
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.

PROFESSOR P. W. SCHMIEDEL of Zurich has written a preface to the English translation of Dr. Arno Neumann's *Jesus* (A. & C. Black; 2s. 6d. net). He has done this because Dr. Neumann is an old pupil of his, 'and one of the ablest of them'; because the view of the Life of Jesus which Dr. Neumann's book embodies is 'in all essentials identical with that maintained by myself in the articles "Gospels," etc., in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*'; and especially because the publishers have invited him so to do. Why have the publishers invited him to write a preface to this book? Because it gives him an opportunity of setting himself right with the 'English-speaking public.'

The misunderstanding between Professor Schmiedel and the English-speaking public arose over what he calls the 'foundation-pillars' of the Life of Christ. In his article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* he seemed to say that in all the Gospels there are only nine reliable sentences. We had better recall these sentences, for they may be half-forgotten now. Five of them seem to be the confession of human infirmity. In the remaining four Jesus seems to repudiate the working of miracles.

The five are these: 'Why callest thou me good? None is good, save God alone' (Mk 10^{18}); 'Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him' (Mt 12^{32}); 'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father' (Mk 13^{32}); 'When his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him; for they said, He is beside himself' (Mk 3^{21}); and 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' (Mk 15^{34}). Then the four passages in which He seems to repudiate the working of miracles are: Mk 8^{12}, 'There shall no sign be given unto this generation'; Mk 6^{5}, 'He could there do no mighty work'; Mk $8^{14\text{-}21}$, the incident about the leaven of the Pharisees, from which Professor Schmiedel concludes that 'the feeding of the 5000 and the 4000 was not an historical occurrence, but a parable'; and Mt 11^{5}, the answer to John the Baptist's messengers, where he thinks that the statement at the end, that 'the poor have the gospel preached to them,' counteracts the preceding enumeration of miracles, and proves, in short, that the blind did not see, nor the lame walk.

Well, Professor Schmiedel calls those nine passages 'the foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus.' Why? Because they could not possibly have been invented by men who looked upon Jesus as Divine.

Now, when the English-speaking public read Professor Schmiedel's article, they came to the conclusion that those nine passages were all that he found credible in the Gospels. Professor Schmiedel protests against such a conclusion. He has written this preface to protest. And he explains how the mistake arose. How did the mistake arise? It arose, says Professor Schmiedel, from the circumstance that the article 'Gospels' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* is really an apologetic article, and the English-speaking public never saw that.

It is an apologetic article. That is to say, it is not written to give an account of the Gospels or their contents; it is written to meet the objections of men like Mr. John M. Robertson to the historical existence of Jesus.

It is no wonder that the English-speaking people did not see that. For Professor Schmiedel is known to be contemptuous of apologetic writing. When, in the *Hibbert Journal*, he reviewed Canon Stanton's *Gospels as Historical Documents*, he spoke of 'the apologetic bias which manifests itself.' And when Dr. Stanton pointed out that a reviewer has nothing to do with his author's motives (unless the author himself says something about them), but only with his arguments, Professor Schmiedel replied and said: 'Dr. Stanton objects to my ascribing to him apologetic bias. I hasten to choose instead of this a purely objective expression, and to say that his positions are well fitted to serve as the basis of apologetic efforts.' Yet it is Professor Schmiedel himself who now tells us that his article 'Gospels' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* was written with an apologetic purpose.

He tells us that, in writing the article, he had in mind a certain type of unbeliever. For it appears to Professor Schmiedel that 'contemporary English opinion as to the Life of Jesus moves pretty much in extremes.' On the one side, 'the genuineness and historicity of the Fourth Gospel is maintained with the greatest confidence, as also the actuality of all the miracles attributed to Jesus, His birth of a virgin, His sinlessness, His bodily resurrection.' On the other side, 'it is denied that He ever existed at all.' So Professor Schmiedel resolved to keep in mind one of these extremes, and to leave the other alone. Which did he determine to deal with? As we know of only one man of any scholarship in England who denies that Jesus ever existed, and as Professor Schmiedel apparently knows no more, we should have expected him to reply to the conservative extreme. But it was not so. When he wrote the article 'Gospels' he resolved to answer the man or men who denied our Lord's existence.

