

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is in the November number of the *Biblical World* a curious short exegetical article which deserves a moment's attention. The writer is one of the greatest critics of the New Testament text that have ever lived—Professor Caspar René Gregory of Leipzig. And it cannot be entirely without significance that he makes the seemingly accidental reading of one old manuscript the occasion for a new and striking interpretation of a most familiar narrative.

It is the narrative of the woman taken in adultery. Jesus had spent the night in some rude hut or under the shade of an olive tree. In the morning He came into the temple. He was about to address the multitude, assembled there already in the early morning, when there arose a stir at the gate. Scribes and Pharisees drew nearer than was their wont. They brought with them a woman taken in adultery,—in the very act, they added with manly frankness,—and they demanded of Jesus what they should do with her. 'Moses said, Stone her, but what sayest Thou?' Jesus was not likely to say, 'Stone her.' It is testimony to the impression His gentleness had made even on the Scribes and Pharisees. But will He dare to contradict Moses and bid them let her go?

Jesus stooped down, and with His finger wrote upon the ground. They did not read the writing.

They were watching his apparent embarrassment, and scenting immediate victory. He lifted up His eyes for a moment. 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her,' He said. And He stooped down, and went on with His writing on the ground. 'They were convicted in their own conscience,' explained some early commentator; and our Received Text has accepted the explanation. Dr. Gregory does not receive it. They were only more exultant now. 'Without sin? Of course we are without sin. Are we not the Scribes and Pharisees who know the Law and need no repentance? This will not do. He cannot answer. He is caught.'

But Jesus was still writing on the ground. And now the near bystanders had begun to look at the writing. By a sudden flash of suspicion, or a sudden glitter of his name on the sand, the oldest of the Pharisees bent his head and read. His name was Eldad. 'Eldad stole a house from Joram's widow.' He turned without a word and went out. Nahum was next in order. He stepped into Eldad's place, and was close to the Writer's finger. 'Nahum slew Azidad in the desert.' The long past deed rushed back. He saw the staff flash again in the sun as he brought it down on his friend's shoulder when there was no eye to see. He turned and passed out without a word. Jesus wrote on. One by one the Pharisees took the place of the one who last went out and read their

sentence. 'And they, *when they read it*, went out one by one, beginning from the eldest even to the last; and Jesus was left alone, and the woman in the midst.'

Next to the birth and the resurrection of our Lord, the most outstanding miraculous fact in early Christianity is the conversion of St. Paul. That it is a fact no one has for a long time come forward to deny. That it is a miraculous fact, however, is still denied by many. The latest is Dr. Orello Cone.

Dr. Cone has published a new *Life of St. Paul*, through Messrs. A. & C. Black in this country. He calls his book *Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher* (8vo, pp. 475, 10s. 6d.). Its peculiarity is that it describes the apostle from his own letters. The Book of Acts is not made use of. Dr. Cone does not think the Book of Acts is worth making use of. If we would seek reliable facts we must go for them to the six genuine Epistles, which are Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philippians. The rest is not reliable.

Whereupon we find that the latest method of handling the miraculous in the conversion of St. Paul is to show that it is not miraculous according to the six genuine Epistles. 'If the Church,' says Dr. Cone, 'had never had the accounts of Paul's conversion in Acts, which show how the event was regarded a half-century or so after it happened, and how tradition had given the occurrence a legendary form and embellishment, no one would have thought of resorting to a miracle to explain it.'

We at once recall the statement, 'And last of all, as unto one born out of due time, He appeared to me also,' in 1 Co 15<sup>8</sup>, which is one of the six genuine Epistles. But Dr. Cone is ready to remind us of it, and his answer is that it does not refer to St. Paul's conversion. In Gal 1<sup>16</sup>, another of the genuine Epistles, is the statement that 'it

pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me,' and the apostle immediately adds, 'that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.' Dr. Orello Cone says that the conversion and the separation to the Gentile mission were two distinct events in the apostle's history. And as the passage in Galatians plainly refers to the Gentile mission, the passage in 1 Corinthians refers to the Gentile mission also.

