

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

As this number is not only the first of a new volume, but also marks the beginning of the forty-first year of the Magazine, a short Foreword may be permitted. There have been letters of congratulation, very encouraging to receive, from all parts of the globe, and some of them from men who had subscribed from the very first number. Of Dr. Hastings' first number a contemporary wrote that he saw in it at once 'the promise and the potency and the certainty of life.' He was right in his forecast, for the circulation not only holds its own but increases steadily year by year. Nor does the standpoint change. Dr. Moffatt once described it as 'a steady adherence to the beliefs of Christianity, interpreted by the fresh results of criticism. Men came to see,' Dr. Moffatt continued, 'that Dr. Hastings knew how these could be held without evasion, and that he was ready to put the best available information at the disposal of not only scholars but his fellow Ministers.'

All the old features will be found in the new volume. The surveys of 'Recent Foreign Theology,' which keep readers in touch with everything of importance in theological thought abroad, will, as formerly, be in the capable hands of Professors J. E. McFadyen, Moffatt, H. R. Mackintosh, Tasker, and Principal A. E. Garvie.

The sermons given 'In the Study' will again follow *The Christian Year*. Readers might note that MSS. of children's sermons for special occasions should reach us two months before the date for which they are intended.

'Entre Nous,' besides its usual items, will contain from time to time studies of the religious motif in some of the best contemporary fiction.

In 1929 to 1930 there will be three new series of

articles. One will survey the contribution of Britain, America, France, and Germany respectively to Old Testament science, New Testament science, Systematic Theology, and Church History. The Old Testament articles will be done by Professor J. M. Powis Smith, Chicago (America); Professor A. R. Gordon, Montreal (Germany); and Dr. Arthur R. Siebens, Chicago (France). Germany's contribution in the other fields will be surveyed by Professor Völrath, Erlangen (Systematic Theology); Professor James Mackinnon, Edinburgh (Church History); and Professor Dr. Martin Dibelius, Heidelberg (N.T.). Fuller particulars will appear later.

'The Cries from the Cross' will be the subject of the expository series of studies.

Under the general title 'The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day,' pressing ethical questions will be discussed, such as marriage, wealth, war, self-expression, commercial morality, education, and women and the ministry. Canon Charles E. Raven will write on the last named, and Professor John M'Murray on self-expression. Contributors whose articles will appear shortly will include The Bishop of Winchester; Dean Inge; Dean Simpson; Professor B. W. Bacon, 'The Blessing of the Peacemakers'; Rev. F. J. Rae, 'Education and Religion'; Dr. Rendel Harris, 'A Western Gloss in John 2<sup>9</sup>'; Professor A. J. Gossip; Professor Fulton; Principal W. M. M'Gregor; Professor J. A. Robertson; Professor W. A. Curtis, 'A Study of our Lord's Temptation'; Rev. J. A. Morrison, 'Miracle and Natural Law'; and Mrs. J. A. Robertson, 'Religion and the Drama.' It is hoped also to survey soon the present position of Archæological Study.

The Fourth Gospel seems to be coming back to its own among scholars, and if so, this will be a great boon not only to Christian thought, but to the ordinary Bible reader. For a considerable time we have been accustomed to see this Gospel and its witness put aside because of the uncertainty of date and authorship. The Synoptists have alone been treated as an authority on the ministry of Christ. The result of all this has been a neglect of St. John which has seriously impoverished Christian faith. The trend back to a more positive and confident position has been definite and reassuring.

Canon Scott Holland did excellent service some years ago by his little book in which he pointed out that a ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem was so likely that for Jesus to neglect the centre of His people's faith and life was unthinkable. Lord Charnwood as a layman also made a helpful contribution. But it is Dr. BERNARD's great work on the Gospel that has, as it were, concentrated the trend towards a new confidence in it. Two of the reviews have long and elaborate articles on Dr. BERNARD's commentary—the *Church Quarterly*, and the *London Quarterly*. It may be useful to summarize briefly the points to which the two writers draw attention.

