

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 Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

THE END OF THE FIRST GOSPEL

But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him; but some doubted. And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the consummation of the age. (Matt. xxviii. 16-20, R.V., with marginal readings substituted for text.)

THE Gospel according to Matthew is eminently fitted to occupy its distinguished position at the head of the New Testament Canon. No other book so bridges the gap between the Testaments. It commences, in a style characteristic of the O.T., by showing how the roots of the Gospel go far back into Hebrew history: its closing words, presenting the Church's commission from her risen Lord, form the introduction not only to the Apostolic service of word and action recorded for us in the Acts and Epistles, but also to the whole history of the Christian Church. The seed of Abraham has borne fruit, and the branches have begun to run over the wall: the Ecclesia of God is no longer to be restricted within the bounds of one nation only, but the Good News is to be preached and disciples are to be made among all the nations. That the First Gospel is in many respects characteristically Jewish it were idle to deny, but it is also characteristically Christian. The fact that it is the only one of the four Gospels to record our Lord's references to the Church ought, apart from anything else, to give pause to those who are content to write it off as "Jewish" and therefore as having no direct application to Christians of the present day. What the intention of the whole Gospel of Matthew is, the following study of its closing verses may help to indicate.

I

CRITICISM

It seems clear that this commission was given to the eleven in Galilee. It is significant and fitting that it should have been given, not in Judaea, but in "Galilee of the Gentiles".

This meeting of the Lord with His Apostles cannot with certainty be equated with any of the post-Resurrection appearances recorded elsewhere in the N.T. The longer Marcan appendix seems to conflate this meeting with that recorded in Luke xxiv. 36 ff., which was, however, a Jerusalem appearance. Mark xvi. 14 is certainly a summary of these verses in Luke, while Mark xvi. 15-18 seems to be partly a summary, partly an expansion of the last two verses of Matthew. The commission of Acts i. 8 is not to be identified with that in Matthew, being given in a different place (Olivet) and at a later date (immediately before the Ascension). It has been suggested that the Matthaean appearance is the same as the appearance "to above five hundred brethren at once" (1 Cor. xv. 6), but this is not certain.

The historicity of this Matthaean appearance has been frequently questioned, chiefly on account of the Trinitarian baptismal formula of verse 19. This, it has been argued, belongs to a later stage of development in the Catholic Church: according to the Acts, believers in the first decades of the Church's history were baptized simply "in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts ii. 38; x. 48) or "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (viii. 16; xix. 5). The argument is fairly plausible, and the prevailing opinion may be illustrated by the words of A. H. M'Neile who, while admitting that "the threefold Name does not in itself point to a late date for the passage" yet concludes that "the section must probably be regarded as the expression by the evang. of truths which the Church learnt as a result of the Resurrection, and on which it still rests its faith".¹

The textual evidence for the words "baptizing them . . . Holy Ghost" is overwhelming. They are attested by all available MSS. and Versions, and among the Fathers Eusebius alone seems to have known a different reading, viz., one which omits those words, but has *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου* ("in My name") after *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* ("all the nations"). But all canons of textual criticism forbid us to follow Eusebius in the face of the united testimony of MSS. and Versions; and the best explanation of his deviation is that he was influenced by the wording of Luke xxiv. 47, where there is no mention of baptism.²

¹ *Commentary on Matthew*, pp. 435 f.

² Attempts have been made to find a Lucan baptismal commission in Acts i. 5, by reading "you will baptize" instead of "you will be baptized." See criticisms of these attempts by Augustine, *Epistle* 265.3; J. H. Ropes in Jackson & Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. III, pp. 2, 4.

So much for textual criticism: what of the "higher criticism"? The argument from probability is very unreliable as a guide to what the risen Lord may or may not have said. Is it so unlikely that He should thus have conjoined the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit? We do not have to go outside this Gospel to find a remarkable passage in which He correlated the Father and the Son (xi. 27); while in xii. 32 "the Son of man" and "the Holy Spirit" are mentioned together. In His discourse of John xiv-xvi, all Three are spoken of in terms implying personality and mutual intimacy; compare also the language of Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 4-6; 2 Cor. xiii. 14, and elsewhere. Comparison with N.T. language elsewhere gives no ground for denying the early date of the Trinitarian formula. From the earliest days of the Church we can trace the acknowledgment of the one God in these three Persons, by implication, if not explicitly.

