

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IF our age rejoices in its rediscovery of the human Jesus it would appear now to be following that up with a rediscovery of the humanness of Paul. Paul is no longer studied as a stern logician or a systematic theologian; he is seen to be above all a Christian believer who speaks out of his own experience, and a missionary preacher whose supreme and passionate desire is to interpret and commend the grace of Christ to men. From this point of view Dr. J. Ernest RATTENBURY has given us a most illuminating study of his Epistles. The title of the book is *The Testament of Paul* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), and it is defined in the subtitle as being 'studies in doctrines born of evangelical experience.'

Few are better qualified than Dr. RATTENBURY to speak of evangelical experience. 'For many years I have worked among degenerate people, and have witnessed miracles which divine grace has wrought in the souls of men and women who have had no difficulty whatever in understanding Paul's evangelical theology, and who, by the practice of it, have been lifted from graves of loathsome sin to the shining heights of the heavenly places in Christ Jesus; and I have felt repeatedly, while reading learned books on Paul, that the simple experiences of such people throw a clearer light upon his letters than the words of many of his commentators.' Perhaps Dr. RATTENBURY spends too much time on an exposition and defence of religious experience, and Christian experience in particular, but his

justification is that it has so often been ignored by those who profess to make a scientific study of the Christian facts. 'It is simply amazing that men who stress the importance of scientific history should fail to see the unscientific character of their non-empirical dogmas.' There is a path of direct access through personal experience for which learning is no substitute, and without which the greatest scholar remains for ever an outsider. 'I know,' said Deissmann, 'when I begin an academic lecture on Jesus, that there is an unacademic way to Jesus, and that it is the best way, because it is open to all.'

St. Paul was the subject of a rich Christian experience. 'Paul's experience may be summarized as one of intimate friendship with his unseen Lord, beginning in the extraordinary personal experience of his conversion, but continuing through a life of outward elation and depression, struggle and difficulty, success and discouragement, expressing itself in heroic deeds, constant preaching of God's love for men, as well as in the vigorous thinking which is transmitted to us in his letters. He became a new creature; all things became new. Apart from his experience these things could not have been. Everything which he did of distinctive value to the world issued from his vital and vitalizing experience of God in Christ.'

Reflecting on his experience, St. Paul was faced with a great moral problem, the problem of his own

justification and of God's righteousness in justifying him. His thoughts on the Atonement have often been criticized as unethical, but this is completely to misunderstand them. 'Whether or no Paul was successful, he was the pioneer in ethical treatment of the experiences of salvation, and his doctrines were his solution of the ethical problem which his experience raised. So far from thinking of him as the preacher of unethical evangelical doctrines, men should realize that he was really the first preacher of an ethical evangelism; that he stood supremely for a proclamation of righteousness, both man's and God's—God is Himself just and yet the justifier of sinners who believe.'

What is the ethical problem? It is the problem of God's righteousness in forgiving sin and treating the sinner as if he were guiltless. This problem is not created by Paul's theology, but arises out of the teaching of Christ Himself. Is it fair that the labourers in the vineyard who did a little work in the cool of the evening should be made equal to those who bore the burden and heat of the day? Is it fair that the prodigal son, and not his hard-working brother, should get the ring and the robe and the fatted calf? Is it fair that he who has merited condemnation should be acquitted, and instead of the punishment he has deserved should receive a royal welcome? To this problem Paul set himself, for he saw that it touches on the very righteousness of God. 'An interpretation of the Epistle to the Romans which ignores the fact that its author is as much concerned to prove that God is just as that He is the justifier of men ignores what is obviously fundamental in its teaching.'

Paul found the solution of the problem in the Fatherhood of God. Dr. RATTENBURY stresses, perhaps excessively, what he calls 'the family solution of Paul's ethical problem.' 'Now we come to what we believe to be the key for solving Paul's ethical problem—namely, that his experience of God in Christ was a filial experience in the context of the family life. He had left the law court—he forgot the things that were behind. He found nothing but despair in his futile moral struggles.

He found in Christ a deliverer. And in Christ, who was revealed in him as God's Son, he found the Father. What he discovered was the ethics of the family, and he was satisfied that they were higher than those of the law court. . . . His justification was by faith—by trust in a Father's heart. Of course, in a sense it was not justification. Justification is a term that belonged to the law court. But when Paul spoke to men under the Law, or in their hearing, he was compelled to use the language they understood.'

