

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

three months a second edition of his book, *Suggestion and Mental Analysis* (University of London Press : 3s. 6d. net), has been called for. It is not a mere reprint, but an enlargement of the first edition. After explaining and criticizing various points in

the theory and practice of psycho-analysis, hypnosis, and suggestion, he warns us—and the warning is timely—that the psycho-therapist ought to be a sound physician, a sound psychologist, and something of a philosopher and religious man.

The Wrath of God in the Teaching of Jesus.

BY EDWARD GRUBB, M.A., LETCHWORTH.

DID our Lord teach that the ultimate Divine answer to human sin is the manifestation of Wrath? Did He reveal a God whose patience with the evil in men's hearts is limited, and who, if their unrepentance exceeds the limit He has appointed, will torment or destroy them? This is not exactly the old question of Eternal Punishment: it goes deeper. The question now asked is whether punishment itself, when all means of salvation seem to have failed, is (in the teaching of Jesus) the Divine way of finally dealing with sin.

On a superficial reading of the Gospels, the answer seems quite clear. Jesus does apparently speak repeatedly of 'outer darkness,' 'unquenchable fire,' 'wailing and gnashing of teeth,' 'the worm that dieth not,' as the portion of the finally ungodly. In the older theology this was spoken of as the 'justice' of God, which used to be contrasted with His 'mercy.' The question before us is whether the God of whom Jesus taught, and in communion with whom He lived, was thought of by Him in those terms; and whether the idea of God as Judge and Avenger can be reconciled with the conviction of His Fatherhood.

Many Christians would probably be content to answer that Fatherhood represents *one side* of the Divine nature, and that there is a sterner one. This sterner side is revealed to us in the natural law of consequence, expressed by Paul in the memorable words: 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; he that soweth to his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption' (Gal 6⁷.⁸). That persistent wrong-doing leads to disaster would seem to be of the essence of a rational and moral universe; were things arranged otherwise, there would be no corrective of human folly. The law of consequence is, in part, remedial: it is through finding out the results of evil that we learn to do

better: 'a burnt child dreads the fire.' Was it this law of consequence that Jesus had in mind when (as reported) He spoke of 'unquenchable fire'? The difficulty is that there is no hint, in any of the passages concerning Judgment attributed to Him, that the 'fire' is remedial and purgative—unless in the sense that fear of it will induce men to repent. It is always presented, in those passages of His recorded teaching, as God's *final* answer to human sin: not as chastisement but as retribution.

Is this reconcilable with His conception of the Divine Fatherhood? All will admit that Jesus taught that the best human fatherhood we know is a clue to the character of God (Mt 7¹¹, etc.). Even the most perfect human father, we should say, must sometimes punish his children; but, if so, he will always do it for what he believes to be their good, and not for the purpose of retribution or of matching ill-desert with pain. The question therefore is not whether Divine chastisement for man's good can be included in the conception of Fatherhood, but whether we have to set, side by side with our Lord's thought of God as Father, the other conception of God as Judge and Avenger: whether, in the mind of Jesus, God was something else as well as Father, and whether the two aspects can be reconciled.

This vitally important subject has been very ably treated by Miss Dougall and the Rev. C. W. Emmet in a book recently published, *The Lord of Thought*.¹ Their contention is, broadly, that the conception of Fatherhood covers *all* that Jesus taught of God, that the other strain of teaching is not consistent with it, and not authentically His

¹ *The Lord of Thought: A Study of the Problems which confronted Jesus Christ, and the Solution which He offered.* Student Christian Movement, 12s. 6d. net.

at all, but one that springs from Jewish eschatology. Before I had read their book, which appears to be of the very highest importance for Christian theology, my own thoughts had turned strongly in the same direction. Perhaps I may be allowed to develop them in my own way, using the book occasionally for purposes of confirmation.

Such study as I have been able to give to the New Testament writings suggests three conclusions :

(1) That Jesus was, as Matthew Arnold used to say, 'above the heads of His reporters' : that the early Church took over the penal ideas of Jewish eschatology ; and, with these thoughts in mind, misinterpreted certain features of its Master's teaching.

(2) That Jesus, while fully recognizing the evil consequences of sin, and solemnly warning His disciples of them, did not attribute these consequences to God, whose character was for Him pure and unmixed love ; and that this constituted His 'gospel.'

(3) That the ideas of Judgment suggested in the Fourth Gospel are nearer to the thoughts of Jesus than are those attributed to Him by the Synoptists, especially the first.

It is impossible in one short article to deal adequately with these conclusions ; all I can do is to indicate some of the data on which they rest, and to try to indicate their practical importance. I cannot keep the three points entirely separate in this discussion.

My own knowledge of the Jewish apocalyptic writings is scanty, but their main drift is set forth by Miss Dougall in Part I. of this book with a wealth of knowledge and illustration that leaves little to be desired. She points out that while not all pious Jews of the time of Jesus believed in a coming supernatural catastrophe, they all had 'the same underlying conception of God and man, of law and punishment,' and that many on both sides were in serious doubt and perplexity concerning the ways of God with men. (Clear evidence of this is to be found in the Apocalypse of Ezra.) What the Apocalyptists tried to do was to assure their people, in face of persecution and distress, of the final triumph of God and righteousness ; but at what a cost !