There remains the apparent discrepancy with early Christian usage as illustrated in the Acts passages already referred to. Of these, ii. 38 and x. 48 must be distinguished from viii. 16 and xix. 5. It may seem hypercritical nowadays, with our knowledge of Hellenistic usage, to distinguish *ἐν* and *εἰς* too finely; but here there does seem to be a distinction (cf. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*). In ii. 38 and x. 48 the preposition is *ἐν*, which is to be understood instrumentally, as so often in the N.T.: the expression is equivalent to Heb. *bēshēm*, "in the name" or "with the name"; and its exact meaning in these two places is probably to be explained by Acts xxii. 16: "arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name." So then, to those who were baptized *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the Name was an "accompanying circumstance" of their baptism, to use grammatical jargon, either because they themselves confessed or invoked it, as did Paul, or because it was named over them (Acts xv. 17; Jas. ii. 7).

In Acts viii. 16; xix. 5, however, the preposition is *εἰς*, as in Matthew xxviii. 19 (cf. also 1 Cor. i. 13, 15), and the R.V. rightly renders it by "into". The idiom has survived to our own day, as when we speak of paying a sum of money into someone's name. A transference of property is implied, and so they who were baptized *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* confessed that they were no longer their own, but had passed into the ownership of the Lord who had purchased them

with His life-blood. Those, however, who are said to have been baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus" were already believers in the true God. The Samaritans of chapter viii were half-Jews, at any rate not Gentiles in the ordinary sense, while the believers at Ephesus were "disciples" before Paul met them. The words of Matthew xxviii are concerned with Gentiles, those without the knowledge of God, who had to learn what Jews knew already of the God of revelation, as well as the Good News of the New Covenant. They, therefore, are to be baptized "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"; and the universal Church has acted rightly in using the full Trinitarian formula in the rite of baptism.

II

THE GOSPEL TO BE PREACHED

"Make disciples of all the nations," said the Lord. The paraphrase in the Marcan appendix makes it clear how this was to be done. "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation" (Mark xvi. 15). By obeying this command, the disciples would fulfil His own prophecy: "the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations" (Mark xiii. 10), or, in the amplified form of Matthew xxiv. 14: "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come." No reasonable exegesis can divorce these sayings from one another. And the apostles proceeded to "make disciples of all the nations" by preaching this Gospel to them. According to the Acts, Philip in Samaria preached "good tidings concerning the kingdom of God" (viii. 12), Paul at Ephesus reasoned persuasively "as to the things concerning the kingdom of God" (xix. 8), or, as he said himself in xx. 25, "went about preaching the kingdom", while later at Rome he expounded the Gospel to the Jews, "testifying the kingdom of God" (xxviii. 23), and in his lodging "received all that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God" (xxviii. 30 f.). A comparison of verses 24 and 25 of Acts xx shows that "to testify the gospel of the grace of God" refers to the same activity as "preaching the kingdom". In the light of these and other scriptures, it is difficult to accept a certain brand of "dispensational" teaching, which makes a

