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.

RECENTLY in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, the aged and saintly Bishop of Gloucester expressed the hope that he might be found fit to share in the first resurrection. He believed that each passing generation was sending up its saintly contingent to share in it. Mr. Rayner Winterbotham says it cannot be. It is not possible, he says, for any Christian of the present generation to share in the first resurrection.

Mr. Winterbotham has published a volume of sermons on the Parables of the Kingdom. At the end of the sermons come four excursuses. The second excursus is 'On Suffering as a Note of the Kingdom of Heaven.' It is there that he expresses the impossibility. He says 'that unless the apostle was strangely deceived, or used extremely misleading language, it is not possible for any Christian of the present generation to share in the first resurrection.'

But he says much more than that. He says that it is not possible for any of us to appropriate any of the future glories and heavenly rewards of the Kingdom. For they are uniformly connected in Scripture with the endurance of persecution and tribulation in this life. We do not suffer tribulation and persecution. We cannot suffer so. Outside the Turkish Empire and a few dark places of the earth, it is not possible, he says, for anyone to suffer so, and therefore it is not possible for anyone to look forward to receiving the crown of life or sharing in the first resurrection.

The rewards of the New Testament are the rewards of suffering. 'Who are these that are arrayed in white robes, and whence came they? These are they that came out of the great tribulation.' 'If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him.' Mr. Winterbotham even recalls the position which the 'Kingdom' holds in the passage which introduces the Apocalypse. 'I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ' (Rev 1^{9}). It expresses the apostolic conception of the Kingdom, of the position of those who belong to it. 'Nothing,' says Mr. Winterbotham, 'could be more simply effective than the position of the "Kingdom" in this sentence. It is identified, by the mere arrangement of the words, with persecution from without, with patient endurance from within.'

Mr. Winterbotham does not mean that we cannot be 'saved' without persecutions. 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' He believes that we can even live our Christian life without persecution, and without very much tribulation. It was not so at first. 'In the world ye shall have tribulation' expressed an actual and universal fact at first. And the apostolic statement, 'All that would live godly in

Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution,' was literally true at first. But he holds that if we do live our Christian life without persecution, we cannot serve ourselves heir to the promises.

Do we claim the ordinary ills of life as tribulation? Surely there are some to whom they are tribulation enough. But Mr. Winterbotham will not allow it. These, he says, are not the tribulation of the Christian. These are the ills that flesh is heir to. They are the loss that is common to the race. 'It is everywhere represented that our Lord's disciples would meet with trial and suffering peculiar to themselves; and the patient enduring of such trial and suffering is made the basis and condition of their heavenly reward.'

And so Mr. Winterbotham will not allow us to claim even the precious words of the Apocalypse: 'They shall hunger no more, neither shall they thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat.' He knows what comfort, what joy, what a blessed foretaste of good things to come, these words have afforded to Christian people. But he says it is impossible to pretend that the good people whose dying hours are soothed to-day with these Scriptures have come out of the great tribulation. 'As a rule, they have had no tribulation worth speaking of, and certainly not that of which the elder spake.'

And he takes from us even our place in the Millennium. He accepts the Millennium literally, 'according to the common belief of the earliest Christian ages.' The saints shall reign with Christ, and for a thousand years. But who are the saints? Those who have been *beheaded* for the testimony of Jesus. The word does not necessarily mean that the head has been struck off. The word which St. John uses is a peculiar one — coined perhaps by St. John himself, as 'guillotined' and 'macheted' have been coined in recent times. It does not need that everyone should have been actually killed with the Roman axe (the word here used). But it does need that they have been martyrs for the gospel. And it is not reason, says Mr. Winterbotham, but an impudent determination to make what we please of the Word of God, if we extend it to amiable and easy-going people who have never suffered anything at all for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake.

Professor Bruce's new book on *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (T. & T. Clark, post 8vo, pp. 463, 7s. 6d.) contains a chapter of special interest on 'The Theological Significance of the Epistle.' In that chapter Professor Bruce says that the doctrine of Christ's priesthood is 'a theological specialty' of this Epistle. 'Practically,' he adds, 'this is the only book of the New Testament in which that doctrine finds any, or at least adequate, recognition.'

But what is the doctrine of Christ's priesthood? Professor Bruce says it is not so narrow a thing as dogmatic theology has made it. Dogmatic theology has thought there is only one idea in it. But this writer is not a man of one idea. He firmly believes in the sacrificial character of Christ's death; it is a cardinal point of his theology. But that is not the only aspect under which he views the event. He handles the topic with great freedom. And Professor Bruce finds it presented under five phases, of which he gives an enumeration, beginning with the lowest and most elementary view, and rising gradually to the highest.

