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

He looks to it to satisfy his sense of order, of right and wrong, of fellowship. All the special modes of conceiving the world are, as it were, fused: and it is somewhat of an anachronism to treat them in the early stages either as co-ordinate separate interests or as a logical series. As time goes on, and man's mind develops, different aspects of experience catch the attention of different minds.'

The Greek mind, attracted and vexed by confusion and uncertainty, sought for some one principle which would explain the whole mass of miscellaneous experiences and reveal a rational order. The Hebrew mind moved along quite a different line. Strongly possessed of a 'numinous' sense, that is the sense of a Numen or Presence in things, it conceived the world as the scene of the activity of a Power which governs the whole. The Hebrews showed little or no interest in metaphysical questions. The main development of Hebrew religion lay in the direction of a continual growth in the fullness of the personal idea as applied to God. This is as peculiar and independent a process as that of Greek philosophy.

It is Dr. Strong's contention that the Christian system comprehends these various lines of thought. 'The philosophic view of things fails to explain the individual experience and the historic sequence of events, all of which are individual. I submit that the Christian scheme of thought, as it covers much more ground, is able to avoid this pitfall. It has room in it for the philosophical method, but it is not bound within these limits. If the Christian point of view is to be trusted the existence and activity of God is the fundamental fact in experience. This fact, if true, must express itself in contact with the souls of men, in the general guidance of history, and the convergence of it on a purpose, only partly fulfilled as yet.'

Zionism.

By Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., United Free Church College, Glasgow.

Zionism a Religious Question.

Zionism is a political question, but it may be of service to remind ourselves that it is also, and even essentially a religious question, and that our attitude to it will depend, in the last analysis, on our conception of religion. Doubtless historical considerations may be, and have been, urged in favour of the Jewish claim to Palestine. But, the Jews themselves being witnesses, that land had not always been theirs, they won it by the sword. And some of their prophets at any rate did not think this a sufficient justification for their being allowed to remain in it for ever. 'The eyes of the Lord Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth' (Am 9^8). If, in spite of a thousand subsequent political transformations, ancient conquest is adequate justification for the descendants of conquerors cherishing the hope of a later return to the land they conquered, we may still have to reckon with an Italian claim to Britain, which was for centuries Roman. Is the Jewish claim to Palestine really much more reasonable? We cannot reverse the processes of history. Others are now in the land. The Zionists ask the world, as Professor D. M. Kay in his Croall Lectures has recently put it, 'to reinstate them in a national home, *where others already have a national home.*' History is not of the distant past alone, but the history of all the time since then has also to be reckoned with; and we have to face our modern problems in the light of the world as it is to-day.

But essentially Zionism is a religious question. The champions and the opponents of it alike appeal to the Old Testament. That cannot, however, decisively settle the matter. For the Old Testament is too splendidly human a book to be dominated by any mechanical unity: it speaks with a double voice, indeed with many voices. Doubtless between its constituent parts there is a very real unity; they are all held together by the idea of God. All of it was written by men whose 'God was their

glory,' by men who 'looked to him, and were lightened.' As Julia Wedgwood has said, no other race 'has left on the ear of humanity so definite an impression of a single voice.' But the idea of God is the most comprehensive of all ideas, and among the Hebrews, as among other races, its expression in life and literature assumes a rich variety of forms.

Difference in Old Testament Ideals.

The difference in the ideals cherished by different Old Testament writers sometimes amounts to a positive contradiction between them. Consider, for example, the attitude to ritual. In the coming days to which the prophets looked so eagerly forward, Jeremiah would assign to it no place at all; for him the only law that mattered was the law written upon the heart. But Ezekiel, his younger contemporary, ends his elaborate description of the Jerusalem To Be with the significant words 'Jehovah is there'—*there*, in the City where the presence of God is guaranteed by a minutely regulated and punctiliously observed ritual. The same contrast is to be observed between Ezekiel and a later prophet of the Exile: Ezekiel toiling with painful steps and slow at the elaboration of Temple architecture and ritual, and Deutero-Isaiah, soaring on eagle's wings, never faint and never weary, amid the broad expanses of the spiritual world. Consider again the difference assigned by different prophets to the heathen in their scheme of the future. A whole moral world separates Joel and Ezekiel on the one hand from Deutero-Isaiah and Jonah on the other. Joel masses the alien nations together for destruction in the Valley of Decision, Ezekiel sees the slain hosts of Gog lying thick upon Israel's mountains and fields, to be devoured by beasts and birds. How different is the noble appeal of the God whom Deutero-Isaiah worships, 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth'; and in Jonah the loving arms of God are stretched across the world even to cruel Assyria, which had wounded Israel so often and so sore. Ezra demands the divorce of the foreign women, the writer of the exquisite Book of Ruth—perhaps by way of protest—welcomes the Moabitess, with her loving heart and her resolve to take Israel's God as her own God, into the commonwealth of Israel.