Thus Dr. Cone makes the conversion of St. Paul an unmiraculous and, it must be added, an unrecorded event. The Epistles do not mention it, the Book of Acts deserves no credit. But has he done away with the miraculous? He has only removed it a step forward. Even in the Epistles St. Paul says that the Lord appeared to him after His resurrection, and that it pleased God to reveal His Son in him. The references may be to the Gentile mission and not to the conversion, but are they not miraculous?

Dr. Cone sees the difficulty. But he has nothing to offer beyond the old story of 'abnormal physico-psychological phenomena.' Since certain other revelations which the apostle had 'were received during a suspension of his normal consciousness,'—Dr. Cone refers to the 'visions and revelations of the Lord' of 2 Co 12<sup>1-4</sup>,—this was the case also whenever he tells us that he had 'seen' the Lord. And then he says that these visions and revelations were really nothing more than a conviction borne in upon the apostle's mind. Thus it comes about that the sight of the Risen Redeemer, which St. Paul places on a level with His appearances to St. Peter and the Twelve, was simply 'an inward manifestation, a conviction, which left the matter beyond all question that Jesus was the Son of God and the Saviour.'

The missing link has been found. Last August Professor Ernst Haeckel of Jena came to Cambridge to deliver a lecture at the Fourth International Congress of Zoology. He gave his lecture the unpretentious title of 'Our Present

Knowledge of the Descent of Man.' But it has now been published. It has been published by Messrs. A. & C. Black, with notes by Dr. Gadow, which make it into a volume. And it has received the title of *The Last Link*.

For there was but one link wanting to the proof of man's descent from the monkey, and it has been found. It was to tell us that it had been found that Professor Haeckel came to Cambridge. It is to assure us that it has been found that Professor Haeckel's Lecture is now published. Dr. Gadow is strictly accurate in his title. It is evidently a matter of much interest to zoology. Who will say that it is a matter of no interest whatever to theology?

Before the last link was discovered there were certain facts established as to the descent of man. Professor Haeckel counted them established, and he enumerates them in this way. The Primates, being the highest order of mammals, form one natural, monophyletic group; and from their common ancestor—from the hypothetical Archiprimas—have descended all the Lemures, Simiæ, and Homines. Of these the Lemures are the oldest, and the Simiæ or Apes next. The Simiæ are divided into two groups, and these two groups differ so greatly that Professor Haeckel thinks well of Hartmann's startling classification: first, man and the Anthropomorphæ, or tailless apes; second, all the other monkeys. In any case, it is to the one group of monkeys, called scientifically the Catarrhinæ, or close-nostrilled, that man is allied. In short, it had been shown that man is descended directly from Catarrhine ancestors. The very species had not been found. It has been found at last.

Not the whole species of course. Unfortunately not even a complete individual of the species. Only the skull-cap, a femur, and two teeth. And these portions have been the subject of the keenest dispute. It has even been denied by very high authority that they all belong to one

individual. But Professor Haeckel does not doubt that they belong to one and the same individual. He believes that that individual was neither a monkey nor a man, but just between the two. He is thoroughly convinced that the *Pithecanthropus erectus*, the name given to the species to which the skull-cap, femur, and two teeth belong, is the long-sought missing link.

It was in 1894 and in Java that the missing link was discovered. When the International Zoological Congress met at Leyden, in 1895, every subject of discussion was dwarfed by the interest of Dr. Eugène Dubois and his new-found fossils. Professor Virchow disbelieved. He held that the skull belonged to an ape, while the thigh belonged to a man. The discussion was warm and long. At last, twelve experts were set apart to examine the fossils and report. Three reported that they came from a low race of men; three that they were the bones of a man-like ape of great size; the rest maintained that they belonged to an intermediate form, which directly connected primitive man with the anthropoid apes. And Professor Haeckel has no hesitation in saying that 'this last view is the right one.' Professor Haeckel is quite sure that '*Pithecanthropus erectus* is the long-searched-for missing link.'

*Audi alteram partem.* It is the most useful instruction a man can give. But he must follow it himself. Where is the divine so good as follow his own instruction here? Dr. Sanday of Oxford is that divine.

