

# 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

carrying His redeeming love into all the waste places of life and wrapping in its warmth the desolate souls who dwell there.

Yet it is true that this is a great venture. The bravest will recoil from a task beset by many and great dangers. The sincerest will question its possession of a power whose sources are an absolute purity of motive and love of right. Who of us is equal to these things? We know all the dangers which lurk in that kinship with our brethren which draws us to them, and through which alone we can hope to serve them. We know all the subtle sympathetic action of soul upon soul, how the weakness of one may infect what another had considered its strength, how the close contact of certain types of character will often release forces which confuse in both the sense of duty and make of each the supreme danger of the other.

We know these things and, knowing them, realize how strong the soul must be that would follow this high call of God. Yet we do not doubt that it is His call, nay that it is the one call which we can recognize in our day as indubitably His. And if it is, ought we not to consider well what is likely to help us in being faithful to it? Now that is just what the religious society can do for us—this is indeed the real function and the pre-eminent value of a church to-day. We want behind us in every venture of the soul a tradition of right which is greater than all that man has ever yet accomplished, and yet has inspired all his various imperfect accomplishment hitherto. We want a tradition which will represent not merely all that

the best souls of men have yet attained, but also, however vaguely, all that the common soul of humanity has ever dreamed of attaining. We want to have our individual consciences rooted in a general conscience which will both rebuke and inspire them.

But we may say, perhaps, 'Where is the religious society that is equal to such a claim upon it? Have not the actual churches of history been refuges for the spiritually cowardly? Have they not been close corporations of the saved hardening themselves in selfishness against a humanity which they dared to declare rejected of God? Has not the taint of the Pharisee been in their blood, in their very constitution? Well, superficially, there is truth in the indictment. And yet if they had never been in fact what they might be and must become, there would indeed be little substance in our hopes for them. But underneath all their own misconception and perversion of their mission, they have always been in fact something more and greater than they knew. They have always witnessed to the love of humanity and inspired it. It is the enthusiasm of a genuine love for man, of a profound faith in man as capable of the best, that has been the fundamental and permanent note of every religious society. And it is the only note by which we shall assess the worth of any Church in the future—the note of Divine fruitfulness. There is the Spirit of God, and only there, where the spirit of man is enlarged to believe in, and to labour to evoke, the Divine possibilities in the worst.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 107.

---

## The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats (Mt. xxv. 31-46).

BY THE REVEREND A. T. CADOUX, B.A., D.D., GLASGOW.

DESPITE its wonderful beauty and power, this Parable contains elements that are very hard to understand. In the first place, the principle of judgment differs from other utterances of Jesus. Here men are not judged for their conscious relation to Him, but for their kindness or callousness to the needy. How are we to reconcile this with such a saying as, 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful

generation, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels' (Mk 8<sup>38</sup>, Mt 16<sup>27</sup>, Lk 9<sup>26</sup>, and also Mt 10<sup>32, 33</sup>, Lk 12<sup>8, 9</sup>)? How, too, could the many whose hospitality Jesus had enjoyed, who had 'ministered to him of their substance,' ask, 'When saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee?'?

Another difficulty lies in the term, 'my brethren.' Who are they? If they are just the needy in the

assembled nations, then we have to conclude either that some of 'my brethren' are amongst 'ye cursed,' or that need and goodness are essentially concomitant. And 'Ye did it unto one of these my brethren' implies a distinction between 'ye' and 'my brethren,' a distinction which is made explicit by the fact that the merciful are not called 'my brethren' but only 'blessed of my Father.' We are therefore compelled to recognize that, as it stands, the Parable tells only of the judgment of those who are not the brethren of the judge, and who are judged by their conduct towards the needy amongst his brethren. And here again difficulties arise. Why should this critical factor, 'my brethren,' be so surreptitiously introduced? And are not all men the brethren of the Son of man? Or if not, who are his brethren?

To the last question there are two possible answers. Mk 3<sup>34, 35</sup> (especially in view of Mk 9<sup>41</sup>, Mt 10<sup>42</sup>) suggests that 'my brethren' might mean the followers of Jesus. But if so, then should not the merciful, since they did the will of God, be included amongst His brethren? And the discrepancy with Mk 8<sup>38</sup> still remains.

The other possibility is to take it that by 'my brethren' the Son of man means 'my fellow-Jews.' In this case we can take τὰ ἔθνη in the usual New Testament significance of 'the Gentiles,' and the Parable becomes one in which the Gentiles are judged by the way in which they have treated the Jews. But this destroys its broad humanity and makes it contribute to a narrow nationalism quite foreign to the mind of Jesus, though possible to the Judaizing section of the early Church.

But both these interpretations of 'my brethren' involve another difficulty. For the people of all nations are judged by their conduct towards 'my brethren,' whereas by no means every soul born into the world has had the chance of helping a needy Jew or Christian.

Now no one setting out to depict the judgment of 'all the nations' would be likely to propound as a criterion of their destiny a test that would be applicable to only a fraction of them. Especially would this be unlikely to an imagination capable of creating such a parable. But an inadequacy of this sort might easily arise inadvertently as the result of editorial changes, which might also account for Judaistic colouring.