On these and on other matters there is an endless variety of opinion in the Old Testament. But all such differences tend to resolve themselves broadly into two opposing categories, the prophetic and the priestly; and our attitude to Zionism will largely depend on which of these two we would wish to see triumph. If it seems dogmatism to say, as one has said, that it is the prophets who laid the true foundations and proclaimed the essence of Jewish religion, it is at any rate a dogmatism which would be supported by the consensus of Christian scholarship. The prophet and the priest were the two most conspicuous representatives of Hebrew religion; but the service of God, to which both alike summoned the people, was interpreted by them in radically different ways. It was the fundamental difference between a moral and a ceremonial religion. Not, of course, that the priests cared nothing for morality, but with it they equated ritual. The priest demanded ritual and the prophet righteousness. It is possible, no doubt, to draw the contrast too sharply between these two types. They are not entirely incompatible with one another, and there are men in whom these interests are, or seem to be, blended. Ezekiel, who is the most brilliant champion of religion interpreted in terms of the cult, yet proclaimed in memorable words that a man's moral quality determines his destiny; and before him, the Deuteronomic reformers, who were busy when he was a child, were as eager for the cleansing of the moral life of the nation as for the purification of religious usage. Nevertheless the distinction between prophet and priest is a vital one, and without it it is impossible to understand the ferment of Hebrew religious thought. Already in the eighth century B.C. the conflict is seen in all its ferocity when the grim Amos, fresh from the wilderness, faces the supercilious priest who wishes to stop his honest mouth (Am 7); and eight centuries afterwards it was revealed in all its tragic solemnity when 'the chief *priests* and rulers delivered up Jesus the Nazarene, who was a *prophet* mighty in deed and word before God and all the people, to be condemned to death, and crucified him' (Lk $24^{19f.}$).

Prophetic Religion.

If we are prepared to take certain utterances of the prophets at their full face value—to believe, in other words, that they mean what they say—we are left with no alternative but to suppose that they were the implacable foes of the ritual system which to the priestly heart was so dear. 'What doth the Lord require of me?' is the question of questions for a religious man; and the prophets—of the golden

age of prophecy at any rate—are ready with their very unequivocal answer. 'Not sacrifice and offering,' says the earliest of them. 'Was it these things that ye brought unto me in the wilderness?' In the context the only possible answer is No: but then and now and evermore the Divine demand is that 'justice roll on through the national life like waters, and righteousness like a perennial stream' (Am 5[24f.]). His successor clinches this truth in an even more incisive antithesis. 'I desire mercy, *and not sacrifice*' (Hos 6[6]). 'What care I,' asks Isaiah, 'for your multiplied sacrifices? Blood of bullocks, of lambs, of goats, is no pleasure to me.' With the same voice speaks Isaiah's younger contemporary. Not for holocausts and rivers of oil, and infinitely less for the sacrifice of the first-born does God ask, but in these immortal words he expresses the Divine demand upon men—'act justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God' (Mic 6[6-8]). A century afterwards Jeremiah is equally explicit, and his words are all the more significant that they were uttered some years after the attempt of the reformers to establish religion on the basis of a purified cult with alleged Divine sanction: 'In the days of the Exodus I gave your fathers no command concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices' (7[22]). The prophets knew very well both what they wanted and what they opposed: they wanted a religion which expressed itself in a moral life, and they implacably opposed a religion which expressed itself in the cult. The contrast—especially in Amos, Micah, and Jeremiah—is deliberately and almost fiercely drawn. In answer to the priests and the people who appeal to the ancient days of the Exodus in justification of the ritual of which they were too fatally fond, the prophets, in the name of their God, unflinchingly maintain, 'I gave you no such commandment. My concern was, and is, with righteousness altogether, and with ritual not at all.' True, some modern scholars, for reasons which we have not space to consider, believe that the prophets did not quite mean all they say; but we can be doing them no injustice by taking them at their word—and that is their word on this supreme question.

Priestly Religion.

