
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 number of books produced jointly by a group of thinkers is increasing. We must frankly confess that as a class they disappoint us. There is frequently a sudden dip below the average level; there is sometimes a lack of cohesion among the parts; there sometimes arises a doubt as to the existence of any real unity of purpose. Here is one, however, to which none of these criticisms is applicable, even remotely. It is entitled *Adventure*, with the sub-title *The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net).

It consists of six essays. Canon STREETER writes on 'Moral Adventure' and 'Finality in Religion'; Mr. Alexander S. RUSSELL, D.Sc., on 'The Dynamic of Science'; Mr. John MACMURRAY, M.A., on 'Beyond Knowledge' and 'Objectivity in Religion'; and Miss Catherine M. CHILCOTT, M.A., on 'Myth and Reality.' Each essay is prefaced by a synopsis of its argument, and the whole book has an admirable index.

Very emphatically we would state, underline, and insist that it is a book to get. Had this note appeared a month ago, we should have added 'and to give'; a better gift-book for a minister we cannot conceive. It will freshen up his preaching, it will cast new light from an interesting angle upon the basal doctrines of his working creed. For the lay-reader who is interested in the big moral and theological discussions of our time, the book may be very cordially recommended likewise.

The standard of excellence is so high and so uniform that to pick out one topic as a sample for our readers is a task which we attempt with some reluctance. The one we have selected is not more interesting than the others, nor is it more adequately treated than the others are, it is just a fair sample. We choose it on the useful principle *place aux dames*, and we shall try to show what Miss CHILCOTT makes of a stiff doctrine like the Incarnation.

In general, with regard to the fundamental questions about the mediatorial function of Christ, Miss CHILCOTT explains that her purpose is not so much to give a new answer 'as to examine the traditional solutions from a slightly different point of view. For my whole thesis is that an answer —if by that we mean some positive and final solution—is not to be looked for, only a progressive understanding to which this or that interpretation gives a direction of greater or less value.' Christ became man, she holds, in order that we might have the fullest revelation of God which is possible. 'We could never have known God unless He had been presented to us in terms of human personality. For ultimately personality is not only the highest category of being of which we are cognisant, but it is also the only thing which we can know in the fullest sense of the term.' God 'must be brought within the scope of our human experience, and this is most fully and completely done by enabling personality to embrace personality, by enabling

us to know God under the highest terms of which our nature makes us capable.'

But the Incarnation gives us also a revelation of the possibilities of human life, Christ being perfect Man; and Christian thought has swung between two extremes, exalting now one side of this revelation rather than the other. The one which emphasizes the Divine has led to a need being felt for other mediators, such as the Virgin and the Saints, or to an emptying of the value of Christ's human experience for us. Over-emphasizing of the human aspect has also led to defects; it gives us an example, but we need more than an example. Man 'needs not only an example but a Presence; not only discipline but inspiration and living fire; sacrifice, discipline and death must be made the means to life.'

The problem of Christ's humanity, Miss CHILCOTT holds, is put in its acutest form in the question, 'Could Christ have sinned?' Many will say that, if He could, He was not God. 'Yet we must still insist that, however shocking it may be to maintain that Christ was liable to sin, the New Testament explicitly states that He was tempted, and nothing short of liability to sin can make temptation a reality. Again, it seems difficult to conceive of the purpose of the Incarnation, if the process stops short just where our human life is most beset with difficulties. It looks like a failure of love—it looks like fear, if we are to assert that Christ refused to shoulder, or could not shoulder, this our last and heaviest burden. And suppose we admit that Christ could have sinned, what does this involve? Surely no more than this: that at every stage in His life alternatives lay before Him, both of which were good, but one better than the other, and He was free to choose the less good if He wished. If we deny to His humanity that attribute, we leave Him little.'

But the Incarnation is to be conceived of, not as a single act, but as 'an eternal law for ever finding realization in history, the Word for ever becoming flesh.' That means that 'all living souls are God expressed in finite terms.' 'Christ's historic experience is not unique in kind in the sense that nothing approaching it ever happened before or could ever happen again. It is an instance of a process of which our lives are also instances.' But if all men are expressions of God, have we not diminished the unique value of the life of Christ? No. 'The fact of history which could illumine for us the whole purpose of creation, must needs be unique, or why had we need to wait until the time of revelation? And more explicitly we may affirm of Christ that His life is set apart by its perfection. Its conditions are the same as ours, but its triumphant mastery of those conditions raises it beyond. It was this which enabled the Incarnation to flood with light the whole process of creation which the feeble glimmer of our lives could never have illumined.' 'Christ's realization and fulfilment of manhood was not an obscuring of the Divine nature within Him, but its necessary expression and unfolding, and for us too the realization of our humanity is the fulfilment of the Divinity within us. The Incarnation offers us a pledge both of the reality of God in the world and of the reality of God's nature in man.'

