
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.

A SYMPOSIUM can hardly fail to be interesting, provided the subject of it is sufficiently important and the contributors to it are sufficiently competent. It will be admitted that these conditions are more than adequately met where the subject is Hell and the contributors include some of the most eminent names of the day in the fields of religion, science, and literature respectively. The exact title of the symposium to which we invite attention is *What is the Real Hell?* (Cassell; 3s. 6d. net), and the contributors are Dean INGE, Sir Oliver LODGE, Abbot BUTLER, Warwick DEEPING, Bishop WELLDON, Professor MOFFATT, Annie BESANT, Sheila KAYE-SMITH, Ernest RAYMOND, the Rev. W. E. ORCHARD, the Rev. F. W. NORWOOD, G. Hay MORGAN, K.C., and Professor Irwin EDMAN.

A sufficient diversity of outlook might well be anticipated from a group of thinkers of calibre so diverse; but, curiously enough, in what they have to say there is a surprising unanimity. It may be true, as one of the writers says, that we are left, as we must inevitably be left in our present state of knowledge, with a whole heap of unresolved difficulties and unanswered questions; but the writers, one and all, believe in Hell. Not indeed in the old traditional Hell; for Hell, like man himself, as Mr. DEEPING reminds us, has had a history. There is a Stone Age Hell, a Bronze Age Hell, the Hell of the Middle Ages, and the Hell of the Now and To-morrow. But of the reality of some Hell the writers have no doubt whatever.

Here are some of their testimonies. 'We know,' says Dean INGE, 'that there is a Hell, for we have been there, or very near it.' 'Belief in Hell,' according to Dr. MOFFATT, 'is an element of any religion which is morally healthy.' 'The man who repudiates Hell absolutely'—thus Dr. NORWOOD—'has either had a shallow experience, or is not true to the experience he has had. I believe in Hell as I believe in Man.' One of the strongest professions of faith in Hell is offered by one of the least orthodox of the contributors. Professor EDMAN reiterates his creed again and again. 'The free mind—if it recognizes the symbolic and revealing poetry of its symbols of God and Heaven—is both dishonest and inconsistent in refusing to recognize the permanent significance, the inescapable moral reality of Hell.' And again: 'What matter that the word sin is out of fashion, or that we have other more medical words for damnation. The fact and its consequences are still here.' And yet again: 'Of all the apparatus of the Christian tradition Hell has been most smiled at by the modern. Yet Hell is of all the theological notions that which empirically he knows best.'

But what is the Hell in which these writers believe, and how do they define it? There is little verbal agreement in their definitions. The representatives of the Church express themselves, as a rule, in religious language, while the others express themselves for the most part otherwise; but at bottom their meanings are not perhaps very far

apart. It will be only fair, however, to let them speak for themselves.

According to Bishop WELLDON, 'the essence of Hell, if rightly understood, seems to be remorse,' a remorse which springs from seeing sinful actions in their own light. Dr. ORCHARD suggests that Hell 'may mean simply an intense sense of what the deprivation of God means, combined with an equally intense determination to deprive oneself of Him: both together and all at once.'

Mr. DEEPING describes Hell in more secular terms. To him it is the realization of one's failure, it is 'to look back at the dim, reproachful faces of those who loved us, those whom we betrayed,' 'to stand at the end of one's days and to know that the landscape you have painted is grey, a place of stones, and of the bones of broken memories.' For Sheila KAYE-SMITH, Hell is 'nothing more or less than a complete or eternal state of self-absorption.' Similarly Ernest RAYMOND: 'Hell is that undeniable cursedness won by the wholly self-centred.' To Mr. MORGAN it 'is the condition or the state of the Spirit suffering the agony of remorse for wrong done and good left undone in this life'; while to Professor EDMAN it is 'to live deprived of all possibility of the Good'—some central good upon which the heart is set.

There is not only a substantial unanimity of thought among most of the contributors, but also at times a curious unanimity of expression and frequent use of the same material, both Biblical and extra-Biblical. Twice, for example, we are reminded that the last farthing must be paid; and twice that the Judge of all the earth will do right; twice Christ's parable of the Day of Judgment is recalled; twice His preaching to the spirits in prison is brought up; and several references occur to His solemn word, 'Fear not them that kill the body . . . but fear him who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell,' though it is rather remarkable, considering the variety of outlook represented by the contributors, that none of them has been induced by the gracious conception of God in the immediate context (Lk $12^{6f.}$) to think of the one who has power to cast into hell as the Devil.