Now the tragedy is that the priest, who had the last say in the making of the Old Testament, has pretty completely dominated our conception of that literature, as indeed he has, in consequence, also dominated certain types of Christian thought. Relative, then, to our discussion, what are the characteristics of the priestly conception of religion in the Old Testament? (i) First and most obvious is its emphasis on ritual as an—we might say *the*—indispensable thing, and its consequent concentration of interest, from 621 B.C., on the Temple. The ceremonies and sacrifices are everlasting statutes, to be valid for all time. To the Chronicler scarcely any history is worth considering but that of Judah; in Judah, the supreme interest is Jerusalem; and in Jerusalem, the Temple. His is indeed ecclesiastical history with a vengeance. Ezekiel, though a prophet, prepared the way by devoting no less than nine chapters of his book to a minute cultic programme, which he manifestly regards as the climax and crown of his message, and the later prophets follow suit. Malachi attributes the disasters that have come upon the people as the Divine retribution for their neglect of the tithes and the offerings. A later prophet, without stopping to consider the impossibility of his dream, envisages with joy the prospect of the nations 'going up from year to year to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles' (Zec 14[16]). But surely Mr. Montefiore is right when he says that 'the one universal God cannot fitly be worshipped by a national cult. The national ceremonial has become too narrow for the universal God. The clothes do not fit the religion.'

When the priest, or a prophet with a priestly heart, stumbles into saying a great thing, it is seldom so great as it looks. At first sight nothing could be more profound than Ezekiel's promise, 'I will give them another heart, and I will put a new spirit within them; and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and I will give them a heart of flesh' (11[19]). But the words that follow undeceive us—'that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances.' Despite the fine spiritual prospect, we are back again in a legal religion after all. So when Joel says, 'I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh' (2[28]), the heart leaps at the glorious vision, but it turns out that it is only upon Jewish flesh that the Spirit is to be poured—upon all of that, no doubt, upon the servants and the handmaidens included, but upon no more than that; a very different fate is reserved for the nations in the Valley of Decision. And when a prophet says a great thing, the priest has to qualify it, if he conveniently can. The magnificent dream in Is 19[23-25] of a world in which ancient and deadly enemies

have become good friends, vanishes at a stroke of the priestly pen: the noble words, 'Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance,' are degraded in the Septuagint to 'Blessed be my people in Israel and Assyria,' etc., which confines the reference, in a pitifully nationalistic way, to the Jews resident in those countries. Again, our present text makes Jeremiah say that 'the priests the Levites shall never want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to burn meal-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually' (33^{17}). Now in view of Jeremiah's real message, of which more presently, it is simply inconceivable that he could have said that; and it is a peculiar satisfaction to know that this whole section (33^{14-26}) is lacking in the Septuagint. It must be very late—as distant in time from Jeremiah as it is in spirit.

(ii) Another characteristic of the priestly religion is its emphasis upon the book. The prophet is a man of the Spirit, the priest of the Book. It was a fateful day for Israel when the newly discovered Book of Deuteronomy was made the basis of a reformation, and a day more fateful still when Ezra, 'a ready scribe in the law of Moses,' set his face towards Jerusalem, 'with the law of his God in his hand.' Under the régime of the priest the decadence of prophecy is only too evident, and it was but a question of time till 'there was no more any prophet' in the land (Ps 74^{9}). The religion of the Book tends to stifle the religion of the Spirit. Very significant in this respect is the difference between Jeremiah, a true prophet, and Ezekiel, a priestly prophet, in the story of their call. Jeremiah's contact with the Lord is immediate. Simply and finely he says, 'The Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth; and said to me, See, I have put my words in thy mouth' (1^{9}). But in Ezekiel the Divine voice says, 'Eat this scroll, and go, speak to the house of Israel' (3^{1}). The message is mediated by the book. Ezekiel is a student of the law, and the presence of the book in the story of his call is of ominous significance. It is the same contrast as we find between Jeremiah and the First Psalm. 'Blessed is the man,' says Jeremiah, 'that trusteth in the Lord, and whose trust the Lord is' (17^{7}). This the writer of the First Psalm, whose imagery puts it beyond doubt that he has this passage of Jeremiah in view (cf. Ps 1^{3} with Jer 17^{8}), significantly transforms into, 'Happy is the man that meditates on the law of the Lord.' The First Psalm belongs to the later period, when the priest is in command. And so we are prepared to understand the sorrowful indignation of Jeremiah when, perhaps with reference to the very men who were issuing a book which, in large part, dealt with ritual obligation, he complains that 'the false pen of the scribes has wrought falsely' (8^{8}).

