

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

at leading those who practise them to the fulfilment of their own aspirations and the satisfaction of their own desires in the person of Jesus Christ. In this way it is certain that the Christian Church as a whole would be rallied to the League of Nations in far greater strength than it is at present. 'Christi-

anity is not dead, its potential strength has lain dormant largely for lack of opportunity. Given the opportunity, there is no limit to its power for peace; add to the force of Christianity the forces of other religions and a new era might be acclaimed as dawning upon the world.'

The Witness of the Baptist to Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

WENDT,¹ in his 'Gospel according to St. John,' raised the problem of the nature and significance of the witness of the Baptist to Jesus in a form which merits closer attention than it has as yet, so far as I know, received in England or Scotland. It formed part of his examination of the historical value of the narrative portion of the Fourth Gospel. He contended that the stress laid by the Evangelist on the evidential value of the witness of the Baptist to Jesus as his appointed Successor was demonstrably unhistorical, on the ground that it was inconsistent with the evidence of our primary authorities for the life of Jesus, St. Mark and 'the Logia.' He accounted for it, as the development of an idealization of the relation between Jesus and John, the beginnings of which can already be observed in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

According to Wendt, the Baptist in St. Mark simply prophesies the advent of a 'Mightier than he.' He does not say that John saw any sign at the Baptism of Jesus, or that he bore any witness to Jesus on the strength of it. He finds a confirmation of this interpretation of the silence of St. Mark in the account in the Logia (Mt 11²⁻¹⁹, Lk 7¹⁸⁻³⁴) of the mission sent by John to Jesus from prison, asking, 'Art thou he that should come? or are we to look for another?' He regards it as inconceivable that the Baptist, if he had seen the sign, could ever after have been in doubt; or that the eulogy which Jesus pronounced on the Baptist, after the departure of the messengers, could be anything but a grateful acknowledgment of a dawning faith.

This position merits and will repay close ex-

¹ Eng. Tr., T. & T. Clark, 1903.

amination. The inquiry will enable us to test on a crucial point the historical value of the Fourth Gospel—an issue which cannot be foreclosed by purely *a priori* considerations. It ought at the same time to throw a welcome light on the place of the Baptist in the religious history of the world. In conducting our inquiry it will be well to consider separately the evidence of (1) St. Mark; (2) the non-Markan document commonly called 'The Logia,' which is assumed to have been in the hands of St. Matthew and St. Luke; (3) passages peculiar to St. Matthew; and (4) passages peculiar to St. Luke.

We begin, then, with St. Mark. The Gospel opens with a brief description of the Baptist and his preaching, especially his prophecy of the coming of one mightier. In so doing he follows the earliest Christian tradition (Ac 1²² 10³⁷ 13²⁹). According to a perfectly possible construction of his opening sentence, he even describes the Baptist's appearance as 'the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.' He proceeds at once (1⁹⁻¹¹) to the Baptism of Jesus, the Voice, and the Dove. But, strangely enough, the Baptist passes out of sight. We are not told whether he saw the Vision and heard the Voice, or not. No mention is made of any public testimony borne by him on the strength of it. Certainly, if the narrative stood alone in the Gospel, it would have been impossible to maintain, on the evidence of St. Mark, that John recognized in Jesus the Fulfiller of his prophecy. This silence is, however, at best only negative evidence for the assertion that, according to St. Mark, the Baptist bore no testimony to Jesus. And this interpretation of his silence is really precluded by the evidence,

which Wendt tries in vain to discredit, of the only other passage in his Gospel in which the baptism of John is referred to.

The scene (11²⁷⁻³³) is a familiar one. Jesus, we are told, when challenged for His credentials in the Temple courts by the Jewish authorities, instead of giving a direct answer, met His challengers by a counter question, 'the baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?' How are we to understand this reply? Is it satisfactory to regard it merely as an ingenious evasion? Would it have succeeded if that were all? The retort, to which they knew that they would lay themselves open, was, 'Why, then, did you not believe that he spoke the truth?' If this had meant merely, 'Why were you not baptized by him?' they could surely have given many plausible reasons for their neglect of the rite. And, after all, they might justifiably have challenged His right to make them prove their spiritual insight, before He chose to answer a question which they 'sitting in Moses' seat' had every right to put.

