
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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Constructive Quarterly is a new 'Journal of the Faith, Work, and Thought of Christendom.' It is published at the Oxford University Press (3s. net). The editor is Mr. Silas McBee; and there is an Editorial Board in America, in Germany, in Russia, in Great Britain, and in India. The second number, issued in June, opens with an article by Professor James Denney on 'The Constructive Task of Protestantism.'

Protestantism, says Professor Denney, is always critical and always constructive. It is always critical. The principle of criticism is innate in it and inseparable from it. Its own constructions, whether they be speculative or practical, systems of theology or of Church order and government, are permanently subject to criticism. The process never ceases. Protestantism constructs nothing which it cannot and does not disintegrate and reconstruct. The interpretations of its faith which it gives are subject to incessant revision: the intellectual and moral structures which it rears for its own habitation—its creeds and confessions, its churches and institutes—can never win an authority which enables them to defy the spirit which has produced them. The system of thought and things which Protestantism is engaged in building is a system which is perpetually being renewed in all its parts.

It is always constructive, as well as always critical. At the present moment three subjects demand reconstruction—the doctrine of Christ, the doctrine of the Church, and the relation between nature and the supernatural.

First, we need to construct or to reconstruct our doctrine of Christ. 'It is not saying too much to say that at the present moment no Church has a living and adequate doctrine of Christ.' It is the subject upon which the early Church spent its strength. But the decisions it reached are out of date. It is useless to name Nicæa and Chalcedon in the present distress. With the categories of 'substance,' 'hypostasis,' and 'persona' the mind will not work any longer. They do not enable us to make known, either to ourselves or to others, the Christ in whom we believe. We must simply set them aside. But when we set them aside, what are we to do?

We are to return to the New Testament, says Dr. Denney. We are to return to the New Testament and see what Christ is represented as doing there. But did not the Reformers do that? Is it not their peculiar glory that they went back over all the mountains of tradition to the Scriptures of the New Testament? It is. But not to construct a doctrine of Christ. Their interest lay elsewhere. What they felt the need of was recon-

ciliation with God. They found the reconciliation in the Cross of Christ. But they did not remain at the Cross. From the Cross they passed at once to the reconciliation with God which the Cross effected. The Person of Christ was not their chief concern. The work of Christ was not of chief interest because of what it revealed about Christ, but because of what it effected between us and God.

Our need is a doctrine of the Person of Christ. And so we consider the work that He did and the words that He spoke in order to understand what He was and is. Now there are two expressions, both of which Christ used of Himself, that are especially relevant. The one is 'the Son'; the other is 'the Son of Man.'

'The Son' is important at present because our search has been for the Father. And in seeking the Father we have overlooked the Son. 'An immense mass of what passes at present for Christian theology,' says Professor DENNEY, 'is, when reduced to its simplest terms, an attempt to do what St. John pronounces impossible—namely, to have the Father while refusing the Son, or to go to the Father behind the Son's back.' But God is Father, first of all because Christ is Son; and He is Father to us because of what Christ has done for us and is to us. 'We are Christ's debtors for the new relation to God in virtue of which we cry, Abba, Father.'

'The Son of Man' is also important. The relation of this title is to the Kingdom of God. As the Son is to the Father, so is the Son of Man to the Kingdom. And just as it is impossible to have the Father without the Son, so is it impossible to have the Kingdom of God without the Son of Man. For the Kingdom of God is not a Utopia, into which you may gather your dreams of bliss and I may gather mine. It is the state of things which is realized, not when our dreams come true, but when the Son of Man comes. Let the Coming of the Son of Man be now or in the future, or let it be both, the Kingdom of God is realized when Jesus establishes a universal and final ascendency in the life of man.

The value of these two titles for a doctrine of Christ lies in this. The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God is supposed to be the great discovery of our time, but it is through the Son, and only through the Son, that we reach the Father. We must therefore know what 'the Son' means before we can know what is the meaning of 'the Father.' And we must in like manner understand what the 'Son of Man' is before we can understand the final and blessed relation of man to man. For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, it is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost—who proceedeth from the Father and the Son.

