
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

friend, more reserved and distant, stands in the shadows watching. The narrative bears all the marks of an eye-witness's story—an eye-witness who was not a participant. The night is cold. The trial continues within hearing and also within sight of the servants' courtyard. An officer strikes Jesus; our Lord takes it meekly. A ripple of scorn runs round the fire. Peter stands and warms himself. He is challenged. 'Are you not one of that man's disciples?'—as if to say, 'That's the kind of unmanly meekness you've been following!' Peter is scandalised—he denies Him. The meekness of Jesus suffering quietly a personal insult offends Peter. Is the second great human reason for the denial of Jesus not that, in our Lord's own words, we are scandalized at much in Him—at His attitude to personal suffering? The sequence of the narrative in this Gospel shows this to be the reason for Peter's second denial.

Then Peter is identified. A kinsman of Malchus identifies him, and challenges him. The striker of Malchus was obviously in danger for some years afterwards. Peter faced with this accusation realises his own peril. He denies Jesus again. This time it is for the sake of his own personal safety. The cock crew.

The Fourth Gospel tells us no more. It omits any reference to the vehemence of Peter's denials, which an observer at a little distance would not appreciate. The story here ceases where the 'other disciple's' witness would also cease. Only here have we a clear account of the denials, of his progressive fall, and the separate reason for each step.

The Synoptics are not even consistent with themselves. St. Matthew mentions two maids, St. Mark, one. St. Luke places the lapse of time between the second and third denials. But all alike emphasize the vehemence of the denials of Jesus, and of Peter's repentance and tears. St. Luke tells us that our Lord turned and looked on Peter. The interest of the Synoptics is in the emotions of Peter rather than in the events. They emphasize what Peter would emphasize, and show signs of confusion where Peter in telling the story repeatedly might be expected to become confused. The participator in such events can rarely give a clear account of what happened—his own mental upheaval preoccupies him. It is the spectator who sees most.

Is there not internal evidence that in St. John's Gospel we have the carefully preserved or accurately recorded witness of that 'other disciple,' and that, so far as it goes, it is historically preferable to the account in the Synoptics?

J. Ramsay Thomson.

Applegarth, Lockerbie.

Entre Nous.

Alington of Eton.

The Dean of Durham has written a delightful book of reminiscences to which he has given the title *Things Ancient and Modern* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net). There is nothing of the set autobiography in it although we have an account of his schooldays, his posts at Marlborough, Eton, and Shrewsbury, and his sixteen years' Headmastership of Eton. The bulk of the book consists of Dr. Alington's views on the public-school system and his programme of educational reform. A classicist himself, he sees clearly the mistakes of the classical party. We are never long under any misapprehension as to his own bent. On page 52 we find the following generalization, which may well cause some heartburning. 'If as Head Master I wanted some piece of work done, I should feel safer if I entrusted it to a mathematician or to an Oxford classic: fairly safe if my classic came from Cambridge: but profoundly uneasy if I had to give it to a scientist. No doubt there are brilliant exceptions, just as there may be women with artistic gifts, or men with feminine practicality, but roughly speaking I believe this (typically Oxonian) generalization to be true.' But it appeared clear to him that the mistake at public schools was that it was not frankly recognized that there are two main types of boys—the literary and the scientific. The boy whose interest lies primarily in literature must be given some knowledge of science, but in a different way from that which is rightly ordained for his scientific brother. He must get some knowledge of scientific results and have an inkling of the method by which they were obtained, but it is quite

unnecessary for him to break test-tubes in his efforts to obtain a smattering of chemistry. And if his scientific and mathematical colleagues will let the literary boy off practical chemistry and off algebra, Dr. Alington, in his turn, is prepared to let the scientific boy off Latin prose. 'I should propose to ask the non-literary boy to learn his Latin grammar with a view not to composition, but to reading.' Where one classical language only is to be studied, Dr. Alington gives the preference to Greek. Instead of struggling through Cæsar and Nepos and Ovid he would have the boy turn to the Greeks. 'The great Greeks are gloriously simple, partly because of the lucidity of their language, and partly because of the clarity of their thought, and for a boy to have even a bowing acquaintance with Homer, Herodotus, Aristophanes and Plato is to open out new literary horizons such as Keats beheld when he first "heard Chapman speak out loud and bold."

'I can testify,' he says, 'from practical experience that it is possible to get a boy who knows no Greek to read these authors with intelligence and appreciation in two years by six hours' work a week in school.'

'Here, then, is my programme for the scientific boy: he should learn Latin (or preferably Greek) grammar, and be able to construe his chosen classical language with reasonable fluency and accuracy, but should make no attempts at composition in it. He should learn, at some time in his career, a modern language: he should be taught history and English, and would probably be able to give to them some of the time saved from classical composition: for the rest, let him have as much science and mathematics as his instructors wish to give him, and of the type which, in their wisdom, they deem best. My strictures upon time wasted in the laboratory have, of course, no relevance in his case.'

There are topics on which some will feel that Dr. Alington does not go far enough. Speaking of the O.T.C., for example, he admits that so far as physical training is concerned, the time could be better spent, but he goes on, 'Of one thing I am perfectly certain, and that is that the O.T.C. does not encourage militarism.' There may be dissenters too from his views on corporal punishment. 'Personally, I have no qualms about corporal punishment, which, if properly administered, has the inestimable advantage of a quick settling of the business and leaves no resentment behind in the mind of a normal boy. . . . Perhaps I may be allowed a footnote of personal experience. On one occasion it fell to my lot to have a boy to breakfast one morning, to beat him (with his entire consent) an hour or two later for an offence undiscovered when the invitation was issued, and to play fives with him before luncheon. This was an engagement made a day or two before, and neither of us saw the least reason for cancelling it. No one who cannot understand that story has any claim to a knowledge of the English public schoolboy—or his master.' That is as it may be. But no one could fail to enjoy the humour in this volume, its tolerant spirit, and its sanity.

