
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 prophetical and poetical books, which are covered by the second volume of Dr. MOFFATT's new translation of *The Old Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), make a much severer demand upon the powers of a translator than the historical books, which are covered by the first volume. And that not only because they contain some of the greatest poetry in the world, but because, as a glance at Kittel's 'Biblia Hebraica' is enough to show, the text of countless passages is difficult and uncertain to the point of desperation.

Nothing could be more exasperating, for example, than the textual problems presented by Hab 3 or Is 53, to say nothing of passage after passage in Job. In such cases any translation is necessarily provisional, and in innumerable places there is no likelihood that finality will ever be reached. But the reader of Dr. MOFFATT'S translation may feel assured that it rests upon a critically sifted text, and has the support of one or more modern scholars.

To the reader innocent of textual criticism this freedom of attitude towards the traditional text will bring a fair measure of surprises, and will alter—he may think regrettably—the aspect of many a famous passage: but truth in such matters is, of course, not to be determined by sentiment but by science. Is 53^{9}, *e.g.*, now reads:

> They laid him in a felon's grave,
> and buried him with criminals.

The 'glory' disappears from Ps 73^{24} in a clause which at any rate makes a good parallel to the clause which precedes it, 'leading me after thyself by the hand.' The perplexing 'world' (R.V.m. 'eternity') in Ec 3^{11}, 'he hath set the world in their heart,' is by another pointing transformed into 'mystery' ('for the mind of man he has appointed mystery'). The often quoted and certainly wrong rendering of A.V. in Ps 76^{10}, on which the change in R.V. is no improvement, 'Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain,' becomes the much more relevant and probable

> All pagans shall give praise to thee;
> the rest of us shall keep thy festival.

(We doubt, by the way, whether 'pagans,' of which this translation makes frequent use, is a happy word, though it is no doubt better than the obsolete 'gentiles.') In Dn 12^{4} 'knowledge shall be increased' becomes 'trouble shall be multiplied on earth.'

All the changes in these passages are justified by the textual facts, and some of them, like the last,

are effected by an almost imperceptible change in the consonantal text. Also in innumerable passages less famous than these there are improvements, justified by text or context or both, upon the older translations. For 'the mountains of prey' in Ps 76[4] we now get 'the hills eternal'; 'iniquity and the solemn meeting' in Is 1[13] is replaced by 'fasts and festivals,' and Ps 87[5] 'of Zion it shall be said' becomes 'Zion — her name shall be Mother.'

This translation also furnishes us, so far as a translation can, with a conspectus of the critical results as they affect the integrity of the Old Testament books. Passages believed to be later insertions are bracketed, such as the reference to Judah in Am 2[4f.] and the epilogue to that book. The marking of insertions in Ecclesiastes also greatly facilitates the true understanding of that book. The redistribution of speakers and sections in Job also helps to clarify the argument; ch. 26, for example, is given to Bildad, and the descriptions of the 'hippopotamus' and the 'crocodile,' in chs. 40 and 41, are placed at the end, outside the book proper. Jeremiah's prophecy to Baruch (ch. 45) is placed between 36[7] and 36[8]. But if the principle of transposition is to be applied to this book, it might well have been applied much more drastically.

The translation is marked throughout by much spirit. Proverbs has a very modern ring, the erotic quality of the Song is now beyond all question, the elegiac metre in Lamentations is well reproduced. Daniel runs smoothly, as also Ezekiel, both in such prose passages as the white-washed wall (ch. 13), and in the poetry, such as the lament over Tyre (ch. 27). The writing is often highly idiomatic, for example Jer 38[24], 'keep this interview a secret, and your life is safe.' The introduction of 'Ah, but' in Ps 11[4] lights the psalm with meaning, as does the prefacing of each new strophe of Ps 107 by the word 'some.' Occasionally the change of a single word imparts a curiously modern touch, for example Ps 139[7], 'where *could* I go from thy Spirit?' But is there not a certain ambiguity in the rendering of Ps 91[11], 'he puts you in charge of his angels'?

