

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE problem of the Fourth Gospel remains a problem, but still invites attempts at solution. Lord CHARNWOOD in *According to Saint John* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net) claims that one, whose special studies and experience have lain in fields far removed from theology, along with certain handicaps, has certain special advantages in writing about the Fourth Gospel; one of which, curiously enough, is that he need not feel restrained by considerations of professional courtesy from dismissing erudite speculations of a futile kind. Dr. William James, 'that brilliant and lovable but supremely credulous psychologist,' in a passage from 'Varieties of Religious Experience' to which the reference is not given, 'uses the supposed mentally-defective genius of St. Paul to illustrate a sort of Gospel of neurotic holiness.'

We fully sympathize with Lord CHARNWOOD in his rejection of the neurotic view of Paul; while noting that, in his statement of the case of those who accept it, he has omitted one of their most important pieces of evidence, the very remarkable passage in 2 Co 12. As for the main subject of this study, one important change that has taken place in the critical study of the Fourth Gospel is that even conservative students no longer find it necessary to assert authorship by the Apostle John.

The author's main thesis is that the Jesus of the
VOL. XXXVII.—No. 7.—APRIL 1926.

Fourth Gospel is the Jesus of history. For this the main evidence lies in chapters 13 to 17. In them you have the living traits of a man of flesh and blood, a picture of a great human commander and a great human friend at a supreme crisis in his career. But if this scene is in the main drawn from the life, then our Lord Himself held that view of His own being and of His own relation to the Father which is set forth in the First Epistle of John, and which the Church later formulated more precisely in her creeds.

Nor is it only in the central discourse that we are in touch with historic fact. From the Baptist's proclamation of our Lord to the Resurrection and final parting, the gospel story is founded on rock. Why should it not be, since, in accordance with ancient tradition which has never been discredited, it is connected in the closest way with one of the Twelve, the Apostle John?

Yet close connexion with the Apostle John does not necessarily mean that John wrote it; nor is it easy even for a conservative critic to believe that he did. For one thing, the foundation of the Gospel in solid fact does not exclude the possibility, something more than the possibility, of a high degree of embellishment in the superstructure. The author writes as a preacher, in some degree as a controversialist. His method, poetical and

selective, permits him to ignore the due order and proportion of facts. Slight recorded incidents or sayings may have been worked up into whole scenes, and even deliberate invention is not ruled out as a possibility.

Moreover, Lord CHARNWOOD is convinced that the Beloved Disciple is the Apostle John. Does this not make it easier to suppose that the author is another than the Apostle, a grateful and affectionate pupil of John? The Gospel, then, is neither simple history nor historical drama, but a unique form of literature, with a doctrinal purpose, and yet finding the essence of the doctrine in the significance of the historical fact.

In *The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), the Rev. R. H. STRACHAN, M.A., D.D., also raises the question whether the Fourth Gospel is a drama. He replies that it is. The note of tragedy is struck in the Prologue: 'He came unto his own, and his own received him not' (should we not call attention to the difference in gender between the first 'his own' and the second?). We have there also sharply contrasted modes of thought: Light and Darkness, Life and Death, Faith and Unbelief. The coming of Jesus Christ has introduced among men a clear line of demarcation.

'The Prologue is the prelude to a drama in which the protagonists are Jesus the Word of God, and the evil powers of Darkness and Unbelief. The Gospel ends, as it began, with an act of creation, in which our Lord breathes into His disciples Life, the Holy Spirit. The Evangelist sets out to tell the story of Jesus' life on earth from this point of view.'

If it is drama, then is it also history? One thing we can say is, that on certain important points no honest harmonization of the first three Gospels with the Fourth is possible. On these points, if things happened as recorded in the Synoptics, they did not happen as recorded in John. The crucial

instance of this is the place which in the Fourth Gospel the raising of Lazarus occupies in the development of the catastrophe.

This raises a prior question. The Christian religion is inseparably bound up with certain historic facts; yet may not the significance of historic fact for Christianity be exaggerated? Have we not been inclined to peer too closely into the Fourth Gospel, and find its truth in this incident or that saying, rather than to stand back and allow the work as a whole to make on us a vivid impression of reality? This Gospel sometimes provides us with material for supplementing or correcting the work of the Synoptists; but it is not in these details that the interests of its author lie. He is concerned rather to place before us, as the origin and basis of the Christian faith, Jesus Christ as an historic personality. In his selection and treatment of his material the Evangelist is consciously or unconsciously guided by his desire to vindicate the historical reality of the Word of God Incarnate.

