
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.

In his new translation of *The Old Testament*, the first volume of which has just appeared (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), Dr. Moffatt has essayed a truly stupendous task. Twice at least it has been already attempted in our generation—by Ferrar Fenton, in his racy and often highly suggestive 'Complete Bible in Modern English,' and by Professor C. F. Kent, of Yale, with an imposing array of critical scholarship, in his 'Student's Old Testament, Logically and Chronologically Arranged and Translated.' There was certainly room for another translation, embodying the modern quality of the one with the critical scholarship of the other.

Dr. Moffatt's translation is not, of course, designed to enter into competition with the Authorised Version. There is no probability that any subsequent translation will ever equal, far less surpass, the beauty and the majesty of that incomparable Version. The new translation is supplementary to it, rather than a substitute for it. It aims at truth rather than beauty, at accuracy rather than dignity and charm.

It would be alike impossible and undesirable to attempt to embody in a translation offered to 'the unlearned' the literary results reached by the critical analysis of the historical books. Impossible, because the results are too complex and would necessitate vastly too much rearrangement of verses, passages, and chapters: and undesirable, because those results are being subjected to perpetual revision, and are not, and may never be, in detail absolutely secure.

But by certain simple typographical devices Dr. Moffatt has at important points in the story let his readers into the secrets of the documentary analysis, and this, at these points, is a real gain. He has revealed the sources, *e.g.*, in the story of Jacob at Bethel (Gn 28), of Abimelech (Jg 9), of David and Goliath (1 S 17), and of the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram (Nu 16) which he has separated from the rebellion of Korah. He has also effected a few transpositions, rightly joining 2 S 24 to 2 S 21. This liberty of transposition might have been taken with even better right in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, where the traditional order does not yield a very intelligible sequence of events.

The English of the translation is undoubtedly modern. 'Kindred' becomes 'relatives,' 'covenant' becomes 'compact,' 'murmuring' becomes 'grumbling,' 'repented' becomes 'changed his mind,' 'the tabernacle of the congregation' (A.V.) or 'the tent of meeting' (R.V.) becomes 'the Trysting tent,' 'the day of atonement' becomes 'Expiation day,' 'elders' becomes 'sheikhs,' 'Cushi' (A.V.) or 'the Cushite' (R.V.) becomes

'the negro,' 'the book of Jashar' becomes 'the Book of Heroes,' 'grove' (A.V.) or 'Asherah' (R.V.) becomes 'sacred pole,' and 'the fourth part of a silver shekel,' which Saul's servant proposes to give as remuneration to Samuel (1 S 9^{8}), becomes 'ninepence.' Once, the attempt to be just to the implications of the original has—perhaps inevitably—tended to obscure an important point, namely, in 1 S 10^{11}, where 'Saul among the prophets' becomes 'Saul among the dervishes.' This word excellently brings out the ecstatic quality of this particular 'prophetic' type, but it obscures the connexion, which is quite real in more respects than one, between these men and the literary 'prophets.' The truth is that either translation is more or less misleading and inadequate: here, as in numberless other cases, where there is no exact equivalent, the translator's task is inconceivably hard.

The translation is often strikingly idiomatic, how idiomatic will be appreciated only by one who would attempt to turn it back into Hebrew. As, *e.g.*, where Jacob says, 'Joseph must have been torn to pieces' (Gn 37^{33}), or where Saul says to the witch, 'What is he like?'—a happy transformation of 'What form is he of?' (1 S 28^{14}). Good, too, is the rendering of Tamar's words to Ammon, 'Do not be so profligate' (2 S 13^{12}): at any rate 'profligate' brings out well the moral connotation that lies in the Hebrew 'folly.' Again, 'one afternoon David got up from his siesta and took a walk on the roof of the royal palace.' This is vivid and modern. Sometimes the translation, while free, skilfully preserves the spirit of the original: as when the aged Barzillai, who says in A.V., 'Can I discern between good and evil?' (R.V. 'bad'), is made to say, 'Have I a taste for pleasures?' (2 S 19^{35}). Or take Elijah's words on Carmel, 'How long will you hobble on this faith and that?' (1 K 18^{21}).