(iii) Again, in their attitude to foreign nations the priestly prophet and the true prophet are poles asunder. We have seen how Joel and Ezekiel would deal with them. Trito-Isaiah is no better. If the gates of Jerusalem are to be open day and night, it is that through them 'men may bring unto thee the wealth of the nations' (Is 60^{11}). The destiny of the alien is to lick the dust of Hebrew feet, or at best to have the privilege of rendering menial service to the priestly nation. This nationalistic *hauteur* is expressively summed up in the lines:

Strangers shall stand and feed your flocks,
And aliens shall be your ploughmen and vinedressers,
But *ye* shall be named the priests of the Lord,
Men shall call *you* the ministers of our God ($61^{5f.}$).

The deplorable anti-Semitism of the modern world has its prototype in the anti-goyimism—if we may coin so monstrous a word—of the ancient Hebrews.

These three characteristics—the ritual, the book, and the *hauteur*—go naturally together. The ritual is recorded in the book: the people who possess the book and the ritual are the elect people. Hence the exclusive attitude to those without. In the scheme of Providence the nations are of very subordinate importance—at best an annex to Israel, if they desire to share her salvation, and at the worst, as in Esther, the objects of fanatical hatred. That, on some of its sides,—though of course there are other and better,—is the ideal of priestly Judaism, and a most unlovely ideal it is.

The Prophetic Conception of the Future.

What a change when we pass to the great prophets; with their generous and comprehensive outlook and their intensely ethical temper! The passion of their hearts was set upon the redemption of the world from misery: first, no doubt, of the Hebrew world—for they themselves were Hebrews—and then of the great world beyond. There is from the beginning a universal drift in the religious thought of the Old Testament; it is seen already in the story of the creation of the world and of man. Deliverance 'from all evil,' from all that hurts and

harms, from social and political strife, from oppression whether by foreign conquerors or native tyrants, from exile, from sorrow, from sin, from death—that is the ideal of the prophets. How irrelevant must have appeared the details of the cult to men who were moving among magnitudes like these! The great prophets were men of international mind, who recognized, like Amos, that God was as surely behind the migrations of the Philistines and the Arameans as behind the Exodus from Egypt, and who knew, like him, that the dark-faced sons of Africa were as precious to God as Israel herself (Am 9^{7}); men who looked hopefully forward to a friendly world in which nations that had hated and feared and fought each other would be bound together by the indissoluble bond of a common worship of the one God who was over them all (Is 19^{23-25}); men who could believe, like the writer of Jonah, that heathen hearts would be responsive to a prophetic word, and who were persuaded that 'the love of God is broader than the measures of man's mind,' broad enough to embrace Israel's ancient and most deadly enemies; men who could anticipate, with Jesus, the time when they would 'come from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and sit down in the kingdom of God.'

The Earthly Zion.

But where in all this does Zion come in? In a sense, no doubt, she is central, and this centrality receives classic expression in the famous passage which represents the nations as carrying to Zion for arbitration the disputes which otherwise would have been decided by sword and spear. 'Let us go up to the mount of Jehovah, for from Zion goes forth the law' (Is 2^{3})—that is, from that city moral direction proceeds, just decisions are issued. Zion is here the moral and religious metropolis of the world. In the happy mistranslation by the Septuagint of Ps 87^{5}, she is 'Mother Zion.' Men in exile wept when they remembered Zion. Nor was it only priests, but prophets too, who believed that in some real sense Zion was Jehovah's earthly home. The great Isaiah, who worshipped a God whose glory filled the whole earth, could yet describe Him as 'dwelling in mount Zion' (8^{18}). Here, one might be tempted to say, is one of those delightful inconsistencies which are sometimes found lying peacefully together even within the most powerful minds. But in point of fact there is abundant historical justification for this claim to pre-eminence of Zion. It is with Jerusalem and her great prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah that ideal religion is associated more than with any other city or men in the world. Jerusalem is, in very truth, the Mother of us all. The anonymous prophet of the Exile was right in believing that, in the purpose of God, the Jewish people held a pivotal place in the religious development of humanity. They were chosen indeed for the world's sake, but they were assuredly *chosen*, and Jerusalem was their capital city.

