

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

LIKE most dictionaries, the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*¹ varies in quality. The latest issues contain some smaller articles which are slight, as, for example, those on Schleiermacher, and Service in War. The latter notes, by the way, that 'if the Church at the opening of the middle ages reverted to the ancient rule which prescribed all shedding of blood, it was in order to put an effective check on the brutality of the German peoples with their strong inclination to acts of violence and murder' (p. 1980). Three longer articles, however, are important. The survey of Scholasticism (1691-1728) by G. Fritz and A. Michel not only covers Eastern as well as Western thought but ends with a few paragraphs on neo-scholasticism outside as well as inside the Roman communion. Scholasticism is defined as 'essentially a method of theological and philosophical speculation which contemplates the rational analysis and systematization of revealed truths, by aid of philosophical concepts.' In a learned and distinguished article on Satisfaction (pp. 1130-1210) P. Galtier discusses the subject at full length in connexion with penance, as a sequel and supplement to the article on Penitence; the discussion is historical but also critical of current views since the Council of Trent. In particular, the outline of mediæval indulgences is illuminating. The third significant article is on Schism. The introductory section by M. J. Congar (pp. 1286-1312) is less interesting than the elaborate study of the rupture between the Greek and the Latin churches (pp. 1312-1468), in which M. Jugie contrives to present the Latin point of view with skill. The shorter account of the ugly papal schism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (1468-1492) by E. Vansteenberghé is descriptive rather than profound, but Jugie's essay clears up some of the ramifications of the issue.

A further instalment (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, December 1938) of Karl Müller's manual of Church history² covers the policy of Constantine,

¹ Fascicules cxxviii.-cxxxii (Libraire Letouzey et Ane, Paris).

² *Kirchengeschichte*, von Karl Müller, Erster Band, erster Halbband, Dritte Auflage, neu überarbeitete in Gemeinschaft mit Frh. Hans von Campenhausen, Zweite Lieferung (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1940).

the rise of movements like Manicheism and Donatism, Asceticism and Monasticism, with some account of popular religion in the fourth century. The bibliographical data are brought up to date, and the revision maintains the balance between new material and a regard for brevity. The edition is a welcome lease of new life for what is the most compact and reliable outline of the subject for German students. The style is plodding, but the matter is well arranged.

Paul Humbert's article on the fault of Adam, in the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (xxvii. 225-240) anticipates what he proposes to argue in a forthcoming critical volume on the Story of Paradise and the Fall in Genesis. He refuses to see in Gn 2^d-3rd anything but extracts worked up into a literary unity by the Yahvist, and agrees with those who take the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to mean experimental knowledge, not the knowledge of sex, nor reason, nor moral consciousness. 'Good and evil' are fundamentally whatever exists. Man was created innocent and ignorant, like a child who ought to obey his father without asking questions. The Yahvist's religious interpretation is that Adam's fault was not a moral error but a lack of faith. Adam did not obey God's authority. He was guilty of proud self-exaltation, of a breach with the normal acceptance of that revealed will of God which meant him to depend on God alone. The temptation of the serpent was to make Adam a god to himself. And the punishment was death, for man was created 'earthy,' liable to mortality; but mortality depended on his conduct towards God. Death became therefore the indirect consequence of his proud self-exultation which proved fatal to him and his race. Not that God promised immortality, for immortality or life eternal is a divine mystery, a gift of free grace. Still, the point of the Genesis story, it is argued, is that man's ideal state was a childlike trust in God, to which blessing was attached. To remain within God's order, as to enter it, the childlike spirit is essential. Any proud effort to be equal to God is tragic and disastrous. The story of the Fall is the first illustration of what the Yahvist brings out later in the murder of Abel, the monstrous union of God's sons with women, the sin of Ham, and the tower of Babel. Whenever man seeks to exalt himself, instead of being content to trust God humbly, the result is a rupture

of humanity, whose true position is one of absolute confidence in the supreme will of God.

The latest issue of the crisp, scholarly *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*,¹ to which attention has been already called in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (October 1937) is devoted to the five Megilloth. Dr. Kurt Galling edits Ecclesiastes, in which he finds some orthodox additions by way of correction, and also pieces from another hand (like 12⁹⁻¹¹ and 12¹²⁻¹⁴) than that of the author, but declines to deny a certain unity. The identification of the author with Solomon, in the opening chapters, is a piece of literary fiction derived from Egypt, where wisdom-speculations were regarded as royal revelations; but the locality of the book is sought in Palestine. It is more likely that it was written in the third than in the fourth century B.C. The bibliography is well selected but it omits Dr. A. B. Davidson's short, penetrating article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. The other four books are edited by Dr. Max Haller. He refuses to find any distinct motive in Ruth, though the addition in 4¹¹ links it to the Davidic line. It is simply a charming idyll of pious peasant life, showing how the Lord cares for His own; perhaps there is a mythological background, but the tale speaks for itself, and Naomi is really more prominent than Ruth, although the latter's deference to old age is one mark of the religious ideal. Canticles is linked to the Mazzoth festival, being a collection of secular love-songs originally earlier than the Exile perhaps, and connected with myths of a Nature-festival. They are located in northern Israel. The elegies collected in Lamentations reflect the experience of some who had been eye-witnesses of the tragedies at Jerusalem in 597 or 586; the acrostic form varies, but in any case it reflects the ancient belief in the magical significance of the alphabet, though for the writers it is a literary convention. The editor renders the last verse, 'Or hast thou utterly rejected us, and art very wroth against us?' It is superfluous for the synagogue to repeat the previous verse, as though the poem ended in pessimism. In reality the poet puts a pleading question which implies that such an idea is impossible. 'Here, as in every prayer, hope has the last word.' The novelist who wrote Esther was not accurately informed about some of the Persian customs which colour his narrative as he accounts for the Purim festival. The story represents a Hebrew adaptation of what was originally an Elamite Nature-myth. It shows