Old Testament criticism may be bewildering, but assuredly it is not dull. In its present phase it furnishes variety enough to satisfy the most exacting taste for excitement. The date of Deuteronomy, the connexion of that law-book with the reformation of Josiah, the post-exilic date of the Psalter, the existence of Maccabæan psalms—these and a score of other positions supposed to be more or less fixed have been assailed, and opinions which had almost grown to be axioms have recently been boldly challenged and even roundly denied. The fear which used to be expressed, that criticism was establishing a tradition which was rapidly becoming as sacrosanct as the orthodoxy which it assailed, has turned out to be groundless. Criticism challenges everything and not least the results with which it was itself once content.

One of the most radical of recent challenges is *A History of the Religion of Judaism* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net), by Emeritus Professor Archibald DUFF, LL.D., D.D. The book is not written primarily as a challenge: it is what it professes

to be—an attempt to reveal the inner spirit of the Judaism of the three centuries from 500 to 200 B.C., in order that, in the end, we may the better understand Jesus, who was, in some sense and to some degree, the product of influences which were then regnant, or at any rate present, in Jewish religion. But in the course of this attempt there is many a clash with current opinion. This is all to the good, for only thus can science grow.

Whatever Professor DUFF has to say on the Old Testament, however unconventional, deserves not only a respectful but an attentive hearing. He has been teaching its literature for fifty years, he is familiar with German, English, and American scholarship, and he has himself made substantial contributions to Old Testament science. He is very conscious in this volume of going a way of his own—'eager,' as he describes himself, 'to gain a hearing for unusual statements.'

One of these 'unusual statements' is that Ezra cannot be a personal name. It is Aramaic for 'The Help,' and was most probably intended as a designation of Nehemiah. Recent scholars have been inclined to transfer Ezra to a period about fifty years later than that with which he has been customarily associated; but this suggestion would have the effect of spiriting him off the stage of history altogether.

Equally radical, and more important for our understanding of Judaism, is Dr. DUFF'S view of the Priestly Document known as P. This, he tells us, 'contains and expresses the soul of all the remarkable development whose climax was Jesus.' Doubtless P has often been unjustly abused and depreciated, but never, perhaps, has he been treated so generously as in this volume. Starting from Ex 25^{22}—'there I will commune with thee of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel'—the writer argues that one of the essential features of Judaism was a continuous trust in fresh revelations of the will of God—in other words, 'in a never-ceasing Inspiration.' True, as he points out, P did undergo modifications, as time went on; but the kind of 'revelation' in which P was interested was hardly a revelation of the will of God, as that will was understood by the prophets.

Dr. DUFF makes the ingenious suggestion that the Sanctuary referred to in Ex 25 was not the Tent, but the Ark, or Casket, or 'precious Box,' which served the twofold purpose of a Library destined as the repository of the P document and of a throne on which Jahweh would sit; or, to be more precise, the Cover is the Throne: and the Cover is described as the Tray of Reception, and the precious Tray for receiving blood-drops from the sacrificial victim—drops which marked the Tray as Jahweh's Throne, just as other drops marked other things as His.

There are other equally startling statements; as for example, that the traditional view given in Kings of Ahaz and Manasseh is sacerdotally prejudiced and not borne out by the facts, and that Isaiah's preaching so affected Ahaz, 'hitherto a graceless young man,' that he 'became the bulwark of the prophetic work.' Nobody will accuse this criticism of conventionality; nor is there anything conventional in the view that Aeschylus may have learned much during the Persian war from Hebrews who may have been among the Persian soldiery on the Bosporus, and that his 'Prometheus Vinctus is simply a Greek version of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.'

