

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

cal lines, both with regard to the Law which Israel had always explained and applied wrongly (Ac 7³⁷), and with regard to the Temple and sacrifices, both of which are contrary to the will of God (Ac 7^{42, 48, 49}). Not only in this respect is Stephen a faithful disciple

of Jesus, but also in the prayer before his death: 'Lord, let not this sin stand against them' (Ac 7⁶⁰). This is the best proof that he had received the Spirit of Christ and grasped the meaning of His Word.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

V. The Contribution of Germany to New Testament Science.

II.

BY PROFESSOR MARTIN DIBELIUS, D.T.H., D.PH., HEIDELBERG.

PSYCHOLOGY had to proceed in a different way in the field of Pauline research. Here the problems arose from the different character of the Epistles; the more of them one considered genuine, the greater number of changes did it become necessary to assume in the theology of the Apostle. Thus there came into being the method of doctrinal systems, by which distinctions were drawn between particular phases in the theological development of Paul. One had naturally to conjecture the reasons which led to these changes in the Apostle. Some scholars felt themselves actually driven to assume a double conversion in the life of their hero—the first which made him a Christian, the second which made him the Apostle to the Gentiles. That conclusion was due to an exaggerated emphasis laid on the subjective elements in the statements of the Epistles; a great deal was traced back to the peculiar character of the Apostle's conversion. What one sought to do was to represent Paul not as a preacher, but as one who had undergone a certain experience; the result was a very 'modern' figure, subject to all sorts of impressions and moods. In all this there was a failure to realize how improbable it was that one could trace a process of development in the Epistles. Of the activity of the Apostle, lasting about thirty years, the Epistles enable us to follow only the bare half, and that the second half; if development there was, it was more likely to have occurred in the first half! This 'subjective' Paul gained perhaps in human interest, but he had less typical significance; he had understood and transformed the gospel from his own peculiar point of view, with the consequence that he had moved ever farther from Jesus and His teaching. The problem 'Jesus and Paul' was thus set in an altogether new light, and with particular

reference to William Wrede's little book on Paul, it occupied in a lively way the attention of scholars in the first decade of the present century.

Although in this way at least some clearer understanding of the problem was gained, the most substantial result of the psychological way of looking at things has still to be mentioned. Its great aim was to bring the personalities of the New Testament near to people living to-day. To that endeavour are due all the advantages as well as all the defects of the psychological reconstruction. None the less, while the scientific gains of this school are doubtful and burdened by many misgivings, its efforts to gain the popular ear were attended with success. Great undertakings in these years served that end—the religious-historical books for the people (*religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*), the commentary on the New Testament edited by Johannes Weiss, the dictionary *Religion in the Past and Present (Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart)*. On every hand the aim was clearly apparent to interest wider circles in New Testament questions and to make them sharers in the results of modern research. The honourable position which scientific theology holds to-day in Germany was won by great scholars like Albert Hauck and (above all) Adolf Harnack; but it has been maintained and consolidated in no small degree by those who, by the courageous exposition of their methods and results, convinced a wider circle that their theological work had been done honourably and impartially, and had no need to shrink from close examination or from comparison with other sciences.

In this connexion mention may also be made of a severely scientific work which none the less is calculated to be of service in wider circles and has

an importance of its own as a gift of German theology to the world—the edition of the text of the New Testament by Eberhard Nestle, who, declining to emphasize his own opinions in textual criticism, produced a ‘resultant’ text from the best known editions and furnished it with a short critical apparatus. This apparatus, it is true, took the form that one wished it to have only in 1927 (13th edition, prepared by Erwin Nestle); now, it contains the most important witnesses to the text, and the untrained reader has his attention drawn by printed signs to the existence of variants. Textual criticism, however, is an international affair; Germany’s share in it, in three different generations, is marked in characteristic fashion by the names of Constantin Tischendorf, Bernhard Weiss, and Hermann von Soden. The edition of the Catholic Vogel may also be mentioned here. One may say in passing that if the work of Catholic scholars has been given a small place in this survey, this is explained by the fact that Catholic collaboration in the New Testament field has been directed less to the production of comprehensive works which are influential abroad than to exhaustive special studies. Particularly characteristic of Catholic scholarship is the great care with which in these studies the whole history of research, both Catholic and non-Catholic, is kept in view.

