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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

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

τὸν παῖδά μου· οὐ γὰρ Δαυεὶδ ὁ πατριάρχης ἀναστήσεται, ἀλλὰ τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός.

It will, I think, be conceded that the foregoing treatment of the first reported Apostolic sermon would supply a unity and a continuity to the discourse which it does not possess in the ordinary text. The principal objection to the amended text will come from those who do not like to think that the words of Ezekiel could be quoted with an unnatural sense given to the expression 'I will raise up,' but such an objection will not greatly impress those who know how readily the early Christians attached fresh *nuances* to ordinary terms: such a case as that of the Psalm might be taken as a parallel, where David says:

> "I [*i.e.* David] fell asleep and I slumbered; I was *raised up* because the Lord helped me."
> (Ps 3[5]); cf. Justin, *Dial.* 95.

This is one of the early proof-texts for the Resurrection. That we are on the right track appears from another consideration; from the new point of view, as we said above, we can shed light on the other Pentecostal discourses. For instance, the last verse of the third chapter of Acts has the conclusion of a Petrine discourse in the words, 'God has *raised up his servant*, and sent him to bless you, in turning away every one from his iniquities.' Here the received text has 'raised up his servant *Jesus*,' and no doubt this is the ultimate intention of the speaker, but the shorter text is more correct, which can carry either the meaning 'David' or 'Jesus' as object. The servant that is raised is, in the first instance, called David, as in Ezekiel's prophecy, but it is really Jesus, because David is Jesus and speaks for Jesus. Thus the παῖς in the first chapters of the Acts is David-Jesus. We can see the same equivalence in Ac $4^{25.\ 26}$ where the Lord speaks through His servant David in the second Psalm, and says, 'Wherefore did the heathen rage, etc.?' for of a truth it was against 'thy holy servant Jesus' that the rulers were gathered together.

It appears, then, that in an undue zeal for finding the Servant in Isaiah, we have missed him in Ezekiel and in the Psalms. The early Church was better instructed; in the first eucharistic prayers of the Church in apostolic times we have the expression of thanks for 'the holy vine of *David thy servant* . . . which thou hast made known to us through *Jesus thy Servant*.' Here, again our David-Jesus parallel is justified. The one is, according to St. Peter, 'dead and buried,' and is in the Creed with Jesus up to that point, but then 'his tomb is with us,' and that takes Him out of the Creed and into the Guide-book. The parallel has been exhausted. The observation of the antithesis between David and Jesus is essential to a right understanding of the first chapters of the Acts.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Was Moses Martyred?

Professor Ernst Sellin is one of the most accomplished, and, in some directions, decidedly the most stimulating of all the scholars working to-day upon the Old Testament; and a brief account of his recent discussion of the significance of Moses,[1] which reveals alike his minute command of the Old Testament text and his gift of ingenious combination, may be not unwelcome to readers who have found it difficult to keep track of recent German criticism.

He begins by remarking that the greatest problem of the religious history of Israel is, Who was Moses? It is not enough to say with Wellhausen that he inspired his fellows with the faith, 'Jahweh the God of Israel, Israel the people of Jahweh.' In 1906 Meyer had maintained the thesis that our knowledge of Moses rests on the tradition preserved by the Levitical priests of Kadesh, a tradition which ultimately influenced the great prophetic reform movement. But as a matter of fact, Sellin argues, from the tenth century onward these Levitical priests were regarded by the prophets

[1] Dr. Ernst Sellin, *Mose und seine Bedeutung für die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte* (Leipzig, Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung [Dr. Werner Scholl]; Mk. 4).

