
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

luctant to teach this positive side of the grace of God in baptism, owing to their reaction from 'sacramentarianism.' They have faithfully taught the relation of baptism to moral conversion and the open confession of religious faith. But the New Testament also connects baptism in water with a baptism of the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* with grace, and makes baptism the entrance into this new life of grace. I believe there is no greater contribution which Baptists could make to the Universal Church than to teach it to reunite faith and baptism, joined by God and sundered by man, to the incalculable loss of Christ's Church. But if they are to make this contribution, they must themselves learn the complementary truth about baptism which the rest of the Church has held, and Baptists have usually neglected—that baptism is the entrance into a new life of power, and of regenerated activity, through the Holy Spirit, and not simply the moral repudiation of an old life of weakness, joined to a profession of loyalty to Christ.

If Baptists have failed to realize the full catholicity of their testimony, they have not failed to make the practical application of their evangelical faith in personal evangelism and missionary service. It is their pride to have been in the forefront of modern missionary activity, through the genius and persistent patience of William Carey, who learnt from Andrew Fuller to throw off the shackles of the narrower Calvinism, and to acknowledge a duty to the whole world, too long neglected by the Church. From 1792, when the Baptist Missionary Society came into being, the missionary spirit has more and more permeated the Baptists, so that it may fairly be placed, along with the passion for liberty, as one of their marked characteristics. 'The Baptist tabernacle is not always a graceful structure, but at least we may say this of it, that the twin pillars at its door are evangelism and liberty.' [1]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 164.

It has mainly appealed to folk in the humbler walks of life, just because of the simplicity, and often the crudity, of its presentation of these two great interests of religion, which means, of the human heart. But its world-message is apparent in the fact that the communicant membership of Baptist Churches throughout the world is now about ten millions, a number exceeded only by the somewhat larger communicant membership of all types of Methodism.

It has not seemed necessary in this brief review of the faith of the Baptists to speak of those doctrines of the faith which they hold in common with other evangelical Churches; but their close, underlying attachment to Scripture ought to be mentioned, in connexion with the appeal to Scripture as the justification for believers' baptism. This habit of reference has been educative, and has doubtless helped to keep Baptists near to the Bible. If this has issued in transient waves of 'Fundamentalism,' and provides shelter for more 'cranks' than other denominations possess, yet the price may be worth paying, for the sake of the deeper quality of Scriptural experience, which seems to me to characterize the living faith of the denomination. As one who was trained in a Congregational college, has often preached in Congregational churches, and is engaged in teaching Congregational as well as Baptist students for the ministry, I should not hesitate to say that there is a real difference between Congregationalists and Baptists, who, in Church polity, have little or no difference. Whilst Congregationalism has more culture, the Baptists seem to me to have a closer grip on the realities of the evangelical experience. This may mean simply that they are more old-fashioned; but I think it means that the retention of believers' baptism has kept them closer to some permanent truths and abiding values of the common Christian faith.

Psalm lxxxi.: A Sidelight into the Religion of North Israel.

By Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., D.Th., New College, Edinburgh.

A difficulty which attends the study of the Psalter is the uncertainty of the date to which any psalm should be assigned. Hymns which were largely liturgical in their origin and use were naturally liable to change according to the developing religious thought and the altered religious practice of the nation. And while it is difficult to prove in any case that an individual psalm has been retouched in order to adapt it for later use, it is often impossible to ignore that it may have been. Even

psalms which preserve archaic language, and so suggest an early date, may have received later modifications, intended to make archaic usages acceptable to a later generation. For religion loves to preserve usages and phrases which are redolent of old associations, while it pours into the old words and rites fresh meaning.

