

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

Abbildungen im Texte, Wien, 1907). Between 1896 and 1902 Professor Musil made six expeditions into Moab, in the course of which he surveyed the country very carefully (from about 31° 55' N. to 30° 55' S., and from the Dead Sea on the W. to about 37° E.), and took full topographical notes of all the localities visited, including not only ruins, interesting architecturally or historically, but also mountains, valleys, rivers, roads, etc. These notes he has now written out and arranged in the present volume, in accordance with the several routes taken by him. The descriptions are in all cases very minute, and abound in valuable and interesting details.

It is a characteristic and admirable feature of the work, which adds greatly to its value, that at the end of each section there are cited *in extenso* extracts from the Bible, Greek and Latin writers (Josephus, Jerome, early and mediæval travellers, etc.), and Arabic historians or geographers, which bear upon the localities that have been described in it: thus on p. 58 *sqq.* there are four pages of extracts relating to el-Kerak (Kir-heres), on p. 210 *sqq.* several relating to Zerka, and similarly on other places. The illustrations (based upon photographs) are excellent: we may instance the

numerous views of el-Kerak, p. 46 *sqq.*, especially the large one opposite p. 48; those of the hot springs of Zerka, p. 95 *sqq.*; of Madaba, p. 114; of the dolmens near Madaba, p. 267 *sqq.*; of the waterfall and springs of Uyun Musa, p. 341 *sqq.*; of Dibon, p. 379; to say nothing of the numerous ones of ruined castles, etc. The volume must not be neglected by the future commentator upon those parts of the Old Testament in which places in Moab are mentioned, especially Is 15-16, and Jer 48; for these are often referred to, and new (though not always convincing) identifications are sometimes proposed: see, for instance, what is said about Zoar, in the Ghôr es-Şāfiyeh, at the S.E. corner of the Dead Sea (pp. 74, 70), Dimon and the 'Brook of the Willows' (pp. 170, 157), Jahaz (pp. 122, 107), Di-zahab and Laban (pp. 210, 196), Bezer (Dt 4, 43) as = Barazên (?; pp. 232, 218), Beer and Beer-elim (p. 318), Zered and Iye-abarim (p. 319). Reference to the volume is facilitated by the copious indices of Arabic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin names. We are grateful to Professor Musil for what he has given us; and trust that he may speedily complete the volumes describing the other parts of Arabia Petraea surveyed by him.

Another Estimate of Ritschl.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. J. DICK FLEMING, B.D., MANITOBA COLLEGE, WINNIPEG.

III.

So much for the formal aspects of Ritschl's method. Ritschl has sharpened his instrument by a revised theory of knowledge; he has defined the sphere of his science so as to guard it from what he considers a too intrusive philosophy; he has still to explain what value he places on the Bible revelation, and how the theologian is to regard the historical material found in the New Testament. His general thesis here is that the 'source and norm' of Christian theology must be found in the Christian consciousness, as that has attained its classic expression in the teaching of the Early Christian community.

The further exposition of this principle shows how earnestly Ritschl strives to reach a definite

and objective standard; while the significant limitations with which he surrounds it indicate the hesitation of a mind attracted by different points of view. Theology, he maintains, is not simply the science of the Christian consciousness of to-day—whether of the individual consciousness, or that of the Christian community; for that would reduce the science to a chapter of Church History, or abandon it to the subjectivism of individual theologians. It must look for its material to the original Christian revelation, as that is laid before us in the New Testament. On the other hand, the authority of the New Testament writers is not to be justified by a theory of verbal inspiration, but by historical considerations. In this literature, namely, we have the Christian revelation set forth in classic form. The special feature which serves

to distinguish it clearly from the immediately succeeding literature of the Christian Church is that it moves within the circle of Old Testament conceptions and presuppositions, and is free from the baneful influence of Hellenism. But we must define the norm more precisely. Just as we exalt the value of the New Testament above that of the Old, though the latter is recognized as indispensable, as containing the groundwork of the New, so we must distinguish in the New Testament itself between what is fitted to the purpose of theology, and what is of merely temporary and subordinate value. Not that we are to prefer the fragmentary sayings of Christ to the more developed teaching of the Apostles: that were a 'falsch-verständener Purism.' But there are individual doctrines in the New Testament, which only in a partial way fall into line with the general Apostolic teaching: individual theologoumena which naturally do not possess the same value for us as the concurrent doctrine of the New Testament writers. It would seem, then, that we should set aside what is peculiar to the individual writers, and accept only what is common. Yet Ritschl confesses that this is not to be made an absolute rule. For example, no one can believe that the Pauline teaching as to justification by faith was a common doctrine, or that it is identical with the teaching of James; and yet the Protestant Church has rightly laid stress upon it, and given it a foremost place. And, on the other hand, it might be asked whether in some respects the theology of the present age has not advanced beyond the circle of ideas that generally prevailed in the Early Christian community. 'Perhaps,' he says, 'we can set up no absolute rule in advance, but must seek to strike the true balance (between the individual and the universal features of Biblical theology) by experiment.'