In fact, the appeal to the Baptist would have been a powerful weapon in the hands of the Jewish authorities could they have said that the one accredited Prophet of their own generation had given no countenance to the claims of Jesus.

No; the only reasonable explanation of the dilemma in which they found themselves is, that *the Baptist's witness to Jesus was a notorious fact which they could not gainsay*. And it is a very weak defence against this conclusion to urge that Jesus asks whether *the Baptism*, and not whether *the Preaching* of the Baptist was from heaven, because it was directly with the Baptism, and not with the preliminary preaching, that the witness of the Baptist to Jesus was connected. 'For this cause,' we read in the careful language of the Fourth Gospel (*i.e.* that He should be made manifest to Israel), 'came I *not* "preaching repentance," *but* "baptizing in water"' (Jn 1³¹).

I claim, therefore, St. Mark as a primary witness to the fact that the Baptist bore public testimony to Jesus as his appointed Successor.

The passage from the 'non-Markan document' (Mt 11²⁵, Lk 7^{18ff.}) is more difficult to interpret. It is no doubt strange that the Baptist should have been in any doubt—after seeing what he saw at the Baptism, and bearing witness; but Wendt goes too far when he speaks of it as 'psychologically inconceivable.' Our faith can never, so long as

we are in this world, be safe from assault. Even the Blessed Virgin herself was warned (Lk 2³⁴) that her Son would remain to the end an 'ambiguous sign,' and that a sword should pierce even through her own soul. The office and work of the Messiah present many and apparently contradictory characteristics. The trial of imprisonment to the Baptist must have been peculiarly searching; and he may well have longed for an opening of the doors of his prison-house in token of the presence and power of the Messiah, until hope deferred made the heart sick. And, even so, the question that he sent was not a recantation—it was not 'are you indeed the promised deliverer?' *but* 'are you the final consummate deliverer—or is there yet another whom God will send after you?'

These, however, are only subsidiary considerations. The key to the solution must lie in our Lord's answer. That answer was of necessity indirect. Jesus could not at that stage in His ministry publicly claim the title of Messiah. It would have led at once to dangerous popular misunderstanding. He therefore replies with an appeal partly by act, and partly by words, to the prophetic picture of the Servant of the Lord in Is 61¹. Now we have from the event and from our Lord's exposition in Lk 24 the key to the interpretation of this reply. But we must remember that all the evidence goes to show that the identification of 'the Servant' with the Royal Messiah was unknown in Jewish circles before our Lord came. So I do not myself think that Jesus could have expected the Baptist to understand the allusion, if this was the first time that he had been confronted with the identification. My contention is, that this reply is in itself evidence that the Lord and His Forerunner had arrived at a common understanding on the banks of the Jordan with regard to this principle of scriptural interpretation.

There is really a good deal of evidence in support of this contention, besides what I cannot help regarding as its inherent reasonableness. Notice first, the coherence and compactness of our Lord's public ministry, the fact that it worked out from the first to a clearly recognized and accepted goal.

This involves a clear acceptance from the first, at least by Jesus, of this principle of scriptural interpretation.

Next, it is really impossible to imagine that the intercourse between the two greatest spiritual

leaders in Israel was limited to a single silent interview on the banks of the Jordan.

I cannot myself help feeling that in the phrase, 'He that cometh after me,' we have not only a chronological note, but an assertion of 'discipleship.' And that the acceptance of Baptism by Jesus at the hands of John was formally an act of enrolment in the band of the Baptist's followers.

In any case, if Jesus brought with Him this new light from the ancient record He must have communicated it to the Master.

Whatever weight may attach to these speculations, we cannot fail to be struck by the extent to which the account of the Baptism is in the different narratives permeated by the atmosphere of Deutero-Isaiah.

(a) The Baptist, according to St. John, describes himself as 'the Voice' crying in the Wilderness (Is 40³).

(b) The words which accompanied the outpouring of the Spirit, 'The beloved in whom I am well pleased,' suggest Is 42¹.

(c) The reference to the Lamb of God recalls Is 53⁷.

(d) The text of our Lord's Sermon at Nazareth, which St. Luke connects directly with His return from the Jordan, was Is 61^{1f}.

We need not, therefore, be surprised that the same passage is echoed in our Lord's reply to the Baptist.