As an example of what has been accomplished with the help of creative intuition and with the aim of bringing the gospel home to wider circles, one may further mention the graphic presentment of the sayings of Jesus in the books of Johannes Müller of Elmau, formerly of Mainberg. Throughout the whole of Germany a great fellowship, drawn from all ranks of society, listens eagerly to the message proclaimed in speech and print by this advocate of ‘essential’ life, that is to say, of a personal life flowing from an inner spring in contradistinction to a life controlled by the circumstances of the moment. Müller’s challenge takes its direction entirely from the word of Jesus, and thus his interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount and of the other sayings of Jesus serves to make the gospel a reality for our own day. His books, accordingly, deserve to be mentioned here as a particular and original form of the psychological treatment of the New Testament.

III.

The progress made by the scientific study of the New Testament in the twentieth century was not

primarily conditioned by new conceptions; it was in harmony with the spirit of a realistic and un-systematic age that the new impulse came from the possession of new material. Circumstances of various kinds led scholars to concern themselves more than formerly with the environment of the New Testament. Important texts were discovered or were edited anew or were made available in translations; classical philology began at last to devote itself to the transition-period of Hellenism; Old Testament and New Testament scholars alike turned their attention to the mass of rabbinical writings. And when, through the reading of these texts, it was realized how foreign that world was to our own, the realization of that fell into line with the reaction against the over-confident psychological method. One became suspicious about bringing the figures of the New Testament into the world of modern feeling, and emphasis was laid on distance rather than on nearness, on the elements which were strange rather than on those which were familiar. Thus there arose what is known as *the religious-historical method*, which is rather a procedure demanded by fundamental principles than a method capable of scientific definition. For it is possible to employ the method in widely different ways, through the collection of parallels, through the derivation of one phenomenon from another, through the investigation of religious phenomenology in the time of Jesus, and through the study of the broad historical relations in the sphere of the spirit.

Among the fundamental demands bound up with the religious-historical way of looking at things, the most important is the setting aside in scientific work of the boundary line imposed by the Canon. William Wrede was the first, on grounds of principle, to advance this claim for New Testament theology, and the claim was asserted in a decisive way by Wernle, later by Weinel and Bousset. When the question involved is not the establishment of the Christian norm, but knowledge of the process of Christian development, no orthodox, heretical, Jewish, or Gentile source which gives any information whatsoever should be disregarded. The adoption of this principle had this result, that certain complexes of thought which in the New Testament are rather presupposed than described could be more accurately discerned and were bound to have their significance better understood.

That holds good, above all, of eschatology. Jewish and Christian apocalypses showed how commanding a place the expectation of a future world-transformation and of a coming deliverance held in the con-

sciousness of men at that time. Baldensperger and Johannes Weiss were the first to draw the conclusions from this which bore on the world of ideas in the Gospels, and especially on *The Preaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God* (the title of the book by Johannes Weiss which appeared in 1892). Many students of Paul, moreover, found in this conception a decisive point of view, but, above all, Albert Schweitzer, who from his excursions in many fields as interpreter of Bach, philosophic student of civilization, and medical missionary, always comes back to the investigation of the New Testament, has never grown weary of exhibiting eschatology as the foundation on which the whole of the New Testament is based. Without accepting all his conclusions, several younger scholars, among them the writer of this article, have sought and found in eschatology the key to important New Testament problems. This comprehensive value attributed to eschatology, one must admit, has encountered opposition; in his book, *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount*, Hans Windisch has subjected it to energetic criticism.

As soon as it was recognized that in the movements led by John the Baptist and Jesus an apocalyptic piety was in conflict with official Judaism, one learned that Judaism as a whole could never be understood from the point of view of apocalyptic alone. There were at least other two elements in the Judaism of the time of Jesus which confronted the student—Rabbinism and Hellenism. Since the beginning of this century up to quite recent days, a great deal has been accomplished, with rabbinical texts as the starting-point, for the understanding of New Testament problems by Strack, Billerbeck, Schlatter, Fiebig, and Gerhard Kittel. As not nearly all the relevant texts have been edited and translated, final results for the whole of primitive Christianity cannot yet be established. A better understanding of Judaism will, in all probability, enable us to define more clearly the heritage of Jewish piety in primitive Christianity, and for the attainment of this end the continuation of the publication of texts is of particular importance. The investigation of Hellenism in its relation to primitive Christianity has been materially advanced, especially by philologists like Norden and Reitzenstein. The conclusive inferences from these investigations and from the new texts were, however, drawn by Wilhelm Bousset, chiefly in his book, *Kyrios Christos* (1913), in which for the first time since the days of the Tübingen school a new view of primitive Christianity was developed. To the

question which lies behind the problem 'Paul and Jesus,' Bousset found an answer which had been suggested a short time before by Wilhelm Heitmüller: between the original community in Palestine and Paul there stands a third entity, pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity, the form of Christianity to which Paul attached himself in Damascus and Antioch, and from which he received the well-known traditions referred to in 1 Co 11²³ 15³. This reconstruction makes it possible to find lines of advance in primitive Christianity that take another way than Paul's, and thus to put in the place of the historical conception of the Tübingen school, which recognized only two tendencies, another differentiated conception of the rise of Catholicism and of Gnosis.

