
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

7, 8, 10, 17, 21 b; with 3 from other sources, viz., Thalmud, Tractat *Aboda Zara*; an addition to Matt. xx. 28 in *Codex Cantabrigiensis*; and 1 Thess. iv. 15–17. The reasons assigned for including the last-named passage amongst the unrecorded Sayings of Jesus are far from convincing, but the work as a whole deserves the attention of all who desire to form a true estimate of the relation of the *Agrapha* to the problem of the origin of the Gospels.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College, Birmingham.

Religious Enthusiasm.

A STUDY OF ST. LUKE XIX. 40.

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY WHITEFOORD, M.A., B.D., PRINCIPAL OF SALISBURY THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

IT would seem as if there were still room for a volume to be written on the proverbial sayings of the New Testament. Certainly the partial inquiries which have been made into the subject show it to be an interesting field of study. But its interest would naturally culminate in the Gospels. To what extent does the Master employ these current sayings, and with what design? These are questions which might be solved by diligent and devout comparison of those passages in which the proverbial element is plainly discernible. A hasty criticism might indeed prompt the conclusion that such sayings were of less intrinsic value than the other recorded words of the Lord Jesus. But the conclusion must not be permitted. It is probable from the list of the Agrapha that not only were such sayings most easily remembered, but regarded as most worthy of remembrance by those whose high fortune it was to have heard them.[1] The fact is clear that the moment a proverb passed those Divine lips it was transmuted, it was consecrated to eternal purposes. Precisely what was done on a large scale in the way of parables took place upon a small scale in the way of proverbs. If the former are rightly regarded as 'earthly stories with a heavenly meaning,' no less are the latter earthly aphorisms invested and inspired with a divine intention. Scarcely less interesting would a subordinate inquiry prove as to the source of such proverbs. In many instances their origin must be local and Jewish, for some are already found embedded in the literature of the Old Testament. Yet students are too apt to regard them as the peculium of the East. Proverbs are, however, the beginnings of all serious thought, the alphabet of philosophy. As such they are cosmopolitan, and no one can fail to be struck with this note in those which appear as issuing from the Master's lips. The present quotation from St. Luke's Gospel offers an illustration of Christ's use of proverbs to which an especial interest is attached.

The occasion of the Triumphal Entry is not only too familiar for description, but defies it. Artists and poets, writers and preachers, a whole group of the picturesque school of commentators, have striven to bring the scene upon the slopes of Olivet vividly before the mind's eye. They cannot do it, they are doomed to failure. The contrast of the triumphal entry is like the contrast of the Incarnation, too tremendous, too sublime to be drawn by human pen or pencil. The only way in which the significance of the event can be grasped is upon the knees, and, maybe, alone with God, when the solitary Hosanna may be uttered, as then it passed from lips of thousands. It was, then, upon this supreme occasion—the unique hour in which Christ deliberately lent Himself to an open triumph—that He used a proverbial expression. A short-sighted judgment might suppose it too frigid and formal for such a moment, but it was a Divine wisdom foreknew that the saying would burn its way into the hearts of thousands down the ages of the Church. Meanwhile no utterance could be more apposite to the immediate occasion. The double

[1] *Cf.* Acts xx. 35: *μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε Μακάριόν ἐστι μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.*

stream of worshippers was paying Christ a right royal tribute—through ignorance perhaps they did it; its ground was uncertain. A good man, a prophet, a worker of miracles, a possible deliverer of the nation, all this Christ may have appeared to such and such among the multitude. It was as much His wisdom as His mercy which accepted what was offered, accepted a homage which He foreknew would be so quickly, so cruelly withdrawn. For a brief moment it was theirs to offer, and He saw it and was glad. There were, however, those who saw it and were not glad. The Triumphal Entry had probably broken up the compact[1] group of Pharisees. Carried away in the sweep of the throng, they were not carried away by its spirit. They regarded the crisis with an uneasy foreboding. The desperate shift to which they were put in making their appeal to Him, rather than in offering an indignant protest to the people, indicates that they felt Christ to be Master of the present situtaion. So they approach Him with an order couched in terms which carefully minimised the claim and scope of His authority. 'Teacher, rebuke Thy disciples.' Then immediately fell the saying, an eternal truth in proverbial form, at once a remonstrance and a benediction, a remonstrance against hardness of heart, a benediction upon the enthusiastic temper—

> If these shall hold their peace,
> The stones will cry out.[2]

Most commentators think that our Lord had in mind the phrase of Habakkuk (ii. 11), but the prophet's denunciations on covetousness and cruelty have no parallel here, and his proverb has a different application. Old Testament literature is full of gnomic sayings, in which a hard heart and a stone are compared together. These would indeed be in the Lord's mind, as He made a current saying His own, and pronounced an eternal blessing upon enthusiasm. Rebuke Christ reserved for far different types of mind and temper: for St. Peter, when he ventured to stand in the way of His cross; for the sons of Zebedee, to show that ambition was not the spirit of the heavenly kingdom; for demons holding men's bodies in possession; for the torturing grasp of fever; for the rage and fury of a Galilean storm;[3] but never for enthusiasm. That at its poorest and lowest He must still bless.