It is difficult to maintain this modern quality in translating from a book where every two sentences out of three are connected with 'and.' But Dr. MOFFATT has frequently succeeded in doing this too. His version of the story of the Gibeonite ruse in Jos 9 reads very naturally, so does the story of Naaman in 2 K 5, and of the two harlots in 1 K $3^{16ff.}$.

One of the merits of the translation is that it brings out much more clearly than even R.V. the snatches of poetry which are incorporated in the prose narrative. Israel's defiant words to Rehoboam are printed as verse (1 K 12^{16}), as is also the mockery hurled at Samson by the Philistines (Jg 16^{24}):

> Our God has now put
> the foe in our hands,
> who wasted our lands
> and slew us in bands.

This adequately represents the rather elementary poetry of the Philistine song. If it does not sound particularly musical, it has to be remembered that it is Dr. MOFFATT'S anxious fidelity to the original that leads him to translate thus: the rhymed lines are an attempt to suggest the fivefold repetition of the first person plural pronominal ending which is the nearest approach Old Testament Hebrew makes to rhyme, a phenomenon of comparatively rare occurrence. Doubtless this is also the reason for his rendering of the words uttered when the ark was set in motion:

> Up, O Eternal,
> for the scattering of thy foes,
> for the routing of those who thee oppose!
> (Nu 10^{35}).

But it may well be doubted whether this scrupulous fidelity is not, in cases like the latter, a mistake. The scholar does not need these reminders, and the 'unlearned' reader is not much edified by them: the jingle produces a rather unhappy—or amusing, as the case may be—impression on his mind. But if this be a vice, it is at any rate the vice of a virtue.

Often the lilt and the language of the poetical

translations are equally good, as in Jacob's blessing of Judah (Gn $49^{11f.}$).

> He tethers his foal to a vine,
> his colt to a rare red vine;
> he washes his clothes in wine,
> his robes in the juice of the grape!
> His eyes are heavy with wine,
> his teeth are white with milk.

But on the whole the legal parts of the narrative are more impressive than the historical or the poetry. The laws, *e.g.*, in the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20^{22}–23^{33}) come home to the reader with a freshness and interest which they do not quite have in A.V., and the Nazirite law in Nu 6 reads very naturally.

There are numerous silent corrections of the text, resting either on the ancient versions or on modern conjecture, which only the scholar will detect and fully appreciate. As illustrations we may take 2 S 21^{1}, 'the guilt of blood lies on Saul and his house'; or 2 K 23^{7}, 'the women wove tunics for Astarte'; or 1 K $8^{12f.}$, where a line is rightly added from the Septuagint at the beginning of the little four-line poem which prefaces Solomon's prayer:

> The sun has the Eternal set in heaven,
> but chosen himself to dwell in darkness;
> so I have built this mansion great for thee,
> for thee to dwell in, to eternity.

Every translator of the Bible into English has to face the difficult question raised by the second person singular pronoun of the original. Is he to say 'thou' or 'you'? A modern translator is naturally tempted to say 'you,' and this is Dr. MOFFATT'S practice: but, while this undoubtedly preserves the colloquial flavour, it somehow seems instantly to lower the literary dignity of a passage. On this point, however, even modern translators may agree to differ: much will depend on the value they place on such dignity. But this problem is raised in a special form in the case of words addressed to or by the Deity. Dr. MOFFATT'S practice is to make the Deity use 'you' in addressing men, but to make men use 'thou' in addressing the Deity. This practice, however, does not seem to be quite uniformly carried out. Cain, for example, says to 'the Eternal,' 'You are expelling me from the country' (Gn 4^{14}): and Moses, who in Ex 4^{10} says, 'thou hast spoken to thy servant,' says three verses later, 'send whom you will.'