The results of the numerous religious-historical studies about Paul which had appeared since the beginning of the century found full justification in this larger setting. Definite progress was also made with the question as to Paul's relation to Hellenistic mysticism and, in particular, to the mystery religions. It had not been possible up till then to find a solution of this problem; to begin with, one was as little clear about the conception of mysticism as about its relation to the mysteries, and, further, the points of attachment between mysticism and eschatology were not sufficiently appreciated. In this field Albert Schweitzer upheld the thesis, and still continues to do so (*The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*, 1930), that Paul did not represent a form of mysticism analogous to the Hellenistic type, but an eschatological mysticism of a quite peculiar kind to be explained from Jewish premises.

This brings us, however, right into the heart of the theological controversy of the present day. This has been directed in the last ten years much more to the problems of Christology than to the problem of mysticism. Here, too, apart from impulses due to systematic theology, religious-historical discoveries and investigations have made their contribution. Above everything, it was from the newly discovered or newly published texts of the Manichæan and Mandæan religion that, mainly by the studies of Reitzenstein (*The Iranian Mysteries of Redemption*, 1921), and also of Bultmann and Walter Bauer, entirely new views of syncretism and of its connexion with primitive Christianity were gained. In the foreground of interest, moreover, was the question as to the origin of the conception, according to which Christ as a heavenly being descended unknown through the heavens, and which laid stress on incarnation and

exaltation, not on death and resurrection, as the essential facts in salvation—a conception, accordingly, which puts faith in Christ in a mythical setting clearly derived from an alien source. Thus, in a quite different sense of the word ‘mythical’ from that given to it by Strauss, there was raised the question of a Christ-myth as the foundation of New Testament Christology. Many of the younger theologians in Germany have taken part in the controversies to which these new investigations gave rise; the names are so numerous that it is impossible to mention individuals.

IV.

It was quite in accordance with the intellectual situation in Germany that the scientific discussion on the social question, on the dependence of men on their social position or on their ‘sociological conditionedness’ (to use the technical language of to-day), had also an influence on the investigation of primitive Christianity. Kalthoff, with his conception of social conditions in the Roman Empire, had already denied the historical existence of Jesus. Max Maurenbrecher, who was originally a follower of Friedrich Naumann, the great exponent of social-ethical politics, and later a political socialist, had given from the point of view of the social situation an interpretation of primitive Christianity which was in much closer contact with the tradition of the Gospels. A clearer understanding of the peculiar social condition of the masses from which the hearers of the Apostle Paul were recruited was promoted in an unanticipated measure by the publication, chiefly in England and Germany, of many non-literary papyrus-texts; letters, petitions, accounts, and receipts of ‘little folk,’ which in themselves had no historical importance, were made to bear witness to ways of thinking and habits of life in the middle and lower strata of society. The scholar who first and most impressively showed his competence to use this enrichment of our knowledge for an understanding of the world of the New Testament, for its vocabulary, the history of its ideas, its style, and its psychology, was Adolf Deissmann in his books, *Bible Studies*, *Light from the Ancient East*, and *Paul*. Before passing judgment on the thought and writings of Paul, he asked the question to what class the Apostle belonged and what kind of people he had in view when he composed his letters. The same question, too, formed the starting-point of the studies which were concerned with the style and literary *genre* of the Gospels. After Gunkel

and Johannes Weiss had urgently commended the question of literary types in the writings of the New Testament as worthy of consideration, the investigation of the pre-history of our Gospels was tackled by the use of the so-called *formgeschichtliche Methode* (the method which deals with the history of literary forms). In the first instance, those who shared in this work were Bultmann, Karl Ludwig Schmidt, and the author of this article, from whose book, *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, which appeared in 1919, this way of looking at things derived its name. Our starting-point was the recognition that in the case of the Gospels one had not to do with works of literature which had their origin in the individual creative power of single writers, but with the products of popular tradition, whose existence and growth were determined in a greater or less degree by supra-personal immanent laws. Accordingly it must be possible to learn from the style of the oldest traditions what ends were served by the original shape of the narrative and consequently what were the circumstances in which it came into existence. The presupposition of the whole inquiry is the decisive impression that this process of the shaping of tradition did not take place in the sphere of literature, but within a community which made no literary claims, had broken with the world and transmitted the sayings and doings of Jesus only to meet its own needs.