Accordingly, he separated the contents of the Gospels into three parts. First there are the incredible contents, next the doubtful, and, last of all, the credible. And when he came to the third part he found himself with only those nine passages. Those passages remained to him, because the opponent against whom he was writing his apology for the Gospels (we are not sure if he had Mr. Robertson actually in mind then or not) held that, first of all, Jesus was made an object of worship, and that then all the things attributing to Him superhuman power which the Gospels contain were invented in His honour. Now it was evident to Professor Schmiedel, and he thought it should be evident to every one else, that those nine passages could not have been invented for that purpose; that, in short, they could not have been invented at all. Therefore he called them the nine foundation-pillars.

The question might be raised whether an apologetic article on the Gospels was in place in an Encyclopædia of the Bible. But we have nothing to do with that. What we have to do with is the success of the apology. That it misled the English-speaking public his publishers have informed him. How did Mr. Robertson take it? First he adopted the view of the English-speaking public, that Professor Schmiedel found only nine credible sentences in all the Gospels; and then he pro-

ceeded to show that the nine were themselves incredible.

It is true that he did not attack them one by one. Professor Schmiedel complains of that. But it was not necessary. They stand or fall together. For they remain, after much sifting, as the sentences which attribute to Jesus weakness or ignorance or some other very human infirmity. Now if it was possible to attribute one confession of weakness to Christ, it was possible to attribute nine. But it was not necessary for Mr. Robertson to examine even one. Professor Schmiedel himself asserts that there is much in the Gospels that is contradictory and haphazard. Mr. Robertson assents. The portrait, he says, is a made-up portrait, and therefore it is not consistent. That there are certain passages which seem to be inconsistent with the Divinity of Jesus is simply part of the inconsistency. Professor Schmiedel admits that the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels is inconsistent. And with the admission his foundation-pillars fall to the ground.

In the *Church Times* for May 11, 1906, there is a review of Bousset's *Jesus*, a small popular volume of which a translation was recently published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate. The review is unsigned, but the reviewer is a scholar. What is the significance of Bousset's *Jesus* to him?

First of all it is a new type of book for Germany. It is critical, and it is popular. Bousset's *Jesus*, Neumann's *Jesus*, and other books of the kind, tell us that the German scholar has become a missionary. He has resolved to break down the barrier between the professor and the pastor. He has begun to appeal to the people. He has discovered that critical conclusions can be conveyed in popular and conciliatory language.

But there is more in the book than that. There is a new religion. For the Jesus whom Bousset has discovered is not that Christ of God who has been worshipped throughout the centuries of Christianity, nor is He the 'mere man' of Keim and the old-fashioned rationalism. It is a new religion, for its founder is neither God nor man.

Bousset's Jesus is more than a man. It is true he speaks of Him as a man. He even measures Him with other men, and says that in some respects they are greater than He. He says that He was a child of His age, of His country, of the Jewish nation. He honours Him as a great teacher. He laments that after a brief and chequered career He died as other men die. He says:

> Now He is dead! Far hence He lies
> In the lorn Syrian town,
> And on His grave, with shining eyes,
> The Syrian stars look down.

Yet Jesus is more than a man. For in His greatness, although other men may have been great, and some of them may even have excelled Him in some qualities of greatness, He is altogether unique. He is a prophet, but more than a prophet; a rabbi, and much more than a rabbi. He is a teacher, but He is not to be ranked with other teachers, for He wields a higher intuitive knowledge of God than has ever been attained. He died as other men die, but 'the days of the Passion were followed by Easter in His disciples' hearts, and with the tidings that their Lord had risen again and was alive they founded the first Christian community.'