First about the authorship, and along with that naturally the historical trustworthiness. It is generally agreed to-day that the author knew Mark and Luke, and freely corrected them. Further, it is agreed that the book is the work of an Aramaic, not a Greek, mind. Also, that, when the chronology of the Fourth Gospel conflicts with that of the Synoptists, the former is to be preferred. There is general agreement that the Gospel was written between 90 and 98. And there is a general agreement to attribute it, if not to an eye-witness, at least to an intimate acquaintance of an eye-witness.

Dr. BERNARD believes that the Gospel was written by 'John the Presbyter.' But the 'ultimate author' was the Apostle John. He was the 'witness' to whom the writer refers. And therefore it is his evidence the Gospel contains for the words

and deeds of Jesus. Just as Mark has the authority of Peter behind it, though *written* by Mark, so the Fourth Gospel, though *written* by the Presbyter, has the authority of John the Apostle behind it. This is an attractive theory, because it explains how the words of Jesus have filtered through another mind and been modified in the process. It explains the difference in form of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists and in St. John.

But the writer of the *Church Quarterly* article refuses to follow Dr. BERNARD in this matter. And he has a good deal to say for himself. His main point about 'John the Presbyter' is that there was no such person. The authority for his existence is a famous passage in Papias who refers to 'the Presbyter John.' The *Church Quarterly* writer, Mr. Fremeneere, contends that this was the Apostle. The Apostles were referred to as elders. Peter calls himself an elder (1 P 5<sup>1</sup>). In short, there was only one John. Further, to clinch the matter, it is pointed out that the Gospel actually identifies the *writer* of the Gospel and the *witness* to its facts: 'the disciple who is witnessing concerning these things and wrote these things' (Jn 21<sup>24</sup>). If 'John the Presbyter' is disposed of, then there remains only the Apostle as the sole author.

Another point of great importance is the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists. This is generally represented as one of contrast, greatly to the prejudice of the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptists are historical, the Fourth Gospel is unhistorical. An effort has even been made, as in the able book of Dr. L. A. Muirhead, to show that the incidents in John are allegories, not facts. This contrast is, however, fast disappearing under the hands of scholars. The tradition in John is in some respects proved to be more primitive than that in the Synoptists. Dr. BERNARD contends that the Fourth Gospel represents faithfully John's picture of Jesus Christ. Matthew Arnold's opinion is quoted that 'the fundamental themes of Jesus [in John] we maintain to be no "arid mysteries" at all, but to be in profound unison with "the sublime and pregnant discourses of the Sea of Galilee";

and we do not see who was capable of uttering them but Jesus.'

---

The special point of contrast which used to be maintained was the Christology of John. It was regarded as very different from that of the Synoptists. But closer study has dissipated this impression. The claims made for Jesus in Mark are as high as any that could be made. Further, there is nothing in John which is not implicit in Paul's Epistles, and these were written and published before the Gospels. In short, the contrast between the Synoptists and John, which was one of the strongest influences weakening the hold of the Fourth Gospel on Christian minds, does not exist. It is one of the great merits of Dr. BERNARD'S great work that he has made this clear in detail.

---

In many quarters we hear of the necessity of a restatement of Christian dogma in view of modern thought, and naturally we turn with interest to what is probably the most recent discussion of this subject. It is contained in the composite volume, *Dogma* (reviewed in another column), and comes from the pen of Professor H. MAURICE RÆLTON of King's College, London, with whose essay of forty-six pages on 'The Reconstruction of Dogma' the volume concludes.

---

The essay begins with an attempt to define Christianity. This is natural enough, as it is the dogmatic effort of Christianity that is *sub judice*. But the author might well have compressed this discussion and left more space for the development of his views on the nature of the reconstructed dogma. While we say this, we appreciate the point that a discussion of the question whether the original Christianity is truly represented by the phrase 'Jesus the worshipper' in contradistinction to the phrase 'Jesus worshipped' is a necessary preliminary to the question of the need of the reconstruction of historical Christianity in the light of modern thought.

---

For answer to the question, What was Christianity? Dr. RÆLTON maintains that the life of

Jesus of Nazareth cannot be divorced from the Life of the Christ of the Creeds, as this is witnessed to by Christian experience. Accordingly he finds at the heart of the Christian religion nothing less than the Dogma of the God-Man. Christianity must stand or fall ultimately, he says, by its adherence to or rejection of this concept of the Incarnation.

