

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

death on the Cross has gone, in due course sacrifices automatically cease. It was Harnack, the famous German professor, who said that wherever the story of Christ's sacrifice is told, the altars cease to smoke and the blood of the sacrifice to flow. It is so even in Jewry. Under the Zionist movement thousands of Jews have been repatriated on the soil of their fathers. Much money has been spent on their settlement in Palestine. There is no proposal to reinstate the sacrifices of the Temple. How significant ! Jesus has made blood-sacrifices finally obsolete.

5. Will we let Christ show us, then, what we have to outgrow ? The prejudices and the trivial-

ities, the treasures open to moth and rust, the human splendours which so quickly fade, the joys with bitterness in their hearts, the will-o'-the-wisps of the human quest—what has Christ to say of them and of us clutching at them, hoarding them, spending body and soul to get them ? He says very little about them, just notes them and says, 'Come, walk with me, and these things will more and more lose their fascination.' St. Paul understood when he wrote : 'When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child : now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things.'¹

¹ R. C. Gillie, *The Gospel for the Modern Mind*, 18.

The New Anglican Commentary.²

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., UNION SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

SINCE the *Speaker's Commentary*, written 'by clergy of the Anglican Church,' was published in last century, Biblical criticism has advanced and altered within the Church of England as elsewhere. The present Commentary is intended to mark the progress of criticism, or rather, as the editors put it, to let Anglican scholars to-day set forth their conclusions—scholars who 'have not found the results of legitimate criticism to conflict with the Catholic faith.' Unlike the *Speaker's Commentary*, however, this is in one volume ; it does not print the Biblical text, as readers are assumed to possess the Revised Version ; and it contains a number of general articles on history, geography, and theology. One's first duty is to congratulate the editors and the publishers on their achievement. Any competent work is welcome which endeavours to educate the public on the Bible. Misconceptions require to be removed from the mind, fresh discoveries (in archæology, for example) have to be assimilated, and traditional renderings need to be revised or abandoned. It is all to the good when such scattered contributions to the better knowledge of the Bible are gathered together and sifted frankly. This the editors have attempted to do, and we wish them every success. Their work will be appreciated

² *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, including the Apocrypha*, ed. by Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, Alfred Guillaume (S.P.C.K. ; 16s. net).

far beyond the borders of their own communion. They have produced a book which is wonderfully cheap, which has a certain unity of outlook, which is religious in its tone without being homiletical, and which externally is pleasant and easy to handle. There are a few misprints : 'Welsh' for 'Welch,' 'pracisise,' and 'Selucid,' are the sort of minor errata which in a large book are inevitable, and such, so far as I have seen, are not numerous. The review copy sent to me does lack pp. 497-527, but that is a mistake of the binders. On the whole the get-up of the volume is excellent. A fuller index, however, would have been appreciated.

Like Dr. Peake's one-volume Commentary, it aims at an audience which is not able to use the original texts, and also at an interpretation which is religious or spiritual. Written for 'the ministers of religion' and for the laity, this work is intended, the editors assure us, to further the spiritual use of the Bible in the Church. Dr. Gore's opening essay claims that the Anglican Church, not the Roman, is the genuine trustee of the ancient liberty of the Church in dealing with the Scriptures, and is therefore bound to teach the faith 'without which the Church cannot live, and which is older even than the New Testament,' which is assumed in the New Testament writings. Great care has been taken to stress the religious setting of the New Testament especially in the life of the contemporary Church. And as the Bible was