This last quotation raises the old question of the choice of 'thou' or 'you.' Much more than prose would poetry seem to demand 'thou.' We cannot quite reconcile ourselves to 'Why are you downcast, O my soul?' (Ps 42[6]), or to 'Bless the Eternal, O my soul; he pardons all your sins' (Ps 103[1. 3]). In this respect the translation does not seem to be quite consistent, as in Ps 116[7] we have 'Return to thy rest, O my soul, for the Eternal has dealt lovingly with thee.'

And this last quotation again recalls the pervasive use of 'the Eternal' for 'Jahweh' or 'Jehovah,' which characterized the first volume. In the prophetical books and the Psalms there is doubtless a certain propriety in this use of 'the Eternal' which cannot be claimed for it in the earlier historical books: for the spiritual horizons of these later writers had greatly expanded. Still, even here, the use of that word destroys the national atmosphere which pervades the Old Testament from beginning to end; and in such a passage as Jer 26 it fatally obscures the point of the threat that Jehovah is prepared to destroy *his own* nation and *his own* temple.

In the frequent word-plays of the Old Testament every translator is faced with a practically insoluble problem. Sometimes Dr. MOFFATT helps his readers to appreciate the point by a bracketed explanation as in Dn 5[25] (*menê, tekêl, perês*), or in the desperate verses in Mic 1, where he puts the Hebrew into brackets and suggestive English equivalents into the text (*e.g.* Teartown, Dustown: Israel's kings are ever balked at Balkton). He gets over the difficulty in Jer 1[11] of the 'wakeful' almond tree by calling it a 'waketree.' His rendering of Am 5[5]:

> Gilgal shall have a galling exile,
> And Bethel shall sink to be bethral,

helps us to feel the insuperable difficulties by which

every translator of word-plays is confronted. For the last line, Wellhausen's 'Bethel shall be the devil's' is simple and adequate. In Ps 121[7f.] three English words are used (guard, preserve, protect) to represent the single Hebrew word that echoes through the psalm.

At many points the rendering is of the nature of interpretation rather than of translation. This is more or less inevitable, especially in the case of an Oriental book, whose figures and idioms are often so different from our own: often, too, it is really helpful. For example, Amos's 'three transgressions and four' becomes 'crime upon crime.' That is excellent. 'If you will purify yourself from passion's dross' (Jer 15[19]) is also good. 'The bleeding wounds of the nation' brings out clearly the sense of 'the breach of Joseph' (Am 6[6]), though it is pretty free. But the principle of interpretation seems to be carried to an unwarrantable length when 'the god at Bethel' is made to do duty for 'the sin' (or 'Ashima'?) 'of Samaria' (Am 8[14]), or when Is 53[2] is made to read 'Israel of old grew like a sapling.'

This liberty of interpretation has not infrequently tended to obscure the pictorial quality of the original text. The 'standing' and the 'sitting' disappear from Ps 1[1]; Goodness and Kindness no longer 'pursue' or even 'follow' in Ps 23[6], they simply 'wait on' me. 'The upright shall behold his face' becomes 'the upright enjoy his favour' (Ps 11[7]). The man with a 'large appetite' is no longer exhorted to 'put a knife to his throat,' but to 'control himself' (Pr 23[2]), and the vivid demonic background of 'Destruction and the demon of noon' in Ps 91[6] is lost in the 'sudden death at noon.' As interpretations doubtless these are all accurate and excellent, but the price has had to be paid in the obliteration of the colour and the poetry of the original.

Occasionally the deviations from the traditional rendering seem unaccompanied by any corresponding gain. The 'weeping' of Ps 126[6] is more impressive than 'sadly,' and the 'rejoices' of Is 62[5] than 'thrills,' and

> There villains cease to rage,
> and their victims are at peace (Job 3[17]),

is not essentially more intelligible than the incomparable lines:

> There the wicked cease their raging,
> And there the weary be at rest.

