

Faith and Thought

Journal of the Victoria Institute

Published by

THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE

27 HERMITAGE COURT, LONDON E.18

Vol. 97 No. 1 Spring 1968

CONTENTS

Editorial	1
EDWARD J. YOUNG	3
What Makes a Contradiction? Donald M. MacKay, B.Sc., Ph.D.	7
The Literary Background of the New Testament F. F. Bruce, D.D.	15
Some Thoughts on Religion and Science A. G. Curnow	41
REVIEWS	58

Editorial Address:

12 Burcote Road, London S.W.18

© Copyright by The Victoria Institute and Contributors 1968

Printed in Great Britain by
RAITHBY, LAWRENCE & CO. LTD
at the De Montfort Press, Leicester and London

Faith and Thought

A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation
of the Christian revelation and modern research

Vol. 97

Number 1

Spring 1968

EDITORIAL

Whilst this Number of the Journal was being prepared we learned with great sorrow of the death of Professor E. J. Young of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, U.S.A. We are honoured to pay tribute to him in the pages of *Faith and Thought*, and we wish to place on record our sympathy for Mrs Young and the members of the family. Among his many interests, Professor Young was known to be in hearty support of the Victoria Institute, and many readers of the Journal will recall with gratitude the contribution which he found time to make in 1963 (Vol. 93 No. 2) on 'Some Thoughts on Old Testament Scholarship'. In this Professor Young made a number of wise observations, one of them in particular should serve as a source of inspiration to all who hold his memory in esteem. He wrote: 'True Christian scholarship therefore is willing and glad to recognize the debt it owes to all who have advanced the cause of learning. In itself, however, it would hold as the great goal to be achieved, the glory of God. In all that it does it strives to bring glory to God, the Creator. The Christian investigator, whatever be the field in which he is working, will realize that this is God's world, and in his endeavour to arrive at the truth will be guided by the Bible itself'.

From the Inter Varsity Fellowship comes a book by Dr Francis Schaeffer, *Escape From Reason*. The blurb is arresting. 'Man is

dead. God is dead. Life has become meaningless existence . . . The only way of escape lies in a non-rational fantasy world of experience . . .’ The author traces a number of trends which have given rise to the shape of modern thought, each put into what Dr Schaeffer believes to be its true historical context. For example, Kierkegaard is portrayed as a decisive stage in a process which ultimately ‘put away the hope of a unified field of knowledge’ so that faith and rationality had to be sundered. Now the upper and lower ‘storeys’, as Dr Schaeffer calls them, are not appreciated for the thickness of the line that separates them by ‘those of us who come out of a Christian background, or an upper-middle-class background’ in contrast with ‘the twentieth-century man on the left bank in Paris – or at London University’. If this appears as an overstatement to us it should at least provide food for reflection from the seven compressed chapters of the book, and it is tempting to think that there is much in it which could usefully be expanded in this Journal.

Christian people in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. have been deeply impressed by the testimony of the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand who was imprisoned by the Communist regime in Rumania for fifteen years. The publication of Pastor Wurmbrand’s latest book *In God’s Underground*, has given readers further insight into the methods of political tyranny in Eastern Europe. Anyone who reads either Pastor Wurmbrand’s latest book, or his earlier *Tortured For Christ* will find himself asking again how it is that Communism can theoretically exalt man on one hand, but oppress the individual in the interests of the State on the other. Defection by prominent Christians, resulting in their being used by the Party for furtherance of its aims under a religious guise, is a constant cause for concern. It is a matter for continuing urgency that we should remember all christians in countries dominated by Communism and help to further the work of such societies as the *European Christian Mission*, the *Eastern European Mission*, and others like them.

EDWARD JOSEPH YOUNG

Obituary

Biblical scholarship not only in America but throughout the world suffered a sad loss with the sudden death on 14 February, 1968, at the age of sixty, of Dr. Edward J. Young, Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and Editor of the *Westminster Theological Journal*.

Young was one of the first students to take a theological course at the Seminary with which his name was to be so closely associated. Westminster Seminary was founded in 1929 to perpetuate the old tradition of enlightened orthodoxy maintained for generations at Princeton Theological Seminary, when it was feared that Princeton was relaxing its adherence to this tradition. He went to Westminster from Stanford University, where he had taken his arts degree, and after graduating as bachelor and master in theology at Westminster he spent some time doing research in the University of Leipzig. On his return he was appointed to the teaching staff at Westminster, and completed his research in Hebrew and other Semitic languages at Dropsie College, Philadelphia, where he earned his doctorate.

Young speedily established a reputation for himself as the most outstanding Old Testament scholar in America belonging to the older conservative school. His standard of orthodoxy was too high for many who adhered in a general way to evangelical orthodoxy; more than once scholars of the latter category have said to me: 'I am orthodox, of course, but not like Edward J. Young'. But if his standard of orthodoxy was high, so was his standard of scholarship. He commanded the respect of many scholars who disagreed totally with his theological position both because of his learning and because of his courtesy. His own beliefs on critical problems were firmly held and faithfully proclaimed, but he did not misrepresent the beliefs of others. He could always be counted upon to state them fairly and not to indulge in denunciation of those with whom he differed. In this

country he enjoyed the friendship and esteem of Professor H. H. Rowley among others. Professor Rowley and he both wrote on the book of Daniel and adopted irreconcilable positions with regard to its date and authorship. The study of Daniel seems to bring out the worst in some commentators, but not in these two: 'even on Daniel', says Professor Rowley, 'he [Young] acknowledged that the traditional view involved difficulties which he could not solve. This was preferable to the bogus solutions so often put forward'.

His principal works included *The Prophecy of Daniel* (1949), *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (1949), *Arabic for Beginners* (1949), *My Servants the Prophets* (1952), *Studies in Isaiah* (1954), *Thy Word is Truth* (1957) and *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today* (1958). His *Studies in Isaiah* constituted prolegomena to his *magnum opus*, his commentary on Isaiah now in course of production in three volumes as the firstfruits of Eerdmans' New International Commentary on the Old Testament. He was General Editor of this series, and had gone a considerable way in planning it and assigning the volumes to various authors. One of his latest literary productions was an essay for a symposium on the Bible currently being prepared by the Editor of *Faith and Thought*.

In his *Introduction to the Old Testament* he took such a conservative line (maintaining the Mosaic authorship of practically the whole Pentateuch, the unity of Isaiah and Zechariah, the historicity of Jonah and Esther, the sixth-century date of Daniel and the like) that many readers were surprised, and some (wrongly) suspected an inconsistency, when they found that he rejected the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes and dated the book in the post-exilic period. The writer, he suggested, 'placed his words in the mouth of Solomon, thus employing a literary device for conveying his message'. Very good, but perhaps other biblical writers employed a similar literary device in works where Dr. Young would have been less willing to allow such a possibility. In the same work he uncharacteristically expressed a preference for a familiar conjectural emendation in Judges 18:30 over the Massoretic reading – possibly because the emendation allows an earlier dating for Judges than does the Massoretic text.

On two occasions I persuaded him to take part in a confrontation in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, once with the late Professor Aage Bentzen of Copenhagen (after I had reviewed and compared their respective Old Testament Introductions), and once with our friend Mr. H. L. Ellison (in response to Mr. Ellison's review of *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*). He affirmed his convictions uncompromisingly, on the basis of 'the Christian-theistic principles of methodology'. But the two scholars with whom he took issue on these occasions also argued from the presuppositions of Christian theism. If investigators embark on the study of biblical criticism or biblical theology with the premise that God has not spoken or that miracles do not happen, their conclusions will be conditioned by their premises. But Christian investigators who regard it as axiomatic that in the world which He created God has both spoken and acted will not on this ground alone achieve unanimity on questions of date, authorship or interpretation of biblical documents. The tools of literary and historical criticism are there for them to use, and if such criticism (pursued with Christian presuppositions) points clearly in a certain direction, its evidence should not be refused because it conflicts with *a priori* theologoumena. For this evidence is an integral part of the world which God created.

These reflections are among the lessons which may be learned from the life and example of Edward J. Young. He has been taken at the height of his powers, and his place will be hard to fill. Many of us are grateful for all that he taught us; our gratitude for his memory can best be shown by giving ourselves with renewed energy to the studies which he adorned so signally.

F. F. BRUCE

D. M. MACKAY, B.SC., PH.D.

What Makes a Contradiction?

'There's only one thing impossible, Jack, an' that's for a chiel to pull his troosers on ower his heid.' Thus a rustic worthy is reputed to have defined the limits of speculation in a harbour-side argument in my home town of Wick. In more theological matters, it is curiously difficult to find any corresponding 'standard cases' of logical impossibility. Arguments in theology tend to be inconclusive. Opponents freely accuse one another of 'having it both ways', and the suspicion grows in the mind of the onlooker that no sharp criteria of contradiction are recognized in talk about God. Why should this be? If the One whom Christians worship is the God of truth, why is it apparently so difficult to pin down different beliefs about Him as clearly and sharply incompatible?

The object of this essay is to throw some light on these questions by taking a closer look at the way in which sharp contradictions come about – in particular, by showing how what we regard as a contradiction, in any field of discourse, depends on certain presuppositions concerning the subject-matter, which may often be held unconsciously by participants on both sides.

Contradiction in Mathematics

Most of us would take mathematics to be the most rigorous of argumentative disciplines, so let us begin by looking at the way in which mathematicians use the notion of contradiction. Suppose that in coordinate geometry we define two points P and Q, and give both of them the same coordinates (x,y) . (This means simply that each lies at a distance of x units from the north-south axis and y units from the east-west axis.) Does this definition of P and Q *contradict* (i.e. rule out, as impossible) the statement 'P and Q are not at the same place'? The answer is of course *Yes*, if P and Q are defined as points *in the same plane*; but other-

wise, *No*. Once we admit the possibility of a third dimension, the contradiction vanishes. It is perfectly possible for two points to have the same grid coordinates on a map, for example, without being at the same place. It simply means that one of them is vertically above the other, like aeroplanes 'stacked' before landing. One of the first things an airport radar operator learns is that two aircraft moving to the same position on the radar screen will not necessarily collide!

Simple though it is, we will find this an instructive example for our present purpose. A reader who *presupposed* that we were talking about two-dimensional geometry will probably have felt slightly cheated by our introduction of a third dimension. 'Oh, if *that's* what you mean, of course it's all right; but you didn't *say*', he may complain. For the sake of illustration, we may even imagine someone accusing us of having 'brought in the third dimension in order to escape from the self-contradiction inherent in our earlier statements'. How then should we answer?

In so far as pure mathematics can be likened to a game, a creation of our own minds, with clearly definable rules made by ourselves, I think we must agree that we gave our critics too little information to play the game properly. We ought perhaps to have prefaced our definition of P and Q with the words 'In a three-dimensional framework'. Equally, they must admit that they had no grounds for accusing us of self-contradiction until they knew *how many dimensions* the space of P and Q might have.

