

counted no doctrine authoritative unless it were prefaced with 'R. So-and-so saith.' It is related in the Talmud that Hillet once propounded a doctrine and, though he discoursed for a whole day in demonstration of its truth, his hearers would not accept it until at last he said, 'So I heard from Shemaiah and Abtalion.'¹ John the Baptist had in his store only 'things new,' the Rabbis had in theirs only 'things old.'

Jesus stood midway between those antagonistic tendencies, at once condemning and combining both. At the very outset of His ministry He defined His attitude. Apprehensive lest He should be identified with His iconoclastic Fore-runner, He protested that He had not come to 'pull down' the ancient Faith (Mt 5¹⁷). And all through His ministry He vindicated His loyalty to the Law and its institutions. It was His custom (Lk 4¹⁶), wherever He might be, to repair

¹ Lightfoot on Mt 7²⁰.

to the Synagogue and take part in its worship; and year by year He went up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast. He might have claimed exemption from the Temple-tax, since the Temple was His Father's House (Lk 2⁴⁹, Jn 2¹⁶) and not on Him should rest the burden of its maintenance; but, had He claimed exemption, it would have seemed to such as knew not who He was a mere violation of the Law, and therefore He paid the half-shekel, 'lest we make them stumble' (Mt 17²⁴⁻²⁷). This was His constant manner. He neither with the Rabbis idolized the past nor with the Baptist contemned it. He bade His disciples cherish the old and welcome the new, recognizing their continuity and the insufficiency of either by itself. The Law, He told them, was the word but not the final word of God, and He had come to complete it, enlarging its content, filling in its outline, and reinforcing it with fresh sanctions.

Jesus Christ and Missions to the World according to the Gospels.

BY THE REV. H. U. WEITBRECHT, PH.D., D.D., LAHORE, INDIA.

II.

THE apparent discrepancy of the statement in Mt 10²³, 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come,' with the prophecy of the universal diffusion of the gospel before the end lies on the surface, and the difficulty of explaining it is a real one. But we may note two facts—first, that these words form part of the same discourse, in which occur later the sayings already referred to (vv. 17, 18), which, indeed, precede this saying and indicate an eventual mission to the Gentiles following upon that to the Jews. 'They shall deliver you up to councils (*συνέδρια*), and in their synagogues they shall scourge you; yea, and (*καὶ δὲ*, indicating something further than the first) before governors and kings shall ye be brought,' etc. A careful and pragmatic writer like St. Matthew does not easily introduce a plain *contradictio in adjectis*. Second, when, as a matter of history, did the visitation of the cities of Israel by Christian evangelists come to a stop, while their

task remained unfinished? Clearly, at the destruction of Jerusalem, which brought the connexion of the Jewish Christians with the non-Christian Jews to an abrupt conclusion. This leads naturally to the interpretation followed by innumerable Christian divines, that in speaking of the 'coming of the Son of man' Christ is here referring to the destruction of Jerusalem as the first act in the drama of judgment on those who reject Him. Do the results of modern exegesis preclude us from still taking this view? In other words, is it inconceivable that Jesus should have used the same phrase, with different, though parallel meanings? We have an analogy in Lk 17. 'Ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man' (v. 22) refers, doubtless, to the days of His bodily presence among them, while the 'days of the Son of man' (v. 26) still more plainly indicates the time of His second advent. And again, in v. 20, the Saviour, in answer to the question when the kingdom of God

cometh, expressly says, 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation,' while in v.²⁴ he no less plainly avers: 'As the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall the Son of man be in his day.' The conclusion from these two pairs of passages is not that one set must be spurious if the other is to stand as genuine, but that the identical or analogous phrases are used with a different scope. Why should not the same hold good of the phrase, 'till the Son of man come' (Mt 10²³), as compared with the analogous phrase (Mt 24¹⁴), 'then shall the end come,' if the trend of eschatological sayings—as it does—points this way? ¹ Then the incompatibility between the provisional and particularistic command of Jesus to His disciples during His Galilean ministry and His permanent world-embracing charge to them after His resurrection will have no really historical basis.

But whatever the view taken of this particular passage, it is sufficiently clear that the universalist element in the recorded utterances of Christ greatly outweighs that which may be called particularist. Why, then, in the face of such exegetical difficulties, should Professor Harnack maintain that Christ can have had no thought of a mission to the world, and therefore gave no command to undertake it? He does not state the reason explicitly in *The Mission and Spread of Christianity*. But we shall hardly do him wrong, if we suppose that this view has been propounded in order to gain a more logical apprehension of the origin of the world-wide mission of the Christian Church, based on a conception of her Founder's attitude, which should be more psychologically true than the idea hitherto held, and from which the world-wide efforts of the Church have sprung. Let us suppose, then, for a moment, that 'missions to the heathen cannot have lain within the purview of Jesus,' and see what we gain in logical consistency and psychological truth.

