

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

masquerades as orthodoxy, that the Lord Jesus Christ by His death, His decease, His exodus, which He accomplished at Jerusalem, reconciled, appeased, propitiated His Father and ours, as if He were a gigantic Shylock who would not pardon His children, no matter how penitent, until He had had his 'pound of flesh' (in the blood of His dear Son). This parody of the Atonement is hideous, pagan, God-dishonouring, and is, I am persuaded, responsible for countless multitudes of unbelievers and scoffers. The death of Christ does not mean Christ reconciling God, but God in Christ reconciling us. According to the Apostle Paul in Ro 5¹¹, it is not God, but we, who receive the atonement. It is perhaps worth noticing, in passing, that this is the only place in which the word atonement occurs in the 1611 version of the New Testament. In the 1881 Revised Version it does not occur at all, reconciliation being substituted for atonement, and the text reading, 'We rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.' Let us try simply to illustrate. Two friends have quarrelled. The guilty one, conscious of his guilt, fears even to attempt to restore the old relationship, lest he should be indignantly spurned. But the one sinned against longs for reconciliation, for the restoration of the old comradeship. And so he awaits his opportunity. Then at a convenient season, Christmas or a birthday, he sends his estranged friend a gift, writes a letter, gives some token, which indicates that on his side no barrier to reconciliation exists. God so loved and longed for the world, guilty, foolish, misunderstanding, wandering, that He gave His love-gift, His best, His only-begotten Son, so that in Him whosoever will may return to the Father's heart and the Father's home.

V. It was a *redeeming*, delivering, liberating act. Let us think of the suggestion of the word *exodus*, 'his exodus which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem.' Our thoughts turn naturally to

the historic Exodus, when Moses, no slave himself, but a prince, 'the son of Pharaoh's daughter' (He 11²⁴), led his enslaved brethren out of the dreadful bondage of Egypt. So Jesus, 'Our Prince Leader in the faith' (He 12², Weymouth), leads His people out of a bondage more terrible by far than the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt. What bondage is this? The bondage of sin, the Egypt of self, what Paul calls the flesh, the lower, self-centred, self-regarding, earthward-looking nature. Self is the Egypt from which we sorely need redemption, deliverance, liberation. Paul suggests this in a great saying, which rewards careful analysis. To the Corinthians he writes: 'Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price' (1 Co 6^{19, 20}). Bought from whom? The old master, of course. Who was he? Not the devil, as Irenæus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and others supposed. The Apostle does not say, 'Ye are not the devil's, for ye were bought with a price.' What he does say is, 'Ye are not *your own*, for ye were bought with a price.' The old master then is self, the old proud, greedy, tyrannous self, who indeed is 'the very devil,' so perhaps Origen was not so far wrong after all. 'Ye are not *your own*,' says the Apostle. You used to be. Self was the old Master, and a pretty tyrant he was. Matheson says, in his great work on the Book of Revelation, that the number of the Beast is number one. But now you have been redeemed, delivered, released, liberated, set free from that worse than Egyptian bondage. How? Through Christ Jesus. When He gives Himself to the receptive, welcoming heart, we receive His spirit, His life, His very blood; so to speak, that blood which, as S. Ignatius said, is eternal love. Then we undergo a progressive, inner, spiritual transfiguration. We are redeemed from the Egyptian bondage of self. 'The law,' the principle, the power 'of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus makes us free,' liberates, redeems, delivers us, 'from the law,' the principle, the power, 'of sin and of death' (Ro 8²).

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

PROFESSOR WOBBERMIN is one of the most instructive writers in modern theology, uniting, as he does, clear vigour of thought with an almost unailing

lucidity of expression. His eminence in his own country has recently been acknowledged by the publication of a special number of the famous *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, composed of essays written in his honour. More than one of

these dwells upon the religio-psychological standpoint for which Wobbermin has impressively contended now for many years, and which has gathered keen adherents.

This new work,¹ though short, is a valuable guide for those who wish for orientation in the present-day field of Dogmatics. It is directed against the Historism and Psychologism (to use terms we may not love, but can hardly dispense with) which, rightly or wrongly, have been charged upon Troeltsch, as well as against Karl Barth's treatment of the problems these terms represent. A subjective psychologism in theology, though certain expressions may be doubtful, was not really taught by Schleiermacher, to whom the consciousness of dependence and relation to God were two names for one thing. But it appeared indubitably in the Erlangen School, who built theology out from inward Christian experiences instead of guiding themselves directly by revelation. Wobbermin's eyes are resolutely open to Schleiermacher's defects, but he holds that a line can be drawn from Luther, through the best things in Schleiermacher, to meet present needs; a line that can be maintained firmly against traditional orthodoxy on the one hand, and rationalism on the other.