¹ *Die Fünf Megilloth* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1940; RM.6).

a 'blind hatred of Gentiles,' and at the same time celebrates the strong family feeling of the Jews, their astuteness, and the folly of any pagan power, corporate or individual, daring to attack them. Dr. Haller's notes, specially on Canticles and Lamentations, are as excellent and stimulating as Dr. Galling's on Ecclesiastes, though the latter has naturally more opportunity for rousing human interest and literary enjoyment.

In the *Revue Biblique* (xlviii. 506-529) R. P. Dubarle spins a hypothesis about the Epistle to the Hebrews which is certainly novel. He infers from some verbal resemblances between it and the Epistle of Jude that the latter writer worked up some notes or a rough draft prepared by the Apostle Paul into what we now read as Hebrews, which probably was addressed to some Asiatic Christians who were liable to be seduced by the Jewish Law. Indeed, the author of this essay thinks that Hebrews and First Peter on the one hand and Jude with Second Peter on the other are connected, though we can only guess vaguely at the circumstances. 'All four epistles were started by the same crisis in Asia Minor' (p. 527). Paul could not leave Rome to deal with the situation on the spot; he had only time to outline a homily on the subject, which Jude edited, and which Peter himself followed up with a couple of letters.

The meaning of Jn 1⁴³ is discussed by Paul Jouon in *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (xxix. 620f.). 'The day following he would (or, was minded) to go into Galilee, and he findeth Philip.' The verb ἠθέλησεν is commonly rendered either by 'he chose (or determined)' or by 'he desired,' though the latter (retained in the Vulgate 'voluit') gives a flat sense. But, as θέλω is elsewhere used in the sense not only of 'would' but perhaps of 'was on the point of' (Mk 6⁴⁸ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν), the author proposes to translate it here, 'he was on the point of going into Galilee when he met Philip.' This at first sight looks attractive. But it would imply that Jesus did not meet Philip in his own district of Galilee. Now Jesus did enter Galilee, since the Cana wedding (2¹) takes place there, and on M. Jouon's theory there is no mention of any actual visit to Galilee which would lead up to Jesus being in the vicinity of the wedding. Besides, with all respect to M. Jouon, θέλω in Hellenistic Greek did carry the sense of 'choose' or 'determine,' as Dr. E. A. Abbott incidentally shows in his *Johannine Grammar* (p. 2471).

New York.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Contributions and Comments.

Mark xii. 35-37 and the Pre-Existence of Jesus in Mark.

SOME scholars affirm that the Second Gospel shows no trace of the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus, whereas others allow that Mark implies it in his narrative. In addition to the suggestion of the pre-existence of the Christ contained in the use of such titles as Lord, Son of God, and Son of Man, the following passages are often mentioned as significant; 1¹¹ (especially εὐδόκησα); 1³⁸ (ἐξήλθον); 1²¹⁰ (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς); 13³² (the Son has rank above the angels); and then such scenes as the baptism, the temptation, and the transfiguration² in which Jesus may be seen as owned and ministered to by the heavenly world from which He came.

But how far is the importance of 12³⁵⁻³⁷ fully realized in this connexion? Origen, in commenting on these words in their Matthean setting,³ certainly understood them as alluding to Christ's pre-existence, but was he at one in this respect with the mind of Mark?

Since Mark and the other Synoptic writers clearly accept the Davidic sonship of Jesus (Mk 10⁴⁷. 11¹⁰) the main purpose of Mk 12³⁵⁻³⁷ is not a repudiation of that theory; but, as E. Lohmeyer⁴ contends, Ps 110¹ is here quoted to show that the Son of David must be understood as something more than an earthly prince. He is also transcendental Lord, or Son of Man. The apparent antithesis between being David's Lord and David's son can only be resolved in that way. That in Mk 14⁶² use is again made of Ps 110¹ and this time in association with specifically Son of Man Christology supports this view. But if for the evangelist Ps 110¹ has relation to Son of Man Christology, it may also bear some allusion to the conception of the pre-existence of the Son of Man held by the apostolic Church.

Another preliminary point is the content of Ps 110¹ itself, especially in its LXX (Ps 109) form from which Mark quotes. The Psalm could be taken to affirm the pre-existence of David's Lord even in the Massoretic text, through the reference

¹ See especially the comment on this verse by E. Lohmeyer in *Das Evangelium des Markus* (1937), 43.

² Cf. J. B. Barnardin, 'The Transfiguration' in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lii. (1933), 181-189.

³ *Commentary on Matthew*, Latin 5. See Harold Smith, *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels*, v. 61.