The first chapter of Dr. Harnack's book is entitled 'Judaism: its Spread and Emancipation' (*Entschränkung*). After showing how the Jews probably formed 7 per cent. of the population of

the Roman Empire, he remarks that to account for this 'the propaganda of Judaism in the provinces must have been extremely vigorous' (p. 6); 'that Christianity inherited its missionary zeal, in part at least, from Judaism.' 'We must suppose that great numbers of heathen, especially low-born Semites of kindred race, went over to the religion of Yahweh in multitudes. . . . Judaism as a religion had already become emancipated in virtue of an internal transformation. . . . The Jew was possessed by a proud consciousness that he had a message to deliver and a boon to offer which concerned all mankind—the ONE spiritual God, and His holy Moral Law. . . . In many cases he might be concerned merely with the snaring of souls; still, Judaism was seriously desirous to overthrow the idols and to bring men to the acknowledgment of their Creator and Judge; for in this the honour of the God of Israel was involved. . . . Judaism developed its great propaganda as the philosophical religion, equipped with "the oldest book in the world." Josephus relates of the condition of things at Antioch: "The Jews in that place constantly attracted a great multitude of Greeks to their services, and made them in a certain sense members of their people"; and this applies to their entire missionary activity.' 'But few Gentiles became full proselytes by circumcision. 'More necessary even than circumcision was the baptismal bath.'²

It was no part of Professor Harnack's plan to go further back and trace the germs from which this remarkable development of Jewish propagandism sprang; but no laboured explanation is needed to show that it had its source in the 'prophetic universalism' to which he refers later on. For this purpose it is unnecessary to go into the age and composition of the Old Testament writings. We are merely concerned with them as they were at the time of Christ, when He studied and expounded them. As they stand, the thread of universalism that runs through them from end to end is unmistakable. The seed of the woman, through whom deliverance is to come from the power of evil, symbolized by the serpent, is of her who is the mother of the whole race. 'In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed (or bless themselves)' is the promise to the great ancestor of the chosen people. In the Psalter, which

¹ Attention has often been drawn to the similarity of the phrase, 'the day of Jehovah,' in the O.T. prophets describing sometimes a more particular judgment on a historical nation of the prophets' age (e.g. Babylon, Is 13⁹), sometimes indicating a more general future judgment of all powers opposed to the majesty of Jehovah (e.g. Is 2¹²).

² This would render it all the more probable that Jesus ordained the use of the 'baptismal bath' by His disciples.

expresses the deepest adoration and the highest aspirations of Israel, we may take one Psalm,—the very shortest, 117—for many, in which all nations are bidden to praise Jehovah for His mercy to Israel, which they could only do because the kingdom of the Merciful One rules over all (Ps 103¹⁰). And in the prophets, what an embarrassment of riches! Take only the great prophet of the Exile, whose first concern is for the salvation of his own little nation from the grip of a foreign power. Yet he is bold to say in Jehovah's name, 'Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth' (Is 45²²); and, 'It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribe of Jacob, and to restore the preserver of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (Is 49⁶). In a word, the salvation of Jehovah could only come truly to His chosen, as it also came *through* them to all. Truly this was a universalism that must needs overleap all racial barriers; and if at any time it should be ignored by the followers of the O.T. prophets, the last must become first, and the first last.

We go, then, a step farther from the universalism of the prophets and its partial realization in the Jewish propaganda before and after 1 A.D., to the Prophet whom even the Moslem acknowledges as greater than all that went before. He is a reverent student of the Law and the Prophets: He claims to fulfil them completely. He applies their words to Himself, when He first begins to teach in His childhood's home at Nazareth, and repeatedly He refers to them throughout His ministry. Yet 'missions to the Gentiles cannot have been contemplated by Jesus.' He rises high above the prophets who went before Him, both in example and teaching; but in His conception of the scope and destiny of the kingdom of God, He is immeasurably behind them. In this respect Jesus is far less open to the teaching of those who had gone before Him than Muhammad, and His religious outlook is incomparably narrower than that of the Arabian prophet, who recognized from the first that his religion must not be less world-embracing than that of the Christian. *Credat Judaeus!* If this is logical consistency and psychological truth, then those sciences must recently have acquired new standards.

If, on this hypothesis, Jesus falls below His predecessors, how much more below His disciples!

It is the part of the disciple to develop the germinal thoughts and impulses of his master; to give them a local habitation and a name. But the greatest of all the ideas so developed by the immediate successors of Jesus, was one which their Master did not so much as entertain.