Even from secular literature the same quotations recur. Twice there are allusions to 'Adam Bede,' and twice to Fitzgerald's line, 'And Hell the shadow from a soul on fire.' Calvinists will be grieved to note that two of the ablest writers independently refer to Calvin's 'sadistic' theology.

Twice appeal is made to the Bible in a way which reveals how ignorant even well-informed persons may be of its real meaning. One writer remarks, 'When it is said that the wicked shall be turned into hell, it may be a statement simply true when rightly interpreted.' But if, as seems certain, this is meant to be a reference to Ps 9^{17}, the writer would have done well to consult the Revised Version, where it is *not* said that the wicked will be turned into hell. The same mistake is made by another contributor, who, doubtless with Ps 139^{8} in view, writes of 'the truth hidden in the Psalmist's discovery that he had found God in Hell,' and adds, 'What could He be there for, He the all-loving, if not to rescue, to save?' It is always a perilous thing for the cobbler to go beyond his last.

The theologically minded contributors naturally appeal to Jesus, and it is not a little strange that in so diversified a volume, the question is only once raised whether He has been correctly reported. It is Dr. ORCHARD, in one of the ablest essays in the book, who reminds us that there are scholars who believe that the report of the teaching of Jesus on this subject has been affected by ideas cherished by the narrators, and scholars more daring still who doubt whether Jesus had worked out to their full consequences the implications of His own teaching about the Fatherhood of God.

But Dr. MOFFATT is surely right when he says that, after making every allowance, 'it seems impossible to eliminate all the severe sayings of Jesus about the future from the tradition of His teaching.' Sir Oliver LODGE agrees: 'He did not scruple to speak of a state of outer darkness where there is

weeping and gnashing of teeth.' And Bishop Welldon: 'Our Lord's language respecting the future invisible world must be figuratively understood; but nobody who reads it can mistake the awful solemnity of the relation between the present and the future lives.'

There is great diversity of opinion among the contributors on the destiny of man after death. Some argue that man is not inherently immortal, but 'immortable'—to use an abominable word, *i.e.* immortality is for him a possibility. Others believe that the soul enters upon a state of probation after death; others that in the end all will be saved, for God must in the end be 'all in all'; others that we know and can know nothing whatever about the future state. While Sir Oliver LODGE assures us that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Divine goodness for ever,' Dean INGE, who has never believed in the inevitability of progress, will say no more than that 'if there is any future probation, it is absolutely unknown to us, and we have no right to assume any such thing.'

The old-fashioned Hell has certainly gone for ever. It has been driven out by science and by conscience, especially the Christian conscience. As Professor EDMAN says, 'it is incredible to our knowledge of astronomy, and revolting to our sense of justice.' Whatever the future may have in store, those who believe in God through Christ will look forward to it in the confident assurance that all that is done to us there will be done in justice and in love; the God revealed in Jesus Christ can be trusted to be neither unloving nor unjust.

But three things must be steadily borne in mind. One is that, on any view of the future, life in this world is of quite incalculable importance. The second is that the belief in God as Father is very far from being identical with the belief that 'He's a Good Fellow, and 'twill all be well.' A God who truly loved us would be quite certain to be much more than a merely good-natured, amiable God. The third is that, if free will is now and continues to be a reality, there can be no demonstrable and irrefragable certainty of final salvation for all; for so long as the conditions of the future state are unknown to us, how could there be any certainty that the soul that rejected the best that it knew in this world would embrace it with rapture in the world to come?

We may fittingly conclude this sketch of an interesting book in the words of Mr. Hay MORGAN, 'I am aware that all this is surmising. We can but guess—we cannot dogmatize. Yes, we can also hope.'

Among the thoughtful and scholarly readers of the Anglican Communion, Dr. A. E. J. RAWLINSON holds a distinctive place. He is, we imagine, an Anglo-Catholic of the broader type, neither an extremist nor an obscurantist, and in his recent book, *The Church of England and the Church of Christ* (reviewed in another column), he shows himself in an attractive light. We are, however, specially concerned here with one section of that book which may possibly turn out to be of special importance. It is an appendix with the heading 'The Doctrine of the Real Presence and the Possibility of an Eirenicon.' The suggestion in this brief essay is one that is worthy of careful consideration.