He gets his raw material partly from Christian tradition, partly from the faith of the Church and the cultural environment of his age, but in part also from his own religious experience. 'I have many things to tell you, but ye cannot bear them now,' is a promise being fulfilled within his own knowledge. He too could say: 'One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see'; could join in the request of the daughter of Samaria: 'Give me this water, that I thirst not,' and in that of the Galilean hearer: 'Evermore give us this bread.' It is this merging of the writer's experience in the experiences he records that explains the monotony alike of the thought and of the language.

Like Lord CHARNWOOD, Dr. STRACHAN believes that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a pupil of the Apostle John, to whom he owed 'his own soul.' What Philemon or Onesimus was to Paul, that was the Evangelist to the son of Zebedee. The Beloved Disciple is, in fact, the idealized figure of

John. He is Beloved, not in the sense that the Master singles him out for special affection—did He not love all His disciples (13¹)?—but that, in the imagination of His devoted follower, the Lord's love for the Apostle was transfigured into a solitary splendour? The interpretation of Jesus given in this Gospel derives its authority from this, that its human source was the Beloved Disciple.

But have we not erred in supposing that wherever there is a reference to an anonymous disciple, the same individual is always meant? We need not, for example, assume that 'the disciple known to the high priest' (18¹⁵) is the same as the unnamed disciple of 13³⁵. The man who introduced Peter to the courtyard of the high priest's palace had some responsibility for Peter's subsequent moral disaster. Is it likely that this would be attributed to the idealized Beloved Disciple? Is it not more probable that the unnamed companion of Peter is the author himself, who is here confessing his guilt? Perhaps also 12⁴² is of the nature of a confession: 'Many of the rulers believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be expelled from the synagogue.'

If the author was on intimate terms with the high priest, this forms one link in a chain of evidence from which, following Professor Burkitt and Principal Garvie, Dr. STRACHAN draws some very interesting conclusions. One who was of priestly family, perhaps himself an ex-priest, must have been originally a Sadducee; for at that time the succession to the priestly office was in the hands of the Sadducees. The word 'Sadducee' is nowhere mentioned in the Gospel, perhaps because the author regarded it as a nickname.

One of the remarkable features of this Gospel, as contrasted with the Synoptics, is the absence of demoniacs; moreover, angels do not appear until after the Resurrection. Further, in 7⁸⁹, we read that during Jesus' earthly ministry, the 'Spirit was not yet, because Jesus had not yet been glorified.'

All this would be very congenial to one who had belonged to the sect which said 'that there is no (bodily) resurrection, neither (hierarchy of) angel(s), nor spirit' (Ac 23⁸). Moreover, the apocalyptic forms of the Pharisees were always foreign to the Sadducees, and in this Gospel, speaking generally, Christian apocalyptic conceptions are transformed into a belief in the abiding presence of the living Christ.

We have spoken of 'the author' of the Fourth Gospel; but Dr. STRACHAN believes there was more than one hand at work in its composition. One proof of composite authorship is that two different guiding principles can be detected in the construction of the book. On the one hand there is a logical arrangement, the work of the original author, whose contributions are designated by 'J.' There are also, however, in the Gospel, various indications of time: 'on the morrow,' 'on the third day,' and so on. These are taken to be evidences of a chronological scheme imposed by a Redactor ('R') on the original logical scheme.

The growing tendency to adopt partition theories of the Fourth Gospel is due to something more than vagaries of the critical fancy. They are in part called forth by the difficulty of reconciling what look like genuine independent pieces of tradition with other material that throws very great strain on our faith. Dr. STRACHAN thinks his 'author and editor' theory explains, among other things, the delay attributed to Jesus in the story of the raising of Lazarus, that 'noblest and most magnificent product of the Evangelist's dramatic imagination.' In the conception of the author, Jesus waited, as usual, that He might know beyond doubt what was the will of God for Him. But the Redactor wants to make the miracle as spectacular as possible; so he accounts for Jesus' delay by His desire to give Lazarus time to die and be buried.