The most conspicuous single feature of the translation is the rendering of *Jhwh* by 'the Eternal.' Dr. MOFFATT knows, of course, as well as any man living all that can be said against this rendering, but he has reluctantly and 'almost at the last moment,' decided to adopt it. This decision will be regretted by many. *Jhwh* is as truly a proper name, the name of the God of the Hebrews, as Kemosh is a proper name, the name of the god of the Moabites. 'The Eternal' would be possible in the psalter, but it is surely misleading in the historical books, in the earlier ones especially.

Not only does this rendering obscure the progressive character of Old Testament revelation, but it obliterates the point of many a passage. Conduct which would be tolerable in a primitive *Jhwh*, would be intolerable in 'the Eternal.' It was surely not 'the Eternal' who wanted to kill Moses in the 'khan' (Ex 4^{24}), or whose anger 'blazed out against Uzza' (2 S 6^{7}). The utter inadequacy of this rendering is most convincingly seen in the great Carmel scene. 'If the Eternal is God, follow him; if Baal, then follow him.' The climax of the struggle between the two national religions and national gods is simply ruined, if we translate 'the Eternal is God, the Eternal is God.'

'The Eternal' is misleading, 'the LORD' still more so (at any rate in the historical books), 'Jahweh' looks uncouth to unlearned eyes, and, apart from this, it is by no means the certainly original form of the name. But why not 'Jehovah'? This word, which has been consecrated by several centuries of religious usage, was freely used by so great a Semitic scholar as Robertson Smith.

Doubtless it is, as Dr. MOFFATT says, an 'erroneous form.' But so is Isaac. The correct form is Yiçḥaḳ, or, as a tolerable substitute, we might accept Yitshak; but we are all quite content with Isaac, erroneous as it is, and we may, for practical and popular purposes, be equally content with Jehovah.

One final point. In rendering so noble a literature as the Old Testament into modern speech, is it enough to be 'exact and idiomatic'? Is there not an obligation to preserve, so far as may be, the beauty of the original, or at any rate to avoid colloquialisms which mar its dignity? Doubtless the beauty has sometimes been caught, but not always. Apart from awkward expressions like 'the Eternal's ark,' 'the Eternal's lightning,' and the curious use of the word 'popular' in 'Joseph was popular with him' (Gn 39^{4})—one's sense of literary propriety is apt to be offended by phrases like 'the divine stick' (Ex 17^{9}), 'the time is up' (Gn 29^{21}), 'be off' (1 S 20^{22}), 'Is young Absalom all right?' (2 S 18^{29}). In Judah's words to Joseph, 'his father would die if he lost him' (Gn 44^{22}), the magic and the simple pathos of the original words are dissipated. It is supremely difficult, but it should not be quite impossible, to combine truth with beauty.

The translation is a striking monument to the industry, ability, and versatility of its scholarly author.

In spite of the past history of Christianity we had almost begun to think it had no great surprises in store for us. Is it possible that, by insisting on reading the mind of Jesus in the light of our thinking rather than reversing the process, we have missed the way of Jesus just where His way diverges from other ways? That, or something like that, was the thesis of Henry T. HODGKIN in 'The Christian Revolution.'

Force, he tells us in effect, has no place in the moral life; and he is prepared to apply this teaching all round; not only in international relations, but to the problems of home and school, of industrial and social life. Whether we agree with him or not, we cannot help feeling that the 'Quakers' have something that the rest of us have somehow missed.

The latest study of the whole subject has been made by Dr. C. J. CADOUX in *The Message about the Cross* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). The subtitle of the book is 'A Fresh Study of the Doctrine of the Atonement.' Somehow we had always thought of the doctrine of the Atonement as a battleground for theologians, on its practical side a source of comfort and inspiration to the individual Christian. That the way to the solution of the difficult problems that confront men and nations at every turn might lie through a fresh study of the doctrine of the Atonement will be to many a new idea.

