

# 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

*Commentaries for Students.*

Votes.	Authors.	Names of Comms.	Publishers and Prices.
DANIEL—			
16	Bevan . . . .	—	Cambridge Press, 8s.
6	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker, 10s. 6d.
HOSEA—			
8	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker, 34s. 6d.
7	Keil . . . .	—	T. & T. Clark, 2 vols. 12s. net.
JOEL—			
10	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
AMOS—			
10	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
6	Orëlli . . . .	—	T. & T. Clark, 10s. 6d.
OBADIAH—			
10	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
JONAH—			
10	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
6	Keil . . . .	—	T. & T. Clark.
MICAÏI—			
9	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
NAHUM, HABAKKUK, AND ZEPHANIAH—			
10	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
HAGGAI AND MALACHI—			
10	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.
ZECHARIAH—			
13	Wright . . . .	—	Hodder, 14s.
9	Pusey . . . .	—	Parker.

*Popular Commentaries.*

Votes.	Authors.	Names of Comms.	Publishers and Prices.
DANIEL—			
40	Driver . . . .	C.B.	Camb. Press, 2s. 6d. net.
14	Farrar . . . .	E.B.	Hodder, 7s. 6d.
HOSEA—			
38	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder, 2 vols. 15s.
31	Cheyne . . . .	C.B.	Camb. Press, 1s. 6d. net.
JOEL—			
42	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
35	Driver . . . .	C.B.	Camb. Press, 2s. 6d. net.
AMOS—			
43	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
35	Driver . . . .	C.B.	Cambridge Press.
OBADIAH—			
44	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
21	Perowne . . . .	C.B.	Camb. Press, 1s. 6d. net.
JONAH—			
44	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
22	Perowne . . . .	C.B.	Cambridge Press.
MICAÏI—			
43	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
35	Cheyne . . . .	C.B.	Cambridge Press, 1s. net.
NAHUM, HABAKKUK, AND ZEPHANIAH—			
44	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
29	Davidson . . . .	C.B.	Camb. Press, 1s. 6d. net.
HAGGAI AND MALACHI—			
44	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
21	Perowne . . . .	C.B.	Cambridge Press, 2s. net.
ZECHARIAH—			
44	Smith . . . .	E.B.	Hodder.
21	Perowne . . . .	C.B.	Cambridge Press.

(To be concluded.)

## James Martineau.

MESSRS. NISBET have published the *Life and Letters of James Martineau* in two Books and in two volumes. The first Book, which occupies the whole of the first volume and half of the second, contains the 'Life and Letters' properly speaking. It is written by James Drummond, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. The second Book is confined to the second half of the second volume. It contains an exposition of Dr. Martineau's philosophy, and is written by C. B. Upton, B.A., B.Sc., Professor of Philosophy in the same college.

The division of labour is commendable, and the result satisfactory. But Professor Upton's work is not promised on the title-page, and although no one will regret to find that the volumes contain this their most valuable part, it is earnestly to be hoped that the publishers will issue the 'Philosophy' alone. Meantime let those who have not yet read the *Life and Letters*, especially if they are not well acquainted with Dr. Martineau's works, begin with Professor Upton. His exposition is a surprise of lucid philosophical writing. Nowhere else can Dr. Martineau's philosophy in particular,

or the tendency of present philosophical thought in general, be more easily read and mastered.

Why are biographies written? They are written in order that the present and future generations may know something of the men and women whose work is not 'interred with their bones.' Will James Martineau's work survive? Professor Upton has no doubt of it. 'The three philosophical systems,' he says, 'which appear most likely to contribute important factors to that philosophy of religion which is now taking shape, and which will dominate the theological thought of the next hundred years, are the systems of Hegel, of Lotze, and of James Martineau.' More than that, Professor Upton believes that Hegelianism will be the first of the three to go. Its influence is past in Germany; it is well shaken in England; it will not long rule America. For the Determinism which belongs to its very essence is incompatible with the ideas of sin, repentance, and true moral responsibility. 'If I mistake not, the philosophy of religion of the twentieth century will combine and harmonize eternal truths which are enshrined in Martineau's *Study of Religion* and Lotze's *Microcosmus*.'

