THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR SANDAY has contributed to the *Guardian* of August 26 a short survey of the work of Abbé Loisy. Abbé Loisy's name is a name to most of us and nothing more. To Dr. Sanday it at once suggests an interesting personality, and represents a noteworthy movement.

The movement is the rise of critical study of the Bible among the Roman Catholic clergy of France. We have been familiar for some time past with the names of scientific theologians who belong to the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, names like those of Cardinal Hergenröther Funk and Bardenhewer in early Church history and patristic; of Kraus in archæology; of Schanz in apologetic and biblical criticism; and of Bickell in the criticism of the Old Testament. But now by the side of these there is establishing itself, or there is already established, a French school, with Abbé Duchesne at its head in the field of critical history, and in the field of biblical criticism Abbé Loisy.

Dr. Sanday's knowledge of Loisy is evidently gathered from his works. But it is from a careful observation and close study of these works. He concludes that he is still a young man, yet his writings are very many. Most of them were published between 1889 and 1893, while Loisy held a professorship in the Institute Catholique at Paris. First came a *History of the Canon of the Old Testament* in 1890. This was rapidly followed by a *History of the Canon of the New Testament* in 1891. Then in 1892, besides the publication of the *Chaldæan Myths of the Creation and the Flood*, the issue began of *L'Enseignement Biblique*, essays and reviews and notes on biblical subjects, which stopped abruptly as a serial in 1893. Some of these essays and reviews were reprinted under the title of *Études Bibliques* in 1894; and since then his pen has been as busy as ever in numerous contributions to Catholic periodicals in France.

In the preface to *Études Bibliques*, Abbé Loisy explains that the issue of the Biblical Notes ceased along with his professorship; and 'there would seem to have been some interference of higher authority with his work.' For Abbé Loisy is a critic, and 'the Church of Rome in France is now going through a modified form of the crisis which began in this country some thirty or forty years ago. With us,' says Professor Sanday, 'it may be said that the worst of the storm is over, and that things are settling down, if not to a state of absolute peace, yet at least to a state of mitigated

antagonisms, which hold out a prospect of eventual peace.' In France the tension may be less severe. For there is nothing of the 'crudity and aggressiveness' of our *Essays and Reviews* in the work of Abbé Loisy. 'All that he has done has been to state modestly and reverently, but firmly, those convictions which a candid mind in touch with the more advanced methods of secular learning cannot avoid. He makes no attempt to disguise the tentative nature of many of the views which he advocates. But without discussion it is impossible to determine what is valid and what is not; and if these discussions do not take place within the Church they will assuredly go on outside it, and the pent-up waters will break over the banks with all the greater fury.'

Abbé Loisy's work covers a wide field. It embraces the Old Testament and the New, and all that throws light on either. Nevertheless, in Dr. Sanday's judgment he is well equipped. In scholarship, in discrimination, in reserve, he sets an excellent example to his pupils, for whom most of his work has been done.

Of his discrimination Professor Sanday quotes an example. It is a criticism of the treatment of the Pentateuch by Renan—'an admirable criticism,' says Dr. Sanday, which 'seems to us to touch very felicitously the characteristic art of M. Renan, which has far more in common with the tact of a skilled diplomatist or Opportunist politician than with the severer methods of a science bent only upon discovering the truth.' The quotation is from the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* of the present year (p. 396). This is Dr. Sanday's translation: 'These opinions are rather an echo of systems old and new, put in circulation by German critics from Ewald to Wellhausen, than the fruit of personal study of the question. Renan's criticism, as we shall often have occasion to notice, is more penetrating than original, more skilful than logical, more subtle than solid. Prudently distrustful of the new theories, he wants to retain something of the old; but one might say that in so doing *he follows a sort of literary and artistic policy, not the direct suggestions of researches conducted with method.* It is not that such researches are altogether wanting, but they seem to have been accompanied by a double preoccupation: the attempt to keep always in agreement with the most renowned of foreign critics, and at the same time to avoid the appearance of radical changes in the way of looking at important problems. The question of the Pentateuch is one of those on which a true and impartial criticism is far from having said its last word.'

