

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

ONE of the issues before the religious world to-day is that of fundamentalism versus modernism. The representatives of these supposedly conflicting types look askance at one another: they have even at times been known to denounce one another. To the fundamentalist the modernist is an iconoclast, almost indeed an anarchist within the sphere of religion, seeming, as he does, to challenge and deny many of the fundamental beliefs by which millions of good Christians live; to the modernist, on the other hand, the fundamentalist often seems nothing but an obscurantist, who lives in the past, is impervious to argument, and closes his eyes to undeniable facts.

But is the issue really so grave after all? Is the truth not rather that all reasonable men are both fundamentalists and modernists—fundamentalists in the sense that the foundations of belief are of primary importance, imperiously demanding to be sought with earnestness and held with conviction, and modernists in the sense that our beliefs must be such as we can intelligently hold in the age in which Providence has placed us? It is true that fundamentalism and modernism are popularly supposed to stand respectively for a certain set of doctrines; but there is so little agreement in detail as to what these doctrines are that it is wiser to regard those 'isms' as designations of principles, each of which is legitimate and even necessary and thoroughly reconcilable with the other. We respect the past,

but we claim our right to live in the twentieth century.

This issue is handled with admirable tact and moderation by Dr. James H. SNOWDEN in his *Old Faith and New Knowledge* (Harper, New York and London; \$2.50). There are great preachers of both types he reminds us—Billy Sunday of the one type, and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman of the other; but it is neither the fundamentalism of the one nor the modernism of the other that makes them the powerful preachers that they are. It is that indefinable quality we call genius, which is not the monopoly of any theological coterie, but which wins its way to the hearts of men from widely different philosophical and theological standpoints. It may not, however, be unseemly to remind the fundamentalist, as Dr. SNOWDEN does, that, as the result of a questionnaire addressed to the ministers of America, of the twenty-five preachers whom they selected as the greatest more than two-thirds were modernists. So 'it does not appear that modernism has weakened the pulpit.'

Nobody will deny that the Bible is fundamentalist, in the sense that it throws its whole emphasis upon the things of fundamental importance. To the Prophets the fundamentals, as defined by Micah, are justice, mercy, and a humble walk with God, and with this all good men, whatever be the theological name by which they are named, will agree. But the attractive and compelling feature of Dr.

SNOWDEN's argument is that the Bible is equally and unabashedly modernist. Indeed, he traces the presence and progress of this spirit not only through the Bible, but through the history of the Church and into the present day. All religious men who have been thinkers at all have rejoiced in the opportunity of reconciling the old faith with the new knowledge.

---

Essentially that is the meaning of the early stories in Genesis. Take, for example, the Creation story in Gn 1. The old Babylonian material—much of it so crude, gross, polytheistic—is moulded, under the spirit of God, by the mature and austere Hebrew genius into a form which does not offend even the most modern religious consciousness. The Bible is progressive as well as conservative; it is not afraid either of new revelations or of new formulations of ancient truth. The Pharisees were fundamentalists, in the bad sense of that word: Jesus and Paul were modernists. The Gospel of Matthew, the Fourth Gospel, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are, each in its own way, attempts to relate the ancient faith to the new experience of religion which came with Jesus, or to express men's experience of Jesus in the categories of contemporary thought. The writer of the Fourth Gospel is not afraid of the word *Logos*: he takes it and baptizes it unto Christ. Even Gnosticism is an effort, however misguided, to domesticate Christianity in the contemporary world of Græco-Oriental thought.

---

So this accommodation of the old faith to the new knowledge proceeds apace throughout the ages. What is patristic literature but just the effort to think out Christianity in terms of contemporary philosophic thought? If the new religion was to hold its own in that seething intellectual world something more was needed than the fine simplicity of the Old Testament. So the Greek Fathers turned, in the main, to the problem of the Person of Christ, and the Latin Fathers to the problem of the Work of Christ—each interpreting that Person and that Work in terms of the categories which were most readily intelligible to their contemporaries. So it was with Anselm, whose doctrine of the Atonement bears the unmis-

takable stamp of the feudal age in which it was born. And so it is to-day. The so-called modernists, in their efforts to relate the old faith to the new knowledge, are simply doing what religious men, whose province it was to think things out, have always done. Their aim, as Dr. Sanday has said, is simply 'the unification of thought. It is the same mind that has to think of things secular and of things sacred, and the processes of thinking for both are the same.'