But another kind of answer is also possible. We could tell our critics that the information we gave them (P is at (x,y) ; Q is at (x,y) ; P and Q are not in the same place) was logically *equivalent* to informing them that the space in which P and Q exist *must have more than two dimensions*. If they had not been so eager to accuse us of contradicting ourselves, they could have learned something that they needed to know, by paying proper attention to the data. In the same way, the radar operator, having observed that the positions of aircraft have frequently coincided on his two-dimensional radar screen without any signs of a collision or a near miss, could in principle infer, without being told anything more, that they must be separated in a third dimension. *An apparent contradiction, both of whose terms are supported by experience, is the logical indicator of an unsuspected dimension*. Conversely, it is

impossible conclusively to settle the question whether two statements about the real world are contradictory by appeal to logic alone. Proofs of contradiction are always *relative* to some assumption about the 'dimensionality' of the descriptive framework, in a generalized sense.

Sad to say, this proviso even questions the rustic example with which we began. In three-dimensional space, it is true that trousers can only be put on 'legs first'; but if four-dimensional geometry were applicable, geometers assure us that the body could be inserted into trousers (or removed therefrom) without passing through any of their apertures! If this is a little difficult to visualize, consider an analogous situation in two-dimensional space. An object inside a circular boundary can get outside (if confined to the plane of the circle) only by passing through the boundary; but in three-dimensional space, it can be removed by lifting it out of the plane of the circle, and *over* the boundary, without penetrating it. Hence there is no necessary contradiction in saying both (a) 'X has come from inside Y (or has entered Y) which has a closed boundary' and (b) 'X has not passed through the boundary of Y'. It all depends on the number of dimensions in which X is free to move; or we might equally well say that an additional dimension in which X is free to move is betokened by the fact that X has entered or left Y without passing through its boundary. In either formulation the arbiter is not logic, but brute fact.

Complementarity

Shocking though our mathematical examples may seem, the removal of apparent contradiction by admitting an extra dimension makes relatively modest demands on our imagination. It is, after all, only what our visual system does for us automatically with the discrepancies between the appearances of solid objects viewed by our left and right eyes. We see, not discrepancies, but *depth* in the field of view. In a clear sense, the two views are not contradictory but *complementary*.

In the recent history of physics, however, apparent contradictions of a still more shocking kind have had to be endured. When light rays or electric 'cathode rays' are sent through empty

space, they are found to ripple round an obstacle, such as the bars of a grating, to form the kind of 'ripple pattern' that a system of *waves* would do, on a receiving screen at the far side of the obstacle. This has given rise to a highly successful 'wave theory' of light-in-motion and matter-in-motion, from which the ripple patterns produced on a receiving screen by passing such radiation through gratings of all different shapes can be successfully predicted.

On the other hand when such rays are emitted or absorbed, they behave equally unmistakably like a stream of *particles*, 'quanta' or 'bullets' of a definite fixed size. Worse still, when the emission is so weak that 'bullets' are given off and received only one at a time, the pattern eventually formed by the 'bullet holes' on the receiving screen or photographic plate is still exactly the same ripple pattern as when the emission was intense.

Now we come to the apparent contradiction. If only one bullet at a time is supposed to encounter the grating (and is not stopped by it), it must surely pass through only one or another of the apertures in the grating. Yet as the bullet holes accumulate on the receiving screen at the far side, the pattern they gradually delineate is found to be still the same ripple-pattern that would be expected if a *wave* had passed through the *whole* grating. Must we then conclude that each individual bullet has somehow gone through *all* the apertures at once?

Initially, this dilemma was felt to be so intolerable that physicists divided into those who accepted the 'wave' model and those who accepted the 'particle' one (or perhaps each on alternate days!); but in due course the weight of experimental evidence has forced us to recognize that *both* thought-models are valid and necessary to do justice to different aspects of the behaviour of radiation (whether optical or electrical). Gradually, it has come to be realized that the situations to which a 'wave' model applies are *not of the same kind* as those in which a 'particle' model is needed. 'Wave' models lead to correct expectations of the behaviour of matter-in-motion (or charge-in-motion, or light-in-motion, etc.) whereas 'particle' models correctly predict the behaviour of matter-on-impact (charge-on-impact, light-on-impact, etc.). Given this distinction, the two are never in practice contradictory, but *complementary*.

It is not my purpose, of course, to commend this state of physical theory as if it were in any way final. All it does is to illustrate dramatically, in terms of actual scientific history, a point which might otherwise seem artificial and academic: namely, that criteria of contradiction, however 'commonsensical', can be dangerously misleading when applied to descriptions of the real world. Always it is the facts, however bewildering, rather than argument, however plausible, that must have the last word. The man who would venture in the name of 'logic' to pronounce any physical event impossible has no guarantee whatever against the arrival of the event in question with a label attached: 'You didn't expect this, did you?'. Readiness to expand our descriptive frame in obedience to fresh data is in fact what is meant by the essential humility of science.

But we can learn something more from this physical example. Confronted with irrefutable evidence of wave-behaviour and particle-behaviour, the physicist is not content to abandon logic and cheerfully maintain a jumbled model with two incoherent ingredients. Instead, he asks at once *under which circumstances* each description is appropriate. Only when each has been *labelled* for the experimental standpoint from which it is known to be valid can he rest content. Similarly, nobody tries to check the plan and elevation drawings of a building for consistency by laying one on top of the other; but until each is labelled for the angle from which it claims to be valid, no one knows how to check whether the two can in fact be consistent as pictures of the same three-dimensional object. Even when different descriptions are known to be complementary, *identification of standpoint* remains a major task.

A third lesson can be learned from the case of wave-particle physics. If we had asked a nineteenth century physicist what hard evidence he had for his assertions about the nature of radiation, his answer might well have been in terms of *entities* such as waves, or particles, which he might claim were 'observable' under suitable conditions. A physicist today would (one hopes!) be more cautious. The hard evidence he would point to would not be observable *entities* but observable *events*, to which he might give hyphenated names such as 'electron-impact', 'photon-impact' and the like. It is in fact by tracing our data back to

events, and patterns and probabilities of events, that we have discovered how to express the facts of atomic physics without any trace of self-contradiction. This is not (as some positivists would have it) a matter of *denying the reality* of the entities confronting us, but only a principle of 'conceptual hygiene' to allow our limited experimental knowledge enough room to grow without breeding spurious contradictions. The entities whose existence we intuit or read off from our data are thus left the more free to impose their true structure upon our thinking as our data (in observed events) accumulate.

Logic and Theology

We may sum up what we have learned from these examples as follows:

(i) In any field of discourse, logic can be used to detect contradiction only when the dimensionality of the descriptive frame has been fixed. Otherwise, every apparent contradiction must be qualified as 'conditional on the non-existence of yet another (logical) dimension in addition to those which we have assumed'.

(ii) In discourse that purports to describe reality, the number of dimensions necessary to do justice to the data of experience must be absolutely open to revision by those data. No event can be held *a priori* to be logically impossible, 'contradictory to fact' or the like. Such claims are strictly nonsensical.

(iii) Where complementary descriptions turn out to be required by the data of experience, it is essential to identify the logical standpoint from which each is defined, as careless mixing of elements valid for different standpoints can lead to confusion.

(iv) It is easiest to see the logical relationship between different data and to avoid spurious conflict if they are expressed in terms of experienced events rather than abstract entities.

What then of theological discourse? Can we justly affirm that 'logic does not apply to the things of the spirit', or even that there is spiritual benefit to be derived from believing both sides of a contradiction in the name of faith? Not at all. Logic applies, and must be scrupulously applied, to any systematic statement worth making, in theology as elsewhere. What goes wrong in religious disputation is not that the anti-religious are too logical,

but that they are often not logical enough in discerning what possibilities are left open by the data. They are too eager to adopt and argue within an impoverished descriptive frame, rather than keep open the possibility that their intuitive frame needs additional dimensions. On the other hand, Christians also often fail to sort out and keep clear the logical standpoints from which different theological concepts are defined; and they could frequently avoid accusations of self-contradiction or 'meaningless' talk if they would take pains to frame theological evidence where possible in terms of events and activities (e.g. obeying-God, being-forgiven-by-God, being-guided-by-God, being rebuked-by-God) rather than entities (God, obedience, forgiveness, guidance, rebuke).

But if we reject the idea that theologians are privileged to defy logic, we must not undervalue the grain of truth that the assertion contains. What it usually means, in fact, is that in theology we have often to deal with concepts whose logical dimensionality is undefined. It follows, for the reasons we have considered, that logical criteria of contradiction can seldom be *applied* with certainty, and that prior notions of 'what seems reasonable' are liable (in the logical nature of the case) to be treacherous guides. These are logical facts, neglect of which has been one of the great weaknesses of theological 'liberalism' and 'rationalism' down through the ages; and nothing we have said should be allowed to diminish their force. Where the subject matter adequately defines its own dimensionality, logical conclusions can be drawn with full rigour; but the onus must be on the logician to prove that this is the case. This is precisely the difference between empirical discourse and an artificial language game.

On the other hand just as empirical science rests content, at a given stage of its development, with *working assumptions* as to the logical dimensions of its concepts, so theology in principle might hope to do the same, and in practice it often does. Within the limits of these working assumptions, potential contradictions can be identified and the discipline of logic pursued with full rigour, subject only to an equally rigorous obligation to make clear at each step what is being taken for granted. After all, it is to the living God of truth, and not to some abstract code of logical

practice, that we are responsible for avoiding self-contradiction, and above all for avoiding self-contradiction in His name.

F. F. BRUCE, D.D.

Literary Background of the New Testament

The literature surveyed in this paper is a selection of Palestinian Jewish literature from the last two centuries B.C. and the first century A.D. It does not include documents which have secured a place in the Septuagint, nor yet the Qumran texts in the stricter sense (although some of the works to be considered here have been identified in the Qumran library, they do not appear to be sectarian documents peculiar to the Qumran community). A number of the works considered belong to the pseudepigrapha: that is to say, in accordance with a literary convention of the time which was followed mainly, though not exclusively, by authors of apocalyptic works, they were published under the name of some outstanding figure of Old Testament history. The selection is made principally with respect to the bearing which these documents have on the interpretation of the New Testament.

I. Literature of the Second Jewish Commonwealth

1. *First Enoch*. This is not a unitary work but a collection of apocalyptic material. It is frequently called the 'Ethiopic Enoch' – in distinction from the 'Slavonic Enoch' (2 Enoch) and the 'Hebrew Enoch' (3 Enoch) – because it is extant in its entirety only in the Ethiopic version, thanks to its canonical status in the Ethiopic Church. The Ethiopic version is based on a Greek version. About one third of the whole work is extant in Greek, mainly in papyri found in Egypt. The original language was Semitic; the discovery of fragments of about ten Aramaic manuscripts of 1 Enoch in Cave 4 at Qumran suggests that most of it was originally composed in Aramaic.

The collection consists of five principal parts: (a) Enoch's journeying to other worlds (i-xxxvi), (b) the 'Similitudes'

(xxxvii-lxxi), (c) the courses of the heavenly bodies (lxxii-lxxxii), (d) world-history seen in dream-visions (lxxxiii-xc), (e) the concluding section (xci-cviii) which incorporates an independent 'Apocalypse of Weeks' in which the history of the world is divided into ten 'weeks' of indefinite duration (xciii. 1-10, xci. 12-17), and fragments of a Noah-Apocalypse (cvi-cvii), other fragments of which may be traced in earlier sections of 1 Enoch. The various parts were composed evidently in the second and first centuries B.C. Some of the earlier parts are presupposed by the *Book of Jubilees* (iv. 15ff.) and by the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*Test. Simeon* v. 4; *Test. Levi* x. 5, etc.).