But to Dr. Sanday the greatest interest in Abbé Loisy is the work he has done and is doing on the Synoptic Gospels. And to us the greatest interest in Dr. Sanday's paper is the gentle dissent he enters from some of Loisy's conclusions, and the statements which that dissent conducts him to. For it is new and exceedingly important to learn that Dr. Sanday is not wholly committed to the 'documentary theory' of the origin of the Gospels. On the contrary, he suggests 'the advisability of still sitting somewhat loosely to it.' For he says that a more prolonged experience has not succeeded in removing all the difficulties. Loisy declares that the theory of oral tradition 'has more the character of an apologetic system than of a scientific hypothesis.' That, answers Dr. Sanday, may have been true at an earlier stage in the history of the hypothesis, but it would hardly be true now. He adds that 'the analogous case of the transmission of Talmud and Targum makes rather for the oral theory than against it.' And he concludes by saying that the Synoptic problem still maintains its ground as one of the most intricate in the whole range of literature.

In the *Biblical World* for September, the Rev. P. F. Jernegan endeavours to explain the force of the Pauline expression 'the faith of Jesus Christ.' There are two phrases, says Mr. Jernegan, which St. Paul is careful always to distinguish—'faith in Christ' and 'the faith of Christ.' The one is the

conscious effort of the believer; the other is the spontaneous utterance of the indwelling Christ.

The passage in which this distinction is made most manifest is Gal. ii. 16, which Mr. Jernegan prints in this wise:—

> A man is not justified by the works of the law,
> but by the faith of Jesus Christ;
> We have believed in Jesus Christ,
> that we might be justified by the faith of Christ.

In that passage the apostle attributes justification to 'the faith of Christ.' It is of course the faith of the indwelling Christ, the faith of Christ operating in the believer's heart. But the point is that it is not the believer's 'faith in Christ.' The believer's faith in Christ has its work to do; but it is a different work, and belongs to an earlier stage. It is 'faith in Christ' that opens the door by which Christ enters the believer's heart: 'We have believed in Jesus Christ.' Then 'the faith of Jesus Christ' does its work of justification: 'that we might be justified by the faith of Christ.'

And this, says Mr. Jernegan, is in accordance with all the apostle's teaching on faith and on justification. Faith is ever a gift: Eph. ii. 8, 'not of yourselves, it is the gift of God'; vi. 23, 'faith from . . . the Lord Jesus Christ'; Rom. xii. 3, 'God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith'; 1 Cor. xii. 9, 'faith by the same Spirit'; Gal. v. 22, 'fruit of the Spirit is faith'; Rom. x. 17, 'faith should stand in the power of God.' And if justification were wrought by the believer's faith in Christ, it would destroy the very foundation of the apostle's gospel; for it would be a kind of *work* though going by the name of faith, and justification would be by works after all.

To the *Guardian* of July 29, Professor Driver has sent another paper of the series entitled 'Archæology and the Old Testament.' The subject of this paper is the Cosmogony of Genesis.

From that day in 1875 when George Smith published in the *Daily Telegraph* the first fragments of the Babylonian account of the Creation, it has been evident that the Hebrew narrative was no independent revelation to Moses. Great as the difference is between the narrative in Genesis and the story on the Babylonian tablets, and in motive and morals it could not well be greater, the resemblances are far too many and far too marvellous to be altogether accidental. Whether the one or the other was the original account, or whether they were both the offspring of an earlier story, is still open to doubt and disputation. But that there is a connexion between them, Assyriologist and critic are heartily agreed.

The first fragmentary inscriptions were published by George Smith in the *Daily Telegraph* in 1875. For in those days a daily paper had some enterprise even in England, and the *Telegraph* paid the explorer's expenses on condition that it should receive the first account of his discoveries. Next year came George Smith's *Chaldæan Genesis*, with the contents of all his tablets in a completed and better form. Meantime this fortunate discoverer had been carried away by fever in Aleppo. But other men entered into his labours, and gathered even richer fruit. More tablets from the library of Assurbanipal were found. More fragments of the Babylonian story of the Creation were added to those upon which the Assyriologists were already busy. And now, though we have no complete edition or translation in English, three full and reliable translations have been made into German—one by Professor Jensen of Marburg in the *Cosmologie der Babylonier* (1890, pp. 263–364); one by Professor Zimmern of Leipzig in the end of Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* of 1895; and one by Professor Friedrich Delitzsch of Breslau in *Das Babylonische Weltschöpfungsepos* of the present year.

