
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.

THERE never was a time when the theologian was so ready to meet the man in the street. For the man in the street became the man in the trenches. The theologian got into touch with him. He was grateful to him. In some ways he greatly admired him. He found himself yearning over him in the very way in which God yearns over a sinner. He was willing, like the Apostle Paul, to become all things to every one of these men if by any means he might save some.

Now the difficulty which stands in the way of full understanding between them is the miraculous. The man in the street has his own experience. In that experience miracles do not occur. He has perhaps obtained a little knowledge of science. In the light of scientific knowledge they cannot occur. He has no difficulty with Christ. And if he would associate the miracles which Christ did with the Christ who did them, his difficulty might depart. But he takes them apart from Christ. He takes them one by one. He cannot see how it is possible for any man to walk on the water or to turn water into wine. He does not believe that any man can rise again from the dead. It is the miracles that stand in the way. And the theologian's great desire to-day is to meet the man in the street with a credible account of the New Testament miracles.

The late Mr. C. E. ROLT was a theologian. He was a friend of Dr. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, who wrote a book on the Resurrection of our Lord, and he criticised that book. He criticised it, we may believe, because it did not meet the difficulty of the man in the street. Then he wrote a book himself. He saw that the Resurrection was the key of the situation. Believe that Jesus rose again from the dead and you will believe that He walked on the water of the Sea of Galilee. Mr. ROLT wrote a book to show that Jesus had so peculiar a body that He might easily be believed to have risen from the dead. He died before the book was sent to press. But his friend, Dr. SPARROW SIMPSON, has seen it published. The title of it is *The Spiritual Body* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net).

To every human being, says Mr. ROLT, there are three possible bodies. One is the body in which we now live and move and have our being. Another is the body which we shall possess during the Intermediate State—the time between our own death and the General Resurrection. The third is the body in which we shall rise at the Resurrection and enjoy the heavenly life for ever. If you wish to distinguish these three bodies by names you might call the first the physical, the second the psychical, and the third the spiritual body.

Mr. ROLT believed that this is the teaching of

St. Paul. He believed that it is the teaching of our Lord. He believed that both our Lord and St. Paul taught that the one body passes imperceptibly into the other, so that a man is weaving the second or third body, unseen by others and even unknown to himself, whilst he is still in the possession of the first or second body. And the weaving will be the more active and effective according to the character of the man.

If a man is 'earthly, sensual, devilish,' there will be little progress made in his psychical body while on earth. If he is spiritually-minded, the psychical body will actually make known its existence in moments of great elevation, as it did to St. Paul that day he was carried up to the third heavens and knew not whether he was in the physical body or out of it. If a man is as spiritually-minded as was the Lord Jesus Christ, he will not have to wait for death to enjoy the possession of the psychical body. And when death comes the physical body will simply pass away. Three days will suffice for its passage. And the man will rise into the intermediate life clothed in the psychical body.

Thus Christ rose from the dead. Thus it was that He could not be holden of death. Death had no more dominion over Him. For death is the death of the physical body, and for Him the physical body was ready to pass into the psychical. It is true He appeared to His disciples after His resurrection in a visible body. Mr. ROLT explains that its visibility was an accommodation to their want of faith. At one time the body seemed to be more physical, at another less. Sometimes He took food; at other times He passed in and out through closed doors. It was a matter of accommodation. They had all—every one according to his individuality—to be convinced of the fact of His resurrection.

But during those forty days which elapsed between the Resurrection and the Ascension, He was living not in the physical, but in the psychical body. Those forty days were His 'Intermediate State.' With the Ascension, He left the psychical body also behind, and entered into possession of the spiritual body—that body in which we shall see Him face to face, what time we are to be changed into the same image from glory to glory.

But what became of the physical body? Is not the present body made of matter, and is not matter indestructible? Mr. ROLT replies that our science is obsolete. The most recent science has exploded all the old theories of the indestructibility of matter. Matter is simply energy. When the physical body of Christ passed into the psychical, the energy which formed the one body passed into the other body and no residuum of 'matter' was left in the tomb.

