
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

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

Perowne's *Commentary*, and the more recent *Commentary* by Jennings and Lowe—both of them being very helpful. For fuller treatment of special books we turned to translations from the German, in T. & T. Clark's Series, *e.g.* Delitzsch on *Genesis* and on *Isaiah*; Keil on *Samuel* and on the *Minor Prophets*. There were also the translations of Ewald's and of Kuenen's *Histories of Israel*, and of Bleek's *Introduction*, which were accessible in libraries. Let me add that, looking back to those days, there were few books which I found so full of suggestive thought as well as useful information as Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*, in T. & T. Clark's Translation Series.

In the present day the student has no lack of literature of every kind. On all the most important books of the Old Testament there are now full and scholarly English Commentaries, meeting all the requirements of the time. The 'Cambridge Bible' is now complete for all the books of the Old Testament, and is brought up to date in matters of scholarship and criticism. 'The International Critical Commentary' is on a more ambitious scale; it discusses not only the general questions of interpretation, but also all the minuter details of text and scholarship. The 'Century Bible,' though quite small in size, has also rendered valuable service to students. The 'Expositor's Bible' has enriched the shelves of every Bible lover with the volumes by G. Adam Smith on *Isaiah* and the *Minor Prophets*. 'The Westminster Commentary' has not as yet gone very far; but if it follows on the lines of Driver's *Genesis*, it will occupy a useful place. The young student now has no need to have recourse to dull translations of foreign commentaries. Modern scholarship is fully represented in the living style of the best English works. Helps to study, of most varied kind, are easily procurable.

The great book by Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, gave an immense impetus to the expansion and liberation of thought upon the Old Testament; while the now classic work on *The Literature of the Old Testament*, by Driver (1891), must always rank as one of the most important influences which contributed to the transformation of educated English opinion upon the subject of the structure and contents of the Jewish Scriptures. Smaller 'Introductions' now abound; and when I see such excellent and compact *Introductions* as those of Bennett and Adeney, of Box and of Gray, I cannot help feeling that the young student in these times has no ground for the kind of complaint to which an earlier generation used to give copious expression. For what young British reader need now turn to the stilted and often obscure translations of foreign books? The materials within his reach by English, Scottish, and American writers will abundantly furnish him with all that he wants. In this connexion it is only just to remark upon the epoch-making service that was rendered to the cause both of theology and of scholarship by the famous *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by Dr. James Hastings. This magnificent treasure-house of learning placed within the reach of teacher and scholar alike the best results of the most recent Biblical study. The *Encyclopædia Biblica*, though somewhat disfigured by a strain of fanciful speculation, has also furnished the student with an indispensable work of reference.

The magnificent *Hebrew Dictionary*, edited by Brown, Briggs, and Driver, has given Hebrew scholars a weapon for which they had long been looking. It is based on the monumental work of Gesenius; but in matters of philology, idiom, literary criticism, and exposition it marks the progress that had been made during the previous century. Its appearance has been a credit to Anglo-American scholarship, as well as to the famous Press of the University of Oxford, which undertook its publication.

The work that was begun by such men as Robertson Smith, Cheyne, Davidson, Driver, Kirkpatrick, George Adam Smith, and Kennedy has been taken up and carried on by a great host. I think of Cook, Burney, Ottley, Selbie, Box, Cowley, Gray, Simpson, A. S. Peake, Wade, and Harford, of Oxford; Kennett, Skinner, Bevan, Barnes, McNeile, Chapman, Macleane, Nairne, S. A. Cook, Bennett, Adeney, Foakes-Jackson, and Lanchester, of Cambridge; Brown, Briggs, Harper, Moore, Kent, H. P. Smith, Barton, Thatcher, Curtis, Toy, and many others in the United States. These are names which at once occur to my mind, and in mentioning them I must plead guilty to forgetfulness of many others deserving to be recorded; for I am writing this at a distance from books. But I am aware I must not allow myself to be run away with by a not unnatural interest in the bibliographical aspect of the great change that has taken place in Old Testament studies since 1889.

After all, the main difficulty thirty years ago was not so much the lack of adequate literary assistance as the attitude of mind on the part of those who in the religious life of the country during the previous thirty years had been responsible for the guidance and direction of thought upon the subject of the Old Testament. It is probable enough that in England the fierce controversies which had raged around *Essays and Reviews*, and had led to the denunciation of the writings of Bishop Colenso, had produced an inevitable reaction. Weariness, disgust, satiety, uncertainty, and timidity may each have played their part. Many of the ablest scholars had been engaged between 1870 and 1880 upon the work of the Revised Version. An enormous amount of minute and careful study was thus being silently done. For some little time, indeed, little was published. But there was a new spirit at work. It was not without significance that young men were at this juncture appointed to chairs for the teaching of the Old Testament—Driver at Oxford, Kirkpatrick at Cambridge, Robertson Smith at Aberdeen.

The impeachment of Robertson Smith for heresy on account of the articles he had written on Holy Scripture, and more particularly on books of the Old Testament, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, produced a prodigious cleavage of opinion in Scotland. In England the trial was at the time strangely ignored. People were a little put off by the technical terms in which the conduct of the case was necessarily obscured. But the popular lectures in which Robertson Smith sought to explain to the world his views upon the Old Testament and the structure of its books, views which, he contended, were demanded by modern scholarship, gave rise to an immense sensation. It was the beginning of a new era. A conflict between old traditional ideas and the 'new learning' was as inevitable at the close of the nineteenth century as it was at the beginning of the sixteenth.