'On account of Him' (Jesus) 'there have come to be many Christs in the world (namely, those) who, like Him, have loved righteousness and hated iniquity.' That is not a quotation from a twentieth-century Liberal theologian; it was written by Origen (*contra* Celsum) in the middle of the third century. We have been accustomed to think of the Crucifixion as a unique experience, in which Jesus suffered and achieved for the human race something that can never be repeated. Yet we find Jesus inviting His disciples to take up their cross, and assuring them that they will drink the same cup that He drinks, and receive the same baptism that He receives.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, strictly interpreted, seems to imply that, until Jesus came, the forgiveness of sins was not only unknown but impossible. Dante and Thomas à Kempis seem to accept this view, but probably few in our day would follow them in this rejection of some of the most beautiful records of religious experience in the Old Testament. Many, too, would demur to the statement

that what the Death of Jesus secures for us is a remission of the penalty of sin. On the contrary, the forgiven man 'moves over to God's point of view,' and accepts, though in a new spirit, the consequences of his transgressions. According to Dr. CADOUX, that from which Jesus ransoms us is not the punishment of past misdeeds, but the commission of future misdeeds. It breaks in us the power of sinful habit in the present.

Is the Death of Christ, then, not a propitiation for our sins? Not if by that we mean that God is a 'capricious and irascible' being, whose 'wrath' can be bought off by the 'shedding of blood.' If we ask, then, Did Jesus die as a mere martyr? the answer is that there is no such thing as a mere martyr. The death of Jesus is the supreme example of the way in which God identifies Himself with the sufferings of His children. Forgiveness is secured only at awful cost to God; and here we come on a mystery which it may be the human mind will never fathom. It was in the vain attempt to sound its depths that the New Testament writers used as their measuring chain the categories of animal sacrifice, which have at times so perverted the New Testament conception of God.

Yet we need not make the mystery more mysterious than it is. Jesus believed that He went to His death 'according to the Scriptures'; but surely the Hebrew Scriptures, on the deepest subject of which they speak, are both intelligible and moral. The death of Jesus must be in accordance with a principle which every disciple of Jesus is called on to follow. Jesus, believing Himself to be divinely commissioned, and faced with the uncompromising hostility of the Jewish leaders, decided to accept martyrdom. In doing so, He deliberately rejected two other alternatives: withdrawal from the struggle, and an appeal to force.

This decision was in accordance with the new principle to which He had introduced men. We call it a new principle advisedly. In the course of a comparison and contrast between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Rabbis, Mr. C. G. Montefiore says: 'Certainly, the active attempt to redeem the sinner by service, sympathy, and love was a new thing.' Dr. CADOUX continues to call this principle 'non-resistance.' Surely this negative and jejune word is a very feeble term to express the positive, courageous, ambitious way of dealing with hostility, that Jesus taught and practised.

According to the Synoptic tradition, even before the beginning of His ministry, in rejecting the temptation to win the mastery of the world by disloyalty to God, Jesus definitely set aside the suggestion of the use of force to further His mission; a temptation far subtler and more plausible than one might suppose who had never thought out the situation. May it be, too, that there is more than we have sometimes allowed in the idea that some of the beatitudes are to be interpreted in a pacifist sense; that they have a negative as well as a positive reference and oppose all thought of armed resistance to Rome?

When Jesus said, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' He was not disclaiming a desire for empire in the hearts of men: He was only abjuring the world's conception of empire, and the use of the weapons by which worldly men seek it. This He did consistently. 'Jesus refuses to be made a king by the Galileans, warns His disciples against wanting to wield a coercive authority like that of the Gentiles, declines either to sanction or to take part in the legal punishment of an adulteress, and makes no attempt to avenge the shameful murder of the Baptist or the slaughter of those Galileans whose blood Pilate had cruelly mingled with their sacrifices.'

