
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

religion a mystical thing with no basis of reason and no outcome in practice. We may neglect the command to be ready to give good grounds for the faith that is in us. Or we may have the coward's faith and the sluggard's trust, thinking that we are not called to devise means and work our brain, but must leave all things to God. Some things pass by the name of faith which God disowns. We are called to live in the world *for* the world. We need wisdom to do God's work. We need wisdom to guard our own faith and protect our own simplicity of heart and save our own Christian character. If we have not something of the prudence of the serpent we will not keep the harmlessness of the dove very long. A well-meaning good sort of man who is foolish and blundering can contrive to do a great deal of mischief in his time. Ignorance is no excuse for mistakes. In Browning's pregnant line, 'Ignorance is not innocence but sin.' For a useful life and for a strong character wisdom is needed, and nothing can excuse the neglect of seeking it.

There is a mawkish sentimentalism in some forms of literature which seems to make goodness synonymous with silliness. Even Dickens, a master in his art, makes many of his good people border more or less on lunacy, nearly always delightfully gullible and impossibly foolish. The folly in some way is supposed to enhance the goodness. But in practical life a man does not need to have a soft head in order to avoid having a hard heart. All such conceptions are due to a false notion of the Christian life. If that life is serious to us, we shall know that we must devote every power we have to attain and maintain it. Hear Paul's sane advice, the echo of his Master's words, 'Brethren, be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men.'

Paul's own life was an illustration of his words, his combination of zeal and knowledge, of unwavering faith and great statesmanship, ingenuous in character and ingenious in plans to bring men to Christ; simple and sincere in faith, wise and prudent in life. Such a man runs the risk of being misunderstood. His simplicity is treated as duplicity, his wisdom is called cunning, his innocence is deemed design. The world cannot comprehend the higher unity of his complex character.

Our Lord Himself is our great example here as elsewhere, combining both factors in harmony. What instances of His wisdom we could recall, and yet where were there such purity of purpose and innocence of heart and perfect uprightness of life? He remains for us the Perfect Man, wise and simple, strong and tender, winsome in His integrity, graceful in His strength, with depth of nature and charm of manner. The Christian, who cannot be satisfied till Christ lives in him, should 'see life steadily and see it whole.' He should look at life through Christ's eyes. He need not be troubled by those conflicting elements which go to the building up of character. He knows that it is Christ's purpose and desire for him to grow in grace and knowledge and Christ-like nature. He finds the unity of opposites in union with his Lord.[1]

[1] H. Black, '*According to my Gospel*,' 75.

Ezekiel.

By Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., Glasgow.

The Book of Ezekiel is at the moment the storm-centre of Old Testament criticism. In Germany, America, and Great Britain the traditional view of the book and the man has in recent years been sharply challenged. Torrey, in his *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*, and James Smith, in his *Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: A New Interpretation*, despite the widest divergence in their respective estimates of the purpose of the book, and a difference of no less than four or five centuries in their view of the date of its composition, have independently reached the conclusion that its historical implications point to a background in the reign of Manasseh, and not, as has hitherto been all but universally believed, in the reign of Zedekiah at the close of the Judæan monarchy. Further, Curt Kuhl, in a review of Torrey's book in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*,[2] confesses that twenty years' study of the book has made it increasingly clear to him that Ezekiel can scarcely have been a prophet of the Exile, and he maintains that Old Testament science will have to consider very seriously the question whether Ezekiel must not be

[2] No. 2, 1932, cols. 27–29.

assigned to an earlier period, possibly even to the reign of Manasseh.

In view of these challenges of traditional opinion, a special welcome will be accorded to Volkmar Herntrich's careful discussion of the problems raised by the man and his book.[1] In the first half of his discussion Herntrich sketches and criticises the contributions made to the criticism of Ezekiel since the appearance of Ewald's volume in 1868, dealing briefly with Smend, Cornill, Bertholet, Kraetzschmar, Jahn, Winckler, Kessler, and Kittel, and at much greater length with Herrmann, Hölscher, and Torrey; in the second half he goes through the book chapter by chapter, and reaches conclusions which differ in important respects from those of all his predecessors, but which seem to account satisfactorily for many of the curious phenomena presented by the book.