There are seven chapters, devoted to the modern crisis, theology as a science, the relation of theology to psychology and ethics, the Church, revelation, faith, and Scripture. All are well worth study, and serve admirably their purpose of placing the reader *en rapport* with the living issues of the hour. They cannot be here studied in detail, but any one who wishes to taste Wobbermin's quality at its best may be advised to read his observations on the religious truth Kant missed by his rigid emphasis on the autonomy of morality; or again, his important pages on the New Testament conception of the Church, and the distinction he rightly finds in apostolic thought between the Church as the object of faith and the Church as acting ecclesiastically, *i.e.* exhibiting in a real degree the marks of an organized society. Still more important is his emphasis on the close relation in which the *fides qua creditur* necessarily stands to the *fides quae creditur*. 'Faith as a subjective attitude of the believer can only be understood by reference to its objective content or counterpart.' This counterpart is, of course, revelation. And Wobbermin makes the good point that *all* revelation is supernatural; there can be no such thing as a purely

natural revelation. We cannot really know God except as He desires to be known and makes Himself apprehensible; no view of God that grew up 'of itself' in the human mind, owing nothing to God's self-disclosing action, could have any value.

Barth's services in the fight against Historism and Psychologism are warmly acknowledged. But he is charged with falling back into an unfortunate dogmatism, which prevents his being fully sensitive to the need for historical research; nor does he do justice to the truth which Psychologism caricatures, *viz.* the need to get at the inmost intentions and motives of faith which lie behind doctrinal expressions, so as to interpret these expressions from within. Too often 'religion' on Barth's lips is equivalent to magic. His dialectic method runs the danger of inviting once more the deleterious influence of speculative thought in theology; and significantly enough, he makes Scripture only one source for Dogmatics amongst others. Other criticisms are to the effect that Barth defines theology as the science of God, so reverting to scholasticism; that he makes man evil as such, *i.e.* verges on Manicheanism; and that his view of revelation is gravely intellectualistic. One may acknowledge the detailed force and point of most of this without at all ceasing to feel the religious power of Barth's teaching as a whole. Nothing but good can result from such carefully considered criticism of a thinker who deserves all the critical care that can be spent upon him.

One point on our own account. Wobbermin, on p. 109, quotes Luther as contending that the Divine promise and human faith are correlative. Then he adds, still reporting Luther's thought, 'where there is no promise, there can be no faith; *and, conversely, where faith is lacking, the promise is nothing.*' But surely the italicized words are either but a rhetorical expression of the fact that a promise not received by faith misses its mark, or they are wholly wrong. My lack of faith does not make the promise void. I have no doubt Wobbermin would cordially agree, but it will not do even to *seem* to invest faith with a quasi-creative power, when, in point of fact, it is but a response to the initial self-unveiling act of God. Any ambiguity on this point—and in theology we are inevitably judged by our words rather than our intentions—immediately forms a full justification for Barth's insistence on the sovereign priority of God in everything that concerns salvation. The point I am insisting on has been made so forcibly and felicitously by Wobbermin himself elsewhere in

¹ *Richtlinien evangelischer Theologie*. By Professor Georg Wobbermin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, pp. 145).

this candid and readable book that it is perhaps ungrateful to dwell upon it now.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

Two articles in the last number of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*¹ are devoted to Ecclesiasticus: one in French, by Dom Donatien de Bruyne, which deals with the prologue, the title, and the conclusion, and emphasizes the complicated nature of both the Greek and Latin texts; the other, by Gottfried Kuhn, offering textual notes on the first sixteen chapters. Starting from the prohibition in Ex 20⁴, Obbink, of Utrecht, discusses the question of Jahweh-images, and concludes by denying their existence. Jeroboam's bull, for example, was really a pedestal on which the unseen Jahweh sat (cf. the Ark). The images used in the Jahweh cult were not images of Jahweh, but symbols borrowed from heathen worship, and what the commandment forbids is this syncretistic Baalization of Jahweh. In a grammatical discussion which carefully considers all the relevant passages, Professor Albrecht argues that in the Old Testament **PN** never stands before a nominative, while the use of **PN** with a passive is confined to its connexion with an infinitive and with the passive forms of **PN**. W. W. Cannon, discussing Is 61¹⁻³, maintains that it is an Ebed-Jahweh poem. He points out its affinities with the other four poems, but admits that it adds nothing to our knowledge of the character or career of the Servant: it is the picture of him 'as he appeared before the promise of his radiant youth was obscured and blotted out by disaster, ruin, and death.'

J. E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Francis of Assisi.²

THE new series of the 'Sammlung Ausgewählter Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte Quellenschriften,' to which students of Church History are already indebted, now provides in this monograph an excellent source-book for the study of the saint. It is a new edition, by Professor Wiegand, of Boehmer's collection of the works of Francis, with some textual and bibliographical notes. The authentic writings come first, then the four doubtful works, including the exposition of the Lord's Prayer,

¹ 1929, Heft 4 (Töpelmann, Giessen; M.4.50).

² *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.3.40).

and finally the spurious Regula. To these are appended a number of personal data about the saint and his rule, including testimonies regarding the stigmata. Those who cannot acquire a large edition of the works of Francis are amply provided for by this cheap and scholarly book. It ought to be in the hands of any one interested in the saint, for it gives his actual writings in Latin, with the famous canticle of the Sun in its mixture of Latin and Italian. Certainly there is no handbook for students of Francis to be compared with this. Both editor and publishers are to be congratulated on its appearance.