The thesis of Dr. CADOUX is that on this subject Jesus meant His teaching to be taken seriously. Would not many of us confess that for the first time we are beginning to ask ourselves seriously, 'May it not be so?' The question at issue is the old, old question: Can Satan cast out Satan?

Can injury and wrong be ended by injury and wrong? We are all prepared to be 'non-resisters' in the same way as we believe in God, 'to a certain extent.' We adopt pacifist measures as long as they seem safe and likely to succeed. If in any given case they seem likely to fail, we have always the world's weapons to fall back on.

But when we speak of 'failing,' are we not begging the question? Did Jesus fail, or James, or Paul? 'There is no escape from the fact that the Cross whereby we are saved owed its existence to the uncompromising pacifism of Him who died upon it, and that the seed which caused the Church of God to grow was the blood of pacifist martyrs.' Will any one who knows anything of history or of life to-day suggest that 'force' always succeeds?

Even if, with a fuller knowledge of the facts than we can ever have, we could say that the Sermon on the Mount sometimes fails, we have to set against that the astonishing story of its successes. The 'muscular Christian' type of padre who wins the respect of the 'Wild West' village by knocking down its leading 'tough,' however effective he may be on a 'movie' screen, in real life (assuming that he exists) proves nothing but that in savage society the virtues of the savage win admiration. Does not the appeal of Salvation Army officers in a city 'slum' lie partly in their voluntary lack of means of self-defence? Is it not generally recognized that the foreign missionary, in so far as he has behind him the strong arm of his own Government, finds his influence to that extent diminished?

Dr. CADOUX is no doctrinaire. He recognizes that in the defence of others there may possibly be a place for coercion, even for violence, employed with lofty motives. Yet speaking generally there is, he claims, no room in the Christian life for what he calls 'injurious' methods of defence, those that 'begin with blows and end in manslaughter.' If this conviction lands us sometimes in agonizing moral dilemmas, with the New Testament in our hands, we cannot say that that proves our conviction is wrong. In short, the preaching of the Cross does not only mean expounding the doctrine of the Atonement; it implies the proclamation of the Cross as the way of life for all men, and the preaching will be in vain except in so far as the preacher accepts the Cross as the way of life for himself.

Out of the ferment of thought and the welter of discussion that have followed the War, one fact has been steadily emerging into clearness, namely, that the world-problem is at heart spiritual. We want, in the words of the late Lord Bryce, 'a world of new and better men.' Questions, therefore, dealing with the cultivation of man's spiritual nature must to-day be paramount. Accordingly we welcome, as most timely, a remarkable series of lectures delivered in Bristol Cathedral, edited by the Very Rev. E. A. BURROUGHS, D.D., and now published under the title of *Education and Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net).

The book 'aspires to do some pioneer work among the public, and is not for educational experts,' but even experts will find here much food for thought. Three groups are specially aimed at—'first and foremost, teachers of all sorts, including parents; secondly, clergy and ministers of religion; thirdly, but not least, politicians of all parties.' Politicians not least, for 'if we really mean to check our present drift towards social ruin, we must before long re-open, if possible on a non-party level, the problem of national religious education, and embody the results of war-time and post-war experience in legislation that will meet our need.'

A wide range of topics is handled in the book, but nothing is more arresting than Dean BURROUGHS' powerful argument for religious education. 'If you teach men to think, and so commit them to thinking about life and death and destiny, you *must* supply them with the needed material to build, each for himself, a real religion. I submit

that the right kind of teaching of religion may be the best way of teaching the average man to think. . . . If there is anything in this argument, then the suppression or hampering of religious teaching becomes a crime against the very soul of education; and on purely educational grounds there is every ground for giving it rather pride of place.' Hence the suggestion that the time has come to re-open definitely the great issue of national religious education, in a new atmosphere, in a different spirit, and on what might be called a different plane.