Enoch, who walked with God and was ultimately translated by God to His own dwelling-place (Gen. v. 21-24) was plainly a suitable person to receive revelations both of the divine purpose for the future and of the mysteries of outer space. Moreover, his career was brought into close connection with the 'sons of God' or fallen angels of Gen. vi. 1-4, to whom in 1 Enoch xvi. 3f. he pronounces their doom. This element in 1 Enoch has left its mark on some of the later books of the NT - cf. the 'spirits in prison' of 1 Pet. iii. 19 (where, however, we should resist the temptation to adopt the conjectural emendation which introduces Enoch as the preacher) and the references to the 'angels that sinned' by leaving 'their own habitation' in 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6. Jude 14f., indeed, presents a straightforward quotation from 1 Enoch i. 9.

But the section of 1 Enoch which is most relevant to Gospel study is that called the 'Similitudes', a separate work in which the fallen angels do not figure. It is reported that thus far, while fragments of all the other main sections of 1 Enoch have been identified at Qumran, no fragment of this section has been found. In view of the fragmentary condition of what *has* been found, it is precarious to base any argument on the absence of anything from the 'Similitudes'.

In the 'Similitudes' God, the 'Lord of Spirits', appears as 'One who had a head of days', or, more briefly, as 'the Head of days'. This designation is certainly derived from Dan. vii. 9, where Daniel beholds 'the Ancient of days', whose hair is 'like the pure wool'. But Daniel's 'one like a son of man' (vii. 13), who is brought to the Ancient of days on the clouds of heaven, appears

in the 'Similitudes of Enoch' as '*the* Son of Man who has righteousness' (xlvi. 3), identical apparently with the person elsewhere called the 'Anointed One' (Messiah) of the Lord of Spirits (xlviii. 10, lii. 4), 'the Righteous One . . . whose elect works hang upon the Lord of Spirits' (xxxviii. 2), and 'the Elect One of righteousness and faith', who has 'his dwelling-place under the wings of the Lord of Spirits' (xxxix. 6f.). This Son of Man 'was named before the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days . . . before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were made' (xlviii. 2f.). He is to be a support to the righteous and a light to the nations (xlviii. 4), but the executor of divine judgement upon the ungodly (xlviii. 8-10).

'From the beginning the Son of Man was hidden,
And the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might,
And revealed him to the elect' (lxii. 7).

But on the day of visitation the Son of Man is manifested as saviour of the righteous and judge of the wicked.

'And one portion of them shall look on the other,
And they shall be terrified,
And they shall be downcast of countenance,
And pain shall seize them,
When they see that Son of Man
Sitting on the throne of his glory' (lxii. 5).

Such references to the Son of Man or the Elect One sitting as judge 'on the throne of his glory', where he is installed by the Lord of Spirits (lxi. 8, lxii. 2) remind us forcibly of Jesus' words about the time when the Son of Man will sit on 'the throne of his glory', with the Twelve enthroned as his assessors in judgement (Mt. xix. 28), while all nations appear before him to be separated one from another 'as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats' (Mt. xxv. 31ff.). The distinctive feature in the Gospel parable of the sheep and the goats is not the general picture of judgement, but the surprising criterion by which judgement is passed.

Before we hastily write down these 'Son of Man' passages in 1 Enoch as Christian interpolations, we must reckon with their unexpected dénouement: in lxxi. 1ff. Enoch is translated to heaven and is greeted by God with the words: 'Thou art the Son of Man who art born for righteousness; righteousness abides over

thee, and the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes thee not' (lxxii. 14). No Christian interpolator would have identified the Son of Man with Enoch.

The Son of Man in the 'Similitudes' as in Dn. vii is to be understood in terms of corporate personality, as the community of the righteous – 'named' and 'hidden' in God's presence from all eternity (or, in Pauline language, 'foreknown' and 'foreordained before the world's foundation') – which can be individualized from time to time in someone who is outstandingly righteous, like Enoch (who, in another section of 1 Enoch, for his righteousness was commissioned to pronounce judgement on the fallen angels), or like that Righteous One who has been chosen to pronounce judgement on all the ungodly at the end-time. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels may also be understood up to a point in terms of corporate personality, but he owes his distinctive character to his identification in our Lord's teaching and redemptive ministry with the Isaianic Servant of the Lord, who (unlike the Son of Man in Enoch) gives his life as an offering for sin. And the Righteous One in whom the Gospel Son of Man is individualized is Jesus Himself.

2. *The Book of Jubilees*. This book is so entitled because it presents the Pentateuchal history from the creation of the world to the Israelites' entry into Canaan in a framework of fifty 'jubilee' periods of forty-nine years each (the Exodus is thus dated A.M. 2410 and the entry into Canaan A.M. 2450). The contents are imparted to Moses by an angel when he went up Mount Sinai to receive the law; 'there are forty-nine jubilees from the days of Adam until this day', said the angel, 'and one week [of years] and two years; and there are yet forty years to come for learning the commandments of the Lord, until they pass over into the land of Canaan' (c. 4).

The entire work is extant only in Ethiopic, into which it was translated from Greek; Greek and Latin fragments are also known. Fragments of the Hebrew original have been found in Caves 1, 2 and 4 at Qumran.

Jubilees was probably composed in the second century B.C. in the same circles from which came 1 Enoch and its sources, and the original draft of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The *Zadokite Work* refers to it as authoritative (CD xvi. 4).

The main purpose of the work is evidently to commend the exclusive use of a solar calendar of 364 days, in which the sacred festivals and fasts would fall annually on the same day of the week as well as on the same day of the month. In the absence of any provision for intercalation, this calendar must have deviated increasingly from the solar and agricultural year, but a calendar of the same general character appears to be attested in the Flood narrative of Genesis and in the book of Ezekiel, and a calendar almost, if not altogether, identical with that of Jubilees was followed by the Qumran community. The moon plays no part in the calendrical system; the months are purely calendar months. Whereas Gen. i. 14 implies that God appointed sun, moon and stars to 'be for signs and for seasons and for days and for years', the parallel in Jub. ii. 9 says expressly that 'God appointed the sun [and only the sun] to be a great sign on the earth for days and for sabbaths and for months and for feasts and for years and for sabbaths of years and for jubilees and for all seasons of the years'. The lunisolar year which was observed by most Jews (including Pharisees and Sadducees alike) is denounced (vi. 36); perhaps it was considered a feature of assimilation to Gentile ways.

The prestige of the tribe of Levi is emphasized. When Isaac blesses Jacob's two sons Levi and Judah (xxx. 12 ff.), he foretells that Levi's descendants will be not only priests but also 'princes and judges and chiefs of all the seed of the sons of Jacob' (verse 15). One of the sons of Judah, he goes on to say (verse 18), will be 'prince over the sons of Jacob' and the Gentiles will quake before him, but no such weight is laid upon his sovereignty as is laid upon the primacy of Levi.

The decrease in men's expectation of life since antediluvian times will continue until 'the heads of the children will be white with grey hair, and a child of three weeks will appear as old as a man of a hundred years' (xxiii. 25); then, with renewed study and practice of the law of God, a time of restoration will set in, when men will live to be a thousand years old (xxiii. 27) and evil will be abolished from the universe.

The biblical foundation of the narrative of *Jubilees* is expanded by means of haggadic and halakhic material. Haggadic amplifications include the account of Abraham's coming to the

knowledge of the true God at the age of fourteen (xi. 16f.) and of his invention of a seed-scatterer to be attached to the plough (xi. 23f.), and the description of the war at Hebron between the families of Esau and Jacob, in which Jacob kills Esau with an arrow (xxxvii. 1–xxxviii. 14). The halakhic expansions represent the patriarchs as keeping the Sinaitic law in scrupulous detail – not only the written law but later oral interpretations of it. Thus Abraham circumambulates the altar carrying palm-branches seven times a day for each day of the feast of Tabernacles (xvi. 31). The interpretation of the law is, if anything, stricter than the later rabbinical interpretation. The tables of the law given to Moses are a replica of heavenly tables, so that the will of God may be done on earth as it was already done in heaven (cf. ii. 18, iii. 10).

3. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a work purporting to reproduce the charges which the twelve sons of Jacob gave their children before they died, has come down to us in Greek, Armenian and Slavonic recensions, the Armenian and Slavonic recensions being translated from Greek. The original language was Hebrew and/or Aramaic, in which the work was first composed in the second or first century B.C. Since the Greek and other versions have been preserved by the Christian Church (like many of the other Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and the writings of Philo and Josephus), they have undergone considerable editing in Christian interests; and even before that there is some reason to discern a variety of Jewish recensions in which conflicting Jewish interests are represented. It is no easy task to establish the history of the work throughout its various recensions from the original core; much depends on the interpreter's understanding of the purpose of the original compiler, and only fragments of the Semitic texts survive. Aramaic fragments of a *Testament of Levi* were found in the Cairo genizah; further Aramaic fragments of the same document have been identified from Qumran Caves 1 and 4, and Hebrew fragments of a *Testament of Naphtali* from Cave 4. It is clear that the Greek *Testaments* are not straightforward translations of the Aramaic and Hebrew texts; the latter are considerably longer than the corresponding Greek texts.

The *Testaments* first became known in the west through Robert

Grosseteste, thirteenth-century bishop of Lincoln, who procured a tenth-century Greek manuscript of the work and published a Latin translation of it. Grosseteste accepted the *Testaments* as genuine utterances of the twelve patriarchs, and imagined that the Jews had withheld them from public circulation because of the testimonies to Christ which they contained.

In fact, we find elements in the *Testaments* which reflect quite different life-settings, not least with regard to the priesthood. Consider, for example, these extracts:

(a) 'To Levi God gave the sovereignty . . . Therefore, I [Reuben] command you, hearken to Levi, because he will know the law of the Lord, and will give ordinances for judgement and will sacrifice for all Israel until the consummation of the times, as the anointed high priest of whom the Lord spoke. I adjure you by the God of heaven, practise truth each one with his neighbour and entertain love each one for his brother. And draw near to Levi in humbleness of heart, that you may receive a blessing from his mouth. For he will bless Israel and Judah, because it is he whom the Lord has chosen to be king over all the nation. And bow down before his seed, for on your behalf it will die in wars visible and invisible, and will be an eternal king among you' (*Test. Reuben* vi. 7-12).

(b) 'A king will arise in Judah, and will make a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles for all the Gentiles. And his advent (Gk. *parousia*) is beloved, as a prophet of the Most High, of the seed of Abraham our father' (*Test. Levi* viii. 14f.).

(c) 'And now, my children, I command you, love Levi, that you may abide, and exalt not yourselves against him, lest you be utterly destroyed. For to me [Judah] the Lord gave the kingdom, and to him the priesthood, and He set the kingdom beneath the priesthood. To me He gave the things upon the earth; to him the things in the heavens. As the heaven is higher than the earth, so is the priesthood of God higher than the earthly kingdom, unless it falls away through sin from the Lord and is dominated by the earthly kingdom. For the angel of the Lord said to me: "The Lord chose him rather than thee, to draw near to him and to eat of His table and to offer Him the firstfruits of the choice things of the sons of Israel; but thou shalt be king of Jacob"' (*Test. Judah* xxi. 1-5).