Of the Assyriologists who have studied the Babylonian story of the Creation, the most distinguished is Professor Fritz Hommel of Munich. Therefore when Professor Driver desires to show that in respect of this part of the 'Books of

Moses' Assyriology and criticism are at one, he as naturally goes to Professor Hommel for the one as he goes to Professor Cheyne for the other. The correspondence seems complete. In Dr. Driver's words in this issue of the *Guardian*, Professor Cheyne 'has simply endorsed Professor Hommel's conclusions.' And to this Professor Cheyne agrees. For to the next week's issue of the *Guardian* he contributes a note on the subject, and in that note he says: 'With Professor Driver's exposition of the views held by certain biblical archæologists of name and repute on the relations between Babylonian cosmogonic stories and the narrative in Gen. i., I venture to express full accordance, so far as I have yet had time to read it.' And then Professor Cheyne points out that, close as the agreement is, his own view is 'not compiled from the Munich Assyriologist,' but of quite independent formation.

Professor Hommel's view of the intimate connexion between the Babylonian and the Hebrew account of the Creation, is thus the view at once of archæology and of the Higher Criticism. And yet it is sufficiently arresting. Professor Driver translates the more important part of it in the following paragraph, pointing out that he sometimes abridges Professor Hommel's actual words :—

'It might at first sight be thought that the simple biblical representation, according to which the light drives away the darkness resting upon the primitive water, was chronologically prior to the more elaborate mythological conception of the contest of Marduk with the waters personified as a dragon; but closer study makes it apparent that the Hebrews, although at the time of their sojourn in Ur of the Kasdim they had already risen to a purer faith, nevertheless appropriated many mythological ideas from their Babylonian neighbours; not only, for instance, the Nimrod legend, but also in particular that of a contest of divine powers with a dragon; only these mythological features never formed part of their religion, but circulated as naïve fables in the mouth of the people. Are not, for instance, the words of Deutero-Isaiah addressed to Jahve's arm (li. 9 f.): "Art thou not it that cut in pieces the sea-monster, that pierced the dragon [*tannin*] that dried up the sea, the waters of the *Tehôm*?"; or again the allusion in Job ix. 13 to "the helpers of the sea-monster," who had to "bow beneath" the "anger of Elôah," unambiguous evidence of the fact that a struggle of God with a dragon and its helpers was an idea naturalised in Israel long before the Exile? And such an idea would naturally not be borrowed by itself, but in the framework which it had in its Babylonian home, to which also other resemblances in Gen. i. unmistakably point. Hence there will have existed, as the basis of the first chapter of Genesis, an older Hebrew version of the story, which narrated the contest with the dragon in place of the work of the first day. If what Delitzsch has said be true (*New Com. on Genesis*), that "it is a heathen form of the cosmogonical legend which, in the biblical narrative, has been reduced to limits capable of enduring the critical test of the spirit of revelation," we must the more admire the revelation-like genius of the last author, who eliminated the mythological element of the conflict of God with the dragon, at which men like Deutero-Isaiah (in the Exile) still took no offence, and created the dignified narrative which we at present possess. It follows from this at the same time that the Priests' Code, in the form in which we have it, is of post-Exilic origin, although its materials, as those derived from Babylonia for Gen. i. existed in Israel long previously, and were even in part committed to writing. The Jahvistic Creation-narrative (Gen. ii. 4 ff.) is constructed upon the same original basis; only there, where it was merely a question of developing somewhat more fully an ancient popular tradition, the writer has handled his materials much more freely.'

With this position, and it is surely a sufficiently forward one, Professor Driver is evidently content. He passes at once to ask through what channel and at what time the Babylonian elements found their way into Hebrew literature. The hypotheses

are many, the positive information is naught. Only one thing Professor Driver says may surely be assumed as certain, that these elements were not derived *directly* from a Babylonian source—at least not from any Babylonian source we yet possess. 'It is incredible that the monotheistic author of Gen. i., whether he were Moses in the fifteenth century B.C., or a Babylonian exile in the sixth century, could have borrowed any detail, however slight, from the crassly polytheistic epic of the conflict of Marduk and Tiâmat.' 'The narrative of Gen. i. comes at the end of a long process of gradual elimination of heathen elements, and of gradual assimilation to the purer teachings of Israelitish theology, carried on under the spiritual influences of the religion of Israel.'

