

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHILE all who realize the horror of modern warfare must share the sense of relief that the immediate danger was averted and must appreciate the persistent and strenuous efforts of the British Prime Minister to this end, there must also be differences of conviction regarding the price paid for the peace, and the prospect that the settlement offers of a permanent appeasement of national antagonisms. To the Czecho-Slovakian people profound sympathy is due in the sacrifice inflicted upon it, and, in all ways open, succour and support to it in its trial and need must be regarded as a debt. Few can feel content with the results, and the best any can plead is that the lesser of two evils has been chosen. If in the situation that was the only choice possible, all the more must many feel sorrow and shame that the peace-making involved pledge-breaking, and that none can boast of a peace with honour. There cannot be many, however, who will dare to say that war was to be preferred. How great is the mystery of iniquity, and how tragic its consequences!

Whether this relief is only a temporary respite or a permanent release from the haunting terror of a world-war depends on a number of factors it is impossible with certainty to determine. The prestige of the dictators has been raised, their support at home strengthened and their influence abroad widened. Will their ambition and arrogance be increased, and will they continue to make demands, which will be ever renewing the peril of

war? Or will the evidence in Germany and Italy during the crisis of the people's dread of war and desire for peace, the world-wide opposition to war among other nations, and the preparations made by some for resistance if need be, serve as a restraint on the policy of violence, and as a constraint to secure the ends desired by negotiations?

The problems to be solved in Europe, if its peace is to be assured, are many; and while there are demands which must be refused lest righteousness be sacrificed to violence, yet there should be on our part a readiness to recognize the justice of such claims as may involve a sacrifice of interests, but not of principles. As regards colonies, for instance, the natives have a prior claim for consideration. It is in the economic sphere that there seems to lie the widest possibility of accommodation, even if there is ground for the suspicion that national ambition is disguised as economic necessity. The spirit of conciliation must be allowed to prevail over the prejudice and the hostility which the policy of the dictators naturally provokes. No statesman would be justified in invoking 'the dread arbitrament of war' unless he had done everything that can be done not only righteously but even generously to promote peace. There is at least the possibility that such an approach would, from whatever motives, find a response.

Much as the profession and the practice of the dictators deserve condemnation from any moral,

not to say Christian standpoint, war-guilt would not be theirs alone ; for all the nations are involved in one condemnation. The last war was fought by many in the belief that it was to end war. An opportunity was given to the victorious Powers to make a fresh start in international relations. A few pleaded that a peace of magnanimity, and not of vengeance, should be attempted. But in vain. The post-War treatment of Germany was such as to increase hatred and the resolve of revenge, although there were in Germany many Christian leaders ready to respond to a policy of reconciliation. The League of Nations was formed as an international organ to promote peace, but some of the nations pursued a national policy provocative of war. And at first the victorious Powers used the League to preserve the unjust *status quo*. The treatment of minorities has in some cases been very bad, and the League did not exercise its influence as it should have done to redress grievances. In history there is the inexorable law : 'Be not deceived, God is not mocked : for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' Are we reaping to-day what has been sown ?

If there is to be any better future for Europe and not growing disaster, there must be a return to the ways of God.

The Christian Challenge Series has produced a number of excellent little handbooks, but nothing better than the most recent volume issued, on *Christian Moral Conduct*, by the Rev. A. E. GARVIE, D.D. (The Unicorn Press ; 3s. 6d. net). DR. GARVIE is too well known as a great religious thinker to need commendation, and doubtless many who have not read his larger works will be glad to have the substance of his thinking in this small book. It is at once profound, clear, and comprehensive.

He insists on the intimate connexion of faith and works, religion and morality. Christian morality is inseparable from Christian faith. They were gravely mistaken who in the last generation imagined that the edifice of Christian morality

could be maintained when the substructure of Christian faith was removed. Time has speedily shown the folly of that expectation. Once the foundation of Christian doctrine was undermined it was not long before the attack was directed against Christian morality. It is only on the basis of Christian truth that Christian standards of conduct can be upheld. The life of love which is the essence of Christian morality draws its motive from the divine love as revealed in Christ, and finds its enabling power in His Holy Spirit.

