
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.

When Professor Huxley was at the height of his popularity as an anti-Christian apologist he entered upon a controversy with Mr. Gladstone about the miracles of the New Testament, and with unerring sagacity he chose for examination the healing of the demoniac. Others of the miracles are just as difficult to believe in. But this miracle offers peculiar opportunities for vulgar ridicule, and Professor Huxley knew how to take advantage of them. He called it the Gadarene Pig Affair. And from that day till now it has been felt that the man who dared to defend the story of the healing of the demoniac must have a considerable spirit of daring.

Yet that man has been found. The Rev. J. Alexander Findlay, M.A., is a scholar, thoroughly furnished with all modern instruments for weighing evidence, and fully aware of the latest criticism of the New Testament, and of its miracles. His book, *Jesus as They saw Him* (Epworth Press; 2s. net), is an exposition of the Gospel according to St. Mark, independent and scientific. Its scientific independence receives the weighty endorsement of Dr. Rendel Harris. 'These studies are not to be taken as an exhaustive review of what has been already said by others. They are fresh investigations with the aid of new instruments.' And Mr. Findlay believes in the Gadarene Pig Affair.

He does not once mention Professor Huxley. But at every step he exposes that very confident agnostic's ignorance. His first words are, 'With the Gerasene demoniac.' But Professor Huxley said 'Gadarene.' Did he really think that the evangelists were capable of making Gadara, a city six miles away from the sea of Galilee, the scene of the miracle? The scribe who first suggested it was as ignorant as the professor. The text had Gerasa. But the only Gerasa he knew was thirty miles from the lake. It was manifestly impossible that the pigs could have run thirty miles before they plunged into its waters. So he suggested Gadara. It does not seem to have occurred to Professor Huxley to inquire if there was, as we know there was, another place called Gerasa, the modern Kersa, on the very shore of the lake, from which it would be an accurate description to say that the swine 'rushed down a steep place into the sea.'

But this is a case of demon possession. Does Mr. Findlay believe in that? He does not need to believe in it. He does not need to believe that Jesus believed in it. Call it what you will. Mr. Findlay calls it a case of 'multiple personality'—a modern and quite scientific name for a scientifically recognized mental disorder. The point is that the man believed in it. The man himself believed that he was possessed with

demons. And Jesus had to cure the man with such a belief firmly fixed in him.

Mr. FINDLAY does not know whether Jesus believed in possession or not. But he says that in this scientific age we are coming to that belief. 'We who are appointed to live in an age which often seems to be demon-ridden are not so ready as were the men of the last generation to scout the idea as mere superstition.' More than that, he says that we are coming to the belief that the sins which we call 'animal sins' are more appropriately named than we imagined. But all that is beside the question. The question is, Did this lunatic believe that he was possessed by demons, and did he require for his healing some ocular proof that the demons had departed from him, such a proof as the sight of the swine plunging violently down that steep place into the sea?

What are your ideals? What do you live for? You are a Christian. Very well; what, as a Christian, do you live for? What are your Christian ideals? Miss Agnes S. PAUL, M.A., late Headmistress of Clapham High School, offers a choice. You may take one or more and leave the rest. You had best take them all.

Miss PAUL has published, through the Student Christian Movement, a short series of addresses given at Clapham High School to students in training for teaching. The title is *Some Christian Ideals in the Teaching Profession* (3s. net). They are addresses to teachers. And they make one wonder how it can ever be that a teacher should be content to teach, or ever choose to be a teacher, without having Christian ideals. It may be that when the reading of this book is over the reader may be able to think himself back into a situation in which Christianity has no significance, or only an ornamental significance. But while the reading is going on it will be difficult for the most secular mind to withstand the impression that the teaching which is not the teaching of Christian ideals is, at the very best of it, no better than a beating of the air.

What are Christian ideals? One of them is a sense of proportion. In the heading of the chapter Miss PAUL calls it 'A True Sense of Values.' She also describes it as discrimination. It enters into life on every side. 'One sometimes finds people in whom it is somewhat dormant or blunted about externals, but very much alive with regard to the things of the mind. Its sphere or range, you see, varies; and in the things of the spirit too there is scope for its action and assuredly need and call for its use.'

