

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

down. All, therefore, returns to this: have we a Heavenly Father who cares for us, and has He a Kingdom whose rule and law obeyed guarantee the security and peace which we seek? Our Lord shows us the logic of trust in God. He has already given us the greater things; He cannot withhold the lesser. As a fact, we have to trust Him for our food and clothing—these things for which we contend. For it is *His* soil and sun that supply us with all the material for life. Everything is given by Him. We are not asked to trust One of whom we know nothing, but One who has been lavish with His gifts. The struggle for their distribution is due to this, that the gifts have been severed from

the Giver and from the laws of His Kingdom. The gifts of God, used according to the laws of the Kingdom of God, could never fail. Not until society accepts the laws of the Kingdom can complete security and peace come to any individual, since we are members one of another. But we cannot wait until all are evangelized. We must begin as individuals and each one seek the Kingdom first. It is not without reason that the 'Te Deum,' beginning in the plural, ends on the singular note. 'We praise Thee, O God . . . we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord'; 'In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted, let me never be confounded.'¹

¹ F. C. Spurr, *Does God Care?* 26.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

DR. HUGO ODEBERG makes a gallant attempt to defend the view that the Book of Ecclesiastes is a unity.¹ The writer, he holds, was no pessimist; such pessimism as he shows is directed only against life 'under the sun,' *i.e.* against immersion in the things of sublunary existence: *that* life is futile. But there is another life, the life of the man who is able to take his stand against the stream of events and to use the sublunary things instead of being used by them. The book is an implicit plea for the latter life, the case for which it presents negatively, so that, despite appearance, the theme of the book is essentially 'the better life.' Earthly existence is not necessarily futile, within it the higher life may be lived. Odeberg represents Ecclesiastes as putting his case thus: 'There is another way of living than that designated by me as "labour under the sun"; that other way of living has permanent results, *וְחַיִּים*, abiding value; to that manner of living I want to direct the attention of thoughtful hearers by picturing vividly and emphasizing strongly the nothingness of the life lived "under the sun."'

One reader, at any rate, the argument, skilfully conducted as it is, has failed to convince. The book, as it stands, presents a predominantly gloomy view of human life: the impression it leaves upon the mind is a melancholy one, and at best the moral to which Odeberg thinks it points is, except for a few incidental verses, only reached through in-

¹ *Qohaetaeth: A Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes* (Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, Uppsala; kr. 2.50).

ference. Odeberg himself admits the presence in the book of interpolations and additions, but such an admission is dangerous, if not fatal, to any theory which maintains the unity of the book. Once it is made, the way is open for the view that a fundamentally pessimistic book has been supplemented by interpolations in the interests of orthodoxy. But even those who differ from Odeberg may learn from him, and especially from the brief but suggestive commentary which accompanies the general discussion. It is doubtful, however, whether he has offered a satisfactory solution of the famous crux in 3¹¹, where A.V. and R.V. render 'he hath set the world (R.V. marg. *eternity*) in their heart.' He translates, 'in their hearts he has laid *all* times'; but fatal to this rendering, as to R.V. text and margin, seems to be the spelling *לְעוֹלָם*; in so late a book as Ecclesiastes—Odeberg puts it about 250 B.C.—one would surely have expected *לְעוֹלָם*. A useful translation accompanies the commentary.

The book is written in excellent English, with hardly a touch that suggests the foreigner: 'facticities' (p. 30), 'category' (p. 79), 'antithese' (p. 31), 'epicureical' (p. 87), and 'some Jews could *desist* their old faith' are among the very few errors we have noticed. On p. 99 *σπέντεσθαι* and *πράττεν* should of course be *σπέντεσθαι* and *πράττεν*.

