
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 critics should be the last people in the world to resent the revision of their results: that would be to resent the process by which they live. They must, if they are true to their profession, be willing to reconsider and, if necessary, to modify conclusions in the light of fresh facts, or of a more penetrating analysis of familiar facts. Truth can only flourish so long as it is not unwilling to accept a challenge: if it is not eager to do battle, it must at least be ready to accept battle.

Now among the truths most surely believed among the critics are these—that Deuteronomy belongs to the seventh century B.C., that it was the basis and inspiration of the reformation of Josiah, and that its chief demand was for the centralization of the worship at the Jerusalem temple. Amid all the perplexing uncertainties that beset the criticism of the Old Testament, these were among the few certainties that could not be shaken. It comes, then, like a bolt from the blue to be told that, so far from these things being certainties, they are not even true.

It is Professor A. C. WELCH who tells us this, in his book on *The Code of Deuteronomy*, noticed elsewhere in this issue. Dr. WELCH has the best of rights to an attentive hearing. He has a singularly independent mind; and his previous work on 'The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom,' 'Visions of the End,' and his articles on 'Jeremiah' in the *Expositor* attest his thorough familiarity with the Old Testament material. So we are prepared for a searching discussion, and we are not disappointed.

Dr. WELCH brings to his task a deeper respect for the traditional text of the Old Testament than is common among critics. Not altogether without warrant does he protest against their excision of words or phrases that are inconvenient to their theories. Where, for example, priests and judges appear together in a passage, and one scholar deletes the one word and another the other as an intrusion, Dr. WELCH insists that they both be allowed to stand in the text. They are together now, they must have had some meaning for the writer who put them together. Can we discover that meaning? Dr. WELCH thinks we can.

His general method is to look at each law first by itself, and then in relation to the other laws which deal with the same theme. He thinks that the whole discussion of Deuteronomy has been vitiated by interpreting its detail in the light of what the critics assert to be its supreme demand—the demand for the centralization of the worship. Dr. WELCH finds this unambiguously expressed in only one passage—12^{1-7}. In this view of the book he is very conscious of running 'counter to the

work of a generation'—he might have said, of more than a century. But his acute analysis of the passages he discusses deserves the most patient and careful consideration.

He discusses, among other things, the laws relating to offerings, and those dealing with the nature of prophecy and the appointment of kings; and the result of his discussion is to show that these laws are all relatively early. Some of the laws relating to offerings prescribe nothing either as to the nature or the amount or the destination or the time of those offerings: all this indefiniteness points to a very early date, perhaps even to the period of the Judges, or at latest of the early monarchy.

Similarly the prophets with whom the book is concerned are not thought of as 'the councillors of kings or the defiant judges of priests.' One of Dr. WELCH's points is that the relations between prophets and priests were more harmonious than the critics customarily allow. 'The prophet is very near the life of the peasant, and to him the peasant is directed to turn.' He, like the peasant, is a 'homely person'; and he can be coupled—as the Elohist would, but as Jeremiah would not, have coupled him—with the dreamer of dreams. This again points to an early date.

The law of the monarchy would also seem to be early. The king must not be a second Solomon. Who would be most likely to make that demand, and when? 'Judah'—Dr. WELCH crisply says—'was longing for a second David, but *Israel* was dreading a second Solomon.' The law reflects the temper of the northern kingdom, and of a period not far removed from Solomon.

This last point illustrates another of Dr. WELCH's contentions—that besides suggesting a relatively early date, these laws also suggest a northern origin. Leviticus may represent the usage of Jerusalem, but behind Deuteronomy lies the experience and the practice of Israel. The tithe very possibly goes back to Bethel, the public celebration of the passover—so unlike that prescribed by P—has its analogy, even to this day, among the Samaritans; and the deadly hostility to Canaanite sanctuaries which explains the unceasing emphasis upon the indefeasible importance of the Jahweh sanctuary—sanctuaries, Dr. WELCH would say—is reminiscent of Hosea's opposition to the Baalized Jahweh worship.