⁴ *Op. cit.* 261 f.

to Melchizedek in v.⁴; but, in the LXX version, a change has been made in v.³ which strengthens the reference to pre-existence considerably: ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐξεγέννησά σε. When v.¹ was quoted from so short a Psalm, would it not have carried some recollection of its original context with it?

But now we come to the main points of our case. Writing of Mk 12³⁵⁻³⁷, James Mackinnon says, 'The allusion to his sitting on the right hand of God seems to point to his future transcendental state, not to a pre-temporal existence. He is the Messianic Lord whom David foresaw.'⁵ But why should Mark have thought that David only 'foresaw' the Lord of whom he speaks? The Greek of Ps 110¹ left him free to believe that David was actually aware of the Messianic κύριος as one then existent in heaven at the time of the writing of the Psalm. Is it probable that Mark did so construe the verse?

The Gospel of Mark came out of a Church which had long believed in the pre-existence of Christ. From 1 Corinthians onwards, the Pauline letters clearly attest this doctrine; and Hebrews, and the Johannine literature give further evidence of its prominence. Even before Abraham was, before all creation in fact, the Church's Lord was said to have lived in heaven with God. From such a conviction, it was a small step indeed to the idea that this pre-existent Christ had had actual contact with Abraham, Moses, David, and other Old Testament characters in their successive generations. Judaism, too, had been speculating about the pre-existent Logos or Wisdom, in just such a way. Pre-existent Wisdom had functioned as the friend and guide of men from Adam to Moses; or by Solomon she was prized, known, and possessed as companion.⁶ Philo's Logos was present to Old Testament men and women. It could be identified with the angel of Ex 23²⁰, and said to superintend all creatures whether mortal or divine; or it was the angel which appeared to Hagar,⁷ etc. If Judaism had been claiming so much for the pre-existent agencies of God's activity in the world, would not the Church have been encouraged to speculate on the pre-incarnation activity of the heavenly Christ in a similar way?

That the sub-apostolic writers did so develop

⁵ *The Historic Jesus*, 378.

⁶ 'Wisdom of Solomon.' See especially chs. 8, 9, 10.

⁷ Cohn u. Wendland, *Philonis Opera*, ii. p. 106, 51; p. 302, 174; iii. p. 111, 5.

the pre-existent Christology is perfectly clear. Melito of Sardis described Jesus as one 'who was pilot to Noah, who conducted Abraham, who was bound with Isaac, who was in exile with Jacob, who was sold with Joseph, . . . who in David and the prophets foretold his own sufferings. . . .'¹ An excellent example of similar thought appears earlier in Justin Martyr. It was Christ, he says, who appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, who shut Noah in the ark, spake to Moses and other Old Testament figures, for 'you must not imagine that the unbegotten God Himself came down or went up from any place' (127). 'Therefore neither Abraham nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man, saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all . . . but (saw) Him who was according to His will His Son' (127). Justin then goes on to mention that it was the same Son whom David called Lord in Ps 110¹, and without any doubt Justin thinks of David as aware of the existence of Christ just as Abraham and the others were.² As Rendel Harris has said: 'The identification of the historical Jesus with Old Testament situations appears to have been a commonplace with a school of primitive exegetes.'³ As pre-existent, Christ did not live in remote passivity in heaven, but was actively present to men of old, and they were conscious of His help.

Did the New Testament writers themselves share this conception? There is evidence that they did. 1 Co 10⁴ reflects it. Christ was with 'our fathers' in their wilderness journeying, and so could be the rock from which they drank. Some MSS. (D G, etc. etc.) also read in v.⁹ that they tempted Χριστόν which though possibly an interpretative reading may none the less be a perfectly legitimate understanding of κύριος. Again in 1 P 1¹¹ it was the Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament Prophets which revealed to them Christ's future sufferings; and because Christ was with Moses in Egypt, Moses could be said quite literally to have accepted the *δνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (He 11²⁶). Why further should the Revised Version want to read Ἰησοῦς = 'Joshua' in He 4⁸? A writer holding the pre-existence of Jesus as strongly as the author of Hebrews did could have understood Ἰησοῦς = 'Jesus' quite naturally, and this obviates the necessity of assuming *θεός* as understood in the text after *κατέπαυσεν*

¹ W. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 53.

² *Dial. c. Try.*, 126-129. See also *Apol.* i. 63; *Ep. of Barnabas*, v. 6, 11; xii. 11; Cyprian, *Testimonies*, ii. 5; Origen, *Possinus' Catena* (Smith, *Ante-Nic. Exeg. of Gospels*), iii. 192.

³ *Testimonies*, ii. 57. See the whole chapter, 'Jesus and the Exodus,' 51 ff.

as Moffatt does (*ICC*). It was the active, pre-existent Jesus who had not given the Children of Israel rest, who spoke of another day of rest, and it was He therefore who also spoke in David, according to 4⁷. Then in Jude 5, there is excellent MS. evidence (A B 33, etc.) for reading Ἰησοῦς (which Souter prefers), and so making Jesus the one who saved Israel from Egypt. Finally, Jn 8⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸ is perhaps noteworthy. Burney (*ICC*) regards καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐώρακέ σε as the true reading of 8⁵⁷; but whether we accept that, or Ἀβραὰμ ἐώρακας, it may be significant that Jesus does not deny the possibility put forward in the question of the Jews. His correction implies not that they suggest too much, but too little—even 'before Abraham was, I am.'