clear-cut distinction between the Gospel of the Kingdom and the Gospel of the grace of God. The only good news that God has to offer men is of salvation by His grace alone, to be received through faith in Christ alone. By the new birth which accompanies the acceptance of this salvation, a man enters the Kingdom (John iii. 3, 5; *cf.* Matt. xviii. 3); and so this Gospel is equally the good news of the Kingdom and of the grace of God.¹ Upon the preacher of any other gospel save this one a solemn anathema is pronounced (Gal. i. 8 f.). Yet the *Scofield Bible*, the most popular compendium of this dispensational teaching, tells us that Matthew xxiv. 14 "has specific reference to the proclamation of the good news that the kingdom is again 'at hand' by the Jewish remnant". For illumination, we turn to its note on Revelation xiv. 6, where *four* forms of the Gospel are distinguished: (1) the Gospel of the kingdom, (2) the Gospel of the grace of God, (3) the everlasting Gospel (Rev. xiv. 6), (4) that which Paul calls "my Gospel"² (Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25). The first of these, we are told, "is the good news that God purposes to set up on the earth, in fulfilment of the Davidic Covenant, . . . a kingdom, political, spiritual, Israelitish, universal". This Gospel was preached in the past by John the Baptist, our Lord and His disciples, until "the Jewish rejection of the King": its preaching will be resumed in the future, "during the great tribulation, and immediately preceding the coming of the King in glory". That is to say, an earthly, restored Davidic kingdom was offered to the Jews, who rejected the offer and crucified the King. Those who teach this seldom face the question, What if they had accepted the offer? If they do, and preserve consistency, they must consent to the conclusion of one of the less orthodox of their number, that "there is no cross in God's plan of atonement".³ That is, had the Jews accepted their King, they would have proceeded at once to the evangelization of the world, which would have received the promised blessing—without any cross! Fortunately, the great majority of dispensationalists see that such an argument undermines the whole of Christianity, and refuse to go so far.

¹ For a compendium of the N.T. treatment of this subject, see G. H. Lang, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (S. E. Roberts, London, 45 pages).

² To distinguish "the Gospel of the grace of God" from what Paul calls "my Gospel" is indeed a *tour de force!* For Paul's insistence that he and the other Apostles preached the same Gospel, see 1 Cor. xv. 11.

³ S. D. Gordon, *Quiet Talks about Jesus*.

No, it was no such earthly kingdom that was offered to the nation of Israel. We know how eagerly they would have jumped at it had it been so. The disappointed crowd, enraged because it was *not* a kingdom of this sort, repudiated the kingly claims of their Messiah, crying "Away with Him! Crucify Him! We have no king but Caesar!" He Himself made the matter plain to Pilate: "My kingdom is *not* of this world." And this Gospel of Matthew which, according to the dispensationalists, has as its main theme this "earthly" kingdom, emphasizes its *heavenly* character by being the only Gospel to call it "the kingdom of *heaven*".

This earthly kingdom, they tell us, will again be preached by a faithful Jewish remnant, which in the course of a few short years, during a time of unparalleled persecution, will accomplish more in the evangelizing of the world than has been accomplished by the Christian Church in wellnigh 2,000 years. For any plain scripture giving clear evidence of the evangelistic activity of this Jewish remnant we look in vain. But the evangelizing of the world, which Christ said must precede the coming of the end, is not the business of the Church, we are told. For the divine purpose for this age, we are referred to Acts xv. 14, "dispensationally . . . the most important passage in the N.T." (*Scofield Bible*). In this verse, James is simply referring to Peter's account of the conversion of the Gentile Cornelius. By blessing this Roman centurion with His salvation, God "did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name". The emphasis is on "Gentiles"—Gentiles, that is, in addition to Jews. James stated nothing new: the Lord had already spoken of "other sheep . . . not of this fold", which were to be united with the obedient sheep of the Jewish fold, so that all that heard His voice, both Jews and Gentiles, might together form "one flock" (John x. 16). We must not confound the *evangelization* of the world with the *conversion* of the world. It is the Church's responsibility to *evangelize* the world by preaching the Gospel to all the nations: to *convert* all the nations lies beyond her power. To preserve the balance of truth, we must not exalt Acts xv. 14 above Matthew xxviii. 18 ff. Dispensationally, i.e., as giving the divine purpose for the present age, our Lord's commission to His Church is surely at least as important as the words of James, if not more so. It is as the Church fulfils the terms

of the commission by preaching the Gospel to the nations that God takes out of them "a people for His name".

The words, "make disciples of all the nations" (*μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, literally "disciple all the nations"), cannot mean that nations as nations are to become Christian. Primarily, it is individuals and not communities that are to be converted. There is no such thing as a "social gospel" apart from the redemption of the individual: the fundamental question is "What must *I* do to be saved?" So also, in what is misleadingly called "the judgment of the nations" in Matthew xxv. 31 ff., those who are gathered as nations are separated and judged as individuals. "He shall separate *them*" (xxv. 32) is on a par with "baptizing *them* . . . teaching *them*" (xxviii. 19 f.): in each case "them" represents the masculine *αὐτούς*, not the neuter *αὐτά*, which we should have expected had the nations (*ἔθνη*, neuter) been separated as such in the one place or baptized and taught as such in the other. In all nations, as the Gospel is preached in them, there are some who believe, and some who believe not.