It is on this point of the spiritual interrelations between Hebrew thinkers and those of other nations that Dr. DUFF is most suggestive, if also highly challenging. Most people are willing to admit that Israel adopted, and transformed in adopting, some of the beliefs of the nations with which she came into contact; but Dr. DUFF is prepared to go further than most; he believes that Egypt and Babylon, in the persons of Ikhnaton and Hammurabi, left an indelible mark on the religion of Israel. He puts it thus: 'it was from an Egyptian heretic king that the foundation faith came, and from an older Babylonian prince came the moral sanctions with which the Hebrews set out on this spiritual road.'

to be—an attempt to reveal the inner spirit of the Judaism of the three centuries from 500 to 200 B.C., in order that, in the end, we may the better understand Jesus, who was, in some sense and to some degree, the product of influences which were then regnant, or at any rate present, in Jewish religion. But in the course of this attempt there is many a clash with current opinion. This is all to the good, for only thus can science grow.

Whatever Professor DUFF has to say on the Old Testament, however unconventional, deserves not only a respectful but an attentive hearing. He has been teaching its literature for fifty years, he is familiar with German, English, and American scholarship, and he has himself made substantial contributions to Old Testament science. He is very conscious in this volume of going a way of his own—'eager,' as he describes himself, 'to gain a hearing for unusual statements.'

One of these 'unusual statements' is that Ezra cannot be a personal name. It is Aramaic for 'The Help,' and was most probably intended as a designation of Nehemiah. Recent scholars have been inclined to transfer Ezra to a period about fifty years later than that with which he has been customarily associated; but this suggestion would have the effect of spiriting him off the stage of history altogether.

Equally radical, and more important for our understanding of Judaism, is Dr. DUFF'S view of the Priestly Document known as P. This, he tells us, 'contains and expresses the soul of all the remarkable development whose climax was Jesus.' Doubtless P has often been unjustly abused and depreciated, but never, perhaps, has he been treated so generously as in this volume. Starting from Ex 25^{22}—'there I will commune with thee of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel'—the writer argues that one of the essential features of Judaism was a continuous trust in fresh revelations of the will of God—in other words, 'in a never-ceasing Inspiration.' True, as he points out, P did undergo modifications, as time went on; but the kind of 'revelation' in which P was interested was hardly a revelation of the will of God, as that will was understood by the prophets.

Dr. DUFF makes the ingenious suggestion that the Sanctuary referred to in Ex 25 was not the Tent, but the Ark, or Casket, or 'precious Box,' which served the twofold purpose of a Library destined as the repository of the P document and of a throne on which Jahweh would sit; or, to be more precise, the Cover is the Throne: and the Cover is described as the Tray of Reception, and the precious Tray for receiving blood-drops from the sacrificial victim—drops which marked the Tray as Jahweh's Throne, just as other drops marked other things as His.

There are other equally startling statements; as for example, that the traditional view given in Kings of Ahaz and Manasseh is sacerdotally prejudiced and not borne out by the facts, and that Isaiah's preaching so affected Ahaz, 'hitherto a graceless young man,' that he 'became the bulwark of the prophetic work.' Nobody will accuse this criticism of conventionality; nor is there anything conventional in the view that Aeschylus may have learned much during the Persian war from Hebrews who may have been among the Persian soldiery on the Bosporus, and that his 'Prometheus Vinctus is simply a Greek version of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.'

It is on this point of the spiritual interrelations between Hebrew thinkers and those of other nations that Dr. DUFF is most suggestive, if also highly challenging. Most people are willing to admit that Israel adopted, and transformed in adopting, some of the beliefs of the nations with which she came into contact; but Dr. DUFF is prepared to go further than most; he believes that Egypt and Babylon, in the persons of Ikhnaton and Hammurabi, left an indelible mark on the religion of Israel. He puts it thus: 'it was from an Egyptian heretic king that the foundation faith came, and from an older Babylonian prince came the moral sanctions with which the Hebrews set out on this spiritual road.'

Dr. DUFF would not be without support in this contention. At the recent Old Testament Conference held at Oxford, Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago argued that there was a monotheism in Egypt before the historical career of Israel began at all, though Dr. Oesterley replied by maintaining that the monotheism of Egypt was a very different thing from the subsequent monotheism of Israel. There we must leave this matter at present.

This book on the Religion of Judaism would have been well worth writing if only for the elaborate chapter on Habakkuk. To the best of our knowledge it is the only discussion in English that deals at appropriate length with the view that the historical background of Habakkuk is not the period of Jeremiah and the early Babylonian empire, but the fourth century, and that the world-conqueror denounced in ch. 2 is no other than Alexander the Great. This view, started by Duhm over twenty years ago, is gradually winning acceptance among scholars, and it is fortunate that we have now the case for it argued so fully and lucidly by Dr. DUFF.

