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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

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

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. Ryder Smith does not express himself hopefully in his Fernley Lecture (noticed in another column) on the subject of the Reunion of Christendom. He would remind us that the controversy about Church, Ministry, and Sacraments still goes on, and is still a thwarting influence; and he is of opinion that, even if all unjustifiable schisms were undone, there would yet remain three churches—'the Sacerdotalist, holding that certain symbols are essential to the Church; the Sacramental, holding that the two Sacraments are obligatory, that other symbols are serviceable, but that no symbol is essential; and a third church, consisting of those who, denying that any symbol or Sacrament is either obligatory or essential, and looking upon all ritual as a hindrance rather than a help, strive to use it as little as possible.'

This position is illustrated in respect of the Sacraments in the statement which was unanimously adopted at the World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne in August: 'The Orthodox Church and others hold that there are seven Sacraments, and that for their valid administration there must be proper form, proper matter, and a proper ministry. Others can regard only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Sacraments; others, again, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward sign of the Sacrament, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through contact with God and through His Spirit.' (We quote from the newspaper report.)

It is upon the question of the two Sacraments that Dr. Ryder Smith concentrates. Upholding the Sacramental as against the Sacerdotalist view (the late Dr. P. T. Forsyth distinguished the two views as the Sacramental and the Sacramentarian), he is led to affirm that Baptism and the Lord's Supper, while obligatory or authoritative, are not essential. 'The essential admits of no exceptions, but the obligatory may' (*sic*). But is there any Church, he adds, whether Sacramental or Sacerdotal, that excludes every one, without exception, who fails to observe the Lord's Supper?

With this question and challenge the rigidity of Dr. Ryder Smith's classification of the 'three churches' appears to break down. That it is no longer a rigid classification is illustrated in another paragraph of the statement on the Sacraments which was adopted at the Lausanne Conference: 'We recognize that under certain conditions the spiritual values of the Sacraments may be realized by Divine grace where the outward signs are absent.'

What is the basis, let us ask, of the distinction between the Sacerdotalist and the Sacramental? The distinction rests upon differing conceptions of the relation between the material and the spiritual in the Sacraments. As regards the Lord's Supper the centre of controversy is to be found in the phrases of our Lord, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' Both schools affirm their belief in the 'real presence'; but whereas the Sacramental

school says that it is a spiritual presence, the Sacerdotal school says that it is also a physical or material presence. Without our Lord's physical presence there is no guarantee, it is urged, of His spiritual presence at all.

Dr. RYDER SMITH has nothing new to say on the interpretation of the phrases, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' but what he says, from the Sacramental as distinguished from the Sacerdotalist standpoint, is well said. As he reminds us, there are parallels within the Bible, from both Testaments, to the use of the verb 'to be' under which the phrases above named mean respectively, 'This is the symbol of my body,' 'This stands for my blood.' For example, 'The seven good kine *are* seven years, and the seven good ears *are* seven years'; 'these bones *are* the whole house of Israel'; 'golden bowls full of incense, which *are* the prayers of the saints'; 'these women *are* two covenants'; 'the field *is* the world'; 'this cup *is* the new covenant in my blood.'

Much less familiar are Dr. RYDER SMITH'S citations from Ignatius, which are relevant to the interpretation of the phrases before us, though adduced in his exposition of Jn 6. For example, 'I am God's wheat, and I am ground by wild beasts' teeth, in order that I may be found pure bread'; or again, 'I desire God's bread, which is the flesh of Christ, who is of David's seed, and I desire as drink His blood, which is incorruptible love.' These passages from the Roman Epistle illustrate the extreme uses to which the metaphor and symbol of 'bread' could be put. In the first, Ignatius uses the eating of flesh as symbolic of the making of bread, and the latter as typical of fellowship with God, just as John uses the eating of bread as symbolic of the eating of flesh, and the latter as typical of fellowship with God. In the second passage, Ignatius does not say, 'I long for the Eucharist,' but, 'I long for martyrdom.'