What are the problems involved in these phenomena? They may be thus briefly summarized: (i) the structure of the book itself, (ii) the destination of the oracles of which it is composed, (iii) the personality of Ezekiel, and—of subordinate importance—(iv) the system of dating which runs through it.

(i) The structure of the book. Is the book a unity? The older scholars answered this question unhesitatingly in the affirmative. They maintained that no Old Testament book bore so obviously the impress of a single mind or was marked by so deliberate and orderly a progress of thought. This view was disputed by Herrmann in his *Ezechiel-studien*, who recognized that, like Isaiah and Jeremiah, the Book of Ezekiel (chs. 1–39) was a collection of independent pieces extending over a long period of years, not a continuous 'book' in the strict sense of the word. It was reserved for Hölscher to deny the unity of the book altogether. He maintained that it reflects two entirely different minds—the prophet, aglow with passion and imagination, who wrote in verse, and the redactor who is responsible for chs. 33–48 and large sections of chs. 1–32, who wrote over a century later, and in prose. Herntrich argues forcibly against what he calls Hölscher's 'hypothetical presuppositions'—among others, against the idea that Ezekiel, as a poet, cannot have written prose—Sir George Adam Smith has demolished this argument as it has been applied by Duhm to Jeremiah—and he further maintains that much that Hölscher claims for Ezekiel ought, on his own principles, to be assigned to the redactor. It is impossible here to enter into detail: suffice it to say that there are three stages in the history of the criticism of the book: (*a*) it exhibits a real unity, (*b*) the seeming unity has been superimposed on independent pieces, (*c*) there is no unity at all.

(ii) To whom were the oracles addressed? This is the question which has been most hotly debated by recent critics, and which has led to a serious reconsideration of the scenery of Ezekiel's prophetic activity. The traditional view, of course, is that he was an exile addressing fellow-exiles. But any one who reads the book with the least attention feels that the theme, at any rate of chs. 1–24, is the doom of *Jerusalem*, and that the sins which render that doom inevitable are the sins of *Jerusalem*. Ch. 22^{1-16}, with its detailed denunciation of the wickedness prevalent there, is addressed to no distant audience, present only to the prophet's and his hearers' imagination; it is addressed to the 'bloody city' itself. What would be the relevance of a succession of impassioned appeals to the exiles, which perpetually envisaged, not *their* condition, but the conditions of the city from which they were separated by many scores of miles? At the most one might say that the prophet was striving to bring home to their consciences the doom of Jerusalem as a religious necessity. Even so, one is uneasily conscious of the irrelevance of these addresses as thus explained, especially as they are charged with all the vehemence of the old prophetic appeal.

But again, on the testimony of the book itself, the people among whom Ezekiel's lot is cast are a 'rebellious house' ($2^{5f.}$ 12^{2}), they are as briars, thorns, and scorpions (2^{6}). Now, according to Jeremiah (ch. 24), this would be anything but a just characterization of the exiles; these were 'the good figs,' and they are deliberately contrasted with the 'very bad figs,' which symbolize those who remained behind in the land and escaped the doom of exile. The people addressed by Ezekiel are denounced in terms which instinctively recall the sins for which Jeremiah denounced the people of Jerusalem. The most natural inference is that Ezekiel's hearers are not the exiles deported with Jehoiachin in 597, but the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and this conclusion has been crystallized by recent discussion almost into a practical certainty.

Herntrich clinches his argument by going carefully through the book, chapter by chapter. Let a few illustrations suffice. The prophet's pictorial representation, on a tile, of a city exposed to a furious siege (ch. 4) gains enormously in grim significance, if he is himself in the city whose impending fate he depicts, as does also the harrowing

[1] *Ezechielprobleme* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.7.20).