These incidental points, however, interesting and suggestive as they are, are subsidiary to the main purpose of the book, which is to give us a fresh and vivid picture of the Judaism which prepared the way for Christ. This Dr. DUFF has done by sketching the later Biblical and some of the Apocryphal literature, and by expounding the inner significance of the Synagogue, the Septuagint, and the Targums. In his hands Judaism is a nobler and more generous thing than it is commonly allowed to be. Any one whose mind is made up about Judaism would do well to acquaint himself with this unconventional treatment of it by an independent mind. We look forward with lively interest to the promised second volume.

There can be no doubt that the supreme question in religion is that of authority. Reference was made in a recent number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to the somewhat inconclusive discussions on the point at the Summer Conference of Congregationalists at Oxford. No one seemed to be clear as to where the seat of authority in religion lies. An altogether different attitude, however, is adopted by a writer in the current *Congregational Quarterly*. Dr. B. L. WOOLF, of whom more will be heard, has contributed an article of exceptional interest and value, which he entitles 'The Authority of the Risen Lord.' That is a proper description, but the article covers a great deal of important ground and is worth summarizing.

He begins with the earthly ministry of Jesus, and makes his point at once. However great and wonderful Jesus was as a Teacher or as a Character, that is not sufficient to account for Christian experience. It is clear that what the Gospels give us is only a beginning, 'what Jesus began to do and to teach.' Two facts may be cited to prove this. One is that the most important parts of the New Testament were written prior to the Gospels. Indeed, it was largely in the light of the former that the latter were written at all. This means that much vital Christian experience took place after the Crucifixion. The second is that the vital change of atmosphere when one passes from the Gospels to the Acts can be explained only by a valid enrichment of a legitimate experience. In other words, the Christian faith depends directly, but only partly, upon the Gospel records.

It is true, and must be emphasized, that the Gospel records are necessary. The distinction often drawn between the 'Jesus of History' and the 'Christ of Experience' is gravely misleading. The 'Universal Christ' is nothing when divorced from Jesus of Nazareth. Faith cannot come to its fullness or certainty unless it is firmly rooted in the Jesus of the Gospels. But it cannot be left there. It is notable that the Apostles seldom invoked the memory of Jesus. They did not deify it. It was important to keep the memory sacred, but the memory was not the dominant factor in the authority of Jesus after the Crucifixion.

After that crisis we find that Jesus is worshipped as Lord. The influence He exercises is not that of a memory personified and revered. There is little turning of the eyes to the wonderful days in Galilee. What we find is that the Apostles all believe themselves to be in relation with a living Lord. And there is little difference between this relation and their relation to God. What they knew of God was what they found in Jesus. And apart from Him and His message they had little or nothing to say about God. That is to say, the authority the living Lord exercised was identical with that of God. It was Divine authority.

This raises three questions which the writer proceeds to answer. The first is: On what grounds was such authority ascribed to Him? The answer lies in two facts—the Resurrection of Christ and Pentecost. On the one hand, the authority of Jesus was founded upon His immediate influence upon individuals and upon the society of believers. And on the other hand, this was made possible by the gift of the Spirit, which was an experience of power, life, and personal communion with the living Lord. And so the authority of Jesus rested on the immediate personal experience of a contact of soul with soul, accompanied by ethical and spiritual renewal of a unique type.

The second question is: On what grounds is such authority to be ascribed to Jesus to-day? That authority is only to be found in the inmost experience of a believing soul. The writer proceeds to consider what this experience is. It is a sense of impact, in which things take place in our life, an ethical redemption, a renewal spiritually and morally. And then there is also an inflow of power. And finally there is the clear identification of this inward Master with the Jesus whose words and deeds are recorded in the Gospels. Thus the voice of the historical record, the inner sanctions of the ethical and religious self, and the immediate influence of the risen Lord unite into one authority with a power and an urgency of the highest conceivable order.

The third question is briefly dealt with: In what way is Jesus the ultimate spiritual authority? How does this authority express itself? The writer warns us against the attempt to stereotype this authority in an institution or a tradition, and makes a plea for freedom. The one sure thing is that in religion Jesus is Master. He is ever new because He is ever present. He is the Lord of life. Such is the conclusion of a really notable essay. The answer it gives to the question so often raised, and so feebly answered, at the Oxford Congress is surely the one sufficient answer. It is definite, and that is what we ask. It is as definite as the Roman answer or the Fundamentalist answer. And it is satisfying. It is a present, living, actual authority. It is the only authority we can recognize as present and as sufficient. It is sufficient because it is the one authority to which we bow, that of God.