There is in places a tendency to colloquialism which is not quite in keeping with the matchless poetry of the original. Is there not a certain lack of literary dignity in words like 'fuddled' (Is 29[9]), in phrases like 'Up, O God' (Ps 57[7] 74[22] 82[8] 108[5]), or 'be off' (Ps 11[1]), in sentences like 'Why should I be afraid *when times are bad?*' (Ps 49[5]), or 'they got your feet deep in the mud' (Jer 38[22]), or 'off went the Adversary from the Eternal's presence' (Job 2[7])? The glorious phrase of Jer 2[13], 'the fountain of living waters,' is reduced to 'the reservoir of fresh water.' The rendering of Bildad's words in Job 26[2] by 'what a help you are to poor God!' is an admirably vivid reproduction of the sense, but, in point of literary form, it comes perilously near to bathos. The fine poetry of the last sentence in Job's splendid challenge to the Almighty, 'I would declare unto him the number of my steps,' becomes the rather bald prose, 'telling every detail of my life' (31[37]). As the conclusion of one of the most magnificent speeches in literature, these words will hardly be felt to rise to the height of the great argument.

The task of the translator of the Old Testament is inconceivably difficult. Its accomplishment calls for the most finished Semitic scholarship in combination with supreme literary genius. Dr. MOFFATT has chosen to concentrate on the vivid and modern interpretation of the ancient original rather than on the reproduction of its literary beauty, though this he has not neglected; and in his task, as he has conceived it, he has achieved a real success.

Few men have done more than Professor Harry Emerson Fosdick to present the claims of the Christian religion persuasively to our generation. By his books on Prayer, Faith, Service, and Progress—to name only some of them—he has sent across the English-speaking world an interpretation of the Christian message which has commended itself alike to the reason, the conscience, and the heart of multitudes who have never heard his eloquent voice. It is therefore with peculiar interest that we open his latest book on *The Modern Use of the Bible* (Student Christian Movement; 6s. net).

The first thing that strikes us is its complete competence. Here is a man who thoroughly knows both the factors with which he proposes to deal. He is modern to his finger-tips; but besides that, he has an expert knowledge of the Bible. He is thoroughly at home in its angelology, its demonology, its Messiah-doctrine, its Logos-doctrine and much else. We are not put off with pious platitudes, but everywhere we feel the grip of a powerful and well-informed mind.

What, then, is the leading idea of the book? Briefly it is this—that in the Bible we have profound, indeed the profoundest, religious truth expressed in ancient categories, and that it is the business of the modern man to recover, to assimilate, and to re-express that permanent truth in categories of his own, that is, in thought-forms and terms congenial to the modern mind.

Not, of course, that all Biblical truth is expressed in ancient and transitory forms. There are many great words stamped with an imperishable simplicity, words which, even as they stand, are as modern as they are ancient, and speak home to the universal heart. Such words as these need no translation into modern dialect: 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' 'Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you.' 'Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.' 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

But there are passages not a few, enshrining what Dr. Fosdick calls a 'reproducible experience,' but expressed in thought-terms which we no longer share—which, indeed, with the utmost goodwill in the world, we cannot possibly share, if we are living in the modern intellectual world at all. Of these Dr. Fosdick singles out four for special discussion. As permanent truths they appear as the immortality of the soul, the victory of God on earth, the reality of sin and evil, and the nearness and friendship of the Divine Spirit; but in their Biblical form they appear as the resurrection of the flesh, the physical return of Jesus, the visitation of demons, and the visitation of individual angels. Dr. Fosdick's argument is that a truly modern Christian man must reject the latter as heartily as he accepts the former.

It is the man who does this who is the real 'Bible Christian,' whatever the Fundamentalist may think: for it is he who accepts the real thing at which the Bible was driving, and which it expresses in its own necessarily ancient way. Each generation must utter its thoughts in its own language: the permanent and reproducible experience has an inevitably 'transient phrasing,' and the trouble to-day is that many good people consider the phrasing as indispensable as the experience. Hence 'the appalling renascence of obscurantism' which 'binds men by a text instead of liberating them by a truth.'

Dr. Fosdick hits the nail on the head when he describes the two parties in the Church as divided most deeply at this point. 'One party thinks that the essence of Christianity is in its original mental frame-works; the other party is convinced that the essence of Christianity is its abiding experiences.' But he takes care to point out that the modern man who insists on a modern expression for his faith loses nothing of what is

essential and vital in the truth which finds an ancient expression in the Bible. 'Everything the devil and his hosts ever meant is with us yet.' But it is our privilege and our duty to 'decode' —a word Dr. FOSDICK is fond of—'the abiding meanings of Scripture from outgrown phraseology.' Towards the end of his book he expresses this idea most forcibly when he says, 'It never would occur to me to use the Nicene Creed as the natural expression of my faith, but the crux of the matter at which the Nicene Creed was driving is my faith.'