Ps 81 offers one advantage to the student: it can be at least approximately dated. For it is a Psalm of North Israel. Thus it opens with a summons to praise the God of Jacob (v.[2]); and it continues by stating that the hymn was meant for use in connexion with some act which was a statute for Israel, a ritual of the God of Jacob (v.[5]), who appointed it as a testimony to Joseph (v.[6]). Israel is summoned to listen (v.[9]), and rebuked for negligence in its obedience (vv.[12. 14]). The Psalm, too, shows a preference for the Divine name Elohim. It only uses Yahweh twice in vv.[11. 16]. In v.[16] the name is doubtful: the sense would be improved if we might read there, not the opponents of Yahweh, but those of Israel (cf. B. H.). But in v.[11] the name Yahweh is employed in its strong, specific sense, for He is contrasted with the strange god of v.[10]. That is, the title is not used for the deity in general, but is reserved for the God of Israel, who claims the solitary allegiance of His people, and who has His own method of worship. Yahweh is the covenant God, who has revealed Himself to Israel.

Written in and for North Israel, the Psalm must date before *722*, when that State with its public worship came to an end. It gives, therefore, a glimpse into the practice and the thought of this early period. What makes this clearer is to recognize that the Psalm was meant for the worship of the community. It is no utterance of individual piety, which might supply no more than how some devout soul thought of the worship and the God of his time. It is an official liturgy, intended for some public ceremonial and for a communal rite. Thus it opens with a summons to all present to unite in thanksgiving (v.[2]), and continues with a call to the priesthood (vv.[3. 4]). These last specially supply the full musical accompaniment, trumpet and timbrel, harp and psaltery. The occasion falls on a fixed day, the full moon or the fifteenth of the lunar month (v.[4]), and is announced by the priestly trumpet. It is definitely said to fall on the day of our *haj*, or festival (v.[4]), and can be described as something which has been prescribed to Israel (v.[5]). The hymn was written to form the liturgical accompaniment of one of the three festivals in North Israel, and reveals the attitude this community took, and the thoughts it was urged to hold, in one of its great acts of worship.

Which particular *haj* was intended is not absolutely certain. But, when Israel is bidden open its mouth wide that Yahweh may fill it (v.[11]), and when the Psalm closes with the promise that Yahweh [1] will feed the people with the finest of the wheat, it is natural to see a reference to one of the harvest festivals, either succoth or ingathering. And as ingathering, which fell at the year's end, implied, not only the final thanksgiving for the harvest of the old year, but the preparation for the ploughing before the new year began its round, it is natural to conclude that a ritual which ends on the note of a promise for the future should be connected with the close of the year.

A certain support for the reference of the Psalm to the feast of the ingathering may be found in one of the directions which appear among the headings. It is to be sung עַל־הַגִּתִּית, and this enigmatic phrase is rendered by LXX and Sym. as ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν, or 'concerning the wine-presses.' That is to say, the Greek translators thought of the Psalm as resembling, or sung to the tune of, the songs sung at the grape-harvest, like those which are spoken of in Is 16^{10}, Jer 25^{30}, Jg 9^{27}.

But whether the festival was tabernacles or ingathering, it was a public and communal celebration. Then it becomes at once significant to note that the Psalm, after its summons to worship, emphasizes the peculiarly Israelite character of the rite. It belongs to Israel alone, a statute for Israel, which the God of Jacob has set to be a testimony among His people. Its *mishpat*, or ritual, must be according to Israel's peculiar practice. The whole service is to acknowledge and praise Him, and the entire conduct of it must be after His ordering. Israel is not at liberty to observe this service after its own ideas, but must follow the Divine direction. Now that is precisely the note which governs all the legislation of Deuteronomy in connexion with festival and sacrifice.[2] The code nowhere prescribes a full ritual for the observance of festival or sacrifice, first-fruits or vow. But it continually insists that everything which is done on any of these occasions must conform with the *huqqim* and *mishpatim*, the statutes and rituals which govern Israel's worship. The attitude to the cult in this North Israel psalm agrees with the outlook of the Deuteronomic code.

[1] Read וְאַכִלֵהוּ in v.[17].

[2] Cf. especially Dt $26^{16ff.}$ in my *Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 25 ff.