We have to remember that thirty years ago the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration was more widely accepted, and in a cruder form, than it is now. Moreover, it was the case then, as it is now, that many good and thoughtful persons who would disown any belief in Verbal Inspiration considered that the cause of Christianity was at stake if the traditional views about, *e.g.*, the authorship of the Pentateuch, of the Psalter, or of the prophet Isaiah, seemed to be questioned. Literary criticism was, as it were, warned off the Christian preserves of Holy Scripture. Its motives were denounced as atheistical: its results derided as merely destructive.

Thirty years have steadily confirmed the justice of the demand that the Bible should be subjected to the free application of the same methods of literary and historical study as other ancient writings. In the learned world a revolution has taken place: the so-called 'critical position' has been universally accepted. Upon matters of detail, as in every living science, there are, and always will be, differing views in plentiful abundance. They testify to the vigour and health of an unfettered and inquiring intellect. But the old traditional system of explanation, respecting the authorship and structure of the books of the Old Testament, respecting the formation of the Canon, and respecting the undeniable presence of contradictions in the Sacred Writings, can no longer be regarded as tenable. The principles which some of us advocated thirty years ago, and on account of which we were denounced as 'unsound' and our lectures labelled 'dangerous,' have now been generally adopted in the teaching of the Universities, both in Great Britain and in America. The 'New Learning' has triumphed.

But do not let us suppose that the triumph of the 'New Learning' denotes a revolution in Christian thought generally. The great majority of the people receive their notions about Holy Scripture from devout persons who have never read an article of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and have never heard of Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*. They still receive instruction from class teachers and Sunday-school teachers, who have been trained on antiquated lines, and have been told to study 'safe,' but obsolete, handbooks. The ordinary layman assumes that what he was taught as a child about the Bible is Christian truth, and that no departure from it is justifiable. He is not prepared to trouble himself over literary problems. He says to himself: 'Moses wrote the Pentateuch; David wrote the Psalms; the whale swallowed Jonah; and what is the good of Christian faith if it does not enable you to believe things like that?'

I received a letter at the beginning of this month from a clergymsn telling me that 'Amongst the masses of the population it is almost universally accepted that you *must* either believe in the historicity and literal accuracy of these [Genesis]

records, or else disbelieve the Bible altogether. *And the clergy almost universally acquiesce in this attitude of mind*, because—as they truly say—the subject is a difficult one, and it is easier to let it alone. But this policy of reticence is having a most disastrous effect. It is indeed very largely responsible for the "alienation" from religion of which we hear, and see, so much.'

My correspondent puts his finger upon a real danger. The 'masses of the population' do not read. The short sermons which are addressed to them cannot deal with literary questions. The children are taught on the lines of an ancient and now obsolete system of thought. The young men and the young women repudiate what they wrongly suppose to be the only Christian view of the Bible. They have never heard of the 'new learning' by means of which their difficulties might have been explained, and their objections at least met, if not answered, in a scientific manner.

I am always grateful for the work that month by month is being quietly accomplished by the instrumentality of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Much, however, remains to be done. The learning of the University has to be interpreted to the occupants of the classroom and the schoolroom. Those who have to teach must themselves have learned. The people generally are not yet in touch with the progress of Old Testament studies. It is no good for superior persons to say, 'We have got long past that problem: that was the problem of thirty years ago.' They do not realize how long it takes to effect a revolution in thought: how small is the proportion of the population that reads, and how much smaller is the proportion that thinks. I do not think I am guilty of any exaggeration when I say that the great mass of our Christian fellow-countrymen are still wholly unacquainted with the principles which some of us were teaching in the Universities thirty years ago, and which are now practically universally welcomed in the *learned* world. The Bible is the people's book. The people will love it better and revere it more intelligently when they become acquainted with the more modern method of explaining its difficulties and of interpreting its spiritual message. I doubt not the present generation will loyally cope with the task of teaching the teachers. We of the older generation are passing away. Our successors have profited by our mistakes; they will make up for our deficiencies; they will popularize that which is still only the privilege of the comparatively few. But there can be no going back to the traditional position of 'Thirty Years Ago.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'A good soldier of Jesus Christ.'—2 Ti 2^3.

ONE October day long ago—it was in the year 1849—there was born in a manse in Aberdeenshire a little baby boy. His father was a Free Church Minister, and owned the honoured Highland name of Mackay. The little boy was christened Alexander.

The father was a learned man who loved teaching. Nothing delighted him more than instructing his little son. At the age of three Alexander could read the New Testament, and at seven he was reading books like Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Then the two often walked out together, and the country people used to wonder why they stopped occasionally as if to look at something on the road. The little fellow was getting a lesson in geography from a map drawn on the road with his father's stick, or he was having a proposition of Euclid demonstrated to him. With such a father it is no wonder he grew up to be a man who did everything thoroughly.

Alexander's map-drawing was exceptionally good. Two famous geologists who visited the manse were greatly struck with the accuracy of his work, and one of them sent him a copy of a book called *Small Beginnings, or the Way to Get On*. He was very proud of it, and read it with enjoyment. Later he began to take an interest in machinery. He loved to see it in motion. He would walk four miles to the nearest railway station, and four miles back, on the chance of getting a look at the engine as the train stopped