---

There is the more need to emphasize this honourable aim of the modernist, as the scientist no less than the theologian has often been guilty of an obstinate traditionalism and of hostility to new discoveries and conceptions of truth. If it be true that the Church has often feared, resented, and opposed the conclusions of scientific thinkers—witness the widespread alarm on the publication of Darwin's 'Origin of Species' in 1859—it is no less true that these conclusions have frequently been derided by scientists themselves. Quoting from the Rev. Robert H. Murray's 'Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century,' for which Sir Oliver Lodge wrote an Introduction, Dr. SNOWDEN appositely reminds us that throughout the last century 'every important scientific discovery was opposed and misrepresented and ridiculed by rival scientists. Jenner with his vaccine, Simpson with his chloroform, Lyell with his uniformitarianism in geology, Darwin and evolution, Pasteur and microbes, and Lister with his antiseptics, encountered this unfair treatment and unhappy fate. Many lesser scientists who made notable contributions to science were neglected and consigned to oblivion. So the obscurantism has not been all on one side.'

---

In theology, as in science, the remedy for this unthinking deference to authority and tradition, which is so often mistaken for reverence, is just to preserve the open mind, to believe that the God who was is the God who is, and who is to be, and to be prepared, while gratefully respecting the past, to give a cordial welcome to new discoveries and fresh interpretations of ancient and eternal truth. The Bible is neither afraid of new experiences nor of

bold experiments. 'Behold, I will do a new thing.' 'Prove all things,' 'Come and see.' 'O taste and see that the Lord is good.' The Bible invites us to serve God with all our minds, and the only mind with which *we* can serve Him is a modern mind. Thus, in proportion as we are prepared to welcome all light and truth, whether it comes from the present or the past, will the needless breach between the fundamentalist and the modernist be healed.

---

The evidence of Christian experience has come in our time to take high rank among the Christian evidences. And justly so, for at the root of the Christian faith there lies an invincible conviction that we find God in Christ. This conviction, however, must not be put forward merely as a dogmatic assertion, as though it were some mystic experience beyond the support of argument or the danger of disproof. If it is to commend itself to rational beings it must manifest its reality and its reasonableness. This is the task which has been attempted in *Experience of God*, by the Rev. Herbert H. FARMER, M.A. (S.C.M.; 5s. net). The subject is an inquiry into the grounds of Christian conviction, and the treatment is distinguished by a high degree of clearness and sanity.

---

First of all it is necessary to determine what are the elements of conviction. How do we know anything to be real or true? We begin with the fact that all experience comes to us through intercourse between our personalities and the world or environment in which we live. There is a continuous interplay or tension between ourselves and the universe. 'On the one hand there is the given truth or fact "hitting us," so to say, and demanding the adjustment of ourselves to it. On the other hand there is the whole impulse of life within us, eager to make the adjustment, believing it can make the adjustment and evolving its highest powers by so doing.' Now, corresponding to these two aspects there are two elements in our apprehension of what is real or true. First, an element of coercion. 'Our minds seem to be so built that a fact or truth has somehow to give us

the impression of standing in its own light and shining in its own light, whatever our feelings may be, before it can fully convince us.' The second element may be called the pragmatic or practical element. It amounts to an implicit conviction or faith that truth is good for man to know, that a man gains in well-being by knowing the truth, that the truth will prove itself in practice. A third element, the reflective, might perhaps be added. Trained minds especially are not satisfied unless their beliefs have been submitted to the criticism of reason, and unless they harmonize with other knowledge and help to give a satisfying philosophy of life. But this third element in conviction is really a combination of the other two. 'The satisfaction of reason is a pragmatic satisfaction. Yet the mark of rational processes is their coerciveness; reason is not satisfied unless each step follows the other in inevitable sequence.' Here, then, are three criteria by which all our beliefs may be tested. If a belief (1) shines in its own light with a certain inherent coerciveness, (2) satisfies us and helps us in the practical task of dealing with our world, and (3) meets the demands of reason by revealing on reflection the further coerciveness of rational consistency and harmony with other knowledge and experience—then we have in regard to it as full an assurance of truth as it is ever possible for us to have.'