meant for the Church originally, so its function is still emphasized by most of the contributors. Thus on Job 34²⁹ we read: 'Peake is undoubtedly right in rendering *If He remain quiet, who can condemn?* The hardest thing to bear is God's inactivity or "quietness" amid the horrors of war or the desolating sorrows of life.' Again, on Mt 21¹⁹, this frank comment occurs: "'The Legacy of Israel" to the world is the legacy of its life and witness before it made the "great refusal," the legacy of the faithful remnant which passed over into the Catholic Church. What has it given to the world since but the ever-present warning of its punishment?' In this connexion the place of mystical interpretation has been occasionally noted. There is a place for this, but it requires a more analytic handling of the data of inspiration in literature than has been recognized; the older 'typical' interpretation of the O.T. has been justly discredited, but it did grope after a truth which ought to be restated in terms of modern psychology and literary criticism. And this has not really been attempted. For example, the comment on the Parable of the Good Samaritan is that 'the great story needs no comment, only constant remembrance and imitation. On the mystical interpretation, which is very edifying, see Trench, *Parables*.' In any case this comment is too curt; the parable does require serious study. But many students feel that the mystical interpretation here is among the weakest and most superfluous examples of the method in question. The words of the Bible, as of any classic, come to have a larger meaning than that originally meant by the writers. But the spiritual or mystical interpretation has often produced a sense of utter unreality, unluckily.

The Apocrypha has fared happily, in the hands of scholars like Dr. Oesterley, Mr. Thackeray, Mr. Bevan, and Mr. Hunkin. Within their limits they have managed to compress just the sort of information which the general reader requires. The Old Testament has in the main been well served. Professor Burkitt's paper on the prophets makes us wish he had been entrusted with more to do; it has the rare quality of distinction. Also we would have liked more from Dr. W. E. Barnes, and something from Mr. G. R. Driver. But the level is well maintained, and an essay like that on the Old Testament in the light of anthropology and archæology, by Mr. E. O. James, will clear up the minds of many readers; it might have been printed with advantage early in the volume instead of at the end of the Old Testament section. The

editors are outspoken in this section. They recognize the legendary elements in the stories of the patriarchs: 'Esther and Daniel are not properly history at all, but edifying stories on a remote basis of tradition,' and so forth. But, they add (and the italics are their own), '*After all the real importance of history lies in perceiving what it is coming to—what is its tendency.*' It is a singular gain to have such candour combined with religious perception, in a work thus intended for popular use. No one after reading contributions, for example, like those by Dr. Guillaume and Canon Battersby Harford—to name only two of the keenest in the team—can fail to possess a surer sense of reality in the Old Testament.

The New Testament, I confess, seems to be treated with rather less thoroughness and critical freedom. Not that the writers of the Commentary are unduly conservative, by any means. On the story of the coin in the mouth of the fish, for example, we are told that 'frequently it is impossible to accept our Lord's teaching and reject the miracles associated with it; the two are bound up together. Here it is not so. Our Lord's beautiful words about sonship do not involve the acceptance of the miracle.' As for the destruction of the Gadarene swine, the comment is that 'it is another illustration of our changed attitude to the infallibility of the Bible record that we should like to think that Mark is in error in connecting their destruction with anything said or willed by the Lord.' Perhaps that is the true solution. Similarly with the Apostle Paul; with regard to angels, for example, 'in view of what we now know of the sources of the later Jewish angelology, we may not accept with confidence all that he accepts.' But one has the feeling that sound, critical principles might have been carried a little further, with profit to the reader. For example, when Luke tells how the risen Jesus ate a piece of broiled fish in presence of the disciples, it is surely not rationalistic to suggest that this is a naïve touch of realism on the part of the writer. Dr. Gore never alludes to this possibility; but if he allows, as he fairly does, a little lower, that Luke was attributing more to the Master than he really said, when he made Jesus declare that His resurrection on the third day had been predicted in the Scripture, does not the principle in the one case cover the difficulty in the other? Dr. Turner's splendid commentary on the Gospel of Mark exhibits the use of true freedom, for example, in dealing with the canonical text of the New Testament; it is a masterpiece of interpretation, from which all may learn; it has

judgment and originality of the best kind ; it does not hesitate to differ from fashionable novelties of criticism as well as from traditional interpretations. I wish something of the same liberty had been exercised more often in handling the historical problems of the life of Jesus ; for, whilst there is a good case for the point of view adopted here, it would have been strengthened if it had been less rigid at several points, particularly in connexion with the question of the miraculous, where the just sense of responsibility may be too much for the spirit of wisdom.