Of course, Bousset does not believe that Jesus rose again. The disciples were mistaken. But it was Jesus that made the mistake possible. His teaching was absolutely faultless, and He lived what He taught. Bousset, says this able reviewer, 'shows, with an inconsistency which he disdains to explain, how this "Child of the age" absolutely transcended the most sacred and most cherished notions of the age.' And he quotes the following words:—'The Jewish commandment lies in the province of calm and reasonable reflexion, whereas the moral world of Jesus, as revealed in His say-

ings, becomes absolutely limitless. He continually lays stress upon the unboundedness of the moral obligation.'

Then the reviewer gives an example. It is the doctrine 'that marriage should never and in no circumstances be dissolved.' But do not some of the Evangelists add 'except for adultery'? Bousset brushes the words aside. They are an obvious interpolation. They are 'inconsistent with the absolute tone of Jesus' ethics.' Morality was, for this Teacher, 'a boundless devotion to the sacred will of God, which knew neither condition nor exception, and was continually urging man on from task to task, and leaving him no rest.'

Yet Bousset's Jesus is not a Demi-god of the old cosmic sort. He is a Hero with attributes that are greater and more enduring than any deified hero of paganism. He is a Hero of an altogether new order, an order that is psychical and moral. 'We run some danger,' says Bousset, 'of painting Him in colours too harmonious and peaceful. It is only recently that we have begun to pay more attention to the other side of the picture, and have asked ourselves whether Jesus was not a visionary, whether He did not live a large part of His life in regions beyond those of ordinary consciousness.'

When Bousset calls Jesus a 'visionary' he does not use that word in a disparaging sense. He means that He was one who could see visions as other men cannot see them. And this because of His exceptional moral and psychical endowment. So Bousset has no difficulty in believing that Jesus was able to work miracles. But what kind of miracles? Not those of a cosmic nature. He could not walk upon the water; He could not say to the wind, 'Peace, be still!' But whenever a miracle touches the region of psychology, Bousset is ready to accept it. He could make the blind to see, the lame to walk; He could cleanse the lepers; is it not possible that He could even raise the dead? For who knows where the limits are to be placed to the influence of soul upon soul? And here it is an influence of absolutely unique value, moral and psychical.

Mr. Alfred William Benn (his book is noticed on another page) rejoices to see the end of all religion near at hand. And if his description of religion is right, we may just as well rejoice with him. For his description of religion is, 'Desire for reward in the world to come, and neglect of duty in this world.'

Desire for reward in the world to come? Mr. Benn has no business to interfere with that. We know that there are two things which belong to the very rudiments of religion. These are the belief that God is, and the belief that He is a rewarder. If Mr. Benn has not discovered that, he does not know much about religion. If he has not discovered that, it is the worse for himself. But if he can bring it home to us that we who believe that God is, and that He is a rewarder, neglect our duty in this world, he has reason to look for an end of all religion, and to rejoice.

What is our duty in this world? It will be found sufficiently stated in a small book just issued from the Methodist Book-Room, and entitled *The Citizen of To-morrow* (Kelly; 2s. net). The book contains fifteen papers by fifteen different writers. The writers are all Methodists. It is the first time that the Methodist Communion has yielded to a public recognition of Social Christianity. It is the first time that any great Christian Church has published a Confession, not of what we ought to believe, but of what we ought to do.

But the time past is sufficient to have discovered what we ought to believe. 'In Christ Jesus,' said St. Paul, 'neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love' (Gal 5^6). Are we always going to leave that sentence unfinished, stopping at the word 'faith'? We sometimes wonder if we have even got rid of circumcision and uncircumcision yet. The time has come when we ought to give faith

its chance, and even some official encouragement, to go and work through love.

'And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come, that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem' (Lk 9^{51}). 'He stedfastly set his face'—the phrase is Hebraic, the commentators tell us. And there is more in it than the expression of a resolve. 'It implies fixedness of purpose,' says Plummer, 'especially in the prospect of difficulty or danger'; and he refers to several passages in the Old Testament, one of which will suffice. It is Isaiah 50^{7}—'Therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed.'