'Some people possess, by nature or "grace," or perhaps both, a discrimination and instinct for the best, of which you can feel the workings in all your dealings with them, whether they may have actually expressed definite opinions or not. They have a certain atmosphere round them which raises our standard of thought; their way of looking at things is in itself a sound judgment. With others it is different. We feel after being with them (again possibly without the interchange of any definite opinions) that certain things we have thought or said are to be regretted; we wish we had been more on guard, less influenced by their outlook, for they have brought out the elements in us that we are rather ashamed of and would gladly suppress; their standard of value is wrong.'

Miss PAUL says that discrimination is an instinct. 'An instinct for the best,' she calls it. But she does not mean that you have it by nature or you have it not. 'The critical faculty can be trained and a sound judgment acquired in this sphere as in others, and by the same means, namely by living in the right atmosphere, by accustoming ourselves to use the best as a standard. And no amount of zeal or enthusiasm will make up for the lack of such discrimination. There is a passage in the Epistle to the Philippians which explains that though love is to be the moving force in our lives, it is to be a force directed by knowledge: "that

your love may abound more and more in knowledge and all discernment, so that ye may approve things that are excellent." That is, you must use not only your capacity for fervour and devotion, but all your faculties; your highest power of vision to reveal to you what is most worth doing, your common sense to tell you how to do it.'

This, then, is one of the Christian ideals. It is discrimination of values. It is seeing things in their right proportion. And the seeing of things in their right proportion 'is a characteristic so important as to be almost the test of complete sanity; for the word "unbalanced," used of those who have lost or have never had the sense of the comparative values of things, carries with it the implication of a lack of complete mental health and poise.'

It enters into life on every side. 'You will remember how large a part of the Greeks' achievement of beauty in sculpture was due to their sense of proportion. The same faculty working in another way shows itself in all provinces of creative art, including literature, in that most vital part of an artist's business, the work of selection; for it is one of the most essential things to know what may be left out and what must at all costs go in. Again we find the same faculty in another sphere of human thought acting as the source of a sense of humour. How refreshing to meet a person who knows when a thing is really serious, and when it is only worth a laugh! And on still another plane, in the world of business and commerce, the necessity for a sound instinct for values is too obvious to need comment.'

It enters into the spiritual life. But here Miss PAUL arrests herself. Is it possible that some of those students who are in training for teaching recognize no life in themselves beyond the physical and mental? Miss PAUL is very gentle with them. 'If we do not feel that we can arrogate to ourselves any claim to much of a "spiritual life" at all,' then say 'those thoughts of ours about life which dominate our minds and determine our actions.'

It enters into the spiritual life. It enters into the narrative of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness.

For what do the three acts of that temptation mean? They mean 'the rejection of certain things apparently desirable in themselves, and typical of desires common to all humanity, on the ground of the superiority or far greater value of something else. This "something else" turns out to be really one thing, expressed in three ways as modified by the different forms of the experience. Christ met these typical problems of His own life, and, we must conclude, means us to meet ours, by keeping hold of one standard of value—loyalty to God and reference to Him as the central fact, and indeed the reason, of our existence. There may be, and probably are, many other truths wrapped up in the teaching of these passages, but this clearly is the main thread running through them.'

Take the first temptation. 'In the answer, "Man shall not live by bread alone," Christ does not deny that man's physical life is dependent on certain necessities, and his natural desires concerned with them. But He shows that there is something of so much greater importance that in comparison with it no lesser desire or need can be taken into consideration. His judgment apparently rejected as unsound the idea of exerting "miraculous" power for the satisfaction of the lesser need; and by using only the forces of faith, love and loyalty, forces which are available for our use also, He conveyed to us the truth that if in doing God's will we have to experience pain or deprivation, God will doubtless sustain us through them.'