Our debt to Principal George GALLOWAY of St. Andrews is very great. His chosen field is the philosophy of religion, a field that is most fascinating but most difficult. On that subject he has already given us several works of high merit. He has written the only book which might be called a text-book. Writers on the philosophy of religion are apt to make one or other of two mistakes. They tend to become so speculative and profound that we lose sight of the cogency of their argument. Or they strike us like men who start out running on one side of an impenetrable hedge, only to appear later on on the other side, and however much we rub our eyes we cannot perceive the gap by which they made the crossing. Principal GALLOWAY avoids both those criticisms. Profound as is his thought, we can always follow him. If there be a hedge he frankly calls our attention to it, and if a convenient gap is not evident he frankly tells us that too.

Our debt is great and it is increasing. We have received and read with great satisfaction his volume of Essays entitled *Faith and Reason in Religion* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). The relations of faith and reason constitute an old but a perennial problem. It exercised the Middle Ages. It was very much alive in the eighteenth century. It produced a great quantity of literature, chiefly in Germany, a quarter of a century ago, and recently again it seems to be arousing fresh attention. It appeals in special form indeed to each successive generation. As Principal GALLOWAY remarks: 'The way in which the problem was conceived and treated in the third century or in the eighteenth differs from the way in which it is handled to-day. The answers which satisfied the men of a bygone time do not satisfy us; for though the problems themselves remain, we see them in an altered intellectual and spiritual perspective.' 'Some ages have felt the pressure of this problem more severely than others. But there can be no doubt that it presses hardly on our age; for we live in days which, more than most, are haunted by the question of the validity of spiritual values and the truth of theological doctrines.' His aim is frankly to recognize the rights both of faith and of reason, and do justice to both.

The main topic is most directly handled in the first Essay on 'Knowledge and Religious Faith.'

It is a masterly handling of a great subject. The issue of a long and careful investigation runs thus: 'While Religion should have sympathy with knowledge and its tasks, while it should treat science as an ally and not as an enemy, it cannot abate its insistence on the claims of faith. As a fact of experience it seems to be true, that an exclusive dependence on reason tends to end in disillusionment and a lapse into nescience.' 'As we grow older most of us, I suppose, feel more keenly the mystery which remains despite all the enterprise and toil of human thinking. And if our sole ground of hope were in the powers of reason, we might well conclude that of ultimate origins and destinies we can know nothing.' 'Reason leaves its task unfinished, and man has to win through faith the world view, the synthesis which his spiritual needs demand. Through faith, and only through faith, does man gain the assurance which forms the stable basis of his religious life, the assurance that there is a living God over all, and that things work together for good.'

'The realm of faith is not the realm of logical thinking, where premises and conclusions are firmly knit together. Here the element of logical compulsion is and must be lacking. For faith is a movement of the whole personality; it is an act of personal preference and freedom. Hence faith cannot be coerced, and no spiritual conviction can be created by a parade of arguments and religious evidences. Any appeal for faith remains futile unless it evoke a free response from the soul; the spirit must seek if it is to find, it must ask if it is to receive. Were faith less than this it would not be the act of a responsible ethical spirit. The conception of faith as an act of freedom suggests to us its moral and spiritual significance in human life. Though faith is free it is not capricious, for it springs from and expresses the universal need of the soul. It is man's personal consciousness of his spiritual needs, and his personal response to them, which he embodies in his faith in that transcendent Good which is the ground of the world and his own being.'

The other essays are all deeply suggestive. They deal with 'The Genesis and Truth of Religious Beliefs,' 'Evolution and the Finality of the Christian Religion,' 'History and its Religious Interpretation,' 'The Theological Antithesis of Grace and Freedom,' 'Butler as an Apologist,' and 'The Study of Theology and the Work of the Ministry.'

One of the great words of the English Bible is 'salvation,' and there is no doubt that English readers generally give to the word a signification that is theological and traditional. In this they are not altogether to blame, for the translators themselves were under the influence of theological doctrines current in their time, and so the words 'salvation' and 'save' were insensibly impregnated with meanings which are not really to be found in many of the passages where the words occur. That is the thesis of a careful and interesting discussion by Professor M. A. CANNEY in the current number of *Theology*.