To the objection that justification is a fiction—for if Paul was really a wrongdoer no amount of calling him good would make him good—Dr. RATTENBURY replies, 'But is this valid criticism? Is not this the only commonsense method of making anybody good? Is it not the very method pursued by all modern educationalists? Is it not precisely the method pursued by Jesus in all His dealing with degenerates, such as the woman in Simon the Pharisee's house and Zacchæus? . . . That is the way in which God treats a man. When a sinner He calls him; when a sinner is responsive and trustful, He justifies him—that is, He treats the sinner as if he were righteous (after all, it is God's way, so Jesus says, to send His rain and sunshine on the just and on the unjust alike)—and then, treating him as if he were righteous, he actually becomes righteous, "is glorified," made Christ-like, that Christ may be the first-born of many brethren. That is to say, "imputed righteousness" is "imparted righteousness" in the household of faith, but nonsense outside of it.'

On the question why grace is mediated through Christ Dr. RATTENBURY is less clear. He replies very effectively to the criticism that there is no atonement in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. 'Jesus spoke of God's mercy from the standpoint of God's Son. Paul says, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor." Should we have felt the graciousness of Jesus if He had talked about His grace and its free gifts? Even men do not talk about their own generosity when they give presents.'

But why must Christ die, and what did He accomplish by His death? Paul must have faced these questions. 'From the earliest days of his Christian life, Paul must have regarded the death of Christ as having some relation to sin. Can we think that he had in his own mind no systematized conception of the grounds of the grace of God? The answer is that, while Paul does not set forth a systematic doctrine of the Atonement, he must have had grounds for his beliefs, which were clear to him, though not so clear to us; but they are, perhaps, more likely to have been a series of intuitive convictions than a reasoned system.' Dr. RATTENBURY falls back on 'the family solution.' 'To belong to God's family and to live on the family level is to justify love—God's love to man. Why trouble about reparation when experiencing regeneration into a new order of life, where men love their Father and His children? . . . Any man, however corrupt or helpless, whose soul is so quickened into a higher life that he becomes a new creation in Christ Jesus, justifies the morality of the ways of God, and reveals the fact that the true relation of a man to God is not that of a slave to his master, but of a child in a family to his father.'

The ultimate aim of gospel criticism, says a distinguished New Testament scholar, is to produce what is called, for lack of better designation, a Life of Christ. It is as a contribution towards a Life of Christ that he views all his own work. During the past twenty or thirty years he has followed up in published volumes the three principal lines of inquiry dictated by the nature of the sources, namely, (1) the story of Jesus' career as prophet and Messianic leader, for which the primary source is the Petrine-Markan record; (2) the nature and content of His message, for which the primary source, apart from Mark, is to be found by critical comparison of the teaching material of Matthew and Luke; (3) the permanent significance of His personality and work for the history and practice of religion, which involves a critical valuation and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Though his contributions taken together fall short, confessedly,

of completeness, they are most lacking in the second of the three departments of inquiry above named. And the volume before us seeks so far to remedy this.

The title is *Studies in Matthew* (Holt, New York; \$5.00), and the author, Professor Benjamin Wisner BACON, D.D., Litt.D. (Oxon.), formerly of the Chair of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University. A new work from his pen is always welcome; and this work on the First Gospel is very timely, as a reference to its contents will show. But let us say at once that its aim is 'to clear the way for such appreciation of the great religious Teacher as can only be gained by placing the witness of Matthew in right relation to the richer resources and more sympathetic touch of Luke.'

We may here add that Dr. BACON hopes in 'such brief working time as still remains' to publish a historico-critical analysis and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel under the title 'The Gospel of the Hellenists,' and so to complete an earlier study in that Gospel.

In the volume now under review the author's deepest interest is in the question of sources. He would dispel the illusion that Matthew is a primary source, as being, if not of apostolic origin, a translation of an Aramaic Gospel by Matthew the Apostle. He would also explode the fallacy of the 'Matthean Logia.' The primary sources for the story and the message of Jesus are Mark and S, and S is not Q, nor is Q the 'Matthean Logia.' But we depend very largely for our knowledge of S upon what may be critically derived, directly or indirectly, from Q; and while we know something of S, we might have known much more if critics had not been obsessed for almost a century with the notion, for which Schleiermacher is responsible, that the compilation of the logia or precepts of Jesus to which Papias refers is to be identified with the common material (Q) used independently by Matthew and Luke to supplement the deficiencies of Mark on the side of teaching. This common material, though designated *Quelle*, Source, is not itself the source (S) on which Matthew and Luke

drew, but only the most easily traceable factor of it.