picture of the famine rations to which he threatens it will be reduced, if he himself is destined to share the horrors which he foretells, but which, to his hearers, with their incurable optimism, seem incredible. More convincing still is the fact that in 12^{19} this latter message is unambiguously addressed to *the people of the land*, as are also the dreadful threats of ch. 7 (cf. v.^{7}), which are clear enough, despite the textual obscurities in which they are embedded. Again, in ch. 12, when he symbolically indicates the doom of exile by wandering forth with the scanty outfit of a traveller, it is clear from his answer to the men who ask him what he means by so doing, that they themselves are the men for whom this doom is impending, not men whom it has already overtaken. In the Hebrew text this reference is still discoverable, though only in a single word, 'I am *your* sign,' *i.e.* a sign to *you* (12^{11}): in the Greek it has been entirely obliterated; but the Syriac, which reads the second person plural throughout, undoubtedly preserves the true text, 'I am a sign to *you*; as I have done, so shall it be done to *you*; *ye* shall go into captivity.' Further, the threat in 20^{45-49} (M.T. 21^{1-5}) that a supernatural conflagration will scorch the 'negeb,' the *south* land, bare, is only intelligible from the standpoint of a speaker in Palestine, not in Babylon. The description of the Temple, in the threat of its profanation, as 'the delight of *your* eyes' (24^{21}), gains its pathetic force from the fact that it is addressed to the people of Jerusalem, whose eyes were daily gladdened by the sight of it; and the terrible indictment in ch. 16 is expressly addressed throughout in the second person singular feminine to Jerusalem (16^{2}). Further, the prophet's audience in 33^{23-25} is unmistakably in the homeland: his message of doom is hurled at those who claim, as the true heirs of Abraham, to be in possession of the land: 'the land,' they say, 'is given unto *us* for inheritance.' It is difficult, if not impossible, to evade the cumulative effect of these passages, and they are but a few out of many. Apparently, therefore, the prophet is in Jerusalem, addressing the people of Jerusalem, before the final blow has fallen.

(iii) The personality of Ezekiel has always been something of a riddle. On the traditional view, it is one of almost unexampled complexity—at once priest and prophet, poet and theologian, strange blend of the old prophetic fire with a scrupulous devotion to the technicalities of ceremonial, gifted with a rich imagination, yet pedestrian to the point of an almost mathematical rigidity, passionate in his ethical appeals, yet so doughty a champion of a legalistic religion that he has been called the father of Judaism, methodical beyond any prophet in the presentation of his message and the march of his argument yet the victim of catalepsy; while to these curiously divergent—some would say irreconcilable—traits has to be added the possession of such supernormal powers as second sight. 'Two souls' seem to have dwelt within that single breast. That is one explanation of these disconcerting phenomena: the other is that the book reflects 'two worlds'—the world of Ezekiel and that of the redactor. The moment a redactor is postulated, the phenomena cease to be disconcerting; they are relegated respectively to these two disparate sources.

In his detailed analysis Herntrich shows much plausible ingenuity in effecting this separation. In chs. 1–3, *e.g.*, he distinguishes between the authentic vision and call, on the one hand ($3^{22f.}$ 2^{6}–3^{9}), and what he regards as its fantastic setting, on the other. The story of the vision and the call is in the grand manner; both the experience and the description of it, which are worthy of comparison with that of Jeremiah, put Ezekiel in the great prophetic succession. But in the elaborate vision of the glory of Jahweh which precedes it in ch. 1, we breathe another air: it is not the reflex of a genuine prophetic experience, but the theosophic speculation of a time when the Temple no longer existed, and its aim was to demonstrate the uniqueness of Israel's God over against the Babylonian pantheon. Herntrich detects a similar distinction between the Jerusalem prophet and the exilic redactor in the crucial narrative (chs. 8–11) which begins with the description of the idolatries in the Temple, whither Ezekiel was miraculously transported in spirit (8^{3}), and ends with the death of Pelatiah (11^{13}), which he witnessed under similar conditions of ecstatic transport (11^{1}). Herntrich's analysis would dissipate the assumption that Ezekiel was gifted with second sight. On his view Ezekiel was actually present, and not merely in spirit, at the scenes he describes. In ch. 8 he moves through the Temple precincts from point to point, observing with horror one idolatry after another; he then delivers a denunciatory speech (11^{5-12}), and the whole scene dramatically concludes with the sudden death of Pelatiah (11^{13}). From a comparison of Am 7^{1} with Jer 1^{10} it is argued that the phrase 'Yahweh brought me' (וַיָּבֵא אֹתִי $8^{7.\ 14.\ 16}$) means no more than that the impulse to make his itinerary of the Temple came from Jahweh. According to Herntrich this narrative has been set by the exilic redactor in a Babylonian framework: Ezekiel is in Babylon, and it is by the mysterious