The second doctrine which demands reconstruction is the doctrine of the Church. The Protestant doctrine of the Church has suffered from the application of a wrong ideal. That ideal is the Roman Catholic doctrine. To a Roman Catholic the doctrine of the Church determines every other doctrine. If he is right about the Church, he cannot be wrong about anything else. If he is wrong about the Church, he cannot do right about anything else. That is not the Protestant ideal of the Church, and must never be made the test of the Protestant doctrine. Such a position is for Protestantism impossible. In the last resort, says Dr. DENNEY, 'Christ and faith are for the Protestant higher categories than Church, and he is not slow to criticise all existing Churches through them.'

The idea of what the Church is, and where is its place, being so frequently misunderstood, it is not surprising that 'to a large extent the Church has been discredited, or that to a still larger extent people are puzzled and at fault about it.' 'It is rare,' says Professor DENNEY, 'to find a Protestant enthusiastic about his Church.' Let us recover the doctrine of the Church. Let us reconstruct

it, not from the point of view of dogma, or of constitution and order, but of faith. Let us assign it a place in Christian life and a function, and men will again believe in it and become enthusiastic about it. Now, it is not in obedience to any commandment, but yielding to a natural instinct more potent than any external law, that Christians gather together in the name of Jesus. This name is a magnet which brings them with one accord into one place, and when they are so brought the Church is constituted by their common relation to their Lord.

The Church, thus constituted, serves two functions. Its primary function is worship—the adoring confession of the name of Jesus, and of the Father who has been revealed to us through Him. With worship is combined witness—the declaration to others of what God has done for men in Christ. This is the only thing which is properly called preaching the gospel, and where the Church lapses from it into an instrument for general educative and ethical ends, it forfeits its right to exist. With the worship which looks Godward, and the witness which is directed to the world, there is inevitably interwoven the action and reaction of Christians on each other. This ought to work out as a perpetual process of mutual encouragement and mutual discipline. The common faith should steady the perplexed or troubled faith of individuals, the common conscience should reinforce and vivify the individual conscience which under the pressure or the seductions of the world is growing lax about the Christian ideal. All this implies to some extent common intellectual forms, common forms of order and of discipline—to put it so, common laws; but the forms and laws must always be secondary and subject to revision in the light of faith; there can be no such thing in any historical Church as divine statutes which simply and authoritatively bind the conscience of all generations, yet are applied and administered by mortal men.

The Roman Catholic is not the only erroneous ideal that is set up for the Church. The social reformer often has an ideal of his own from which he criticises the actual existing Church. 'Even loyal members of the Church may be in need of enlightenment on this point. They are interested in various good causes, economical, social, political, and what not; and because the Church in some sense must be interested in all good causes, they would like to see it taking a more active part with them. They are eager to take it by force, and enlist it under their banner, as the multitudes would have taken Jesus by force and made Him a King; and when it is slow to move they are apt to denounce it as indifferent to evil and hostile to progress. What needs to be made plain is that while there are many cases in which the Church, and, let us say for illustration, the State, or trades unions, or political societies, may have the same ethical ends in view, the Church is not at liberty, as a spiritual society, to use all the means in pursuing these ends which are appropriate and legitimate for others.'

Dr. DENNEY takes temperance legislation as an example. Temperance is a great moral interest, but it does not follow, he says, that the Church should directly promote any particular piece of temperance legislation, such as a high licence law, an abolition law, a local option law, or whatever it may be. It has its own motives and weapons for fighting intemperance, and it does not gain strength, it only loses the consciousness of what it is, when it snatches at the weapons of the State, and tries to wield them instead of its own.

The confusion between the function of the Church and the function of the State has much to do, Dr. DENNEY holds, with the neglect of Christian education. Christian education is the one great task which Protestantism has conspicuously neglected, and with the most deplorable results. 'In modern communities,' he says, 'education is the business of the State, but State education is inevitably determined by State ends.

