

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

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE cleavage within the Christian Church between the Fundamentalists and those whom, for want of a better word, we may call the liberals, must be a matter of profound regret to those members—and they doubtless represent an overwhelming majority—of both parties who recognize the indefeasible importance both of the Church and of the Bible to the spiritual life. Any effort to bridge this gulf without the compromise of intellectual sincerity is eminently worth while. Incidentally an attempt to render this service has been made by the Rev. Professor H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in his brief but thoroughly suggestive book on *The Church and the Bible* (Longmans ; 4s., paper covers 2s. 6d.).

Dr. GOUDGE is well qualified to make this attempt. For while he was brought up, as he tells us, to read the Bible in the Fundamentalist way, he is nevertheless convinced that the critics are 'substantially right.' Here, then, is a man who has the necessary inner sympathy with both sides, and only such a man can help us. What has he to say ?

First, let us see how far he sympathizes with the critics ; for 'we shall shut our eyes,' he says, 'to nothing that the critic has to tell us.' One of those things which the critic has to tell us, and which Dr. GOUDGE admits, is that the representations of the past by Hebrew historians 'were often profoundly affected by the lessons which they wished to teach.' 'They have no scruples about mingling

fiction with history, when they are using both for the same purpose. There is history in the books of Chronicles, but there is fiction also.' Again, in discussing the character of the law of Sinai, he admits that 'the narrative of Exodus is here in confusion,' and that while in Joshua the conquest of Canaan is described as rapidly effected by the Divine power, 'we have only to turn to the book of Judges to see how different was the reality.' And again, 'we have no history that we can trust for details ; the historical framework (in Judges) is artificial, and some of the Judges may have been contemporaries.' No critic could ask for more. The man who could write those sentences has the right to be heard. _____

But here are some of his other sentences. 'If we ask what the Song of Songs means as a part of Scripture, the answer is that it sets forth the mutual love of Jehovah Incarnate and His Church,' and that, 'interpreted with restraint and reverence, it will supply us with beautiful thoughts' about the relation between Christ and His Church. Of Ecclesiastes he says that 'the book in its original form may have been nearer to the mind of Omar Khayyám than to that of Christ ; but as interpreters of Scripture we are not concerned with that. Words which in themselves would bear a heterodox meaning must be interpreted in accordance with the context which the later editors have provided for them.' _____

Again, 'the mystical interpreters have seen in

Isaac bearing "the wood of the burnt-offering" the Lord bearing His Cross; and, if we accept the highest meaning of the story as the truest meaning, it is right to see Him there.' Again, taught by St. Paul, we shall 'find in the Red Sea Holy Baptism, and in the manna our Eucharistic food.' This type of interpretation reaches its climax when we are invited to contemplate Jonah 'giving his life for the mariners'—the mariners whose peril, as the story implies, was directly due to Jonah's own disobedience—'and passing through seeming death and resurrection to be the evangelist of the heathen world'; and what an evangelist! 'angry and displeased exceedingly' (Jon 4¹) because the gracious God had cancelled His threat against the Ninevites upon their showing the fruits of repentance.

Here seems to speak the Fundamentalist; and the average critic will follow him, if at all, but far off and reluctantly. But to describe Dr. GOUDGE as a Fundamentalist would be to do him very much less than justice. What he is pleading for is the legitimacy not so much of the fundamentalist as of the mystical interpretation. With mystical interpretation, he assures us, historical criticism can have no quarrel. The meaning of Scripture grew with the advancing spiritual experience of the Church, and the original meaning, which it is the task of criticism to discover, by no means exhausts its meaning. Indeed, Dr. GOUDGE affirms that 'the original meaning of the words is often not their meaning as part of Canonical Scripture.'

Much of the original meaning of the ritual and ceremonial described in Leviticus is now beyond the possibility of recovery; but with that, it seems, we are not concerned. 'The true meaning is the highest meaning.' 'It is Calvary which must explain Leviticus, and not Leviticus Calvary.' It may even be that 'the unlearned Christian sometimes grasps the acquired meaning better than the scholar, since he is primarily interested in what the words mean and not in what they meant.'

This is an idea and a phrase to which Dr. GOUDGE recurs again and again: 'What Ecclesiastes meant,' he tells us, 'is one thing, and what it means is

another.' In many passages where our forefathers found the Lord and the modern critic fails to find Him, 'we must ask not only what the words originally meant, but what they came to mean and should mean to us.' 'We should put upon the old words the highest meaning we can give to them.' An interpretation of the Old Testament which is not in the modern sense historical 'is none the less not only true interpretation, but for us far more valuable than the historical interpretation itself.' The Church, with its growing experience, comes to interpret old words differently from the way in which they were at first interpreted. What they once meant is one thing, but what they now mean another.