III

THE COMMANDS TO BE TAUGHT

As we read the words, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you", we naturally think of the Lord's words recorded in this Gospel—the Sermon on the Mount, the Parables of the Kingdom, all the teaching which shows how those who belong to His Realm should regulate their lives. Surely it is for want of applying these principles to practical life that we—even we who profess and call ourselves Christians—find ourselves in such a desperate impasse to-day. These are the lessons which, if learned and practised, provide a secure foundation for life, whether of men or nations: where they are neglected, ruin is as certain as to a house which, built on a foundation of sand, is exposed to the rage of wind and wave. But we are reminded that all this body of sublime teaching is not for Christians of this age, but for a hypothetical Jewish remnant of a future day.¹ The

¹ Both Old and New Testaments do, of course, speak of a remnant of Israel, but "a remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. xi. 5). Neither in its character nor in its activity can this be identified with the remnant pictured, e.g., in the *Scotfield Bible* note on Micah v. 7.

standards too high for us to reach in our hours of ease will be attained by them in days of unprecedented trial. And so some of the greatest passages of Holy Writ—the Sermon on the Mount, with the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, the Kingdom Parables, the Little Apocalypse—all find their way to the Jewish waste-basket. There is but one logical consequence: the Great Commission must go the same way. And while most teachers of this school stop short of this consequence, some, clear-sighted and logical, take this step. Thus, for example, the late Sir Robert Anderson, while allowing an "intermediate fulfilment" for the commission in the present age, proceeds to argue "that prophetically the commission belongs to the age when the Church of this dispensation shall have passed to heaven (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17), and when the true remnant of Israel—the 'all Israel' of Romans xi. 26 (see ix. 6, 27), typified by the 'five hundred brethren' who gathered round the Lord upon the mountain—shall be the missionaries to the world".¹

The logical consequence, certainly; but Euclid had a method of carrying a hypothesis to its logical consequence which is known as the *reductio ad absurdum*; and the reader may well feel that in such an argument as that contained in this last quotation we have the *reductio ad absurdum* of the "dispensational" theory with its "remnant" hypothesis. When the disciples heard the Sermon on the Mount, the Kingdom parables, the apocalyptic discourse of Matthew xxiv, or the commission which we are considering, did they receive from the Lord the slightest indication that He was then addressing them, not as representatives of that Church which He told them He was going to build, but as representatives of a Jewish remnant to arise on a far distant day? And what indication have we, apart from a very precarious hypothesis, proved by no certain warranty of Holy Scripture, that as we in our turn read those wonderful words, we are not to apply them to ourselves, but to others of a future day, who while enjoying far fewer privileges than we do, must shoulder far weightier responsibilities than ours? None. And as for the

¹ *The Bible or the Church*, pp. 231 f. Another example of his extreme futurism is his applying the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse to that future age; see *The Coming Prince*, pp. 171, 180. These remarks are not intended to be disparaging, for I am fully sensible of the great value of Sir Robert's contributions to Biblical studies, particularly prophetic and apologetic.

hypothetical remnant, the following description of it reduces it *ad absurdum* as effectively as words can:

“the two-headed, two-tongued monstrosity in Israel and Christendom at the End-time—a half-converted, half-Christian Jewish Remnant, which at one and the same time evangelizes the nations—and invokes the curses of heaven upon them: which cleaves to the Imprecatory Psalms—and uses the Lord’s Prayer, some of the Beatitudes, and the Missionary Commission of Matthew xxviii: which knows nothing of present peace, forgiveness and deliverance—and converts untold millions to Christ: which is sealed against death—and has many thousands of ‘martyrs’ who are so fortunate as to enter heaven and attain the highest blessings: which is nebulous in its knowledge of full salvation—and becomes nursing father to the glorious martyrs of Revelation vii.”¹

Fortunately, if the “remnant” exegesis of Matthew xxviii is the logical result of the “remnant” exegesis of the earlier parts of this Gospel, the converse is also true: if the Great Commission was given to the Church (and the Church has never been more worthy of her calling than when acting upon this commission), then the earlier parts of Matthew are also intended for the Church, and are to be taught as part of the “all things” commanded by the Lord.