Take the second temptation. 'In the answer, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," there appears the same steadfast loyalty, the same con-

viction about the one thing which is of supreme value. To prove by a short dramatic or melodramatic method that He possessed superhuman powers was not the important point. His choice was very different. The powers He called upon in facing this problem too were such as man also can use, these same powers of faith, love and loyalty. "He was made man" in the sense of choosing to keep to the way that man had to go; to accept man's limitations and yet achieve, from out of their network of hindrances, the highest. And for man the highest, the pearl of great price, is a right relationship with God.'

Take the third temptation. 'The answer, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve," is the most comprehensive and final expression of the three. Against such clearness of vision, such a true and secure judgment of value, the inducement "All these things will I give thee" could not have much chance of prevailing.'

'The last experience,' says Miss PAUL, 'may perhaps be taken as typical of a kind which may befall people who, after starting out on their life-work with a pure and single aim, become entangled in material preoccupations and obsessed against their will by the feeling of the importance of external things. It is easy for them to justify to themselves such preoccupation by telling themselves that everything is an asset if it is used in a good cause. They want, so they think, to get a good position, because then they will have a wider sphere of influence for good. But by the time the wider sphere is theirs, the spirit which was to pass out in influence may have fled like a "fugitive essence," the jewel may be missing from the setting they were so carefully preparing for it. No amount of external power or influence will make up for the loss of the inner light. Christ's answer in that third experience went again straight to the root of the matter. You must care for nothing but God's will. If you desire earnestly to serve Him, He will find ways for you to serve Him well, and you need not concern yourself about position or influence. He can give them to you if your work needs them. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God."'

Mr. G. G. COULTON, of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, in his book, *Christ, St. Francis, and To-day*, told us that 'what most separates the churchman inside from the man in the street outside, is the current ecclesiastical conception of physical miracles. The multitude is slipping away from the Wesleyan, as from the Anglican and from the Catholic. You may test this for yourselves; in every serious religious discussion, the argument will soon settle down to this question of miracles.' Yet here is a book written by another Cambridge scholar in which the question of miracles is dismissed as scarcely worth discussion.

The Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, has made a prolonged study of St. Luke's Gospel, and now publishes the result in a handsome volume with the title of *Christianity according to S. Luke* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). The title is an appeal to the public. So is the book. But it is of the most exact scholarship. It may be taken without hesitation as representing the latest research work of the modern mind. Yet the fact that many of the events in St. Luke's Gospel are miraculous 'need not,' says the author, 'detain us long.'

Why not? For several reasons. 'First, because we are no longer in the eighteenth century. At that time on the one hand it was supposed by many that a story containing miracles, if not actually an indication of *mala fides* on the part of the writer, could anyhow be dismissed at once. On the other hand Christianity was sometimes defended on the ground that the evidence in favour of its miracles was well up to the legal standard, and was accordingly sufficient to establish the truth of the religion. Secondly, because we are no longer in the nineteenth century, when, in the first enthusiasm of certain newly realized

and overwidely dominating conceptions, it was supposed that the universe was made for law and not law for the universe.'

From this 'accident of birth' there proceed two results. 'We no longer, with Paley, attempt to prove Christianity on the evidence of its miracles; we have, in fact, reversed the process. And, in the second place, the discussions which took place forty or fifty years ago on the *a priori* possibility of miracle have been replaced by consideration of the "creative" nature of evolution or, in more definitely theological language, of the freedom of God. It has become much easier to believe in miracles, but on the other hand Christians attach less importance to them, and are prepared to believe that some other name may presently be found for them.'

Does that mean that the miracles in St. Luke's Gospel are not miracles? Not altogether. It means that 'the spiritual exaltation of the early Christians and the discernment which they unquestionably possessed of the veritable, eternal truth of God were accompanied by a remarkable control over human bodies and perhaps other material things.' But it also means that the resurrection of Christ is a literal physical fact. For 'the despair into which the disciples of Jesus had been plunged by the Crucifixion was quickly changed to a condition of happy faith, which is only to be explained by believing that their Master had really risen from the dead.'