Luther on Hebrews.³

LUTHER lectured on the Epistle to the Hebrews at an early stage of his career, in 1517-18. His lectures lack the maturity of those on Romans, but they possess an interest of their own as reflecting the writer's mind. Thus, as Herr Vogelsang points out, Luther betrays a distinct linguistic care, which is allied to the humanistic culture of the day; he is alive to the need of accurate exegesis in order to understand Scripture. He criticises, on the basis of Hebrews, the contemporary Roman church with its pilgrimages and fasts and external ceremonies. But he distinguishes sharply between the humanistic conception of a religious morality and the Christian stress on repentance and forgiveness. The lectures on Hebrews give him the opportunity of bringing out this contrast and of reiterating the quality of faith as a personal attitude towards God for which the individual is responsible, an attitude which corresponds to the revelation of God in Christ as the sinless High Priest.

Herr Vogelsang discusses such aspects of the lectures mainly with a view to elucidating the relation of Luther towards Humanism. His essay appears in the wake of two separate editions of the lectures, one by Ficker and the other by Hirsch and Rueckert, so that the student is now equipped with all material needful.

The Ottoman Turks.⁴

THE recent *volle face* on the part of Turkey gives point to Herr Tschudi's fresh and admirably clear

³ *Luthers Hebraerbrief-Vorlesung* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.80).

⁴ *Vom Alten Osmanischen Reich*, von Professor Rudolf Tschudi (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.80).

sketch of the Ottoman Turks as they came forward ultimately in the rôle of champions of Islam. He argues, with many modern scholars, that it was the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders of Christendom in 1204, not the final seizure by the Turks in 1453, which proved fatal to New Rome. The historical reasons for the push of the Turks into the West are analysed in the light of recent researches by Giese and Silberschmidt, and high praise is given to the sultan Mahomed II. for his patronage of culture as well as for his astute religious policy. Oddly enough, the friendly attitude of this sultan in the fifteenth century has been reproduced to-day by the nationalistic movement in Turkey, which has at once sought some approximation to European civilization and, as the price of this gain, repudiated the pan-Islamic rôle of the earlier Ottoman conquerors.

order to do justice to the characteristic belief. All such categories, according to Herr Stauffer, go back to the intuition of the resurrection of Jesus as an act of God in the world-order, and he discusses in this relation the prophetic consciousness and the primitive attempts to explicate such supernatural phenomena in other faiths. There is an excellent analysis of the martyr-consciousness in Paul and in Ignatius, on the lines of Lohmeyer, but Herr Stauffer's real service is that he brings out the originality of the Christian consciousness even as he discusses what is common to its categories of expression and those of contemporary religion. He has struck out a new line of discussion, which is fruitful, more fruitful for theology than much of what is being written by adherents of the 'Formgeschichte' school.

New Testament Thinking.¹

HERR STAUFFER'S pamphlet is concerned with the methods used by the New Testament writers, especially St. Paul, in stating their convictions. This morphology he distinguishes from 'Formgeschichte,' the latter dealing with æsthetic and literary or historical data, the former with the logic of thought. He starts from the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, where historical assertion accompanies proof from Scripture and religious intuition, the argument being progressive and helped out by analogies and axioms. The Apostle, he argues, like the other writers of the primitive Church, uses traditional forms in order to state his intuitions. This took place in a world where the Greek mind was primarily interested in the being of God, and the Jewish mind in the rules governing the relationship between God and man. In the Mandæan theology Herr Stauffer discovers a third type of thought, which emphasized the name of the Deity, whereas the Greek stressed the conception and the Jew the regulations of the Deity. In Paul and the other New Testament writers the category is represented by terms like ἀρχή, τέλος, ὄρα, καιρός, αἰών, and μαρτυρία, since the fact of the Resurrection (ἐγγήρηται) necessitated such new forms of expression and categories of thought in

¹ *Grundbegriffe einer Morphologie des Neutestamentlichen Denkens*, by E. Stauffer (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M. 3).

The Primitive Soul.²

IN this lecture, delivered last August at Lund, Professor Bertholet compares the two conceptions of the soul in primitive life. Some held that this 'something' which made a man a living being was a sort of semi-spiritual stuff, connected with his hair or blood. Such a view, which practically identified the soul with a power of life or a substance of vital energy, is called 'dynamismus.' On the other hand, the soul might be conceived as a personal power personality which resides in the body and may leave it as in a trance. This is termed 'Personalismus.' The latter is to be traced in Greek religion and in Persian. After a brief study of the data furnished by comparative religion, the author points out that our conventional distinction between personality and power did not exist for the 'primitive mind'—a statement which hardly answers to the facts of the case. The argument of the lecture, which is alert and incisive, is that the assumption of the personal idea being necessarily later than the dynamical is not well founded; also it marks a reaction against the 'rational' element in animistic theories like those of E. B. Tylor.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

² *Dynamismus und Personalismus in der Seelenauffassung*, by Alfred Bertholet. In the 'Sammlung gemeinverstaendlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte' (Mohr, Tübingen; M. 1.80).