The question of religious education raises the question of the teacher, and this must be faced. 'We compel no man to believe the accepted principles of geometry, but he who rejects them cannot well teach mathematics. So neither can he who rejects Christ's scale of values be a teacher of the science of life. In other words, if we really mean that civilization shall go forward, we cannot leave the religion of the teacher, in any kind of school, to chance.' On the other hand, the day is clearly past for tests of a dogmatic nature. It is the man's personality, not his formal creed, that matters: his personality as the outcome of his view of life. 'This does involve taking every possible precaution that the teacher's personality shall be such as we need, and encouraging the right sort of development in him—a development marked by character on the one hand and inspiration on the other. . . . Therefore the first need of our threatened civilization is what it should be the first objective of true statesmanship to supply: a system of education grounded in, permeated with, essential religion, and, above all, teachers who can "speak to the heart" of those they teach because "it is not they that speak, but the Spirit of their Father that speaketh in them."'

Some time ago a book was published with the title 'Immortality' which contained a number of essays investigating the evidence for a future existence. Many eminent men contributed to it, and it was recognized as a valuable piece of religious apologetic. The editor was Sir James MARCHANT, and he has now followed up his previous success by editing a companion volume, with the succinct title *Survival* (Putnams; 7s. 6d. net). The essayists in this second volume are of a different colour from the previous writers. Sir Oliver Lodge, Lady Grey of Fallodon, Sir A. Conan Doyle, Mr. J. Arthur Hill, Professor Richet of Paris, and Sir Edward Marshall-Hall are (with others) a distinguished team.

The very names of these writers will at once reveal their standpoint. It can be easily understood, however, how fascinating a book this is to which such men contribute of their best. One of the most interesting essays is the first, by Sir Oliver Lodge, on 'The Rationality of Survival in Terms of Physical Science.' It begins with a brilliant exposition of the recent achievements of science and of the process by which the material elements in Nature have been refined away into forms of electricity. Then Sir Oliver proceeds to denounce the materialism which, obsessed with physical causes and effects, can see nothing else.

Where, he asks, shall we find the essence of life and mind? Not by groping among the material relics of discarded carcases; that is only a part of the whole economy. If we want to find the permanent essence we must commune with other minds. We must not *assume* that mind can be found only in association with matter; that is just what has to be ascertained. But it may be asked, how can we, with our limited material senses as our channels of information, be open to impressions save those that come through those senses?

The answer is that our sense-organs may not be our only mode of recipience. Inspiration, *e.g.*, such as poets and saints have experienced, apart from the organ of sense, may be a reality. And experimental telepathy seems to show that mind

can communicate with mind apart from material concomitants. It is urged again, however, that, while all this may be true, the difficulty remains as to the method by which ideas or messages can be made known to uninspired people and ordinary people. A material organism must be utilized.

Granted, says Sir Oliver. A material instrument is not needed by discarnate spirits in their discarnate life. It is only needed for purposes of communication. And such an instrument is available in the mechanism possessed by all of us. The only question is, Can it be borrowed? Can its possessor allow another intelligence to use it? The possibility of this is suggested by the phenomena of sleep and trance, and by those of multiple and dislocated personality. This is true as to the possibility. And as a matter of fact certain people do have the power of vacating portions of the organism, and certain of the discarnate do make use of them.

Here comes the question of volume and cogency of evidence. And the facts are no more incredible than the facts recently discovered about the atom and the ether. 'Long study of psychical facts has convinced me—not doubtfully or apologetically or tentatively, but with the most profound and deep-seated conviction—that memory does not reside in the brain . . . that character and affection are not attributes of the body, but are phenomena of the mind or soul. The complete man is not body alone, or soul alone, but both. The soul dominates and has constructed the body, as a physical representation of its own appearance and properties and powers, to serve as a temporary instrument on this planet; and it is equally able to construct another instrument—probably has already done so before the one built of atoms has worn out.'

