

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

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

L. I. Pap¹ challenges the view, which in recent years has been sturdily championed by Volz, Mowinckel, and others, that in pre-exilic times there was a New Year's festival in autumn, in which Jahweh was represented as ascending the throne and renewing his sovereignty for the coming year. In reality there were, Pap argues, two New Years—the agricultural year which began in autumn, and the official ecclesiastical year which began in spring (note the order of the feasts in Ex 23¹⁴⁻¹⁶ 34¹⁸⁻²²; cf. Jer 36²²), but no New Year festival is attested (the feast of tabernacles is not necessarily such). The analogy of the Babylonian New Year festival carries little weight, as the genius of Hebrew religion was very different from that of Babylon; and in any case the cult played a part of no great significance, the priest being subordinated to the prophet. Pap examines the Psalms adduced by Mowinckel as accession Psalms (47, 93, 96-99), and maintains that they are to be interpreted eschatologically, and that the evidence of the Mishnah for the New Year festival is of no value for the earlier period. Well as Pap has argued his case, he has by no means proved it: he seems to depreciate unduly the value of later tradition, the influence of Babylon, and the importance of the cult.

A. von Selms² discusses with much learning, which will appeal chiefly to specialists, the Babylonian expressions for sin and their significance for our knowledge of the Babylonian conception of sin. On the basis of the religious texts and treating the legal and historical literature as a source of the second rank, he deals exhaustively with ten of these terms (e.g. *ikkibu*, *hafû*, etc.), almost all of which, when they occur in the political texts, may have the meaning of rebellion. As the result of the investigation Babylonian religion is characterized as a sacramental religion, which has not entirely succeeded in dominating ethics.

Albert Condamin, S.J., contends for the strophic arrangement of Hebrew poetry,³ the verses of which,

¹ *Das israelitische Jahresfest*, von L. I. Pap (Verlag von J. H. Kok, Kampen, Holland).

² *De Babylonische Termini voor Zonde* (H. Veenman & Zonen, Wageningen, Holland; fl. 2.40).

³ *Poèmes de la Bible*, avec une introduction sur la

he argues, are regulated by laws analogous to the law of parallelism which regulate the stichoi within the single verse. It has long been recognized that the recurrence of refrains and of 'Selah' points to a grouping of verses which suggests an approximately strophic arrangement; but Condamin carries the principle much further, finding that this arrangement is frequently characterized by the deliberate repetition of words and phrases. In proof of his thesis on the strophe, which he discusses at length in the Introduction, he presents fifty-three poems drawn from the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Wisdom books, in a form which, besides exposing their strophical arrangement, gives typographical prominence to the repeated words. But is it probable, one has asked, that men like the prophets could have subjected to so artificial a form the words which leaped impetuously from their deeply moved hearts? On the answer to that question much depends. On the one hand, it will hardly be denied that the prophets were poets, and some of them literary artists: on the other hand, recent discussion has tended to show that for the most part it is idle to look for closely knit sequences in their utterances. 'The more one studies these nine poems,' says Condamin, with reference to Is 40-55 and 60-62, 'the more one observes the unity of plan, the marvellous gradation of ideas, and the harmony of the general structure.' Volz takes the diametrically opposite view. Those who can still believe in the strophic nature of Hebrew poetry will find in Condamin the best that can be said for it.

Max Levy discusses the Sabbath in England with characteristic German thoroughness.⁴ After an Introduction which traces the Sabbath back to Moses, he deals in successive chapters with the theory and practice of the English Sunday according to periods ending respectively with 597, 1066, and the later Middle Ages. Most of his attention, however, he devotes to the period of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Elizabeth, and the early Stuarts (1536-1660), but the discussion is brought down with less elaboration to the present day. It is aptly illustrated by frequent and often lengthy quotations

strophique hébraïque, par Albert Condamin (Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, Rue de Rennes, Paris; 36 fr.).

⁴ *Der Sabbat in England*, von Max Levy (Verlag von Bernard Tauchnitz, Leipzig; Mk. 10).

from laws, ecclesiastical injunctions, homilies, etc. Indeed the quotations, which are in English, are so numerous that much of the book could be profitably read even by one who was innocent of German. Here is a sentence from a royal declaration to the King's subjects on 24th May 1618: 'As for Our good peoples lawful Recreation, Our pleasure is, That after the end of Divine Service, Our good people be not disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any lawful recreation, Such as Dauncing, either men or women, Archery, for men, leaping, vaulting, or any other such harmless Recreation, nor from having of May-Games, Whitson Ales, and Morris-dances, and the setting up of May-poles, and other sports therewith used, so as the same be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or neglect of Divine Service,' etc. Here is another from the diary of a German who visited England in 1710: 'In the afternoon to St. James's Park, to see the crowds. No other diversion is allowed on Sunday, which is nowhere more strictly kept: not only is all play forbidden, and public houses closed, but few even of the boats and hackney coaches may ply. Our hostess would not even allow the strangers to play the viol di Gamba or the flute, lest she should be punished. This is, I suppose, the only point in which one sees that the English profess to be Christians, certainly from the rest of their conduct one would not suspect it of many of

them.' It is very interesting to observe the long struggle between the austerer and the more tolerant view of the Sunday. One cannot help feeling the inadequacy of the merely negative attitude, which has emptied the day of much human interest. But, as Levy says somewhere, it furnishes a fine opportunity for the spiritual assimilation of the experience of the previous week.

In a brochure of sixty-two pages¹ Vannutelli, who recently published an elaborate synoptic study of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin texts of Kings and Chronicles, discusses in Latin the famous fragment of Papias' preface to his 'Exposition of the Words of the Lord' preserved in Eusebius, *Ecll. Hist.* iii. 39 (3-4), with special reference to the question whether John the presbyter is to be identified with John the apostle. A careful examination of the use of the word *πρεσβύτεροι* leads Vannutelli to the conclusion that neither in the New Testament nor in the Apostolic Fathers is it ever applied to the Apostles, but only either to elderly men or to elders of the churches. He therefore entirely rejects the identification.

J. E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

¹ Primus Vannutelli, *De Presbytero Joanne apud Papiam* (Roma, L.I.C.E., R. Berruti & C.).

Contributions and Comments.

2 Cor. iii. 17:

ὁ δε Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν.

THIS important verse has always presented difficulty. Some theologians take it to mean that St. Paul identifies the Risen Christ with the Holy Spirit. But this interpretation has won only limited support among scholars. The generally accepted interpretation has been stated by Dr. A. C. Headlam (*St. Paul and Christianity*, 107 f.) as follows: 'St. Paul is arguing that the ministry with which he is entrusted is far more glorious than that of the Old Covenant. At the reading of the Old Testament there remained a veil unlifted, a sign of the veil which lay on the hearts of the hearers. This veil has been done away in Christ. If a man turns to the Lord, the veil is lifted from his heart. That

is because Christ means the Spirit, for where Christ's Spirit is there is the freedom of the Gospel. . . . It is Christ in us that is identified with the Spirit, because He dwells in us through His Spirit. But the Christ that lived and was crucified is never in any way identified with the Spirit.'

The majority of Greek Fathers, however, held that Κύριος bears here, as throughout the paragraph, the same meaning as in the LXX, and that Paul is saying, in effect, Now the Κύριος of whom I have just spoken in 3¹⁶ in my reference to Ex 34³⁴ is the Spirit (Lebreton, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, 492).

The following considerations may be adduced in support of this interpretation:

(a) 3¹⁶ is, if not a direct quotation, a reminiscence of Ex 34³⁴ (LXX) which reads: ἦν ἵκα δ' ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωσῆς ἐναντι Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, περιηρέτο