

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

interpretation, he began his study of the Book with the conviction that the visions referred to incidents which, in St. John's day, were already in the past. It was only after reading two-thirds of the Book that this conviction gave way to the belief that the apocalypticist's foresight extended to mediæval, if not to modern times, and that he has, in fact, drawn a glowing picture of the magnificent results accomplished by the Reformation. These results the author finds, on the one hand, in the free circulation of the Scriptures; on the other, in the heavenly ideal actually realized in the present day in the form of constitutional monarchy, purified sport, humane legislation and other embodiments of a new spirit.

The Book is not really an apocalypse, he finds, but an inspired parody of one, the apocalyptic form being given it to correct more impressively conceptions of the Messianic Kingdom that are grossly unspiritual. In 18²⁰ the fall of the corrupt Roman Church is viewed as the sudden effect of Luther's defiance of the Pope. 20⁷⁻¹⁰ predict the beginning of colonization, when heathen nations, incensed by their inhuman treatment by Jesuits and so-called Christian explorers, rose against their oppressors. The author does not seem to be any fonder of the higher critics than he is of the millennialists. We are, however, assured that no one is consigned to the bottomless pit, except the Emperor Nero.

The Idea of God in the Psalms.

BY F. HERBERT STEAD, M.A., LONDON.

I.

A MAN set on the summit of the Salève and bidden describe in all weathers the overpowering grandeur of the Alpine panorama stretched before him—what Browning calls 'Earth's most exquisite disclosure, Heaven's own God in evidence'—would have an easy task compared with mine. The Idea of God—in the Psalms!—casts utterly into the shade the splendour and terror of any Alpine scene. Heights sublime, depths terrific; illimitable dome above, expanse of serene tranquillity below; tragic outbursts of wrath, disappointments overwhelming, crashing ruin, blackness and darkness trailing over the once joyous scene, the wildest tumult of passionate revulsions, then returning glimpses of the blue heaven: a whirl of agony coming to rest in a flow of unearthly music; almost all conceivable experiences jumbled and jostled together in the stupendous panorama of God as disclosed in the Psalms—one's very impotence of phrase attests the presence of the Indescribable.

Yet the most tremendous spectacle of Nature in convulsions is mirrored in a single human retina. And the kaleidoscopic and encyclopædic vastness and variety of the thought of God in the Psalms cast their reflection on (it may be) a single human consciousness. There reflected, it may yield on

inspection some account, however faulty, of the Transcendent Scene.

To Hosea, more than to any other prophet, we owe the key to what, borrowing a convenient patristic word, we may call the Psalmic Deity. The domestic tragedy of Hosea's life enabled him to rise to the thought of Yahweh as faithful husband to unfaithful Israel. Marriage was troth-pledge or covenant, and the closest kind of kinship. It is at once a legal bond, and constitutes man and wife one flesh. This, then, was to Hosea the best way of expressing what we moderns may term the Solidarity of Yahweh with the nation and with the members of the nation, as also of the members with one another. The relation—more than kin and still more than kind—can be named **bond-kinship**, if such a word be coined. Hosea gave to it the one Hebrew word which is untranslatable by one Greek, Latin, or English word, and has to be represented by different terms, according to the differing context. The word is חֶסֶד (*hesedh*). The Latin *pietas* comes nearest to it, but is still no true equivalent. Buxtorf's *benignitas* is far too vague. The Greek translation ἔλεος is a poor substitute. Cheyne suggests 'loyal affection' as an occasional paraphrase: which becomes 'fraternal

affection' or 'paternal affection,' according to context. Our English 'loving-kindness,' most frequently used for it, is a beautiful word, but as a translation it is imperfect. To modern ears it conveys nothing of the obligation of covenant, and nothing of the tie of kinship. As used of men, חַסְדִּים is rendered in Greek as ὄσιος, even as of God ὁσιος is used. Ἄγιοι in the N.T. comes near to the idea of חסד as including the human community bound to God and to its members by covenant and adoption. But 'saints' or 'holiness' would utterly fail to convey to the modern mind the denotation and still less the connotation of חסד.

Now חסד is the dominant conception of God in the Psalter. Yahweh stands to His people, and they to Him as to each other in the relation of bondkinship. Their dealings with each other rest on the basis of covenant. Below this lies a layer deposited from the time when as tribal God, or God of a cluster of tribes, Yahweh was literally of kin to them, and they were kin to Him, asserting and renewing by sacrificial rites their mutual blood-relationship. Still deeper, mostly buried from view, lay and heaved the volcanic mass of the old thunder-god, ever and again bursting upwards in a way that threatened destruction alike to ancient kinship and to חסד. It is this shattering emergence of the arbitrary and fitful Wielder of the forked flame that upsets so many attempts to reach a unified concept of the Psalmic Deity. From that same seismic source come some of the non-moral and non-rational elements which Otto delights to call 'numinous,' and also those elements which by the standard of Christian ethics can only be pronounced flagrantly *immoral*.

