I do not mean that he is to ask concerning that: all iniquity is sin, and there is sin not to death.'—1 Jn $5^{16.\ 17}$.

No reader of the First Epistle of John can fail to be deeply impressed with the interest of the Apostle in the Christian community. The prominent place taken in the Epistle by exhortations to love of the brethren is one of its most marked features. Among the duties arising out of brotherly love would naturally be included those which found the occasion of their exercise in the imperfect sanctification of the brotherhood. How should the individual Christian conduct himself in view of the sin of which he could not fail to be aware in the conduct of his fellow-Christians?

Well, for one thing, he should pray for his erring brethren. It is this duty of prayer for the erring brother which is laid on the hearts of Christians in the two verses which are now before us. Having intimated the intimacy of the intercourse which the Christian has with God in prayer, and the prevailing power of the Christian's petitions—it is even said that whatever he asks he receives—the Apostle founds on this an exhortation to use this prayer-power in behalf of sinning brethren. His zeal is for the holiness of the Christian community. The instrument which he here employs to secure it is brotherly prayer. As the community is bound