We have quoted Dr. GOUDGE at some length, because we wished to have his defence of the mystical interpretation presented with unimpeachable fairness. Is that defence convincing? There is, we must admit, a certain measure of truth in it. The great words of the Bible, as of all noble literature, grow with the deepening experience of the race, and it may readily be conceded that the writers of the Old Testament spoke better than they knew.

The critic, too, will readily admit that interpolations may have not only historical interest, but high spiritual value. The brilliant hopes that seem to be occasionally appended to the stern threats of prophecy have their own value as a revelation of the mind of God just as truly as the threats whose force they are intended to mitigate.

But one may admit all this without going all the way with Dr. GOUDGE. 'The Church,' he says, 'has always believed in mystical interpretation, and that with justice,' and at one point he even laments the neglect into which the 'typology' of Scripture has fallen. The point at which we part company with Dr. GOUDGE is this. We believe that the later meaning may be *deeper* than the original meaning; he maintains, or appears to maintain, that it may be *different*. Though essentially we may perhaps not be very far apart, there appears to be here a real and important distinction. 'The Church,' we are told, 'comes to interpret old

words *differently*.' 'Hosca and others knew how to deal with the old tales, and what they mean is very *different* from what they meant' (italics ours).

Our contention is that to understand what a passage *means*, we must understand what it *meant*. If it is held to mean not only something deeper, but something different, who or what is to guarantee this later interpretation which is imported into or superimposed upon the original words? Perhaps Dr. GOUDGE would find this guarantee in the Spirit-led Church. But interpretation is necessarily conditioned by the intellectual atmosphere and methods of the time, and it is through these that the Spirit must work. If the methods and conclusions of one age carry no conviction to the mind of another, what then? If with the best will in the world we are unable to find in the sensuous imagery of the Song of Songs the love of Jehovah for His people or of Christ for His Church, what then? These things have their important place in the history of interpretation, but they cannot be determinative of the true meaning.

Whether one agrees or disagrees, however, with this contention, all will agree that Dr. GOUDGE has written a stimulating book; he has raised an important question and discussed it in a judicial and irenic spirit. He has also rendered a valuable service by reminding Catholics of the importance of the Bible, and Protestants of the importance of the Church; and his discussions are conducted with a calmness, trenchancy, fairness, and lucidity which forcibly remind us of Butler and his famous 'Analogy.'

The supplementary chapter of sixty-six pages prefixed to the recent reprint of the third edition (1923) of Dr. Charles HARRIS's textbook of apologetics, *Pro Fide*, does not attempt so much to solve problems as to point out where the problems lie. None the less it is a useful chapter, as at once indicating the most recent phases of apologetical discussion and introducing the reader to much of the relevant literature.

Dr. HARRIS begins by suggesting that the Christian apologist need not pay so much attention to *Modernism* as was desirable half a dozen years ago. In recent theology it is not the modernist but the liberal-orthodox (or critical-catholic) who has been most prominent; and the bulk of liberal thought appears to favour the liberal-orthodox rather than the definitely modernist position. The outstanding characteristic of the liberal-orthodox school, it is added, is its attempt to revive the speculative spirit of Origen, greatest of the early apologists. The veteran editor of 'Lux Mundi' may be regarded as the head of this school, and a notable exponent of it is Fr. Thornton in his recent study of the Incarnation. All this may be granted, but although the output of modernist literature may have diminished, the spirit of Modernism is still alive.

Indeed, Dr. HARRIS allows that there is a modified form of Monism still in much vogue to-day which is allied to Modernism on the philosophical side. He would name it *Semi-Pantheism*. What is the difference between Semi-Pantheism and Pantheism? Semi-Pantheism aims at modifying Pantheism in such a way as to render it consistent with, in particular, the Christian doctrine of creation. It is implied in a saying like this, 'Creation is the complement of God,' or this, 'The relation of God to the world is organic.' On such a theory, it is here declared, we are logically compelled to postulate the existence of some unknown 'Super-God' (something like the 'Veiled Being' of Mr. Wells) to account for the existence of God and the world.