This view runs counter to the common assumption that man has a sufficiency in himself to attain and live the good life apart from the grace of God. 'Morality assumes that what man *ought* to do he *can* do, that his freedom matches his duty.' This is a profound error, as men discover when they set themselves seriously to do the good. Then are they constrained to make the sad confession, with St. Paul, 'the good that I would I do not, but the evil that I would not, that I do.' The standard of common decency and morality to which we are accustomed is not the simple product of the natural goodness of man's heart as many suppose. On the contrary, it is the fruit of centuries of Christian doctrine and discipline without which it would speedily wither away. 'This natural goodness in the community which for generations has been under Christian influences cannot be regarded as altogether detached from the divine grace mediated by human lives ; and it may be doubted whether apart from such influences the Christian standard at its best would have been recognized, or at its best realized.'

DR. GARVIE raises the question, What is Christian morality ? Is it in any wise different from ordinary morality ? Has it a distinctive quality of its own ? This is a question which is frequently overlooked. Books on Christian ethics have been written which do not differ greatly from other books on ethics. In them the cardinal virtues are discussed after the manner of the Greek philosophers, and then perhaps, by way of addendum, something is said about the Christian graces. Christian morality is not presented as an organic whole, rooted in Christian

truth, and drawing its vitality from Christian faith.

In order to determine what is distinctive in Christian morality we must for one thing understand the governing concept of the Kingdom of God. 'The Kingdom of God, the term so often on the lips of Jesus, is not primarily an ideal of human society to be realized by human effort with the help of God; it is God's sovereign activity in human history, of which such a society should be the result if men in all their aspiration and endeavour will depend on and submit to that activity. It is God's *rule* to form God's *realm*.' This Kingdom comes through the agency of God's Word, which is a dynamic Word, effecting what it declares. It is not in word only, but in deed and in power. God acts and suffers as well as speaks through the Incarnate Word. 'It is an unhistorical restriction of the Word of God in Christ to limit it to the teaching and example of Jesus, and to exclude the activity of God in the living Christ and the Holy Spirit, as experienced in the primitive church, and as evidenced and interpreted in the New Testament.' The Kingdom of God as presented in the New Testament is 'a *saving sovereignty* in divine passion as well as action.' It is not individual only, but also social. The first company of Jesus' disciples became the nucleus of the primitive Christian community, and the Church throughout history has been both the object and the organ of divine grace, the recipient that it might become the agent of the saving sovereignty. 'All these terms—Kingdom (a rule involves a realm), ekklesia (the called assembly), and Son of Man, present the dynamic Word of God as creative of a community, and of individuals as members of it. Thus Christian morality has necessarily reference to the divine purpose for human society.'

Another great concept which governs Christian morality and gives it its distinctive quality is the concept of grace as revealed in the redemption which is in Christ. 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is the love of God bearing man's burden, sharing man's sorrow, making man's life and death its own concern.' The deepest meaning of the

Incarnation is that the Son of God was identifying Himself with mankind. His death was the consummation of His life as the self-sacrifice of vicarious love. This grace calls for the response of faith, which is 'man's self-identification with God in dependence, submission, and devotion. This Paul describes as being crucified and risen with Christ.'

In the light of these governing concepts it becomes apparent that Christian moral conduct does not consist in obedience to a divine law, but is a participation through love in God's saving activity in Christ. 'Moral conduct is *Christian* when it is in accordance with and advances the Kingdom of God, His redeeming and reconciling purpose in Christ; and not necessarily so when it conforms to the precept or example of Jesus, or any Scripture precedent.' The law of love to God and man is for the Christian not, strictly speaking, a law at all, in the sense of an outward commandment carrying rewards and penalties. 'It is more like a *natural* law, which is a description of what natural processes *are*, not an injunction what they *ought* to be.' This is Luther's 'liberty of the Christian man.' This is what Augustine meant when he said, 'Love God and do what you like.'

In this spirit of love the Christian seeks his neighbour's good. What that good consists in must be determined by what is God's will for both. 'God desires all men to be redeemed from sin, reconciled unto Himself, renewed by His Spirit in holiness, and so fitted for the eternal life in heaven. Love for self is the gradual conforming of the imperfect self to that ideal self. Love for a neighbour is doing all possible to enable another to be also so conformed.'