Dr. E. J. Bicknell's notes on Acts are good reading ; it must have been hard to construct a commentary on the lines required, but he has succeeded in conveying the spirit of the book and in bringing out its movement. Once, I think, he has been too subtle ; in suggesting the possibility that presbyters were not the same as 'episcopoi' in the apostolic age, he argues that when Paul addressed the presbyters at Ephesus (Ac 20²⁸) as *episcopoi*, 'a wave of his hand would be enough to make it plain that he was now addressing not all the elders, but only those to whom the further duty of overseership had been granted.' To put it mildly, this sounds far-fetched. Another exegetical oddity is the description of 'the love of God' in Ro 4⁵ as our love to God. This has been held, but the evidence against it is generally taken by scholars to be decisive, so decisive that the possibility of the other rendering ought at least to have been mentioned. On Ex 20¹⁷ it is noted that 'Do not defraud' in Mk 10¹⁹ is an echo of the tenth commandment ; but on Mark the real exegesis is given, showing that the words are an echo of the eighth commandment, if they are an echo of anything. In passing, I may observe that one feature of the literature is occasionally missed. Justice has been done, in the Old Testament, to the transposition of certain passages in the text, e.g. Is 41^{6, 7} and Job 28^{10, 11} ; but further use might have been made of this method to clear up Jer 21^{11, 12}, for example, Zec 3^{4, 5} and Mic 2^{12, 13}. Dr. Lock regards disarrangement as possible in some sections of the Fourth Gospel, but the theory is not worked out. Dr. Goudge admits the justification of the principle in the literary criticism of the Apocalypse, particularly in the closing chapters.

In forthcoming editions of the Commentary I hope the editors will pay more strict attention to the bibliographies. In Dr. Peake's Commentary these were a special feature. Here they vary ; sometimes there are none at all, sometimes foreign work is ignored, and often important foreign and

even English works¹ are passed over. It ought to be borne in mind that the object of bibliography is to aid the student in further study, and, competently done, a note of the best literature is most educative. The bibliographies, however, are frequently defective in this Commentary. Unless I am mistaken, for example, the reader would never know that Lagrange, the great French scholar, had written some of the finest commentaries on the New Testament ; one or two are tucked away in the bibliography at the end of the article on 'The Sacred Sites of the Gospel'—I mean, the names of them are. But his commentary on Judges is ignored, and so is his edition of Romans. French work has indeed failed to win proper appreciation ; even Dhorme's contribution to the Books of Samuel has been ignored ; so has Condamin's on Jeremiah, and Podechard's on Ecclesiastes. The German work has also been fitfully acknowledged ; Feldmann's book on the Wisdom of Solomon should have been brought to the notice of English readers ; so, I think, should Caspari's on the Books of Samuel, and Sanda's on Kings. But the New Testament has fared worse still, for the reader is never told of standard works like those of P. Ewald on Ephesians, of Riggenbach on Hebrews, and of Zahn or Bousset or Lohmeyer on the Apocalypse. In bibliography of this kind, as in poetry, the safe rule is : either the best or none at all.

It would not be fair to end this notice, however, on a chord of criticism. What has been done has been done on the whole extremely well, tested by a stiff standard. With regard to the general point of view, it may be said that the editors deserve warm thanks for reminding readers that the Bible is not to be isolated from the Church ; not all will agree with the details of their argument, nor with their inferences in every respect, but the position was worth stating. The spirit of the Bible is not to be grasped, unless it is read as the literature of a worshipping community, and one merit of this Commentary is that such a focus is never lost sight of. Another merit is the collection of salient data for the interpretation of the religious ideas, and the uniform presentation of the same—uniform, without being stereotyped. It is certain that the publica-