What is taken as the 'crucial instance' of the partition theory, namely, the date of the cleansing

of the Temple, will not appeal with equal force to all. Like many others, Dr. STRACHAN assumes that the Synoptists are right in placing this incident in the last week of the ministry. If this is so, the Fourth Evangelist puts it so early in the story in order to make way for his interpretation of a famous saying of Jesus, a saying also embedded in the Synoptic narrative (Mk 14⁵⁸): 'Destroy this sanctuary, and in three days I will raise it up.' The spiritual significance of the incident lies in the destruction of the old ecclesiastical order and the coming of the new.

It may be so ; but it is often forgotten that since the Synoptists do not bring Jesus to Jerusalem till the last week of His life, if they are to describe the cleansing of the Temple at all, they have no option but to place it where they have it. To some, the incident will seem far more congenial in the joyous days of the early ministry when there still seemed hope for people, priests, and Temple, than in the disillusioned days of approaching tragedy.

There are some who believe that, as a vehicle of instruction within the Christian Church, the days of the Old Testament are numbered, if indeed they are not already over. It contains much—so it is argued—that represents a long superseded type of religion, tales that are unedifying and tempers that are unchristian, and all that is good and great in it is expressed in the New Testament in terms more relevant to the world in which we live and to the religion which we profess. It is difficult to believe that such sentiments can be cherished by any one who has a really intimate knowledge of the Old Testament. Still, the prejudice exists and it has to be met.

It is met in a very interesting series of essays on Old Testament subjects, written by members of the Society for Old Testament Study, gathered together in a volume called *The People and the Book* (Milford ; 10s. net), and edited by Professor

A. S. PEAKE. But besides attempting to counter the prevalent tendency to depreciate the value and significance of the Old Testament, this volume also aims at explaining to the general reader the present position of Old Testament study. It is good alike for the public, for scholars, and for science, that stock should now and then be taken of the results reached by the men who are devoting their lives to it. The measure of agreement and the problems that yet remain unsolved thus come into clearer light.

Probably no one but a professional Old Testament scholar has any adequate idea of the ramifications of Old Testament study. The last chapter of the book on 'The Horizons of Old Testament Study,' by the late Professor G. BUCHANAN GRAY, gives in brief the impression which the book as a whole cannot fail to create, that the scientific study of the Old Testament involves not only excursions into, but an accurate acquaintance with, many other studies, which Professor GRAY broadly summarizes as the study of language, literature, history, and religion. All these interests are represented in this collection of essays, and the selection of topics and writers has been governed by that sense of fitness which we are accustomed to look for in so experienced a writer and editor as Professor PEAKE.

The editor has wisely left his contributors a free hand. This has the effect of revealing the uncertainty which attaches to some of their tentative conclusions. Even on important issues, such as the date of the Exodus, they do not always all see eye to eye: the editor and Professor W. Emery BARNES, for example, differ in their interpretation of Is 53. But vastly more impressive than their occasional differences is their substantial agreement. While they are all, in the words of the editor, 'united in the conviction that the classical literature of Israel possesses an inestimable value, they are equally united in accepting what is generally called the critical, as opposed to the traditional, approach to the Old Testament.'

The general reader, anxious to gain some insight

into this critical approach, of which he has heard so much, will be inclined to turn first to Professor T. H. ROBINSON'S essay on 'The Methods of Higher Criticism.' On this Dr. ROBINSON writes very persuasively, and by recounting an interesting experiment made by a group of Sunday-school teachers who were working over the story of Joseph in Gn 37, he shows that thoughtful people, untrammelled by a theory, in endeavouring to account for the literary facts which confront them, adopt the same methods and reach the same results as the critics: in other words, that criticism is primarily nothing but the application of intelligence to the facts.

But notoriously this eminently reasonable method does not always lead to absolutely assured results, and on questions of great and even fundamental importance the critics are often far enough from unanimity. But, as Professor MCFADYEN remarks in his essay on 'The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism,' this is due to the paucity of the facts. How little, after all, do we really know of the period of nearly two thousand years covered by the literature of the Old Testament. If we knew more, the margin of uncertainty would be correspondingly less. The essay just mentioned, which concentrates more particularly on the problems raised by the Pentateuch and prophecy, presents an elaborate survey of the formidable divergences of opinion within the critical ranks; for example, on such questions as the date of Deuteronomy or of the constituent documents of the Pentateuch—a survey which conceivably might comfort and reassure the opponents of criticism, who might plausibly argue that, if the methods were sound, the results could not be so discrepant. But the essayist points out, as the editor does in his preface, that 'many assured results have been reached which the future is not likely to reverse,' and these are enumerated.