I conclude, therefore, that the witness of the 'Non-Marcian document' when rightly understood points, as the Gospel of St. Mark does, to the recognition of Jesus by the Baptist at the time of His Baptism. Nor do I find anything inconsistent with this view in the strong commendation which Jesus takes occasion from this mission to pass on the Baptist, after his messengers had departed. Had the words been meant to be an acknowledgment of a dawning faith, parallel to the acknowledgment that greeted St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea-Philippi, they would have been part of the message sent to John himself. Addressed to the multitudes, they are the Lord's testimony, in the hour of his weakness and of his apparent degradation, to the inherent strength of His great Forerunner.

The position of the Baptist 'outside the kingdom' involves difficulties of its own, but they are not peculiar to this passage, and we may defer consideration of them for the present.

When we pass on to 'the secondary sources,' the material peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Luke, we are arrested at once by St. Matthew's account of the Baptist's reluctance to accede to our Lord's request for Baptism at his hands, and to our Lord's answer (Mt 3^{14f}).

It calls attention to a serious difficulty in the situation. One whom we know to be immeasurably greater submits Himself to one, who not only was less, but who had the grace to be conscious of his inferiority.

It was a testing situation for both. We have nothing but the recorded words that passed between them to guide us to a solution of the difficulty.

The reluctance of the Baptist is, of course, quite natural, if we regard it simply as the instinctive recognition by a man of keen spiritual insight of the presence of a soul of perfect purity. I am inclined to suggest another, at least possible, supplementary cause for the reluctance.

The candidates for Baptism, we are told, made public confession of their sins, as each Israelite did when he brought his sin or trespass offering to the priest in the Temple. And this confession, which was made no doubt to God, would not, according to Jewish custom, be made *sotto voce*. Eli was disturbed because Hannah's prayers were inaudible. And our Lord's habit, as we see on several occasions, was to pray out loud even in His personal and direct appeals to His Father. If, therefore, He conformed to the universal custom when He came to the Baptism, He must have made a confession of sins out loud in the hearing of the Baptist.

Here we find ourselves up against a serious difficulty, which was felt quite early, as one of the Apocryphal Gospels shows, though it does not seem to have troubled the Evangelists. What place was there in a Baptism of Repentance for one who was personally sinless? What sins could He have had to confess?

Clearly, on the atomistic, individualist conception of Sin, none. But that was certainly not the view of the leaders of Israel, especially after their Return from the Captivity. Ezr 10¹, Neh 1⁶, Dn 9^{4, 20}, Bar 1^{15f}.—all felt the burthen of the national guilt the more intensely by reason of their own loyalty to the Law of God.

There would then have been nothing unusual, or unprecedented (except, indeed, in the depth and

earnestness of the confession), if Jesus had poured out His heart to the Father in humble acknowledgment of the sins of His people.

There is, of course, no direct evidence for this, but it would at least help to explain the Baptist's sense of personal inferiority; and it would help to explain the wonderful title under which the Baptist, according to St. John, introduced Jesus first to the Jews, and then to his own disciples: 'Behold the Lamb of God, who beareth (taketh away) the sin of the world.'

Our Lord's reply, 'Suffer it to be so now, for so it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,' has depths in it which I cannot pretend to have fathomed.

To 'fulfil all righteousness' must imply far more than personal conformity to any and every Divine commandment. It seems as if it must include a reference to the bringing in of the Kingdom of Heaven. Righteousness is essentially the condition of those who have been admitted into personal communion with God. It is the characteristic of members in the Kingdom. And, in face of the fact of human sin, it is the fruit of the sin-bearing. I cannot help feeling, therefore, that our Lord's share in bringing about the result lay in His conscious self-dedication to death in the waters of the Jordan for the sins of His people. And for this the co-operation of the Baptist in administering the rite, for which he had a direct Divine commission, was in some sense necessary.

It is remarkable that in the only other reference to the Baptist which is peculiar to St. Matthew (21²²) Jesus tells the Pharisees that the Baptist had come 'in the way of righteousness.'

Here again His words imply that a loyal acceptance of the Baptist's words would have led to faith in Himself. He implies, though He does not expressly affirm, a personal witness of the Baptist to Himself.

There is nothing in the matter peculiar to St. Luke that need detain us just now, though we shall have to refer later to the hint that he gives in chapter 1 of a relationship between the Mother of our Lord and the Mother of the Baptist; and to the evidence of Ac 18 and 19 to the existence of disciples of the Baptist, who even after their master's death remained outside the Church.