Of these three passages the first ascribes kingship as well as priesthood to the tribe of Levi, the second ascribes priesthood as well as kingship to the tribe of Judah, the third ascribes priesthood to the tribe of Levi and kingship to the tribe of Judah.

The first reflects a period in which a Levitical family exercised the authority of kingship as well as that of priesthood. Such a period we know: it was the period of the Hasmonaeen rulers, from Jonathan's assumption of the high priesthood in 152 B.C.

to the execution of Antigonus by Antony in 37 B.C. But recognition of the Hasmonaeans' claims to high priesthood is not characteristic of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; if this first passage is not an interpolation, it bears witness to a recension of the work by a sympathizer with the Hasmonaeans.

The second passage is surely Christian in origin. Whatever priestly functions may have been discharged by David and his successors in pre-exilic times, no suggestion of a priesthood associated with the tribe of Judah appears in the age of the Second Temple until the rise of Christianity. 'For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests' (Heb. vii. 14). But here a king who arises in Judah (the Davidic Messiah) will establish a new priesthood and will exercise it for the Gentiles. Moreover, this priest-king will be a prophet of the Most High – our Lord's *triplex munus* is quite clearly in view. Again, if this passage is not an interpolation, it belongs to a Christian recension of the *Testaments* – a recension, moreover, made under the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The third passage represents the general OT and Jewish tradition by distinguishing the Levitical priesthood from the royal power of Judah. But in placing the kingship below the priesthood it betrays its affinity with that strand of interpretation which goes back to Ezek. xl–xlviii, where the Davidic 'prince' is unmistakably subordinate to the priesthood in the administration of the restored community of Israel. The same emphasis appears in another passage in the *Testaments*, where Naphtali is the speaker:

'In the fortieth year of my life, I saw a vision on the Mount of Olives, on the east of Jerusalem: the sun and moon were standing still. And behold, Isaac, my father's father, said to us: "Run and take hold of them, each according to his strength; and to him who seizes them the sun and moon will belong." And we ran all of us together, and Levi took hold of the sun, and Judah outstripped the others and seized the moon, and they were both lifted up with them' (*Test. Naphtali* v. 1–3).

The meaning of this vision plainly is that Levi's priesthood surpasses Judah's kingship as much as the sun excels the moon in glory.

This is probably the original outlook of the *Testaments*, freed

from pro-Hasmonaean or Christian editing. And it is very much in line with the Qumran outlook on this subject.

The title 'Messiah' does not appear in the *Testaments*, apart from one or two manuscripts where it has evidently been interpolated in a Christian sense. The verbal adjective *christos* appears in its ordinary sense 'anointed' in *Test. Reuben* vi. 8, where Levi is to 'sacrifice for all Israel until the consummation of the times, as the anointed high priest (*archiereus christos*), of whom the Lord spoke.' This priesthood, according to *Test. Levi* xviii. 2ff., is to be embodied on a coming day in a 'new priest' whom the Lord will raise up – probably the great priest of the new age, the 'Messiah of Aaron' of the Qumran texts.

'His star shall arise in heaven as of a king,
Lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day,
And he shall be magnified in the world. . . .
The heavens shall be opened,
And from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification,
With the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac.'

M. Black has suggested that, since the only recorded words of Abraham to Isaac are those of Gen. xxii. 7f. ('Here am I, my son . . . My son, God will provide for Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering'), the implication here is of the voice of God 'calling for the obedience of a beloved son to the point of complete readiness to offer himself in sacrifice' (*Exp T* 60, 1948–49, p. 322).

This new priest, moreover, will re-open paradise to the godly, removing the flaming sword, so that they may eat of the tree of life (*Test. Levi* xviii. 10f.). He will bind Beliar and 'give his children power to tread on evil spirits' (xviii. 12). This new age of paradise restored is evidently the resurrection age, for in it 'Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will exult . . . and all the saints will clothe themselves with joy' (xviii. 14). So in *Test. Benjamin* x. 6, when the salvation of God is revealed to all the world, 'you will see Enoch, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob standing (*or* raised) at His right hand with exultation'. The twelve patriarchs themselves will be raised to share the eternal kingdom, and each will rule his own tribe (*Test. Judah* xxv. 1; *Test. Zebulun* x. 2) – a privilege promised in the Gospels to the twelve apostles (Mt. xix. 28; Lk. xxii. 30).

Beliar (a Greek spelling by dissimilation from Heb. Belial)

appears in several places throughout the *Testaments* as 'the personification of iniquity, and the supreme adversary of God' (H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 1963, p. 72). (In NT he appears once in 2 Cor. vi. 15, as the antithesis to Christ.) When Beliar is conquered, then 'the saints will rest in Eden, and the righteous will rejoice in the new Jerusalem, which will be God's eternal glory' (*Test. Dan* v. 12).

A markedly ethical note also pervades the *Testaments*, with special emphasis on the duty of brotherly love. As in our Lord's teaching, the two great commandments are conjoined: 'Love the Lord and your neighbour; have mercy on the poor and weak' (*Test. Issachar* v. 2); 'Love the Lord with all your life, and one another with a true heart' (*Test. Dan* v. 3). Unlike the characteristic Qumran texts, the *Testaments* denounce hatred and express sentiments of hope and goodwill towards the Gentiles. A detailed comparative study of the ethical teaching of the *Testaments* and that of the Gospels would bring to light some impressive parallels; their significance would, of course, depend in large measure on our conclusions about the degree of Christian redaction to which the extant text of the *Testaments* has been subjected.

4. *The Psalms of Solomon*. This is a collection of eighteen hymns whose titles bear an ascription to Solomon. The ascription is purely conventional, and is designed to characterize this psalter as secondary in relation to the canonical book of Psalms, nearly half of which exhibit the name of David in their titles.

The *Psalms of Solomon* are extant in a number of Greek manuscripts, and also in a Syriac version, translated from the Greek. The Greek bears signs of being itself translated from a Hebrew original.

The date of the collection is not difficult to determine; the poems clearly have as their background the situation in Judaea following the Roman conquest in 63 B.C. They have commonly been regarded as Pharisaic compositions, but it might be wiser to think of them more generally as originating within the hasidic tradition represented not only by the Pharisees but also by the Qumran sect and by the circles into which John the Baptist and Jesus were born. Much of the psalter breathes the devotion and aspiration of such pious people.

As in the Qumran texts (particularly the Habakkuk comment-

ary) the Roman conquerors are viewed as the executors of divine judgement against the Hasmonaeans. But whereas in the Qumran texts the Hasmonaeans are condemned mainly for usurping the high-priesthood, which belonged properly to the house of Zadok, they are condemned in the *Psalms of Solomon* for usurping the kingship, which belonged properly to the house of David: 'they laid waste the throne of David in tumultuous arrogance' (xvii. 8). Hence came their judgment:

'Thou, O God, didst cast them down, and remove their seed from
the earth,
In that there rose up against them a man that was alien to our race'
(xvii. 8f.).

The man 'alien to our race' is Pompey, the captor of Jerusalem.

But, as in the Habakkuk commentary from Qumran, the oppression of the Romans becomes almost as intolerable as that of the Hasmonaeans; indeed, when the psalmists cry out against the oppressors, it is not always easy to decide whether they have the Hasmonaeans or the Romans in mind. Among other things, Pompey's sacrilegious insistence on entering the holy of holies in the Jerusalem temple is contemplated with horror, and his assassination in Egypt fifteen years later is viewed as condign punishment for his impiety (ii. 30ff.).

The hope of the restoration of the Davidic monarchy under the Messiah finds clear and eloquent expression in xvii. 23ff.:

'Behold, O Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David,
At the time which Thou knowest, O Lord, that he may reign over
Israel Thy servant;
And gird him with strength to shatter unrighteous rulers,
May he cleanse Jerusalem from the nations that trample her down
with destruction,
Wisely and righteously expel sinners from his inheritance,
Dash in pieces the sinner's arrogance like a potter's vessel,
And smash all their substance with a rod of iron,
Destroy lawless nations with the word of his mouth,
Make the nations flee before him at his rebuke,
And reprove sinners for the device of their heart.
He will gather together a holy people and lead them in righteousness,
He will judge the tribes of a people sanctified by the Lord his God.
He will not suffer unrighteousness to lodge in their midst any more,
No man who knows wickedness will dwell with them.
He will know them, that they are all sons of their God,

And he will apportion them in their tribes upon the land.
 The sojourner and the alien will sojourn with them no more;
 He will judge peoples and nations with the wisdom of his judgement.
 He will have Gentile peoples to serve him under his yoke,
 And he will glorify God with the praise of all the earth;
 He will cleanse Jerusalem in holiness, as it was from the beginning,
 That nations may come from the end of the earth to see his glory,
 Bearing gifts for her sons that were utterly weakened,
 And to see the glory of the Lord with which God has glorified her.
 And he himself is a righteous king over them, taught by God,
 And there shall be no unrighteousness in their midst all his days,
 For all will be holy, and their king is the anointed Lord.'

The references to Ps. ii. 9 and other OT prophecies of the messianic kingdom are not difficult to recognize. As for the 'anointed Lord' (unless we have to reckon with a mistranslation of Heb. *meshiach YHWH*, 'the Lord's anointed'), this is the same expression as appears in the angelic message to the shepherds outside Bethlehem in Lk. ii. 11: 'a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord' (*christos kyrios*). There is, indeed, a close affinity between the sentiments of Ps. Sol. xvii. 23ff. and those of the canticles of Luke's nativity narratives. The ardent prayer for Messiah's appearance becomes a divine promise of imminent fulfilment on the lips of Gabriel in Lk. i. 32f.:

'He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High;
 And the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David,
 And he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever,
 And of his kingdom there will be no end.'

The fulfilment is celebrated by Mary in the *Magnificat* (Lk. i. 54f.):

'He has helped his servant Israel
 In remembrance of his mercy,
 As he spoke to our fathers,
 To Abraham and to his posterity for ever' –

and even more expressly by Zechariah in the *Benedictus* (Lk. i. 68ff.):

'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel,
 For he has visited and redeemed his people,
 And has raised up a horn of salvation for us
 In the house of his servant David,
 As he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old . . .'

In the light of the *Psalms of Solomon* we can understand better the thoughts of those who, with Simeon and Anna, were 'looking

for the consolation of Israel' and 'for the redemption of Jerusalem' (Lk. ii. 25, 38). And it must be added that we can also understand better the disillusionment of people who shared our psalmist's messianic expectations when they found that nothing was more remote from Jesus' mind than the smashing of Israel's enemies like a potter's vessel.

5. *The Assumption of Moses*. The *Assumption of Moses*, like 1 Enoch, is referred to by Jude, when he mentions the dispute between Michael and Satan over the body of Moses. The part of the work which recorded this dispute is unfortunately lost, although it was this part that gave the title the *Assumption of Moses* to the whole work.

The work is extant only in one Latin manuscript, in the Ambrosian Library in Milan; the Latin text was translated from a Greek version, which in turn was based on a Semitic original.