But the work of that city was done when the ideals cherished by her greatest men were lifted up into the higher life of the world. Indeed, she herself had been blind and recreant to her high privilege. That city of priests, as our Lord reminds her in words throbbing with agony, had had the tragic distinction of killing the *prophets* and stoning those that had been sent to her, and in the end she had crucified the greatest Prophet of them all. So her work was done when her message was liberated and carried across the world to the islands of the sea. But surely nothing is more natural than the inextinguishable affection of the Old Testament for Zion. This localism is just one form of that charming and very intelligible materialism which hovers over almost the whole range of Old Testament thought. Not indeed of it all. There is no hint in Is 19, such as there is in Zec 14^{16}, that Egypt and Assyria need come to Zion to worship the God who claims them as His people and the work of His hands. There is no hint that the Ninevites, in order to be welcomed by Jehovah, need adopt the Jewish cult or do anything other than show fruits worthy of repentance. But in general, on the scenery of the Old Testament, Mount Zion towers aloft, unique and indispensable. No voice within it ever quite succeeded in saying, 'Neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem.'

The City of God.

But that does not prove the case for the Zionists. The thing that was precious in Zion was a spiritual thing, and spirit knows no bounds of place or time. The peaceful arbitration of international disputes, which a Hebrew prophet naturally enough associated with Jerusalem, would surely be just as welcome and as potent, if it came from Geneva or the Hague. Every thinker expresses his ideals in forms that are locally and temporally conditioned in a hundred ways, but it is the ideal, the spirit, that matters.

That spirit is seen in its purest essence in Jeremiah. He uttered three great words whose effect is to emancipate religion from every local and material association, words which constitute the everlasting charter of spiritual religion. The first is, 'I gave you no commandment concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices' (7[22]). The second is, 'In those days when you have grown numerous and fruitful in the land, men shall speak no more of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah: it shall never enter their minds, they will neither think of it, nor miss it, nor shall it be ever made again any more' (3[16]). And the last word is the greatest, for it is the secret of the other two, 'I will write my law in their heart' (31[33]). A law that can be written there, is essentially not for the Jewish heart alone, but for every human heart. Religion, in being spiritualized, becomes universalized, and Zion counts for nothing any more. To the popular mind, dyed in priestly conceptions of worship, animal sacrifice and the ark were indispensable accompaniments of religion; from the religion of the future, as Jeremiah conceived it, they would be absent, and their absence 'would never be missed,' because the Divine law was written upon the heart.

In other words, we have to reckon seriously—and how few there are who do this!—with the truth that God is *Spirit*. The Kingdom for whose coming Jesus taught us to pray is righteousness, peace, and joy, which things are for all men everywhere. It has nothing to do with the revival of any particular sacrificial or ritual system, or with the increase in numbers or glory or prosperity of the Jews. To emphasize these things as essential is just pure religious materialism, and the wonderful hymn of Habakkuk should have taught us better than that (3[17f.]). If the world continues to grow in spiritual apprehension, it is difficult to believe that Judaism can have a vital future, in so far as it consents to be bound up with ritual and the earthly Zion. But it may have the most splendid of all futures, if it resolves to serve the world by re-asserting its own great revelation of God—the God of the 90th Psalm; the God of the 139th Psalm; the God of the prophets; the God whose supreme and eternal demand upon men is for justice, compassion, and humility; the God who, as Spirit, can be truly worshipped, not in Jerusalem only, but everywhere the wide world over, wherever men are willing to worship Him in spirit and in truth.

Literature.

THE DECALOGUE.

The scholar is not always a preacher, the preacher is even less often a scholar: it is a happy coincidence when the same man is both. Such a man is the Ven. R. H. Charles, D.D., D.Litt., LLD., Archdeacon of Westminster. His scholarship has carried his name throughout the whole theological world, and his quality, both as scholar and preacher, has been once more revealed in his recent book on *The Decalogue* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). An exhaustive and up-to-date book on the Decalogue was overdue. There have been sporadic discussions of it in general treatises, but what we needed was a thorough discussion which would do justice alike to the grave historical and literary problems which gather round it, and to its spiritual content and suggestiveness. This is exactly what Dr. Charles has given us in these Warburton Lectures: here the critical, the historical, and the practical all come to their own.

An Introduction running to fifty-eight pages deals very minutely with the problem—especially on its textual and literary side—of the origin and growth, by successive accretions, of the Decalogue. It is not long since a scholar, who had the hardihood to claim for the Decalogue a Mosaic origin, would have been considered reactionary—a rather benighted person who could have little conception of the historical development of moral ideas within Israel: a date for it earlier than the eighth century, say, the time of Hosea, was held to be as good as inconceivable. But a healthy reaction is setting in against this extreme view; and Dr. Charles has the courage to proclaim that the Decalogue—of course in its original form of ten single clauses—is really and truly the work of Moses. And he not only proclaims this, he seeks to prove it by tracing