Just before our Lord's ascension, as St. John tells us, He breathed on His disciples, and said 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' Why did He breathe on them? The act was unusual. When He gave forth power in the days of His flesh, it was by means of the sense of touch. He touched the leper. The suffering woman touched the hem of His garment.

Nor has the act been repeated. When the Bishop or the Presbytery would confer power or authority, it is the laying on of hands that is the act resorted to. Why did Jesus breathe on His disciples?

Mr. C. E. ROLT, in the book just noticed, sees significance in the breathing. 'As we read the passage,' he says, 'can we not feel that this breathing was no act of ordinary breathing? If we try to realize the scene, there is perhaps something grotesque in the suggestion that our Lord in the ordinary sense breathed upon His disciples. Surely that which the Evangelist is trying to express but cannot, because all human words fail him, was a spiritual process by which a spiritual influence like the Pentecostal wind streamed forth from the Saviour's lips and touched that little band

and sank into their hearts and bathed them in unutterable bliss and sweetness. The sheer grotesqueness of the incident, if the words are taken to mean what they would ordinarily mean in our earthly life, a grotesqueness so out of keeping with the austere and gracious majesty of the events in which the passage is embedded, makes this spiritual interpretation of them seem almost inevitable. Moreover, the fact that there were several present points in the same direction. Our Lord might, of course, be conceived of as breathing on each one separately and then pronouncing the words to all of them together; but the account seems to suggest that He not only addressed them but breathed on them all together. And this would be almost an impossibility if it were an act like physical breathing.'

What was it, then? It was an act, and an appropriate act, of the Son of God now ready for His Ascension. It was the first act of the Spiritual body. It was a spiritual breathing. 'Just as He touched the sick with the hands of His physical body to convey the gift of physical health, so He breathed on them in His Risen Body to convey the Holy Spirit. Thus the Holy Spirit was actually in some manner radiating from the breath He breathed. He breathed the power forth to show that it came from the depths of His own being. The breath of life is an apt symbol of the Spirit, as the very etymology of the word "spirit" shows. And thus the very act of giving the Spirit by this means was a claim to be the Source and Origin of all the Church's spiritual life.'

In *The Galilean* (James Clarke; 5s. net) the Rev. Nathaniel MICKLEM, M.A., Tutor and Chaplain of Mansfield College, Oxford, makes an energetic effort to commend the Christianity of the New Testament to the modern mind. The modern mind is an after-the-War mind. It is also the mind of a young man. It demands reality and reasons. Mr. MICKLEM endeavours to furnish both.

Can he secure reality in Prayer? Can he give good reasons why an after-the-War young man should pray? Can he persuade him to pray for others? Mr. MICKLEM is not without a sense of his difficulties, but he is thoroughly practical and thoroughly modern even in what he has to say of intercessory prayer.

He sets down two preliminary cautions. First, Prayer is not a dodge. Simon Magus thought it was. There was a secret in it. Put him up to the trick of it and he will work miracles by prayer, as any one. But there is no trick in it. It is the response of love to love—the love of God to a man who loves his brother.

Next, Prayer is not a compulsion. If the person who prays is free to pray, the person prayed for must be free to enjoy the benefit of the prayer. Much as God desires to do us good, He forces no good thing upon us, not even in answer to other good men's prayers for us. It is very clear to Mr. MICKLEM that if one man is to benefit by another man's prayers there must be some sort of correspondence between them. Both must be willing in the day of God's power.

He gives an instance. 'If,' he says, 'by prayer I can compel so-and-so to give money to the poor, there is no kindness in his doing so; I have not awakened his insight nor enabled him to do what is right because he himself sees it to be right; I have used a kind of violence with him.'