Dr. HARRIS also touches upon the relations between Science and Religion, in which he notes a change for the better in recent years. The pressure of the strain between the two has been largely relieved not only by the almost universal acceptance by orthodox theologians of the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, but also by the new emphasis on the part of evolutionists upon *emergence*, by which is meant the unexplained appearance—generally in ascending series—of new qualities and values. At the present time the view that evolution is an 'emergent' process, or—in Bergson's phrase—a 'creative' process, is widely accepted

not only by philosophers but also by biologists. It is capable of being harmonized with the theistic standpoint, as interpreted, for example, by Professor Lloyd Morgan.

The theory of *Relativity*, like that of Emergent or Creative Evolution, has also aroused much discussion among theistic apologists in recent years. It is not easy to say whether Relativity is intended to be taken as a philosophical theory of the actual objective structure of the physical world. If it is to be so taken, then it is of significance for religion. But religion, in Professor Eddington's opinion, has nothing to fear from it. In fact it supports the ideas of the objective existence and creative activity of God.

The chief danger to religion, as Dr. HARRIS goes on to affirm, proceeds not so much from physical science as from the extravagant claims sometimes put forward by the *New Psychology*, inasmuch as it aims at being an entirely 'natural' or experimental science, like chemistry and physics. It is with mental states as such, and not with the metaphysical nature of the soul or mind, that the 'New Psychology' is concerned. And its point of view is subjective. It is concerned, not with God, but with human ideas and beliefs about God; not with the moral law, but with man's moral ideas and sentiments. Its leading conception is that of mental activity directed towards a biological 'end' or 'purpose.' To the soul it assigns a native energy of its own (*libido* or *hormé*), which is different in kind from physical energy, and capable of directing and controlling it.

Such a psychology, as Dr. HARRIS maintains, is inconsistent with atheism, and even involves some form of theism as its philosophic basis. On the other hand, he acknowledges that certain schools of the 'New Psychology' are antagonistic to religion. *Freudianism* is usually regarded as the most antagonistic. Yet a certain number of Freudian practitioners are orthodox practising Christians, and hold that their therapeutic method (psycho-analysis) may be as useful to pastors and teachers as it is to physicians. But how do they

reconcile Christianity with the pansexualism and the determinism usually associated with the Freudian psychology? There is, however, this to be added: the 'Oedipus' complex plays a much less prominent part in Freudian teaching than was formerly the case; and in Freudian practice mental therapy finds itself compelled to work on libertarian principles.

There appears to be no doubt that *Behaviourism*, which is the 'new psychology' of America, conflicts inherently and necessarily with all forms of religion. Dr. HARRIS characterizes it as a slightly Americanized version of the views of Clifford, Huxley, and Tyndall. It is a system of pure materialism based upon the assumption that man is a mindless and soulless automaton, actuated and directed entirely by physical forces. In its extreme form it denies the existence of subjective or mental states altogether. But although the Behaviourists have opened up new avenues of psychological research (their investigations of the mentality of apes may be cited), they have been losing prestige even among the experimental psychologists of America. It is being realized, for example, that an act of memory involves knowledge, not only of past facts, but also of the rememberer's soul or mind, the existence of which the Behaviourist denies.

We shall not follow Dr. HARRIS in his reference to *Christian Science*, which is so far behaviouristic in its denial of the reality of the mental state of pain; enough has been said to indicate the scope of his supplementary chapter.

'South India' is the great problem which is at present before the minds of Anglican Churchmen in this country, and raises the most drastic issues which are to be submitted to the coming Lambeth Conference of Bishops. There is hardly any book issued by leading Anglican writers which does not deal with this matter. What, then, is the South India problem? What are the proposals which have raised such a storm of controversy? In a book written to expound and examine these proposals,

South India Schemes, by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow SIMPSON, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), we have the proposals set forth clearly, and a very drastic criticism of them by an earnest Anglo-Catholic.

The South India United Church was formed in 1908 by the blending together of various Congregationalist and Presbyterian Communions. Having secured this union of non-episcopal ministries, which in itself, considering their original differences, was a remarkable achievement, the South India United Church desired to extend their Union to Communions possessing an Episcopal ministry. The Indian Episcopal Church shared this desire, and in 1919 a more or less informal meeting was held between ministers of the Anglican Communion in India and the South India United Church. The Anglican members asked for the acceptance of the historic episcopate, which they explained to mean 'acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy, and not any theory of its character.'

The members of the South India United Church asked for recognition of the universal priesthood of all believers. Both sides were prepared to unite, so far as ministry is concerned, in agreement that acceptance of the fact of the Episcopate does not involve the acceptance of any theory of the origin of episcopacy, or any doctrinal interpretation of the fact. It was further agreed that the terms of union should involve no Christian community in the necessity of disowning its past, and that it was no part of their duty to call in question the validity of each other's orders.