We must pass on to the evidence of the Gospel according to St. John.

Here no doubt the contrast is at first sight

startling. Hitherto the evidence has all been under the surface, implicit, not express. If the Synoptists stood alone we should have evidence to show that the Baptist stood at the meeting-point of the two great spiritual epochs in the world's spiritual history—the Greatest of the Old Order, the Herald of the Advent, the promised Elijah, 'the beginning of the gospel,' and yet never passing the threshold—less than the least of the New Order. We should be able to trace some of the work that he did in preparing the people for the development that was at hand. But we should have been at a loss, if we had to define precisely the positive contribution that he made to the coming in of the Kingdom.

In St. John the work of the Baptist is approached from precisely the opposite end. We hear nothing directly of the Baptist's popular preaching, or of his personal appearance, or of his tragic end. The Fourth Evangelist does not even give an account of our Lord's Baptism. Our whole attention is concentrated from the first reference in the Prologue 1⁶ to the last (10⁴¹) on his personal witness to Jesus.

We cannot help being struck by the contrast. We have, I hope, seen enough under the surface of the Synoptic narrative to be assured that it is not a contradiction.

Further consideration may help us to understand it. St. John's Gospel is what the Synoptists are not—a treatise in Christian evidences; and from this point of view the office of the Baptist stands out in a new light. It was, we may fairly say, necessary, that our Lord should appear before the people with some credentials besides the testimony of His own consciousness. The Jews themselves, we are told, had a tradition that the Messiah would be unknown until Elijah came to declare Him to the people. And our Lord on more than one occasion declared expressly that John was the Elijah whom they were expecting (Mt 11¹⁴, Mk 9¹¹⁻¹³). The Lord Himself came, as St. John tells us in his first Epistle (5⁶), by water as well as by blood; evidenced by the sign at His Baptism and all that that implied, no less than by the Crucifixion. And, that He might come 'by water,' it was necessary that the Baptist should be sent before Him. It was a true instinct that led the Evangelist to feel that faith in Christ must come for all men no less than it had come for himself, through the Baptist. 'We all believe through him' (1⁹).

At the same time there is no justification for the charge that the Evangelist has tampered with the facts in order to bolster up his theory of evidence. So far from idealizing the account of the earlier Evangelists, he simply supplies us with direct information of facts which we have already found it necessary to infer from the evidence supplied by them.

Nor is it, as Wendt suggests, a natural evolution from the faith in the relationship between the Blessed Virgin and Elizabeth, which made the Baptist's faith in the Messiahship of Jesus a foregone conclusion. The Baptist in St. John expressly declares that he knew Him not, *i.e.* as the Son of God, till he beheld the Spirit descend from heaven and abide on Him.

John tells us of an official commission (1¹⁹; cf. 2²⁶) to which the Baptist gave public and explicit testimony to Jesus on the strength of the sign that he had seen at His Baptism. He shows (5³³) how our Lord had referred to this testimony when earlier in His ministry His claims had been made the subject of an official inquiry; and His hint (10⁴¹) that the memory of the Baptist's witness was still fresh in the minds of the people when our Lord's public ministry was drawing to a close throws a flood of light on the perplexity of the Jewish authorities when challenged to declare themselves about John (Mk 11).

Even the most mysterious element in the witness of the Baptist as St. John records it, the reference to Jesus as the Lamb of God, if it is based, as I have suggested, on the prophecy of the Servant of the Lord in Is 53, reflects and receives light both from our Lord's answer to the Baptist's disciples in the non-Marcan document and from the conversation between our Lord and the Baptist recorded in St. Matthew.

There is, therefore, we may well claim, a remarkable harmony between St. John and the three earlier Gospels on the fact of the Baptist's testimony to Jesus, of a kind that is all the more convincing because it is unobtrusive and cannot have been the result of deliberate design.

There remain two difficulties, which the materials at our disposal do not enable us entirely to remove. It cannot but be strange to us to find (1) that after his experience, and after his express testimony, the Baptist should not have enrolled himself in the number of the Lord's disciples; and (2) that he should have allowed men whom he could influence

to continue to band themselves together in his name after the Lord's ministry had begun.