'He stedfastly set his face (*τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν*).' It implies fixedness of purpose, and the translators have tried to bring that out. 'Set his face' comes from Tindale, from whom come most of the immortal phrases in the English Bible. It was a second thought, however, with him. In the edition of 1526, his translation was 'he determined hym silfe.' But in 1534 he hit upon 'he set his face,' which is more literal as well as more vivid. The Geneva translators went back to 'he bent himself,' and Coverdale offered 'he turned his face.' But the Bishops returned to Tindale's 'he set his face,' and strengthened it by inserting the adverb 'stedfastly' (there is no adverb in the Greek); and the translators of the Authorized Version accepted the insertion.

'He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.' And yet there was no place to which the pious Israelite had more delight to go. When the time came—it came at least once every year—that they said, 'Come, let us go up to Jerusalem,' his heart thrilled with joyful expectation; he went with singing unto Zion.

Jesus 'set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem.' And yet He loved Jerusalem. 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings.' 'How often,' He says. We miss that word. The commentators almost always miss it. They miss it altogether, or they merely point to it as a proof out of the Synoptics themselves that the ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem was longer than the Synoptics give account of. But there is more in the word than that. 'How often would I have gathered thy children together' is the story of love's persistence. Was it to the Galilæans only that He cried, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest'? No, it was to Jerusalem also. And not once or twice, but many times. He loved Jerusalem with the persistence of a mother's love. And yet when the time came that He had to go up to Jerusalem, He had to set His face stedfastly.

For this was the third temptation of His life, and the hardest. We speak of our Lord's three temptations, by which we mean the three temptations in the wilderness. But these were three aspects or three incidents of one temptation. The temptation in the wilderness was the first of the three great temptations by which the Son of Man was tried upon earth.

The first, we say, was the temptation in the wilderness. It came from the devil. Taking Him up into an exceeding high mountain, the devil showed Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and said, 'All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me.' There was some audacity in it. The robber had come to offer the King His own, and on condition that the robber should be acknowledged King. And yet he had some appearance of right upon his side. 'All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me,' he said; and it is only now that we begin to understand how widespread in the world the power of the devil has been. Read the last book on the religion of Africa. Read Dr. Nassau's *Fetichism in West Africa*. It is simply a history of the worship of the devil.

'All these things will I give thee,' he said. It was somewhat audacious, but it was a real temptation. For Jesus had come to obtain these things. He had come to seek and to save that which was lost. He had come to win it all back from the devil. And the devil's offer was an offer of it all. How hard He found it afterwards to win men back, to win them back the way by which He had to go to win them. You remember that in the great intercessory prayer He said, 'Those whom thou hast given me I have kept.' There were not many of them, but He seemed so thankful to have kept them. 'I have kept them,' He said, 'and none of them is lost.' None of them? 'None of them is lost, but the son of perdition.' There were only twelve; but even of the twelve one goes away. It is so hard to save the lost in the way He had to save them.

It was a real temptation. For the devil offered them all, and offered them all at once. In the devil's way not one of them would have been lost, and not one pang would Jesus have had to suffer to win them. But the conditions were not possible. The worship of the devil was not possible. For although Jesus had at the last to identify Himself with those whom He came to save; though He had to be numbered with the transgressors as if He were Himself a transgressor; yet He could not join them in their worship of the devil. That would have been to make Him actually a sinner, and a sinner can never be a saviour. The worship of the devil was not possible.

Nor was it possible to accept them from the devil even without the worship. For the devil was a tyrant. His subjects obeyed him because they feared him, not because they loved him. Now Jesus had come to win the love of men. Their persons, which was all that the devil could have given Him, were nothing to Him without their love. If it is a mere matter of persons, 'God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.' If it were a mere matter of persons, Jesus could have gathered the children of Jerusalem together whether they would or not. The temptation of the devil was a real temptation. But the conditions were not possible. Jesus cannot become a sinner and worship the devil, and none can be His until they have learned to say, 'We love Him.'