At first it was proposed that each of the two bodies should 'commission' the ministries of the other. But this idea was soon (and finally) put aside. Two alternative proposals remained. One was that all ministers in the United Church should accept Episcopal ordination. That was never seriously urged, since acceptance of it by non-episcopal ministers would involve a disowning of their past and an agreement that their ordination had been no ordination at all. The only possibility left was to accept the ministries of all the uniting Churches. The Joint-Committee therefore

recommended that the existing ministers of the three Churches, the Anglican, the South Indian (*i.e.* Presbyterian and Congregational), and the Wesleyan, should all be accepted as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the Church after union. This would hold for fifty years (afterwards reduced to thirty). But at the close of this period no one should minister in the Church unless he had received regular Episcopal ordination.

This proposal, to accept both types of ministry as equally ministers of the Word and Sacraments, is explained to involve 'the practice by which members of either Church secure communion without question in the other Church, and ministers of either Church are free to invite ministers of the other Church to preside at Communion Services.' But it was also agreed that 'no minister ordained before the union shall minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister . . . any congregation accustomed to an episcopally ordained ministry will not either temporarily or permanently be placed in charge of a non-episcopally ordained minister unless all the communicant members of the congregation have been informed of the suggested appointment, and no one has signified his objection to such an arrangement.' Finally, while after thirty years all the ministers of the United Church are to be episcopally ordained, 'after this period of thirty years, the United Church will consider and decide the question of [such] exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.'

No, not quite finally. There was also the important matter of Confirmation to be dealt with. And it was agreed that 'until the Synod of the Church shall frame general rules with regard to full or communicant membership, either the rite of Confirmation administered by a Bishop of the Church, or such a service of admission to full membership as was in use in the South India United Church before the union, or such a service for the recognition of new members as was in use in the Wesleyan Church in South India before the union, shall be employed in admitting persons

to full or communicant membership of the United Church, and persons so admitted shall be recognized as communicant throughout the whole Church.'

These are the main features of the South India scheme, a notable and (from any point of view) courageous effort to embody the aspirations after reunion which are in the hearts of men of goodwill in all the churches. It will be obvious that the scheme is vulnerable at certain points. And Dr. Sparrow SIMPSON does not shrink from the task of exposing this. But the most momentous feature of the proposals is the challenge they present to the Church of England, and especially to the Lambeth Conference. It is not any weakness in the scheme itself as a basis of reunion that is serious. The really serious thing is that the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England will have nothing to do with it. This is made abundantly clear by Dr. SIMPSON in his book. He has many criticisms to offer, but the only one that matters essentially is that, if these proposals were accepted, the Anglican Church would be committing itself to the 'Protestant' theory of the ministry. To allow a non-episcopally ordained minister to

celebrate the Eucharist—one, that is, who is not a priest, and who has not received his commission by Apostolic Succession from the Lord—would be an intolerable thing. The one thing that gives a priest authority to minister the Holy Supper is that he has received it by orderly succession from the Apostles, who received it from Christ Himself.

It is true that scholars like Dr. Streeter and Dr. A. C. Headlam assert that there is no evidence whatever in the New Testament for the theory of Apostolic Succession. And Dr. SIMPSON knows this, and deals with them, not very convincingly we fear, but still very honestly and fairly. He is, however, quite unmoved by their arguments. And whether they are right or not matters nothing for the present point, which is that not obscurely he hints that the acceptance of the South India scheme here may lead to a serious disruption of the Church of England. That is the issue that faces the Bishops at Lambeth. They have a difficult task set them. The whole world will watch with interest how they deal with it. And, we add very sincerely, all good men will wait and watch (and pray) with sympathy and goodwill.

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

VI.

War.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND E. A. BURROUGHS, D.D.,
BISHOP OF RIPON.

THE difficulty of determining the mind of our Lord on any problem of a social or political nature is sufficiently indicated by the way such topics as this are discussed again and again, without even the most earnest and best-informed Christians having yet arrived at one mind. Part, at least, of this difficulty arises out of what seems to have been an aim of the whole teaching of Jesus, viz. to leave the particular application of general

principles to the individual conscience. In this certainly He is followed by St. Paul, *e.g.*, in his discussion of 'meats offered to idols.' Again, the issue is always complicated by the extraordinarily different social and political conditions under which both our Lord and His early followers lived; not the least baffling difference being the fact that, under the Roman Empire, there was no such thing as public opinion in politics. The re-