It appears that the New Testament writers shared the view of the sub-apostolic age that Jesus as pre-existent, heavenly Man lived in no distant detachment from life on earth, but had personal contact with men in this world. It will therefore be reasonable to suppose that this idea existed in Mark's mind when he wrote 12³⁵⁻³⁷ into his Gospel. If so, then Mark believed that David did not merely foresee his Messianic Lord, but had knowledge of Him as then in heaven with God, one to whom God had already vouchsafed the place at His right hand. So understood the words of the quotation read less awkwardly, and certainly imply the pre-existence of Christ. G. H. BOOBYER.

Selly Oak, Birmingham.

A Peculiar Reading of Colossians ii. 5.

ON reading recently Augustine's treatise entitled 'A Reply to Faustus, the Manichaeon,' my attention was arrested by a very peculiar reading of Col 2⁵, which occurs in the first of the thirty-three books. It will be best to give the passage as it stands:

'Augustinus respondit: Tu semichristianos cavendos putas, quod nos esse dicis: nos autem pseudochristianos cavemus, quod vos esse ostendimus. Nam quod semis est, ex quadam parte imperfectum, ex nulla tamen falsum est. Quid ergo? Si aliquid deest fidei eorum quos circumvenire conamini, numquid ideo id quod eis adest destruendum, ac non potius id quod deest astruendum est? Sicut ad quosdam imperfectos loquens Apostolus ait: *Gaudens et videns*

vestram conversationem, et id quod deest fidei vestrae in Christo (Col 2^b). *Cernebat utique quamdam fabricam spiritualem, sicut alibi dicit, Dei aedificatio estis: et in ea cernebat utrumque: et unde gauderet et unde satagaret. Gaudebat ex eo quod aedificatum videbat; satagebat eo quod usque ad culmen perfectionis adhuc aedificandum esse sentiebat.*'

This may be freely rendered:

'You warn us against Semi-Christians, which you say we are; but we warn against Pseudo-Christians, which we have shown you to be. Semi-Christianity may be imperfect. What then? If the faith of those you try to mislead is imperfect, would it not be better to supply what is lacking than to rob them of what they have? Even as it was to imperfect Christians that the Apostle wrote: *Joying and beholding your conversation and the deficiency of your faith in Christ* (Col 2^b). The Apostle had in view a spiritual structure, as he says elsewhere: *Ye are God's building*; and in this structure he found both a reason for joy, and a reason for exertion; he rejoiced to see part already finished, and the necessity of bringing the edifice to perfection called for exertion.'

The fact that Augustine was driven to such a strained exegesis, suggests that he was entirely satisfied with the correctness of the text in front of him.

The Treatise is dated 400 B.C., and though Jerome seems to have completed his Vulgate New Testament in 385, a study of the abundant quotations from the New Testament which are embedded in Augustine's 'Reply to Faustus' indicate that he was still using the Old Latin Version.

The explanation of this Old Latin reading is not, I believe, far to seek. A Greek scribe had evidently misread ΤΟCΤΕΡΕΩΜΑ as ΤΟΥCΤΕΡΗΜΑ, and it is interesting to note that the Old Latin of D (Codex Claramontanus) has another rendering of the same mistake: *id quod deest necessitatibus*; showing that the error was current elsewhere, though no Greek MS. now existing contains it.

Since writing the above my attention has been called to the fact that T. K. Abbott notes this Greek reading as inferred from d and e, 'Quod deest necessitatibus fidei vestrae,' and accounts for it in the same way. (See Ephesians and Colossians in ICC, p. 244), giving two other references in Augustine for it. One is in Joh. Tract. 98 (written A.D. 416), where, after quoting Col 2^b in this form, he further cites 1 Th 3¹⁰, 'et suppleamus quae

desunt fidei vestrae,' suggesting the idea that the defects in his readers were, as it were, providential, as affording him pleasure in supplementing them; cf. Ro 1^{11, 12}. The other reference by Abbott is Epis. 149; but, owing to the confusion in the numbering of the Letters, I cannot locate this in the Benedictine Edition. FRANK ANDERSON.

Huron College,

London, Ontario, Canada.

The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom ii. 24.

(φθόνος δε διαβόλου θάνατος εισήλθεν εις
τον κόσμον.)

MOST commentators, including Goodrick,¹ Deane,² Holmes,³ and Harris,⁴ have seen in this verse an identification of the Devil with the serpent of the Fall Story. This is most important, being the first occasion in extant literature on which the two are equated, unless the reference in the Slavonic Enoch is regarded as being earlier. In Apocalyptic literature of a later date this identification is frequent (*vide* Rev 12⁹).

But the correctness of this exegesis may be questioned. It is *death* which 'enters into the world'; it is not *evil*, as would be expected if we had here a reference to the Fall Story. Again, so far as Gn 3 is concerned, we are not told that the serpent was envious. It was considerations such as these which led Gregg⁵ to abandon any Fall Story interpretation, and to assert that the reference is to the murder of Abel by Cain.