But as to when the myth first came into Israel the hypotheses are many, the positive information naught. Dillmann held that the Hebrew and the Babylonian narratives were separate developments from a common Semitic germ, each being carried along the lines of the nation's particular genius. Hommel derives the Hebrew story from the time when the Hebrews lived side by side with the Babylonians in Ur of the Chaldees. Budde and Kuenen recall the age of Ahaz, when there are traces in the Old Testament of intercourse being carried on with the East. But the prevailing hypothesis at present—the hypothesis accepted by Gunkel, Zimmern, Winckler, Cheyne, and, we think, by Professor Driver himself—has sprung up since the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. These tablets prove the existence of strong Babylonian influences in Canaan, even before the immigration of the Israelites. By this channel Babylonian ideas may have become naturalised among the Canaanites; and then the Israelites coming into the land and having intercourse with the Canaanites who dwelt in it, may have first heard this story of the Creation, accepted it, purified it, and made it the common property of mankind.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales met at Leicester in the autumn, and the annual sermon was preached by the Rev. P. T. Forsyth, D.D., of Cambridge. A verbatim report of Dr. Forsyth's sermon is found in the *Independent and Nonconformist* of October 1st.

The sermon is very long, and very difficult to follow. The loss of the living voice, the imperfectly printed report, have something to do with the difficulty. 'Strained attention,' however, is the expression used of the listeners. And if it were not perfectly true that 'it is a sermon that will haunt us for many a day, a sermon that cannot but have a modifying and enriching effect on the thought of those who read it,' we might easily excuse ourselves the task of endeavouring to gather its meaning into a few short paragraphs.

The sermon is long, but the text is short. 'Holy Father,'—that is it all. The words belong to the high-priestly prayer of the Master. They are found in John xvii. 11. They could not be found in the Old Testament. God was revealed as 'Father' to the Hebrew prophet, but He was not known as 'Holy Father' till Jesus came and called Him so. It is true that the 'Father' of the 103rd Psalm is Father in an original and tender way, but the distance is very great to the 'Holy Father' of Jesus Christ. He is the Father of Israel in the psalm, the Father of 'them that fear Him.' But especially He is the Father of pity, not yet the Father of holiness.

The Father of the 103rd Psalm is especially the Father of pity. 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the LORD pitieth them that fear Him.' And the Father of pity we beautifully understand, for it is the father of our childhood and weakness. We have poems innumerable in which it faces us with infinite pathos. You remember Coventry Patmore's little poem. He had punished his motherless son, and sent him to bed. Sore himself, he went to see the child, and found him asleep, with all the queer and trivial contents of a

little boy's pocket set out beside him to comfort him—

So when that night I prayed
To God, I wept, and said:
Ah, when at last we lie with tranced breath,
Not vexing Thee in death,
And Thou rememberest of what toys
We made our joys,
How weakly understood,
Thy great commanded good;
Then, fatherly not less
Than I, whom Thou hast moulded from the clay,
Thou'lt leave Thy wrath, and say,
'I will be sorry for their childishness.'

That has a very sweet and poignant pathos. It melts us; it is very sacred. And it is neither too keen nor too kind for the pity of God for His weak children. But there is a tenderer as well as a deeper note than that. It is the 'Holy Father' of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

And if 'Holy Father' is more than pity, it is also more than love. To our common thinking, while the Father of the Old Testament revelation is pity, the Father in the New Testament is love. For when we are asked to find the Father of the New Testament revelation, we turn to the parable of the Prodigal Son. But the father of the Prodigal Son is not the Father in heaven. He is carefully distinguished from the Father in heaven. 'Father I have sinned *against* heaven, and *before* thee.' He is an earthly father, 'before' whom sin is possible, 'against' whom it is impossible. He is patient and wise and infinitely kind, a magnified and most natural man. He does not stand for the whole of God, not even for the whole of the grace of God. He stands for the *freeness* of the grace of God, not at all for the cost to a Holy God of His grace. The father of the Prodigal Son is a father of boundless, patient, waiting love; but there is more in fatherhood than that. There is more in 'Holy Father' than the love which accepts repentance as atonement, and eagerly cuts confession short: 'Let us say no more about it, pray do not mention it.'

He came to my desk with a quivering lip,
The lesson was done.
'Dear teacher, I want a new leaf,' he said,
'I have spoiled this one.'
In place of the leaf so stained and blotted
I gave him a new one all unspotted,
And into his sad eyes smiled,—
'Do better now, my child.'

I went to the Throne with a quivering soul,
The old year was done.
'Dear Father, hast Thou a new leaf for me,
I have spoiled this one.'
He took the old leaf, stained and blotted,
And gave me a new one all unspotted,
And into my sad heart smiled,—
'Do better now, my child.'

But the 'Holy Father' of our Lord's high-priestly prayer, with all its simplicity, means very far more than just a clean page and a fresh start.