But it is not to be supposed that Dr. FOSDICK is an uncritical worshipper of the modern mind. Some of the wisest words in his book deal with the dangers and limitations to which it is exposed. Being analytic and critical, it is apt to be deficient in reverence; it is also apt to be vague, and it tends to stress the intellectual at the expense of the moral. These are grave limitations, especially the last, for the study of the Bible has done little for the man whom it has not more completely 'furnished unto all good works.'

There is another limitation. Too often the modern man is a prisoner in the thought-forms of his own age: but the really educated man, the true liberal, is the man who is liberated from contemporary prejudices and modes of expression, and who has enough imaginative sympathy to enter into ancient forms of thought as well as into that thought itself. Life is the poorer if we do not understand, and, in a sense, believe in, the angels. We are simply intellectual provincials if we can understand nothing but contemporary thought.

Upon those who hold the modern position there lies the obligation to create a positive formulation of our faith. It is not enough to reject the ancient formulations: negations help nobody. We must not allow ourselves to welter in flabby sentimentalism, we must gird up the loins of our mind to express definitely in our way the great truths and experiences which the Biblical writers expressed definitely in their way, so that the Church shall not 'drift before the breezes of inspirational preaching upon the rocks of intellectual confusion.' Such a study of the Bible as Dr. FOSDICK commends in this eloquent, virile, and inspiriting book cannot fail to lead to spiritual enrichment as well as to intellectual liberation.

Principal L. P. JACKS, D.D., LL.D., is known for the boldness and courage of his utterances. He has now issued the Hibbert Lectures for 1924 under the ringing title of *The Challenge of Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). Although we may not travel all the way with Professor Jacks, this is a book that rouses and makes one think. The challenge is both to the individual and to society as a whole.

Man's life was never intended to be easy. As Cromwell wrote on the day before the battle of Dunbar, when he was hemmed in by superior forces, 'We are upon an engagement very difficult.' 'There is a dream of human progress which makes it to consist in a gradual *easing* of the lot of man, in the gradual lightening of his task, until the last straw of difficulty has been lifted out of his path, the last peril extinguished, the last lee-shore weathered and all smooth sailing ever afterwards. May it never come true.'

Why? Because a state of society where everything was made easy would be morally ruinous. Everything of value the human race has achieved has been wrought by heroic action, by difficulties overcome, by slow fighting forward against fearful odds. Under such conditions man has disciplined, proved, and glorified his manhood. 'Nowhere in the Gospels do I find the faintest indication of "a good time coming," either for the individual or the race, when cross-bearing will be done away and lotus-eating take its place.' That would sound the death-knell of all the heroic in human life.

To society the challenge is the same. 'To a

degree unknown in earlier and simpler societies, the fortunes of civilisation for weal or woe have come to depend on vast concerted operations, on organised mass-action.' Democracy, having promoted mass-action in all directions, must provide the morality by which mass-action is to be governed. 'The morality of mass-action must be the highest morality known to man—that is, the morality of the hero.' The Challenge of Life, then, to our generation is primarily for mass-action on the heroic level.

Is this challenge being met? One has to confess that the signs of the times do not indicate that the challenge is being met, or even that the willingness to meet it exists. 'The chaos of modern life is the chaos of self-protection, in which the efforts put forth by innumerable groups, each to protect itself, renders the whole structure of civilisation, on which their fortunes are embarked together, radically insecure, and leaves it without unitary guidance, drifting no man knows whither. The unheroic character of the total enterprise is the outstanding feature of it.'