It is as a philosopher, thinks Professor Upton, that Martineau's name will go down to posterity. It will rest upon two great works which he published after he had passed his eightieth year—*Types of Ethical Theory* and *A Study of Religion*. The late editor of the *Spectator*, Mr. R. H. Hutton, who was Dr. Martineau's pupil and life-long friend, does not agree with Professor Upton in this. He says: 'Important as are such of his later works as the *Types of Ethical Theory*, or the *Seat of Authority in Religion*, we have no hesitation in saying that in his wonderful sermons, known collectively as *Hours of Thought on Sacred Things*, and in his *Endeavours after the Christian Life*, the real Martineau, the spiritual teacher who will endure, has accomplished his greatest and finest work.' The reader will agree with Professor Upton. The sermons are great. They have touched with emotion and aspiration many a candid inquiring spirit. We can understand how special circumstances made them specially dear to Mr. Hutton. But unless this biography has been written in vain, it is certain that Dr. Martineau's fame will rest upon the work he accomplished in philosophy. It is even possible that he will be

recognized by the generations that are to come as the greatest moral philosopher of the nineteenth century.

*Moral* philosopher, we say. Professor Upton tells us that Dr. Martineau had three great courses of lectures. Two of these courses were published, as has already been stated, after Dr. Martineau had passed his eightieth year. They were, however, written much earlier than that. It is quite a mistake to speak of them as the work of an octogenarian. Even the *Seat of Authority*, which was published still later, incorporates much earlier material, and 'presents ideas which had been gradually accumulating for many years.' The first of the three courses has not been published.

Now it is the second of these courses, the Ethical, published as *Types of Ethical Theory*, that is most characteristic of Dr. Martineau, and contains his most original thinking. 'The ethical,' says Professor Upton, 'was certainly the predominant interest with him, and sometimes, I think, his writings betray the defects of excessive Ethicalism.' It was in Ethics, that is to say, in the conscience, that Dr. Martineau's religion, and even, it might be said, his philosophy, began. His first thought of God was of one who made Himself known in 'Thou shalt not.' 'I believe,' says Mr. Stopford Brooke, 'that Dr. Martineau arrived at the close-fibred convictions he had concerning the predominance of the things of the spirit by passing first through the things of the intellect and the conscience in their relation to God; but that is not the path the man takes to whom the things of the spirit are natural, and therefore expressed with ease and passion. Such a man, like the writer of the Gospel of St. John, first lives in the spirit, and then, from the spirit, realizes God in the conscience and the intellect. Martineau, on the other hand, was led to the spiritual life by discovering where the conscience and the intellect failed in finding the last and highest truths of God and man. It is for that reason, I think, that he had not, in his work, the spiritual world under his command as fully as he had the intellectual and moral worlds. In fact, he was not born with a large and piercing imagination, nor with the deep emotions of a mystic.'

The outward incidents of Dr. Martineau's life are found in the biographical part of this work, written by Principal Drummond. They are not

of great value to the student of his writings. With two exceptions, they seem to have had little influence on the development of his thought. Dr. Martineau was a reader of books. He had many friends and they were very faithful, yet even his friends touched him but superficially. He read his books and thought his thoughts. His life was full of change and activity. He engaged in many controversies, wrote to many periodicals, attended many club meetings. 'Our life,' writes his wife in 1869, 'becomes more and more complicated and intense, till I feel the thread *must* snap or tangle soon. My husband's wonderful calm and arrangement and grasp and power of work carry him through all, while *I* quiver and gasp and suffer the more the less *I* really do.' Yet, in spite of it all, his religion, as Mr. Armstrong asserts, was essentially a lonely and not a social religion, and so was his own intellectual life. With two exceptions, as we have said, the outward events of his life had no effect upon his philosophy.

One of the two events was his birth, in 1805, into a Unitarian family; the other was a year spent in Berlin, between 1848 and 1849.

Perhaps the most interesting thing in all this biography is Martineau's relation to Christ. That was greatly influenced by his birth into a Unitarian family. But his philosophy was influenced also. For he found himself, when he began to think, the heir to the necessarian doctrine of the will, which Dr. Priestley had taken from Hartley and impressed upon the Unitarians of his day. Dr. Martineau accepted the necessarian philosophy, and taught it for ten years of his professorial life.

Dr. Martineau's biographers cannot trace with certainty the steps which led him to abandon the Hartleyan doctrine of the bondage of the will. But it is clear that the revolt began in his conscience. He had never been able to find complete satisfaction in Dr. Priestley's candid acknowledgment that 'a Necessarian who, as such, believes that *nothing goes wrong*, but that everything is under the best direction possible, himself and his conduct, as part of an immense and perfect whole, included, cannot accuse himself of having done wrong in the ultimate sense of the words. He has therefore, in this strict sense, nothing to do with repentance, confession, or pardon, which are all adapted to a different imperfect and fallacious view of things.' His conscience revolted