Enough has been said to indicate the freshness, the strength, and the independence of this important book. Everywhere there is the note of challenge. Dr. WELCH maintains, for example, that the Israelites 'never adopted as their own any of the Canaanite shrines,' well aware as he is that this is a critical heresy of the first order, and well aware, as he must be, that a shrine with such a name as Bethel may very well go back to a time immensely earlier than the Hebrews.

So to the question, Is Deuteronomy the programme of Josiah's reform, as most critics believe, or the deposit, as Hölscher has recently maintained, Dr. WELCH answers confidently, It is neither. It is a very radical answer, and, if correct, it would oblige us to modify our views on a good many other matters. The date of Deuteronomy is pivotal to Old Testament criticism: if that can be dislocated, much else will be uncertain. The purpose of Dr. WELCH's book is 'to examine carefully and afresh the Deuteronomic code itself, and, on the basis of this examination, to seek to determine its aim, its composition, and its period' (p. 174). Whether his conclusions be accepted or not, we cannot but be grateful for so able and stimulating a discussion. It is a book that will have to be reckoned with in future discussions of Deuteronomy.

The Eleventh Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen was held at Oxford on August 25th–31st, and the report, with the papers read, forms a bulky and extremely interesting volume. The present conference seems to have been one of the

best held so far. The papers, at any rate, are of great value, and are from men who are experts in their own region. The general subject was 'The Scientific Approach to Religion,' and Evolution was dealt with by Professor MACBRIDE, Biology by Dr. J. S. HALDANE, Astronomy by Professor Lloyd MORGAN, the History of Religion by Professor WEBB, Psychology by Dr. HADFIELD, and so on over the whole field.

The president was Dr. INGE, and some of his words in the opening address have been widely quoted: 'The conflict of Science and Religion is still a long way from being reconciled. It is an open sore which poisons the spiritual life of the civilized world. It is difficult for a man to accept orthodox Christianity as the Churches present it to him without treachery to his scientific conscience. The injury thus inflicted upon religion can hardly be measured. Intellectual honesty is, to a large extent, strained out of the Church, and public opinion within it does not reflect either the best knowledge or the most candid temper of the community. Our Society exists to deal with this lamentable state of things.'

It is not difficult to see why Dr. INGE is called 'the gloomy Dean.' We need not accept the extreme optimism on this subject of the late Professor Drummond, though we regard the Dean's deliverance as somewhat extreme in its pessimism. Professor Drummond asserted that the assumed conflict between science and Christianity did not exist. And there seems to be more ground for his opinion than for the gloomy judgment of the president.

There are two things we may urge in defence of this opinion. One is that the spiritual interpretation of the universe has been spreading over every field of thought until it may be asserted confidently that to-day materialism as a creed is exploded. In philosophy, literature, and even science the spiritual hypothesis has gained more and more acceptance. The other thing to be said is that what conflict does exist is not between science and religion but between science and certain religious interpretations.

A very good instance of this is to be found in the very first paper in this volume, by Professor MACBRIDE, on 'Evolution a Vital Phenomenon.' Dr. MACBRIDE devotes most of his able paper to the task of proving the evolutionary hypothesis. But he begins with some assertions which are at least susceptible of wider inferences than he may have meant to draw.

The doctrine of evolution seems to him to necessitate an entire re-casting of the foundations. And then he proceeds to give a sketch of the orthodox doctrine which the 'sober and religious Englishman believed . . . about the middle of the nineteenth century.' It is a picture of traditional and conventional orthodoxy of an extreme kind, which Professor MACBRIDE asserts was 'unequivocally enunciated by Paul.'

It is difficult to deal with a picture in which things not in the least essential to Christianity are mixed up with things that are. Dr. MACBRIDE is, however, dealt with faithfully, if gently, by the editor of the volume who, in his introduction, puts the matter in a helpful perspective. He admits quite a number of things which science has 'disposed of.'

Among these is the historicity of the Fall story, the guilt of original sin, a state of 'original righteousness,' death as a result of sin, and the pangs of childbirth as a result of the sin of Eve. The editor (Dr. MAJOR) also admits that a certain amount of what we find in Paul was of his own age, and that Paul, if he were alive to-day, would likely jettison his Jewish mythology and eschatology.