Dr. Alington belongs, as he says, to the two most criticised professions, for a clerical schoolmaster offers four cheeks to the smiter. While retaining all the educational chapters, we wish that he had given us more on religion. There is only one chapter devoted to it. But what we have is extremely suggestive, and Dr. Alington explains the smallness of the space because in three previous books—'Elementary Christianity,' 'Doubts and Difficulties,' 'The Fool Hath Said'—he had expounded his religious convictions.

In this chapter he has something to say on the ever-recurring difficulty of the opposition of science and religion. He uses the simile of a jigsaw puzzle, the workers on which may fail to see any connexion between the parts at which they are severally working. 'We shall not know the full answer until the picture is completely finished: all that we can do is, in our respective spheres, to fit together those pieces of the puzzle which undoubtedly cohere, and to insist that they must find a place in the whole when it is ultimately completed. . . . To develop this simile a little, Christians are bound to believe that in the centre of a completed picture there will be found a Figure on a Cross, but that Figure will not be seen in its true glory until the flowers in the foreground and the clouds in the background have each been fitted into their place. The picture at which we are working is, we are bound to believe, a coherent whole in which each detail has its value and its meaning.'

Science, he reiterates, is concerned with the question How: religion is concerned with the question Why. 'The difference is perhaps most clearly seen in the sphere of art. Science, if it looks at a great picture, can tell you how the pigments have been made and can explain the effect of the various colours on the eye, but it is not interested in the question why one picture is a mere daub and another a masterpiece. Similarly, in the field of music, science can do much to explain the mysterious processes by which sounds reach the brain, and the mechanism by which such sounds are produced; but it is not concerned with the problem why some

combinations of sound have the power to stir human nature to its depths. Browning may have been wrong when he saw in such results

" The finger of God, a flash of the will that can,"

enabling a musician " out of three sounds to frame, not a fourth, but a star," but in any case the process is one with which science, as such, has no concern. Again, to take a still simpler illustration, the mystery of poetry is one outside the scientific ken : science can tell you the origin of words, but the scientific man, in his purely scientific capacity, can give you no explanation why we are so deeply stirred by such simple phrases as

Old unhappy far-off things
And battles long ago

or wherein lies the magic of the lines :

But at my back I always hear
Time's wingèd chariot hurrying near,
And yonder all before us lie
Deserts of vast eternity.

'The fact is that we have allowed ourselves to be hypnotized by the marvellous achievements of science into forgetting how large a part of human life and human interest lies outside its purview. The questions which most of us take an interest in discussing, such as the relative merits of our favourite authors or composers, or the beauties of nature and art, are completely outside its range.'

Selfish Mistakes.

'The heart of every Head Master knoweth its own bitterness, but I may be forgiven for thinking that the six whom we lost were among the most remarkable of their profession. Two of them, Malcolm White and Evelyn Southwell, were commemorated in a small volume privately printed, called *Two Men*, which I take leave to regard as one of the most vivid of war records.' White in his last letter to his family wrote : 'It seems to me that, if I die in this action, it gives me a great simple chance of making up for a lot of selfishness in the past, and when I want to reconcile myself to the idea of not coming back again, I just think of all those selfish mistakes I've made, and I am almost glad of the opportunity to put them right. That's my view of it. It is not priggish—I hope it doesn't sound like that.' [1]

The Spiritual Field.

'A parent walking round the grounds once said to me, " What a wonderful field you have here, Mr. Alington ! " Anxious to show how up-to-date we were, I explained that the cricket pitch was just being treated with the newest preparation. It was distressing to us both to find that he was alluding to the spiritual field.' [2]

[1] C. A. Alington, *Things Ancient and Modern*, 141.

Professor Dodd on the Atonement.

Professor Dodd in *The Parables of the Kingdom* has a searching comment in one place on *the theological problem of the Atonement*. He has no doubt that Jesus foresaw and predicted His own death. And just as certainly He proclaimed that God's Kingdom had come and was now in being, an impact upon the world of the powers of the world to come. His death, therefore, did not bring in the Kingdom and was not a piece of the Kingdom or a way of making its coming morally possible. It was itself a result and proof of the Kingdom being there. If then for Paul the Cross was the manifestation of the righteousness of God, it was because he had understood this. The death of Jesus had been part of the effective assertion of God's sovereign rule. It is the fact that Christ's death fell within the 'Kingdom of God' that compels the formulation of what Paul called a 'word of the cross.' To have the Cross as an accident of history is not only to turn from Pauline theology but from Jesus' own teaching regarding the relation between the coming of the Kingdom and His own death.

Pentecostal Power.

If we study the first three chapters of the Acts with some care, we shall find that two things are closely allied : the new surge of power, that quickening of the being which came to the company of Christians gathered in Jerusalem, and their facing the social tasks of their time. The point most often forgotten is this : the disciples received the Pentecostal power when they faced the Pentecostal task. What the experience seems to teach is a lesson of enormous significance for the Church of our day and of any day, that God gives power only to men who need it. He gives it to those who have tackled something so big, so overwhelming, that their own resources are quite insufficient. Such a tackling of a task too big for human power is the opening of the door through which there comes the rushing of a mighty wind of the spirit.[3]

[2] C. A. Alington, *Things Ancient and Modern*, 156.
[3] H. E. Luccock, *Christian Faith and Economic Change*, 201.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.