Besides the two main synoptic sources, Mark (M) and S, Dr. BACON recognizes three classes of material, which are designated P, Q, and R. P stands for the material peculiar to Matthew or Luke; Q, as already noted, the coincident or common material of Matthew and Luke not found in Mark; and R the material contributed by the redactor or editor. Allowance is also made for elements taken up from current oral tradition (O), and for a certain element, the Hebraistic, notably contained in Matthew's preamble, designated N on the hypothesis that it came from a precanonical form of Aramaic Gospel circulating among a body of Nazarene Christians.

The mention of Matthew's preamble leads us to the point that in seeking to give the First Gospel its true historical position and value Dr. BACON arranges his Studies in a way that is designed to show the Evangelist's structural plan. For half a century it has been recognized that the main body of the First Gospel, apart from the Preamble and the Epilogue, consists of five discourses or sermons; and the recognition of it marks an epoch in the critical understanding and valuation of the work, which the public should by this time learn to regard as a compilation of gospel teaching in five parts from material furnished mainly by Mark and S. Accordingly here is the division of Matthew employed in the volume before us: Preamble (cc. 1-2); Book I, sub-divided into a Narrative A, introducing a Discourse B (cc. 3-4 and 5-7); Book II, similarly subdivided (A, cc. 8-9, B, c. 10); Book III, (A, cc. 11-12, B, c. 13); Book IV (A, cc. 14-17, B, c. 18); Book V (A, cc. 19-22, B, cc. 23-25); Epilogue (cc. 26-28).

This division of the material largely determines the method of study employed, which consists principally of Introduction. After the General Introduction, in which the external and internal evidences for sources, authorship, and date are critically sifted, comes the Special Introduction, in which each of the seven parts of Matthew's

structural plan is similarly scrutinized, the emphasis here being on purpose, meaning, and the use of sources. Then follows a new Translation of Matthew in which sources are clearly differentiated. The concluding section of the work is comprised of discussions of the five themes presented by the Evangelist in the five discourses or sermons. These are the New Ethics of Jesus and the Law, the Apostolate, the Hiding and Revelation of the Mystery, the Problem of Church Unity, the Messianic Judgment.

There can be no question as to the timeliness of these Studies from the pen of an able and open-minded scholar of repute. As for their value, it will depend in large measure on whether they have succeeded in throwing new light upon the actual teaching of Jesus.

In the first section of his work, General Introduction, Dr. BACON has subjected the tradition of the Matthean origin of the First Gospel to a very careful examination, and concludes that for real information concerning the background and origin of Matthew we are thrown back upon the internal evidence. From internal evidence he would assign Matthew to the date A.D. 80-100, or more exactly 90-95, a closer approximation being hardly required, because the history of that period is extremely obscure, and it is enough if Matthew is brought into true relation with its environment, particularly the mental environment of contemporary Christian literature. From internal evidence also he would say that the Q material in Matthew points to a single real document S, which, when in the hands of Matthew and Luke, if not of Mark also, had already advanced beyond the stage of being a mere collection of the sayings and doings of Jesus toward that of a biographical record, including the Passion story in some form.

Passing from the General Introduction to the Special Introduction, we note that the key to Dr. BACON's discussion of the Preamble lies in the remark that 'the glory of the resurrection vision casts its ray backward into the deepening obscurity.' In the five books a certain uniformity, or rather

conformity, in structural design is traced. And Matthew is found throughout his five books to have been faithful to Jesus' message as he understood it. But his use, which is no abuse, of the freedom allowed by Synagogue and Church alike to the haggadic writer reflects the converted rabbi of A.D. 90-100. A survey of the Epilogue confirms the conclusion, previously reached on broader grounds, that Matthew represents a late type of synoptic tradition, holding indeed a golden treasure, sacred, invaluable, but holding it in an earthen vessel.

On the third section, containing the new Translation, we remark that many will prize the work for it alone. It is not only that the translation is trustworthy and felicitous, but the spacing of the material is admirably done, and the marginal symbols clearly show the various sources from which, according to the conclusions reached by Dr. BACON, the material is derived. Though Professor James Moffatt's conception of the sense is not always accepted, his 'telling phraseology' is in many instances employed.