Our aim, however, was not merely a literary one; it was not even one merely concerned with the history of literature. We hoped to be able to test the trustworthiness of the tradition of the life of Jesus by the employment of new and less subjective criteria, to escape in this way from the arbitrary judgments of the psychological treatment of the life of Jesus, and finally in some measure to establish more firmly the knowledge of the words and deeds of Jesus. It is intelligible that the diverse ways in which the method has been applied have led so far to considerable differences of opinion; one has only to compare Bultmann’s book, *Jesus*, with Schmidt’s article, ‘Jesus,’ in the dictionary *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Not only so, but objection is still taken to the legitimacy as well as to the application of the new method; it would be presumptuous, accordingly, to speak as yet of established results.

V.

Theological discussion in Germany to-day has been most deeply influenced by the movement in

theology which took its rise in Karl Barth, Friedrich Gogarten, and Emil Brunner. Although the aim of this 'dialectic' theology is entirely directed towards a new and complete orientation of theology, its earliest pioneer work was Barth's commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans* which appeared in 1919, and its first effect on the popular mind was distrust of that exegesis which aims merely at giving historical results and forgets the precise reason why the books of the Old and New Testaments are read and studied by Christian people—which is not to understand the man Paul and his personal experiences, but to hear the Word which proceeds from God, and is meant not to edify and to exalt men but to bring them into judgment. The sharpest reaction against all psychologizing is here united with the absolute rejection of that secularization of exegesis which makes it nothing but Biblical philology and inquiries into the religion of Jews and Christians. In all this no attack is made on the methods and results of theological science, even when it is critical and sceptical; on the contrary, the negative results of criticism are regarded as a kind of proof of the questionable character of human activity, and in this sense they are further affirmed. But the claim of the Church to hear more from theology than historical statements and critical disquisitions has found in this movement the most energetic and most reasoned advocacy.

It would, however, be preposterous to see in the dialectic theology only a reactionary movement. The positive influence which it has exerted on New Testament research, as shown in the above-men-

tioned expositions of Bultmann and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, proves that we have to do with a new and fruitful development, whose outcome for the field of New Testament study it is as yet impossible to estimate. The new theology, when all is said and done, is an integral part of a great movement traceable in all the sciences of the mind, which aims at synthesis rather than analysis, at intellectual comprehension and interpretation rather than registration.

The endeavour to understand is based on intuition, on the inner act, on 'vision.' This tendency has also asserted itself in New Testament science outside the confines of the dialectic theology; in particular, Ernst Lohmeyer's studies on Paul should be mentioned as evidence of this endeavour.

This article can serve only as an introduction to the present-day discussion. It does not pretend to have the detachment which the historian has in regard to questions and tasks which are part and parcel of the life of every fellow-worker in this field in Germany. It cannot give in historical perspective a general view of the present position of New Testament research in Germany. Such a survey, however, may be got by any one who takes a conjunct view of the facts set forth in the last three sections (III., IV., V.). For the unsettlement which is so marked a feature of the present situation is entirely due to this, that fresh material and new methods have given our branch of study a vast and unprecedented extension, while at the same time a searching contemplation of self demands the most rigid concentration on the actual task of theology.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

It is a pleasure to note that this famous brief treatise of Kant,¹ truly described by Professor Otto as the most important of all writings for the ethical thinker, has been freshly edited by a competent hand. The book, which is a credit to the printer, is pretty much an exact reproduction of the second edition, published in 1786. But Otto has greatly

enriched it. An analysis of the argument is given at the beginning, extending to ten pages, and this is repeated piece by piece at the foot of successive pages. The footnotes include, in addition, remarks explanatory of the more difficult terms and ideas. Not only so, but longer elucidations are given of some leading conceptions, such as will, good will, feeling, interest, law, imperative: the finest shades of meaning being set out carefully. And to crown all, at the close there are critical discussions of special points. Nothing has been left undone to make the volume attractive and useful.

¹ *Immanuel Kant: Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*. Newly edited by Rudolf Otto. (Gotha: Leopold Klotz; 1930, M.7.)