But to note that the Psalm requires the community to order this part of its worship, after the prescriptions of its own religion, rouses the expectation that it may continue with further detail as to what constitutes the content of this religion. The writer, who has laid down for his primary demands that this is Israel's own festival and that it must be celebrated after Israel's own ritual, will continue to dwell on the same theme, namely, the content of the revealed religion. And that is the sense of the enigmatic clause in v.^{6c}, I hear a voice or speech which I do not know. It is the introduction of the didactic close of the Psalm (vv.$^{7-17}$). After the choral opening and the summons to praise, a single voice takes up the theme and develops it. And this voice introduces Yahweh as speaking for the guidance and instruction of the worshippers. Throughout, vv.$^{7-17}$ appear as a direct speech of Yahweh.[1] The speaker is a prophet, or at least a priest who speaks in the name and by authority of the Deity. When the Psalm represents him as hearing an unknown and mysterious voice, it is again following the Deuteronomic tradition, according to which the nation once heard the supreme message of its religion out of the midst of the fire, but saw nothing (cf. *e.g.* Dt 4^{15}). Yet the prophetic voice can be introduced in connexion with the cult, and can guide the thoughts of the worshippers at one of the public acts of their religious worship. Prophet and priest in North Israel are working together in complete amity, and are able together to serve their common religion.

The first demand which the prophet makes on the people (vv.$^{7-11}$) is extremely definite. Yahweh is the God to whom Israel owes its life and its land, since He delivered it from Egypt and brought it to Palestine. As such, He merits and ought to receive its complete allegiance: there must be no alien god within its bounds. Again, this is the fundamental religious claim in all the Book of Deuteronomy: the primary virtue in Israel is absolute allegiance to its own God. But the resemblance is not confined to ideas: it extends also into language. Thus the opening of the whole address in v.^{9} recalls at once the famous Shma Yisrael (Dt 6^{4}), and v.$^{11a, b}$ is practically the exordium of the Deuteronomic decalogue, 'I am Yahweh thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slaves.' Against the strange god and the foreign god of v.^{10}, Deuteronomy also issues stern warning (32^{12} 31^{16} 32^{16}). There too, 30^{10} etc., Yahweh bears witness to the people about His will (v.^{9}). And the waters of Meribah (v.^{8}) are also singled out in Dt 33^{8} as a place of some peculiar testing, which was not attended merely by failure. The North Israel psalm is closely related in ideas, language, and tradition to the Book of Deuteronomy.

In contrast with the clear demand and definite teaching of vv.$^{7-11}$, however, it is interesting to notice how vague and inconclusive the rest of the Psalm becomes. Israel has not (v.^{12}) listened to its God's voice, nor consented to Him—another Deuteronomic phrase (13^{9}). Instead it has walked after its own counsels (v.^{13}). Would that it might hearken and walk in His way (v.^{14}). But there is no effort to define what the Divine ways are, or what the Divine voice exactly demands. Nothing is said to show how and where Israel's own counsels differ from or conflict with those given by its God. The same generality of language and appeals in similar terms may be found abundantly in the parenetic sections of Deuteronomy. There is a possible reason for the lack of definiteness. Both psalmist and legislator take it for granted that their hearers know from other sources what is the precise content of the Divine will for them. That, of course, is perfectly true. But it deserves notice that in Deuteronomy the parenetic sections and allocutions with all their vagueness are allied with a code which is full of the clearest teaching about social duty. Embedded among them also is the Decalogue which sets laws about murder and theft, adultery and false witness, alongside Sabbath observance. In the Psalm the vague generalities about the Divine ways and about human wrong counsels are set down alongside very definite orders about correct methods of ritual and correct observance of outward worship. The whole emphasis becomes different. Spoken as these words were at a religious festival and at a shrine of common worship, their vagueness, after sharp, crisp statements of Yahweh's mind in connexion with the cult, was calculated to turn the minds of the worshippers in the direction of the ceremonial, rather than the moral demands of their faith. The worshipper is told with great clearness that Yahweh requires his undivided allegiance. He has been reminded that his presence at the festival was appointed as an ordinance by Yahweh. He has heard that the ritual in which he takes part must be the Israelite ritual and may not contain other elements. The natural result of the vagueness in