This is by far the weakest feature of Ritschl's system; and those who think that by this attitude to the Bible he has opened up a new path for theology and based it more firmly than ever on the foundation of the New Testament, are surely deceiving themselves with vain hopes. We heartily recognize that by his earnest attempt to reinterpret the teaching of the New Testament in the light of its own Jewish surroundings, he has done much to free Biblical theology from traditionalism and to disperse the cloud of dogmatic prejudice that obscured the teaching

of Christ and the early community. And had Ritschl been content to emphasize that in Christ and the faith of the Early Church we have the outstanding facts with which theology must deal, and the historical revelation without which theology must remain barren and unfruitful, he would have gained the consent of most scientific theologians. But when he proceeds to designate the New Testament as the sole source, measure and regulative norm of theology, and to demand that the theologian shall go to the New Testament, not only for the historical facts to be considered, but for all doctrinal deductions as well, he simply bids adieu to science. That Ritschl, nevertheless, is a scientific theologian is due to the fact that he is not in earnest with his principle; and it is not difficult to show that his 'norm' when pressed vanishes into thin air.

Let us assume, to begin with, that Ritschl is true to his principle that the source and norm of theology can be found solely in the New Testament, and that the aim of theology is to 'gain an authentic knowledge of the Christian religion and revelation.' What else, then, we ask, is the historical science that goes by the name of Biblical Theology? Its source and norm is, in its second great division, the New Testament; and its aim is to make authentic acquaintance with the Christian religion and revelation as historically presented there. Rightly enough, Ritschl argues against Schleiermacher's definition that the systematic presentation of the doctrines held by the Church at a given time, is not, properly speaking, theology at all, but belongs to the department of Church History. But what is Ritschl's own theology, assuming that he holds faithfully to his Biblical method, but just another section of Church history, namely, a summary presentation of the faith of the earliest Christian community? The old dogmatic was something more than a historical discipline. It sought at least to prove the reasonableness of faith in God, and in the authority of the Scriptures, and was thus in part scientific in its treatment. But Ritschl will have us reject this rational basing of theology, and content ourselves with the systematic presentation of the revelation given in the New Testament. But this last is a purely historical study, and nothing more. If it be alleged in defence of Ritschl's position that the teaching of the New Testament is not blindly accepted, but, if not proved, at least interpreted

and gauged according to the rule of 'Werthurtheile,' we admit that this is what Ritschl intends, but maintain that Ritschl defeats his own intention. For he says expressly that the individual appreciation is not to be made the standard of truth, and the norm of theology is in no wise the subjective religious consciousness. In other words, theology as an independent science of God and our relations to God, is an impossible ideal. It reduces itself to a bare echo of the New Testament doctrine: it is but the gathered result of Biblical inquiry.

But Ritschl's scientific instinct is too strong to permit of his falling into mere Biblicism. As a matter of fact, when we come to examine his norm, we find it gradually melting away, till nothing more is left than the despised religious consciousness of the individual.

Ritschl tries first of all to put something in place of the old discarded theory of verbal inspiration. He distinguishes the New Testament Canon from the later literature of the Early Church by emphasizing that the thought of the New Testament is conditioned throughout by the Old Testament presuppositions, and thus stands out from other literature which is impregnated with an atmosphere of Greek thought.

Even were this thesis true, it would still be a question whether it really adds to the value of the New Testament as a norm for faith. Is the Hebrew dress the sole form, or the best form, in which the truth of the Gospel can be presented? May not the Greek modes of thought possess certain advantages over the Hebrew? Are there not presuppositions in Hebrew thought which have lost their validity to the modern mind? And is Hellenistic thought so deadly and poisonous that it cannot hold the treasure of the Gospel without tainting it? Why should not Christianity clothe itself in the forms of thought that are natural to each succeeding age?