The most elementary view of the death of Christ is found in Heb 9^{27}. Jesus died once, and once only, as it is appointed unto all men once to die. On this view Christ's death is simply an instance of the common lot. The next is seen in 9^{16}. When Jesus died He left a will bequeathing an inheritance. On this the manner of the death is nothing, it might be by disease or accident. All that is necessary is that, being a testator, He be known to be dead. The next is earlier, Heb 2^{10}. The death of Jesus was the climax of a varied

experience of suffering, through which He was qualified to be a Captain of salvation. Crucifixion, with all that went before it, was a discipline for Himself, not a sacrifice for others. The next follows closely, $2^{14.15}$. Jesus though sinless died. Thus the close connexion between sin and death as its penalty is broken, and sinful men are delivered from the fear of death as penal. The idea is not yet that the Sinless One dies instead of the sinful, only that though sinless He dies, and no emphasis is laid on the manner of the death. The last is found in 10^{14}. The death of Jesus was a *priestly act of self-sacrifice* whereby He 'perfected for ever them that are sanctified.'

All these views helped the Hebrew Christians to see why Jesus had to die. Dogmatic theology has made little use of any but the last. Dr. Bruce admits that it is by far the most important view. But he thinks it is a great ethical loss that so little has been made of the third view. Christ's experience of suffering was for His own sake in the first place. But it is invested with a unique ethical interest for us. It carries the interest of a heroic life lived under the hardest conditions. His whole suffering experience, including His death, is seen to be the natural result of His moral fidelity. The cross came to Him because He cared supremely for the Divine interest and for duty.

'Professor Hort and the "Te Deum"' is the title of an article by President Thompson of Philadelphia in the American *Sunday School Times* for 4th March. The purpose of the article is to prove the early origin of the 'Te Deum.' It includes a long letter from Professor Hort of Cambridge.

The 'Te Deum' and the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' says President Thompson, differ from the other hymns of the Latin Church, not only in their grandeur, but also in their composition. The earliest Latin verse was characterized by accent and rhyme. Then came the period of Greek predominance in literature, and Roman verse lost its metre in imitating the Greek succession of long and short vowels or quantity. But the popular songs in Latin were probably always rhymed. And the time came when Pope Damasus ignored the classical models of Horace and Virgil, and composed his hymns in accented and rhymed verse after the manner of the popular songs. By and by the Irish and Anglo-Saxon writers added alliteration. But the 'Te Deum' and the 'Gloria in Excelsis' have neither rhyme nor accent nor quantity nor alliteration.

They are modelled, to all appearance, not on the Latin or Greek poetry, whether classical or popular, but upon the Hebrew Psalms. Dr. Thompson thinks that all the earliest Christian hymns were modelled on the Psalms. 'When ye come together,' says St. Paul to the Corinthians, 'each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation' ($1\text{ Co }14^{26}$). Does he simply mean that persons selected a Psalm from the Old Testament Psalter to read or recite? Dr. Thompson does not think so. The 'psalm' like the 'teaching,' the 'revelation,' the 'tongue,' and the 'interpretation' was evidently something original. Dr. Thompson understands that the Christians in Corinth were producing Christian psalms after the Hebrew model.

Then the only examples of these earliest Christian hymns that have come down to us are the 'Gloria in Excelsis' and the 'Te Deum.' The 'Gloria in Excelsis' was originally written in Greek. Its Greek original has been preserved. But the Latin translation is very early. The 'Te Deum' must have been written in Latin originally.

The proof of the very early origin of the 'Te Deum' is twofold. First, there is the Hebraic form of structure already mentioned. And next, there is a notable coincidence in three of its verses (7–9) with a passage in the writings of Cyprian. In his treatise, 'Concerning Immortal-

ity,' written in 253 or 254 A.D., Cyprian encourages his flock against the fear of death at the hands of the persecutors. He holds out hopes of reunion with the beloved dead. 'There the great company of our dear ones—parents, brothers, children—awaits us, and the abundant throng of those who in their own security are none the less concerned for our salvation; there the glorious choir of the apostles, there the exulting company of the prophets, there of martyrs multitude beyond number.' The connexion with the 'Te Deum' is obvious. And Dr. Thompson sees clear evidence, in the greater vividness and concreteness of the hymn, that Cyprian quoted the 'Te Deum,' not the 'Te Deum' Cyprian. He would therefore locate the 'Te Deum' in Africa, and date it in the age of Cyprian, if not earlier.

But there is a difficulty. In the end of the hymn there are phrases which are clearly taken from Jerome's Vulgate, and Jerome did not finish his Vulgate till 404 A.D. President Thompson believes that the last eight verses of the 'Te Deum,' in which the Vulgate phrases occur, are no part of the original poem, but were added by a later hand. It was in support of that belief that he sought the assistance of Professor Hort.

Professor Hort's letter was long, but very cautious. He could not say that the first two parts of the 'Te Deum' were wholly dependent on the Old Latin versions which Jerome worked on for his Vulgate. There are two words which point that way: *Sabaoth* (of i. 5) is the Old Latin reading against Jerome's *exercituum*, and *mortis aculeo* (of i. 17) is Old Latin against the Vulgate *stimulus mortis*. But both phrases are probably due to liturgical recollection, and not directly to an Old Latin version. On the other hand, there is nothing in the first two parts of the 'Te Deum' which demand dependence on the Vulgate. Professor Hort allows Dr. Thompson to maintain his argument of the composite character of the 'Te Deum' and the early origin of its first two parts.