---

Coming now to the question of the reality of God and of that unseen spiritual world with which religion concerns itself, we find much that satisfies these three criteria. 'Beyond all question there is something tremendously coercive lying at the heart of religion.' What is it? For answer we must interrogate our own experience. When we hear or read of any great act of pure self-sacrifice there is an instant and inevitable response of reverence, a feeling that here is something of infinite worth, something *sacred*. By that word 'sacred' religion has always signified two things. 'First, it has signified by the word the impact of a higher world upon men's spirits, the impact of the divine. Second, it has signified by it a certain distinguishing quality of that higher divine world, namely, that it demands the utter surrender. If

need be, of this life to itself.' Here, then, we recognize the authentic touch of God upon the human spirit, compelling its homage. Again, applying the pragmatic criterion, we find that man in his present environment is in many ways a painful misfit, while the central assertion of religion is that there is a wider environment in which alone man can find his true well-being. 'We have then this significant situation. Here, on the one hand, is man, by his very nature restless, dissatisfied, at conflict with his environment and himself, his best powers continually stretching out like the filaments of a spider and either floating in a void whence there is no response, or else snapped in twain on harsh uncomprehending rock. There, on the other hand, is religion asserting that there is an environment larger than this world into contact with which man can at any time come. . . . Do not these two things fit?' And the truth and value of any religion may be tested by the extent to which it does introduce a man into this larger world and satisfy his longing soul.

---

The plain man is usually content to stop here in his religious thinking. Feeling the coercive touch of God upon his spirit and finding the practical helpfulness of his faith, he does not feel impelled or competent to frame a philosophy of life. But for many minds there is an urgent necessity to search far and wide through the fields of knowledge to see whether confirmation and support are to be found there for faith in God. 'Such rational confirmation may take the form of arguments for the existence of God based on the observed facts of the Universe. Second, it may take the form of reflection upon the religious experience itself which it is seeking to confirm and support. Third, it may take the form of negative criticism of other views of the Universe and of religious experience, showing their inadequacy in themselves and their inferiority to the account which religion itself gives of the Universe and of itself.'

---

Passing to the question of the distinctively Christian experience of God, we must test its truth and reality by the same criteria. It might, indeed, seem at first sight that the grounds of our belief

in Christ must be quite distinct from the grounds of our belief in God. But that is not so, not if what we believe about Christ is true, that He was God manifest in the flesh. 'Christianity asserts, and the assertion makes it Christianity and not some other religion, that God came and comes into human life in quite a peculiar and unique way in Jesus Christ.' Here, therefore, more than anywhere else, the touch of God upon man's spirit will be felt. And so we find it. For, first, in the apprehension of Christ we experience the coercive sense of the Divine. It was thus that He impressed Himself upon His first disciples, and something like that must be our experience if the Christian conviction about Him is to become really ours. 'In some way or other, it must be possible for us to look at Jesus and, seeing Him, to find our spirits bowing with just exactly that awe and reverence which are our instinctive response to the living touch of God, and are the only way we have of ever identifying the presence of God in our midst.'

---

This is possible despite the lapse of time and the scantiness of the Gospel records. For, if what Christianity says of Christ is true, then He is independent of time and change, and His relationship to every human mind and personality must be quite unique. 'He must be the norm, the ideal, that completed and balanced maturity which every human being by the essential law of his nature is striving to achieve. Obviously there is something in every human personality which is governing its growth from its first conception, and determining that it shall grow into a man, with all a man's qualities, and not into a baboon or a bird or a tiger. . . . It is what may be called the entelechy of the organism—the governing idea of it, that which it was always meant to be. What, then, is the entelechy of the human organism, its governing idea? If Christianity be true it is Christ. Christ is perfectly what we are meant to be. In other words, if Christianity be true there is at the heart of every human being, more or less frustrated and dammed back, but restlessly pressing upward all the time to gain expression and achievement, a latent Christ, a Christ within.' And when we see His face in the Gospels we recognize it, and in-

stinctively do homage to it as Divine. 'Supporting this primary impression there is the verification of it in practical life—in the increasing health of soul and power over our world which the acknowledgment of Jesus as worthy of our utmost reverence and obedience brings, and in the capacity of such acknowledgment to unify our experience and give us a credible and satisfying philosophy of life. Given this primary impression, and given sufficient evidence of its verification in one's own life and the lives of others all down the ages to make it reasonable to trust it, then to hold back because the manner of the Incarnation is not explicable in precise intellectual terms is absurd. It is always the deepest and most significant and most enriching things in life which are incomprehensible and indefinable. But the incomprehensible is not the irrational, and the indefinable is not the unreal.'