as their deadly enemies: in spite of occasional friendly contacts, real religious reform was inspired almost exclusively by the prophets. Gressmann in 1913 recovered a more adequate picture of Moses, as not only the priest of Kadesh, but as the leader of the Exodus and the founder of a religion which had a creative influence on faith and morals. But between the Moses who inspired the prophets and the Moses to whom, *e.g.*, the bull-worship of Dan is traced, there is a chasm, which suggests to the fertile mind of Sellin that there must have been an independent prophetic tradition about Moses, a tradition which supplements the traditions of the Pentateuch; and this he finds first clearly represented by Hosea, who speaks of Moses as a prophet, but who knows nothing of the Levitical priest of Kadesh. His thesis is that the religion of Moses was never that of the people as a whole, but only of an inner circle, and that it can still be traced from Deborah and Samuel on to Hosea, Deutero-Isaiah and ultimately Deutero-Zechariah. He believes that Moses died a martyr's death, and that towards the end of the Babylonian exile the hope emerged that he would rise again from the dead, lead his people again through the wilderness and declare to all the nations of the earth, as once to his own people, the revealed will of God. When this expectation collapsed (though it was never quite extinguished, cf. Mt 17^{1-13}) the memory of the great shepherd who had given his life for his religion was still alive, and in the third century B.C. the apocalyptist Dt.-Zech. associates the final salvation with the penitent return of the people to him whom once they had pierced. This, thinks Sellin, is the long-lost key which would unlock many an Old Testament problem.

It is indeed a strange thesis, carried through with all the writer's wonted intuition and ingenuity. He begins his discussion with Hosea. To that prophet Israel's historical career from her emergence upon the soil of Canaan was one unbroken apostasy, revealed alike in her idolatry and in her moral and political chaos, but at several points in that history that apostasy had been peculiarly appalling—at Gibeah, Mizpah, Bethel, Shechem. Most awful of all, however, had been the conduct of the people at Shittim, to which Sellin finds allusions in 5^{1} 9^{7-14} 12^{14}–13^{1}; it is in this section, and in contemplating the sin therein reflected, that the most dreadful curse in his book occurs—$9^{11f.\ 14}$. By transposing and emending 12^{14} (E.V. ^{15}) 13^{1} he secures the reading, 'Ephraim provoked him' (*i.e.* the prophet Moses mentioned in v.^{13}), 'Israel embittered him. So long as Ephraim spake my Torah, he was prince in Israel; but he paid the penalty on account of the Baal and was put to death. His blood will I leave upon thee, and his reproach will I recompense unto thee.' The explanation of the allusion that Moses was put to death on account of the Baal, Sellin finds in Nu 25, which consists of three unfinished or fragmentary stories (J, vv.$^{1f.\ 4}$, E, vv.$^{3.\ 5}$, and P, vv.$^{6-15}$) gathering round Israel's idolatrous Baal-worship at Shittim. The P section seems to Sellin to contain (and partly to conceal) an expansion of the hint suggested by the J section. In P a plague falls which sweeps away 24,000 people, but it is stayed by the priestly Phinehas who drives his spear through an obscure Israelitish chief and his guilty Midianite paramour. Is this probable, asks Sellin? He reconstructs the story thus. Moses had commanded the 'judges' or leaders to slay the apostates: they refused: then the priests turned their spears upon Moses himself and slew him. Very naturally all this is skilfully obliterated, or rather transformed, by the priestly narrator. Nevertheless, asks Sellin, 'Who but Moses had a Midianite wife? (Ex 2^{21}, Nu 12^{1}). Who but he had entreated Jahweh to slay him for the sin of his people? (Ex 32^{32}). And through the death of what other could so fearful a plague have been lifted, and the whole people redeemed? In confirmation of this is the singular fact that the grave of Moses remained unknown (Dt 34^{5}). This is all very ingenious: is it probable?

But Sellin's acute discussion of Hosea leads to other results scarcely less interesting. According to him, while Canaan is to be desolated, the wilderness into which Hosea represents Israel as being allowed is to be turned into Paradise: there, as in the days of old, she will again find God and salvation. There is no reference in 2^{16-25} to any return to Canaan: the vineyards are to be in the wilderness; there will be there no wild beast or Bedouin arrow, but the end will be as the beginning in the wilderness. That is the place to which Jahweh retires in 5^{15}, and that is the place to which, in the beautiful hymn $6^{1ff.}$ the people propose to go back: 'Come, let us return to Jahweh,' *i.e.* to the wilderness, for He is there. These prophecies of salvation are all genuine, all explicable on the basis of Israel's own traditions without summoning

the aid of Babylonian or Egyptian eschatology. When the dead people have rested for two days at the Mount of God, on the third they will rise again to life (cf. Ex $19^{11.\ 16}$). Thus Hosea's ideal has only a superficial resemblance to that of the Rechabites, for his God dispenses the gifts of the cultivated land, but He dispenses them in the wilderness.