[1] This is an additional reason for suspecting the text of v.^{16a}. It is not natural to find Yahweh appear in the third person in a series of verses where He is otherwise the speaker.

connexion with the other demands was to make men conceive that they had fulfilled all the claims of their faith when they had observed its ceremonial. And the concluding verses were calculated to deepen this impression. For these promise that, if Israel would walk in Yahweh's ways, He should subdue its enemies under it and, in two phrases (v.[17]) which again recur in Deuteronomy ($32^{13.14}$), send it abundant prosperity.

The wholesome effect of such a liturgy depended on how its hearers construed vv.[12-14], and what elements in their faith they believed to be primary for men who gathered to the worship of the God of their fathers. Were the ways in which He required them to walk above all the ways of moral uprightness, or those of a careful ceremonial obedience? And from which of these could they conclude that He should come to their deliverance?

The Psalm gives the situation in North Israel to which Amos spoke, when he appeared at Bethel. He found men observing with extreme care all the outward forms of their religion. They were sacrificing after the ancestral fashion and were offering tithes with extreme care. And good men among them were expecting and sighing for the day of the Lord which was to crown and reward their faithfulness. Surely now Yahweh should turn His hand against their adversaries and satisfy them with all good. What Amos did was to lay a new emphasis on the meaning of the ways of Yahweh. They were the ways of moral uprightness, since Yahweh Himself was righteousness. What made Yahweh to Amos distinct from all other gods was, not that He had delivered Israel from Egypt by mere power, but that He had delivered Israel to serve His ends and fulfil His will. The two, God and people, could only walk together, if they were of one mind. And, since Israel had chosen to follow its own counsels, the two must part company and Yahweh must go in anger. Therefore the day of the Lord, for which good men sighed, must be darkness and not light.

For a long period after the conquest priest and prophet could work together, because they had a common task. Both needed to insist that the religion of their people was distinct from that of all the other nations. Yahweh must have the supreme place in His people's worship and a solitary allegiance. He must have His own altars and His own ritual, lest the people be led astray to worship Baal. But, when this was driven into the minds of Israel, the people and their priests were inclined to call a halt and be content. To the prophets like Amos there could be no halt. Why was Yahweh different? Why did He demand this distinction in His worship? What was His purpose, when He called Israel out of Egypt and made it His own?

He was different, not in name, but in character, for He was the righteous God. Therefore he could not be indifferent to the way in which He was worshipped, for righteousness can never be indifferent. And His purpose in calling Israel was to create a nation like Himself, capable of entering into His mind and willing to serve His ends. But Amos was not creating a new religion: he was demanding a moral revival. For he claimed to restore the ideals of Moses.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Are you playing the Game?[1]

'Kept back part of the price.'—Ac 5^{3}.

RUN your finger round the edge of a sixpence or a shilling, and you'll feel it isn't smooth like a penny's, but all rough with any number of little ridges, as if tiny horses had been drawing a tiny plough and making tiny furrows up and down and down and up a tiny fairy field. Why is it all ridged like that? Long ago people were very poor, and some of them took to stealing. They didn't break into houses; but, whenever they got a gold or a silver coin, they took a sharp cutting thing and pared off a thin strip all round it as you peel an apple, or rather as father does, for he can do it much thinner than you. And the gold and silver they peeled off they kept until it grew into a little heap, and then they sold it. But meanwhile they were cheating the shop people. For when they bought anything, they paid for it with a coin that was supposed to be worth five shillings, or two shillings and sixpence. And yet it wasn't really, for they had kept back a part of it. And at last things got so bad that these rough edges had to be put on the coins so that, if anybody

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.