It neither is, nor can be, nor ever will be, Christian education, and the passive surrender of education by the Church is simply suicidal. Catholics are abundantly right when they emphasize the importance of the religious atmosphere, and maintain that Christianity can only be communicated by Christians; and until the Protestant churches recognize that faith is social, that it is the conviction and inspiration of a community which its immature members must breathe as continually and unconsciously as they do the air which fills their lungs, Protestant Christianity will suffer from a congenital weakness. A doctrine of the Church is wanted which, while it will secure the freedom of the spirit in all its relations to Christ, will recognize the fact that faith has to be naturalized —not indeed in the world, which is impossible, but in the Christian home and the Christian Church, and that to educate its children into the freedom and fulness of faith is a primary and inalienable duty of the Church itself.'

The last doctrine that calls for reconstruction is the doctrine of the Supernatural. Efforts have been made of late to get rid of the distinction between natural and supernatural. 'Much ingenuity has been spent in trying to melt the terms down and make them run into each other.' And Dr. DENNEY is not altogether out of sympathy with these attempts. But meantime science, in its usual meaning, has no explanation to give of Jesus, the forgiveness of sin, or the life everlasting. And as these are facts to us, as real as any physical fact, we need some term to cover them.

It is generally known that there is at the present time a cleavage in Judaism which is causing considerable searching of heart. There are now in Judaism Liberals, and there are Traditionalists. What is the difference between them? That question is answered clearly and conveniently in an address by the Rev. I. I. MATTUCK, which is published in *The Jewish Chronicle* for June 13.

'The Traditionalist in Judaism,' says Mr. MATTUCK, 'accepts the Jewish tradition as absolutely authoritative for his religious life. Whatever conceptions it offers about God and the universe are for him the absolute and complete truth.' Now the Jewish tradition is that 'God spoke to a man, Moses, dictating to him words, some of which he was told to write, others to transmit by word of mouth, and in this revelation are all the laws that ever were or ever will be given by God. Through Moses and the prophets God revealed full knowledge of Himself, His truth, and His laws. He has spoken never since.'

The Liberal believes in a continuous and progressive revelation. God has not spoken once and remained silent ever since, but God speaks to man constantly. God speaks not to one set of men or to one age, but to all men and all ages. His voice is never silent. His light did not flash once or twice or thrice, but is constantly streaming from Him, into the hearts and souls and the minds of men. The purpose of this continuous revelation is to convey to man an ever fuller knowledge of truth and of righteousness, and an ever clearer conception of God and of His laws, to help humanity to struggle upward that the beast in it may die and its divine powers grow in strength until they triumph, and to lead every man to evolve a holier personality and to live a more righteous life.

This difference seems to Mr. MATTUCK to be fundamental. He thinks it may be 'prompted by temperamental causes.' There are those who, when looking at the life of the universe, fix their eyes upon the static forces in it; there are others who see most clearly the dynamic forces. Some like to think that the universe is already established in perfection upon some lofty summit. Others, again, rather believe in the existence of forces leading the universe, the human race, upwards towards a summit perfection, which, with our soul's eye we can but dimly see, but which no man and no age has known. The full knowledge of it

exists only with God. The belief in a fixed revelation suits the former, while the belief in a progressive revelation agrees better with the intellectual and spiritual life of the latter.

Mr. MATTUCK himself is a Liberal. To him the Jewish traditions simply contain the expressions of the truth and righteousness revealed to past generations of Jews. 'The institutions of tradition are the crystallisations of the religious experiences of the generations that have preceded us. It follows upon our belief in progressive revelation that this experience could not have been final, and the knowledge of truth here evidenced could not be complete. New light has come to us in every age through the labours and achievements of natural philosophers, scientists, and historians. They carry us a little further toward our goal, taking us from the place where tradition leaves us. We do not, however, discard those expressions of the religious experience of the past as useless or worthless. We reverence them, we even love them. We take them into our hearts, but, above all, we use them. We brush aside nothing carelessly, we despise nothing that has been of spiritual value to any generation of men, but we think about all things; we would consider and test the value of all religious ideas and institutions. The spirit that impelled and filled this tradition came from God, and though it does not reveal the fulness and completeness of that spirit (for when has man been able to speak of God except in halting and inadequate words?), we yet value it and give thanks for it. While, however, we thus use tradition for instruction in the spirit of God, and for some infusion of it within ourselves, we cannot accept it as a final expression of that spirit and as authoritatively binding upon us. This, then, is our attitude, reverence and love for traditional institutions with freedom in the use of them. We would use them where we can for our spiritual life, recognizing the incompleteness of the revelation embodied, and hoping for its gradual completion.'