against this doctrine. He himself says also that at this time his mind began to assume a 'new attitude towards the early Christian modes of conception, especially those of the Apostle Paul, whose writings seemed to be totally transformed and to open up views of thought of which I had previously no glimpse.' And he preached a sermon on 'The Christian View of Moral Evil' and declared his emancipation. The sermon reached Dr. Channing in America. 'The part of your discourse,' wrote Dr. Channing, 'which gave me the sincerest delight, and for which I would especially thank you, is that in which you protest against the doctrine of philosophical necessity. Nothing for a long time has given me so much pleasure. I have felt that this doctrine, with its natural connexions, was a millstone round the neck of Unitarians in England. I know no one who has so clearly and strongly pointed out as yourself its inconsistency with moral sentiments in God, and with the exercise of moral sentiments towards Him by His creatures. I have always lamented that Dr. Priestley's authority has fastened this doctrine on his followers.'

This was in the year 1839. The other important event was the visit to Berlin in 1848-1849. It was after this visit, says Professor Upton, that all Dr. Martineau's College Lectures (except the early course on Political Economy), as well as all his more important philosophical works, took their final shape. He hesitated between Berlin and Tübingen, for he had a strong leaning towards Baur and the Tübingen school. But Berlin won. He heard Neander lecture. 'A little shy-looking man, with a quantity of black hair, and eyes so small and overshadowed by dark brows as to be invisible, slinks into a great lecture-room; steps up to his platform; but instead of taking his professor's chair, takes his station at the corner of his tall desk, leaning his arm upon the angle, and his head upon his arm; with his face thus hanging over the floor, and pulling a pen to pieces with his fingers, he begins to rock his desk backwards and forwards on its hind edge with every promise of a bouleversement, and talks smoothly, as he rocks, for his three quarters of an hour, without a scrap of paper, quoting authorities, chapter and verse, and even citing and translating longish passages from ecclesiastical writers; and finishing every clause by spitting, in a quiet dropping way, upon the floor, as if to express the punctuation. When

the clock strikes, the demolition of the pen is just complete, and he slinks out of the room without apparently having once been conscious that anybody was present.'

That was how Dr. Martineau saw Neander the Great, and that was how Dr. Martineau wrote in the days before he fell into that 'metaphysical habit of writing' which he himself thought spoiled his style, and made all he wrote very stiff reading; but which—well, so competent a critic as Dr. P. T. Forsyth speaks of as 'so lucent, jewelled, over-polished at times, perhaps, but never metallic; full of fancy—sometimes too full—and of imagery now scientific, now poetic; full of delicacy, lithe as steel, with a careful felicity saying the unsayable.'

But it was not Neander that made that year in Berlin so memorable to him. Nor was it Trendelenburg, whose lectures he frequented most. In his 'Biographical Memoranda' he wrote, 'A short experience convinced me that, for the purpose of my special studies, I should gain most by reading a good deal and hearing a little.' So he heard a little, not only of Neander and Trendelenburg, but also of Gabler, Michelet, Vatke, Boeckh, and Ranke; and he read a great deal *in two authors only*—but they were Plato and Hegel.

Dr. Martineau was born into a Unitarian circle, and he remained a Unitarian all his life. He saw some of his friends, such as the Huttons, leave Unitarianism and enter the Church of England, 'in order that they might keep a God essentially *social* before their hearts and minds.' He was often in keen antagonism to what he would have called 'orthodox' Unitarianism; he was often in keen sympathy with men like Maurice and Stanley. He even deplored his theological isolation. 'In reading these things,' he said in 1852, 'I am ashamed of the effect they have upon my weakness; not on my convictions—for I see where they logically fail—but on my mere human feelings; it is so painful to be exiled from the sympathies of faith, and observe the horror and scorn with which others regard what is religion to us.' And again in 1871, 'Never do I feel my exile from the common heritage of Christendom as in reading a book like this [it was Bunsen's *Prayers*], which, after making me sure of the profoundest communion, reminds me but too

plainly that I am and must remain a spiritual outlaw.' Yet he was never ashamed to call himself a Unitarian, rejoiced in the liberty which he thought Unitarianism yielded him, and as the years went on gradually grew more reserved in what he affirmed of the Person and Work of Christ.

In the year 1828, when Dr. Martineau was ordained to the ministry of the gospel, he was requested to make a declaration of his faith. In that declaration he spoke of Jesus Christ as 'God's well-beloved Son,' he called Him 'the Mediator between God and men,' he said that He 'lives for evermore and shall hereafter judge the world in righteousness.' He spoke of His 'sinless excellence,' 'in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily'; 'as authorities for our duties' he said, 'as fountains of consoling and elevating truth, Jesus and the Father are one, and in all subjects of religious faith and obedience not to honour Him as we honour the Father is to violate our allegiance to Him as the great Captain of our salvation.' And in all the declaration there is one word only which a Trinitarian might not use. He speaks of 'that position which He now holds above all *other* created beings.'