The work opens with a charge by Moses to Joshua; among other things, Moses delivers the books of the law to Joshua, who is to 'anoint them with cedar oil and lay them in earthenware jars in the place which God made from the beginning of the creation of the world' (i. 17) – an interesting literary parallel to the bestowal of the scrolls found in Cave 1 at Qumran. Then comes a hasty survey of the history of Israel from the settlement in Canaan onwards, put in prophetic language into the mouth of Moses before his death. The exile, the restoration under Cyrus, the Hellenizing movement and the Hasmonaean dynasty are mentioned in this survey. The attitude to the Hasmonaean is hostile: 'they will verily work impiety in the holy of holies' (vi. 1). They are followed by a self-willed king, not of the priestly line, who will deal ruthlessly with the remnant of the Hasmonaean family. This king, perhaps identified by the author of the *Assumption* with the 'wilful king' of Dn. xi. 36, will reign for thirty-four years – a detail which confirms what is in any case clear, that Herod the Great (37–4 B.C.) is meant. 'And he shall beget sons that shall succeed him and reign for shorter periods' (vi. 7). Since two sons of Herod who succeeded to part of his kingdom – Philip (4 B.C. – A.D. 34) and Antipas (4 B.C. – A.D. 39) – ruled for more than 34 years, the work must be dated within the 34 years that followed Herod's death, and probably in the earlier rather than in the later part of that period. The

last historical event clearly referred to is the punitive expedition of Varus during the disorders that followed Herod's death: 'into their parts [i.e. into the territories of Herod's sons] will come cohorts and a mighty western king, who will conquer them and take them captive, and burn part of their temple with fire, and crucify some around their colony' (vi. 8f.; cf. Josephus *B^J* ii. 66ff.; *Ant.* xvii. 286ff.). The work, then, was evidently composed during the lifetime of Jesus, and probably during His youthful years.

From this point on Moses' forecast becomes vague, as he describes the last days. The rulers will be impious gluttons, until Antichrist arises to take vengeance on them. He is not called 'Antichrist', but 'the king of the kings of the earth' (viii. 1); his portrait is modelled so closely on Antiochus Epiphanes that many commentators have thought that this passage (viii. 1-5) has been displaced, and that it should be regarded as a pseudo-prophecy of the persecution under Antiochus, belonging originally between chapters v and vi.

In the days of this imperial persecutor a Levite named Taxo and his seven sons decide to fast for three days and then enter a cave to await death rather than be compelled to transgress the divine commandments, that so their blood 'shall be avenged before the Lord' (ix. 1-7). The identity and name of this Taxo have been the subject of much ingenious speculation; he and his sons are modelled on the *hasidim* who endured martyrdom under Antiochus, and were probably expected, in circumstances which must remain obscure for us, to play a significant part at the end-time. For the Taxo episode is followed immediately by the manifestation of the kingdom of God, the abolition of evil, and the exaltation of Israel.

The theme of ch. i is then taken up; Joshua professes his incompetence to take Moses' place, but Moses reassures him and sets him on his own throne. The narrative of Moses' death and assumption into heaven, which presumably followed, has not survived.

6. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. This work, in the form in which we know it, is composite, consisting of two Christian parts and one Jewish part, which were put together by a Christian editor in the second century A.D. Like 1 Enoch and Jubilees, it is extant in

its entirety only in an Ethiopic version (translated from Greek); Greek, Latin and Slavonic fragments are also known.

The Jewish part (i. 1–iii. 12, v. 1b–14), recording Isaiah's martyrdom, may be pre-Christian and exhibits affinities with Qumran literature. It tells how Isaiah, to avoid the wickedness rampant in Jerusalem during Manasseh's reign, left the capital for Bethlehem and then withdrew to the hill country, accompanied by other prophets, all of whom wore the conventional prophetic garb of haircloth. But when Manasseh, of whose heart Beliar had taken possession, came to know of Isaiah's hiding-place, he had him seized and sawn in two with a wooden saw. Before his death Isaiah commanded his disciples to escape to the region of Tyre and Sidon, 'because', said he, 'for me only has God mingled the cup' (v. 13).

There is probably a reference to this narrative in Heb. xi. 37. As for the 'cup', we are reminded of our Lord's use of this figure in Mk. x. 38, xiv. 36; Jn. xviii. 11; and Isaiah's concern for the safety of his disciples is paralleled by our Lord's words about *His* disciples at His arrest: 'if you seek me, let these men go' (Jn. xviii. 8).

II. Literature after the Destruction of the Temple

The destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 compelled a new perspective in Jewish apocalyptic. Two works written under the influence of the catastrophe – the Apocalypse of Ezra (4 Ezra) and the (Syriac) Apocalypse of Baruch (2 Baruch) – purport to contain revelations given to Ezra and Baruch in the period following the earlier destruction of the city and temple by Nebuchadnezzar; but this is a patent disguise for the situation following A.D. 70.

1. *The Apocalypse of Ezra*. This apocalypse forms the kernel of the composite apocryphal work which we commonly call 2 Esdras – or, following the Vulgate, 4 Esdras. This work, as it has come down to us, consists of (a) a prologue in which Ezra prophesies the rejection of the Jews in favour of the Church (chs. i.–ii.), (b) the apocalypse proper (chs. iii.–xiv.), (c) an epilogue containing denunciations of all men in general and certain nations in particular because of their wickedness. The apocalyptic kernel of the work is all that concerns us here, for the prologue and

epilogue are later Christian compilations. Scholars have devised the designations 4 Ezra, 5 Ezra, and 6 Ezra, for the apocalypse, the prologue and the epilogue respectively. The Hebrew original of the apocalypse is lost, and so is the Greek text of the whole composite work; it is extant, however, in other versions based on the Greek – Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian and fragments in one or two other languages.

The *Apocalypse of Ezra* consists of seven visions granted to Ezra in Babylon, the first of them dated 'in the thirtieth year after the destruction of our city' (iii. 1). In the first (iii. 1–v. 20) Ezra, bewailing the national disaster, is told that righteousness will be vindicated in the age to come, and that that age will dawn as soon as the foreordained number of the righteous is complete. Its advent will be preceded by supernatural signs.

The second vision (v. 21–vi. 34) gives the assurance that the righteous who die before the new age dawns will suffer no disadvantage in comparison with those who are alive at that time (*cf.* 1 Th. iv. 15). The third vision (vi. 35–ix. 25) opens with a haggadic recapitulation of the six days of creation, which is said to have been brought into being for the sake of God's people Israel. How then has Israel been given into the hands of other nations, which have no place in God's saving purpose? By way of answer, the new world is brought in to redress the inequalities of this one: 'the entrances of this world were made narrow and toilsome; they are few and evil, full of dangers and involved in great hardships. But the entrances of the greater world are broad and safe, and really yield the fruit of immortality' (vii. 12f.; *cf.* the 'abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom' of 2 Pet. i. 11). The distresses of this world must be endured if the bliss of the new world is to be enjoyed. But the new world will be preceded by a messianic age of limited duration.

'For my son the Messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him, and those who remain shall rejoice four hundred years. And after these things my son the Messiah shall die, and all who draw human breath. And the world shall be turned back to primaeval silence for seven days, as it was at the first beginnings; so that no one shall be left' (vii. 28–30).

(The four hundred years of the messianic age are derived from Ps. xc. 15, 'Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil',

interpreted in the light of Gn. xv. 13, where Abraham is told that his offspring will be afflicted for four hundred years. The alternative reckoning of the duration of the messianic age in Rev. xx. 1-6 is based on another passage in Ps. xc. - verse 4, with its reference to a thousand years which are in God's sight 'as yesterday when it is past.')

After the seven days of annihilation, the resurrection and the new creation take place and the dead are judged. Ezra is dismayed because the lost so greatly outnumber the saved, and all through Adam's disobedience:

'O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants. For what good is it to us, if an eternal age has been promised to us, but we have done deeds that bring death?' (vii. 118f.).

He is forbidden, however, to pray for the doomed multitudes. 'Many have been created, but few shall be saved' (viii. 3), and it is not for a mere creature like Ezra to be more compassionate than the Creator. For the lost there is no hope, but to Ezra and the rest of the elect minority comes the assurance:

'It is for you that paradise is opened, the tree of life is planted, the age to come is prepared, plenty is provided, a city is built, rest is appointed, goodness is established and wisdom perfected beforehand. The root of evil is sealed up from you, illness is banished from you, and death is hidden; hell has fled and corruption has been forgotten; sorrows have passed away, and in the end the treasure of immortality is made manifest' (viii. 52-54).

The fourth vision (ix. 26-x. 59) portrays the desolate city of Jerusalem under the guise of a bereaved woman, who is suddenly transformed into the heavenly Jerusalem. In the fifth vision (xi. 1-xii. 39) a great and rapacious eagle rises out of the sea, symbolizing the Roman Empire (here identified with the fourth empire of Dn. vii. 7ff.). The eagle is reproved by a lion, symbolizing the Davidic Messiah, who will judge and destroy evildoers at the end-time. The vision is to be dated in Domitian's reign (A.D. 81-96), and Domitian is evidently expected to be the last Roman Emperor.

The sixth vision (xiii. 1-58) describes the Messiah again, this time in the form of a man who rises from the sea and stands on Mount Zion; he destroys all his enemies with the fiery breath of his mouth and gathers the exiled tribes of Northern Israel. As in

vii. 29, God calls the Messiah 'my son' (xiii. 32). 'My son' is also the designation given in the seventh vision (xiv. 1-48) to a heavenly being with whom Ezra will live 'until the times are ended' after he has been translated to heaven. But before his translation Ezra is commanded to dictate all the revelation of God to five men over a period of forty days, since the pre-exilic records of the revelation have been burned in the destruction of Jerusalem. Ninety-four books are thus produced. Twenty-four of these, by divine command, are to be published for worthy and unworthy alike to read; the remaining seventy are to be kept for 'the wise among your people' (cf. Dn. xi. 33). The former are no doubt the twenty-four books of the Hebrew Bible; the others are apocalyptic works like the *Apocalypse of Ezra* itself. Then comes the promised translation: 'at that time Ezra was caught up, and taken to the place of those who are like him, after he had written all these things. And he was called the scribe of the knowledge of the Most High for ever and ever' (xiv. 49, Syriac version).

2. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*. The *Apocalypse of Baruch* (2 Baruch), a work extant in a Syriac version, is one among several apocryphal or pseudepigraphic works which bear the name of Jeremiah's friend and secretary. In addition to the apocryphal Baruch (1 Baruch) which follows Jeremiah in LXX, there is a second-century A.D. *Apocalypse of Baruch* in Greek (3 Baruch), and another Greek work, *The Rest of the Words of Baruch* (4 Baruch), which can be dated shortly after the crushing of the second Jewish revolt against the Romans in A.D. 135.

While 2 Baruch is extant only in Syriac (and for 77 out of its 87 chapters in a single Syriac manuscript), the Syriac text is plainly a translation from Greek, and the Greek text in turn was in all probability based on a Hebrew original.

The apocalypse purports to have been revealed to Baruch 'in the twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah, king of Judah' (i. 1), i.e. in 573-2 B.C. (cf. Ezk. xl. 1). But, as in 4 Ezra, the period actually reflected is that following the downfall of the second Jewish commonwealth, not the first.