It is to be noted in this connexion that the judge throughout the body of the Parable is 'the king,' and only in the introductory sentence is he called 'the Son of man.' This change in itself calls for explanation, especially as the passage is not properly

speaking a parable at all. In His only other analogous use of the word 'king' Jesus means 'God,' *i.e.* in 'the city of the great king' (Mt 5<sup>35</sup>); and the dominant phrase of His teaching 'the kingdom of God' confirms this meaning.

It may be therefore that in the original form of this passage Jesus depicted the judgment of the nations by God, but that the Evangelist understood 'the king' to be not God but Jesus, and made his interpretation clear by replacing the original opening by v.<sup>31</sup>, 'But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory.'

In support of this suggestion it may be remarked that the First Evangelist lays great stress upon the judgeship of Jesus, and where we can check his procedure he is found in more than one case modifying his source in this interest. For instance, the Marcan version of the Gerasene madman's cry, 'I adjure thee by God, torment me not,' appears in Matthew as, 'Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*?' Very significant is the form in which the above-cited Mk 8<sup>38</sup> is given in Mt 16<sup>27</sup>, 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds.' Not only does the alteration involve the express assertion that the Son of man will be judge, but the criterion of judgment is so modified as to remove the contradiction between the Marcan saying and the Parable of the Sheep and Goats. The extent of the Matthaean departure here from the original form of the saying may be judged by the fact that in Q's version of it as given by Luke (12<sup>8, 9</sup>) the Son of man is witness rather than judge, as is Jesus in that given by Mt 10<sup>32, 33</sup>, but the latter is so turned as to seem to speak rather of Jesus' prayer than of His appearance at the last judgment, 'Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven . . .' A further instance for consideration is that in place of the Lucan, 'He (*i.e.* the master of the house) shall answer and say to you, I know not whence ye are' (13<sup>25</sup>), we have in Mt 7<sup>23</sup>, 'Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you.'

On the other hand, when we consider such sayings as, 'Whosoever shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me (Mk 9<sup>37</sup>), and, 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (Mt 10<sup>40</sup>; cf. Lk 10<sup>18</sup>), they suggest to us that in describing the final quality of life, Jesus would think of God rather than of Himself as saying,

'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me.'

And now we may note that, if we compare Mt 19<sup>28</sup> with Lk 22<sup>28, 29</sup>, the Matthæan version has an additional phrase very like that which seems to have been added at the beginning of our Parable. It runs, 'in the regeneration (*παλιγγενεσία*), when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory.' And in this case the editorial nature of the addition is confirmed by the statement of Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, p. 177) that *παλιγγενεσία* cannot be literally translated into Hebrew or Aramaic.

It is difficult, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that in both these cases (Mt 25<sup>31</sup> 19<sup>28</sup>) we should see the influence of the Similitudes of Enoch, where 'on the throne of his glory' is a commonplace, and where—in ch. 62—the Son of man is twice said to 'sit on the throne of his glory.' Nor does this seem to be the only influence of Enoch on the existing form of the Parable. 'The eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels' (Mt 25<sup>41</sup>) is strange amongst the words of Jesus as a synonym for the usual 'Gehenna,' and He speaks always of 'demons,' not of the devil's 'angels.' But Enoch has much to say of evil angels, and we are especially reminded of his vision (ch. 54) of 'a deep valley with burning fire' where were cast 'the kings and the mighty,' and where he saw chains which he was told were 'prepared for the hosts of Azazel' (*i.e.* for the evil angels).

Of course, if in the original form of the Parable God was 'the king,' then several more elements in the existing form must be reckoned as editorial. The king as God could not have been said to say, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father,' and it will be noted that the parallel phrase in v. 41, 'Depart from me, ye cursed,' is without 'of my Father.' Even in the Parable as it stands these words are awkward, for 'Ye blessed of my Father' is a term more appropriate from a king's son than from a king.

And if God is the judge, then the words 'my brethren' of v. 40 must be editorial, if indeed they belonged to the original text at all, which their absence from B and certain other authorities makes doubtful. They are also absent from the parallel phrase of v. 45: 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these.' And their removal from v. 40, removes the confusion which they create. Without them the criterion is restored to its simple and broad humanity. The nations are judged, not by their behaviour to Jews or Christians, but by their pity or lack of it to any needy soul in their midst.

But though we seem justified in concluding that in the original form of the Parable God was the judge, and in making the concomitant deduction of editorial additions (to which we should possibly add v. 40), two questions still remain. Was the Parable originally a parable of the judgment of all nations or only of the Gentiles? And why is the criterion of judgment different from that of Mk 8<sup>38</sup> or Lk 13<sup>24-27</sup>, *i.e.* why has it no reference to a man's attitude to Jesus? These two questions are closely connected; for while on the one hand τὰ ἔθνη (Mt 25<sup>32</sup>) usually in the New Testament has the meaning of 'the Gentiles,' on the other hand Mk 8<sup>38</sup> and Lk 13<sup>24-27</sup> are couched in terms that seem to have Jews only in view, for the former speaks of those who are in the midst of 'this sinful and adulterous generation,' and the latter of those who thought they had privileged acquaintance with 'the master of the house.'