The fourth and concluding section endeavours to set forth the actual teaching of Jesus, allowance being made where necessary for Matthew's application of the teaching to the needs and conditions of A.D. 90-95, and for the particular motives effective in the composition of his various books. In this section there is a wealth of matter which we would commend to the notice of the Biblical expositor and the Christian preacher, some of which, for example the interesting note on miracle under the second theme (the Apostolate), we should hardly look for in a work so fundamentally and intimately concerned with the problem of sources.

The author's theological tendency well appears at the close of the work, in his endeavour under the fifth theme (the Messianic Judgment) to penetrate the mind of Christ in His conviction of the triumph of righteousness. If the modern Christian insists on having both the New Jerusalem of the Jews and the mansions in the skies of Gentile eschatology—ideals literally as far apart as earth from heaven—

there should be no need to despair of bringing into harmony the Jewish and the Greek conception of the future. 'We may well be thankful that our religion's strength is derived not from its Jewish ancestry alone. From the very earliest times there existed also a gospel according to the Hellenists, a gospel for which Paul claimed and obtained unshackled freedom of interpretation. In this Hellenistic tradition the example is set of penetration beneath the transitory form to the enduring substance. Whatever balance is then struck between Jewish and Greek modes of thought, apocalypse and mysticism, our ultimate confidence in the coming reign of justice will still be the indomitable, victorious faith of Jesus Christ in the God "that loveth righteousness and truth."'

These are the closing words of the volume proper (a number of useful and important Notes are appended), and they may be taken as forming the transition to Dr. BACON's promised 'The Gospel of the Hellenists,' in which he will endeavour to show John's true place in the development of the religion *about* Jesus. Meantime we are indebted to him for this patient, scholarly contribution to our knowledge of the religion of Jesus.

The Trustees of the Arthur Davis Memorial Lectureship have been fortunate in their lecturers. Only lately we had occasion to comment with appreciation on Mr. C. G. Montefiore's 'Study in the Development of Universalism based on 4 Ezra,' and now comes another lecture—this time on *The Hope of a World to Come* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. cloth, 1s. paper)—delivered by Mr. Edwyn BEVAN, M.A.

As the sub-title indicates, the hope which Mr. BEVAN sets out to discuss is that 'underlying Judaism and Christianity,' so that his study has historical as well as theological interest. The first half of the lecture is occupied with the discussion of the relation of Persian to Jewish belief. Zoroastrianism and Mosaism alike look forward to some great final consummation, in which the earth is to be transformed and good to triumph over evil.

'Neither,' says Archbishop Söderblom, 'seems to have borrowed it from the other.' Is this view tenable?

It is well known that the vistas of hope which often conclude the denunciations and threats of the Hebrew prophets are regarded by many scholars as later exilic or post-exilic additions—a notable case being the epilogue of Amos. But there is a critical school which denies the necessity of such a conclusion. They maintain that the idea of a world-process ending in a golden age had been cherished by the thinkers of Babylon and Egypt long before the prophetic period, and that this idea had infiltrated into the mind of Canaan. It would consequently be familiar to the Hebrew prophets, and it is therefore futile to regard them merely as messengers of doom. Their message of hope is their own.

The question of possible Persian influence is complicated by the disconcerting fact that the dates assigned to Zoroaster fluctuate between the fourteenth century B.C. and 522, when, one scholar maintains, he was still alive. Mr. BEVAN's own conclusion is that 'it seems not unreasonable to believe that Jewish apocalyptic,' at any rate, 'did owe something to Persian influence.' He bases this conclusion on the fact that an idea analogous to the Persian conception of 'a world-process marked out in three-thousand-year periods' does not emerge among the Jews till we reach the Book of Enoch, whose earliest parts probably belong to the second century B.C.

But while that is true of this particular aspect of apocalyptic, Mr. BEVAN does not believe that for their general conception of history as an age-long conflict between good and evil, a process guided by God, inspired by His purpose, and issuing in His triumph, the Hebrew prophets were in any way indebted to the Persians. Such a conception is already present in Amos and Isaiah.