This love and desire to promote a neighbour's well-being will include a real concern for his physical and social good. Necessarily so, for the greater includes the less. 'The Golden Rule is a limitation set on selfishness, not a limit to generosity. He who truly loves will not measure his obligations to others by his expectations from them, but he will give more than he hopes to get.' It will also include, what is far harder, forgiveness. 'Forgiveness is

the gift of love which costs most, and that gift comes to sinful mankind in the Cross of Christ.' 'Love must always be ready to take the initiative, but the forgiveness is not effective until he who needs to be forgiven has recognized, repented of, renounced and confessed his sin, in response to such an initiative. Love will not wait in cold aloofness until forgiveness is sought, but offers the forgiveness that it may be sought. God's grace in Christ anticipates man's faith, but becomes effective only through faith.'

The application of Christian principles in particular cases must be made the subject of constant and careful study. How far shall a man sacrifice himself in the service of others? How best is the neighbour's good to be promoted? 'One cannot but wonder whether the community is not doing too much for some men to allow them the full development of their manhood as God wills it should be. While these warnings may be necessary for some Christian men, it is to be feared that the majority need to be made to realize that the Christian life is, because Christ-like, God-like, a life of self-emptying, self-humbling, self-giving in order that God's saving activity may be made manifest, and His Kingdom may come.'

It must not be lightly assumed, as it is by many, that Christian love in forgiveness excludes all resistance of evil and demands submission to any wrong. Love does not annul, but fulfils law. Love may need to smite that it may save, to be severe that it may be kind. But 'this retributive method must always be subordinate to the redemptive purpose of God. Accordingly, resistance to wrong is only justified if forgiveness and sacrifice are being constantly exercised.'

Early this year there was published 'Doctrine in the Church of England,' as the long-awaited Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. The Report took cognizance of liberal views, in particular on the Doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of

Christ, while sounding in general the note of conservative theology. And it was welcomed on the whole by theologians so diverse in standpoint as Dr. N. P. Williams and Dr. H. D. A. Major.

Much has been written about the contents of the Report. It has even been affirmed that the Report leaves people free to believe or reject almost any article of the Christian Creed. This stirred up the Bishop of London to write a little book for laymen in which he pointed out that the Report has to do with Doctrine *in* the Church of England, and is not an exposition of the Doctrine *of* the Church of England. There he also proceeded to criticise certain points in the Report and to set forth in a popular way and from a conservative standpoint the traditional Anglican positions (as stated in the Prayer Book, the Creeds, and to a lesser degree the Articles).

More recently another conservative exposition of Anglican Doctrine has appeared. The writer of it is the Rev. R. S. T. HASLEHURST, B.D., Vice-Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral; and his aim has been both to expound the Report and to provide a manual for study circles. The work is published in two paper-covered volumes (which may be obtained separately for 2s. each) under the title *Church of England Doctrine* (Part I., 'God and Redemption'; Part II., 'The Church and Sacraments and Eschatology'). The publishers are the S.P.C.K., and the volumes belong to the publishers' series of Educational Books.

Mr. HASLEHURST has succeeded admirably in his twofold aim. Taking the latter aim first, we note that he sets questions for study circles on each of his twelve chapters, and follows this up with a list of books and pamphlets, at once scholarly and cheap, for further study. We are inclined to think, however, that a more systematic book on Christian Doctrine is preferable in study circles to one which is of the nature of a 'companion' to a Report.

As for his expository aim, he is, as already said, on the side of traditional theology. Yet a perusal

of his book shows that he is alive to modern positions and no partisan of a one-sided Anglicanism. The book has also the merit of amplifying in popular terms and with simple illustrations (some of which may, however, offend some minds) the doctrinal statements of the Report.

Let us give his views on certain points. He would retain the Thirty-nine Articles in their present form, even though they represent the mind of the Church of England on matters which were much debated in the sixteenth century, but which are, in some cases, of purely academic interest to-day. His reason is that they were worded so as to be 'comprehensive,' in the sense of keeping wide the door of a National Church, and that it is better they should receive a 'general assent' from the clergy than that new and more up-to-date, but more constrictive, formularies should be devised.

On the subject of miracles he adopts the newer standpoint in Christian Apologetics, not the standpoint of the 'Evidential School,' who found evidence in miracles of the truth of Christianity: 'It is not miraculous that the world's great Miracle should have wrought miracles. It would rather have been miraculous had He not done so. Yet He was not miraculous because He did miraculous things: He did miraculous things because He was miraculous.'