In the seven successive sections of the book Baruch sees a series of visions which, while they differ in various details, show him that under the fourth of Daniel's world-empires (assumed rather than stated to be Rome) life will become more and more difficult

for the righteous and iniquity will be increasingly rife. The messianic woes are impending; the present age is approaching its end:

'For the youth of the world is past,
The strength of the creation is already exhausted,
And the advent of the times is very short;
Yea, they have passed by.
The pitcher is near to the cistern,
The ship to the port,
The course of the journey to the city,
And life to its consummation' (lxxxv. 10).

Meanwhile, the path of the righteous man is clear; it is obedience to the law:

'Now the righteous have been gathered in,
And the prophets have fallen asleep
And we also have gone forth from the land,
And Zion has been taken from us;
We have nothing now save the Mighty One and His law' (lxxxv. 3).

And obedience to the law will bring happier times:

'If you endure and persevere in His fear,
And do not forget His law,
The times will change upon you for good,
And you will see the consolation of Zion' (xliv. 7).

Each man is responsible to keep the law, and has the power to keep it, if he gives his mind to it. Adam's disobedience did indeed involve multitudes of his posterity in physical death, but their sin (as distinct from their mortality) stands rather 'in the following of Adam' than in the inheritance of his fallen nature:

'For though Adam first sinned
And brought untimely death on all,
Yet, of those who were born from him,
Each has prepared for his own soul torment to come,
And each has chosen for himself glories to come . . .
Each one of us has been the Adam of his own soul' (liv. 15, 19).

There is a notable contrast between this 'proto-Pelagian' point of view and Paul's teaching in Rom. v. 12-21, where each human being is involved in the corporate personality or solidarity which *is* Adam.

The messianic woes are variously portrayed, but most picturously in the vision of the waters (liii. 1-lxxiv. 4). Here the history of the world is presented in the form of a succession of

dark waters followed by bright waters. The first dark waters are Adam's transgression, their darkness being intensified by the subsequent fall of the angels (Gen. vi. 1-4); then follow the bright waters of Abraham's call and obedience. The last dark waters are the messianic woes, marked by war, earthquake, fire and famine, when 'all the earth will devour its inhabitants' (lxx. 10). But the inhabitants of the holy land will be immune from those plagues, as the Israelites in Goshen were immune from the plagues of Egypt. These last dark waters are followed by the brightness of the messianic age.

Not much is said of the Messiah's rôle, except that he will kill the last imperial Antichrist (xl. 1f.; cf. 2 Th. ii. 8) and summon all nations before him for judgement, destroying some and sparing others (lxxii. 2; cf. Mt. xxv. 31ff.). But the messianic age which he inaugurates is described in glowing terms as an age when the curse of Eden will be removed and joy and fertility will abound. Men will feed on Behemoth and Leviathan, the great monsters which were created on the fifth day of creation but reserved for the messianic age (so also 4 Ezra vi. 49 ff.);

'the earth also will yield its fruit ten thousandfold; on one vine there will be a thousand branches, and each branch will produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and each grape will produce a *cor* [220 litres] of wine . . . And at that same time the treasury of manna will descend from on high again, and men will eat of it in those years, because they are the ones who have come to the consummation of time' (xxix. 5-8).

The passage about the abnormally fruitful vine represents a widespread theme of Jewish and early Christian expectation; it appears in essentially the same form as a *baraita* (a non-Mishnaic pericope from the period immediately following A.D. 70) in TB *Baba Bathra* 74b-75a and elsewhere; and Papias (*ap. Iren. haer.* v. 33. 3f.) reports a similar oracle as a saying of Jesus.

The heavenly Jerusalem, laid up with God before the earthly paradise was formed, will be revealed on earth (iv. 2-7), and the holy vessels and other installations which were rescued by an angel before the first temple was destroyed, and safely concealed in the earth until the appointed time, will be restored to their proper place (vi. 5-10). (This belief in the concealment of the holy vessels is reflected in a number of curious incidents in the apostolic age.)

After this messianic age the Messiah, instead of dying as in 4 Ezra, experiences a glorious epiphany (perhaps being caught up into heaven), and the righteous are raised from the dead (xxx. 1-5). Their resurrection to bliss seals the doom of the wicked. But to the question imagined by Paul, 'How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?' (1 Cor. xv. 35), the answer received by Baruch is that when the earth gives back the dead, 'it will make no change in their form, but as it has received, so will it restore them'. They must be raised in their original form so that their identity may be recognized (xlix. 1-1.4).

It may be that the *Apocalypse of Baruch* had an ending (now lost) which recorded Baruch's translation to heaven, as the *Apocalypse of Ezra* ends with an account of Ezra's translation. For such an ending we are prepared in lxxvi. 2, where Baruch is told that after he has given final instruction to his people, 'thou wilt surely depart from earth, nevertheless not unto death; but thou wilt be preserved to the consummation of the times' (cf. Dan. xii. 13).

III. *The Works of Josephus*

Although the works of Josephus were published in Rome, not Palestine, they must be included in the literature of first-century Palestinian Judaism.

Josephus (c. A.D. 37-103) was a native of Judaea, the son of a priest named Mattithiah, of the order of Jehoiarib (cf. 1 Ch. xxiv. 7), and claims kinship with the Hasmonaeans, who belonged to that order. After a brief period of association with the Essenes, and with an ascetic wilderness-dweller named Banus, he joined the party of the Pharisees at the age of nineteen. On a delegation to Rome in A.D. 63 he was greatly impressed by the power of the empire. He was strongly opposed to the Jewish revolt against Rome in A.D. 66, and although he was given a command in Galilee in which he manifested considerable energy and ability, he had no confidence in the insurgent cause. After the Roman seizure of the stronghold of Jotapata, which he had defended until further resistance was useless, he escaped with forty others to a cave. When this refuge in turn was about to be stormed, the defenders entered into a suicide pact, and Josephus

found himself one of the last two survivors. He persuaded his fellow-survivor that they might as well surrender to the Romans, and then he contrived to win the favour of Vespasian, the Roman commander, by predicting his elevation to the imperial purple – a prediction which came true in A.D. 69. Next year Josephus was attached to the Roman general headquarters during the siege of Jerusalem, acting as interpreter for Titus (Vespasian's son and successor in the Palestinian command), when he wished to offer terms to the defenders of the city. After the fall of Jerusalem Josephus went to Rome, where he settled down as a client and pensioner of the emperor, whose family name Flavius he adopted when he became a Roman citizen.

Not unnaturally, Josephus's behaviour during the war won for him the indelible stigma of treason in the eyes of his nation. Yet he employed the years of his leisure in Rome in such a way as to establish some claim on their gratitude. These years were devoted to literary activity in which he shows himself to be a true patriot according to his lights, jealous for the good name of his people. His first work was a *History of the Jewish War*, written first in Aramaic for the benefit of Jews in Mesopotamia and then published in a Greek edition. The account of the outbreak of the war is here preceded by a summary of Jewish history from 168 B.C. to A. D. 66. His two books *Against Apion* constitute a defence of his people against the anti-Jewish calumnies of an Alexandrian schoolmaster named Apion; in them, too, he endeavours to show that the Jews can boast a greater antiquity than the Greeks, and in the course of this argument he has preserved for us a number of valuable extracts from ancient writers not otherwise extant. In *Ap.* i. 38ff. he gives a brief account of the Jewish canon of Holy Scripture; he reckons the books to be 22 in all, but these 22 comprise the same documents as the traditional 24 books of the Hebrew Bible or the 39 of the Protestant OT. His longest work is his *Jewish Antiquities*, in twenty books, relating the history of his people from earliest times (in fact he begins his narrative with the creation of the world) down to his own day. The first edition of this work was completed in A.D. 93. Finally he wrote his *Life*, largely as a defence of his war-record, which had been represented in unflattering terms by another Jewish writer, Justus of Tiberias. It is impossible to reconcile the account of his

war activities given in his *Life* with that given earlier in his *Jewish War*; the suspicions of Domitian, Vespasian's second son and successor (A.D. 81-96), who was now Josephus's patron (nominally at least), made it politic for him to minimize his part in the Jewish revolt, which in the earlier work he had perhaps exaggerated.

For the history of the Jews between the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-163 B.C.) and the war of A.D. 66-73, and especially for the period beginning with the Roman occupation of 63 B.C., the works of Josephus are of incomparable value. He had access to first-rate sources, both published and unpublished: the work of Nicolas of Damascus, historiographer to Herod the Great, supplied a detailed record of that monarch's career; official Roman records were placed at his disposal; he consulted the younger Agrippa on various details concerning the origin of the Jewish war, and of course could rely on his own immediate knowledge of many phases of it. He can indeed be thoroughly tendentious in his portrayal of personalities and presentation of events, but his 'tendency' is so obvious that the reader can easily detect it and make necessary allowances for it. He consistently places his own dubious conduct in the most favourable light; the Zealots and other anti-Roman factions are represented as bandits and thoroughly malignant and impious characters.

In his attempts to make things Jewish intelligible or acceptable to his Gentile patrons he sometimes modifies the true picture to the point of misrepresentation. Thus the parties of the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes are called 'philosophies' (*BJ* ii. 119; *Ant.* xviii. 11), after the fashion of the Greek philosophical schools; the same designation is even given to the followers of Judas the Galilaean (usually identified, though not by Josephus, with the Zealots), for they are called the 'fourth philosophy' (*Ant.* xviii. 23) and their leader becomes a 'sophist' (*BJ* ii. 118, 433). The doctrine of bodily resurrection, which the Pharisees accepted and the Sadducees denied, is transformed into the immortality of the soul, which was more congenial to Greek thought (*BJ* ii. 163, 165; *Ant.* xviii. 14, 16).

In the pages of Josephus we meet many figures who are well known to us from the NT: the family of the Herods; the Roman emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero; Quirinius, the

governor of Syria; Pilate, Felix, and Festus, the procurators of Judaea; the high-priestly families, including Annas, Caiaphas, Ananias, and the rest; the Pharisees and Sadducees; and so on. Against the background which Josephus provides we can read the NT with greater understanding and interest.

In addition to the rising under Judas the Galilaeen (*cf.* Acts v. 37), incidents common to the NT narrative and Josephus are the famine in Judaea under Claudius (Acts xi. 28; *Jos. Ant.* xx. 101) and the sudden illness and death of Herod Agrippa I (Acts xii. 19–23; *Ant.* xix. 343–350).

Still more germane to the NT record is Josephus's account of John the Baptist's activity and his death at the hands of Herod Antipas:

'Herod killed him, though he was a good man, who bade the Jews practise virtue, be just to one to another and pious toward God, and come together in baptism. He taught that baptism was acceptable to God provided that they underwent it not to procure remission of certain sins, but for the purification of the body, if the soul had already been purified by righteousness. And when the others gathered round him (for they were greatly moved when they heard his words), Herod feared that his persuasive power over men, being so great, might lead to a rising, as they seemed ready to follow his counsel in everything. So he thought it much better to seize him and kill him before he caused any tumult, than to have to repent of falling into such trouble later on, after a revolt had taken place. Because of this suspicion of Herod, John was sent in chains to the fortress of Machaerus . . . and there put to death' (*Ant.* xviii. 117–119).

