

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

adjustment to the world as a whole, so widespread as that of religion and with such a striking uniformity underlying its variations, must be supposed to be rooted in requirements of a universal kind. It is the business of the psychologist to inquire what these universal requirements are. This is, indeed, the problem to which most psychologists of religion have devoted their energies. A grave defect of most of the attempts to grapple with this problem is that psychologists have been too eager to find a simple answer to a question essentially complex. There is no one mental root of religion. William James with his emphasis on emotional experience, Levy-Bruhl and the other French sociologists who have spoken of *collective ideas* and *pre-logical* thinking, and the intellectualists who seem to think that religious belief is grounded on the arguments for the existence of God and on logical inferences from experience, are alike in being obsessed with the idea that there is one mental origin of religion. There seems to be no reason to suppose that religion has any such single mental root. Historically and psychologically, religion is a complex growth from many conflicting and diverse elements. Man's sexuality and his egoism; his craving for power, his sentimentality, his awe in the presence of the mighty forces of nature, his fear of death, and his love for the dead; his reverence for custom and traditional beliefs, and his rebellion against them, have all alike contributed to the system of beliefs and feelings that he has woven round the objects of his religious beliefs. The true path of the psychologist of religion is not to select one of these numerous roots and say that it is the essential element underlying religion. He must rather investigate them

all, recognizing the different parts they all play in the formation of the complex system of beliefs, sentiments, and rites we call 'religion.'

This regrettable tendency to seek for simple answers to the religious problem in general psychology may well be corrected by an attention to the second problem we mentioned—that of individual psychology. From race to race, and even from individual to individual in the same race, the religious adjustment varies. What are the psychological causes underlying these variations? This is a problem of individual psychology with which the psychologist has hardly yet attempted to grapple. Yet the common assumption that everybody is religious in much the same way is untrue. William James' division of religious persons into healthy-minded and sick souls, or Jung's division into introvert and extrovert, makes some attempt at tackling the problem. Yet we feel these solutions are too simple; men do not fall naturally into types. On the contrary, we find continuity in the individual differences between them. The task of providing a satisfactory explanation of these individual differences remains one for the psychology of religion in the future. We have before us conspicuous triumphs of individual psychology in the discrimination of imaginal types,¹ in mental testing,² and in the investigation of the ætiology of psychoneurotic conditions.³ The understanding of the psychological basis of differences in religious adjustment should not prove to be a problem insoluble by the methods of individual psychology.

¹ F. Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty*.

² C. Burt, *Presidential Address to the Psychological Section of the British Association*, Liverpool, 1923.

³ The works of Janet, Freud, Brewer, etc.

Recent Foreign Theology.

PENTATEUCHAL criticism has had a long history, and Professor Löhr's discussion¹ is one of many signs that that history is by no means at an end. His brochure, which deals only with Genesis, is the first of a series of studies whose object appears

¹ *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem*, von Max Löhr, I. *Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis* (Töpelmann, Giessen).

to be to challenge current conceptions of the composition of the Hexateuch. Briefly, this discussion is an attempt to prove that there never was such an independent documentary source as most critics believe in and describe as P, that the assumption of such a source rests upon an error, and that the phenomena which have been held to prove it can be better accounted for otherwise. From the

frequent repetition of the same words or phrases, e.g. 'be fruitful and multiply,' Professor Löhr maintains that we may have a right to infer one author, but not necessarily one continuous documentary source. We have not, he believes, anything like sufficiently reckoned with the possibility of later interpolations and glosses: the endeavour to assign practically all the material to documentary sources he regards as one of the fundamental errors of the prevalent literary criticism.

He certainly puts his finger upon some awkward facts, whose difficulty cannot escape the attention of the most careless student of criticism and which are yet for the most part passed by, as he says, by the critics in solemn silence. How are we to account, e.g., for the extraordinarily sporadic nature of P, especially in Genesis? In the Sodom and Gomorrah story, Gn 19²⁹ stands in an isolation which is anything but splendid. Still more unintelligible are the occasional fragments of verses, e.g. 16¹¹ 30²²; and Dr. Löhr here puts a question which must have occurred to many another student of the problem. How are we to make intelligible to ourselves the mind and method of a redactor who, with ample documentary sources before him, chooses to select just such paltry fragments as these, and daubs them into his picture, like a painter dealing with the colours of his palette? Either, he argues, the redactor must have been a very moderately gifted person indeed, or—he rather ironically suggests—he may have been guided by a feeling of sympathy with the literary critics, for whose benefit he desired, in the goodness of his heart, to set up finger-posts. Stray verses and fragments like these are more easily explained as interpolations than as remains of a once more or less extensive documentary source. Another objection urged by Dr. Löhr to the documentary hypothesis is that not one of the assumed sources constitutes a real unity, but a host of redactors has to be summoned to account for its present form. The upshot of the discussion is that there was never a priestly codex composed in and brought from Babylon to Palestine by Ezra, but that essentially the Pentateuch, as we have it, was the work of Ezra and his associates.

Dr. Löhr clinches his argument by examining in detail some of the longer passages, notably chaps. 17 and 23 which, in their present form, have been assigned with much confidence and with practical unanimity to P. Chap. 17 he regards as a literary mosaic: vv. 6-8, he maintains, depend on vv. 1-5.