How then is intercessory prayer effectual? Mr. MICKLEM's answer is that it creates an atmosphere. 'There are certain people who as soon as they come into the room bring with them, as we say, such an "atmosphere" as that all that is best in us is fortified and strengthened, and in their presence it is comparatively easy for us to do what we know to be right. If they could compel us, there would be no value in their presence, but *they* enable *us* to do the right. Now when we pray for someone absent, I conceive that in effect we go and stand

by them; we cannot compel them, but we can help to create an atmosphere for them in which it is easier for them to do that which is right. If we pray for a sick friend, we stand by him and help him to overcome if it be possible. If we pray for a tempted friend, we stand by him and help him to fight his own battle and to overcome.'

It is strange that our Lord's temptations are so rarely taken into the pulpit. There seems to be a feeling that they are His and His alone. They belong to the history of His life. The scenery also is peculiar to Palestine—the wilderness with its wild beasts, the unnamed high mountain whence all the kingdoms of the world could be seen, the wing of the Temple in Jerusalem. And as the scenery is peculiar to Palestine, so the experiences (if they were experiences) are supposed to be peculiar to Christ.

Is that so? It cannot be so, else had they not been recorded. If there were experiences of Christ which it is impossible for us to suffer or enjoy we may be sure that their tale was never told. The story of the Temptation in the Wilderness, as we call it, came from Jesus Himself. What purpose could He have in telling it if it was an experience in which we could have no share?

We are distinctly told that He was tempted in all points like as we are, But even with that text to work upon, and with what Henry Drummond called the subject of most consequence in human life to preach about, how rarely does the preacher use the temptations of our Lord to show what temptation is; how rarely does he enable us to see that they cover the whole range of our experience; how rarely does he draw the victorious conclusion that just because He was tempted in all points like as we are, it is possible for us to count it all joy when we fall into divers temptations.

Is the order of the temptations of any account? Is it of any consequence whether we adopt St. Matthew's order or St. Luke's? The Rev. W. J. Foxell, M.A., who has made an able and thorough study of *The Temptation of Jesus* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. 6d. net), does not seem to think so. For he shows that the more likely order is St. Luke's, and then proceeds to follow St. Matthew.

The more likely order is St. Luke's. It is not the more popular order. For we read the Gospel according to St. Matthew first and become familiar with his way of telling the story. There is just one argument in favour of the order in St. Matthew, and Mr. Foxell gives it all its value. It is the argument that the most impressive of the three scenes is that on the top of the high mountain where Jesus was shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time. It is impressive, but it is not an argument in favour of that order. For it is easy enough to understand why one of the evangelists should have arranged the three temptations in an ascending order of impressiveness, and St. Matthew is fond of such artistic arrangements; it is not so easy to understand why another evangelist should change the order and spoil the climax.

In favour of St. Luke's order is St. Luke himself. He was a historian. He took pains 'to set forth *in order* a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us.' It is therefore open to any preacher to follow the order of the temptations as he finds them in the third Gospel—the wilderness, the high mountain, the pinnacle of the Temple—if he finds that there are good reasons for doing so.

And there are good reasons. One thing we may be sure of—the order is not accidental. Clearly enough the three temptations are meant to cover the whole range of human temptation, and in all human temptations there is an ascending order of importance. It is not outward impressiveness. It is inward assault. Now if we divide a man's avenues of temptation into three classes we shall see that they assail the bodily appetites first, next the desires of the mind (or soul), and last of

all the aspirations of the spirit. In other and clearer words they are first physical, next social, then spiritual. In the clearest and best words of all, they are first temptations within a man's own individual self, next temptations in his intercourse with others, last of all temptations in respect of his attitude to God.

And that is the order of the temptations in St. Luke. In the Wilderness Jesus was tempted to make use of His peculiar gifts—gifts given for a special purpose—in the satisfaction of His hunger. The word of the devil is the proverbial wisdom of the world. Think first of yourself. Charity begins at home. Jesus answered pregnantly that a man's first thought must be the will of God. The will of God covers the needs of the body, but they do not come first—'all these things shall be added unto you.' 'Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.'

Let us not think that the temptation to the body is simply the temptation to indulgence. Indulgence, whether in eating or in drinking or of any other appetite, pays its own penalty at once, and with ever-increasing heaviness. The temptation is to claim for the individual life its rights without consideration of the rights of others, or of the purpose of God.