¹ The reader ought to have been sent on to Burton's edition of Galatians, to Kennedy's Philippians, and to Peake on Colossians, for instance. And, in the Old Testament, there is no reference to Dr. W. H. Bennett's fine book on Chronicles in *The Expositor's Bible*, though it does exactly what the Commentary desiderates.

tion of this Commentary will lead to animated discussion, for it initiates many people into views which may be at first unwelcome. But it marks a stage in the education of the public mind. It will reach thousands who are not reached by ordinary

critical text-books, and the spirit in which it has been executed is all the more likely to be persuasive since it is, in the best sense of the terms, both candid and ironical. To sum up, the book is timely, full of stimulus, and a genuine guide.

Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A., B.D., RIPON.

VI.

PART II. B (*continued*).

3. Dt 12¹⁻²⁸. Four times over (vv. 5-7, 11-12, 13-14, 26-28), it is here laid down that all sacrifices, tithes, and vows are to be brought to the place chosen by Jehovah, and (vv. 2-3) all rival places are to be destroyed or (v. 13) passed by. But (vv. 20-25, 15-16) distance would make it a great hardship if, when the Israelites were spread over the land of their inheritance, they could only eat of flock or herd at the one centre. Permission is therefore given to them to kill and eat non-sacrificially within their own gates. To such a feast the ceremonially unclean could come. Only the blood must be poured out upon the earth as water. So far Wellhausen and Wiener agree. Difference begins when we ask: What was the occasion which led to this ordinance being laid down so emphatically? Wellhausen answers: 'We have here the embodiment of the prophetic views which inspired the reformation of Josiah. Up to this time sacrifice and feasting have taken place at a number of sanctuaries and altars. But now, in view of the heathen character of the worship at the high places, the order goes forth that at one place only is sacrifice to be offered. And, as a corollary to this, feasting is not henceforth to be tied to sacrifice, and Israel may feast at home.' (See Part I. A, II. and B, II. in Articles I. and II.)

Wiener repudiates this altogether. Moses is the legislator, and Israel is in the plains of Moab. In the first year after their arrival at Sinai the Israelites had been permitted to offer sacrifices at various local altars (Ex 20²⁴), but this permission was abused, and therefore in the second year was superseded by a new rule which forbade sacrifice anywhere except at the door of the Tabernacle (Lv 17). Under this rule they had lived for nearly forty years. But now they are about to enter

Canaan, and Dt 12 lays down an amended rule to meet the new conditions. At the three pilgrimage seasons they must still offer sacrifices at a central sanctuary, but at other times Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶ is to be once more in force, and both non-sacrificial slaughter at home and sacrifices at local 'lay altars' are to be again permitted (*Essays*, p. 193).

Is this view possible? In confirmation of it, Wiener advances five considerations:

- (i) This whole legislation is expressly said to be spoken by Moses (4⁴⁴ 5¹).
- (ii) Dt 12⁵⁻⁷, etc., refer to statutory offerings, and do not touch the customary offerings of Ex 20²⁴.
- (iii) Dt 12²¹ and 16²¹ expressly recognize the altars of Ex 20.
- (iv) It is unthinkable that public worship should be restricted to the Pilgrimage seasons.
- (v) Semitic usage, ancient and modern, exhibits a dual system of sacrifice.

We will consider each of these in turn.

i. Wiener has the initial advantage that in *form* this chapter purports to be spoken by Moses in the Plains of Moab. But (a), as we saw in connexion with Lv 17, it is not safe to take everything at its face value. V.⁸, e.g., bids us pause. If, as Wiener holds, the Tabernacle with all its elaborate ritual and its three Orders of Ministers had been set up by Moses in the wilderness and it had been the centre of camp life for nearly forty years, can we imagine him saying to Israel, 'Ye shall not do after all the things that *we* (emphatic in Heb.) are doing here this day, every man that which is right in his own eyes,' and contrasting the present lack of order with the future happier days of rest and security when it would be possible to set up a central 'place' of Jehovah's choosing to