Perhaps the most remarkable of these expressions is that of 'sinless excellence.' From that expression and that position Dr. Martineau never departed. Nothing in all his life caused him acuter agony than the publication of *Phases of Faith* by his old close friend, F. W. Newman, in which he read depreciation of the moral perfection of Christ. Even when he wrote his lecture on 'The Proposition that Christ is God proved to be false from the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures,' he stated that 'Christ possessed and manifested all the moral attributes of Deity.'

But other phrases were weakened with time. In a letter of 1861 he wrote, 'My scruple about the terms "Mediator," "Redeemer," and "Saviour," applied to Christ, has always lingered and hung about my mind from boyhood, though I am ashamed to say I have never till now had the courage and simplicity to look it fairly in the face.' And when he does look it fairly in the face, he comes to the conclusion that he cannot use these words in the sense which they bear in Scripture or the usage of the Church. A 'Mediator' is one who brings us to God; but he means

no more by it than that we owe to Christ *our right apprehension of God*. It speaks of a change from darkness to light; but he has never been in darkness in this sense, he has all along been with God, and at no date required to be brought to Him by Christ. 'Redeemer' and 'Saviour' also are words implying in the 'redeemed' and 'saved' a *transference* from a lost to a rescued condition: 'to most Unitarian Christians no such transference takes place.' He is a man of prayer. 'Few men,' says Dr. Drummond, 'have come nearer to the fulfilment of the apostolic precept, Pray without ceasing.' But he ceases to pray *in the name of Christ*.

And yet, strange to say, he never ceases to worship Him. 'The doctrine of the Trinity,' he says in 1863, 'does not consist in owning and enumerating *three objects* of religious faith—God the Supreme Father, the Son of God, the Spirit of God—for the acknowledgment of these three is the essential characteristic of all Christendom in

all ages; but in making these three, *equal persons of one Godhead*.' And in 1886, after he had retired from the Principalship of Manchester New College and all active service, he sent a paper to the *Christian Reformer* on 'A Way out of the Trinitarian Controversy,' in which he claimed that the Being whom Unitarians worship corresponds with the second Person in Trinitarian theology, who was 'manifested through all ages by nature and history, but concentrated with unique brilliancy in the character and existence, the holy life and redeeming work of Jesus, in whom the Spirit so dwelt without measure that He was the very "Word made flesh," the Divine perfection on the scale and united with the incidents of humanity.'

What shall we say—that James Martineau was really a Trinitarian but unevangelical?—that he believed in the Deity, but not in the Cross, of Christ?—that he was strong on the Person but weak on the Work?

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### 'The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament.'<sup>1</sup>

THAT the kingdom of God is a New Testament not an Old Testament conception, is a commonplace of Biblical Theology. But it encounters us on the first page of the New Testament as a conception already in full currency; it accordingly belongs to the stock of ideas which, however transformed by the teaching of Christ, was not strictly created by Him, but found by Him ready to hand. This means that, although not strictly an Old Testament idea, it is based upon Old Testament ideas. To identify and trace historically these ideas, the substratum or *Unterbau* of the New Testament idea of the kingdom of God, is a definite problem for Biblical Theology. Dr. Böhmer attempts this, and his treatment, if not exhaustive of the whole contribution of the Old Testament to the result, is so at least along one special line of development, namely, the conception of God as King. And the treatment of this special theme throws

most valuable light on the conception of the kingdom also. Dr. Böhmer considers the question in the light of the divine names, and of the comparative significance of the title 'king' as applied to God in Israel and in other Semitic peoples. He draws out very carefully the influence of the monarchy and of the Davidic ideal as determining factors in the development. He shows how in the course of the development the idea of divine sovereignty extended beyond the limits of the chosen people to that of royal care for the heathen as well. He takes stock of disturbing elements in the working out of this idea, and shows how the more universal and spiritual elements of it were in Daniel to some extent narrowed and hardened as the price paid for an intenser realism in its apprehension.

It might be possible to question Dr. Böhmer's treatment of details, e.g. his assignment of Ex 19<sup>5</sup> to a very late stage in the development. But the student must be referred to Dr. Böhmer's pages for the presentment of his case, which is all along sober and reverent and worthy of careful attention.

In so far as the history of the place of the

<sup>1</sup> *Der Alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes.* Von Lic. Dr. Julius Böhmer, Leipzig, 1902. Pp. v, 235.