Yet the distinction can hardly be merely national, *i.e.*, as between Jew and Gentile. For in the Parable of Dives and Lazarus the rich Jew is judged on precisely the criterion employed in dividing the sheep from the goats. And if, in the latter Parable, we have an adequate account of the judgment of the Gentile as distinct from the Jew, it would imply that no Gentile was to have the privilege of the gospel. The difference seems therefore to imply a difference of opportunity, the coincidence of the privileged with the Jew merely reflecting the actual situation when Jesus spoke. We must, therefore, take πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in its most inclusive sense—all 'the nations,' which means that, so far as the privileged are concerned, this is only one aspect of the judgment they must undergo: those who know must pass an additional test, from which the ignorant are free. And this difference brings the suggestion that in the Parable of the Shut Door, as told in Lk 13<sup>24-27</sup>, and in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats, we have complementary pictures of judgment. Both Parables are of the same peculiar nature—half-parables—the figures and what they depict being mingled. It is significant also that in Mt 25<sup>11, 12</sup> (the difficult ending of the Parable of the Virgins) we have what appears in more appropriate setting at the end of the Lucan Parable of the Shut Door (Lk 13<sup>25b</sup>), and that between these verses and the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats comes only another Parable which, according to Luke (19<sup>11</sup>), belongs to a different occasion. These two semi-parables, moreover, are complementary in their contents. In the one those who are judged claim acquaintance with the judge, 'We did eat

and drink in thy presence . . .,' and the judge repudiates the claim, 'I tell you, I know not whence ye are.' In the other the judge claims acquaintance with the judged, and is answered with astonishment, 'When saw we thee . . .?' The first Parable was, Luke tells us, spoken in answer to a Jew who asked, 'Lord, are they few that be saved?' It is the question of one who thinks himself of their number and wants to know how exclusive the privilege is. Jesus' answer is that consciousness of privilege is only too likely to blind a man to the necessity of utmost concentration of endeavour, if he is not to miss that for which the privilege has been given. Privilege will be pleaded in vain by those who have not agonized to enter at the narrow door.

But if this was all that Jesus said, it would leave the portrayal of judgment incomplete. To say nothing of the unprivileged would leave something unsaid that concerned all. The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats is the complement of that of the Narrow Door. Here, in God's final judgment upon human life, we have again one of the most frequently reiterated truths of Jesus' teaching—

that what we endeavour to be to our fellows determines what God will be to us.

The two Parables give two essential aspects of judgment upon life. For him who has heard the Divine invitation and knows that it is life's opportunity, there is the test of focused endeavour—the narrow door. For all men there is the test of compassion: are you open to those calls that show life to be larger than your private pains and pleasures? The qualities tested seem to be opposite, yet both are needed. The motions of compassion are the beginning of spiritual discernment: the spontaneity of charity keeps concentration wholesome; and the consummation of knowledge and duty is in love.

If these two Parables stood beside each other in Q, it is likely enough that Luke, not finding in the Parable of the judgment of all the nations any reference to the gospel, omitted it, replacing it by a saying that told how 'they shall come from the east and the west, and from the north and the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God,' but gave no criterion of admission (Lk 13<sup>28, 29</sup>; cf. Mt 8<sup>11, 12</sup>).

---

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Missionary Literature.

FROM the publishing house of C. Bertelsmann, in Gütersloh, three works dealing with missionary themes have recently been issued:

*The Letters of the Apostle Paul considered as Missionary Epistles*,<sup>1</sup> by Dr. Julius Richter. The key to the understanding of Paul the theologian and the ecclesiastical statesman, is found in the manifold demands made upon him as a missionary. Since the Edinburgh Conference, undue stress has been laid, it is thought, upon the missionary strategy of Paul, for it was frequently impossible for him to carry out his plans. All that the scanty material warrants us in saying is that he had very little time for organizing Churches. His missionary journeys are 'comparable to the widespread evangelistic tours of Bishop William Taylor, Dr. John Mott, and Dr. Sherwood Eddy rather than

to the steady and persevering labour of present-day missionaries.'

In studying Paul's attitude towards the heathen world it is essential to distinguish between (a) the superstitious beliefs of the common people encountered in Lystra, Philippi, and Ephesus; (b) the philosophical theories of the Athenians, with their pantheistic watchwords; and (c) the syncretism which resulted from the impact of Oriental cults upon Hellenistic religions. As different as the forms of error were the Apostle's modes of presenting the gospel message. He was neither an orthodox Lutheran nor a modern Rationalist, but 'a typical Oriental, elaborating his thoughts now in one direction, now in another, to meet changing needs.' Traces of humour are discovered in Paul's use of the phraseology of the Mystery religions, as, e.g., Ph 4<sup>12</sup>, 2 Co 3<sup>10</sup>. 'It is obvious that this continually changing necessity of combating and overcoming erroneous and dangerous tendencies could not fail to stimulate the Apostle's theological thought.'

<sup>1</sup> *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus als missionarische Sendschreiben*, von Professor D. Julius Richter (pp. 212; geb. M.8).