With that more permanent instrument, the essence of personality, in its full sense, survives and operates, in its new sphere, quite independently of its discarded physiological machinery. The remarkable thing is that it still retains the power of, with difficulty, making use of similar machinery belonging to another individual, when that is made available; and thereby we are supplied with a demonstration of continuous existence, as a fact of experience and not of unsupported theory.

'This lump of matter on which we and others live, is very beautiful and interesting and astonishing, but it is not the whole. Away and beyond our finite slight conception of reality lies the realm of the infinite. Humanity is as yet but little risen above the animals, and what it has already accomplished is but a trifle to the splendour that lies before it in the infinite future.'

The publication of a new life of Christ is always something of an event. It seems safe to say that a deserved popularity awaits *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*, by Professor E. I. Bosworth, of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), a book which we have read with very great pleasure.

What is it that men of our generation expect from our Christian teachers in the study of the life, mission, and teaching of Jesus? In the first place, we expect from them a recognition of the supreme importance of the study of all that we can learn of Jesus. It is still possible to hear sermon after sermon preached by Christian ministers who seem to be unaware of the existence of the four Gospels. There are still multitudes in our churches who never seem to have been taught that the Christian religion is the religion of Jesus. Moreover, the attempt to resolve Christianity into a few ideals, such as the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, while it may give us some kind of a religion, will never give us a religion in the line of historical Christianity. Professor Bosworth quotes Bousset: 'In no other religion has a personality ever won a significance in any way approaching that of Christ in the Christian religion.'

The author leads us with a masterly ease through the discussion of the perplexing questions—how far Jesus adopted apocalyptic views, and to what extent His ethical teaching was meant only for the days of 'the present distress.' The fact that, in common with many other scholars, he finds extreme views on the subject no longer tenable is a warning against puzzling the 'plain man' in the pew with premature discussion of fancied discoveries of theologians. But when a position of more or less stable equilibrium has been reached with regard to any new theory (as has happened in this case), might not at least the intelligent young people in the minister's Bible-class be introduced with advantage to the changed point of view?

We do not any longer ask our teachers to prove to us that the four Gospels always all say the same thing. We know that they do not, and we ask for a 'synopsis' rather than a 'harmony' of the Gospels. To avoid the difficulty of complicated critical questions connected with the Fourth Gospel, Professor BOSWORTH bases his study chiefly on the first three Gospels. Even among them he shows how 'Matthew' was composed in, and in a measure influenced by, an atmosphere in which conservative Jewish Christians were alarmed at the radical views of the leaders of the Gentile Christians. They may cast out demons in Jesus' name, and prophesy in His name; they are doers of 'lawlessness' all the same. The man without the wedding garment was voluble enough during the controversy, but in the end he will be reduced to speechlessness.

Again, we expect of all our teachers absolute sincerity. Just as we expect our physicians nowadays to tell us in plain English what is wrong with us, and how they are treating us, so we look to our spiritual leaders to say what they think and to mean what they say. Teachers who 'hedge' through fear of hurting the feelings or the faith of those who look up to them, would often be surprised to find the relief and stimulus they can give by a little frank discussion.

The younger members of our churches, some of them, too, that one would hardly expect to trouble much about such matters, have very definite views on such a subject as the Virgin Birth. How does Professor BOSWORTH treat it? 'In certain circles this wonderful life seemed logically explained by the theory that Jesus, the source of it, had been born as the result of the direct and exclusive action of God upon his mother. Such a theory was not uncommon in the Greco-Roman world as an explanation of remarkable men, nor was it inconsistent with Jewish thought.' If this is somewhat non-committal in form, its meaning seems clear enough. One would have liked the author to elaborate the last clause. Dr. A. H. McNeile's testimony is that there are no Jewish parallels at all.