On the subject of the Resurrection of Jesus the writer's orthodoxy is clearly expressed. But he is not unwilling to go out of his way to make a present to the liberal critics of a rationalistic theory. After reviewing rationalistic theories of the Empty Tomb he says that (if the miraculous were conceded to be impossible) a simple explanation would be that the earthquake on the Day of the Crucifixion may have caused a fissure into which our Lord's body disappeared, the tomb subsequently recovering its previous shape (more or less) and the stone rolling away.

There is a modern tone in Mr. HASLEHURST'S insistence that belief in the Trinity is the result of

an experience, and its doctrine an attempt to put that experience into words. Let a man live the Christian life, he says, and share in the fellowship of those who live it, singing their hymns and praying their prayers, and he will generally come to find that the formulæ in which, however inadequately, they have tried to express their convictions are not barren and soulless abstractions, with no bearing on life and its problems, but verbal approximations to spiritual truths.

An exclusive or narrow use of the term 'Catholic' is deprecated: "'Catholic'" is not the opposite of "Protestant," as is proved by the fact that 1400 years lie between the births of the two words in their religious sense. The opposite of "Catholic" is "heretic," the opposite of "Protestant" is "papist." Deprecated also is 'devotions' before the Reserved Elements at a public service: 'A Bishop may consider that he has a right to go behind the Prayer Book and permit Reservation for the sick, on the ground that modern conditions, unforeseen in 1662, render it in some cases almost necessary to revert to what was the custom in the earliest days, but that it is a more serious matter if he permits what is of comparatively modern growth, and is taken from the usage of another communion.'

One other point. It is Mr. HASLEHURST'S opinion that without belief in some kind of purgatorial state Prayer for the Departed is redundant. If the departed are in perfect joy and felicity, they plainly do not need our prayers. The Church of England, however, permitted prayers for the departed during the war against Napoleon and again during the Boer war; but as such prayers are based on the conception that the soul passes through a further stage of development in the hereafter (a conception refuted by many 'Evangelicals'), it is better to leave them, unless in times of very general mourning, to the private devotions of individuals.

Hindus, in one of his best-known works, traces the collapse of Russia after the War, and the

triumph of Bolshevism, largely to the deadness of the Russian Orthodox Church. And this has become a commonplace. We have most of us had the idea that there was practically no religion in Russia except a kind of ritualism from which all vitality and reality had long since fled. One should perhaps suspect such generalizations. And certainly this one is far from reliable in view of the facts disclosed in a rather remarkable book on Russian life and religion just published—*The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*, by Nadejda GORODETZKY, B.Litt. (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net).

The book is interesting because of the light it throws on the inner life of pre-War Russia, not only its religion and theology but its literature also. And the most interesting thing that emerges from the writer's review is that the key to all Russian thought and literature is to be formed in one word, *kenosis*. We restrict this term to its theological application in the case of the self-emptying of Christ. But there is no such restriction in Russian thinking. It applies to life and literature as much as to the Person of Christ. 'Long before Russian thought was mature enough to face the doctrine of *kenosis*, the attention of the Russian people was struck by the evangelical call to meekness, poverty, humility, and obedience.' This type of character was widely represented whether in history, literature, or devotion. It is a constant feature in all forms of Russian thought. One of the most famous of its writers says that 'the exterior form of a slave in which we found our nation, the pitiful condition of Russia in economic and other domains, far from being a contradiction of her vocation, rather confirms it.'

Her vocation was to present to the world a kenotic type of life. The call of the highest free activities of the human spirit—thought, science, art, and so-called civilization—is to *serve* the gradual incarnation of the Christian ideal in human society. This ideal was taken from the Gospels and was regarded as having nothing to do with riches or power. Poverty was regarded with respect. Simplicity of life was the true aim. Luxury or

even comfort was felt to be an 'unlawfulness,' not only from the religious point of view but from the moral and social. 'A Russian respects the rags of a fool for Christ's sake more than the golden brocade of a courtier.'