Dr. Sanday has published, through Messrs. Longmans, a volume of sermons to the times. He has given his volume the general title of *The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England* (crown 8vo, pp. 128, 3s. 6d.). He has given it this title because he knows that round the conception of priesthood the great religious conflict of the present century is raging. Other issues occasionally appear, other

controversies, as that of ritual, sometimes raise a cloud. But Dr. Sanday sees no vital question in ritual. 'Tastes differ largely,' he says, 'as to the extent to which they would choose to have ideas presented to the eye and to the ear as well as to the mind. But if the ideas that underlie the presentation are not harmful, the mode of presentation does not make them harmful.' It is not ritual less or more; it is not even the right of one person and not another to use the ritual; it is whether or not that ritual includes a sacrificial offering.

There are four sermons in Dr. Sanday's volume. In the first he discourses on the unity of the Church, and says memorable things in his own impressive way. In the last, he pleads for patience in the present stress. Even the second, which traces the origin and early history of the Christian ministry, is subordinate. The third, with its title, the single word 'Sacerdotalism,' contains the beating heart of the book. Its first sentence opens the whole matter: 'I suppose that the deepest cleavage at the present moment in the Church of England is that between those who hold and those who deny the priestly character of the ministry.' We shall touch on that sermon only.

In the second sermon Professor Sanday has shown that the controversy as to the origin of the Christian ministry is best represented by two champions, the late Dr. Hort and Dr. Moberly. The controversy regarding the priesthood is between Dr. Moberly and Bishop Lightfoot. And Dr. Sanday shows, first of all, that when Bishop Lightfoot spoke of the minister as priest, he had in mind the sacrificial priesthood of the Old Testament. The minister of the New Testament, said Bishop Lightfoot, is not a priest in that sense. And Dr. Sanday believes that Dr. Moberly would agree. Dr. Moberly holds that the minister of the New Testament is a priest, and a sacrificing priest, but not such a sacrificing priest as we find in the Old Testament.

That being so, the controversy between Dr. Moberly and Bishop Lightfoot may be mainly one of words. Dr. Sanday believes that it is. But we may say at once that we doubt it. What does Dr. Moberly mean by a sacrificing priesthood?

Dr. Moberly says that Christ's offering of Himself to the Father was an act of sacrifice. Rather, to make a distinction familiar at least to Presbyterians, it was a sacrificial *work*. For it was accomplished not by His death only, but by the whole earthly life of which the death was the last element. The death was necessary, for 'without shedding of blood there is no remission'; but it was only the necessary culmination of the sacrifice which covered the whole earthly life. But what Christ does, the Church does. We are crucified with Christ. We offer ourselves a living sacrifice every day of our lives. And if the Church does it, then especially the ministry, who are its executive organs, do it. And the New Covenant has its sacrificial system as well as the Old.

Dr. Sanday illustrates by means of the passage which he has chosen for his text. Let us follow his exposition of it. The passage is Ro 15<sup>15, 16</sup>. St. Paul is apologizing to the Roman Christians for his boldness in urging upon them their duties. But he tells them that he is urging nothing new, and even in recalling to their minds what they already know, he does it in virtue of the apostleship to the Gentiles which has been committed to him. 'I write,' he says, 'because of the grace that was given me of God, that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles' (λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη—I need not remind you, adds Dr. Sanday, that λειτουργὸν is exactly the word that would be used of the discharge of the priests' office in the temple), 'ministering the gospel of God' (the R.V. notes in the margin that the Greek is 'ministering in sacrifice'—the word is *ἱερουργούντα*, the technical term for the function of sacrifice), 'that the offering up of the Gentiles' (ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν, that is, not the offering which the Gentiles *make*, but which the Gentiles

are) 'might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.' Dr. Sanday continues: 'The apostle conceives of himself as standing at the altar; and the offering which he lays upon the altar is the Gentile Church, so far as it is of his founding, or comes within his special province. An offering ought to be without blemish. It ought to be first purified before it is offered. And it is the apostle's earnest prayer to God, that these converts of his, these Gentile Churches for which he is responsible, may be so sanctified by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon them that they may be an offering really acceptable, a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour, for the purpose for which they are destined.'

Now, if this is what Dr. Moberly means by the sacrifice of the New Testament altar, and if this is all that he means, there is no doubt that between Bishop Lightfoot and him—as between any Christian whatever and him—there is no controversy. The only question that could arise is over the name of the Christian minister. If the minister is called priest, simply because he is the instrument through whom his people are enabled to crucify the flesh, and live and die to God; if he is priest because he is a true pastor, and offers his flock to God, as Christ offered His earthly life, on the altar of obedience, who will cry out against the name of priest? It may be taken from another office to express this one, and so give rise to misunderstanding. On that account it may be pronounced a mistake. But it is in itself an inoffensive word, and it expresses not only an inoffensive, but a most commendable office.