But Dr. MAJOR points out how little of the essence of religion all this touches. Science does not touch either the reality of sin, or the fact of 'original' sin, or the sense of responsibility, or the fact of a Divine election, or indeed anything

that can be regarded as essential to a spiritual view of the universe. There are serious facts in the world and things difficult to be explained. But we question if anything in this volume by its scientific writers affords an adequate ground for the pessimistic outlook of the distinguished president.

Two months ago we selected a sermon by Miss Maude ROYDEN for special attention. It dealt with the question of Women and the Ministry of the Churches. Now Miss ROYDEN has published a book, in 'The Living Church' series (edited by Dr. McFadyen), which deals with the whole subject of women and the Church. The title is *The Church and Woman* (James Clarke; 6s. net). However the matter may be settled eventually, every individual member of the Church must think it out and come to some conclusion on it, and we venture to say that no conclusion should be come to without careful consideration of Miss ROYDEN'S presentation of the facts and of her arguments.

In a chapter on 'The Influence of Tabu,' Miss ROYDEN says that she was once asked to conduct the Three Hours' Service at St. Botolph's, in Bishopsgate, and the Bishop of London objected to her doing so on the ground that, although this was not a statutory service, 'it was a peculiarly sacred one.' Then Miss ROYDEN adds further: 'Because the chancel and sanctuary are commonly regarded as more sacred than the nave there are churches in which they are debarred to women. A woman may not act as server at the Holy Communion, because this would involve her entering the sanctuary and approaching the altar. In Roman Catholic churches women are not allowed to wash the communion linen. In nearly all Anglican churches they are forbidden to sing in the choir.'

What is the objection? Miss ROYDEN says that the Church has admitted that women are capable of doing these things, but debars them from doing them 'in consecrated places.' The logical argument would then appear to be that the presence of woman has a desecrating effect. It is, Miss ROYDEN says, an insult to womanhood, and it implies 'a base and immoral conception of sacramental religion.'

What is it based on? Largely on St. Paul's teaching. In 1 Corinthians, St. Paul lays down two injunctions which are not easy of reconciliation. The first, in the fourteenth chapter, is that women are to 'keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak'; and in the eleventh chapter, that when they 'pray or prophesy' they should cover their heads. Here Miss ROYDEN accepts Miss Alice Gardner's view that St. Paul's meaning might perhaps be interpreted as 'do not let women speak unless they have really got something to say, and in that case let them clothe and behave themselves with a view to ordinarily accepted decency.' Another pair of conflicting statements might also be put side by side, both from the eleventh chapter, 'In Christ there is neither male nor female,' and again, 'The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.' Miss ROYDEN believes that these two statements are irreconcilable, and that the latter represents St. Paul's real position. He excludes women, 'not on the ground of manners and customs or of expediency, but on the ground of fundamental spiritual inferiority.'

But to-day the spiritual inferiority of women is not given as the reason for excluding them from spiritual office. St. Paul's position, Miss ROYDEN holds, has been abandoned, and she quotes from the Lambeth Conference Report (1920): 'Difference of function between man and woman in the Church, as in the world . . . in no way implies an inferiority of women in regard to man.' But if it is granted that women are different from men and have different functions, does this necessarily mean that men are included and women excluded from the ministry? Have women not also got the vocation of the prophet and the vocation of the priest?

Miss ROYDEN defines the vocation of the prophet

as 'the possession of a message from God.' It is a message to the great mass of mankind, and so may be distinguished from the vocation of the priest. The latter conveys a message from God to the individual. 'Christ was supremely Prophet and Priest in that He had a supreme message to all mankind, and also a divine tenderness, compassion, hunger and thirst for every individual soul.' If God gives this vocation of prophet and priest to women, it is the Church's duty to authorize them to exercise it.

The whole case against the prophetic office for women 'was abandoned,' Miss ROYDEN says, 'when the Church decided that women might go forth as missionaries.' And again, 'If the vocation to the priesthood be that universal and Christlike love of souls which for ever sends the lover forth to seek and to save that which was lost, to guide, strengthen, and save those who are already in the fold—can it be seriously contended that no woman is capable of such a love and such a calling? Was not the mother of the Salvation Army, Mrs. Booth, such a priest-like soul?' One test, then, is whether the Holy Spirit has blest the ministries of women.