---

In *The Anglican Tradition* (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net), the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., Vicar of Bolton, would offer a solution of the problem confronting the Church of England at this juncture. It is his conviction that the problem has been largely brought about by departure from the Church's true constitution and tradition. Accordingly, the burden of his vigorous little book is *solvitur Anglicando*. Its standpoint may be described as in a broad sense Anglo-Catholic; the author himself might prefer to say, primarily Catholic, and secondarily Reformed and English.

---

It is on Eucharistic doctrine that Mr. CARPENTER concentrates, as the chief source of the present trouble and confusion. He claims that the Prayer Book of 1662, which established the true Anglican Eucharistic tradition, presents a Reformed and English version of the Catholic Eucharistic tradition. There is such widespread misunderstanding of the teaching of the Church of England on this doctrine of the Holy Communion that it appears worth while to consider in these columns the exposition here offered. At the same time it may be remarked that the misunderstanding is natural and almost inevitable in view of the difficulties attaching to

the conception of spiritual participation of the Body and Blood of Christ.

---

Mr. CARPENTER hesitates over certain practices in the Church of England that are liable to the charge of being Romanizing, such as the practice of 'Devotions' before the Blessed Sacrament, or genuflexions according to the rubrics of the modern Roman Rite at the Prayer of Consecration. But he is clearly in much greater sympathy with the so-called 'Romanizers,' 'Anglo-Catholics,' 'extremists' (or whatever the term of condemnation may be), than with those who oppose them in the name of Protestantism. With Protestant 'extremists' he will have no traffic at all—those 'scurrilous, blaspheming jackals' of the 'underworld,' 'largely recruited from Northern Ireland'!

---

In setting forth Eucharistic beliefs which may be properly held in the Church of England, Mr. CARPENTER begins by stating two positions on which he says there is universal agreement. The first is, that there is in the Sacrament *as a whole* a real presence of Christ, so that He Himself therein really gives us His own life; and the second, that a living faith is essential for the reception of the spiritual gift of the Body and Blood of Christ. But while there is universal agreement on these positions, there are different ways of understanding the Sacrament. They may be classified as three, and they are all legitimate within the Church of England; nor are they of necessity mutually exclusive.

---

The first is Receptionism, which is the theory that the special presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is in faithful receivers. This theory may be held in a meagre sense or in a rich and glowing sense; in any case its contribution to the truth about the Sacrament is not so much intellectual as devotional. But it is a true theory, says Mr. CARPENTER, so far as it goes. It would appear, however, that according to Dr. Barnes no more is to be said after a bare Receptionist doctrine has been stated; for 'there is no *objective* real presence of Christ attached to the bread and wine used in Holy Communion.'

The second theory represents a sort of compromise between this last position and a doctrine of the Real Presence objectively conceived. It is the theory known as Virtualism, and it maintains that the elements of bread and wine, when consecrated, have the virtue or efficacy of the Body and Blood of Christ. This appears to have been Hooker's teaching, and it is in some respects a characteristically Anglican theory. For it may be in fact almost equivalent either to Receptionism or to belief in the Real Presence, that is, an objective Real Presence.

---

The third theory consistent with the Anglican tradition is, then, that of an objective Real Presence, which Mr. CARPENTER describes as 'the belief that after Consecration there is a true gift of our Lord's Body and Blood, and that this gift is not dependent on the faith of the recipients (though it can only be received by faith), but is in some way connected with the elements themselves.' This is not, like Transubstantiation, a philosophical theory of the manner of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist; it is but an affirmation of the reality of the 'inward part, or thing signified,' and its inseparable connexion with the 'outward part, or sign.' And this is the doctrine for which the author would contend as representing the vocation which he desires to reclaim for the Church of England.