IV

THE CONSUMMATION OF THE AGE

Such a commission, given by our Lord to those men who, at His arrest, “all left Him, and fled”, would certainly have remained a dead letter (as Sir R. Anderson says it did in any case!)² had not some powerful change been wrought in them. And such a change He proceeded to bring about, by the impartation of His unlimited authority, and by the assurance of His unfailing presence. So, when Peter and John were asked by the Sanhedrin “by what power, or in what name” they had healed a lame man, they claimed their Lord’s authority, and answered, “in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth” (Acts iv. 7 ff.). That was the authority, that the power, which changed doubting Thomas and denying Peter and persecuting Saul into men who “turned the world upside down” (Acts xvii. 6). The commission was no “dead letter” to them, but instinct with life-giving spirit!

Not only had they His authority, but His very presence.

¹ A. Reese, *The Approaching Advent of Christ*, p. 115.

² “The fact that the commission there recorded remained a dead letter is wrongly used to discredit the authenticity of the words. That the commission was not acted on by the Apostles is clear to every student of the Acts.” (*The Bible or the Church*, p. 231.)

That this promise was made good to them is evident not once or twice in the later writings of the N.T.¹ And the Lord's presence was to be with them not intermittently, but continuously, "all the days", and not for a restricted period only, but "unto the consummation of the age". This last phrase will repay further study. It is peculiar to this Gospel (*συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3 and here). The word *συντέλεια* occurs in one other place in the N.T., at Hebrews ix. 26, literally, "the consummation of the ages".² "It was at the heading up of all the various epochs appointed by Divine counsels that Christ was manifested (i.e., in His Incarnation) 'to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself'."³ And just as the ages before Christ found their consummation in His first appearing, so the present age will find its consummation in His future manifestation in glory. This is the point of time referred to in the Matthaean occurrences of our phrase. According to chapter xiii, the wicked are then to be severed from among the righteous, and the latter will "shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (ver. 43). In xxiv. 3, the disciples ask: "What shall be the sign of Thy coming (*παρουσία*), and of the consummation of the age?" The Lord in His answer confirmed the implication of their question, that His Parousia is to coincide with the consummation of the age. In verses 30 f., He describes His coming as immediately to be followed by the "great sound of a trumpet" (surely the same trumpet as in 1 Cor. xv. 52 and 1 Thess. iv. 16) and the angelic gathering of His elect, the counterpart of the angelic activity of xiii. 41, 49, which takes place at the consummation of the age. Until this point of time, then, the Lord vouchsafes His presence to His servants: after that, we think rather of their being with Him where He is than of His being with them where they are.

But if the Lord's presence is promised to them until His appearing in glory, what becomes of the theory, closely linked with the other dispensational teaching which we have considered, that at some time before this consummation, seven years at least, the Church will be removed from earth? According to this theory, the Church, by this removal, will be spared the horrors of the great tribulation. That a rapture of living

¹ e.g., Acts xviii. 9; xxii. 18; xxiii. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 17.

² Compare also *καιροῦ συντέλεια*, Dan. ix. 26, 27 (LXX and Theodotion).

³ W. E. Vine, *Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words*, Vol. II, p. 27.

believers, to coincide with the resurrection of the just, *will* take place is taught in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16 f.; but this event is accompanied by "the trump of God"—"the last trump" of 1 Corinthians xv. 52. Now, if this trump is indeed the last one, it can scarcely precede by several years the trumpet of Matthew xxiv. We must conclude, then, that all these three passages refer to the "last trump" (possibly to be identified with the seventh trumpet of Revelation xi, though this need not be pressed), which accordingly is sounded "*after* the tribulation of those days" (Matt. xxiv. 29).