The second temptation was keener. It came from the people. He had found them in the desert, and had fed them. He had had compassion upon them, for they had been with Him a long time, and they had nothing to eat; and He had fed them—fed them apparently with nothing to feed them with, fed them till they were satisfied and basketfuls were left over. It was a great risk He ran. And He need not have run the risk. He could have sent them away. There is no doubt He could have sent them away, and they could have gone into the villages and got food for themselves. He knew the risk He ran. He knew that they would misunderstand it and would tempt Him.

They tempted Him at once. They came and offered themselves to Him. They offered to follow Him whithersoever He went. Well, He had come to win them. He had come to seek and to save the lost—just such as they were. And it was a keener temptation than the devil's. For they offered themselves in love. They did not come because they feared Him; they came because they loved Him.

But their love was only cupboard love. 'Ye seek me because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.' Jesus has often been offered cupboard love. Men seek Him because they have eaten of the loaves, or because they hope to eat. And it is a real temptation. He is so considerate. He is so hopeful. May not the love for the loaves turn into love for the Giver of them? 'A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench.' But cupboard love is not love, for the heart of it is selfishness, and where self is there love is not. 'If any man will come

after me, let him deny himself.' It was a real temptation, because He had come to seek and to save that which was lost. And when the lost were coming to Him in crowds hoping to be fed, hoping to be clothed, hoping to be done with toil and pain and be at rest, He had to send them away with an offer of rest for their *souls*. He looked upon them and loved them as they went away sorrowful. And He knew that the time was not far off that He must go up to Jerusalem.

The third temptation was the hardest. It came from Peter. Jesus had asked the disciples, 'Whom do men say that I am?' He had asked them, 'But whom do ye say that I am?' And Peter had answered, 'Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God.' From that time He began to show His disciples that He must go up to Jerusalem and be put to death. Why 'from that time'? Because it is absurd to suppose that the Messiah is to be put to death. Jesus of Nazareth might be put to death. But now we know that Jesus is the Messiah, and the Messiah is far too high to die. 'From that time,' because from that time the temptation was possible. And the temptation came. Peter took Him and began to rebuke Him. 'That be far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee.'

It was a keen temptation. How keen it was we see in the severity of Christ's answer: 'But he turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a stumblingblock unto me.' For Peter would have Him win men by living, by living as the Messiah, not by dying. Certainly He must win men's hearts. Certainly He would not have them if He did not have their love. And it must be the unselfish love of the heart. Well, He was winning them. Had He not won Peter himself, and James, and John, and Bartholomew? And how had He won them? By teaching, by living, not by dying. Let Him have patience. Did He say, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me'? No; no. Let Him remain on the earth, and in time, in time, all men will come to Him.

It was the keenest temptation of all. They did love Him in life, and He loved them for loving Him. And it was an awful thing to go up to Jerusalem to die. So He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem.

Gustav Adolf Deissmann.

By Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., Lecturer on English Literature in the University of Heidelberg.

Gustav Adolf Deissmann, the son of a pastor of the United Evangelical Church, and writer on local history, was born at the village of Langenscheid on the Lahn, 7th November 1866, just after Nassau, through the war of that year, had become a Prussian province. He was educated first, like most German children, at the Elementary School (*Volksschule*) of his native place, afterwards at the Modern School (*Realschule*) of Erbach on the Rhine, where his father became pastor, and finally at the Grammar School (*Gymnasium*) of Wiesbaden, where he received his classical training. He left school at Easter, 1885, and, having resolved to follow his father's profession, he matriculated at Tübingen, where every third man in the university was a theological student, in the summer term following. Here he spent three years altogether; but in his second and third 'semesters' he can have given little time to books, and still less to lectures, for he was serving with the fusiliers in garrison in the town. He served with such good will that a prize for marksmanship fell to his share.

On leaving Tübingen, Deissmann spent the summer of 1888 at Berlin, a much larger university, where the theological element was not quite so conspicuous. The time had now come for him to present himself for the examination *pro licentia concionandi*, the first of the two Government ex-