Fundamental, of course, to the adequate study of a foreign literature is the knowledge of the language in which it is written, and Mr. G. R.

DRIVER, in a learned essay on 'The Modern Study of the Hebrew Language,' shows that a real appreciation of Hebrew involves a knowledge of many languages besides (Ethiopic and cuneiform, for example, no less than Arabic). Many illuminating suggestions with regard to Semitic tenses are dropped by the way. Of special interest is the conjecture, based on Assyrian and Babylonian, that Urim and Thummim properly mean 'Oracles and Spells,' and the other conjecture, based upon Ethiopic usage, that the Hebrew plural '*elohim*' is rather a relic of heathenism than a plural of majesty. The whole essay is one which will rejoice the heart of a linguist.

A true understanding of the progress of Old Testament thought is hardly possible without some knowledge of the history of Israel. This scheme, in which—especially upon the pre-Davidic period—it is possible to break new ground, is discussed with his customary freshness and keenness by Professor A. C. WELCH, who adopts the view of the date of the Exodus in 1445 B.C. elaborately advocated by Mr. J. W. Jack, and tentatively sets the beginning of Israel's conquest of Palestine about the middle of the fourteenth century. In a careful discussion of the invasion of Palestine, he suggests that the invasion of Central Palestine may have been effected by a tribe which was never in Egypt at all.

Professor WELCH'S discussion shows how little it is possible to consider the history of Israel in isolation; but the interrelations of Israel with other nations are considered on the large scale by Dr. H. R. HALL in his essay on 'Israel and the Surrounding Nations'—a subject upon which he brings to bear his vast knowledge of the ancient East. He puts back the date of the Exodus to the beginning of the sixteenth century, and identifies it with the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. With regard to the Habiru of Akhen-aten's day, he shares the view, which is being increasingly accepted, that they are to be identified with the Hebrews of Joshua's time.

Of course incomparably the most significant thing about the Hebrews is their religion, and to this theme, appropriately enough, no less than three essays are devoted. Principal LOFTHOUSE deals with 'Hebrew Religion from Moses to Saul,' the EDITOR himself with 'The Religion of Israel from David to the Return from Exile,' and Professor BARNES with 'The Development of the Religion of Israel from the Return to the Death of Simon the Maccabee.' These three essays together furnish a convenient conspectus of the progress of the religion of Israel for over a thousand years.

Needless to say, each of these essays is full of good things, and even when the thought is familiar, it is memorably put. Dr. LOFTHOUSE offers a brief, but careful discussion of the Decalogue, and he makes the point that 'the general idea of justice seems to be central for the Semitic conception of godhead as a whole.' Professor PEAKE presents a very sympathetic sketch of the prophetic movement and of the great prophetic personalities from Elijah to Deutero-Isaiah; and it is interesting to find that, in opposition to some modern scholars, he thinks that, in explaining the prophetic message, not only the prophet's moral and psychical sensitiveness, but also his 'keen political insight,' should be taken into account. In discussing the disruption of the kingdom he makes an excellent point when he argues that, but for it, religion would have been stifled: an established despotism would have yielded only one more commonplace religion, subservient to the Court and divorced from morality. Professor BARNES, who places Ezra forty years or so later than Nehemiah, pays a glowing tribute to the variety of religious experience and expression during the much decried post-exilic period, and he renders good service by emphasizing the undoubted fact that in that period there was very much more than legalism.

But the religion of Israel, like the history, was affected by her neighbours, and the nature of this influence is suggestively sketched by Dr. Stanley A. COOK, who points to Babylonian, Egyptian, and

other parallels to phenomena in the religion of Israel, but takes care to utter the wholesome reminder that it is possible for a people to be relatively indifferent to the higher civilization by which it is surrounded. He speaks with discriminative appreciation of the astral theories of the pan-Babylonists, and elsewhere he expresses his adhesion to Robertson Smith's theory of a primitive Semitic totemism as 'the best guide to all the facts.'

In 'Worship and Ritual,' though he covers relatively familiar ground, Dr. W. O. E. OESTERLEY traces very clearly the progress of religious usage from its pre-Mosaic beginnings, shows how profoundly that was transformed by Moses, and how seriously it was affected in later times by the Canaanites. Of special interest is his discussion of female deities, who clearly long exercised a certain fascination over the Hebrew mind.