The Book of Proverbs, as Professor Gemser² remarks, hardly makes attractive reading: even

² *De Spreuken van Solomo, Tekst en Uitleg*, door Dr. B. Gemser (J. B. Wolters' Uitgevers-Maatschappij, Groningen, Holland; pp. 213; fl. 2.90).

in its more elaborate sections there is a certain monotony. But by his commentary he has certainly done as much as any man can do to redeem it from the undeserved neglect into which it has fallen. For he has shown in his introduction that it is a monument not only of national but of international importance, having affiliations with Babylon, and more particularly with Egypt. After sketching in successive sections the Wisdom of the Ancient East, its nature, its antiquity, and its representatives, he proceeds to discuss against this background the wisdom, the wise men and the wisdom books of Israel, making good use of every direct or covert allusion to this wisdom in the Old Testament. Then he deals in detail with the Book of Proverbs, discussing its literary form and the nature and historical implications of its component parts. It is a mistake, he argues, to regard Proverbs as entirely a product of the Greek period; much of it must be pre-exilic, as it reflects unmistakably the conditions of the monarchy, and some historical value ought to be attached to the statement in 25¹. While admitting the indebtedness of 22¹¹-23¹¹ to Amen-em-ope, he rightly maintains that the Hebrew writer has stamped with the seal of Israel's spirit the Egyptian material which he appropriated. Dr. Gemser, who teaches at the University of Pretoria, has enriched his discussion by adducing parallel proverbs from native African races. The book is the work of a scholar who can make what he has to say not only intelligible but interesting to the common people.

Dr. Oestreicher, already well known for his contribution to the Deuteronomic problem, discusses the question of the central sanctuary from a new angle.¹ He maintains that, just as there is no incompatibility in Islam between the one Ka'ba and the many mosques, so neither is there any between the central sanctuary and the many local sanctuaries: a temple (whether at Shiloh, Gibeon, Samaria, Bethel, or Jerusalem, according to the period or the kingdom which it represented) appears side by side with local sanctuaries from the Conquest to the Exile; and the idea embodied in this usage goes back to Moses. It is significant that *היכל* can mean either temple or palace: the temple was really the religio-political centre of the country, and to proclaim its doom, as Jeremiah (26) did, was at once treason and blasphemy. When Judah was the vassal of Assyria, the Assyrian cult was not optional but obligatory, and the real meaning

¹ *Reichstempel und Ortsheligtümer in Israel* (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. 56; Mk. I.80).

of Josiah's reform is to be found not in any centralization of the cult—for not even Jeremiah or Ezekiel, much less the earlier prophets, presuppose this—but in the proof it affords that Judah had now definitely shaken off the Assyrian yoke. Oestreicher maintains that his argument, if accepted, must lead to a new orientation of the Pentateuchal problem, which has for a century and a quarter been dominated by de Wette's view of Deuteronomy.

Professor Paul Heinisch, of Nymwegen, Holland, a Roman Catholic scholar, has written an elaborate commentary on Genesis² for the series 'Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments.' In length, though not in brilliance or originality, it is almost comparable to Gunkel's famous commentary; and, marked as it is by wide and solid learning, it is a valuable contribution to the literature on Genesis on the conservative side. Dr. Heinisch is careful to explain that the decision of the Papal Commission of 27th June 1906 does not prevent the Roman Catholic scholar from approaching without prejudice the literary problems involved; he himself admits post-Mosaic interpolations in the Pentateuch—for example, the Law of the Kingdom (Dt 17^{14ff.})—and he explains divergent laws as successive codifications to meet altered circumstances. But substantially the Pentateuch—to the history of the criticism of which a long section is devoted—is Mosaic. It need not be supposed that Moses wrote it all at once or single-handed; he may have had assistant scribes who worked according to plan, and it may have occupied him for several decades. Duplicates are to be explained as due to a double tradition rather than to two documentary sources, though Heinisch thinks that written material, of which Moses made use, may lie behind certain parts of the narrative, for example, Gn 2¹⁰⁻¹⁴ 6¹⁻⁴ 14; and we may assume, he thinks, not only that it was Moses who collected the popular traditions about the patriarchs and transmitted them to posterity in literary form, but that it was he also who preserved the traditions current in Israel relative to the prehistoric period. Naturally this view of the authorship of the Pentateuch inclines Heinisch to accept the substantial historicity of its narratives and to reject all tribal, astral, and mythological interpretations. The very gaps in the narrative are eloquent: it speaks, for example, for the reliability of the tradition that so little is said about Isaac. And an indirect proof of the essential truth of the patriarchal narratives is

² *Das Buch Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (Verlag von Peter Hanstein, Bonn; pp. 436; Mk. 15 and 17.50).

that the situation they reflect agrees with what we know of Canaan and Egypt in the second millennium B.C. The book, however, as a whole, able as it is, will do little or nothing to rehabilitate, among Protestant scholars, the Mosaicity of the Pentateuch.