'It is the teaching of Christ which must in a last resort guide all our actions.' Very carefully and exhaustively Miss ROYDEN examines Christ's teaching, and her answer to the question, 'Is there any justification either in the words or in the acts of Jesus Christ for the exclusion of women from any spiritual office whatever?' is 'I maintain with conviction that there is none.'

But the action of the Church is not in accordance with the teaching of Jesus Christ, for by her action in excluding women from the ministry, 'she has emphasized and still emphasizes the belief that the personalities of women are of less value than those of men. Yet it is the glory of the Church to emphasize in every possible way the infinite value of personality.'

Professor FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D., has written a book that is both useful and interesting, both in a high degree. It is *Studies in the Life of the Early Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). The more one reads of Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON's own work, the more one marvels at his association with Dr. Kirsopp LAKE. There is nothing revolutionary in this book. You would never suspect the author of having a bomb concealed in his sleeve. It even gives the impression of a moderate orthodoxy. And certainly the book is a rewarding one.

In short chapters the writer depicts aspects of the life of the early Church, its discipline, its literature, its attitude to other religions, and to philosophies, its apologetics, its constitution, its worship, and much else. Every chapter is packed with information. And yet it does not seem overloaded. It certainly is not heavy. The style is delightfully simple and natural. In short, the book is one that could only be produced by one who is a master of his material and moves about in it easily, giving out by the way all kinds of fascinating information.

One of the best chapters is on 'The Church as a System of Belief.' The writer begins his account of the early Christian beliefs by dissipating the idea that Christianity was originally a simple religion full of amiability and benevolence, and lacking in definiteness. The very opposite was the case. Take these two books, both obviously from the same hand, Acts and the Third Gospel. In the Gospel the humanity of Jesus is depicted in a delightful fashion. But the preaching in Acts is quite different. If we had Acts alone we could never have imagined the Jesus of the Gospel. Acts shows that the earliest preaching of Jesus was of Him as Messiah, the Risen Lord. And so in the Church the Divine aspect of the Master preceded the human.

Incidentally this is a very powerful confirmation of the trustworthiness of the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels, and in particular of St. Luke's character as an historian. The representations of Jesus in Acts and the Third Gospel are so different and yet are from the same hand. And Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON makes a remark later on which adds to this argu-

ment. After tracing the development which ended in the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, he says: 'It is doubtful if the Synoptic portrait of Him could ever have been made, when this was fully realised'—'this' being the idea of Jesus as the Eternal Word.

This is an aside, however. The first emphasis in the Church, as indicated, was on the Divine side of Jesus. There was little interest in the human side. This is shown alike by Acts and the letters of Paul. In these letters Christ is presented in a threefold aspect. In Thessalonians He is the Coming Judge. In Galatians, Romans, and 2 Corinthians He is the Saviour of all who have faith in Him. In the late Epistles He is above all the Heavenly Powers, the First-born of all creation, by whom God made the worlds. By the end of the Apostolic Age in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus becomes the Word of God, who is God, and the only means by which God can be known. This is the basis of all subsequent Christian theology. The Fourth Gospel is the logical outcome of the first preaching about Jesus in the Acts.

The great difficulty in discussing the Divinity of Jesus is that to the Jew and the Gentile the word 'God' had different meanings. To the pagan 'God' was Divinity, as we use 'Man' for humanity. To the Jew, God was a Being of attributes and personality, and was essentially One. The question, 'Was Jesus regarded as God?' can be answered without difficulty in the affirmative. To the more important one, 'In what sense was He so regarded?' it is more difficult to reply.

It must be remembered that from the earliest days the Divinity of Christ was an all-important doctrine. Jesus Christ was the Son of God, the Saviour, and the Coming Judge of the World. But how was this to be reconciled with the unity of God? The answer was at least partly furnished by the Alexandrian Jews with their conception of the Divine Wisdom or Word. Christian piety identified this with the Master. God by His wisdom made the World. This wisdom is His Word (Logos). Ever since time was, the Word of God has been in operation. And so came the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, and the basis of Christology was laid on a firm foundation.