The facts are undoubted. Our Lord Himself calls attention to the first in the words that He uttered on the retirement of John's messengers: 'Among those that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist. But he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.'

We have also evidence for the second in the continued existence of a body of men who were known as John's disciples from each of the four Gospels and from the Acts.

Various explanations more or less convincing may be given to account for these facts. It may well be that the office which the Baptist was called to fill in preparing the nation by baptism for the coming of the Kingdom, was still incomplete when Jesus came to be baptized by him; he may have recognized that it was God's will that even after that event he should go on and finish the work that had been given him to do. The Evangelist gives us early a pregnant hint of the solution of this difficulty when he records how the Baptist described himself as 'the friend of the bridegroom.' There is no hint that he ever received and refused a call from Jesus to follow Him.

It would also be quite natural to suppose that not a few of the disciples who had gathered round him in the earlier stages of his ministry, and whom he had had time to train in regular rules of fasting and prayer, preferred to remain with their old master to carry on his work, because, content with the old wine that he had given them, they felt no irresistible attraction to make trial of the new (Lk 5³⁹). But we need not build on any such conjectural explanations as these. We may be content to know that those who record the facts from which our difficulty springs did not regard them as inconsistent with their belief that the Baptist had borne express testimony to Jesus. Indeed, the only disciple of John whom we know by name is introduced in the Acts as 'teaching accurately the things concerning Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John.' We may be reasonably sure, therefore, that if we knew all the facts our difficulty would disappear.

We conclude, then, on the concurrent testimony of all our authorities for the reconstruction of the evangelic history, not only that the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ dates from the appear-

ance of John the Baptist, though in itself that is a remarkable fact, but also, that the Baptist recognized and publicly acknowledged Jesus as his appointed successor.

The verdict on the question of historical value is emphatically in favour of St. John.

But there is another side to the question which our Lord hints at in His challenge to the Pharisees.

Granted that the Baptist bore this witness. What is the evidential value of that fact for us to-day?

For it is a fact in human history. We cannot explain away the evidence by which the fact is supported, except on grounds which would condemn us to universal historical scepticism. If, therefore, historical criticism is to vindicate its power to bring light for the lives of men from the lessons of the past, it cannot evade the challenge to give an account of a fact of once fully authenticated and of fundamental importance. If, as the opening words of 'Ecce Homo' remind us, 'the Christian Church sprang from a movement which was not begun by Christ,' men will crave to know what they are to think of the man who gave the first impulse to the movement from which Christianity sprang.

It is clear that it is not enough to speak of the Baptist vaguely as 'a product of his time.' That is at best only to restate the problem, not to solve it. For the historical problem with regard to any striking personality is, from one point of view, simply the determination of the forces, general and special, at work in his time to make him what he was. And in the case of the Baptist, as Professor Harnack has pointed out, the social and political conditions of the time will not by themselves explain the origin of the religious movement begun by John.

Nor, again, can the movement have been due entirely to the Messianic anticipations which were no doubt somehow 'in the air' at that time. Otherwise it is hard to see how the Baptist's preaching can have run so directly counter to the most strongly marked features of the popular hope. A moral and spiritual judgment, which should begin with the Chosen People, has very little in common with the Judgment which, according to the expectation of the Jews, was to break the power of Rome and set Jerusalem in its place at the head of the empire of the world.

The movement, therefore, clearly owed more to special and individual causes than to the general forces at work at the time, and it is just these special and individual causes which it is our business as historical students to determine. To this end there can be no doubt that we ought first to discover if possible what account the man gave of himself. In the case of John there is no room for hesitation about the answer. By his dress, by his action, and in express words, John claimed to have received a direct communication from God. The conviction underlying this claim was for him beyond question the decisive factor in determining the whole course of his activity. There is no room here, as we should all admit, for the hypothesis of conscious hypocrisy. So the issue narrows itself down precisely to this dilemma: 'The Baptism of John, was it from Heaven or from men?' In other words, was his claim true or false? Had he really a message from God for men, or was he in some way or other self-deluded?