Mr. Hugh J. SCHONFIELD, in *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*, makes the startling claim that the du Tillet MS. of St. Matthew's Gospel, published in 1555, and hitherto considered to be a Hebrew version of the Vulgate, may be a descendant of a lost Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel, and that at any rate it contains within itself evidences of the existence of a Hebrew original underlying St. Matthew's text.

A comparison of Mr. SCHONFIELD'S translation of the Hebrew Matthew—for which we owe him a debt of gratitude—with our English Version reveals many interesting variants, and a careful consideration of them would help us to form a judgment on his thesis.

A very interesting reading in the Hebrew Matthew is to be found in 8^{20}: 'And Jesus saith unto him, Foxes have holes, and the birds of the heavens nests; but the Son of man hath not a floor (קרקע) whereon he may lay his head.' No doubt Mr. SCHONFIELD is inclined to see in this last clause an authentic touch of the Master, and accordingly to derive support from it for his theory of a Hebrew (and not merely an Aramaic or Syriac) original.

Certainly the addition of the word 'floor' seems

to lend a new pathos to the utterance. It is suggested that the reference is to a paved recess in the common khan or caravanserai of the village, raised a foot or two above the level of the courtyard where the cattle were tied; there the traveller would find for the merest trifle a place on which to lie and sleep. And yet Jesus could not afford that merest trifle!

But is it the point of the utterance that Jesus was stricken with poverty? As Montefiore remarks, He never seems to have been at a loss for friends or lodgings. Is it not rather that He warned the scribe who wanted to follow Him that He was living at the time a life of wanderings, having no fixed abode? If that is the meaning, then the reference in the Hebrew Matthew to the 'floor of the inn is perhaps not altogether apposite. Could He not always find accommodation there, should the worst come to the worst?

The realistic note struck in this old Hebrew text lends support to Mr. SCHONFIELD'S contention that the du Tillet MS. is very early (of the second century A.D., he thinks); but it may be gathered from the foregoing that we should have difficulty in allowing that the reading in 8^{20} supports the argument for a Hebrew original. Indeed, it looks as though the translator has taken liberties with his text.

Leaders of Theological Thought.

KARL HEIM.

BY THE REVEREND EDGAR P. DICKIE, M.C., M.A., B.D. (EDIN.), B.A. (OXON.), LOCKERBIE.

GERMAN philosophy and theology were content, on two great occasions, to turn their eyes towards sons of the University town of Tübingen. Later still, the twofold mantle of Melanchthon and Hegel fell upon F. C. Baur and Strauss, from whom it has passed, worn and tattered, but not inglorious, to light to-day on the shoulders of Karl Heim. In a time of intellectual upheaval and spiritual longing, Heim is playing an important rôle as the Christian thinker to whom many, of all grades and opinion, look for guidance. As a preacher in the *Stiftskirche* in Tübingen, he is beloved of the common folk, who crowd the church to its doors whenever he is preaching. Apart from his published sermons, which reach a wide audience, his writings represent, on the one hand, the best Christian apologetic of the day, and, on the other, the best exposition of Protestant thought and evangelical theology. As Professor in the theological faculty he lectures daily to some three hundred students, and in his class-room can be seen occasionally an unostentatious visitor from the Roman Catholic faculty. Especially is Heim reckoned as a leader of the German youth. He is looked to for counsel by the numerous youth-movements which have been launched and revived since the War, and he was the founder of the Tübingen circle of the Student Christian Movement, a circle which is now the largest in Germany. It may not be irrelevant to say here that he was born in 1873, and that he served as a chaplain during the War, with battalions of the line and in prison-camps.

He has not been translated into English, but a beginning is now being made in America with an earlier work, *Das Gewissheitsproblem in der systematischen Theologie bis zu Schleiermacher*.

There are two ruling motives which can be felt behind most of his writings. The first is his conscious duty to combat the thought, the popular appeal, the ecclesiastical presuppositions of Roman Catholicism. He maintains a running controversy with his friend and colleague in Tübingen, Karl Adam, of the faculty of Roman Catholic theology (see, e.g., *Hochland*, August 1926).

The second underlying motive is that of giving to evangelical theology a firm foundation in philosophy. In his preface to *Glaubensgewissheit*, he says that the aim of the book is to bring into relation with post-Kantian philosophy the new understanding of the certainty of God, which was a possession of the Early Christian Church and of the Reformers, and to which Karl Barth, in his *Epistle*