Enthusiasm is one of those terms of which the definition is made the more difficult on account of the number of correlated expressions, excitement, zeal, fanaticism, earnestness, and the like, approaching it in sense, but not exhausting its inner significance. But allowing the full force to the derivation of the word, then 'religious' becomes a constant epithet of enthusiasm. Christians need not shrink from a word whose antecedents are clearly pagan, only that the strong and passionate feeling it represents, the fervour and glow of love, will be for them not kindled by this or that personage in a theogony, but will be the symbol and the outcome of the indwelling Presence of the Spirit of God within the heart. To make this claim is not to deny that there is an enthusiasm in a lower degree fired by objects not in themselves spiritual, prompted by no yearning of the soul Godward, yet spending itself in devotion to high aims, and noble living.

Take the case of the patriotic sentiment. Here is a typical instance of the lower type of enthusiasm, elicited by a very pure love, that of one's country, marked, as all wars of independence show, by the heroic temper. Macaulay and Kingsley, in verse and prose, with true insight, mark the resistance to the Armada as a triumph won by enthusiasm. It may be evoked in lesser ways. Men are brought by associations of birth, of education, of residence, into sympathy with cities and places beautiful and attractive in themselves. Their very names are names to conjure with. These spots become sources of the feelings of affection and reverence, and there is a kind of local inspiration about Athens, about Rome and Florence, about our own Oxford and Cambridge and Edinburgh. Humanity would be the poorer for the loss of such places, because there would be a corresponding loss in the sum of enthusiasm.

Or, as no less felicitous source, there is the zeal inspired in and through a man's life work. This is not impossible in the humblest occupation, or the dullest of professions wherever there is a strong sense of duty, and an appreciation of the inherent dignity of work.

Or, again, this lesser enthusiasm may be evoked

[1] τινες τῶν φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου.

[2] The gnomic form is more plainly discernible in the Greek, and is enhanced by the omission of the adverb, 'immediately,' of our A.V.

[3] The verb ἐπιτιμάω is uniformly used. The passages are too numerous for quotation.

by a crisis—the witness of some golden deed, or at the recital of some dauntless resistance to oppression or cruelty.

Yet more truly, as most frequently, it is at once called out and exhibited in strong affection. Many a man's heart may be dead and hard as a stone to any passion for country or birthplace—dead to any sense of the beautiful in nature or of the grandeur of work, yet here full of passion and life. It is a matter of experience to anyone who has knowledge of human nature, that there are many men who will exhibit not one trace of eager interest upon any subject upon earth until you touch their family, their home. Then indeed, and often by accident, you touch a chord which vibrates. A memory thus revived of brother or sister, father or mother, husband or wife, son or daughter, kindles the eye and lights the face.

The vital spark, the heavenly flame,

is not yet extinct.

As they review the causes of the Triumphal Entry, one commentator declares that the multitude was prompted by patriotism, another finds in it an indignant protest against the Pharisaic temper and action, a third supposes that the beauty of the scene and the contagion of a crowd caused this passionate outburst, a fourth finds a sufficient reason in the transient admiration for the life and work of the Prophet of Nazareth. These suggestions are not mutually destructive as theories. All these factors were present and forcible. The place an inspiration, a deep-seated mistrust of Christ's natural foes, the national hope and its possible chance of realisation in and through Him, these thoughts and aspirations were enough to produce strong emotion and a demonstration of favour such as Jesus never had received before, nor would again receive in His earthly life.

What, however, remains quite clear amid any uncertainties is this. Christ discerned what commentators must guess at, and in unmistakable phrase—unmistakable because it was proverbial—pronounced his most emphatic commendation on the spirit and consequent action of the multitude. He blessed this homage, unworthy, incomplete and transient as it was. How full of a grave import, how full of strong consolation to Christians down the ages, to mark when and on whom the word of praise was bestowed; for at the root of all He discovered love. That was the redeeming feature, and He could not but bless it.

