
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

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).

Evidently Professor Frick is impressed by two things; one is the sincere division of opinion among Christians upon the problem of war, and the other is the danger as well as the value of such an expression as 'a moral equivalent for war' (to quote the words of Professor William James). He seems to recognize that the latter phrase may become a glib utterance, as indeed it does become, in certain circles. He pleads for the heroic following of Jesus as the only real interpretation of it for Christians. Yet he pleads for a recognition of the fact that a Christian soldier may be equally satisfied in his conscience. The tone of the essay is high, and, though there are no very definite conclusions, it is refreshingly free from the 'superior' tone which afflicts so many pacifist proclamations.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Contributions and Comments.

The Tree of Life in Eden.

THE narrative of the Biblical Paradise contains many difficult points. One of them has always been pitifully neglected: the problem of the tree of life. In most cases the discussion is confined to the tree of knowledge and the eating thereof, or at least this is the central point, and the difficult question of the tree of life is little heeded. Some scholars take the easy way: they expunge the passage. Others contend that man, although living in paradise in the proximity of the tree of life, and although the eating thereof was not forbidden, nevertheless did not eat from that tree. Why not? By mere chance? At all events they could eat.

In 1928 at a Congress at Oxford, I pointed out that the man not only could eat from the tree of life but that he actually did, and that this tree was a *φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας*, their ambrosia (*i.e.* a-mṛ-ta) the remedy of the gods against death. Their being driven out of paradise means death, it is being driven away from the tree of life (Gn 3^{24}). Against this way of taking it is alleged the remark, Gn 3^{22}: 'the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest (פֶּן) he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.' But פֶּן does not always mean 'lest,' but also 'lest further,' 'lest more' (cf. Ex 1^{17}, 1 S 13^{19}). Thus Gn 3^{22} does not exclude that man in paradise has eaten from the tree of life.

This is in my view the only way to solve the problem of the tree of life. They who will not go this way must leave the problem unsolved, as they actually do. Either they pass it over silently, or they expunge it from the text. Indeed, no reasonable answer is to be given why man should not have eaten from a tree so within reach as the tree of life, nor is the part that plays the tree of life in the garden of Eden to be realized. It stays there as a sentinel in the attic. And just these two questions remain usually untouched in the discussion on the narrative of paradise.

This narrative must be taken this way. The Biblical writer did not invent the two trees of paradise either, he borrowed them from the old material. Now the eastern Semitic peoples relate of a dwelling-place of the gods (a paradise) with a microcosmic character. To the inventory belongs always a tree of life, plant of life, water of life, etc. Only gods are there, it is forbidden for man. At the entrance are monstrous beings (cherubs) to prevent man from coming in lest he acquires eternal life like the gods. Now the Biblical narrative is different in one momentous way: the Biblical paradise is not only a *talaktu*—place of Jahve (Gn 3^{8} מִתְהַלֵּךְ), but it is as much a dwelling-place of man. According to the Biblical narrator, man is as well immortal as the God and may eat of the tree of life. Hence the absence of the cherubs. But after his transgression of the Divine command man was driven out from the tree of life, and the cherubs appeared on the stage, and man has become mortal.

This, I think, is the clear meaning of the narrative. This important point of the narrative should not be overlooked for the sake of the tree of knowledge in order to wring therefrom an intended meaning.

H. TH. OBBINK.

Utrecht.