Tolstoy was not the only one to take the gospel teaching at its face value. 'When a man is called of God, the evil of riches is then revealed' is a characteristic saying. Poverty and wealth are neutral in themselves, but wealth can be used according to Christianity only in one way: by complete distribution of it, not by exercises of charity. It is not Socialist theory that lies behind this, but the conviction that the absolute of Christ's Commandments creates the spirit of self-sacrifice which led Christ to His Cross. And so a Russian writer (Tareev) claims that, poor and insignificant as their literature is in history and philology and other sciences 'the problem of the very nature of Christianity is faced in its depth'; and that even their secular literature therefore is filled with compassion for the toiling and the humble.

Thus Russian life and literature were dominated by the kenotic ideal long before this thought came into theology. But into theology it did come. And the whole history of Christ as the Godman became inspired by the same idea. It was, of course, the very meaning of the Incarnation. This is a familiar field to us in the West. But a word or two may be spared for the Russian way of regarding it. The Incarnation was not due to man's sin. It was 'an original good will of God which existed before the creation of the world as its basis and aim.'

The Incarnation is not merely a *means* of redemption but its highest achievement. The goal of the divine purpose is to unite all the heavenly and the earthly world under one head, Christ. Russian theologians go into great detail as to the act of self-limiting which took place in the Incarnation. The theory of the two natures rules all their thinking, and it is pursued with great subtlety. The *kenosis* is not, however, a matter only of the *act* of God in Incarnation. It applies to all the

Lord's ministry, to His poverty and humility, but above all to His temptation and His utter obedience. The ideal for a true life, which had preceded reflection on the mysteries of the faith, found confirmation in the ministry of Jesus.

All the problems raised by the *kenosis* in the Incarnation occupied the Russian religious mind. But this is not the most interesting feature of their thinking about *kenosis*. They carried the idea up into the divine life itself. The pre-mundane *kenosis* consists of the mutual love of the divine hypostases. The Fatherhood is the image of love which does not desire to possess within and for Himself. It reveals His love in the spiritual begetting of the Son. This is a self-emptying which is at the same time a self-realization.

The Sonship is already an eternal *kenosis* in that the second hypostasis makes Himself the Word of the Father. He becomes poor and sacrificially silent in the bosom of the Father. If on the side of the Father there is self-negation in the begetting of the Son, the Son is emptying Himself when He accepts the passive state of the One who is begotten. This mutual sacrifice is not a tragedy because it

is overcome by the bliss and joy of this accepted mutual sacrifice. And, finally, the triumphant cognition and witness in God of Himself and His only-begotten Son is the procession of the Holy Ghost. The passive character of the procession is in harmony with the sacrificial kenotic love.

This survey is in accord with the purpose of these Notes, which is to give an account of what is going on in the world of religious thought. It is a matter of great interest to know that, so far from Russian religion before the War being dumb and lifeless, a very definite movement was at work, dominated by one idea, which appears not only in theology but in literature, in the works of men like Dostoevsky, the idea of *kenosis*. The idea was absorbed from the Gospels. But when reflection on it began to be made, it became the ruling and inspiring idea in theology. It explained creation, which was a kenotic act. It explained the coming, and also the whole ministry, of Jesus. And it explains the very nature of the inner life of the tri-une Deity. Much Russian theology seems abstract until we realize that what it is working with, and trying to understand, was something so real to these thinkers that it expressed their ideal for daily living.

Aldous Huxley—Cosmology and Ethic.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, M.A., BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

ALDOUS HUXLEY has won the attention and the respect of the discerning public because his wit and his limpid style display to the best advantage a philosophy of life which cannot be ignored, and because his keen imagination has penetrated right to the heart of some of our problems of to-day. Perhaps his creative powers are not great, he has hardly given the world one striking or memorable character: it is often difficult even to remember the names of the men and women who saunter through his novels. Nor yet have these vigour of action or plot—many of them seem like one long house-party of desultory and sometimes brilliant talk, punctuated by amorous interludes and marked

by growing tedium. There is in his works little of that entralling vitality and enjoyment of human character and action, that love of life and men, that exuberant laughter with them and at them that marks the greatest novels. How is it, then, that Huxley deserves the place which the modern world has given to him as a writer? The answer is that it is as an essayist and philosopher that he excels, even in his novels. In nearly all of them there appears at least one figure who is merely put there to express a point of view. Huxley has not much power of painting a character from outside, but he has an uncanny capacity for getting inside his characters, and seeing the world through their