operation of the Divine Spirit (8^3 11^1) that he is, as it were, transported to Jerusalem, and enabled to witness what is happening there. Chs. 9 and 10, we are told, are interpolations by the same hand and have a purely ideal character. If this be so, we must at any rate allow that the prophet was fortunate in his interpolator, as the description, with its masterly reticence, of the destroying angel dealing death to the idolatrous worshippers, and the picture, suggested but not drawn, of the guilty city about to be consumed by supernatural fire scattered from the Divine chariot, are among the most awe-inspiring things in the Old Testament. Herntrich further argues that chs. 40–48, which envisage the future in a way so different from chs. 34–37, where the cult is barely mentioned, are certainly not from the hand of Ezekiel, but probably from the writer of ch. 1, who was, we may conjecture, a disciple of Ezekiel. This section is 'literature,' priestly composition, the product of reflection and not of that direct contact with life which the unredacted sections of chs. 1–24 manifest in every line.

The book undoubtedly received its present form in Babylon. The genuine prophecies contained in chs. 1–39 were delivered by Ezekiel himself in Jerusalem between 593 and 586: these were probably taken to Babylon by Ezekiel himself in one of the later deportations, and there, in common with the historical and other prophetical books, they were subjected to that process of redaction which criticism has taught us to associate with the Exile. Such is Herntrich's explanation of the divergent phenomena presented by the book.

(iv) There remains the problem of the dates which appear at intervals throughout the book. What is the system which governs them? To this problem Herntrich makes a valuable contribution by suggesting that there are two systems—one, exilic, represented by 1^2 33^{21} 40^1, and the other, pre-exilic, represented by all the other dates. The former counts from the captivity of Jehoiachin in 597: this is probably from the hand of the redactor, who may himself have been among those then deported; the latter, which makes no mention of captivity, dates from the accession of Zedekiah and is from the hand of Ezekiel himself. In this connexion Herntrich offers a happy solution of the opening words 'in the thirtieth year,' which have been a crux from time immemorial. This phrase has been variously interpreted as the thirtieth year of Manasseh, of Josiah, of Nabopolassar, the thirtieth year after the publication of Deuteronomy, or the thirtieth year of Ezekiel's own life. Herntrich ingeniously proposes to read 'third' for 'thirtieth,' *i.e.* the third, dating from the accession of Zedekiah (cf. Ezk 24^1 with 2 K 25^1). This dating would be Ezekiel's own, and his call would thus be assigned to July–August 593. 1^2 is a gloss, but a correct gloss, on 1^1.

The general result of recent criticism is to make it highly probable that Ezekiel was not an exilic prophet, addressing an audience whom he has to summon before his imagination, but a pre-exilic prophet in Jerusalem, addressing, like Jeremiah, the people of Jerusalem. The other 'world' represented by so much of the book is not the world of the prophet Ezekiel, but of the theological and priestly redactor. Herntrich's conclusion is that Ezekiel stands to gain enormously by the removal of these accretions. He is now seen to be 'a man of quite monumental greatness,' worthy to stand by the side of his great contemporary Jeremiah. Indeed, 'in his exalted conception of God, which in its transcendence has been reached but never surpassed, he towers above Jeremiah. Here, from His unique height, speaks the God of the Old Testament as the Other, who separates a man for Himself to be the witness of His honour. Like a theme from a fugue of Bach, there runs through the book the solemn refrain, "So shall ye learn that I am Jahweh."'

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Churches and Peace.[1]

THIS is a new contribution to the Sammlung in which Professor Wrede's essay appears. Professor Frick of Marburg surveys the problem of the Church's duty towards the movement for peace, moved partly by the recent deputation of Church leaders in Britain to the Prime Minister, and partly by the situation in his own country. The essay, it must be confessed, reaches no definite conclusions.

[1] Dr. Heinrich Frick, *Die Kirchen und der Krieg* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.50).