This is a perfectly tenable explanation, for, according to Genesis, this murder was the first appearance of death in human history. There is, however, the difficulty that, in Genesis, no mention is made of the 'envy of the devil,' but Gregg attempts to surmount this by drawing attention to the fact that Theophilus (*ad Autol.*, II, 29) says that Satan was jealous of Abel, when he saw that he was pleasing to God, and therefore prompted Cain to kill him. A somewhat similar explanation is to be found in Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.*, III).

Commentators, however, have not stressed that the English Version is hardly correct—'But by envy of the devil death entered into the world.' Yet in the Greek text no definite article is to be

¹ *The Book of Wisdom* (Rivington).

² *The Book of Wisdom* (Oxford).

³ Art. 'Wisdom' in *Apocrypha* (ed. Charles).

⁴ Art. 'Wisdom' in *New Commentary* (S.P.C.K.).

⁵ *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Camb. Bible).

found with the word 'devil.' Another, and perhaps more accurate, translation would be: 'But by envy of *an adversary* death entered into the world.' No longer is any explanation needed to justify the reference to the Devil, for διαβόλου is taken as referring to Cain himself. He, it cannot be denied, was Abel's adversary: and his sin was caused by envy.

It may be objected that the true meaning of διάβολος is 'slanderer.' This objection does not hold good so far as the LXX Greek is concerned. The Hebrew word SATAN (שָׂטָן) is often used in the Old Testament of an adversary, either earthly or angelic; and here the LXX generally has διάβολος, or some periphrasis employing the word διαβολή. And in 1 Macc 1³⁶ (καὶ εἰς διάβολον πονηρὸν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ παντός) the word can be used of a definite locality.

The absence of the definite article has been passed over by most commentators, but Goodrick quotes Ac 13¹⁰ (ὡς διαβόλου) as another example of this omission. Against this it may well be asked whether Paul was referring here to *the* Devil, or to a devil or a slanderer. In the New Testament, when meaning the supreme power of evil, the word generally has the definite article. The same may be said of SATAN (שָׂטָן) in the Old Testament; the sole exception being 1 Ch 21¹, and even here there is a considerable amount of doubt as to whether Satan or an earthly adversary is indicated.

If this suggested translation and this interpretation are accepted, we have yet another example of that peculiar mannerism of Pseudo-Solomon which causes him to avoid the mention of proper names.

W. H. A. LEAROYD.

St. John's College, Durham.

ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου
στόματος Δαυειδ παιδός σου εἰπών
ἸΝΑ ΤΙ Κ.Τ.Λ.—Acts iv. 25.

THOUGH this is the oldest extant text, supported by B, 8, A, and others, few persons perhaps believe that, if St. Luke wrote it at all, it is what he meant to write. We are told that all the variants are attempts to set this chaos right—*i.e.*, that the scribes had this text and tried by various alterations to produce grammar and sense. In modern days Hort seems to have considered that τοῖς πατέσιν for τοῦ πατρὸς would remove all difficulty. Torrey ingeniously supposed a mis-translated Aramaic original, but who did he

convince? For how could a writer like St. Luke possibly admit such a sentence as the mistranslation, *ex hypothesi*, produced?

Whatever the true explanation may be, it is curious that the words as we have them contain traces of three or more alternative ways of writing the sentence, any one of which could introduce the quotation "ἸΝΑ ΤΙ Κ.Τ.Λ. Thus:

1. ὁ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἰπών
2. ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαυειδ [τοῦ] παιδός σου εἰπών
3. ὁ διὰ στόματος τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυειδ εἰπών.

Several places in the Acts suggest that the writer made more than one draft of his book, and that these drafts were far from coinciding verbally. Sometimes he re-wrote his sentences; sometimes, without re-writing, he may have made alterations, adding, subtracting, etc. This verse looks like a case in point. He wrote a first draft and then made corrections. Perhaps something like this—the bottom line being what he wrote first, and the others tentative alterations:

¹ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
στόματος Δαυειδ παιδός σου
ὁ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου εἰπών

He knew his own marks for deletion or addition, but one of the earliest copyists misunderstood them, combined words which were really alternative, and thereby sowed the seed of confusion for all time. Some such theory as this is perhaps both simpler and less unlikely than those generally put forward.

H. W. MOULE.

Damerham Vicarage,
Fordingbridge, Hants.

The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

THE suggestion made by Mr. L. G. Buckingham in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December 1939, p. 157f., that Paul's first and second visits to Jerusalem in Acts correspond respectively to his first and second visits in Galatians, although Galatians was not written until after the third visit (Ac 15), agrees with the view formerly expressed by Ramsay, *e.g.*, in the earlier editions of *St. Paul the Traveller*. The question why the Council is not mentioned in Galatians was thus dealt with by Ramsay (SPT, 187 f.):

¹ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν applied to David seems odd; the oddness would disappear if Hort's τοῖς πατέσιν ἡμῶν were read.