That Dr. Moberly holds the pastoral office in high esteem is made abundantly evident. He would have the priest to offer his people so. But when the priest has laid his people in spotless acceptance upon God's altar, he has not done the work that gives him the name of priest. Dr. Sanday acknowledges that that is only the half of Dr. Moberly's meaning. Is it even an essential part of his meaning? Is not the sacrifice which

Dr. Moberly's priest offers upon the altar a *propitiatory* sacrifice? If it is, it can be neither the person of the offerer, nor the persons of his flock. It must be the person of Christ.

Now Dr. Sanday does not believe that even the very 'highest' among the clergy of the Church of England understand that in offering Christ in the Eucharist they are repeating the sacrifice of Calvary. That act is done, he says, once for all, and cannot possibly need to be repeated. But there is an offering ever being made in heaven. As the shedding of blood in the levitical sacrifice was only the preliminary to the sacrifice being laid upon the altar, so, says Dr. Moberly, Calvary is only the preliminary, though the indispensable preliminary, to 'the eternal self-presentation in heaven of the risen and ascended Lord.' But what Christ is in heaven, the Church, which is His body, is upon the earth. What He does eternally she must do eternally also. If He makes an eternal offering of Himself in heaven before the presence, and on the throne, of God, she on earth makes the same offering on the altar of the New Covenant. To leave Dr. Sanday for a moment longer, and quote Dr. Moberly exactly: 'Christ Himself has prescribed for all time an outward ceremonial, which is the symbolic counterpart in the Church on earth, not simply of Calvary, but of that eternal presentation of Himself in heaven in which Calvary is vitally contained. Through this symbolic enactment, rightly understood,—an enactment founded on, and intrinsically implying, as well as recalling, Calvary,—she in her eucharistic worship on earth is identified with His sacrificial self-oblation to the Father; she is transfigured up into the scene of the unceasing commemoration of His sacrifice in heaven; or the scene of His eternal offering in heaven is translated down to, and presented, and realized in the worship on earth.'

This is the controversy between Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Moberly. Is it a controversy about words? If there is reality in Dr. Moberly's posi-

tion; if, as he believes, it is an intelligible idea; then it differs from the sacrifices of the Old Testament only in its victim being Christ the heavenly Lamb instead of bulls and goats, and Bishop Lightfoot was surely aware of that distinction. However nebulous it may be to others, however mystical to Dr. Moberly himself, it is intended to be regarded as a real sacrifice, and the priest who offers it on earth is a real sacrificing priest. There is probably not another point in all the line of controversy where Dr. Sanday has failed to draw the controversy nearer a conclusion. But this is the point of hottest conflict, and we fear he has failed completely here.

---

Dr. G. A. Smith's Biography of Drummond is short enough and of interest enough to be read right through; all its readers will read it right through. And then they will find that they are just where they were when they began. There is not a new fact; there is not a new impression. The puzzle of Drummond's life is a puzzle still.

---

The puzzle is that he gave his life to evangelistic work, that he associated with evangelistic people, and evangelistic people, with a single heroic—he hesitated, after reading the Biography, if quixotic was not the word—evangelistic people, with a single heroic exception, hated him.

---

Who can explain this? Not we. All we can do is to set down the explanation which Professor Smith's Biography seems to give, though it is incredible that it should be true. Professor Smith's Biography seems to say that it was because Drummond never was suddenly converted. Do not laugh. Sudden conversion was a fact in Drummond's methods as in the methods of all the evangelistic people he worked with. 'Once when talking of sudden conversions, I asked Drummond whether he had passed through one. "No," he said, after thinking for a little; "I cannot say I did. But," he added, "I have seen too many ever to doubt their reality."'

He had seen too many ever to doubt their reality. He believed in them up to that. But he had not passed through one, so he did not believe in their necessity. Now an evangelistic preacher preaches his necessary beliefs—that is to say, his experiences. At first Drummond preached Moody's experiences, and so the necessity of sudden conversion. But when he came to preach his own, he did not preach the necessity of sudden conversion, he did not preach the fact.