Josephus adds that, in the opinion of many Jews, Herod's defeat (*c.* A.D. 36) by the Nabataean king Aretas IV, father of Herod's first wife whom he put away in order to marry Herodias, was a divine judgment for the murder of John.

There are some differences between this account and those given by the Evangelists. According to the latter, John was imprisoned because he denounced Herod's marriage to Herodias, and beheaded him at Herodias's instance (Mk. vi. 17ff.; Lk. iii. 19f.). But this explanation and that given by Josephus are not mutually exclusive. Again, according to Mk. i. 4 John proclaimed 'a baptism of repentance for remission of sins', whereas Josephus implies that his baptism was for those whose sins had already been cancelled by righteousness. The Markan and parallel NT accounts are earlier than that of Josephus, who indeed appears

to attribute to John the baptismal doctrine which he had learned during his brief association with the Essenes (as we may now recognize in the light of the Qumran texts). Josephus's statement that John bade his hearers 'come together in baptism' (or 'by means of baptism', if the dative *baptismō* is instrumental) suggests the formation of a religious community which was entered by baptism. This is in keeping with the 'Q' summary of John's preaching in Mt. iii. 8ff./Lk. iii. 8ff.; the community so formed would be the 'people prepared' – the remnant which John was to 'make ready for the Lord', according to Lk. i. 17.

In *Ant.* xx. 200 Josephus tells how, during the interregnum between the death of the procurator Festus and the arrival of his successor Albinus (A.D. 62), the high priest Annas II 'assembled a council of judges and brought before it the brother of Jesus the so-called Christ, whose name was James, together with some others, and having accused them as law-breakers, delivered them over to be stoned to death'.

This prepares us for a previous reference to 'Jesus the so-called Christ' in His own right, and raises the question of the authenticity of the *testimonium Flavianum*, the well-known account of Jesus which appears in the transmitted text of *Ant.* xviii. 63f. As it stands, this account has been heavily edited in the Christian interest. Probably, however, it is not a complete interpolation; behind it we may discern an original text along these lines:

'About this time there arose a source of fresh troubles – one Jesus, a wise man and a wonder-worker, a teacher of men who gladly welcome strange things. He led away many Jews, and many of the Greeks also. This man was the so-called Christ. When Pilate had condemned him to the cross on his impeachment by the chief men among us, his original followers did not cease, and even now the tribe of Christians, so named after him, has not yet died out.'

Further contacts with the gospel narrative found in additions in the Slavonic version of the *Jewish War* are of even more doubtful authenticity than the *testimonium Flavianum*, and need not be discussed here.

Josephus must have given long and careful thought to the messianic hope and related expectations of his people. The taking away of the daily sacrifice (foretold in Dan. viii. 12ff., ix. 27, xii. 11) he finds fulfilled in the cessation of the sacrifices about

three weeks before the Roman capture of the temple (*BḲ* vi. 94); and when he describes how the victorious legionaries sacrificed to their standards in the temple court (*BḲ* vi. 316), there is little doubt that in his mind he identified this incident with the 'abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet' (Dn. viii. 13, ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11). And even if he hailed Vespasian as the predicted world-ruler from Judaea (*BḲ* iii. 400ff.; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 13), his enigmatic reference to the stone in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (*Ant.* x. 210) makes it clear that deep within his heart he hoped and believed that Rome would not have the the last word: Israel's day would come.

A. G. CURNOW

Some Thoughts on Religion and Science

The years behind us

Robert Browning, writing in 1864, five years after the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, thus sums up his impression of the popular reaction to the stirring events of the times:

The candid incline to surmise of late
That the Christian faith proves false, I find:
For our Essays-and-Reviews' debate
Begins to tell on the public mind,
And Colenso's words have weight.¹

Darwin's epoch-making book is not specifically mentioned in this verse, but there can be no doubt that it, more than the composite volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, which appeared in 1860, or than Bishop Colenso's critical commentary *On the Pentateuch*, which was published in 1862, accounted for the 'surmise' of the falsity of the Christian faith.

It was more than a surmise. It almost bordered on panic. It is difficult now to conceive the horror with which Darwin's theory of evolution filled the minds of the vast majority of English people who were at all religiously inclined. They were certain that rejection of a belief in the creation of the universe by six divine acts on six days of a single week destroyed the foundations of religion and morality. It is probably true to say that no book ever published, before or since, caused so much consternation in the public mind as Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

It is important to note that, while the religious aspect of the controversy of a hundred years ago is now alone remembered, the main opposition to Darwin's views came from his fellow-

¹ *Gold Hair: a Story of Pornic.*

scientists. The permanence of species was a doctrine held by practically all the leading naturalists and geologists of the time. No blame therefore can reasonably be attached to Christians if they accepted the prevailing judgement of men of science, and joined with them in the condemnation of a novel and doubtful theory.

It is also important to note that a few churchmen, including some of the most distinguished, welcomed Darwin's theory from the start. Clergymen like R. W. Church, afterwards Dean of St Paul's, A. P. Stanley, afterwards Dean of Westminster, Charles Kingsley the novelist-historian, and F. J. A. Hort the eminent theologian, were unequivocal in their support, as letters in their biographies amply prove. But unfortunately they did not speak out, and their views were largely unknown to their contemporaries.

This left the controversial field, as far as the representatives of religion were concerned, to champions who, however earnest and well-meaning, were ill-equipped for the fray, believing as they did that the cosmology which was contradicted by Darwin's theory was an integral part of the Christian religion.

Of these champions the most famous was the redoubtable Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, who made up in eloquence for what he lacked in insight, and in deftness for what he lacked in knowledge. In many respects he was an able man, but he had a closed mind and was impervious to new light. In particular, he allowed his skill in debate to lead him to make statements which, however much they won applause, did not impress the more thoughtful of his hearers, and have not added to his reputation at the bar of posterity.

'If the theory of evolution is true, the Book of Genesis is a lie', he thundered, and no one could object to such a downright declaration of his conviction, however much one might dissent from it. But when he went on to insinuate 'our suspected cousinship with the mushrooms', and to ask 'is it credible that all favourable varieties of turnips are tending to become men',² one cannot but feel that such arguments, however laughter-provoking, were unworthy of the man and of his theme.

² Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 225.

Everybody knows how this tendency to score smart debating points led him to disaster in the celebrated encounter with T. H. Huxley at the assembly of the British Association in 1860. There is no need to repeat the oft-told story here; suffice it to say that it showed him at his worst, just as in the following passage from his pen we see him at his best: 'To oppose facts in the natural world because they seem to oppose Revelation is but another form of the ever-ready feeble-minded dishonesty of lying for God, and trying by fraud or falsehood to do the work of the God of truth'.³ How he could square the sentiments of this admirable statement with many other of his utterances – such as those already quoted – it is difficult to see.

Leslie Stephen, writing of the famous encounter between Wilberforce and Huxley, says that 'it was one incident in a remarkable outburst of intellectual activity. The old controversy between scientific and ecclesiastical champions was passing into a new phase . . . and the intellectual issues to be decided were certainly no less important than those which had presented themselves to Erasmus and Luther'.⁴ What were these issues?

In answering this question we may follow the guidance of the former Dean of St Paul's, Dr W. R. Matthews. In a sermon in St Paul's Cathedral on the occasion of the tercentenary of the Royal Society in 1960, Dr Matthews made reference to the controversies on evolution of a century ago, and said: 'Very few educated Christians today could sympathize with the stand taken then by the representatives of orthodox Christianity . . . Yet these men were intelligent and honest . . . What then was the cause of their violent reaction against the new hypotheses? They believed that they were defending a truth so precious and so fundamental that any apparent attack upon it, or weakening of its authority over men's minds, must be repelled. In my opinion, fundamentally they were right. The belief in God the Creator and His revelation held a truth that mankind cannot abandon . . . But they were wrong, disastrously wrong, in thinking that this truth depended upon the literal accuracy of the Creation

³ Review of *Origin of Species* in *Quarterly Review* of July, 1860, Quoted by Lack, *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief*, p. 15.

⁴ *Studies of a Biographer*, p. 188.

myths in Genesis. They were wrong too in thinking that the Bible was a source of scientific knowledge'.⁵

This is a well balanced appraisal of the strong and weak points in the position taken up by the protagonists of religion in the controversies of a hundred years ago. In passionately contending for a belief in a divine Creator and His revelation 'fundamentally they were right', as Dr Matthews says. This is a truth which religion cannot surrender. But they did not discern that this truth was not linked up with the interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis then taught by the Church and universally accepted by Christians.

Thus the conflict between science and religion a hundred years ago was based on misunderstandings – misunderstandings on both sides. But that does not alter the fact that the conflict was very real and deep. And it was to survive for many years – indeed, it has not entirely ceased even yet. As late as 1877 a late Pope described Darwinism as 'a system which is repugnant at once to history, to the tradition of all peoples, to exact science, to observed facts, and even to Reason herself'.⁶ This sweeping and categorical condemnation of course settled the matter for Roman Catholics, and not many Protestants would have demurred to its wholesale strictures.

Here and there cautionary and steadying voices were heard, as for instance when George Eliot wrote, in a letter of 5 Dec., 1859: 'To me the Development theory, and all other explanations of processes by which things came to be, produce a feeble impression compared with the mystery that lies under the processes'.⁷ But these voices had little or no effect on the popular conception of the issues involved in the conflict. The man in the street, or at any rate the average thoughtful citizen, in trying to make up his mind in the confusion of the conflict, was bewildered as to the decision he should make.

On the one hand there were the scientists who seemed ruthlessly determined on the destruction of all that was regarded as sacred, and whose position, or at any rate the consequences of

⁵ Quoted in *A Threefold Cord*, by Lord Samuel and H. Dingle, p. 226.

⁶ Barnes, *Should Such a Faith Offend*, 132.

⁷ Quoted in *Life*, 2. p. 110.

whose position, is voiced in the grim eighteenth century lines of James Thomson :

I find no hint throughout the Universe
Of good or ill, of blessing or of curse;
I find alone Necessity supreme.⁸

At the other extreme were the ecclesiastical writers who vociferously asserted that Darwinism was entirely opposed to 'everything which the Creator Himself has told us in the Scriptures of the methods and results of His work'.⁹

In between these two extremes there were the well-meaning but futile 'reconcilers', who endeavoured to make 'the best of both worlds by urging what amounted to 'a tacit agreement to use words with double meanings'.¹⁰ It is no wonder that uncertainty and confusion were the characteristic mental notes of the day.

For the forty years following the appearance of the *Origin of Species* in 1859 – that is, for the remainder of the nineteenth century – the Christian found himself and his faith assailed by vigorous and relentless criticism in the name of science. Darwin himself, who survived for the first half of the period, took no part in such controversies; but some of his followers would have been satisfied with nothing less than the total destruction of religious faith.

Not only were the religious bases of morality criticized in the name of scientific humanism, but religion itself was discounted as merely subjective. Indeed, some scientists went so far as to describe all spiritual phenomena as pathological.

Confident assertions were made by those who maintained that the physical sciences had the answer to everything, and that in a mechanically organized universe of cause and effect there could be no place for God.

When those who held that there was 'no place for God' were pressed to say what then was the driving impulse behind evolution, they replied by such question-begging epithets as 'Universal Mind', 'Life Force', 'Creative Evolution', 'Emergent

⁸ *The City of Dreadful Night*.