Now this attitude affects Judaism both in its ideas and in its institutions.

First, it affects the ideas or what we call the theology of Judaism. The theology of Judaism, it is true, has never been compressed into a creed. Various Jewish teachers have attempted to formulate the dogmatic principles of Judaism, yet not one of these catalogues has been universally accepted. The thirteen articles of faith, formulated by Maimonides, have for many reasons become a sort of popular formula. But the absence of any synodic decree as to what the principles of Judaism are, has left Jews in a measure free to think for themselves. There are, however, some ideas about God and the Bible definitely fixed in Jewish tradition, so that he who accepts this tradition must accept those ideas as true. The aim of Liberal Judaism in regard to all the ideas that form the spiritual essence of the Jewish tradition is to express the spirit of them in the terms of modern thought, and to supplement them in accordance with the later revelation that has come to us through many sources, and with the revelation which, we believe, comes to each one of us still.

Accordingly the Liberal in Judaism no longer hopes for the personal Messiah who will lead Israel back to Palestine. He may hope for the advent of the Messianic age; but he believes that it will be brought about by God's redeeming power working through all men. The Liberal does not believe in the resurrection of the body. He is satisfied to know that life is eternal and the soul immortal.

The new Liberalism affects also the laws and institutions of Judaism. And that is a more serious matter for Judaism. For the Jews have laid much more stress upon institutions than upon ideals or ideas. 'There is a notion,' says Mr. MATTUCK, 'that a Jew may believe almost anything he likes, but so long as he observes certain things in practice he is fulfilling his Jewish obligation.'

The Liberal Jews do not wish to sweep away all institutions, but 'we find,' says Mr. MATTUCK, 'that some of them have for us lost all meaning; others embody ideas which we cannot accept. We are, therefore, constrained to abrogate some and to modify others. In whatever we do, the needs of the spiritual life are consulted. We abrogate, modify, or add ceremonies as the religious experience of our age, touched by our individual experience (both are impelled and directed largely by tradition), dictate.'

Is this not a religion of mere convenience? The charge has been made. Mr. MATTUCK answers: 'If it is easy to exercise all the faculties of mind and heart and life itself in the development of one's own faith, then ours is a convenient religion; but let no one judge us until he has tried to find for himself a spiritually satisfying conception of God and life.'

And he ends with this brave utterance: 'It is because we have faith in our Judaism and would allow full play to its spirit that we would free it from what to us are meaningless encumbrances. Our teachers of old have warned us not to make the fence greater than that which it is to guard, lest it fall and destroy the plants. The spirit is the essential. The greatness of the Jewish tradition is in its spiritual ideals. Our fathers' devotion to God, their burning passion for righteousness, their love of purity in home and in life, their indomitable hope for the triumph of right and the final establishment of an eternal peace—these and the memory of those who lived for these ideals, who strove with their life to realise them, and who died for them triumphantly—they are our Jewish tradition. Institutions are valuable only when they help us to feel deeply the spirit of our fathers. But ideals are greater than all institutions. Let us unto them give the devotion and the love of our hearts and the work of our hands. Established in the spirit, they will ever live, for the spirit is eternal.'

Mr. Arthur C. BENSON has contributed to the *Church Family Newspaper* for 13th June, an article on Balaam. He is astonished at 'the disgrace or dishonour' which has fallen upon Balaam. It is undeserved. To Mr. BENSON, reading the story 'with older eyes,' Balaam seems 'one of the finest, most radiant, most heroic characters of the Old Testament.' Next to the story of Joseph, there is none of the old Patriarchal tales that is more heart-stirring. It is one of the great stories of the world.