But more. The Decalogue, which is presupposed in 4^2, goes back to Moses, and Hosea's aim was to revive its interpretation of the Divine will. This explains his polemic against idolatry and his demand for justice and kindness in social relations (6^3 12^6 (E.V.^{7})). The references to the 'prophets' in 6^5 $12^{10\ (11)}$ suggest that the stone tablets embodying the law were prepared by a college of priests, and this again points back to the story of Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and the seventy elders on the Mount of God (Ex $24^{1ff.\ 9ff.}$). The true tradition of Moses was preserved in small circles of prophetic spirits, but most of his essential teaching was abandoned by the representatives of the official religion, who also very naturally distorted the tradition of his death.

Sellin then pursues his way backward through the prophetical and the historical books, and finds in them subtle traces of the true Mosaic tradition. Amos, though he does not directly refer to Moses, is yet a true disciple of his in his anti-cultic emphasis upon morality as the true service of God: so Elijah, Nathan, and Samuel with his famous 'to obey is better than sacrifice'—an utterance which, of course, Sellin accepts as genuine. (At this point occurs one of those brilliant emendations which are scattered throughout the pages of Sellin. In 1 S 19^{19} he proposes to read נְבִיוֹת, Nebaioth, instead of נָיוֹת or נָיוֹת, Naioth; and he finds in Samuel's mysterious disappearance into the wilderness of Nebaioth, east of Moab and Edom—like Elijah's later disappearance—a reminiscence of the old wilderness tradition.) Between Samuel and Moses, Deborah is the figure who stands in the great succession: she instructs her people in the will of Jahweh and in Jg 2^{2-5} Sellin sees a possible allusion to her protest against the Bethel cult. Thus the old Mosaic tradition, with its demand for morality and its protest against the worship of other gods, runs through the history like a scarlet thread.

The memory of Moses was better preserved in the north than in the south, as Moses, according to Sellin, was an Ephraimite. But his spirit at any rate is reproduced in Isaiah (though he, unlike Hosea, sets his paradise not in the wilderness, but in Judah and especially Jerusalem): and Micah and Jeremiah expressly mention him, each in a great passage expressing the Divine demand in ways hostile to the cult (Mi 6^{6-8}, Jer $7^{21f.}$), while in Jer 15^1 Moses appears as intercessor.

To most readers, however, the chief interest of Dr. Sellin's book will centre round his discussion of the 'Servant of Jahweh' songs in Deutero-Isaiah. Here he maintains that the presence of Moses is pervasive—indeed, Moses is himself the Servant; and he goes through the songs to show how completely this key unlocks their secret. Dt.-Is., like Hosea, makes the wilderness a Paradise, though, following Isaiah, he regards Zion as the goal. 43^{22-28} admirably maintains the old Mosaic tradition which represented Jahweh as not demanding sacrifice or incense. The songs occur in contexts which deal with the return across the wilderness, and with the hope of deliverance from exile is associated the hope of the return of Moses. The Torah which he is to bring in 42^1 is not Deuteronomy, but the Decalogue with its insistence on the exclusive worship of Jahweh and its condemnation and intolerance of idolatry. The end-time will repeat the beginning, with the difference that then the Torah will be declared not, as formerly, to Israel, but to all the peoples of the earth. The Pentateuchal story allowed that Moses had been continually opposed by a murmuring and recalcitrant people: Dt.-Is. 49^{1-6} reflects very vividly his experience, crowded as it was with disillusion, opposition, and persecution. Moses was not a brilliant speaker, neither was the Servant (49^2 50^4). Many of the indignities heaped on Moses (50^6) are suppressed in the earlier tradition, but hinted at in Ex 17^4, Nu $12^{1.\ 11}$. The rebels in $50^{10f.}$ who find themselves in the end among the fiery flames are Korah and his band: these verses are continuous with the preceding poem 50^{4-9}. The climax of the discussion lies, of course, in 52^{13}–53, which describe so vividly the sorrows and sufferings of Moses, smitten as he was by an Egyptian disease (elephantiasis?) and put to death without a trial, but to this long dead faithful servant the unbelievable is to happen: he will be miraculously raised from the dead. As the wonder of the return will be performed for the people, so the wonder of resurrection will be performed upon Moses, who