---

Mr. CARPENTER's exposition of the terms 'real' and 'presence,' and of the term 'spiritual,' helps to remove a certain amount of prejudice against the doctrine of an objective Real Presence; and it may well be that this doctrine is implied in the Black Rubric of the Prayer Book, the Church Catechism, and the Thirty-Nine Articles, and that, accordingly, Consecration is regarded in the Anglican tradition as having a spiritual effect upon the elements. But unless a definite theory of the manner of Christ's presence, distinguishable from that of Transubstantiation, can be put forward in defence of this doctrine of the Real Presence, it seems very unlikely that the objections to 'Devotions' and genuflexions will cease. Transubstantiation is the only truly metaphysical theory which holds the field, and as this is so, the Anglican

traditionalist must learn to be tolerant even of the 'Protestant under-world.'

---

After all, the Anglican tradition in this matter of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is essentially the Calvinistic (rather than Lutheran) tradition; and, as has often been observed, the Calvinistic tradition is subject to the instability belonging in general to mediating theories. What Schleiermacher said on this point a century ago is worth repeating to-day. He sympathizes with the Calvinistic view as mediating between 'the over-intellectual bareness' of the Zwinglian view and 'the mysterious sensuousness' of the Lutheran view (which is closely allied to the Roman Transubstantiation theory), but he adds that the Calvinistic view provides new excuses for vacillating between the charm of symbolism, which allures men to find additional meanings in the Sacrament, and the intellectual satisfaction of a colder and more external position.

---

One of the urgent needs of to-day is that the Bible should be read historically. It cannot be understood otherwise. In our schools, Sunday and day schools alike, the traditional view of the Bible is being perpetuated. And even in our pulpits, by the preaching on texts and by 'topical preaching,' with the neglect of real teaching, the same tradition is allowed to prevail. And the results are, for one thing, that the true nature and grounds of the authority of Scripture are unseen or perverted, and, for another, that we are exposed to all sorts of unhistorical interpretations which have mischievous religious issues.

---

An example of this may be found in Miss Christabel PANKHURST's latest book, *Seeing the Future* (Harper; 7s. 6d. net). No one can help feeling a profound sympathy with this ardent soul. She was one of the protagonists of the Female Suffrage Movement, and for long she pinned her faith for world reform to this measure. But after it was passed, and when she found that things were just

the same, only more so, her thoughts took another direction. Her account in an earlier book of how she discovered the message of prophecy, to her own great comfort, was touching and even moving. Since then her whole soul has been possessed by a great conviction—that the one hope of the world lies in the immediate coming of Christ.

---

This gospel she has expounded with real ability and fervour in several volumes, and in her newest essay she again holds it out to us as the sovereign specific. The book is full of interest of varied kinds. The author has read widely in current science and she fills her pages with quotations from modern scientific literature. But after all her study of science she would probably say, parodying a famous monarch, 'we are not impressed.' She is amazed that religious teachers should (as she imagines they do) base theology on science. For science changes every day, and gives up yesterday's conclusions to-morrow. To her theology is the *only exact science*.

---

There is only one infallibility, and that is found in the Bible. And the proof of the Bible's infallibility lies in verified prediction. 'Verified prediction is the strongest kind of proof.' It is a far firmer basis for faith than experience, which may be delusive and is likely to be limited in range. Prediction is the only crushing fact that cannot be evaded. The reason why Einstein has convinced people is that he was able to predict the facts which showed the soundness of his conclusions.

---

Now in the Bible you have three strands of prediction, a three-ply rope. One concerns Christ, another the Jews, a third the Gentiles. The first is obvious. The coming of Messiah is foreshadowed all through the Old Testament. But so is the return of the Jews to their old home. And finally the whole course of Gentile history is traced out for us in the Bible. Thus, according to Miss PANKHURST, the Bible is a sort of Programme of the Future. To her that appears to be its main value. Perhaps we do her injustice in this, because she is so possessed by the great Hope that other aspects of Scripture are of necessity in the background.

But it is not only these three things that are predicted. The author gives us a whole series of Biblical anticipations. First come the great upheavals of Nature, and surely we have had sufficiency of these. They are duly noted here, earthquakes and such like. Our age apparently has been a terrible time for earthquakes. But these natural catastrophes are not the only modern phenomena predicted in the Bible. There is the present moral degeneracy. And there are wars and rumours of wars. And there is Zionism, with its repopulation of Palestine. And, perhaps most plainly of all, there are the lines of world history set forth in the Bible ages before. Daniel is the chief authority here. 'The Book of Daniel, whenever and by whomsoever written, is truly prophetic, because it reflects in advance international developments taking place in this our own time.'