---

It follows that, if this be true, the Christian philosopher is committed to some form of Dualism. He is not free to accept either an absolute Monism or a thoroughgoing Pluralism as the solution of the Cosmic problem. But neither absolute Monism nor thoroughgoing Pluralism, nor indeed any other system of philosophy, is within measurable distance of being *the* philosophy of the twentieth century, and therefore *the* philosophy in terms of which we must present our faith for acceptance to-day. Thus we need not be afraid of being philosophically out of court if we seek to ally ourselves with a Dualistic type of philosophy.

---

On the other hand, restatement in terms of modern thought to-day is hindered by the fact that philosophical opinion is in a chaos. It is also hindered by the fact that the results of historical and Biblical study are as yet insufficiently determinate for the purposes of a restatement comparable in scope to that of the ancient formularies. Indeed Dr. RÆLTON is so impressed by the magnitude of these hindrances that the time does not appear to him to be ripe for a re-formulation of the Christian Faith.

---

But there is one modern philosophy, he avers, in which the doctrine of the Incarnation as the Church conceives it can find no adequate place. It is the modern philosophy of change, by which he means the philosophy which, abandoning the concept of Transcendence with the associated ideas of creation and a twofold order—heavenly and earthly—of reality, reads reality not as Being but as Becoming, not as a static changelessness but as a dynamic change. Such a philosophy appears to leave no room for that conception of God in relation to the world and human life which is indissolubly bound up with the Dogma of the God-Man. If the modern philosophy of change cannot entertain

the concept of Transcendence, Christian theology can have no part with it.

---

What kind of synthesis, then, between the concepts of Immanence and Transcendence is needed if we are to build up a distinctive Christian philosophy in which the full content of our Christian Faith shall find adequate intellectual formulation? It is the synthesis for which Christian Theism stands. Christian Theism lifts the whole problem of the One and the Many, of Monism and Pluralism, of Transcendence and Immanence, into the realm of ethical and spiritual, as distinguished from ontological, relationships. It deals in terms of personality. It is committed to the concept of finite created personality in relation to the Absolute Personality of God. In this concept alone is contained the view of the relation of God to the world which is most consistent with the whole content of experience, including, as this must, religious experience, or the experience of the soul in communion with God.

---

Dr. RELTON concludes by describing the kind of basis upon which he would reconstruct dogma in terms of modern thought. It would be upon the threefold foundation of Tradition, Reason, and Experience. A theology thus constructed would be saved at once from traditionalism, intellectualism, and emotionalism.

---

It would seek to do justice to historical Christianity as this presents itself in the form of the Catholic Faith supernaturally originated and historically mediated. It would submit the Catholic Faith to the considered judgment of the human reason. It would also submit the Catholic Faith as thus tested and judged to the verdict of disciplined experience. If such a presentation of historical Christianity critically sifted were found to answer to the needs of human life, we should be justified in regarding it as an adequate and satisfying reconstruction of dogma.

---



---

Who was the Rich Young Ruler who came to Jesus and asked about eternal life? The Rev.

T. A. MOXON believes firmly that it was St. Paul, and he gives his reasons in a rather fascinating article in the current *Church Quarterly Review* with the title 'Did St. Paul see Jesus Christ in the Flesh?' The writer begins by insisting that the invitation Jesus extended to the young man was one to apostleship. It was couched in exactly the same terms as Jesus used when He called Peter and Andrew and Matthew: 'Leave all and *follow me.*' If the young man was St. Paul, then this was his call to apostleship and his title to be regarded as one of the band.

---

The proof of the identification proceeds on two lines. The first claim is that the description given of the Young Ruler is in complete harmony with all we know of Paul's early life. St. Luke tells us that he was a 'ruler,' which means a prominent young member of the sect of the Pharisees. But we know of St. Paul that he was just that. He was educated in Jerusalem as a Pharisee under Gamaliel, and he was evidently destined for a high place in the official body. Again, when we remember Paul's deep dissatisfaction with the Law, and his autobiographical statement of this in Ro 7, is not this an echo of the young ruler's 'all these have I kept, but there is a lack yet'?