How far does the pulpit conception harmonize with the pew conception of the nature of the resurrection of Jesus? If there is a wide diversity between them, is it well that it should be so? Professor BOSWORTH recognizes that the New Testament accounts themselves do not always harmonize, the differences being perhaps attributable to the different views held of what was implied in resurrection. The message of the New Testament, however, is not so much that after death Jesus 'appeared' to certain of His followers, but that as a matter of incontrovertible and joyful experience a permanent connexion was established between Him and them. What the first Christian preachers were concerned to prove was 'the continuance of Jesus' power as a Messianic leader to work on human life for the establishment of the will of God.'

Further, we expect our teachers to show open-mindedness. This is usually understood to mean that their minds should be open to receive new truth. May we not include in it also a willingness to abide by unpopular old truth, if it seems to be established by sufficient evidence? In discussing the stilling of the storm, we are reminded that the forces of nature, by reason of their fixed laws, are 'extremely susceptible to the manipulation of

personal human wills'; and that it is 'not inconceivable that the mysterious will of God should under certain circumstances co-ordinate some of these forces in response to prayer.'

It is required of the Christian teacher that he should be as honest in dealing with the moral teaching of Jesus as in discussing critical questions. We look askance at an exponent of the Gospels who finds in the story of the Rich Ruler, and other similar stories, that Jesus had no antipathy to hoarded wealth. We have here a penetrating study of Jesus' attitude to this question. Yet the author realizes that our vast modern enterprises, in many departments of life, requiring as they do friendly co-operation of rich and poor and the throwing of all kinds of gifts into the common stock, were not in Jesus' purview; and that His teaching on wealth must be adjusted to modern conditions before it can be helpfully applied.

Very many Christians are still at the stage when they require to have it brought home to them that the gospel story is history, not a series of stained-glass window pictures; that Jesus, His friends, and His enemies were real people who did things and to whom things happened, and who were actuated by intelligible motives which it is within our province to inquire into. One way of making the story live is to give free rein to a vivid imagination. Professor BOSWORTH has chosen the more difficult but safer method of painting the background of the picture from a study of the history of the period.

He recognizes, however, that there is a place also for the exercise of reverent imagination; for example, in trying to penetrate the mystery of Judas. As this author sees him, he must have had in him seeds of good and a certain moral earnestness since Jesus chose him as one of the Twelve. But he never got beyond the imperial conception of the Messiah; and soon decided that as a Messiah Jesus was a failure. He antagonized the religious leaders, failed to organize His Galilean followers, refused a virtual offer of a crown, fled when He should have gone forward, and, in short, brought forward no proofs that the Kingdom, as Judas conceived it, was coming.

The last straw was the clear evidence that Jesus expected soon to die. 'In spite of his bold words he was nothing but a queer sentimentalist, fond of extravagant attention from women, ready to tend babies, full of weak foreboding in the face of danger, unequal to the administration of a great world empire.' Well, perhaps that explains it; who can say? As for what Judas betrayed, Professor BOSWORTH accepts the suggestion (made, was it not, by Professor Bacon in a magazine article?) that it was the acceptance by Jesus, at the hands of a woman, of the 'anointing' that designated Him as the Christ, the Messiah.

After all, the chief thing we expect in a Christian teacher, is that he should show some appreciation of Jesus, of what He has been, of what He is to be. Professor BOSWORTH looks on Jesus, like the author of 'to the Hebrews,' as the captain of the army of the men of faith. Before He could heal the sick they must expect to be cured; not as an end in itself, but to fit them to take their places in the healthy life of the New Age. In Jesus Himself the healing power of God so welled up that it overflowed and spread life all around.

As the will of God took possession of Him, in all circumstances His adjustment to it was perfect; He learnt obedience by the things He suffered. Especially after the Transfiguration the conviction was borne in on Him that He was to introduce an order of things in which 'all men would have the same experience with the will of God that he was having. A vision of humanity shaped itself in his mind in which no limit could be set to the achievements possible to a race of men working together, in the invincible goodwill of faith, with the unseen energy of God.'