---

MISS PANKHURST'S position is definite and clear cut. All these phenomena are predicted as signs of the End. They are to be features of the last age before the 'Day of the Lord.' And they are all features of to-day. Therefore we are at the close of the era which is to usher in the millennial kingdom, when Christ will appear, and all the evils of our day will be rectified. Moreover, the Bible has given us a clear indication of definite things that are to happen, and they have all happened or are in course of happening. What, then, is the duty of the Church? The answer is, apocalyptic preaching, earnest, passionate apocalyptic preaching, to prepare the way of the coming Lord.

---

It is an ungrateful task to criticise any earnest conviction. But nevertheless it may be pointed out that this whole outlook depends on a view of the Bible which is unhistorical. It makes the Bible a sort of scheme of the Future. Its main significance as Holy Scripture lies in its power to foresee events that are to happen hundreds of years later. It is plain that such a view takes much of its reality and most of its values from the Bible. Instead of being a great message from God to its own time, Prophecy is a forecasting of another age. Instead of the Bible being a book of its own time, throbbing with the interest which

a living book has, it is a book whose main significance lies apart from the problems and facts of its own age.

But this is just what is not true of the Bible. It is a real book. It spoke to its own age. The Prophet spoke to his own age about its own problems. And when the Prophet spoke of the future it was, for one thing, in general terms, and, for another, it was to influence his own time. The Prophet's picture of the future is always general enough to apply to any age. And as a matter of fact those predictions which Miss PANKHURST sees fulfilled in our day have been similarly applied by similar interpreters to every age since the Prophets lived. Every period has seen in these pictures of the future its own conditions.

In reality, the Prophet's horizon was bounded by his own time. Daniel did not foresee the twentieth century. Nor did any other Prophet. It is a popular delusion that a prophet is one who predicts. A Prophet is one who speaks for God, primarily to his own time. He spoke about foreign

policy, about the social problem of his age, of drunkenness, of woman's dress, and of religious indifference. He passionately defended the poor. And when he looked away to the future from the present, it was because the present was so bad that his hope and faith eagerly scanned the horizon to see some signs of better things. And when he depicted the future it was in colours borrowed from his own time.

There is nothing in the predictions mentioned by Miss PANKHURST that goes beyond what has been said. And it must be insisted that if the main significance of the Prophets lay in their predictions the Bible would cease to be a book of living interest. Happily such is not the case. The Bible reveals God in actual touch with actual events and persons. And its gospel for the future is just the application to each age of the eternal principles which we see applied to that age long ago. And as to the Second Coming of Christ, the last word was said by an old Scottish peasant woman, 'I dinna ken when He is coming. But I'll be gey glad to see Him when He comes.'

## The Hebrew Prophets and their Modern Interpretation.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR T. H. ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

It was held for many generations that prophecy was primarily, indeed entirely, prediction. It was supposed that the Divine Spirit revealed to these men the future with greater or less exactness of detail, and that every word they uttered would find its fulfilment in later history. Jews and Christians alike adopted this interpretation, and if any element in the prophetic message failed to materialize, the only possible inference was that fulfilment was delayed, and the consummation of the word was postponed to a date still further in the future. Hence from the great body of 'unfulfilled prophecy' was deduced a whole system, and, in particular, the doctrines of the Messiah and of the Divine judgment, originally distinct,

were combined to form a picture of the end of things. In fine, prophecy was so interpreted as to make it appear identical with eschatology.

This method of interpretation, then, dominated for many centuries the whole of that world which was interested in the Old Testament, and has not wholly disappeared. But the spirit which came to birth in the Renaissance compelled men ultimately to look elsewhere for the prophetic message. A real effort was made to set these men once more in their own age, to see them as their contemporaries saw them, and to interpret their message in the light of history. The nineteenth-century studies in the prophets were dominated by such considerations, and the process was carried so far that any interpretation of prophecy as prediction aroused grave suspicion. The resurrection of the ancient

<sup>1</sup> Murtle Lecture, delivered before the University of Aberdeen, 9th December 1928.