But the thesis itself breaks down; and if there are any who subscribe to it to-day the number is steadily diminishing. Ritschl himself held determinedly to the view that there was scarcely a tincture of Hellenism in the New Testament. (He admitted, however, that there were two passages in the later Epistles, where there were slight indications of a Hellenizing tendency, namely, in 2 P 1⁴, 'that ye might be partakers of the divine nature—*Θείας φύσεως*,' and in Tit 2¹³, 'Our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ,' where *Θεός*, God, is

used instead of the usual *Κύριος*, Lord.) Even after the warm discussion of this point among his own school, he still clung to the position that the New Testament was free from the taint of Hellenism; and in the last revision of his *Rechtfertigung*, published shortly before his death, he still wrote: 'It has never been proved that Hellenistic ideas, or the influence of Philo, extend to the Gospel of John, or the Epistle to the Hebrews, or to other writings of the New Testament; nor can I persuade myself of it.' In carrying out this endeavour to rescue the Old Testament writers from the charge of speculation, and particularly of Greek speculation, Ritschl is forced to adopt some very remarkable exegetical interpretations. Thus, 'In the beginning was the Word' (Jn 1¹) is taken to be a simple Old Testament thought drawn directly from the first chapter of Genesis, where the creative word is mentioned so frequently. 'Before Abraham was, I am' (Jn 8⁵⁸) means simply, 'I am He, the Messiah appointed from the beginning' to carry out the eternal purpose. 'The first-born of every creature' (Col 1¹⁵) does not refer to any pre-existent Christ, but to the present pre-eminent position of Christ at the right hand of the Father, and His relation to God as the well-beloved Son. 'The beginning of the creation of God' (Rev 3¹⁴) is a beautiful alternative expression for the 'Word of God,' since 'beginning of creation' is just a periphrasis for 'Word.' This extraordinary exegesis has not commended itself much even to Ritschl's own followers. The editor of the Ritschlian magazine, Professor Gottschick, prefers to return for his norm to the self-witness of Christ, and frankly recognizes the influence of Hellenism as well as Rabbinism in the thought-world of the New Testament. It is, indeed, scarcely possible to deny that Hellenistic presuppositions have entered deeply into the New Testament forms of thought. But what becomes, in that case, of the theological norm? It has vanished with the thesis that supported it; and, accordingly, we find Gottschick freely confessing that 'for us these thought-forms of a past age can no longer serve to express the eternal content of reality which has entered history in the person of Christ.'

Ritschl himself does not yield in this direction; but he gives the case away in another. For while vindicating his standard as being free from Greek speculation, he shows that he is not perfectly

satisfied with his own norm. He points out that there are differences in the New Testament itself: there are also individual peculiarities of doctrine which cannot claim to be received as authoritative for all time; nay, we may find it impossible to place ourselves entirely at the point of view of the Early Church, or of its accredited guides. The distinction between what is taught in common by the New Testament writers and what is merely individual theory, though generally serviceable, becomes unsatisfactory when taken as an absolute rule. Evidently theology has a most delicate task before it, and must not decide off-hand what in the regulating norm is to be regarded as regulative. The theologian cannot accept the entire heterogeneous doctrinal content of the New Testament—such a reproduction of Bible teaching would be, as Ritschl says, 'a mere surrogate for systematic theology'—and yet there is no clear law to decide what doctrine is essential and what may be safely passed by. We must strike the right compromise 'durch das Experiment,' that is, in the course of the special investigation. In other words, the New Testament is the sole norm; but how far it is to be normative, what special doctrines are to be held sacred by the theologian and what he may give the go-by, can only be determined 'by experiment'; and clearly, therefore, by the experimenter, who will naturally affirm or reject the normative character of the particular doctrine in question according to his own religious consciousness, and his individual conception of its value or truth.

So vanishes for ever the figment of a theological norm. In truth, science will have none of it. To seek a norm for theology other than the ordinary laws of thought and the facts of nature, history and religious experience, is to confess the bankruptcy of theology as science. As a matter of history the great theologians of the Church have never allowed themselves to be fettered by any external norm. When they acknowledged the absolute authority of the letter of Scripture, they used their private judgment all the same, and by their doctrine of a twofold sense freed themselves from too enslaving trammels. When they ceased to be bound by the latter, they fixed the norm according to their private judgment, making excisions in it wherever they pleased. The first method was applied by Origen and Augustine: the second by Martin Luther; Ritschl helps himself to both methods,

and excises or explains away as seems most convenient. Why does not the theologian assert his freedom from all swaddling bands of authority? We do not need to apply to the New Testament to be convinced of the universality of sin, and no man believes that God is, simply because the Bible says so. Faith is free: the Bible is not a law to the intelligent Christian; and why should theology bind itself to any norm? The very diversity of doctrine in the New Testament warns us that there is no finality in Christian thought. Are we even sure that Christianity at the beginning received its relatively best doctrinal expression? Apart altogether from the question of the local colouring of century and circumstance, have we any reason to believe that the Early Church were the purest interpreters of the Christian faith? May not the Church of to-day still possess something of the Spirit promised, and be able to advance a few steps further than even Paul and the Apostles—scarce released from the fetters of Judaism—to the full understanding of the Spirit of Christ and His religion?