To Mr. BENSON's mind Balaam is better than the best of the Old World heroes. For there is no cunning in him. There is no power of accommodation to circumstances. The hero of the old tales was not only the man of strength and courage and vigour, but also of facile inventiveness, of a resource which was by no means always straightforward. Odysseus is, on the very first mention of him, the man of many devices. 'It is almost disconcerting,' says Mr. BENSON, 'to see in the Odyssey, how Odysseus is praised, not only for being brave and spirited, but also for displaying a most adaptable ingenuity, a readiness to deceive and beguile when occasion arises.' For it was necessary for the heroic character in those days always to come out on the top, by fair means if possible; if not, then by subtlety and acuteness.

Opinion now is different. Even in the case of Jacob, Mr. BENSON thinks that our estimate is different from that of Jacob's own time. It is different even from that of the historian of Jacob's artifice. 'The device by which Jacob acquired Esau's blessing, by deliberately trading on his father's infirmities, was not necessarily viewed with the same shrinking with which we view it now. Such conduct had the merit of ingenuity, of achieving its end, and though it is not wholly approved by the writer who recorded it, it is not regarded with entire shame and disapproval. Jacob is penalized indeed for his guile, but he does not lose his blessing.'

But Balaam, as Mr. BENSON now understands him, is above all this. When the messengers of Balak arrive at his home, he goes to consult God. Having learned God's will, he says that he can do nothing, and dismisses the messengers. A second embassy is sent. Greater rewards are offered. Mr. BENSON admits that Balaam 'speaks with a certain relish of the wealth offered,' and that possibly he made a mistake in not being content with the answer which God had already given him. If he made that mistake, he suffered for it. And he did not deserve the disgrace that now attaches to his name.

Having consulted God a second time, he is told to go. Then comes the episode of the ass. Balaam is angry but straightforward. He acknowledges that his ass has served him well. He is wholly overcome at the sight of the angel, and declares himself ready to return. There is always a certain majesty in whatever he says or does. Even to the angel, however respectful, he speaks his mind. And when he is told to go forward, he goes in the determination that what God gives him to speak that will he speak and that only, whatever the consequences may be. And he keeps his word.

Balak is soon in despair. He had sent for Balaam to curse Israel, and Balaam blesses them altogether. He entreats the unflinching prophet to leave the matter alone. 'Neither curse them at all, nor bless them at all.' Then comes the last attempt. With the ampler blessing, the anger of Balak breaks out. But Balaam is utterly unmoved: 'What the Lord saith, that will I speak.' And then follows the greatest blessing of all: 'I shall see Him, but not now: I shall behold Him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.' Balak has his answer at last.

And thus they part for ever, the undismayed prophet and the despairing king. And then comes the dark sequel; how Phinehas went out of the host with the twelve thousand warriors; and the five kings of Midian were slain, and Balaam also fell before the sword, the man 'whose eyes were open, which heard the words of God and knew the knowledge of the Most High.'

From first to last Mr. BENSON sees nothing but fearless rectitude and great dignity. 'The words, "While I meet the Lord yonder," have a magnificent fearlessness about them which seems to me unsurpassed for dignity in the Old Testament.' Did he err in consulting God that second time before he left his home? The doom is not delayed. 'Even when the blessing comes from his lips again and again, we may think that he read in it his own death-warrant:

> As some bold seer in a trance,
> Seeing all his own mischance.

And yet he shows no blenching or craven fears. God, whom he meets yonder, whose knowledge he knows, will do His awful will.'