will return from the dead to make the Torah great and glorious. (Among the interesting textual suggestions to chap. 53 may be mentioned that in v.[9], where 'he made his mound with the rich,' עשיר becomes 'with *the satyrs*,' שְׂעִירִים, 'the demons of the wilderness.') Here again, much as in Hosea, the end repeats the beginning, only on a more glorious scale: the people are to be led by him across the wilderness once more, and the Torah will be proclaimed by him throughout the whole world. Jesus and His disciples found in these Servant songs, with their picture of innocent vicarious suffering and death, a solution of the dark riddle of existence, and His salvation, in a grander sense than could be predicated of the redemptive work of Moses, was to reach to the ends of the earth. Thus the prophetic religion of the Old Testament is even closer to that of the New than we had supposed—founded, on the one hand, on the grace of God, and, on the other, on the life and suffering and death of the founder of the religion. But, alas! Judaism chose the path of legalism, which was the antithesis of the prophetic redemption.

In Deutero-Zechariah (11^4–13^9, third century B.C.) the ancient tradition re-emerges: Moses is the good Shepherd (11) who was pierced and slain (12). Dt.-Zech. does not speak of his return, nor of the vicarious value of his life and death, nor of his mediation of salvation to all peoples: but what he does say is very significant: and both he and Dt.-Is. would have been better understood had the tradition of the martyrdom of Moses been more clearly preserved in our historical sources.

What, then, are those sources? They are three —J, the Levitical tradition (expressed chiefly in Dt 33^{8-11}) and E. According to J, Moses was neither a political leader, nor a magician, nor a miracle-worker, nor an ecstatic, nor a Levite, nor a priest, nor the founder of a new religion. He is the inspired shepherd who proclaims the will of Jahweh and has it set up on stone tablets. In J he dies in Shittim, probably a martyr's death, as we may infer from P's continuation of the story in Nu 25^{6-15}. In the Levitical tradition, the Levites claim descent from Moses, but they may well have been of a spirit very different from his, and this may be reflected in the stories of the opposition offered to him at times by Aaron and Miriam, Nadab and Abihu, Korah, etc. For E, Moses is in the first instance a *nabi* (cf. Dt 34^{10}) not an ecstatic, but a visionary in the sense that he had seen God and spoken to Him face to face: he is also, like Elisha with his magic staff, a wonder-worker; and further he is an inspired priest. We seem to see in E a compromise between the priestly tradition which demanded the cult and the prophetic which rejected it as an expression of the Divine will.

The great crime of Israel was the murder of Moses. The priests obliterated the tradition of his death, as they were ashamed of it, but it lived on in prophetic circles and is reflected, even if somewhat obscurely, in the pages of Hos., Dt.-Is., and Dt.-Zech. The people as a whole never understood him, his name was associated with a view of religion of which he was the sworn foe. The words 'O Jerusalem, that slayest the prophets,' acquire a new pathos, if Israel began by slaying the first and greatest of them all; but Dt.-Is. was right in maintaining that Moses and his Torah belong to all the world.

This is but a brief sketch of an extraordinarily stimulating and suggestive book. The thesis that Sellin has defended can never be more than a hypothesis, but that can be said of many another finding of Old Testament criticism. Whether we accept his thesis or not, we must admit that it has been brilliantly stated and defended; and the best scholars are those who will value most the suggestions scattered throughout its fruitful pages.

J. E. McFadyen.

Glasgow.