Now if Christ Jesus rose from the dead, everything else about miracle, says Mr. CARPENTER, 'is comparatively unimportant.' We may then take the specific miracles and apply to them one by one the ordinary canons of historical probability. 'Let us be fully conscious of the simple faith which led S. Luke to accept without any kind of philosophic hesitation the traditions that Jesus had raised the widow's son and the daughter of Jairus. But if we nevertheless believe that Jesus is one to whom such operations are normal and natural, that "the Lord of all good life" could hardly be manifested among men without affecting His environment in some such ways as these, let us not stumble at the fact that the narrative is miraculous.'

To the mind of Mr. CARPENTER there is a much more serious difficulty in St. Luke's Gospel than the Miracles. It is the Eschatology. It may be that the 'eschatological difficulty' presses hard on the modern mind because it is modern. The time may come when men will be as much astonished at the magnitude it presents to us as we now are astonished at the size of the supernatural difficulty as science presented it to our fathers. Meantime we have to take it as we find it. And no one will deny that it is a serious matter to accuse our Lord of raising expectations of a speedy return which were not fulfilled, and a difficult task to acquit Him.

The Evangelists themselves were aware of the difficulty. And they have their solution, 'although with varying emphasis and consistency.' 'The "Coming" was, for the time being, realized when the Church was born. In particular S. Luke is associated with the belief that the dispensation of the Spirit in the Church is a real continuation of the Life of Jesus. But he is also concerned to shew that the Life of Jesus was the necessary exordium to the dispensation of the Spirit. Where the King is, there is the Kingdom. This is what has been described as Transmuted Eschatology. It is not found only in S. Luke, but it is a feature of his Gospel. It means that events which have hitherto been supposed to be connected with the future advent of Messiah are actually occurring now.'

Is there any parallel? Mr. CARPENTER finds one. 'English Churchmen,' he says, 'will readily recall the phrase of the Catechism, "I was made . . . an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Is the kingdom there present or future? Does inheritor mean one who has already inherited or

one who will inherit in the future? Plainly, it means both. The Church of the baptized is a real home of grace, and its members have a real communion with the heavenly world. But they are not yet perfected.'

But what evidence is there in the Gospels themselves that the 'Coming' of Christ was not altogether future? One item Mr. CARPENTER finds in the mysterious saying, 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven' (10^{18}). That saying was uttered on the return of the Seventy. 'This has been thought to refer to the Temptation, or to the original fall of Satan, but it probably means, "While you were on your mission you were but reaping the fruits of My concentration here. I wrestled with the demons, and so they were exorcised at your word."' Mr. CARPENTER quotes Professor Sanday: 'What He meant was that the victory over the Power of Evil was virtually won. The healing of those few demoniacs might seem a small thing . . . it was really a crisis—*the* crisis in the history of the human race.' It seems to signify that the fall of Satan was already an accomplished fact.

'More certain are the following: At the first sermon in Nazareth (iv. 21), "to-day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." The Sons of the bride-chamber are not to fast while the bridegroom is with them (v. 34). "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see" (x. 23). "If I with the finger of God cast out demons, no doubt the kingdom of God *is come upon you*" (xi. 20). Whatever be the meaning of the famous phrase, "The kingdom of God is within you" (xvii. 21), at least the time referred to is the present. The kingdom has to some extent arrived already.'

'Above all, there is the reply sent back to S. John Baptist when he asked, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" The reply is a frank appeal to the signs of the kingdom which are before the eyes of the messengers. "Go, and tell John what things ye have heard and seen: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear: the dead are raised up and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them" (vii. 22).'

That is the first thing, then. St. Luke rescues the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Christ from its association exclusively with the end of all things. It is part of the complete and permanent gospel. But that is not enough. There is a catastrophic element in the apocalyptic. What is to be done with it? How does St. Luke himself deal with it?