Then Mr. BENSON follows Balaam back to his own home—some lonely hill farm—to wait the coming of the hosts of Israel which he had blessed, and his own death at their hand. 'One cannot think of him as doubting any longer; he thought no more of his enchantments, but turned his face towards the wilderness. The magical rites that he had practised, by which he had gained wealth and renown, they were useless now. Disgrace and failure were behind him, and death before him. Perhaps the reaction had come, and the passion of the great vision had died down in his mind. But I am sure of this, that Balaam did not meet his death with any craven fear. In the days that intervened, he went to and fro perhaps, performing his tasks mechanically enough, saying farewell to the hills he loved, and to the grey stone-piled house upon the upland, where he had lived his life and where he had been joyful and strong; perhaps he heard the horns of battle blow beneath, and the tumult of the fight. Perhaps he

even saw from the mountain ridges the onset and the victory; and then at last, when the day dawns, and the chosen warriors of Israel come sweeping over the hill and hem him round, I believe that he bore himself nobly; though I cannot think of him as raising hand or weapon against the host whose oncoming he had so greatly blessed. I think of him as coming out unarmed and majestic to meet the last stroke, and dying as he had lived, undismayed.'

Inscribed Hebrew Weights from Palestine.

By Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., University of Edinburgh.

The publication by Professor Macalister, in his great work, *The Excavation of Gezer* (abbreviation *E.G.*), of a unique catalogue of weights, some twelve score in all, suggests that the time has come for a fresh examination of the whole subject of the weight-standards of Palestine in Old Testament times. This renewed study of the material seems all the more necessary, since it does not appear, to the present writer at least, that the learned and versatile excavator has been altogether successful in his admittedly tentative identification of the various standards represented by the Gezer weights.

These, he suggests, are seven in number, indicated by letters of the Greek alphabet from α to ζ (see *E.G.* ii. 287 ff. and the summary, p. 292). The most serious objection to Mr. Macalister's scheme is the unnecessary multiplication of standards. Thus his standards α and δ are really one and the same, the heavy and light forms of the Babylonian shekel of the so-called 'royal' standard (for which see the arts. Money in Hastings' *D.B.* iii. 419, and Weights and Measures, *D.B.* iv. 902 f.). The same applies to his standards β and $\bar{\chi}$, explained below. It is also impossible to admit the 'Phœnician silver shekel of 14·9*g*' (230 grs.)[1] as a standard γ distinct from ϵ, 'the Hebrew shekel, 14·55*g*' (224 grs.).

On the other hand, one or two important weight-standards have been overlooked, as I shall try to show. Further, any identification of ancient weights that brings out results showing 11, 13, and 17 units is open to the gravest suspicion.

It is not my intention to attempt a re-allocation of the Gezer weights to their respective standards, but only to justify in part the criticism here passed on their identification in the official publication, and more especially to discuss the *inscribed* weights recovered in recent years from Gezer and other parts of Palestine. Has not Professor Macalister said of his own efforts in this department of metrology—'that this bewildering subject is exhausted here cannot be claimed'?

I. The Phœnician Standard.

The best attested of all the weight-standards of Palestine is, of course, the Phœnician with its shekel unit of 224 grs. (14·5 *g*). That this was also the national Hebrew silver standard is beyond dispute. The Phœnician shekel, and no other, was 'the shekel of the sanctuary,' or 'sacred shekel,' of the priestly legislation (see *D.B.* iii. 422). The effective weight of the Phœnician shekel or tetradrachm varied considerably in different places and at different times. The best coins of the Phœnician cities yield an average shekel of about 220 grs. (14·25 *g*), with a maximum of 224. The same may be said of the famous Jewish shekels and half-shekels. Professor Flinders Petrie estimates the average of the long series of tetradrachms issued by the Ptolemies of Egypt on this standard at 218 grs. (*Encyc. Brit.*,[11] art. Weights and Measures).

On the other hand, when Darius introduced his gold coinage on the higher or 'royal' standard, with a shekel of 260 grs., as compared with the ordinary shekel of 252, the Phœnician silver shekel —15 of which were equivalent to 2 gold darics of 130 grs. each, on the ratio of gold to silver of 40 : 3 —rose at Aradus, in Cyprus and elsewhere, to 230 grs. (14·9 *g*). Two of the Jerusalem weights published by Sir Chas. Warren (*P.E.F.St.* 1870,

[1] In this paper *g* in italics will be used to denote grammes, in terms of which all the Gezer weights are expressed, while grs. will signify grains. A gramme contains 15·43 grains; 7*g* = 108 grs. A 'French penny' (10 centimes) weighs 10*g*.