We seem to be on the main road that leads to the extinction of the heroic spirit in society and the certain vengeance that follows. 'Is there any other road that gives promise of a more auspicious ending? I think there is at least one, opening out from the very spot where industrial civilization is now standing, but narrow and straitened, like all the roads that lead to life. I will call it the Ethic of Workmanship.' Here is the challenge to labour. If truth, beauty, and goodness are to be effectively at home in a working world, they must be lodged in its *work*. All attempts to find culture, religion, salvation for a working world *outside the sphere of its work* must, from the nature of the matter, resolve themselves into spoken nothings. There are dark moments of depression when the ethic of workmanship seems to the believer in it to be utterly forsaken and abandoned, a thing on which our civilization has definitely turned its back with a mind made up to seek its fortunes by other roads—by the introduction of new systems, by legislative cure-alls, by the incantation of formulæ, by anything but good work. Yet it survives in the silent heroism of uncounted multitudes who 'mind' the vast complex of industrial machinery; it survives in the excellence of the machinery, which often betrays an almost superhuman skill in the invention of it and a 'Divine thoroughness in the construction of it'; it survives in the trusteeship unbetrayed of workers in manifold vocations, from the driver of the locomotive to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

'These are the forces, these are the qualities, which the ethic of workmanship counts on as the growing point, under right development, of a nobler civilisation than this; claiming thereby affinity with the "Ethic of Jesus," and predicting that many a poor fellow with nothing but a worn shovel to show for himself on the Day of Judgment will find *that* a valid passport into the Kingdom of Heaven—no doubt to his great surprise and to the greater surprise of any pompous professors who may be standing by.'

Professor John LAIRD, M.A., recently appointed to the Chair of Moral Philosophy in Aberdeen University, has enriched Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton's 'Library of Philosophy and Religion' with a most fascinating book on *The Idea of the Soul* (5s. net). Professor LAIRD is known for his larger work 'Problems of the Self,' and his present essay is very much on the same subject but in a different vein. *The Idea of the Soul* is, one might say, philosophy in homespun. It is intelligible to the average educated layman. The writer has a powerful mind but he does not give us too much of the power. His writing is delightfully unconventional, and the argument is lightened up with many literary illustrations.

We intend to refer to one special chapter in the book, but something may be said of its contents

generally. We have a good deal that is purely historical (and very interesting), the opinion of all the great thinkers on the subject, from Plato to Bertrand Russell. We have good chapters on the 'Biological Approach,' the psychological view, the moral aspect, leading up to the metaphysical idea. The conclusions come to may be briefly summarized. The soul is a psychical reality. It is a continuant, *i.e.* it persists, and, even if its persistence be intermittent, it is still the same thing. Finally, it is a partner with the body in our existence on this planet.

Well, then, what about the most important issue all this raises? What about personal immortality? Professor LAIRD devotes his last chapter to this question, a chapter of amazing interest and value. To begin with, the partners (soul and body), if they are distinct, may very well exist separately. Why must the term of their existence be exactly the same? At any rate we may say of them here and now that they can hardly be indifferent to one another. The body must leave something of itself in the soul, and the soul in the body.

But even if this be so it is reasonable to suppose that if the soul is suffused, so to speak, with its body during its incarnate existence, it is bound to become very different indeed when it becomes discarnate. Being discarnate, we might not need to peep through lattices of eyes, or hear through labyrinths of ears, but if so, it is probable, surely, that our being would be profoundly modified by this fundamental difference in our mode of existing.

Death would not mean that we have only a pitiful remnant of selfhood with us. But it *would* mean adaptation. Continuing, we ought to learn how to continue; and the integral self, which by hypothesis continues, would doubtless learn to adapt *itself* to its new sphere. This idea would be seriously modified if the spiritualistic 'proofs' of survival could be accepted, because these ghosts are only feeble replicas of their former selves, interested in trivial petty affairs. But we may dismiss these 'proofs.' The evidence is 'miserably inadequate.'

Another conception of our destiny which is sometimes considered threatening is that the soul may be absorbed in the Deity. There may or may not be evidence for this. But in any case it need not alarm us. For it is possible that this is quite consistent with personal existence. We may retain our own integrity and yet be part of a greater spirit. This may amount to nothing more than communion. If 'absorption' meant the loss of individuality, then *we* would not be immortal at all. Our interest is in what happens to *us*.