Of the four remaining essays, that on 'Jewish Interpretation of the Old Testament' is by a Jewish scholar. Mr. ABRAHAMS makes it plain that Jewish and Christian scholars can readily cooperate, because, so far as they work in accordance with scientific methods, they are without bias: both alike, for example, refuse to recognize in the Old Testament literal specific predictions of Jesus. There is a valuable Jewish touch, however, in the reminder that to the Jew the Law no less than Prophecy is a factor in religious progress. A summary historical sketch is presented of the course of Jewish exegesis, which is shown to have contained many sound, if also many fanciful things; and faulty exegesis, we are reminded, may lead to edifying practice.

Many readers will be introduced to a new world by Principal Wheeler ROBINSON's discussion of 'Hebrew Psychology,' which offers some curious analogies to modern psychology. He points out that in Hebrew psychology there is no trichotomy, nor strictly even a dichotomy. The Hebrews have no proper word for body: flesh as well as

soul can function psychically. 'The Hebrew idea of personality is an animated body, and not an incarnated soul.'

Professor KENNETT, dealing with 'The Contribution of the Old Testament to the Religious Development of Mankind,' frankly admits survivals of primitive thought in the narratives and the ritual of Israel, but shows that they are usually made subservient to the higher religion. In later Israel there was a singularly high standard of sexual morality, an uncompromising monotheism so different from classical paganism, and the germ of individualism and universalism. In the light of pre-Christian history, the student of the Old Testament is justified in making the boldest claims for the Religion of Israel.

As Professor GRAY points out in the concluding essay, the Old Testament bears very directly and fruitfully on the study of the New Testament, and, were it for no other reason, the study of it would be indispensable. It is therefore appropriate that the volume should contain a chapter by Professor G. H. BOX on 'The Value and Significance of the Old Testament in Relation to the New.' In this chapter he shows how heavily indebted, alike in respect of language, style, and ideas, the New Testament is to the Old, how thoroughly Old Testament is the atmosphere that surrounds the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, and how the conceptions not only of Jesus but of Paul are rooted in the Old Testament.

This singularly interesting volume, with its manifold and various contents, is obviously written by men to whom the study of the Old Testament is not only a professional duty, but an absorbing passion. They are proud of its uniqueness. 'The Old Testament as a whole,' remarks Dr. KENNETT, 'its lowest with its highest, is infinitely superior to the literature of ancient Greece or ancient Rome.' But its supreme value to these scholars is as a revelation of God. Professor T. H. ROBINSON defines the purpose of all genuine Old Testament

study as 'to discover the process by which God led Israel to higher truth'; and all of his fellow-essayists would doubtless agree with Dr. S. A. COOK that 'as we place the religious development of Israel upon that wonderful background which we are slowly recovering, the more impressive is the picture we gain of the Divine Process working among men.'

Gifford Lectures are of two kinds. The one kind obviously is directed to expound and uphold some particular theory of the lecturer, scientific or philosophical, and the religious element or factor is brought in as a kind of justification for the writer undertaking the business at all. The other kind is as obviously directed by the founder's motive, and has as its main object the establishment of a religious belief on solid foundations. The latest published series by Professor Emeritus C. Lloyd MORGAN, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., entitled *Life, Mind, and Spirit* (Williams & Norgate; 15s. net), belongs to the second class. It has the distinction of being intelligible and the further attraction of being interesting. It will assist inquiring minds also by its transparent candour.

The main position of this book is expressed in its opening words with admirable clearness: 'If one accept a naturalistic interpretation not only of inorganic events, but of those events which we group under the headings of life and of mind, can one still believe that all these events are manifestations of Divine Purpose? I, for one, can and do accept the most thorough-going naturalism. I, for one, still retain, and am confirmed in, my belief in God.'

'My thorough-going naturalism takes form in the concept of evolution as emergent and universally applicable throughout nature, including human nature, bodily and mental. But I am one of those who hold that life and mind should not be identified with, but should be distinguished from, spirit. I regard life and mind as manifestations of spirit in an ascending hierarchy of such manifestations.'