'The main burden of these books is the scarcity of righteous souls and God's implacable vengeance on the unrighteous. . . . The

Gentiles were not thought of as ruled by a different idea of God, but as merely "ungodly." Impious Jews were even worse than ungodly. Worst of all were the Gentiles who oppressed the Jews. God was not thought of as able to overcome sin and save the sinners ; it was only by the destruction of all the ungodly and sinners that God and good could prevail.'

The authors rightly point out that this theory of Judgment required a rigid separation of all men into wholly bad and wholly good—a conception which passed over into Christian thought, but which is contrary to all our experience of men in this world.

It was into the midst of a people so taught that John the Baptist came with his preaching of repentance, as a refuge from the swiftly approaching wrath of God.¹ His message was mainly one of gloom and dread. Jesus contrasts with it His own message, as being one of gladness and joy (Mt 11¹⁶⁻¹⁹). Could this have been so, if He also thought of God as finally the Avenging Judge ? The fact seems certain that the preaching of Jesus was felt to be indeed 'good news' ; and this can only have been because it was based on a new and truer idea of God and of His purpose for men. If He really held, with the eschatologists and John the Baptist, that it was only a few who would escape the Divine wrath, could there have been in His teaching this note of joy in God ?

In Luke (13¹⁻⁵), Jesus repudiates the popular notion that calamities are 'sent' by God as punishments for sin. The massacred Galileans, and the eighteen on whom the tower in Siloam fell, were not 'sinners above all.' It is true He adds, 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish' ; but the authors are surely right in interpreting this as a national and not an individual warning. If the Jewish nation went on as it was then going, the certain issue would be revolt against Rome and inevitable destruction. This national aspect of the teaching of Jesus is, happily, receiving attention now in many quarters ; and there is a growing

¹ The writers suggest (with Wellhausen) that John really spoke of his Successor as one who should baptize *with fire* ; that Mark has changed this to 'the Holy Spirit' ; and that Q has combined the two versions of his teaching. (See also Manson, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, p. 71.) I am inclined to think that John was rather more truly a forerunner of Jesus than the authors seem to allow.

belief that His fundamental teaching about the necessity of the forgiveness of enemies has, as its primary reference, national forgiveness of the Roman oppressors. However this may be, He clearly taught that men must forgive because God forgives. He saw that God is 'kind toward the unthankful and evil' (Lk 6³⁶), and men must share God's spirit of universal love. He desired national as well as individual repentance, that His nation might take up the missionary service which the greatest of the prophets had foretold for it, and become 'a light to the Gentiles' (Is 49⁶).

But what, now, of His warnings of doom? These are the subject of very careful study by Mr. Emmet in Part III. of the book. It is shown that the bulk of these warnings of Divine punishment are in the First Gospel; and evidence is brought to prove that its author has interpreted, in accordance with his own ideas about 'Judgment,' passages which in Mark and Luke are much less eschatological in tone.¹ It is in the explanation of parables that Matthew finds the chief opportunity for these warnings, and many of these explanations should probably be attributed to him and not to Jesus. As is pointed out in the footnote below, Luke is much less 'eschatological' than Matthew. Was this because as a Gentile Christian he was not interested in eschatology, and therefore toned down the teaching of Jesus, or was he nearer to its true meaning? Mr. Emmet pleads for the second view. After careful inquiry he sums up thus:

¹ In Mark's Gospel there are (I believe) only four passages concerning the final Judgment, all of which appear also in Matthew. They are Mk 3²⁹ (=Mt 12³¹, Lk 12¹⁰); Mk 8³⁸ (=Mt 16²⁷, Lk 9²⁶); Mk 9⁴⁸⁻⁴⁹ (=Mt 5^{29, 30} and 18⁹, not Lk.), and Mk 12⁹ (=Mt 21⁴¹, Lk 20¹⁰). The 'little Apocalypse' in Mk 13 is, in parts at least, of doubtful authenticity, and clearly refers mainly to the destruction of Jerusalem. Besides these Marcan passages there appear to be eighteen others of a similar character in Matthew, of which seven only are paralleled in Luke. The terrible denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, which occupies nearly the whole of Mt 23, is in Mark condensed into three verses (12²⁹⁻⁴⁰), and is much milder in tone. The lesson drawn from the withering of the fig-tree in Mk 11²⁰⁻²⁵ is not, as might have been expected, Judgment, but faith, prayer, and forgiveness. Luke has three passages referring to future punishment (in addition to 13³⁻⁵, already alluded to) which are his alone: 13⁹, 16¹⁹⁻³¹ and 19^{14, 27}. The last appear to be portions of a lost parable which has been confused with the Parable of the Pounds.