Dr. RAWLINSON begins with the distinctions which are traditional in regard to the Sacrament. These are the 'sign' or symbol, the bread and wine, the 'reality' (*res*), which is the Body and Blood of the Lord, and finally the 'virtue' or efficacy, which points to the benefits conveyed. And these point also to the distinct views held of the Sacrament. The purely symbolist view (associated with Zwingli) affirms that the Sacrament is merely a sign; the 'receptionist' view asserts that it is not merely a sign but an efficacious sign, a means of Divine grace which in effect conveys to those who rightly receive it the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood; while those who affirm the doctrine of the Real Presence acknowledge the actuality and objectivity in the Sacrament of the *res sacramenti*, or 'thing signified.'

It has been said that 'the danger of the word "Presence" is its connotation of absence at other times.' But those who affirm a belief in the Real Presence would deny that their doctrine involves such a connotation. They discriminate different senses and meanings of the term 'presence.' They would agree that Christians are at all times and in all places in the presence of Christ. Yet they would affirm that there is in a real sense a special presence of Christ which is objectively mediated through the sacramental elements of bread and wine, which, in virtue of their consecration, are no longer *mere* bread and wine, but have become for faith's discernment in a real though mysterious sense Christ's Body and Blood.

Now the difficulties of this doctrine are obvious. What is at stake in the controversy is the affirmation of the actuality and objectivity in the Sacrament of the *res sacramenti*—Christ's Body and Blood. Is there any way of presenting this truth which may provide an eirenicon between 'Catholics' and 'Evangelicals'? The present Master of Corpus Christi College, Mr. Spens, has suggested such a way, and Dr. RAWLINSON is impressed with the possibilities of reconciliation that lie in his view. The essence of his view seems to lie in the belief that in the Lord's Supper there is not only a symbolism of action (as in Baptism), but also 'an effectual symbolism of objects.'

By an 'effectual symbol' is meant a symbol which does not merely convey a message but effects a result. A case in point would be token coinage, or paper money. A florin has not only the value of its intrinsic worth as silver, but a further value which is given to it by the State, and is capable of effecting results. So a pound note in itself is valueless, but, as a symbol of further value given to it by the will of the State, it is an 'effectual symbol' of a pound note. The essence of such symbolism is the association of certain results with certain visible signs by a will which is competent to bring about those results. Now in the case of the Eucharist the authority which invests the elements of bread and wine with a significance, character, and potency which did not belong to them before is the will of God, which is competent to bring about the results which are in view in the Holy Supper.

In other words, the bread and wine, from the moment of their consecration as media of the appointed Sacrament, become, for Christian faith, instinct, by a determination of the sovereign will of God, with a wholly new meaning and potency, a new character, a new set of capacities and properties. They become from henceforward the effectual symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, capable of mediating all that is meant and involved in eucharistic communion with Christ. They have acquired a new property, namely, that their devout reception secures and normally conditions participation in the blessings of Christ's sacrifice, and therefore in His life. In *this* sense, they have become, without any connotation of materialism (and also without any implication of cannibalism), Christ's Body and Blood. They have become Christ's Body and Blood '*simply in and through their becoming effectual symbols.*' (The italics are Dr. RAWLINSON'S.)

This is important, and may be expanded. An effectual symbol is rightly described (as we saw in the case of a pound note), not in terms of its original and natural properties, but in terms rather of its new and acquired significance and efficacy, *i.e.* in terms of the reality which it effectually symbolizes. If this holds good even in the case of a piece of paper, which by a determination of the will of the State has the significance and efficacy of a pound sterling, *a fortiori* it holds good in the case of the eucharistic gifts, which by a determination of the will of God have the significance and efficacy of the Body and Blood of Christ. For the new spiritual significance and efficacy of the elements in their sacramental capacity are no less real than their original character and significance as merely natural objects. This would justify us speaking of the elements as Christ's Body and Blood simply as asserting that they render Him appropriable as our sacrifice.

The natural properties of the bread and wine,

considered simply *as* bread and wine, remain wholly unchanged. But now, from the point of view of faith, these are irrelevant. What is significant about the elements *now* is that they have become the potential media of communion, that they are (' in the sense indicated, though not, of course, in any other sense ') the Body and Blood of Christ. It is precisely because the devout reception of the elements unites us to Christ—it is upon the ground of the new significance, capacity, and efficacy which from henceforth attach, by Christ's appointment, to the consecrated elements in virtue of their consecration—that they can be rightly called the Body and Blood of Christ. They are a *focus*, in time and space, for the objective worship of Christ as our sacrifice.