This brings them within the orbit of natural events to be interpreted subject to the methods of naturalism. In accordance with this view, spirit is not a "quality" at the summit of the evolutionary hierarchy. It is that of which *all* qualities, from lowest to highest, are manifestations under the conditions of "time and space."

Further on, the same position is stated in other words, and these are quoted because the contention is so interesting and important. 'What is given for reflective contemplation is a world-plan of natural events. I hold that this world-plan is a manifestation of Divine Purpose. We human folk are, in life and mind, integral parts of that world-plan. We too are manifestations of Spirit which is "revealed" within us. . . . The world-plan, through and through, from its lowest to its highest expression, is manifestation of God; in you and me—in each of us severally—God as Spirit is partially revealed.'

So that Dr. MORGAN is a sheer and 'thorough-going' monist. And his monism is pure naturalism. He rejects dualism, and especially the dualism that is what he calls 'animistic,' the conception of a realm of discarnate spirits acting on and using Nature. We are not minds using our bodies *ab extra*. Life and mind are 'concomitant.' They might almost be described as the same thing from different sides. Almost but not quite, because Dr. MORGAN never says this. At any rate they are concomitant *within the system of Nature*. And evolution proceeds emergently by stages, each of which is 'supernatural' to the one below. This is the only sense in which he recognizes 'supernatural.' In this sense the advent of life, of mind, of the spiritual are successive instances of the supernatural. Natural and supernatural do not belong to Divine orders of being. There is only one order of reality, one realm of reality, *which is both natural and spiritual*.

Now in this world-plan of emergent evolution, stage after stage supervening, the inorganic, the

living, the mental, the spiritual, in all this, and in the activity in it all, God is present in purpose and in energy. His activity is manifested in *all* action, in that which obtains in the atom as in that which obtains in man, each according to its status. In other words, Dr. MORGAN holds a doctrine of thorough-going immanence. God does not act from without but from within, and in all activity He is active. All stages that are 'emergent' in evolution are the expression of His purpose and His power.

Of course the writer comes inevitably up against the fact of evil. Is this—in the sense of sin—contributory to the manifestation of Divine Purpose? He answers 'No,' but the grounds of his answer are not very clear. He states generally that dissolution and degeneration occur, as well as progress, in evolution, and that these do in a way contribute to progress. According to the evidence before us 'much at the lower level [of evolution] must be unmade that a richer entity at the higher level may be made.' But he shrinks from applying this to sin, of which he says that it is 'purely retrogressive and in no valid sense contributory to progressive advance.' What he makes of sin in the emergent evolutionary process we are unable, with the best will in the world, to make out clearly.

But, passing this, we come to closer quarters with his thought when we see what he means by Divine Purpose. He identifies it with the rational order of the cosmos. Not in the sense of suggesting it is impersonal, but in the sense that he discovers Divine Purpose identifiably with the rational order. Both are parts of his final synthesis, the concept of Divine Purpose 'in spiritual regard,' and rational order 'in scientific regard.' The question of personality comes up as applicable to God, and there is a most interesting and thoroughly sound discussion of the term. Dr. MORGAN rightly distinguishes personality from individuality. He finds the personality of God reflected and manifested in our human personalities, and, above all (and, we gather), finally in the personality of Christ.

But the question of the objective truth of this theory of a progressive manifestation of Divine purpose still remains, and the lecturer shirks no difficulty. A monist and naturalistic scientist might say, 'I agree with your monism and with your naturalism, but I do not find your Divine purpose. It is only an imagination of yours imposed on the natural order.' What does Dr. MORGAN say to that? Briefly, as we understand him, he says the reality of God stands very much where the reality of the outside world stands—on experience. We all accept the outside world as an objective fact. Idealism criticizes this and sweeps away an outward world. But idealism cannot disprove it, and we go on our way relying on our plain experience. Similarly, we all begin with a belief in God. Materialism criticizes this and sweeps away the concept of God as guiding events. But materialism cannot disprove it, and we go on our way relying on our plain experience. This experience, if it is not necessitated by the facts, is in complete harmony with them and explains them better than any other conceivable theory.

An event of much significance is the publication of the English translation by Dr. Herbert DANBY, of the Hebrew work *Jesus of Nazareth, His Times, His Life, and His Teaching*, by Joseph KLAUSNER, Ph.D. (Heidelberg), of Jerusalem (Allen & Unwin; 18s. net). In recent years the work of Montefiore, the Abrahams, Herford, and others has done much to help Jew and Christian to understand each other, and the process of mutual comprehension has been carried a long step forward by the publication of an appreciation of Jesus by this accomplished Jewish scholar.