'It appears then that Luke has no particular bias against eschatology as such, but simply follows his sources. This conclusion is of the greatest importance for our whole investigation. . . . Seeing that Luke retains the eschatology of Mark and of his sources in Acts, there is no reason to suppose that he deliberately cut it out from Q. We follow him rather than Matthew as giving us the truer report of Christ's teaching where the two overlap.'

We may remember it is Luke who gives us the principle of Divine justice, that he who knew not his lord's will is to be beaten with few stripes (12^{47, 48}); and who makes Jesus, when reading from Is 61 in the synagogue at Nazareth, stop short of the words, 'and the day of vengeance of our God' (4¹⁸). In the priceless parables which he gives us from his special source, there is (except in Dives and Lazarus) almost no eschatology.

Finally, we have to reckon with the Fourth Gospel, to which in some respects the third makes an approach. I dealt with its Eschatology in an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. xxviii. p. 308), and need only now recall that Judgment is there presented, sometimes at least, not as a future event in time, but 'as a present and perennial experience, as something inherent in the very fact that new moral truth is revealed, and as irrevocably bound up with the way a man uses the revelation. . . . The "world" is not to be destroyed but "overcome."'² If it is possible to think of the author as an actual companion of Jesus, he would seem to have caught his Master's meaning better than any one else; and, if not, it is perhaps no extravagance to believe that that meaning was revealed to him by the Spirit. In either case it is difficult to think that he had more insight into truth, and more sobriety of outlook, than Jesus Himself.

The importance of these conclusions, if they are in the direction of the truth, can hardly be exaggerated. Should they meet with general acceptance,

² In other words, the deeper teaching of the Fourth Gospel is that Judgment is not God's personal act, but is an outcome of the necessary constitution of the universe. It is not possible here to discuss this great and difficult subject; but I earnestly commend Miss Dougall's two central chapters on the teaching of Jesus concerning consequence and concerning forgiveness.

the Christian Church will gain, for the first time in its history, a consistent thought of God as love and nothing else; and it will recognize that this is due entirely to its Founder. The moral and social and international effects of such a revolution in the general conception of God are almost incalculable. As Miss Dougall says:

‘Whatever a man thinks his God is and does, he seeks to be and do, and generally succeeds. If his gods are sexually immoral, such is he, and that even in his worship. If his God is a God of war, he is truculent. If God is one among many, and jealous, unable to abide other gods, His followers are jealous of the prestige of any nation but their own, unable to abide other nations. If God is conceived as the One Absolute Reality, rational but impassible, man holds himself above human

joys and sorrows in Stoic aloofness. . . . If God's holiness consists in the vindictive punishment of wrong, and His glory consists in the power to coerce His creature into obedience, human civilization will express itself in a penal code and will be founded on military force. . . . A penal code cannot command obedience, as the Jews discovered; but a Living Love, give it time and scope, does adapt men to the good life. Love is thus higher and more majestic than law, for it rules free spirits. It is the only power that can leave men free while yet it controls their actions.’

Jesus Christ met the evil of the world not by overwhelming it with supernatural force, but by going to the Cross. If He was really Divine, then His way of overcoming evil is God's way; and it must be man's way too.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A New Departure in the Investigation of the Synoptic Gospels.¹

It is difficult, in a brief review, to give an idea of the significance of this book. Professor Bultmann, whose reputation is established among the younger scholars of Germany, has here set himself to the important task of attempting to get behind the Synoptic Gospels as we have them and to analyse the process by which they reached their present form. The inquiry is one which must often have appealed to New Testament investigators, and, whatever may be thought of its results, it is at least a real advantage to be shown clearly the various difficulties involved.

Bultmann examines the material with extreme minuteness under two main headings, the ‘Tradition of the Words of Jesus’ and the ‘Tradition of Narrative Matter.’ The former division is subdivided into (a) a group which he names *Apophthegmata*, i.e. passages ‘whose point consists in a word of Jesus apprehended in a brief

framework’; (b) words of the Lord (Logia in the strict sense, prophetic and apocalyptic words, legal words and regulations for the Church, I-words, and parables). The second division embraces (a) miracle stories, and (b) historical narratives and legends. Bultmann's standpoint is that the first Gospel writer, Mark, must have found a number of isolated traditions floating about, and he tries to show in detail how the evangelist constructed them into the form in which we have them in the Gospel. But he also analyses what he conceives to be those separate, isolated passages with the most laborious thoroughness. A glance at the register of passages from the Synoptic Gospels (for he applies a similar treatment to Matthew and Luke) reveals the astounding pains he has spent on the analysis.

It may at once be admitted that over and over again his analysis brings out most interesting and instructive results. Take, e.g., the very difficult passage, Mt 5¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Bultmann thinks that the passage goes back to the discussion between the more conservative (Palestinian) and the more liberal (Hellenistic) section of the early Christian community. ‘*μὴ νομίσητε*’ shows that v.¹⁷ arose from debate. . . . V.¹⁸ in its formulation of principles and in its antagonism to primary tradition can

¹ *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*. By R. Bultmann, Professor in Giessen, Göttingen: Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1921. Pp. x, 229. Price 9s.