It means a Father who has to do with sin. An earthly father has no authority over sin. We may sin *before*, we cannot sin *against* our father upon the earth. For sin implies holiness. Where holiness is not, there is no sin; it is holiness that makes sin sin. Therefore before forgiveness can be given, there must be a reckoning made with sin. Sin is a rent in the seamless robe of righteousness. The Father who forgives sin must be a 'Holy Father,' a Father who knows what righteousness is, and knows how to maintain its wholeness and integrity.

Now no one can maintain the wholeness of holiness but God. It is beyond us for ever and ever. It involves a sacrifice which costs more than we sin-struck men can pay. Sin steadily maims the sense of holiness, and therefore the power of sacrifice. And even if man, by any sacrifice or penitence, could mend the moral order that he had broken, it would be an order for him no more; it would be supreme and commanding for him no more. If we could heal our own conscience, it would be no more our king. If we could satisfy the moral order that we disturbed, our self-satisfaction would be insufferable. It would derange that order straightway. We should be, as Luther said, 'the proudest jackasses under heaven.'

We may be sorry and we may amend; but God alone can mend the rent in the seamless robe of righteousness. He mends it at the Cross. This is the first and fullest meaning of the Cross. It is a recognition of the integrity of holiness. As Jesus crept the nearer to the Cross, this was the thought that most engrossed Him. It was not man's need of Him; it was not His action upon man. It was God's need of Him; it was God's own need of His sorrow, God's holy will for His obedience and death; it was the action of His Cross upon the holiness of God.

And when God's holiness has been satisfied, then the repentance comes. For it is atonement that makes repentance, not repentance that makes atonement. Repentance comes because the Father of love has proved Himself a 'Holy Father.' He has closed the rent that sin had made; He offers a pardon that *is* a pardon, and that is absolutely free.

Back to St. Paul.

By Professor the Rev. J. S. Banks, Headingley College, Leeds.

We know that the authority of the apostle to the Gentiles was questioned by an active party in the Church during his life. The Judaisers, who would have made Christianity a reformed Judaism and the Church another Jewish sect, put him on his defence. In the Epistle to the Galatians and elsewhere St. Paul meets these assaults, vindicating for himself and his teaching the authority of an apostle of Christ. The gospel which he preached came to him 'through revelation of Jesus Christ.' He received it, not through the hands of James, Cephas, and John, but directly from heaven. 'Am I not an apostle? The seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord.'

In our day St. Paul's authority is attacked not by Jewish but by Christian assailants. The cry we hear, 'Back to Christ,' means in some quarters not merely 'Back from the Church and dogma,' but 'Back from the Epistles' to the teaching of Christ in the Gospels. Dr. Horton's book, *The Teaching of Jesus*, is constantly playing on this string. The position of the new Ritschlian school, represented by Dr. Wendt, author of *The Teaching of Jesus*, is that Christians are bound only by the express teaching of Christ Himself, and that the teaching of the apostles is to be accepted only in so far as it is supported by sayings of the Master Himself. A distinction is thus made in the New Testament, which practically reduces it to the Gospels. The Gospels are not only made a court of appeal, but the only court with authority in matters of faith. It should be noted further that the Gospels thus set apart are the three Synoptics. The Fourth Gospel is only a witness to Christ's teaching at second-hand, because it is supposed that in passing through the writer's mind the teaching has undergone considerable modification, the amount of which is not easily defined. We could almost wish that St. Paul were alive again to meet his new assailants. The question in dispute is much more than one of mere sentiment. If the contention were that special sacredness is due to the words of the Lord Jesus Himself, no one would contradict. But the question is not one of special sacredness in Christ's teaching, but of any sacredness at all in apostolic teaching.

There can be no doubt that the influence of St. Paul on Christian thought has been very great. The subtraction of Pauline theology from Christian doctrine would make an immense difference. It is sometimes assumed that the dominance of this theology began at the Reformation, but this is a mistake. Its influence was greatly increased at the Reformation by the rediscovery, so to speak, of St. Paul's teaching on the nature of justification and redemption, which has remained ever since in the front line of Protestant testimony. But, apart from these subjects, St. Paul's teaching entered into the very substance of Christian faith from the first days of the Church. It would be easy to show this by reference to Christian writers down to the time of the Reformation, but it is needless. Now it is proposed to take a new departure. St. Paul, and for that matter St. John also, are simply great Christian teachers, important as standing nearest to the great Teacher Himself. But their teaching is as open