We have set forth this remarkable statement at length, because it is an effort to build a bridge between reasonable Evangelicals and reasonable Anglo-Catholics. And it does seem to hold out a prospect of a common understanding. The reasonable Evangelical will probably reflect, 'if the elements are only effectual symbols (in the full sense of these words as explained) as a paper note is an effectual symbol, then there is no change in the actual element. As the pound note remains paper, and is only invested with greater properties by the will of the State, so the elements remain bread and wine, and are invested with higher value by the will of God. There does not seem to be any ground for serious difference in such a view, and I need not find any ground of serious criticism in the devotional language in which devout souls may clothe this faith.' Probably extremists in both camps will remain unreconciled, but Dr. RAWLINSON is appealing beyond them to the large company of earnest and open-minded Christians in both camps. And he may find sympathy and understanding among them.

The Virgin Birth of Christ (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 15s. net), by Professor J. Gresham MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D., is a notable contribution to conservative Christian apologetics. Though he is now Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Dr. MACHEN is an inheritor of the Princeton theological tradition, standing in the succession of Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield. Indeed, much of the matter contained in this volume has already appeared, sometimes in more elaborate form, in the *Princeton Theological Review*. Whatever we may think of Dr. MACHEN's doctrinal standpoint, we cannot but be impressed by his learning and ability, and recognize that in this respect also his name may fitly be placed alongside those of Hodge and Warfield.

Two explanations are possible of the Church's belief in the Virgin Birth of Jesus of Nazareth. One is that Jesus was actually conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. That explanation Dr. MACHEN considers in chapters i.–xi., in which he examines the positive testimony to the Virgin Birth and the objections that have been raised against it. The other explanation is that through some sort of error the Church came to accept the Virgin Birth as a fact. That explanation is considered in chapters xii.–xiv., in which the alternative theories that would elucidate the origin of the idea of the Virgin Birth are examined. The exposition tends at times to become prolix and commonplace, and even to repeat itself; on the other hand, this is counterbalanced by a wholly admirable lucidity.

An analysis of the work will show its scope and standpoint more clearly. But let us preface our analysis with the remark that Dr. MACHEN does little to meet the main difficulty attaching to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. It is not enough to show (if it is shown) that the Virgin Birth tradition is securely imbedded in the Gospels and that, if it is not true, its origin has not been explained. The difficulty concerning the doctrine is scientific or biological rather than critical and historical; and all that Dr. MACHEN can say in this reference is that the fact of the Virgin Birth is a miracle—a miracle in no lower sense than that it represents 'an intrusion into the order of nature of the creative power of God.'

First comes a learned investigation of the second-century testimony to the Virgin Birth; as a result of which it would appear that a firm and well-formulated belief in this doctrine extends back to the early years of the second century, and that the denials of it in the second century were probably based upon philosophical or dogmatic prepossession, whether on the part of individuals like Carpocrates and Cerinthus, or on the part of groups like the obscure sect of the Ebionites. Following up this investigation, Dr. MACHEN considers the birth and infancy narrative in the Third Gospel, and reaches the conclusion that if literary criticism has established anything at all, it has established the fact that this is an integral part of the Third Gospel.

The genuinely Palestinian character of Lk 1^{5}–2^{52} in general is then vindicated; after which special consideration is given to the Magnificat and the Benedictus, which are represented as not—as in Harnack's view—artificial compositions of a Gentile Christian, but as confirmative of the author's opinion as to the Semitic and Palestinian origin of the whole narrative. It is uncertain whether the narrative was composed by Luke himself on the basis of Aramaic oral tradition or of a Semitic document, or whether the source, if it came into Luke's hands in a Greek form, was composed originally in Greek, or in Hebrew, or in Aramaic. But in the midst of so much uncertainty the fact of its genuinely primitive and Palestinian character, it is held, stands out clear.

Here Dr. MACHEN has to face the theory of interpolation. Many modern scholars grant the Palestinian origin of Lk 1^{5}–2^{52}, but declare that attestation of the Virgin Birth formed no original part of the narrative. This theory is carefully examined in its various forms; and in particular Völter's theory is refuted, that those parts of Lk 1 which concern Jesus (including the mention of the Virgin Birth) are secondary elements in a process of literary manipulation. The Virgin Birth, it is contended, is no secondary element in the Lucan narrative.