'The answer is obvious. He is engaged in proving that, when he gave his first message to the Churches of Galatia, he had never received any charge from the older Apostles. His whole point is: "Cleave to my first message, which came direct from God: if Silas and I afterwards said anything inconsistent with that message, we are accursed." The third visit to Jerusalem did not take place until after the Galatian Churches were founded, and therefore it could find no place in the autobiographical retrospect of 1¹²⁻²¹⁰; but it is clearly implied in the scornful and impetuous sentence, 1⁸: "Even if Silas and I (as these emissaries have been telling you), if an angel from heaven, should preach to you a Gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, a curse be upon us."'

This position is definitely preferable to the theory that the second visit of *Acts* is omitted in *Galatians*. Ramsay, however, later found reason to change his mind about the date of *Galatians* and place it before the Council; see his prefatory essay to *SPT*¹⁴ (1920), p. xxxi, and *The Teaching of Paul*, 372 ff.

This last position, supported by Burkitt, Professor Duncan (and at one time by Professor Lake), is probably the least beset with difficulties. The varied circumstances which called forth the epistles largely account for the differences in style, as they also determined the degree of eschatological emphasis. The situation which called forth *Galatians* had nothing to do with eschatology. Behind 1 Thessalonians, on the other hand, lies the question: 'What of believers who die before the Parousia?' This question certainly implies, what we already know, that Paul had given the Thessalonians some eschatological teaching; but, 'touching the Parousia,' he warns them in 2 Th 2 not to be misled into supposing that the Day of the Lord is imminent, so such imminence can scarcely have formed part of his teaching.

We may well doubt whether the eschatological interest in 1 and 2 Thessalonians is greater than that in 1 Co 15 (not to mention such later passages as Ph 3²⁰, Col 3⁴, Tit 2¹³). Indeed, 1 Co 15^{51ff.} is very similar to 1 Th 4^{15ff.} We need not press 'we' in 1 Th 4^{15, 17}, 1 Co 15^{51ff.} and Ph 3²⁰ to imply that Paul expected to be alive himself at the Parousia. 'We' is there general, as is 'us' in 2 Co 4¹⁴, which might equally well be pressed to mean that Paul expected personally to share in the resurrection, and therefore to die first.

F. F. BRUCE.

The University, Leeds.

The Feeding of the Four Thousand: Mark viii. 1-10.

It is generally supposed, from the similarity of symbolism and context, that this narrative is a 'doublet' of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. Even Lagrange finds that 'the only serious argument that one may allege against the duality is the attitude of the apostles,' which he considers to be notably different in the second account.¹ Bultmann, however, regards this difference as indicative of the secondary nature of the story.

Assuming the single source of the two feedings it is yet necessary to find the reason for the double tradition. In the first account the disciples take up twelve basketfuls of fragments; in the second, seven basketfuls. The first number obviously corresponds to the twelve apostles; the second has been explained with reference to the seven loaves, but it seems better to accept the hint of Rawlinson's, 'is there a further correspondence with the seven deacons of Acts 6³?'² This may give the clue to the problem of the perpetuation of the doublet.

It appears that the Hellenistic Jewish Christians early had their own meetings and organization. After the death of their leader Stephen, the Hellenists alone seem to have been dispersed from Jerusalem, to spread the gospel outside Judea and form communities soon to be partly non-Jewish (Ac 8¹). Of these Hellenists the seven 'deacons' are the chiefs, or at least the prototypes; perhaps with a certain symbolism in the universal figure seven. Loisy considers the choice of the deacons as subordinate officers to the apostles to be a fiction.³ It is known that there were disputes about food between the Palestinians and the Hellenists (Ac 6²), and probably on more than one occasion. No doubt part of these food disputes would concern the administration and the participation in the 'breaking of bread,' first with the Hellenistic Jews and later with uncircumcised Gentile converts (Gal 2¹²). Already debate as to 'orders' and 'validity'! It is not difficult from this to see that the variant of the Feeding would be seized upon as justification for the sacramental meals of the Gentile Church. The variant would have arisen originally doubtless from different accounts as to the number of the loaves and the size of the crowd at the one historical event.

Corresponding to the sending out of the twelve apostles to the twelve tribes of Israel, the Gentiles

¹ *Evangile selon Saint Marc*, 204.

² *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 104.

³ *La Naissance du Christianisme*, 140-143.

have the mission of the seventy disciples to the seventy nations (Gn 10; see Creed on Lk 10¹). The Jewish Christians obviously treasured the Five Thousand Feeding as a type of the Christian agapé; in John it is the only Eucharist. 'The evening hour, the people disposed in orderly eating companies (συμπόσια), as when Christians gathered for the love-feast. . . . the Twelve acting the part of deacons in the service and afterward in collecting the remnants (as we know was done at the Church observance),' all bring out the parallelism with the later ritual.¹ Similarly, the Hellenists and Gentiles would naturally take the variant of the Feeding as giving the origin of their sacred meal, and adapting the basketfuls to the number of their seven administering deacons. Both Jew and Greek sought the authority of the Lord.