This conclusion is reinforced by the consideration that the risen Lord grants us His presence by the Holy Spirit (compare, e.g., John xiv. 16 f. with xiv. 18).¹ Many, though not all, who hold the theories above noticed, believe that at the Church's pre-tribulation rapture the Holy Spirit will also be removed. So the *Scofield Bible*, on 2 Thessalonians ii. 7, says of the restrainer there mentioned: "this Person can be no other than the Holy Spirit in the Church, to be 'taken out of the way'."² This view, however, apart from the lack of all basis in the context of 2 Thessalonians ii. 7, contradicts the promise of the Lord's presence by His Spirit "unto the consummation of the age". Besides, it leaves us to conclude that the "Jewish remnant", *without* the Holy Spirit, are to endure greater trials and achieve greater results than Christians to-day do *with* Him. But even if the remnant theory were true, this figment of the Holy Spirit's removal is patently false. According to the remnant theory, it was as representatives of the future Jewish remnant that the disciples were addressed by the Lord when He said:

¹ Compare also Mark xiii. 11: "it is not ye that speak, but *the Holy Ghost*," with Luke xxi. 15: "I will give you a mouth and wisdom."

² For an excellent treatment of 2 Thessalonians ii. 7, see *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*, by C. F. Hogg and W. E. Vine, pp. 255 ff. They explain the restraining power as being Gentile dominion or constituted government. This is the more to be noted, as these writers teach the pre-tribulation rapture (see their *Touching the Coming of the Lord*, the ablest presentation of this view), but combine it with loyalty to the principles of sound exegesis. For another example of this combination, see C. F. Hogg and J. B. Watson, *Some Chapters on the Sermon on the Mount*, in which the "dispensational" interpretation of the Sermon is decisively rejected in favour of its plain, practical application to Christians to-day. The criticism of this article is directed rather at the attempt to make the pre-tribulation rapture an integral part of a complete dispensational scheme which denies the relevance to the present age of the bulk of our Lord's teaching in the Gospels. This theory leads to much the same practical conclusion as the "interim-ethic" theory of the eschatological school of Schweitzer and others. A writer who repudiates all this dispensational scheme even more radically than those already mentioned is P. Mauro, who yet "believes in a Rapture of the Saints . . . which shall remove all the people of God from the world, so that not one child of God shall be on the earth when God pours forth His final wrath and His final judgments on men" (*The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. V, p. 326).

"it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" (Matt. x. 20; cf. Mark xiii. 11: "it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost"). If, however, we believe that Christ was speaking to His followers as the foundation-members of His Church, this mention of the indwelling Holy Spirit causes no such difficulty: it is just what we should expect.

Thus our study of the closing paragraph of Matthew's Gospel suggests that our application of the great commission must control our application of the rest of the book. If it is for the Church, so also is the Lord's Prayer, despite assertions that its use by the Church "is wrong, decidedly unchristian" and that the future remnant "will undoubtedly use this prayer during the great tribulation".¹ It is not its *use*, but its *misuse*, that is "wrong, decidedly unchristian". And as we use it aright and pray "Thy kingdom come", let us realize that it is partly in our own power to "hasten the coming of the day of God" by fulfilling the terms of this commission; for "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and *then* shall the end come"—that "end" which will be but the beginning of the new, unending day:

The day in whose clear-shining light
All wrong shall stand revealed,
When justice shall be throned with might,
And every hurt be healed:

When knowledge, hand in hand with peace,
Shall walk the earth abroad—
The day of perfect righteousness,
The promised day of God.

F. F. BRUCE.

The University, Leeds.

¹ A. C. Gaebelien, *Gospel of Matthew*, pp. 139 f. See also the *Scofield Bible* on Matthew vi. 12 (the very section of the Lord's Prayer which He immediately repeated and emphasized, vv. 14 f.): "This is legal ground. Cf. Ephesians iv. 32, which is grace." A little reflection might have convinced the writer that Matthew vi. 12 and Ephesians iv. 32 express the same principle from different points of view. Forgiveness, however considered, is not "legal ground" at all. The theory we are examining cuts off the present age, from Pentecost to the pre-tribulation rapture, from the main stream of Scriptural history and prophecy. To use the favourite metaphors, "the prophetic clock has stopped", and "the Jewish train has been shunted into a siding to let the Church express thunder past". See further the articles on "Modern Dispensationalism" by O. T. Allis in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, pp. 22 ff., 272 ff.