But apart from these tribal and fulminant eruptions which caused the Psalmists more anguish than they ever cause us, the main idea of God in the Psalter is represented by חסד. Yahweh and His people were bound together by covenant and kinship. Their obligation was to show 'loyal affection' to Him, by obeying His commands and participating in His worship. The obligation incumbent upon Him was to protect His people and to reward them for their fidelity, by victory over their enemies, by triumphant peace, and overflowing prosperity.

Righteousness (צִדְקָה, or less frequently צְדָקָה) is an essential element in the character of Yahweh

as presented in the Psalms. The common definition of Righteousness as 'conformity to a norm' naturally refers us to the norm as the more important and decisive factor. The norm may have been originally a physical standard, like our standard weights or measures, or plumb line, or spirit-level: then a judicial verdict, pronouncing acquittal; then, most generally, the relation and quality of bondkinship, or חסד; and persistent conformity with חסד is the general idea of Righteousness in the Psalms. This view seems to make it a dependent quality, rather than the substantial attribute which the Psalter extols. Perhaps we might help ourselves by an anatomical parallel; and think of חסד as the spinal cord, and Righteousness as the column of vertebræ. The vertebræ are there to enclose, and protect, and secure the action of the spinal cord, and have a substantial value of their own. Without the bony case, the nerve-content would, in man, be helpless and useless slush. Righteousness is the backbone of the character of Yahweh: חסד is its spinal cord. Righteousness is thus the firm and resolute purpose of Yahweh to carry out, despite all inducements to the contrary, what is involved in His חסד. He can be relied on to 'put it through.'

'Faithfulness' or 'truth' (אֱמֻנָה, or less often אֱמֻנָה) is a kindred idea, but may be thus distinguished: faithfulness is contractual fidelity, with emphasis on contract; righteousness is resolute and unflinching purpose, with emphasis on purpose. Faithfulness implies parallelism to the contract, however varying the line of contract might conceivably be. Righteousness implies rectilinear resoluteness, which does not swerve or wobble, nor allow חסד or covenant to wobble or swerve. And this persistent determination of Yahweh was counted on to bring about the material or temporal welfare of His people.

This theory, however modified by untoward experiences, runs through the various books of the Psalter, from first to last.

It influenced their survey of the past, and their forecast of the future. They set all history, history of Creation as well as history of Israel, to the joyous refrain, 'His חסד endureth for ever!' As Israel had come into contact with world-empires of wider and wider extent, Yahweh's protectorship of Israel must enable Him to deal with those Empires. As He had begun to protect His people in the re-

mote antiquity, so He would be bound to protect their posterity through all generations. These beliefs were hints of and prelude to a yet larger view. The leap of thought from the known world to all space and from recorded history to all time as the sphere of Yahweh's action, was a leap of faith. *Natura non facit saltum*, but here we trench on what is above Nature. The expansion of the unmeasured past and of the unmeasured future into eternity is no necessary evolution of the human mind: whether in Jewish or ethnic religion, it seems to be Something given. Like the expansion to unbounded space, and like the conception of the One Creator of the Universe, no explication of human reasoning can account for it. It is the result of that faith which is 'the gift of God.'

The **monotheism** which prevails throughout the Psalms, with only occasional lapses into the *usus loquendi* which mention 'other gods' as a sort of real entity, may or may not have been the logical development of the original monolatry which Moses imposed. But how came Moses to the initial conception of monolatry—that Yahweh alone must be worshipped by the Bⁿe Israel, and that therefore Yahweh was able to do all for Israel that could be expected in other nations from all their gods? Do we not there come upon a *datum Dei*, a special gift from the Unseen to the soul of Moses? And as the horizon of Israel's action and reaction extended to the bounds of the known world, monotheism may be a *logical* inference from the postulates of monolatry. But how came the *religious* certitude, which no mere logic can create? Is not monotheism, however conditioned like monolatry, a sheer gift of Divine grace to receptive souls?

These Divine data, so wonderfully portrayed in the Second Isaiah, are assumed and implied throughout the Psalms. They form the universal background behind the relation and operation of **חסד**; and give the widest guarantee to its efficacy.