The higher enthusiasm, save within the experience of the Lord's earthly life, is rare still. It is its fate to be counterfeited, travestied, caricatured. A cold criticism frowns upon it, and since our age is nothing if not critical, religious enthusiasm is disregarded if not despised to-day. It is held to be an interference with the scientific temper, a thing purely of the emotions, and therefore destructive of true mental balance. This is simply because the caricatures of enthusiasm attract more notice than its real and genuine presentment. Bishop Warburton, in the eighteenth century, could not distinguish it from the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, and so he defines enthusiasm as 'that temper of mind in which the imagination has got the better of the judgment.' Many to-day would accept such a definition, not so much because they have really tested its accuracy, as because they dislike the crude extravagances of the Salvation Army. Yet once granted that enthusiasm is the indwelling of God within the heart, once granted that that Presence is marked inevitably by love, having the strong expulsive power belonging to every high affection, yet casting out only that which offends, love consecrating life and ennobling work, then at our peril we ignore and despise that which is the moral dynamic of Christianity—

A fervent, not ungovernable love.[1]

Enthusiasm in the lower planes is a note of power and genius. In the higher plane of religious experience it is a mark of the energy of the spiritual life. Human temperaments are indeed of infinite variety, and our judgment upon them are always imperfect, and will mostly have to be reversed. But one issue is clear, that wherever the heart is as stone, and love is cold, and devotion cautious and calculating, then a man is still far from the kingdom of God.

Hence enthusiasm is a temper to be quickened and cherished in Christian souls. True, that it cannot be possessed to order, for 'love,' as the writer of the famous essay on 'Enthusiam of Humanity' declares, 'knows no imperative mood.' But while it is finally a divine gift, it is appropriated by the human will. The heart is first surrendered and then possessed, and once possessed there is no possible limit to the power of such a spirit and temper, for it is thus that 'God worketh in men, both to will and to work for His good pleasure.'[2]

[1] Wordsworth.

[2] Phil. ii. 13.

Could Jesus Err?

By the Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, D.D., Kilmarnock.

II.

The third example of imputed error—and that on which most stress is laid—is derived from Christ's interrogation of the Pharisees concerning the Davidic Sonship of the Messiah, as recorded in the first three evangelists (Matt. xxii. 41–45; Mark xii. 35, 36; Luke xx. 41–44): 'If David then calleth Him Lord, how is He his son?' Accepting the historicity of this question placed by the Synoptists in Christ's mouth, and repudiating the extraordinary notion of Strauss, Holtzmann, and others, that Christ purposed thereby to assail the popular belief that the Messiah should be David's son, Professor Schwartzkopff engages to convict Christ of error in respect of both the authorship and the sense of Psalm cx., on which the question is based. In the attempt to fulfil this contract, twenty-two pages of argumentation are expended,—which shows how hard the Professor finds it to make out his case,—but nothing really new is advanced. The Psalm, it is argued, could not have emanated from David, because 'of no single Psalm can the Davidic origin be now asserted with any degree of certainty'—the titles which ascribe them to the son of Jesse having been affixed at least 500 years after his decease . . .; because 'the office of the priesthood could never have been assigned to a king as something special, at a time when sovereigns were accustomed to exercise, but only when they had ceased to perform, sacerdotal functions,' *i.e.* not in David's time but after the Exile; because 'no theocratic ruler (in Israel or Judah) could ever have looked upon a descendant of himself as his Lord, or upon himself as a servant of anyone but God, not even of Messiah'; and because 'no sufficient proof exists that David's poetical efforts ever partook of a specifically religious character.' Nor, if David did compose the Psalm in question, the Professor argues, could he have referred to Messiah, because no prophet's outlook, it is alleged, could have extended beyond his own immediate horizon, so that David must have had in contemplation some near (say, Solomon) rather than some distant successor (like Messiah); because 'David never had a conception of Messiah,' in which case it is clear he could not have written about Him; because when the Hebrew prophets did allude to Messiah, they were accustomed to speak of David as 'the type (Vorbild), original (Urbild), and even model (Musterbild) of the Messiah,' but never of Messiah as either David's Son or David's Lord; and chiefly because 'in order to be able to foresee this future priest-king, David must have had before his eyes a more exalted picture than the greatest prophets of the most flourishing period of prophecy ever had,' which, of course, would have been 'a measureless anachronism,' utterly subversive of the sacred law of prophetic evolution. In either case, whether Christ accepted the Davidic authorship or the Messianic reference of the Psalm, in Professor Schwartzkopff's judgment He stands convicted of error. Nor need it be questioned that this conclusion is inevitable, and the defenders of Christ's inerrancy will be forced to throw up their brief if the above critical positions are impregnable. But, seriously speaking, can a fair-minded reasoner claim that even one of them has been placed beyond challenge?