When Jesus had fasted for forty days it was no question of indulgence to ask Him to eat. But there was a higher claim just then, and the higher must always precede. It was the claim of the will of God, as He saw it. When the soldier is in the trenches, short of food or of water, it is no concession to his bodily appetites to invite him to eat and drink. But he can eat and drink only by leaving the trenches and becoming faithless to duty.

Next comes the temptation to the mind. Now it is not necessary to say that the mind is greater than the body. Each has its place. The mind must not claim attention regardless of the body, nor the body regardless of the mind. If the athlete's 'fitness' is obtained at the expense of the cultivation of his mind it costs too much; if the culture of the mind is obtained with the loss of bodily health it costs too much.

Again, the temptation to the mind is not the temptation to indulgence. Here also indulgence—leaving undone the things that ought to be done, or doing the things that ought not to be done, whether it is due to moral weakness, the tyranny of habit, sheer indolence, or momentary rebellion—receives its own inevitable reward, and we know it. The temptation to the mind, before which rise the ideals of beauty, truth, and goodness, is more exquisite than that.

It is the temptation to desire to do good without paying its price. The devil invited Jesus to a high mountain, showed Him all the kingdoms of the world, and offered to let Him have them. The devil knew that He desired to have them, though he may not have known how ardently. He had come to make them His own, in order that He might make them God's. But He must pay the price. And the price is Calvary.

For this is in accordance with the will of God and the constitution of the Universe. We are ambitious. We have gifts, gifts given us by God, gifts of influence, leadership. We wish to use them in God's service. We would do good with them. But no good can be done in God's universe without sympathy. And sympathy is never anything else than 'suffering along with.'

Is there any right-minded man or woman in this land who does not desire a diminution of the evils due to alcoholic drinking? How are they to be diminished? There are two ways—but both involve sacrifice. One way is to deny oneself the use of alcohol by way of example. It is the easier way. The Apostle Paul recommends it. The question in his day was meat—not any kind of food, but food offered to idols. What did he

say. 'If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.'

The other way is to recover the drunkard. It is the harder way. For it is to 'feel with,' to 'suffer with,' the drunkard's wife and children; it is to suffer with the drunkard himself. That is done by removing his temptations, and especially by the patient labour of rescue. And 'the Salvation Army lass,' throwing her arms around the woman who has become degraded into a drunken sot, and kissing her swollen discoloured lips, is doing more to overcome the temptation to the mind (the 'social soul,' men call it now) than the millionaire with the best use he can make of his money.

The temptation that assails the spirit is in the way of experiment. And here let us notice that the three temptations of Jesus, being the three temptations of man, are the three temptations of Eve. What are the words? 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat' (Gn 3^6). 'Good for food': 'command this stone that it become bread'; 'pleasant to the eyes': 'he shewed him all the kingdoms of the world'; 'and a tree to be desired to make one wise': 'cast thyself down from hence'—the parallel is so perfect that it is scarcely possible to suppose it accidental. What more likely than that Jesus threw His narrative into a form which was already familiar and which covered all the range of possible temptation?

The temptation that assails the spirit is in the way of experiment. For in the Eden of every man's life there is a tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and he is forbidden to eat of the fruit of it. It is a tree to be desired to make one wise, but that wisdom is beyond the will of God for us. They will tell us that we are bound to know evil sooner or later in any case. So we are. But what do they mean by 'bound'? If they mean by the laws of the Universe or the will of God, they are wrong. The only compulsion is the failure of the will to respond to the call of God. That is evil, and the knowledge of it, and that only. We are not bound to take and eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. And if its fruit is beyond the limits of God's purpose for us, or if it trespasses on the rights of others, to take of the fruit and eat is to fall before temptation.

It is a matter of experiment, of experiment with God. Now experimenting with God is not always wrong. Without the dash of adventure that is in it there is no true faith, and without faith there is no true fellowship. But the venture of faith is never in the direction of breaking the commandments, always is it in the way of observing them. The venture that is made for the satisfaction of curiosity—as when the young lad takes strong drink in order to know how it feels to be drunk; or for the unfettered enjoyment of existence, as when the young girl determines at all costs to see life—is experimenting with God in the way that the devil invited Jesus to experiment when he told Him to cast Himself down from the wing of the Temple.