The extended conception of **חסד** leads to a demand that pervades all the collections in the Psalter and is there more evident and clamant than in any other book of the Canon. That is the demand for TRUST. Mostly used is the Hebrew word **בטח**, which may at first have meant 'to lean on': less frequent is **חסה**, 'to flee for refuge

to.' One wonders whether there is any linguistic connexion between **חסה** and **חסד**. Is it a proof of the religious poverty of the Greek language or the fault of the Septuagint translators, that out of 43 cases of **בטח** in the Psalms, *πειθῆναι* is used only 7 times, and *ἐλπίζειν* 36 times, and out of 25 cases of **חסה**, *πειθῆναι* occurs again only 5 times, and *ἐλπίζειν* 19 times, and *σκεπάζεσθαι* once? Be it said with all firmness, hope is not trust; *ἐλπίζειν* is no proper equivalent to **בטח** or **חסה**. Our English word 'trust' seems admirably adapted to express either Hebrew word.

The most cursory perusal of even the English version of the Psalter shows that trust is continually urged or confessed as the proper attitude to Yahweh. The Solidarity of Yahweh and His people expressed by **חסד**, involves their trust in Him. 'Trust in him at all times' is the diapason of the music of the Psalms. On the very face of the Psalter lies the conviction that Yahweh is to be trusted, above princes, above all men. Confronting us on every page is this conception of the Psalmic Deity, that He is at all times to be trusted: He is the supremely trustworthy. In all trials and disappointments, in every emergency, however harrowing, He is to be trusted. He is to be trusted for certain things—for victory in war, for security from enemies within and without, from drought, famine, and pestilence, for the preservation of His people in all circumstances.

But we do not read far in the Psalms without finding that this trust at times seems to be bitterly disappointed. The people bound up so closely with Yahweh are beaten on the field of battle, are ravaged by pitiless enemies, are exiled, are overwhelmed with all manner of evils. Even the Temple is invaded, mutilated, desecrated.

We meet with frequent wails of disappointment and cries of agony. The bondkinship had somehow or other broken down. One of two things, the Psalmists argued, must have happened; either Yahweh had failed to keep the covenant, or they had. They dared not long rest in the first alternative. But they did give it expression. Yahweh had not remembered His oath-sealed covenant. He had cast off and abhorred His heritage. He had forgotten to be gracious. Why, oh why was this?

The easy answer was, 'You have been unfaithful to the covenant. You have sinned.' Job's friends were not wanting to say, 'You must have sinned.'

Yahweh would never let you suffer in this way, if you had been faithful.' Then arose the frenzied protests of outraged innocence :

I have washed my hands in innocency (Ps 73¹⁹).

I have walked in mine integrity.

Examine me, prove me :

I have trusted in Yahweh without wavering
(Ps 26^{1, 2}).

Now thou hast cast us off, and brought us to dishonour ;

And goest not forth with our hosts.

Thou makest us to turn back from the adversary :

And they which hate us spoil for themselves.

Thou hast given us like sheep appointed for meat ;

And hast scattered us among the nations. . . .

All this is come upon us ; yet have we not forgotten thee,

Neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant.

Our heart is not turned back,

Neither have our steps declined from thy way . . .

Awake, why sleepest thou, O Yahweh ?

(Ps 44^{9-19, 23}).

At other times, the unfortunate people were driven to the second alternative. Yes, they must have sinned. Not conscious of guilt by any verdict of conscience, they pleaded guilty before Yahweh that He might repent and turn again and be gracious to them. This was often no genuine conviction of sin as we know it : they seemed to argue : ' We suffer : suffering only comes as punishment for sin : therefore, O Yahweh ! do forgive us : we plead guilty if thereby we may win thy favour.'

It is when they feel themselves arraigned, for unnumbered transgressions, before a very irascible Judge, that the Psalmic Deity is presented in the most repellent light. He is the old thunder-god, blazing out in explosions of anger against an abject and terrified crowd. Hear their pitiful lament before Him :

We are spent in thine anger,

And in thy rage we flee away.

All our days are passed away in the outburst of thy wrath :

We spend our years like a moan.

Who knoweth the power of thine anger ? (Ps 90).

So they grovel before Him in terror, and hope by utter humiliation to turn away His wrath. Then, maybe, He will come to their aid : deliver them : and again be their gracious Protector.

The Psalmists seem to have felt towards Yahweh as children towards a very good-hearted parent, who is generally delightful to them, but has an

unusually choleric temperament, which unaccountably bursts out into fury and vents itself on all and sundry in the family ; they tremble before him in shrinking dismay ; but when the explosion is over, he returns to his old loving self. While the fit of Divine rage lasted, the frightened folk thought of all manner of ways in which they might have given offence ; even what was hidden from their own consciousness was exposed to the fierce light of His countenance. So they begged to be delivered from the sin that had caused Him to take such terrible umbrage : they confessed, as tortured victims on the rack confess, any crimes in order to obtain release from torment ; and, for the same reason, craved to be forgiven. They could even implore Him to repent !