With respect to the authorship of the Psalm, the following considerations may be pondered. Granting for the moment that the titles were affixed to the so-called Davidic Psalms 500 years after David,[1] does it not seem a large order to ask acceptance of the proposition, that all of these titles were wrong? That not so much as one of them rested on carefully sifted and authentic tradition? That the Hebrew rabbis in every instance erred in their reckoning, while German scholars, living 2000 years later, never miss

[1] Although the *final* redaction of the Books of Samuel may have taken place in the fourth century, it does not follow, as Schwartzkopff after Cornill imagines, that the titles to some of the Psalms may not have been affixed much earlier than this. David's history was known to the eighth century prophets, and, assuming the Psalms to have been in existence then, some at least of their superscriptions might have been then prepared. Besides, at the most, neither Cornill nor Driver professes to have established more than that the titles are not all reliable; neither has proved them to be all wrong. The subjective test—the correspondence of the titles of the Psalms with their contents—is one upon which equally competent critics may reasonably differ.

the mark in finding both a date and an author (when they want one) for the strayed songs or 'lost chords'? Had only the critics been less sweeping in their demands, they might have more readily obtained credence. Had they seen their way, for example, to entertain the suggestion that perhaps they themselves might not be infallible,—an extremely violent supposition, no doubt,—and that probably the Hebrew rabbis knew a little about their own religious books,—which, it must be granted, is preposterous!—ordinary persons might have been disposed to bow to the superior learning of modern scholars. As it is, these must not be surprised if the average intelligence should argue that the likelihood is that the rabbis were occasionally right in their conjectures, and most probably in this instance in which Christ confirms their judgment.[1] Then it puzzles untrained intellects to discover why it should have been impossible for David to conjure up before his imagination the picture of a priest-king like himself, but perfectly possible for an unknown psalmist 500 years afterwards to conceive such a lofty ideal, when king-priests no more existed? And just here, again, one not an expert might want to know how it came to pass on evolution principles that the king-priest conception of Israel's sovereignty, which, according to Schwartzkopff, was its 'ideal' conception, realised itself in David's time, and not in the post-Exilic era? Was not this pretty much like setting evolution at defiance, if not turning it upside down? As for the allegation that theocratic kings in Israel—like the Pharaohs of Egypt, the Sennacheribs of Assyria, and the Nebuchadnezzars of Babylon, or like the emperors (say) of Germany and China at the present day—found it a stiff mental exercise to imagine any successor who could be more distinguished than themselves, why should this have hindered David, under the Spirit's guidance, from representing Messiah as his superior? That he could have done this in exceptional circumstances it is doubtful if Professor Schwartzkopff would deny (see below); that he actually did this is what Christ asserts. To complain that David should not have called himself the servant of anyone but God, and therefore not of Messiah, is to assume that David could not have risen in a moment of supernatural inspiration to the idea of a divine or at least superhuman Messiah. It is arbitrary criticism with a vengeance to cite 'the only authentic song of David's handed down to us, the song of the bow, 2 Sam. i. 19–27,' as a proof that David never composed a 'specifically religious poem,' and that therefore Psalm cx. never proceeded from his pen.

As little satisfactory are the grounds upon which all reference to Messiah is excluded from the Psalm. That Old Testament prophets, 'in exceptional cases justified by special circumstances,' could look beyond their immediate environment, Professor Schwartzkopff allows (p. 24). That they often did so, Peter in his First Epistle distinctly affirms (i. 11, 12). Christ claimed the 110th Psalm as a specific illustration of this truth; while Driver admits that 'the Psalm is a Messianic one, and that the august language used in it of the Messiah is not compatible with the position of one who was a *mere* human son of David.' But if a post-Exilic writer could look beyond and above his environment to a superhuman Messiah, why could not David have done the same? Of course, if David never possessed a conception of Messiah, as Professor Schwartzkopff endeavours to demonstrate by an examination of Nathan's promise to David (2 Sam. v. 12–16), David's thanksgiving to Jehovah (2 Sam. vii. 18–29), and David's last words (2 Sam. xxiii. 2–7), it will follow that, even though written by David, this Psalm could not have had an outlook towards his Greater Son. But, while conceding that in all three places lay a primary reference to Solomon, it is enough to reply that many competent exegetes hold that the language, when fairly interpreted, cannot be restricted to one or even to all of David's royal descendants, but attains its full significance only when applied to Him who appeared in the fulness of times, and of whom it was spoken: 'And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David.' Then, that David did not picture Messiah as 'another David,' but as his 'Lord,' simply shows that Jesse's son was not so egregiously vain as some moderns think he should have been, but was endowed with more modesty than these are disposed to give him credit for. Imagine the