The exegetical part of the Commentary shows that Heinisch has caught something of Gunkel's fine appreciation of the literary quality of the narratives on their æsthetic side. But the critical element is by no means wanting. Heinisch queries, for example, 'Moriah' in his translation of 22², remarking that the writer of 2 Ch 3¹ would probably have referred to this incident, rather than to 2 S 24^{18a}, had Moriah stood in his text of Genesis; he concludes that Moriah is not original—the site may have been Hebron or some point a little farther north.

From the pen of Professor Hempel, the distinguished editor of the 'Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,' comes a searching discussion of the conception of history which underlies the literature of the Old Testament.¹ Two subjects are treated (1) the Old Testament idea of history, (2) the position of the Old Testament in the history of the religious consciousness as a problem for systematic theology. It is impossible in a few lines to give any idea of the penetrating quality of these weighty discussions, which are obviously the work of a profound thinker as well as of an excellent scholar. He shows that the real problem is how to reconcile the dominion of sin, which makes man, as it were, the determining factor in history, with the dominion of God, whose control of history, as of Nature—for the world is one—is to issue in His victory, for His purpose is a redemptive purpose, and history has a goal. The instrument of that purpose is Israel, and the election and the judgment of Israel are the two poles of Hebrew history. In the Old Testament the history of the world is the judgment of the world, but judgment is not only retributive—this is one strain of Old Testament thought—it is also educative, and this constitutes its contribution to the

¹ Johannes Hempel, *Altes Testament und Geschichte* (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. 88; Mk. 3).

Divine purpose of salvation. Already in J pessimism is accompanied by an ineradicable optimism. God is at once distant and near, near above all in the great personalities who carry out His purpose, though the sense of His nearness hardly ever issues in what we now call mysticism. The presence of God in history and man reaches its consummation in the person of Jesus, as the New Testament is well aware when it calls Him the Messiah. These are but a few of the suggestions scattered over eighty-eight pages packed with thought.

The *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*² for 1930—Heft 1—opens up an article by M. Noth on the Five Syriac Apocryphal Psalms, of which the Syriac text is printed with a German translation and a Hebrew rendering of the second, third, and fourth psalms. The Pentateuchal problem is set in motion once more by three articles. In the first, J. Kaufmann maintains that Wellhausen was wrong in regarding hierocracy as the ideal of post-exilic Judaism; in point of fact the ideal still centred upon the king, as is evidenced by the 'Messianic' hope and the Chronicler's treatment of David. He further maintains that though D became a book earlier than P, in reality P is pre-Deuteronomic; it is the code which regulated the worship on the high places. In the second article, König deals with certain aspects of the Deuteronomic problem, reaffirming against recent critics that Deuteronomy demands not merely the purification but the centralization of the worship, and emphasizing the deliberate use of the singular in 12¹⁴ and cognate passages (not 'in all places'; but 'in the place which Jahweh shall choose'). The third article, by R. H. Pfeiffer, attempts to prove that, apart from J, E, and P, Genesis contains an Edomitic work of the time of Solomon, which in the fifth century was added to JEP by the final redactor of the Pentateuch. H. Bauer, of Halle, discusses the value of Hebrew proper names in helping us to determine the nature of the spoken language in ancient Palestine.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

² Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk. 4.50.

Entre Nous.

God in the Slums.

Tales of conversion have always fascinated and delighted the human mind, from the story of that first great act of faith recorded in Hebrew history

when Abram went out not knowing whither he went, to William James's 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' or the marvellous records of the London City Mission to-day. And now we have