Ah, you will be no thief nor take
The false coin for the true,
Nor let a single soiled caress
Be passed between us two.

And yet you know how sweet 'twould be
To take what you might take;
But you do hold yourself in love
And honour for my sake.

As you have willed, so let it be,
My dear—and yet, more dear
Is all your true withholding than
If you had held me near.

It is simply the setting of our own will against the will of God. The will of God may seem to work along a narrow groove, it may seem to be

slow and even ineffectual in its working, but if it is the will of God there is nothing for us but to wait upon it. To hasten its working, to turn it into a new channel, to widen its scope, is certain to end in disaster. And when the disaster falls it is poor consolation to remember that we thought we were doing it for the best. They say that Judas Iscariot was guilty of nothing worse than a desire to make Jesus reveal Himself. He would put Him in a corner, where He would be compelled to declare His Messiahship and accept His crown. It was an interesting experiment. But it ended on Calvary for Jesus, and on Aceldama, the Field of Blood, for Judas.

Belief in God and its Rational Basis.

By the Reverend J. Dick Fleming, D.D., Professor of Theology, Winnipeg.

Since the time of Immanuel Kant it has been customary, for theologians and philosophers alike, to concede that the existence of God is not a matter of reason, but only of faith. The critical philosophy of Kant was directed to prove, on the one hand, that since the categories we employ in our thinking have validity only in the field of the empirical consciousness, we can only conceive, without being able to comprehend or verify, the Absolute realities; and on the other hand, that the Absolute reality from which our theoretical reason is thus debarred is made known to us by the Practical or moral reason. In other words, theoretic knowledge concerns itself with the realm of nature, the things of sense-experience; the realm of ends, which is the Absolute reality, is shut out from science proper, and must be relegated to moral faith. We know only phenomena, the things of space and time; the ultimates of existence are only matters of moral persuasion. Hence philosophy must limit itself to a criticism of the categories and forms of our knowledge; while those absolute realities, with which Ontology formerly dealt, have their true place in the moral sphere, as ethical postulates of the practical life.

In varying language and under somewhat modified forms, this distinction has largely prevailed in the thought of the nineteenth century. It reappears, in its Kantian form, in Hamilton and Mansel; in Herbert Spencer's doctrine of phenomenalism, which relegates religious faith to the realm of the Unknowable; and in the Ritschlian and other theologies which are based on Kant, and maintain that our beliefs in the supersensible rest on Value-judgments. It reappears in a more directly empirical form in the activism of Eucken, in Bergson's exaltation of intuition and instinct above the theoretic intelligence, and even in modern Pragmatism. In the last form, however, it threatens to abolish the theoretic side of knowledge altogether; for the pragmatist proclaims that all truth has its value ultimately in its practical application, and that the test of truth is its working value.

This agnostic, or anti-intellectualist, attitude of mind seems to be in a fair way of working out its own salvation. The original doctrine here was that knowledge properly so called is confined to phenomenal experience and has a higher degree of rationality within these limits than the faith which carries us beyond phenomena. But the advancing anti-intellectualism of our time is beginning to criticise this distinction, and to recognize that if the knowledge of things seen is only phenomenal and partial, it has no valid claim to be exalted above the other factor—call it faith, intuition, or moral will—which brings us into living touch with reality. Very few adhere to the extreme view of Spencer that the non-phenomenal is absolutely unthinkable. It is widely recognized that the conclusions of faith are quite capable of being intelligently stated, and the reasons for these conclusions intelligently given. But if they thus yield us deeper insight into reality than that which the scientific intellect gives, why should we refuse them the title of knowledge? Why not allow that they belong to a higher kind of reason, which deals with things beyond sense by methods that are proper to them? No one, of course, would deny that we have many practical beliefs and intuitions which we have never rationalized; that is true not only of our faith but also of all our