He does not reject it. Canon STREETER, it is true, detects a slight tendency in St. Luke to tone down eschatological language, and Mr. CARPENTER admits that 'in this as in some other respects S. Luke's is the mildest of the three Gospels.' But there are catastrophic passages even in St. Luke. How does the Evangelist himself regard them?

Some of them he would find fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. 'In 21^{20}, for example, he 'substitutes for the mysterious phrase of Daniel the much more intelligible gloss, "Jerusalem compassed by armies."' But there is more than that, and it is more important.

'One of the most striking features in the character of the Apocalyptic Christ, as depicted by S. Luke, is His attitude of being constrained and borne along by an absorbing—even violent—sense of mission. It is in this direction that Eschatology has done so much to vindicate Christianity as a real religion. One of the conclusions of the eschatologists in which there is surely a great deal of truth is that Our Lord solemnly and deliberately approached His death, believing that it would release forces which were required for the establishment of His kingdom. S. Matthew and S. Luke would agree that it was His Death and Resurrection which burst the bounds of merely Jewish nationality. And S.

Luke is, of course, particularly associated with the position that His Ascension and Return at Pentecost completed the process of universalization, and made Him available for the needs of all lands and all times.'

'Thus the Lukan solution is of two kinds. The religion of Jesus was capable of being carried over into the quiet, regular processes of a Church, and the Church itself was only an extension of the Incarnate Life of Jesus. Jesus of Nazareth, Who required faith in those around Him, Who demanded from them an intense activity of co-operating prayer, was well assured that, though God His Father would shortly make Him Lord and Christ, yet His Lordship and His Christhood would not become perfectly effective till all Israel should be saved and the fulness of the Gentiles should come in. His own appointed triumph and the coming of the kingdom with power and great glory lay on the other side of death. But that death would be for the ransom of many. The spiritual children of His Body were already come almost to the birth. But without the Cross He would not have strength to bring them forth. Only that Baptism of blood would summon into being the sons and daughters that God would give Him. His pangs would be their life. And the new life to which He Himself should come through death would then be their life for ever. Parent and children, Saviour and saved, Christ and His Church, for ever.'

Thirty Years Ago.

By the Right Reverend Bishop Herbert E. Ryle, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

Thirty years have passed since I was privileged to contribute to The Expository Times a series of articles, which later on were collected, revised, and published as a little book, with the title of *The Early Narratives of Genesis*. Those articles were based on a course of lectures which, as a young Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, I had been giving once a week in the evening at the Divinity Schools to a small but enthusiastic group of students. So far as I can recollect, it was the obvious interest and pleased excitement of those lads at what seemed to them a novel treatment of the subject which encouraged me to offer the lectures to a wider public through the medium of The Expository Times. I owed it to the kindness of the Editor, Dr. James Hastings, that they were permitted to appear in this form.

Well! since those days we have travelled a great distance. We, who now belong to the older generation, can look back to that time 'thirty years ago,' and can thank God that, so far as Old Testament study is concerned, a great advance has been achieved. The legitimate claims of scientific literary criticism have come into general recognition. The history of the People of Israel, and the story of the growth of their religious ideas and institutions, have been far more minutely investigated than ever before. A flood of light has been thrown upon the field of study by the unexpected treasures of Assyriology, and by the development of the new branch of learning represented in the lore of Comparative Religion. Hebrew, and the Semitic languages generally, are better understood, and more intelligently taught than they were. In every branch much still remains to be done; but we can be truly thankful, both that so much has been done, and that in Great Britain it has been done on lines which have satisfied the just demands of intellectual progress, and have inflicted no outrage upon that loyal reverence with which every devout Christian turns to the study of the pages of Holy Scripture.

People nowadays could hardly credit the dearth of good English books on the Old Testament at the time, forty years ago, when I was reading for Theological Honours. We had Maclear's and Smith's *Old Testament Histories*; we had the inspiring eloquence of Stanley's *Jewish Church*; we had articles in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. We had Wordsworth's *Commentary* and the *Speaker's Commentary*. We had Pusey on *Daniel*, and on the *Minor Prophets*. On the Psalms, we had