This conception of a purpose inspiring the time-process, which was one of the great legacies of Judaism to Christianity, is now so familiar that it

is with difficulty that we realize how life must have looked to men who did not bring this conception to the interpretation of it. To Græco-Roman society the world was but a 'vain eternal recurrence, leading nowhere.' And this very un-Hebraic attitude is reflected in the Book of Ecclesiastes, which must have been profoundly influenced by Hellenism. A German writer whom Mr. BEVAN quotes attributes the victory of Christianity to its emphasis upon the idea that the time-process had meaning, value, and a goal; it began in the unique act of creation, and moved on to a unique consummation in the Kingdom of God, and was punctuated in its course by mighty acts of redemptive love.

A teleological view of this kind was peculiarly welcome to men who saw nothing but eternal repetition, with no hint of a forward movement, in the time-process, and to whom, therefore, all things were 'vanity.'

From these historical considerations Mr. BEVAN passes on to the larger question. 'How do we stand to-day?' and he argues that, though our conception of the universe and of the duration of the time-process is immeasurably vaster than that held, say, even a hundred years ago, there is a real analogy between the view of the time-process presented by modern science and that presented by Judaism and Christianity. For modern scientists, doubtless with a few exceptions, regard that process as a continuous forward movement with unique moments, such as the moment when man arose from the animal, though science has neither the right nor the power to dogmatize about the issue of it all. Or, as Mr. BEVAN puts it, 'If to-day Jews and Christians still adhere to the old faith that the time-process is being guided by God to some glorious end which will give its value and meaning to the whole, that is plainly not a conclusion of scientific research, but an act of religious faith, like the belief in the reality of God Himself.'

Mr. BEVAN joins issue with Dean Inge, who, as is well known, has little use for a religion which rests on any hope regarding the future. The relative justification for this attitude, he points

out, lies in the fact that 'no realization of the Kingdom of God under conditions of earthly space and time could be satisfying, and that any religion which made its chief concern an improvement of conditions on this planet would not meet the highest spiritual exigence of man.' The hope of 'a good time coming' in this world is too reminiscent of the materialistic dreams of some Jewish apocalyptic.

Yet Mr. BEVAN does not regard as absurd or unspiritual the hope that even on this planet man may be brought to a higher level of goodness or

happiness. But while that is not an unreasonable hope to entertain, for one who understands the Christian faith it can certainly never be the great consummation of history. That can only be found in 'a communal bliss, an existence of the Divine community of spirits in perfection and mutual love and joy.'

This fine lecture, with its wide outlook upon history, its brave faith, and its cheerful yet solemn hope, is at once an intellectual treat and a spiritual stimulus.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

V. The Contribution of Germany to New Testament Science.

I.

BY PROFESSOR MARTIN DIBELIUS, D.TH., D.PH., HEIDELBERG.

THERE is justification for considering the history of scientific study within national limits. To begin with, it has often been the case that there has been no association in work between the scholars of different countries, with the inevitable result that in many cases conclusions had to be sought and established more than once, quite independently in every nation engaged in scientific research. This failure to exchange ideas continued longer in theology than in other sciences, for the diversity of ecclesiastical affiliation and the want of reciprocal activities between Churches had necessarily an influence on theology. In the commentary on *The Epistle of James*, by August Rudolph Gebser of Jena, which appeared in 1828, the author at the close of his preface speaks of 'my esteemed friends in England,' 'who have had their attention drawn to me by the work on which I am engaged, the *Bibliotheca Latina poetarum veterum Christianorum*.' From this manner of speaking, as well as from the fact that Gebser took the opportunity afforded him of expressing his gratitude for literary gifts from England, one may infer how infrequent such relations must have been at that time. The necessity for an international interchange of views was recognized earlier by scientific theologians than by the Churches, but now that ecumenical

fellowship has to a very large extent begun among the Churches, scientific theology is bound to reap some benefit. To say the least, it will learn from ecumenical conferences that the most important condition of mutual understanding in every sphere is to be found in becoming acquainted with and in learning to appraise the intellectual forces of foreign countries. It is from this point of view that the following discussion should be understood; only so can the development of New Testament research in Germany have any claim on the sympathetic interest of English readers.

The restriction of one's view to the scientific development of a single people has an inner justification as well. For every separate branch of knowledge is dependent on the development of the intellectual life of the people, and that life again is the expression of the intellectual endowments of a nation in a definite historical situation.

How deeply influential these relationships are may be realized when one considers the two great achievements of German theology in the New Testament field, which, about the middle of last century, gave a decisive impulse to scientific research and provided the material for extremely fruitful discussions in the generation following—the *Life of Jesus* (1835-36), by David Friedrich