Saussaye's *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* had reached its third edition before the War, but this standard work has been out of print for ten years. During the war the publication of a new edition was impossible, the co-operation of scholars from different countries being essential to success. The original editor, Dr. Chantepie de la Saussaye, died on the 20th April 1920, and the editing of the fourth and thoroughly revised edition has been entrusted to the eminent scholars, Professor Albert Bertholet and Professor Eduard Lehmann. The new edition, like its predecessors, will not include dissertations on the religion of Israel and the Christian religion, monographs on the Biblical religions being, it is held, numerous and easily accessible. There is, however, the welcome announcement that Professor Bertholet is preparing a History of the Religion of Israel. Vol. I. contains two introductory articles by Dr. Lehmann; on Primitive

Religions, Dr. Ankermann (Berlin) writes; on Chinese, Dr. Franke (Berlin); on Japanese, Dr. Florenz (Hamburg); on Egyptian, Dr. Lange (Copenhagen); on Further Asian, Dr. F. Jeremias (Magdeburg); on Islam, Dr. Chr. Snouck-Hurgronje (Leiden). In Vol. II. Dr. St. Konow (Christiania) writes on Indian Religions; Dr. Lehmann (Lund) on Persian and Manichæan; Dr. Nilsson (Lund) on Greek; Dr. Deubner (Freiburg i. Br.) on Roman; Dr. A. Brückner (Berlin) on Slavonic; and Dr. Grünbech (Copenhagen) on German.

The work is published at the *Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr* (*Paul Siebeck*) in Tübingen, and it is stated that the two volumes will be completed in the autumn of 1925. The parts are issued monthly, the price of each being four Swiss francs.

The Bicentenary of Kant's birth (22nd April 1724) has been celebrated by the publication of a goodly number of volumes dealing with various aspects of his philosophy. Professor Heinrich Rickert, of Heidelberg, author of many erudite works and a student of Kant for 'more than forty years' has published *Kant als Philosoph der modernen Kultur: ein geschichts-philosophischer Versuch* (pp. xii, 216; 6½ Swiss francs. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen). In 1891 Rickert delivered his first lecture on Kant, and in recent years he has given special attention to the relation of modern culture to the *Critiques of Reason* (*pure and practical*). There are many *Dilettanten*, he thinks, who claim to be followers of Kant, though they have little scientific knowledge of his teaching. Rickert himself is not a Kantian, if that name connotes agreement with all the essential principles of the Königsberg philosophy. Kant did not found 'a system which, in its entirety, must be either accepted or rejected.' In Rickert's opinion, 'he most truly has the mind of Kant who endeavours to complete and transform the critical philosophy.' The purpose of this book, as defined by the author, is to discover 'what Kant, as a philosopher, has to say to us concerning the historical epoch in which we are living, which we call 'modern.' In pursuit of this aim, Rickert writes succinctly and lucidly on, *inter alia*, 'European Rationalism' and 'Greek Intellectualism.' A comprehensive and informing study closes with chapters on 'Knowledge and Faith' and 'The Problem of Final Unity.'

In the series of pamphlets, whose general title is 'Philosophy and History,' the same publisher issues the address given at the Kant celebration in the University of Basle by Professor Karl Joël: *Kant als Vollender des Humanismus* (Gm 1). Kant's teaching is held to be, in the Renaissance meaning of the word, Humanism, inasmuch as it is 'a call to human beings to be manly, that is to say, to be mature and self-reliant.' Kant's ambition was not to teach philosophy, but 'to teach to philosophize'; therefore, he would have philosophy conclude and not begin with a definition. How the Socratic Kant became a Platonist is instructively shown, and the merit of his Ethics is held to be that it is neither an ethic of God, nor of Nature, but of Man. Humanism completed itself in humanity. 'The categorical imperative of duty is addressed to man, for in the holiness of God it is already fulfilled. Only for man is there an "ought"; for the animal there is only a "must"; therefore, because man alone is a being who "ought," man alone is free.' A suggestive sentence may be quoted, as an example of others like unto it, which are expanded at length, and expounded in detail: 'Kant set out to define the limits of Reason, and discovered the power of Reason.'

J. G. TASKER.

Leamington Spa.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Ben Jones, his Mark.[1]

'Even a child is known by his doings.'—Pr 20[11].

THE other day some of you thought you had me out, clean bowled, the middle stump, right out of the ground! I was telling you about the bees, how, when they find a flower quite full of nectar or of pollen, they hurry home and spread the news to all the rest: and that these others know where to look for the treasure, because the finder of it carries home some of the scent of the flower. And that's where you thought you had me! Yes, you

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.