When the Rev. J. H. Jowett of Birmingham preached in Wolverhampton, on the Sunday after the sudden death of Dr. Berry, he told an anecdote of Dr. Berry's ministerial life. He said, 'Sometime ago I travelled with Dr. Berry to London. We had the compartment to ourselves, and unveiled to each other the secrets of our spiritual life.' Dr. Berry told him that when he began his ministerial life he never mentioned the Atonement, and seldom spoke of the Cross. But one dreary November night he was called to see a dying woman. He was led into the lowest part of the town of Bolton, down a narrow street, into a court, up two or three flights of stairs. 'I found I was in a brothel'; in a corner of the garret lay the dying woman. 'I told the woman that God was her Father, and she was His child. There was no response. I then told her the story of the Prodigal Son, but it awakened no ripple of interest. I told her how the Magdalene had been turned from a sinner to a saint. She seemed to get no nearer to the peace she sought. Then, Jowett, bit by bit there was dragged out of me the story of the Crucified, as I heard it at my mother's knee. She awoke; and, Jowett, I think we got her in.'

Mr. Jowett's sermon was reported in the *Independent* of 9th February. Next week there was published in the *Independent* a letter from the Rev. John Hunter, D.D., of Glasgow. 'I read with surprise and sorrow,' said Dr. Hunter, 'Mr. Jowett's somewhat sensational statement in last week's *Independent* of a conversation he had with Dr. Berry in a railway carriage.' Then Dr. Hunter used language about the morbid cravings of the crowd, which was not without justification, but is not our present concern. But he added: 'I am quite sure Mr. Jowett (unintentionally, no doubt) misrepresents our departed friend. Dr. Berry was a many-sided man, but he was, I think, the last man to

put up an ignorant and superstitious strumpet in the last mortal sickness, as a qualified interpreter and judge of our deeper human needs, and of what is most divine in the Christian gospel. Mr. Jowett's version of the incident reads to me like a parody of what Dr. Berry told me, five years ago, in Aberdeen, when I had some long talks with him on deep subjects; and the application of it, I think, is somewhat strained and unfair. It was told to me in another connexion and for another purpose.'

Now it happened that on another page of the same issue of the *Independent* which contained Dr. Hunter's letter, there appeared some notes copied from the *Free Methodist*. The notes were recollections of Dr. Berry, contributed to the *Free Methodist* by the Rev. Thomas Law. Mr. Law said it was well known that Dr. Berry's theological views had very much changed during recent years. In the early days of his ministry he was one of the leaders of what was known as the advanced modern school of theology, 'and in effect, he preached that the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice was an immoral doctrine. I shall never forget his telling me—when we first crossed the Channel together—what brought about the change.' And then Mr. Law told the story of 'the ignorant and superstitious strumpet.'

Mr. Law's version of that story differs from Mr. Jowett's. Mr. Law says it was a girl that Dr. Berry was called to see; Mr. Jowett says that a girl came to Dr. Berry's door, but that it was her mother she asked him to come and see. Mr. Law says that Dr. Berry did not feel he had much fitness for such work, and suggested that another minister in the neighbourhood should be called; Mr. Jowett says only that he had never been asked to do anything so practical, and 'was half inclined to shirk it.' Mr. Law says that Dr. Berry spoke of the beauty of a noble life, the worth of goodness, and the reward of right doing; Mr. Jowett says definitely that he told her of the Fatherhood of God. Mr. Law says that then by one plunge he went back to the most old-fashioned theology, and said to the girl, 'Jesus Christ died for you; He died in your stead, and if you will only believe in Him and accept Him as your personal Saviour, all your sins will be forgiven'; and he adds that immediately he spoke to her in that way she rested as quietly on her pillow as if she were resting her head on her mother's bosom. Mr. Jowett simply says that the story of the Crucified was dragged out of him bit by bit, and that then she awoke, and, 'Jowett, I think we got her in.'

The details are different. But the story is the same. The centre of it is unmoved. Dr. Berry became a preacher of what he once called an immoral doctrine, and it was the practical necessity of preaching to a 'strumpet' that wrought the change. This story may be remembered when we set ourselves to the criticism of the Gospels.

But the most significant thing in the whole incident is the reference made by Dr. Hunter to the 'ignorant and superstitious strumpet in the last mortal sickness.' Dr. Hunter does not consider such an one 'a qualified interpreter and judge of our deeper human needs, and of what is most divine in the Christian gospel.' The phrase has much the same sound as the kind of consolation which Dr. Berry is reported to have offered the woman first. It really means that Dr. Hunter has no gospel for such a woman, and he is not ashamed to say it. But Jesus had a gospel for her. When He came, there were the two classes of people—the righteous who needed no repentance, and the sinners who, as the righteous said, needed it very much, but would never get it. Jesus came to give repentance and the remission of sins to the sinner. 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.' He reckoned this woman the very person who could interpret and judge our deeper human needs, the very person who needed and could recognize what was most divine in the Christian gospel.