There was something very melancholy about the spectacle of unusually good people racking their brains and probing their consciences to find out what they could have done wrong to bring upon them such fearful suffering. There was something wrong, they had no doubt.

They were perfectly correct : there *was* something wrong ; but it was not the heinous transgressions they were hunting for : it was a wrong theory of life. They held throughout the Psalter that suffering was punishment for sin, known or unknown ; and they tried to argue back from the suffering to the sin. The indignant refutation of this cruel theory in the Book of Job had evidently not mastered the writers of the Psalms : still less had they advanced to the teaching of the Second Isaiah, that suffering may be the vicarious lot of the Righteous Servant of Yahweh. To the end the Psalmists hoped that Yahweh would vindicate the right by destroying the enemies who assaulted Israel and by giving to His people prosperity and peace. There may be hints here and there of His calling in a life hereafter to redress the balance of this. Eudæmonism remained a permanent element in the theology of the Psalms. And as even a modern thinker like Kant argues that there must be another life to bestow the happiness which is due to virtue and which virtue does not receive in this life, the eudæmonism of the Psalms may represent an integral element in the religious consciousness of Man.

But solution of the problem presented by the suffering of the righteous was not found in the Psalms along eudæmonistic lines. A solution was hoped for and prayed for, but not in that way

obtained. The contradiction between faith and fact led the Psalmists to feel they were in presence of the Inexplicable. The supremely Trustworthy behaved in a way that made Him utterly Inexplicable. They found the numinous element in God, as Otto might say; for to Otto the numinous is simply what is Inexplicable—beyond reason and right. But the agony of finding the Trustworthy to be acting totally otherwise than their trust demanded, the collision between the ex-

pected and the actual, did lead Jewish piety to the inner solution of its difficulty. In Yahweh Himself, in intimacy with Him, not in change of outward circumstance, not in victory over enemies, not in vindication before the world, not in abundance of prosperity, but in God they found their exceeding great reward:

Whom have I in heaven but thee?
And possessing thee, there is none upon earth that I
desire (Ps 73²⁸).

To take up the Cross.

BY J. DAVIES BRYAN, ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT.

THE phrase 'Take up thy cross' has no connexion whatsoever with the fact or with the form of Christ's death by crucifixion; nor did it arise out of the custom of compelling condemned prisoners to carry their own cross to the place of execution.

The argument in the passages in which the words occur is this:

There are two realms—the 'world' and the 'kingdom of heaven,' distinct, and by their nature inimical. There is no affinity, there can be no fusion between them.

Now, 'no man can serve two masters'; he must 'deny' or renounce his citizenship of the one state before 'confessing' or acknowledging allegiance to the other. He cannot be a subject of both; he cannot even retain friendly relationship with the two. There must be an unqualified abandonment of all old values, a complete breaking away from former surroundings and attachments. A man must *pull up the stake which pins him to the old life*, and definitely turn his back on the 'world,' to go over and 'follow after' a new leader on the other side. It is the same call as that which was given to Abraham—'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come unto the land which I will show thee' (Ac 7³).

The words, with but slight variation, are found six times in the Gospels, and were used, according to our records, on four separate occasions:

(1) When the great charge was given to the Apostles as they were on the point of starting

on a preaching and healing mission to the Jews (Mt 10³⁸).

(2) In the course of, or soon after the journey to the coasts of Cæsarea-Philippi. This report is given in three of the Gospels—Mt 16²⁴, Mk 8³⁴, Lk 9²³—and the only marked difference in the wording is where Luke introduces the term 'daily' into his narrative.

(3) Immediately after, and closely dependent on, the Parable of the Great Supper (Lk 14²⁷).

(4) To the rich man (Mk 10²¹). Though the words fit in perfectly with the spirit and the teaching of the story, they are omitted from the R.V. on the ground that they are not found in some of the oldest MSS.

The teaching in the contexts of the phrase is not directly concerned either with the suffering of Christ or with the persecution of the disciples.

In three of the chapters (Mt 10, Mk 10, Lk 14), that is, on three out of the four occasions when the words were spoken, there is no reference to the events which were to take place in Jerusalem. In the other passages there is nothing in the narrative connecting the call to take up the cross with the announcement made a few verses earlier—'From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how he must go to Jerusalem . . . and suffer . . . and be killed.' The sequence of events is not quite clear in Matthew and Luke, but Mark indicates a separate occasion and a different audience. Moreover, *in none of these forecasts (made to the disciples only) is there any intimation*