But of course there was the question of salvation. How was this wrought out? The question was not much discussed, *i.e.* the means of salvation. But salvation was sacramental. Baptism was the instrument of justification, and the flesh was redeemed in the Eucharist. At this point of Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON'S exposition one cannot help asking: What about St. Paul's emphasis on justification by faith alone? And one is more than a little surprised by a remark made in this context: 'It is remarkable how little interest was taken in many things which aroused furious controversy in later days, such as justification, grace, sanctification and the like; and even the writings of Paul failed to draw much attention to these topics before Augustine.'

One of the great interests of the early Church was the future world. All the questions that gather about Millenarianism absorbed it. As to definite problems, such as the fate of unbelieving souls after death, and the immortality of the soul, Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON is indefinite, as the early Church appears to have been. The chief defect of a most interesting discussion of the growth of early belief is the failure of the writer to indicate what place the Gospel narratives of the ministry of Jesus had in the content of faith. Granted the earliest preaching was of the Risen Lord, what influence did the accounts of the earthly ministry exercise? The author says nothing about that.

'If the trees looked like lodging-house furniture, and the birds, transformed into cheap wedding-presents, sounded like klaxons and railway whistles; if the flowers looked like grinning skeletons and smelt like dead rats; if the oxen slid about the fields like tram-cars and lowed like the beating of cans, and the meadows were like the shops in mean

streets, and the hills like dust-heaps among back-to-back houses. . . . No! we cannot imagine it. We can only say that such a world would be like the worst sort of nightmare, and that we should all quickly go mad.' These words occur in a striking dissertation on *Art and Religion*, by the Rev. Percy DEARMER, D.D. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net).

The writer finds that a disastrous confusion has arisen between Art and Life. During the general concentration upon science and commerce in the last century, there was a widespread tendency to forget the place of art in human life. At the same time in the religious world there was a fairly general idea that ethics was the only matter that need concern a religious man. 'Art had come to be regarded as a frivolous and rather naughty damsel, to be avoided by serious people.' The position, then, to-day is that art suffers from loss of contact with religion, and that religion suffers from loss of contact with art.

How is this disastrous confusion to be cleared away? It can only be by realizing that the spiritual life depends upon the three Ultimate Values—Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. 'The artist has to understand that beauty is not the only spiritual value. The religious man has to understand that goodness is not the only spiritual value. And the scientist has to understand that there are two other spiritual values besides truth.' These three Ultimate Values are co-ordinate, each one absolute in its own sphere, yet forming together a harmonious unity. Beauty *exists*; it is as real as goodness or truth. Art is man's answer to that beauty, and his worship of it. 'No doubt goodness comes first, and last. It is the supreme value of life, the final test of a man's soul. But truth cannot be disentangled from it; and beauty is the air in which truth and righteousness live, and which they help to create, as the air helps to make the grass and the trees. Without it the other two sicken and fade; and with its complete loss they would die, because reason itself would be overthrown.'

In the full recognition of the three Ultimate Values, and the due exercise of the spiritual activities which are man's response to them, will art, science, and religion maintain their independence, and find their essential harmony. 'Let us say to the artist, "If you are indifferent to the moral activity your art will suffer; because your art expresses your whole self, and your whole self needs to be worth expressing." And to the scientist, "Your difficult and engrossing work may dull your God-given æsthetic faculty; but remember that beauty *is*, even if you may have perhaps little eye or ear for it; do not spoil your science by a bad philosophy." And to the moralist—to the religious world which is still in the main only interested in morals, "The perfection of man is to understand all the spiritual activities, and to practise those which lie within his power." For unless a man's heart is thus purified, he will not have a true conception of God; and if he has not a true conception of God, to the extent of his untruth he will be worshipping a false god.'

Telescoped History.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D., UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

NOTHING can be plainer than that the Biblical, or at any rate the Old Testament, conception of historiography was very different from our own. Whether we consider the content or the form of the historical narratives, this is abundantly plain. Their very brevity is eloquent of a deep-seated difference of purpose. Contrast, for example, the Books of Kings with any ancient or modern history. The whole story of the Kings, which traverses about four hundred years, could be read, though doubtless not very carefully, in about six hours. Compare with this the elaborate treatment given