If the above suggestion is valid it must be admitted that the question in dispute is not made wholly clear in the Synoptics. Luke does not use the second feeding, and in omitting the whole section has been thought to act rather on critical grounds. Possibly the Gentile interpretation of the second feeding was unknown to Luke, or he may have omitted it in accordance with the principle,

¹ B. W. Bacon, *The Story of Jesus*, 152-153.

which he observes in the Acts, of toning down controversial matter. Mark places the first feeding, if not in Galilee, at least to a Jewish audience; but the Four Thousand are definitely fed in Decapolis, and therefore, by inference, to an audience largely composed of non-Jews, or people of mixed blood. Matthew has obscured this geographical move in order to keep Jesus within the bounds of Jewry. But it is not necessary to assert that even Mark wished to stress the definitely Gentile bearing of the doublet. It is likely that he incorporated the two versions because both had become well known and the duality was fixed; he may, indeed, have had two written sources before him. The double version was originally due to difference in the testimony of eye-witnesses; but the preservation of the second narrative was probably of considerable importance to a large section of the Christian community. But, after the early days, the principle for which they contended was accepted. The double reference, however, was still recognized in patristic exegesis which compared the five loaves of the Law given to the Jews, with the seven loaves of the Spirit given to the Gentiles.

Porto Novo, Dahomey, E. G. PARRINDER.
French West Africa.

Entre Nous.

E. C. Bentley.

In *Those Days* (Constable; 12s. net) Mr. E. C. Bentley is concerned with the past—from the '80s to the last War. He avoids praise, for he is too good a journalist and man of letters not to know that praise of the past is boring. He tells us that he is concerned merely to tell about the past, but there is no doubt that for him 'those' days are better and happier than 'these' days.

'But if any one should declare his conviction that better times are coming, I should agree with him. It is a question of faith, without which nothing can be done: it is a necessity just as much as facing hard facts is a necessity, and neither of them is of any use without the other.'

Mr. E. C. Bentley was for years on the staff of the 'Daily News' and then on the 'Daily Telegraph' and so most of his writing has been anonymous. But, to readers of detective fiction, he has been known for a quarter of a century as the author of that early thriller, 'Trent's Last Case.' And when it is remembered that he is also the author of 'Biography For Beginners,' wherein originated those amusing verses, somewhat similar to limericks,

his versatility will be appreciated. We expect *Those Days* to be eminently readable and so it is. His own account of the book, given in the Preface, is chapters strung together on a thread of personal experience, some parts of the book being plain autobiography, 'but these have been included as possessing (I hope) some interest of their own, apart from the subject of Me: they are stories in a book which consists very largely of stories.'

At Oxford, Bentley made many friends, in especial F. E. Smith, John Simon, Hilaire Belloc, and John Buchan. Of the latter he says, 'Buchan had a great affection for his friends; he did not care much for those who lacked that kind of feeling. "So-and-so has a heart like a dried pea," I remember him saying, "If you shook him you would hear it rattle".'

Frank Lenwood was at Oxford with him and was elected President of the Union. It was the custom that a newly-elected President should give a dinner to his Committee, with any other guests that he might choose—this naturally included ex-Presidents, who were in residence and this included F. E. Smith. Bentley tells a fine story of the courage which the

late Reverend Frank Lenwood showed, even in those early days, in maintaining his principles.

Frank Lenwood.

'When I was Librarian of the Society a president was elected—F. Lenwood—whose principles and practice as regards alcoholic liquor were exactly opposed to those of F. E. Smith, whom Lenwood invited to his dinner as a matter of course. When the invitations had gone out, I doubt if it occurred to any of the guests—it certainly did not to me—that Lenwood's opinions would stand in the way of his deferring to custom in the matter of wine. However, when we were seated, with F. E. at the new President's right hand as being the most eminent of his predecessors then in residence (he was in fact a Fellow of my own college), our host arose and announced that he could not reconcile it with his conscience to offer his guests any intoxicating drink, and that he hoped they would not very much mind. I do not suppose that most of us did very much mind: to me, and doubtless to others, it was a declaration that compelled respect, considering what courage was needed to make it. Unfortunately, F. E. minded a great deal, and showed it. He turned his shoulder to his host throughout the dinner; and he called loudly and frequently for glasses of milk. I repeat that this action, done by a younger man who was entertaining F. E. as a distinguished guest, and who knew all about him, his opinions, his tastes, and his capacity for making himself unpleasant at need, showed moral courage of the highest order.'¹

A Lion in the Garden.

G. B. Stern is at her light-hearted best in *A Lion in the Garden*. It is the story of typical old-fashioned servants and principally Norman Pascoe.

In Chapter One we are told how a trio of lions got loose from a travelling show and one came trotting towards Spinnny Mead Lock; discovered that the gate of Norman's garden had been left swinging open and strolled up behind him 'where he was intent on clipping the privet hedge, and announced itself with pleasant purring noises.

"Puss, puss," said Norman absently. "Pretty puss . . ."

'The purring went on, strangely loud.

'He turned and saw the lion.

'It was a large lion, and not behind bars.

'His description to the local paper said, at this point: "I did not stop to think, though it was as close as you are to me. I enviggled it into the kitchen and shut the door."

¹ E. C. Bentley, *Those Days*.

This brief encounter with the lion, which happened twenty-five years before the other events in the story, gives the book its title and supplies the motif—courage. Telling the story to his friends and hearing their chorus: 'Well done old man! Couldn't have handled it better meself!' he has dreams of fine behaviour; of faithfulness, and especially of courage, to him the best of qualities.