[1] Here it is worth observing that Ewald agrees with Hengstenberg in acknowledging that if the title of this Psalm be accepted as correct, the conclusion drawn by Christ in the Gospels was valid, whereas, if the title was inaccurate, the conclusion was wrong. Schwartzkopff and Driver unite in saying that even if the title was inaccurate, the Saviour's argument was not affected thereby; but, of course, these scholars are too modest to expect everybody to recognise them as superior to their predecessors just named.

conceit that Saul's successor must have exhibited had he been guilty of holding up himself as the type of Messiah! And conceive, if that be possible, the scorn with which his boundless egoism would have been reprobated by the critics! Like old Moses, for talking about a prophet like unto himself, young David for singing about a Messiah like unto himself would have been impaled upon the sharp stake of pitiless critical raillery! But because the sweet Psalmist avoided the venerable lawgiver's supposed indiscretion, he has incurred the hot displeasure of his friends. For friends of David not a few of his nineteenth century critics claim to be. In denying him the authorship of the 110th Psalm, and in contending that even though he wrote it he could not have dreamt of Messiah, do they not seek to wipe from his fair fame the scandal of subverting the sacred law of evolution? For this is what it comes to, they keep on assuring the unlearned, if once it is allowed that before David's eyes flitted a loftier conception of Messiah than was cherished by the great prophets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It is idle to interpose that the facts of Old Testament Scripture do not establish the modern development theory of Israel's religion, unless by first cutting and carving the documents in accordance with the preconceived theory, or to suggest that it is reasoning in a circle first to demonstrate the evolution law of Israel's conception of Messiah by denying that David could have written Psalm cx., and then to parade that law as evidence that David could neither have penned the Psalm nor thought about Messiah. Yet pretty much after this fashion does the German professor build up his accusation against Christ. David could not have produced the 110th Psalm, because then he must have foreseen Messiah as his Lord. No Hebrew prophet could have had such a vision of the distant future unless it had been specially revealed to him. Such special revelation is forbidden by the law of prophetical development which criticism has invented. Jesus affirmed that such special revelation had been vouchsafed to David by the Spirit; that David had foreseen Him, the Messiah, in the distant future, and that David had composed the Psalm in question. Therefore, is the Professor's unwritten but implied conclusion, since the critics are unquestionably right, Jesus was undoubtedly wrong. Those who are satisfied with this reasoning must be easily pleased.

In closing this section of his treatise, Professor Schwartzkopff assures his readers that the above instances of so-called error on the part of Jesus belong to the most important that come before one in the New Testament. The remark sets one wondering what the least important might be, and what form the evidence offered in proof of them might assume.

Point and Illustration.

MESSRS. OLIPHANT ANDERSON & FERRIER have just published an attractive crown octavo volume by an accomplished American preacher. Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis is the preacher; *A Man's Value to Society* is the title of the book. The book is further described as 'Studies in Self-Culture and Character.' In short, it is a volume which the librarian must place in the most elastic of all his shelves, the shelf where the *Essays* stand. But it must not be left standing there. For it is a very able and original book. Do not dream, because the three anecdotes that follow are quoted from it, that it is a gathering of crumbs from the ordinary raconteur's table. The book was being read, and with quite uncommon pleasure, and the anecdotes came in the course of it.

The Inner Motive and the Outer Fact.

When Coleridge the schoolboy was going along the street thinking of the story of Hero and Leander, and imagining himself to be swimming the Hellespont, he threw wide his arms as though breasting the waves. Unfortunately, his hand struck the pocket of a passer-by, and knocked out a purse. The outer deed was that of a pick-pocket, and could have sent the youth to jail. The inner motive was that of an imaginative youth deeply impressed by the story he was translating from the Greek, and that inner motive made the owner of the purse his friend, and sent young Coleridge to college. Thus, the motive made what was outwardly wrong to be inwardly right.

Nothing Covered.

The story has been told recently of a burglar who accidently discharged a magnesium light connected with a kodak on the shelf. The hour was midnight, and everyone