---

For in sudden conversion the indispensable and moving agent is the Holy Spirit. So all the evangelistic people preach. But so did not Drummond. 'You ask what it is, this coming to Christ,' he said to the Edinburgh students. 'Well, what does Jesus Himself tell you here? He says, Learn of Me. Now, you are all learners, you have come to Edinburgh, some of you from the ends of the earth, to learn. And how did you put yourself in the way of learning what is here taught? You went to the university office and wrote your name in a book, you matriculated; and, becoming a university student, you went to get from each individual professor what he had to teach. So, with definite purpose to learn of Christ, must you come to Him and surrender yourself to His teaching and guidance.'

---

It was his own way. When he found himself as a preacher, he could do none other than preach his own experience. And the Holy Spirit was not in it. Then he went further. He denied the necessity of the Holy Spirit. If a man is lost, none but the Holy Spirit can find him. But if he is only sunk, another man may lift him up. 'There are two ways,' he said, 'in which men who offer their lives to their fellow-men may regard the world. The first view is that the world is lost and must be saved; the second, that the world is sunken and must be raised. I shall now speak from the last standpoint.'

---

So Moody stood by him, but by and by the evangelistic people would have none of him.

'The story goes that a deputation of the usual adherents of Northfield Conference waited on Mr. Moody and urged him not to allow Drummond to speak. Mr. Moody asked a day to think over the matter; and when the deputation returned, informed them that he had laid it before the Lord,

and the Lord had shown him that Drummond was a better man than himself; so he was to go on.' But Drummond came to Northfield, and the word which he wrote after he left is, 'At Northfield I felt a good deal out of it, and many fell upon me and rent me. It was not a happy time.'

## The Incarnation and the Inner Life.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

ONLY too commonly the Incarnation is regarded as a doctrine which faith must accept, but which, except in its issues and results, has no immediate connexion with the tenor of daily life. It has been felt, even by serious thinkers, to offer but little on which the soul can meditatively rest in relation to the movements and developments of the inner life. It is, and it remains to many a good Christian, simply a holy mystery, a vital article of belief, but not a truth, like its sequel the Redemption, which seems to quicken every thanksgiving, and to give warmth to every utterance of prayer.

And yet it is plain enough from the text that to confess the Incarnation, in all its blessed fulness and reality of meaning, is to afford a proof of being a very son of God, and a recipient in fullest measure of the inworking power of the Spirit.

'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.' Let us then, under the hallowing influence of this momentous declaration, at once humbly endeavour to realize the Incarnation, and strive to make our hearts feel it to be, as it is, one of the two great spiritual powers that, in faithful hearts, are ever felt in all the varied movements of the inner life. The power of the Incarnation and what an apostle speaks of as the power of the Lord's Resurrection are the two great powers ever working, either latently or patently, in the deeper depths of the believing heart.

But how shall we best realize this power and its manifestations? Perhaps thus. By keeping in the foreground of our thoughts two simple

'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.'—1 John iv. 2.

questions, and from the answers we give to them arriving at what this power of the Incarnation is that we are seeking to bring home to our souls.

I. The first and fundamental question is obviously this: Who is He of whose Incarnation we are speaking? The immediate and instinctively given answer that each one of us would return would probably be the one word, God. True, most true, most blessedly true, but yet not the suggestive and instructive answer which the apostle who wrote the words on which we are meditating has enabled us to make. What St. John, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, plainly reveals to us is this, that He who was Incarnate was He who was in the beginning, ever with God, and Himself God. And the name that he gives to Him is the Word; that studiously chosen term being designed to include all those higher approximations to the belief in the eternal sonship of our Lord which are to be traced in the Old Testament, and which, when St. John wrote his Gospel, were finding a more and more defined place in the higher and holier teachings of Jewish theology. To the cultivated Jew of Ephesus or Alexandria the one word *Logos*, imperfectly rendered in our language by *Word*, awakened thoughts that, probably in many and many a case, prepared the way for the reception of the gospel message, and for the soul-saving conviction that He who in bygone days had spoken by the prophets was now speaking by His Son. And not to the Jew only did that mysteriously chosen term bear its awakening and life-giving thoughts. How it discloses to each one of us, as the apostle