Saul of Tarsus, who had known Christ after the flesh, was deluded in thinking that He had sent him 'far hence unto the Gentiles,' for his Master, strange to say, though conscious of the Jewish propaganda (Mt 23¹⁵), had never thought of bidding His disciples carry on a similar mission in the true spirit. Paul and others could bear to endure not only hardship from without, but much obliquely from within the Church, in order to carry a free gospel to the uncircumcision, yet without warrant from their Lord. And, indeed, the missionary activity of the Church generally has sprung from a misapprehension. For it is not the example of St. Paul, in the first instance, that moves the missionary to go forth,—that might be merely a subjective and individual instance of religious genius—it is the conviction that the will of his Lord is embodied in the commands that He gave to make disciples of the nations, and to preach the gospel to every creature.

Professor Harnack writes: 'Christians were "to let their light shine, so that the Gentiles (*Heiden*) might see their good works, and glorify their Father in heaven."' As a quotation, the words are inaccurate, but the turn given to them is perfectly true. Even in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus has His eye on the Gentile world. He condemns its caste spirit ('Salute your brethren only,' Mt 5⁴⁷), its formalism in religion ('vain repetitions,' Mt 6⁷) accompanied by entire secularity in conduct ('all these things do the Gentiles seek,' Mt 6³²); and in the midst of that Gentile darkness He constitutes His followers the light of the world, with the object that men may see the brightness which radiates from them, and trace it to its source in the Heavenly Father, who is and acts as the Father of *all*, the evil and the good, the just and the unjust (Mt 5^{14, 16, 45, 48}). The world mission of the gospel, instead of being a superadded element, separable by a sound analysis from the personality and teaching of Jesus, is in fact inseparably interwoven with both, a factor imperatively demanded by that which preceded Him, and the necessary condition of that which followed from His life and teaching.

In presenting the facts of the Gospels to non-Christians, the Indian missionary is by this time not unaccustomed to be met by his opponents with arguments taken from the *Encyclopædia Biblica* and by the name of the Oriel Professor of Divinity; but the overwhelming mass of Christian scholar-

ship gives him ample material to vindicate the historical credibility of the Gospels. If, as is likely enough, he is now met with the thesis under discussion, he will have little need to concede that he is working in the name of a Master who never contemplated the world enterprise of His servants.

Literature.

THE THEORY OF GOOD AND EVIL: A TREATISE ON MORAL PHILOSOPHY. By Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt. (Oxford), Hon. D.C.L. (Durham), Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. In Two Volumes. (Oxford: *At the Clarendon Press.* 14s. net.)

It may be well to state in the words of the author himself his aim in writing these volumes. "The scope of the present work is perhaps made sufficiently obvious in the title-page. It is an attempt to deal with the chief topics usually discussed in books bearing the title "Moral Philosophy" or "Ethics." It is on a larger scale than the books described as "Text-books," or "Introductions," and it is occupied to some extent with difficulties and controversies which can hardly be called "elementary." Still, I have in writing it had chiefly before my mind the wants of undergraduate students in Philosophy. I have endeavoured, as far as possible, to assume no previous acquaintance with ethical or general Philosophy; but it has not, in all parts of the work, been possible to avoid alluding to the arguments and objections of writers whose systems cannot be fully explained or examined in a book like the present" (Preface, p. v). It is well to have given this explanation, as it indicates many of the merits of the book. It explains, for instance, its great lucidity, its aptness, and its intelligibility. The undergraduate, always in the view of the author, has constrained him to use, when possible, untechnical language, or to explain in ordinary English the technical terms he does use. There is never any doubt as to the meaning of the author, nor any lack of lucidity in his statement. Add to this that Dr. Rashdall is the master of clear, racy, idiomatic English, and that his statement often rises to real eloquence, and the reader is assured that in the present work he has literature as well as philosophy. From this point of view

his work is a contrast to those of many writers on philosophical topics. In their works, lucidity and felicity of expression are too often conspicuous by their absence. Nor is this lucidity obtained by a refusal to look at the ultimate issues involved in the discussion. Dr. Rashdall has the faculty of stating these in language that may be understood by the undergraduate, or even by the man in the street. It is a great advantage to the reader, and we hope that readers will abound, for this is one of the greatest contributions to the study of Ethics in our time.

The title itself is suggestive. It is the Theory of Good and Evil, which means that, in the view of the author, Good and Evil are the decisive contrasts, the ultimate forms of ethical inquiry. The ultimate terms might conceivably be held to be those of 'Right or Wrong,' or 'Virtue or Vice,' and some account of the nature and working of the moral consciousness might be given from those points of view. Or it might be said that Right and Wrong regard conduct from the point of view of reference to a standard, that Virtue and Vice regard conduct in relation to character, and that Good and Evil regard conduct in reference to the end. Is it possible to find a point of view which will harmonize all these, and to state the ethical contrasts so as to have a central position which will make Right, Virtue, and Good aspects of the same ethical reality? It may be well to set forth, in the first place, the aim and method of this important work.

He begins with the obvious remark that the exact scope and object of a science is only arrived at as the science itself makes progress. What is true of science, is also true of philosophy and its branches. Thus he does not begin with a definition of Moral Philosophy. He is content to say that he is investigating the meaning and