Our conclusions, then, seem to be these. The self, during our earthly existence, is plainly a partner with its body. If the self is *not* its body, and is *not* one-sidedly dependent on its biological partner, it is hard to imagine a reason why the mental partner should cease to exist at death. The fact that a discarnate self must be different from an incarnate one need not annul the integrity of the self or its power of adapting itself to its new mode of existing. It must not be forgotten that what we are seeking is light on the future of our self. It is our whole self that continues, if anything does.

What, then, has really been shown by the argument? Two things. (1) The *possibility* of immortality, and (2) its *meaning*. It is personal continuance and nothing less. If we want *proofs* of immortality we must, like Kant, seek them in the ethical region. The important argument is this. Impermanence is a defect, and the universe is impugned if it lets worth and dignity pass into everlasting night. 'If this integrity of the self, so firm in its outlines despite its mutabilities, so hardly and painfully acquired in its noblest instances, were a thing that perished utterly, there would be a futility in the best of things that we could not lightly accept.'

'We believe, indeed, that personality is too fine

a thing to be utterly transient, that waste so great and so broad is an unbelievable occurrence, and that a universe which had the power of retaining these excellences would be vain and wicked if it allowed them to disappear.' And so in the end there is no sufficient argument, unless impermanence is a defect, and unless moral considerations are relevant, not to men only, but to the universe itself. 'Souls, if they are worth the making, are also worth the keeping, and the universe would fail in its duty if it did not preserve them. If this be so, by far the most reasonable conclusion is the continuance of individual persons.'

The Bible and the Child.

By the Reverend E. Basil Redlich, M.A., B.D., Director of Religious Education in the Diocese of Peterborough

We may approach our subject by considering the problems which a teacher has to face in presenting some of the well-known Old Testament stories to children. For the present, we shall leave out all reference to any view of inspiration, but we cannot leave out any reference to the mental equipment of the child, the knowledge the child gains from other subjects of study, and the curious questionings which any story arouses in the child's mind. The modern child is a phenomenon; he (or she) is not content to accept a story as true simply because it is found in Genesis or Exodus, or any book of the Bible. He is critical. He knows from nature study, from science lessons, from object lessons such as visits to museums, from reading and through hearing what his elders say, that the science of to-day is not the science of the age of the Patriarchs, the Prophets, or the Apostles. He knows about the explorations in Palestine and Mesopotamia and about the discoveries in Egypt. The questioning and critical spirit of the child cannot be overlooked. It challenges the very faith of the teacher who cannot, if he is true to his work, remain complacent at the eager searchings of thoughtful children who, when they leave school, will be brought more closely still to scientific and historical and moral problems in technical classes, evening classes, and even in factory, workshop, and pit. Children wish to prove all things in order to hold fast to that which is good. So we encourage the child of to-day to ask questions; we teach the child to think for himself, and I have learnt more from the questions of children than from other sources about the real difficulties which a teacher has to face in teaching Bible stories. Questions raised by children to-day are not solely concerned with Old Testament difficulties. I have had questions put to me which dealt with moral problems, the Virgin Birth, the miracles of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and of Walking on the Sea and of the Stilling of the Tempest, the Trinity, Angels, Spiritualism, the Sacraments, Death, the various Denominations, and so on. The time has arrived when a teacher has to be conversant with the problems not only of the Old Testament but also of the New Testament. I will, at this stage, confine myself to those of the Old Testament, but will try, as best I can, to bring the teaching of the New Testament to bear on these problems.

Let us take the story of the Flood as our first illustration. What has a teacher to be cognizant of when he teaches this story? There are at least six points which should influence any one who attempts to present this story to children. (1) He must be careful to protect the character of God and not to leave the child to infer, though the teacher does not mean the child should, that God is cruel, vindictive, and unforgiving. (2) He must not let the child think that God is human in form and outline. (3) He must not teach any unscientific doctrine, such as that water does not seek its own level, or that the rainbow did not appear in the sky before the Flood, or that waters exist as a mass above a solid firmament and fall on the earth through windows in heaven in the form of rain. (4) He must not overlook the contradictions in the narrative as we have it in Genesis concerning the duration of the Flood, or the number of each kind of animal taken into the ark. (5) He must be prepared to give an answer to the question,