Turning to the narrative in Matthew, Dr. MACHEN holds that, even granted to Merx that the original reading in 1^{16} is 'Joseph begat Jesus,' no conclusion derogatory to the attestation of the Virgin Birth would necessarily follow. As Burkitt points out, the word 'begat' in the genealogy simply means 'had as a legal heir.' The physical paternity of Joseph is not asserted.

The relation between the infancy narratives in Matthew and in Luke is now considered, and the conclusion stated that they are on the one hand completely independent, and on the other hand not at all contradictory. This strengthens the external evidence for the Virgin Birth, and leads to the further consideration: Are the narratives inherently credible? This, as we remarked at the outset, is the crucial question. The answer will be given in the negative by those who are opposed in principle to an acceptance of the supernatural, or else do not believe that the supernatural is manifested in the life of Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity. But where the supernatural origin of Christianity is allowed, there should be no special objection, says Dr. MACHEN, on psychological or historical grounds to the infancy narratives.

Moreover, these narratives are congruous with the rest of the New Testament. 'If the question were simply whether a man about whom otherwise we knew nothing was born without human father, no doubt that question would have to be answered in the negative. But as a matter of fact that is not the question at all. The question is not whether an ordinary man was born without human father but whether Jesus was so born. . . . So unique a person, it might well be argued, may well have had a unique entrance into the world.'

So far chapters i.–xi., which occupy two-thirds of the book. A more modern conservative writer would probably have traversed the aforesaid ground more rapidly, and given more space, relatively speaking, to the discussions of the alternative theories which, on the assumption that Jesus of Nazareth was not really born of a virgin, seek to explain the origin of the belief in the Virgin Birth.

While saying this, we cannot but be grateful to Dr. MACHEN for his very full and fair-minded discussion of the theories of Jewish derivation and pagan derivation respectively—a discussion, we should add, which reckons with the findings of the most recent scholarship, as exemplified in works by Gressmann, Leisegang, and Norden.

As for the theory of Jewish derivation, the overwhelming majority of modern scholars are agreed that the story of the Virgin Birth is, in Merx's words, 'as un-Jewish as possible.' It never arose in the Jewish Christian Church on the basis of purely Jewish ideas. There has been a practically universal rejection of the view that the principal germ of the story is to be found in Is 7^{14} ('Behold the virgin shall conceive,' etc.). And as for the theory of pagan derivation, its advocates are divided among themselves. Some regard it as a reflex among Gentile Christians of the pagan notions about children begotten by the gods; others as an ancient pagan idea already naturalized in the pre-Christian Jewish doctrine of the Messiah. But neither of these theories has obtained anything like general assent.

In his concluding chapter Dr. MACHEN emphasizes the importance to his mind of belief in the Virgin Birth to the Christian man. It is important for the general question of the authority of the Bible. It is important as a test of our view of Jesus Christ, as to whether it is naturalistic or supernaturalistic. And it has an importance all its own. Without the story of the Virgin Birth there would be something seriously lacking in the Christian views of Christ. It is just here, however, that the modern dogmatician would be likely to join issue. In most modern theologies of the conservative type the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is not regarded as integral to the dogmatic system.

The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day.

V.

Marriage.

BY THE REVEREND A. HERBERT GRAY, D.D., LONDON.

IT might well be thought that everything has been said about Marriage that can be said, and that there is no need for further writing about it. But if the real truth about it has often been declared, it has certainly not been generally believed and acted on. There is no subject on which to-day there is more confusion of thought, and there is still a vast amount of suffering in our midst due to the mismanagement of the married relationship. Wherefore it would seem to be worth while to attempt to state the truth about it as clearly as possible.

The mind of Christ about marriage must be understood rather by realizing the implications of the few things He said, than by insisting on the letter. His one great saying really goes to the root of the matter. 'He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said . . . they twain shall be one flesh.' That is an emphatic assertion that the intimacies of married life are part of the Divine intention. If that be so, they must be essentially beautiful and capable of forwarding the highest life of men and women. To think of them as almost shameful, or as mere manifestations of some animal element in our humanity, is to go wrong in thought from the first. Unless this central thing in life which we call marriage can, with all its various implications, be caught up into man's highest life and made to minister to the spirit, no complete redemption is possible for us. Assuredly if we are to be 'saved,' marriage must be 'saved.'

The one vital truth at the heart of this subject is also the central fact about sex. That truth is that the sex element, which is so central and masterful, alike in men and in women, makes possible a union of a man and a woman on all levels of their personalities so complete, harmonious, and joyous that it may well be considered the crown of