We have only space for a word or two as to the special doctrines of Ritschl's system. If he is led by his principle of Scripture on the one hand, and his anti-speculative tendency on the other, to turn a blind eye to the metaphysics of the New Testament, he shows an unrivalled power of appreciating the moral and spiritual aspects of the Christian faith. In his doctrine of sin he rightly insists that the old view rested on an abstraction, and attributed to some unknowable essence of the soul what was a matter of personal activity, or a quality of the thinking, feeling, and willing person. In his doctrine of the Person of Christ, his anti-speculative method has at least this advantage, that it sets him to trace out the moral and religious motives that gave occasion for the speculative forms of thought, and still explain their survival in the Church. There can be little question that he has brought into relief some of the most valuable and fundamental elements of the faith, and so paved the way for a more satisfactory metaphysical treatment of the question. In his treatment of the Atonement doctrine, he has opened new points of view, and done much to clear the ground by careful analysis of the terms involved. When he insists that justification and forgiveness are one, and that the Atonement must be interpreted from the Christian standpoint of the Fatherhood of God, and not from

the judicial standpoint of the law, he is preparing for a better understanding of Scripture teaching, as well as of the facts of Christian experience. It may be questioned, however, whether Ritschl has been successful in his attempt to supplement the moral theory of redemption. He is not satisfied with the view that God is revealed to us in Christ's life and death, and that we have there also a picture of the life we ought to live, and, by the aid of Christ's influence, may live. He adds to it the thought that Christ is our representative before God, the eternal object of the Divine love, and that we enter into the same relation to God by attaching ourselves to Christ by faith. This personal relation to Christ, he always hastens to add, is not an immediate relation, but is practically realized by attaching ourselves to the Christian community. This seems to be a concession—made and then half-withdrawn—to the old legal point of view.

In general, Ritschl's type of theological method may be compared to the tendencies that show themselves in the writings of the Apostle Paul. We can discern, namely, the germs of four styles of theologizing in the New Testament: the Biblical,

the Traditional-orthodox, the Experiential, and the Speculative. The Biblical tendency is represented by Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews; the Traditional-orthodox method is seen in the later Epistles, and is sufficiently explained by its motto, 'Hold fast the form of sound words.' The Experiential or moral-historical method is represented by Paul; the Speculative by John. Where lies true theological science? The Biblical method is useful as a basis, so far as it leads to sound historical results; but, unfortunately, the individual consciousness always obtrudes itself, and the worshippers of the letter have always been remarkable for their heedlessness of its meaning. The Traditional-orthodox method has a conservative use; but a system of borrowed conclusions is not science. There remain the Experiential method of Paul, and the Speculative method of John. The one examines and interprets the faith, keeping close to the shore of religious experience; the other seeks to understand the presuppositions of faith, and the conditions that lie behind experience. And with all deference to Ritschl, I do not think that either of these last methods can safely exclude the other.

The Nickname 'Son of Man.'

BY THE REV. DAVID SMITH, M.A., TULLIALLAN.

ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου γέγονεν ἵνα οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦτέστι Ἀδὰμ, υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ γένωνται.—S. Athan. *De Hum. Nat. Suscept.*

WHAT is the meaning of this title, 'the Son of Man,' wherewith Jesus loved to designate Himself? There is no question in the whole range of New Testament study which has been more largely discussed, and none regarding which there is less agreement.¹ According to one opinion it means the Ideal Man,² and constitutes a claim on the part of Jesus to a unique character and mission; according to another it means the Mere Man, and identifies Him with the other members of the race, 'the sons of men' (cf. Mk 3²⁸ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν

ἀνθρώπων = Mt 12³¹ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). Some regard it as a Messianic title; others maintain that it has nothing to do with Messiahship. And recently, on the ground that in Aramaic 'the son of man' would mean simply 'the man,' the startling opinion has been propounded that the title is unauthentic and was never used by Jesus at all.

In face of such wide divergence of opinion there is reason to suspect that the investigation has been prosecuted along false paths, and a fresh starting-point and a new clue are necessary in order to a satisfactory solution of the problem. Nor is the initial fallacy far to seek. It has been generally assumed that Jesus derived the title from the apocalyptic literature, in the first instance from the Book of Daniel and then from the Book of Enoch. This, however, is very questionable. It is even

¹ Cf. Driver's art. 'Son of Man' in Hastings' *D.B.*

² Calv. *Instit.* ii. 13, § 2: 'Siquidem palam est hebraico more vocari filium hominis verum hominem.'