In his study of the Gospels Dr. KLAUSNER adopts critical methods. On such subjects as the Virgin Birth, miracles, and the physical resurrection of Jesus he writes as any Liberal Christian might write; but to the gospel narrative as a whole he adopts a conservative rather than a radical attitude.

'To cast wholesale doubt on the historicity of the Synoptic Gospels becomes more impossible the more widely we study all the branches of Judaism during the Second Temple'; that is, from the Return from Exile till the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, or 70 C.E., as he prefers to put it.

There are few subjects connected with the story of Jesus on which Dr. KLAUSNER, with his knowledge of the Jewish background, does not shed new light. In particular it is incumbent on all who would understand the Gospels to study the Jewish sects of the time of Christ, and the history that preceded the mission of Jesus, as seen in this book from the inside, not, as we usually study them, from the outside. Sometimes agreeing, at times doubting, not seldom strenuously disagreeing, we are carried eagerly on right to the end of the long volume by the sheer interest of the story as the author tells it.

Dr. KLAUSNER does his best—whether successfully or not the reader must judge for himself—to absolve the Pharisees from any important share of the blame for the death of Jesus, a death the nature of which he describes with details of unforgettable horror. Why should the Pharisees put to death one who was Himself a Pharisee? Whatever we may think about that, we agree that in the last critical days the conduct of the opposition to Jesus was largely in the hands of the priests.

But the Bœthusean High Priests, including all the infamous High Priests from the time of Herod (among them the Annas of the Gospels), were hated by the rank and file of the Jews with a deadly hatred; witness a lampoon against them in the form of a street-ballad preserved in the Talmud which speaks of their 'clubs' and their 'whisperings' or secret denouncements, and tells how their sons-in-law are Temple-officers, and their servants beat the people with their staves. It was they, and not the Pharisees, who ordered the arrest of Jesus, and conducted His 'trial' as we are accustomed to

call it (though according to Dr. KLAUSNER it was only a preliminary inquiry, the trial by Pilate being the only trial).

We may also agree that from the earliest times Christians tried to minimize the part played in the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus by Pilate, the object being to throw the whole responsibility on the Jews. We see this tendency at work even in the pages of the New Testament. Dr. KLAUSNER here is trying to do far more than merely score a point in historical criticism. No Christian can be unmoved by the plea he rests on his argument. 'The Jews, *as a nation*, were far less guilty of the death of Jesus than the Greeks, as a nation, were guilty of the death of Socrates; but who now would think of avenging the blood of Socrates the Greek upon his countrymen, the present Greek race? Yet these nineteen hundred years past the world has gone on avenging the blood of Jesus the Jew upon his countrymen, the Jews, who have already paid the penalty, and still go on paying the penalty in rivers and torrents of blood.'

Of great interest is the study of Judas, the one Judæan among the Twelve. At first an enthusiastic follower of Jesus, he yet, to begin with, saw in Him nothing more than a Pharisaic Rabbi or Jewish prophet; but when, at Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus accepted Peter's ascription of Messiahship, Judas expected that Jesus would publicly vindicate His claims by mighty works.

The event did not justify this expectation. Far from subduing His enemies, Jesus was afraid of them, and sought to evade them. He was not always successful even in healing the sick. He blew hot and cold in His attitude to the Law, to Cæsar, to the Temple. He told His followers not to strive against evil, yet He Himself expelled from the precincts of the Temple the traffickers and money-changers. The rich ruler was told to divide his all among the poor: Jesus Himself accepted anointing with expensive unguents. He could only be a false Messiah, and the Law ordained that such should

be put to death without pity, compassion, or forgiveness.

The section of the book to which Christian readers will turn with greatest interest is that in which Dr. KLAUSNER tries to explain why the Jews continue to reject Jesus. Jesus taught that new wine needs new wine-skins. It is true that He Himself, till the last night of His life, obeyed the ceremonial laws, though not with the scrupulousness and pedantry of the Pharisees. He spoke respectfully of the Temple, the altar, the offering of gifts, the Scribes. The claims of justice and mercy and faithfulness were to be satisfied without neglecting the most rigorous demands of the tithing system. But by concentrating on the ethical, He in effect undermined the Jewish Law as *Jewish Law*, for is there not but one moral law for all nations alike? In singling out from the Law the elements that were most universal and least characteristically Jewish, He struck a staggering blow at the Jewish nation.