Professor CANNEY points out that William Tyndale, in his translation of the New Testament, made a courageous attempt to find new renderings for Greek words of which the English equivalents had acquired in the course of time ecclesiastical and technical associations which were not present to the minds of the Evangelists. Thus (as Dr. Pollard, in his edition of Tyndale, points out) for 'church,' 'priest,' 'grace,' 'charity,' Tyndale substituted 'congregation,' 'senior' (*sic !*), 'favour,' 'love.' This reasonable effort met with great opposition, and hindered the acceptance of Tyndale's translation. But modern translators have followed in his train, and Moffatt, for example, frequently discards the renderings 'save' and 'saviour' for more accurate equivalents.

The Hebrew word, or group of words, which is rendered by 'save,' 'saviour,' 'salvation,' really means more. It does often mean 'deliver,' but its wider significance is nearer the idea of sufficiency or fullness of life and power. And so Moffatt frequently translates the noun 'hero' or 'champion,' for example in Jg 3^{1}, where the R.V. has 'the Lord raised up a saviour to the children of Israel, who

saved them,' and Moffatt has 'the Eternal raised up a champion for the Israelites, who rescued them,' and 2 K 13^5, where R.V. has 'the Lord gave Israel a saviour,' and Moffatt has 'the Eternal gave Israel a hero.'

There is another Hebrew verb which is translated 'save,' but it means properly 'to live.' In several passages, for example, we have 'God save the King,' or 'God save King Adonijah.' This really means 'Long life to the King,' or 'Long live Adonijah,' like the French 'vive le roi,' or 'vive l'entente.' In the causative form the word is used of reviving or bringing to life again, and often occurs in this sense in the Old Testament, where God is spoken of as One who causes men to live on, or One who gives life. It will be seen that, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, the words translated in our versions, both A.V. and R.V., as 'save,' 'saviour,' and 'salvation' have nothing at all in them of the traditional theological idea of salvation from sin by an atonement. They mean 'help' or 'deliverance' in a sense indicated by the context, or, more generally, they mean that gift which a sufficient God can offer to His people in any time of need so as to add to their fullness of life.

But what of the New Testament? Professor CANNEY suggests that throughout the New Testament the dominant idea is life or new life. The woman who touched Christ's garments, for example, said, 'If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole.' The R.V., obsessed with the word 'save,' puts in the margin 'I shall be saved.' An old version, the Syriac Peshitta, has 'I shall live.' So in a passage in which Jesus says, 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole,' R.V. margin has 'thy faith hath saved thee.' Professor CANNEY points out that the Syriac versions invariably render the word translated 'save' in our versions by verbs meaning to give life. In the words at the Cross, for example, 'He saved others, himself he cannot save,' they translate 'He gave life to others, but he cannot preserve his own life!'

The significant conclusion of this study is to give support to the suggestion made by Burkitt, that Jesus described Himself, and was described, according to Aramaic usage, as Life-giver rather than as Saviour. If this were so, the Fourth Gospel, in the general impression of the teaching of Jesus which it gives, may be felt to reflect that teaching better than the Synoptists. And, further, it is interesting to note that this is being regarded in our time as the whole meaning of religion, and particularly of Christianity—life, access to life, fullness of life. The idea of being 'saved' by the blood of Jesus from the wrath of God here or hereafter has little meaning for men and women to-day. We are 'saved' when we gain true life. We are 'saved' when we learn to pierce the dead husk of life and penetrate to the living kernel. We are 'saved' when we succeed in recognizing or apprehending the spiritual realities hidden behind material phenomena. Salvation means a new birth, a new consciousness, a new life.

The Holy Spirit in the Bible.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REVEREND H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE, LONDON.

AMONGST the toys of childhood is—or was—the kaleidoscope, that transparent box of fragments of coloured glass, yielding the symmetry of an ever-changing pattern when viewed through the triangular tube of mirrors which multiplied and co-ordinated their 'broken lights.' No doctrine of the Bible is more kaleidoscopic than that of the Holy Spirit, whether we choose to think of the fragmentary elements which exhibit the πολυποίκιλος σοφία of God, or of the elusive transformations which the doctrine undergoes within the thousand years of its revolving history, or of its fascination