Pascoe's second brave act is his espousal of the cause of Polly Brooks the housemaid. She chose to spend a legacy on 'high cockalorum'—a trip to the south of France. Pascoe speaks up for her at the risk of losing his job.

The third brave act alters the course of his future.

He is now engaged to Gwennie, a pretty young maidservant, who is attracted to the insignificant Pascoe, because she believes that he not only 'knows everything' but also 'he can do everything too.' At this period, the family have a property on a small island and Norman is Houseman. Gwennie is entertaining her brother and sister-in-law, who have come to see her, bringing their little boy of four. They are proposing to leave him for a few hours with Norman, while they visit relatives. But Roysie is a venturesome little boy, who insists on playing on the edge of the island. "He'll be all right with Norman," Gwennie reassured her. "Won't he, Norman?"

'Fred Dyson said: "Mustn't make a nunny out of the boy. If Mr. Pascoe don't mind diving in and pulling him out of the water every few minutes—"

"Not a bit," replied Norman, cheerful and obliging.

'Yet he turned his back on the little group, and walked to the prow end of the island, where he stood a while looking down into the rushes as though lost in thought.

'Presently he returned and said gently:

"Better not risk it. You see, I can't swim."

And so Norman loses Gwennie—however much of a loss this may be, for she was not the kind to understand when she saw him turn and come back to them across the lawn 'and heard him say in front of her, "I can't swim," that she was witnessing the third brave act of his life: an equivalent to the lion act, to the Mrs. Herrick act, but even more desperately courageous, done under the gaze of his beloved.'

Means of Grace.

Religion is a state and activity of the soul, and theology but a partial and blundering effort of the mind to explain it. The life of God in the heart of man is quite independent of any theories or explana-

tions of it that may be offered. It is of real importance that such theories and explanations should be true, but, true or false, they can never be a substitute for the life itself. Therefore to make a man's theology the criterion of his religion may be most misleading. It is notorious that men who are very jealous for the correctness of their theological opinions are often wholly irreligious, while some of the most truly devout and religious persons may be quite innocent of anything that can be called theology.

It is much the same with things ecclesiastical. A man is not made a Christian by joining a Church. Christ must be born in him first, and when that has happened his only concern about Churches will be to know which of them will help him best to nourish this divine life in the soul. . . . Let no man despise what are sometimes called the means of grace. Our church and chapel services, with all their crudities and imperfections, are for most people the only available means of coming into touch with the eternal and unseen, and so of cultivating the life of the soul. It is their task to keep religion alive in the land and to save us from the ruin that must overwhelm a godless nation in the end. It is a task in which all men and women of goodwill can help. By making the worship of our churches more devout and appealing and by maintaining in them a high standard of Christian character and witness, they can prove the power of religion and help to keep alive the soul of England.¹

No Racial Boundaries.

After his death 'on Sunday morning 11th January 1931 the family of the great philanthropist, Nathan Straus, called me by telephone from New York, saying it was their unanimous request that I make the address at his public funeral.

'I took the train to New York and at the station entered a taxi to be taken to the beautiful Temple Emanu-El for the funeral exercises. When I gave that address to the taxi driver, he said, "Then you are going to the funeral of one of the best men who ever lived."

'Not many days before his death I had a remarkable conversation with Nathan Straus. He was on his deathbed and he knew it; yet as I bent close to his face, he whispered, "I am one of the happiest men in the world, for although I am weak and hopelessly ill, I know that I have done the right thing with my wealth, in giving so much of it away while I was alive and well. . . . John D. Rockefeller has been so wise in this respect. He is a man of the

¹ W. B. Selbie in *The Christian World*, 18th April.

noblest and finest character. He has shown us all what to do with our wealth."

'He repeated to me one of his favourite quotations: "Money given in health is gold; money given in sickness is silver; money given at death is lead."

'Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Straus were devout and deeply religious Jews; their charity and love for mankind knew no racial or theological boundaries.'²

Modern Poetry.

In Mr. E. W. Parker's new anthology, *Modern Poetry* (Longmans; 2s. 6d.), there has been no attempt, he says, to make any well-balanced survey of modern poetry but rather to display its range and variety. This has been accomplished with success, though we doubt if Christina Rossetti, Hardy and Meredith can come under the category of 'modern' poets. We value them too much, however, to quarrel with their inclusion. The poets of to-day are many in number and several whose work we admire are not represented, but Mr. Parker's taste is sound and A. E. Housman, Victoria Sackville West, and Siegfried Sassoon are given a place. We find also 'The Tower' of Robert Nichols, omitted from too many anthologies, and T. S. Eliot's lovely 'Song of Simeon.'

Lord, the Roman hyacinths are blooming in bowls
and

The winter sun creeps by the snow hills; . . .

Grant us thy peace . . .

According to thy word.

They shall praise thee and suffer in every generation
With glory and derision,

Light upon light, mounting the saint's stair.

Not for me the martyrdom, the ecstasy of thought
and prayer,

Not for me the ultimate vision.

Grant me thy peace.

(And a sword shall pierce thy heart,

Thine also).

I am tired with my own life and the lives of those
after me,

I am dying in my own death and the deaths of those
after me.

Let thy servant depart,

Having seen thy salvation.

² William Lyon Phelps, *Autobiography with Letters*, 849.