In Dr. KLAUSNER's judgment, Jesus did not realize that Judaism was a way of life. We are accustomed to laugh at the hair-splitting sophistry and casuistry of the Scribes; but this was only a regrettable development of a great truth that the Jews held, that religion is life and that life must be sanctified by religion. Far from enlarging the knowledge, art, and culture of His nation, Jesus despised their politics ('Cæsar's to Cæsar, *but* God's to God'), ignored the claims of civil justice ('resist not evil'), and by His insistence on poverty removed that economic basis on which alone culture can be built.

For a tiny nation, struggling as the Jews then were to save their great ideals from sinking into the broad sea of heathen culture, striving to realize the moral ideals of the prophets in civil life and in the present world, the teaching of Jesus seemed nothing but an abnormal and dangerous fantasy. 'Judaism brought forth Christianity in its first form (the teaching of Jesus), but it thrust aside its

daughter when it saw that she would slay the mother with a deadly kiss.'

Jesus believed He was the Messiah and was sure that the Kingdom of God was near. Had He not held both beliefs, He could never have taught His extremist and individualistic ethics, fitted only for the needs of the oppressed and the down-trodden in that terrible epoch when 'all the nations were writhing in the claws of the cruel and voracious Roman eagle.'

All this means at least a great clearing of the issue. It is much gained that we know how the story of Jesus seems to a Jew of the ability, the

learning, and the fine type of mind that this book reveals. It is much that Dr. KLAUSNER, speaking with an authority which does not always lie behind such statements, acknowledges that 'in his ethical code there is a sublimity of distinctiveness and originality in form unparalleled in any other Hebrew ethical code.' In view of the past and present attitude of a large part of Christendom to the Jews, can we wonder that men like Dr. KLAUSNER approach the study of the Christ with the conviction that any creed that would weaken the bonds that hold together this wonderful people, that would tend to their absorption among the Gentiles, is *ipso facto* self-condemned?

The Parable of the Pounds.

BY THE REVEREND J. G. SIMPSON, D.D., CANON OF ST. PAUL'S.

THE Parable of the Pounds, according to Luke, who alone records it, was spoken by the Lord at Jericho between the incident of Zacchæus and the resumption of His interrupted progress towards Jerusalem. The figure may have been originally suggested by a palace which Archelaus had built in Jericho, and which remained to meet the observant eye of Jesus many years after the territory of this unfortunate son of Herod the Great had been absorbed in the Roman province of Syria. All commentators agree in pointing to the 'ambassage' sent by the disaffected citizens of the nobleman to resist his claims as recalling the Jewish deputation which in A.D. 4 went to Rome, whither Archelaus had himself gone to obtain imperial recognition as successor to Herod the Great. But, however suggested, the idea remained in the mind of Jesus throughout the closing days of His ministry. The point of attachment to the historical incident disappears after the first parable. We hear no more of the nobleman seeking a kingdom and his subsequent dealing with the citizens. It is the purely imaginative development, concerning the relations of the master with his household, that finds further application, not only in the Parable of the Talents (Mt 25¹⁴⁻³⁰), but in that of the Household (Mk 13³⁴⁻³⁷), and in

the similitude of the slaves waiting with loins girt and lamps burning for the master returning from a wedding feast (Lk 12³⁵⁻⁴⁰).

In considering the Parable of the Pounds it is important not to omit the two narratives, by which our Lord enforces the obligation of a dutiful vigilance. The one comes from the entirely independent tradition of Mark; and neither can by any stretch of imagination be treated as a variant of the Pounds. With the Parable of the Talents it is otherwise. The superficial reader, familiar only with the one parable, would not be unlikely to suppose, when confronted with the other, that he had read it before. True talents are not pounds. And if, as is probable, Matthew has been read first, Luke seems to break the unity of the narrative, by inserting what looks as though it ought to form the subject of an independent parable, the irrelevant account of the citizens. The rest, however, it is not unnatural to think, must be just one story assigned to different contexts.

When we turn from the superficial impressions of the casual reader to the careful investigations of the scientific critic, certain phenomena are exhibited, as the two narratives are set side by side and minutely compared one with another, for