---

Again, the young man had 'great<sup>r</sup> possessions.' Now Paul was obviously poor. But he cannot have been of a poor family. He had an expensive education. And, as Ramsay pointed out in 'St. Paul the Traveller,' his long stay at Cæsarea in 'free custody' was only possible to a man of means. Besides, Felix evidently expected a large bribe from him. And finally, the appeal to Cæsar was a very costly business. Ramsay suggests that Paul had inherited the family fortune at this time. In any case he had been a 'rich young ruler.' Is it not more than possible that, when he became a Christian, he obeyed the demand of Jesus to give up his wealth and position?

---

Further, it is often assumed that Paul was absent from Jerusalem when Jesus was there. But what ground is there for this assumption? He was

brought up in Jerusalem ; he had family links with the city ; he had a nephew there ; he was residing there shortly after the birth of the Church. The incident of the Young Ruler occurred shortly before the Crucifixion, and Paul's presence at the same time may be regarded as probable.

Finally, there are two statements of Paul's which appear to be conclusive in support of the belief that he had personal dealings with our Lord, and any attempt to explain them away seems to be an abuse of the plain meaning of words. The first is in 2 Co 5<sup>16</sup>, 'Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.' The second is 1 Co 9<sup>1</sup>, 'Am I not an apostle? . . . Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' Most commentators refer these words to the vision on the Damascus road. But, as a matter of fact, Paul is maintaining, in answer to his critics, that he has had personal knowledge of Jesus Christ, and

claims the title of apostle on that ground. If his only claim was the vision on the road to Damascus, the claim is pretty thin. But if Paul had seen Jesus and received the call 'follow me,' then his claim was unanswerable.

The second ground on which Mr. MOXON identifies Paul and the Young Ruler is that, if it is valid, certain incidents in Paul's life are explained that would otherwise be inexplicable. This part of the article is not so persuasive as the first part. But the trend of it is very much as follows. The 'goads' against which Paul had evidently been kicking were the thoughts and feelings aroused in him by the words of Jesus when He demanded a full surrender. They had been rankling in his mind, and he had tried to still them by his fierce opposition to the infant Church. The incident of the Gospels explains the whole of Paul's inner life before his conversion.

---

## A. S. Peake.

BY PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE, D.D., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

I FIRST came to know Peake when he was an undergraduate of St. John's College, Oxford, and we were both studying theology. We used to meet at Dr. Fairbairn's house, at various lectures, and at debating societies, and soon struck up a firm friendship. He was a quiet, gentle, unassuming little man, delicate even then, with no capacity for games, and taking little or no interest in ordinary undergraduate pursuits. By the student he was set down as a smug, but to those who really knew him he soon stood out as a man of mark. His conversational powers were extraordinary. We often spent the afternoon in a dinghy on the upper river—I sculling, while he steered a most erratic course, talking all the time. His subject was theology in some shape or form. We were both attending the lectures of Driver, Cheyne, and Sanday, and making acquaintance for the first time with the higher criticism of the Bible, then a new, and to most people rather terrible, thing. Peake reacted to it very characteristically. He had been brought up in the old orthodoxy, but

with a minute knowledge of, and intense affection for, the Bible. But he was very conscious of the difficulties which the old position raised, and he welcomed Pentateuch criticism in particular as an obvious way out. He set himself to master it, and was never weary of discussing the problem how to make criticism positive and constructive, an aid to faith rather than a hindrance. His whole bent of mind in these early and formative years but anticipated what was afterwards to become his life's work. He won the Denyer and Johnson Theological Scholarship, and took a first-class in the school, and immediately on taking his degree was appointed tutor in Hebrew and Old Testament in Mansfield College. No sooner had he begun work there than he was elected to a Theological Fellowship at Merton. At the time this was a remarkable appointment, seeing that he was a layman and a Nonconformist, and could only have been possible in the case of a very exceptional man. Peake continued to teach at Merton and Mansfield together, but only for a short time. His heart