But v. 6, with its reference to the *kings* that are to spring from Abraham, implies a date before the fall of the monarchy, i.e. a pre-exilic date, and therefore vv. 1-5 must be earlier still: authorship by some post-exilic P is therefore out of the question. Even phrases which have usually been regarded as the special property of P, e.g. *El Shaddai*, appear in other and earlier sources (e.g. 43¹⁴ 49²⁵), and this may have been a familiar formula used in blessing. It will thus be seen that an attempt is made at many points to undermine the current theory of the origin of the Pentateuch. It is rather significant that Volz has also attacked it in a recent criticism of Eissfeldt's book which was noticed in these columns some months ago. The difficulty of the problem and the folly of dogmatizing upon it are well illustrated by the fact that while Löhr is seeking to withdraw one of the documents currently believed to be an ultimate Pentateuchal source, Eissfeldt has forcibly argued for the existence of a document (L) additional to those currently accepted. But it is in just this way that Old Testament science, like every other, advances. When hypotheses are put forward which fail to account for all the facts, they are supplemented or replaced by other hypotheses which account for them more adequately. Convinced believers in the documentary hypothesis will not be seriously shaken in their faith by Dr. Löhr's argument, but they will await with interest the discussions which are to follow. Dr. Löhr pays Mr. Harold M. Wiener a high compliment for his contribution to the problem of the composition of the Pentateuch.

Who are the 'weak' to whom Paul refers in 1 Co (esp. ch. 8) and in Ro 14? This is the question which Dr. Max Rauer sets out to answer in an instructive and exhaustive study;¹ or rather there are two questions here which demand and receive a separate answer. After a keen examination of all the available evidence Dr. Rauer reaches the conclusion that, so far as the Corinthian Church is concerned, the 'weak' were Gentile Christians, not indeed a large body, quite certainly a minority, but a group which earnestly believed that the sacrificial flesh which had been dedicated to idols, remained in some mysterious magical connexion with those idols, and was, so to speak, demonically

¹ Die 'Schwachen' in Korinth und Rom, nach den Paulusbrieffen, von Dr. Max Rauer (Herder & Co.: Verlagsbuchhandlung, Freiburg im Breisgau).

infected, so that those who partook of it would be literally and inevitably drawn under the power of the evil spirits, to the certain peril and the probable ruin of their souls. Their 'weakness' consisted in their inadequate appreciation of, and defective confidence in, the power of Christ.

The 'weak' within the Roman Church Dr. Rauer believes to have been men who had been Gentile Gnostics before they became Christians, and who in their adopted religion continued to practise the vegetarianism which had been obligatory in the religion which they had abandoned—practised it all the more earnestly, as Christianity was felt to be a call to perfection, and with this they not unnaturally associated asceticism. It is also possible that their conduct was determined in part by an eschatological motive, according to which the latter days were to reproduce the ideal primal time, when animal food was believed to form no part of the diet of man. As against this conception, Paul desires to bring home to those who held it that the kingdom of God has nothing to do with meat or drink. Dr. Rauer rightly comments on the fine pastoral tact which Paul displays in both discussions. This suggestive and illuminating study helps us to appreciate the difficulties which the great apostle had to encounter through the retention in the minds of his converts of ideas which

had been engrained in them or become precious to them through their former way of living.

A strange fascination attaches to the reputed words of Jesus which are found in extra-canonical sources. Curiosity will be abundantly satisfied by the very extensive and beautifully printed collection¹ gathered together by M. Besson from many sources—apocryphal gospels, apocryphal Acts, the Talmud, the Fathers—and supplemented by two interesting appendices on Christ in the Talmud and in Muhammadan Tradition. The French translations of the Sayings are accompanied by brief notes. In spite of the writer's disclaimer that his work has no scientific pretensions, the collection cannot fail to be welcome to ordinary readers who are eager to gather up such fragments as ancient tradition, whether reliable or unreliable, has left us of the words of Jesus. But when we have read them all, we can only endorse the author's own statement when he says that 'the striking thing is that, after all the studies devoted to Christian literature, so small a number of words has been discovered which can with any certainty be attributed to Christ.'

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

¹ *Les Logia Agrapha*, par Emile Besson (Bibliothèque des Amitiés Spirituelles, à Bihorel-lez-Rouen, 2, rue du Point-du-Jour, chez A. L. Legrand; 7 fr.).

The Institution of the Eucharist.

BY THE REVEREND G. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., HOVE, SUSSEX.

THE main purpose of this paper is to defend the genuineness of Lk 22^{19b-20} against the prevalent opinion to the contrary. But by way of clearing the ground for this important task, it is necessary first of all to consider the difference as to the date of the Crucifixion, and inferentially the Institution of the Eucharist, between St. John and the Synoptics, as well as the variations between the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark on the one hand and that of St. Luke on the other.

A.

The contradiction regarding the date of the Crucifixion and the time of the Eucharist between

St. John's account and that of the first three Gospels is, indeed, as pronounced as it possibly could be. According to St. John, the Crucifixion took place in the afternoon of the 14th of Nīsān (see particularly 18²⁸ and 19¹⁴), whilst the three other Evangelists place the date of the Crucifixion on the 15th of Nīsān, that is the first day of the Passover-feast itself, the Paschal lamb having been slain and eaten in the evening of the 14th of Nīsān, which according to Jewish ideas counted as the beginning of the 15th day of the month (see Mt 26¹⁷, Mk 14¹², Lk 12⁷).

Now if the Synoptic statement had, like that of St. John's Gospel, been consistent in itself, it