Is there, then, any reason why we should despair of being able to find an answer to this question? The Baptist, as we can see from his advice to those who came to consult him, as well as from the moral earnestness which inspires his whole movement, was very far removed from a commonplace fanatic or enthusiast. He would not lightly have confounded the voice of God with fancies of his own. He was at the same time, as far as we can judge, entirely free from any taint of personal ambition, content to be himself nothing but a Witness and a Voice, if only he might prepare the way for one mightier than he, and point his own disciples away from himself to the 'Lamb of God.' It would be strange, therefore, if we were forced to believe that he was after all a prey to delusion. It would be still more strange if through this delusion he blundered on a truth of vital importance for all mankind. For we must not forget that his teaching was prophetic, and from the first claimed its final justification from the event. Within three years of his death the people in Palestine had seen enough to satisfy them. 'John,' they said, 'John indeed wrought no sign.' He came without the credentials that we are accustomed to look for in a messenger from God. But all that John said of this man was true.' And it would seem very like a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole Science of History, if, after nineteen Christian centuries, we should be asked to believe that John was after

all self-deceived, or made a more than usually lucky guess.

I do not see, therefore, how we can escape the conclusion, which was clearly our Lord's conclusion when He made the challenge first, that the Baptism

of John was from Heaven and not from men. Or, in other words, in dealing with John the Baptist we are dealing with a man through whom we must admit, if history can prove anything, that the race has come into direct and conscious contact with God.

Literature.

THE RE-VALUATION OF ST. PAUL.

NOT very long ago an experienced publisher said to a younger man who was beginning the business, that the two parts of the Bible he must not touch were Job and Paul. He would be certain to lose money on either! So far as St. Paul is concerned this prediction seems in a fair way to be falsified. Certainly among the learned there is a decided Pauline awakening. We have had 'Lives' from Dr. Glover, Professor Peabody, and Mr. C. T. Wood (to name only the most recent), and appreciations from Dr. Deissmann, Dr. D. M. Ross, and others. Of course, Paul has always attracted study, but the interesting thing about recent books is that they are all on the same lines. We hear little of 'Paulinism' at present, but a great deal about the greatness of Paul the man, and about the experience of Paul the Christian. The idea, which earlier found so much favour, that Paul was the real author of traditional Christianity, which is in sharp contrast to the simplicity of the Gospels, seems to have gone by the board, and with striking unanimity writers to-day find between Jesus and Paul an essential harmony, so that Dr. Ross can sum up the tendency of present studies by the formula 'back to Christ *with Paul*,' instead of the older formula, 'back to Christ *from Paul*.' Generally speaking, the result of contemporary work in Paul is to lay stress on his Christian experience and to strip away from this its husk, the forms in which the experience was expressed which Paul naturally adopted from his training and environment.

Will all this fresh appreciation, which might almost be called a rediscovery of Paul, succeed in including books on Paul among the 'best sellers'? Not yet, perhaps. But the effect of these fresh studies is bound to penetrate by and by to the general mind, and we do not despair of seeing Paul

and books on Paul among the favourite reading of the man in the pew. This desirable end will be furthered by two books just published which have suggested the above general reflection. Both come from Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. One is by a new writer, the Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith, and bears the suggestive title *St. Paul's Life of Christ* (7s. 6d. net). The other is a fresh contribution from the Rev. D. M. Ross, D.D., *The Spiritual Genius of St. Paul: A Contribution towards the Re-Interpretation of his Message* (7s. 6d. net).

Mr. Griffith's book is a striking and original performance. The general idea is that while Paul has left us no Life of Christ as such, he has left many hints and sketches which, when we put them together, give us a general outline of Paul's own conception of Christ's life in time and in eternity. This Life was written in Paul's experience. It was part of him. It was continually being annotated and enlarged. Mr. Griffith whimsically calls it the 'Pauline Q,' because we are bound to suppose it, and can trace it everywhere though we can discover it nowhere! There was a prologue to it written on the heart of Saul, and this pre-Christian, Pharisaic life of the still unconverted Saul is reconstructed by the author with a vividness and suggestiveness which make this part of the book a really brilliant and original contribution. In a second chapter the author gathers together all the passages in Paul which contain suggestions for the 'Life,' following this up by a summary and review of its different 'Chapters.' The first chapter is in eternity, the second is Christ's cosmic activity in the making of the worlds, the third is Christ in the experience of men (before His Incarnation). Then the Incarnate stage. Then the Cross. Then the Resurrection life. Then the Return. And finally the 'End,' the consummation of Redemption. The rest of the book is occupied with the enlargement and exposition