⁹ *The Bible Today*, p. 64.

¹⁰ Cyril Bibby, *T. H. Huxley*, p. 253.

Evolution', 'Holistic Urge', and so on. But question-begging though these epithets were, they sounded impressive, and many who ought to have perceived their hollowness were deceived by them.

The prevailing belief among those scientists who flouted the divine-intervention idea of Creation – and these were the majority – was that living matter arose from non-living matter under peculiar physical and chemical conditions prevailing far back in the earth's past, and not since repeated. This was a theory easy to formulate, but obviously difficult to substantiate.

When it came to man and his origins, the general view of the time, shared by not a few scientists, including such eminent ones as A. R. Wallace and St George Mivart, was that while the human body was evolved by natural means from other animals, the soul came by a special divine creation.

Other scientists, and by far the greater number, followed the lead of Darwin in arguing that man's mental and spiritual qualities were derived from rudiments present in the lower animals.

The interests of true religion were not helped by the attempts of certain well-meaning Christians – akin to the 'reconcilers' of whom mention has been made – to 'harmonize' a quasi-science with an attenuated (and sometimes with an extravagant and distorted) religion.

Of these attempts one of the most deplorable was that of those (Philip Gosse, for instance) who countered the argument that the evidence of the rocks refuted the Bible story of Creation by the extraordinary theory that God Himself had interleaved the strata and put in the fossils.

Still less, if possible, were the interests of religion helped by the lamentable sophistry of other 'defenders of the faith,' among whom Cardinal Newman may be mentioned. Newman, with reference to the assertion of the Bible that the sun moves round the earth, while science holds that the earth moves round the sun, said that 'we shall never know which is right until we know what motion is'.¹¹ Which is surely one of the most flagrant instances of obscurantism on record.

¹¹ A. L. Rowse, *Studies in Social History*, 27.

'In the 1890s', writes Bishop Stephen Neill, 'it was by no means easy for an intelligent man to be a Christian', and that is by no means an overstatement. 'Yet it was precisely in this decade', the bishop goes on to say, 'that the tide began to turn.'¹² As the nineteenth century merged into the twentieth, Darwinism showed signs of losing much of its hold on many scientific minds. Some biologists – Driesch, for instance – wrote of 'the decline of Darwinism', and even said that 'Darwinism is dead'.¹³ This decline was largely due to the new discoveries in genetics and the mutation theory which dated from about 1900. Later, as biological knowledge increased, Darwinism revived in prestige, and as the twentieth century advanced won back more than its previous position in the acclaim of the learned, and in popular esteem.

An interesting instance of how Darwinism was regarded by a devout and able mind at about this time is afforded by the case of Edward Wilson, the scientist of Scott's ill-fated expedition to the South Pole in 1914. 'The works of Darwin', we are told by Wilson's biographer, 'were for him almost a second Bible. He saw life at every phase as one, and in the law of evolution a principle which gave to all life a meaning and value, and therewith a key to unlock the door to the meaning and value of life in the realm of the spirit. From the dawn of creation when the life-giving Spirit brooded over the formless abyss, to the incarnation of the Son of God when the Life was made manifest in terms of human personality at its topmost reach, he perceived the mysterious operation of the same eternal law . . . an imminent purpose ceaselessly at work.'¹⁴ It is just another illustration of a growingly common outlook among intelligent Christians in the early years of the twentieth century.

The situation today

'Nothing would more astonish the materialist philosophers of the last four decades of the nineteenth century,' says George

¹² *Twentieth Century Christianity*, p. 15.

¹³ *Science and Philosophy of the Organism* (Gifford Lectures, 1907) p. 340.

¹⁴ George Seaver, *The Faith of Edward Wilson*, p. 7.

Sampson, writing in 1941, 'than the changed attitude of scientific speculation towards the intangible element in human aspiration. With the advance of research into regions undreamt of there has come a lessening of the confident agnosticism and materialism that marked the period of Huxley and Tyndall.'¹⁵

'Confident agnosticism and materialism' was indeed a marked feature of the period referred to, while in the same period 'the intangible element in human aspiration' was by the protagonists of science largely ignored, or even denied. Slowly but surely the situation changed as the twentieth century advanced. Science became less aggressive, and in the 1930s we find an eminent astronomer (Sir James Jeans) asserting that 'the universe shows evidence of a designing and controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds'.¹⁶

Even more striking, as an indication of the change in the climate of scientific opinion, is the confession, dating from the same time, of J. B. S. Haldane, 'I am not myself a Materialist because, if Materialism is true, it seems to me that we cannot know that it is true. If my opinions are the result of the chemical processes going on in my brain, they are determined by the laws of chemistry, not those of logic'.¹⁷

This discerning statement – which incidentally shrewdly diagnoses the inherent weakness of the materialist position – illustrates one aspect of the better relations which had come about between science and theology, viz. the admission on the part of scientists that the limits of scientific 'explanation' of nature are soon reached, and that the ultimate causes, forces, conditions of nature are as unexplained, as full of mystery as ever.

In equal part the better relations of theology and science were the outcome of the abandonment of false claims on the part of theologians, and the recognition that there is no 'Bible revelation' in matters of science. Many of the questions which troubled the pious in the middle of the nineteenth century were seen to be harmless enough in the light of fuller knowledge and a different perspective. In particular, difficulties which had for

¹⁵ *Concise History of English History*, 886

¹⁶ *The Stars in their Courses*, p. 134.

¹⁷ *The inequality of Man*, p. 157 (Pelican).

long afflicted and distressed devout minds over the creation stories in Genesis ceased to be troublesome, were seen to be unnecessary, because based on a complete misunderstanding of the scope and aim of the sacred writings.

Viscount Samuel may here be adduced as describing, in a striking passage, the position arrived at by an increasing number of scientists in the period immediately prior to the second world war: 'In so far as it [science] accepts, and emphasizes, the principle of causality, and in so far as it perceives that the universe, as we see it, cannot be self-caused, science leads inevitably to the conclusion that there must be a casual factor not comprised within our view of the universe. If this be Deity, then science has made atheism impossible'.¹⁸

In a later book the same author, referring to the volume just quoted, says that he wrote it 'less with a view to writing a book than for the sake of clarifying my own ideas. At the end I found I had come a long way from the negations of my earlier days; was less of an agnostic; definitely anti-materialistic; convinced that the universe is charged with mind and purpose'.¹⁹

That Lord Samuel here speaks for a large number of his contemporaries in science and philosophy is confirmed by the words of another recent writer: 'It is a popular delusion to suppose that the vast majority of scientific men today are atheists'.²⁰

It may be said then with confidence that the conflict between religion and science is much less strident at present than it was. But it would be going too far to say that the gulf between the two is completely bridged. There are still obstacles on both sides.

Of these obstacles one of the most real and serious is that so many scientists are almost completely out of touch with modern theological thinking. Prof. John Baillie truly says that 'many men criticize and even oppose Christianity without ever having taken much trouble to discover what it is all about . . . It is remarkable what nonsense is spoken about it even by men of the highest distinction in departmental fields of knowledge'.²¹

¹⁸ *Belief and Action*, p. 33 (Pelican).

¹⁹ *Memoirs*, p. 251.

²⁰ A. F. Smethurst, *Modern Science and Christian Beliefs*, p. 37.

²¹ *Invitation to Pilgrimage*, p. 13.

'Nonsense' is not too strong a word. Take this testimony from a keen and experienced observer of modern life: 'How often one has met otherwise intelligent people who have dismissed the whole Christian Faith because, for instance, they cannot believe that the first chapter of Genesis is true to science, that Jonah was swallowed by a whale, that unbaptized babies go to hell, or that heaven is above the bright blue sky'.²²

There can be no doubt that these strictures can be substantiated up to the hilt. The intelligent agnostic, with his prejudices against the churches and all their ways, very rarely takes the trouble to look behind the tradition and the surface appearance in order to find out the meaning of essential Christianity. Consequently his attacks against Christianity are nearly always ill-informed or out-of-date. Someone has said that the information on which many a criticism of Christianity nowadays is based has apparently been obtained from the critic's washerwoman. It would be still nearer the mark to say that the source was the washerwoman's grandmother. Bishop Gore speaks with complete justification of 'really distinguished men' who 'exhibit an ignorance of Christian thought at its best, whether ancient or modern, the like of which in the treatment of science would expose a theologian to well-merited ignominy'.²³

But while it is undoubtedly true that scientists are largely out of touch with modern theological thinking, further out of touch than theologians are with science, this is not to say that the representatives of religion are to be exonerated from blame for the continuing conflict between the two. There are a number of sinister trends in recent theological writings which are putting back the clock of progress. Religious obscurantism, which has caused so much mischief through the centuries, is again rearing its unattractive head. The ideas associated with the school of Karl Barth, coupled with the effects of the deliberately anti-scientific and anti-rational teaching of Kierkegaard, whose influence, after long eclipse, seems to be on the increase, are tending to widen the gulf between scientists and theologians.

In particular, there is in our day a revival of views of Scripture,

²² J. B. Phillips, *God our Contemporary*, p. 76.

²³ *Philosophy of the Good Life*, p. 270 (Everyman).

which substitute a belief in Biblical inerrancy and verbal inspiration for a belief in (to quote a phrase from C. S. Lewis) 'God's gradual and graded self-revelation',²⁴ and which are an ominous threat to a better understanding between science and religion, being flatly contrary to the great principle laid down long ago by Bishop Butler, that Reason is 'the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even Revelation itself'.²⁵

What then are the prospects of the future as far as the relations between science and religion are concerned? Our answer to this question must take into consideration certain characteristics of our day and age, in addition to those already mentioned.

J. B. Priestley has said that we live in the 'most blankly secular and material society the world has known since Hadrian's Rome'.²⁶ There may be an element of exaggeration in this statement, but there is at least this amount of truth in it: that the scientific discoveries of the twentieth century have resulted in a large scale ignoring of Christianity as redundant and irrelevant. This is the real threat to religion at present: not so much an active and overt opposition, but a widespread indifference, the indifference alike of the 'intelligentsia' and of the masses.

There is also on the part of a small but by no means negligible coterie of philosophers a denial of the possibility of all objective knowledge. This phase of thought is exemplified in the scepticism of Kierkegaard, who refused to grant either to religion or to science the claim to belong to the category of truth.

These are disquieting features of the life of our day, but they make even more important the fact that, as the late Canon Raven said, 'the attempt to interpret man's religion and man's science in terms not only mutually intelligible but also mutually interdependent, remains the great cultural task of our time'.²⁷

This task must be undertaken. We must resolutely aim at 'that synthesis of religion, philosophy and science in which alone the

²⁴ *Reflections on the Psalms*, p. 114.

²⁵ *Analogy of Religion*, Part I, chap. 3.

²⁶ *Thoughts in the Wilderness*, p. 123.

²⁷ Quoted in *Modern Churchman*, Sept. 1950, p. 214.

enquiring mind can find a resting place'.²⁸ And in spite of all the difficulties that beset us, there is reason to believe that this synthesis is no mere dream, but a practical possibility; that there are good prospects of an increasing *rapprochement* between the two ancient combatants whose conflict is the theme of this essay.

If this is to come about, there must be adjustments on both sides. The bridge over the gulf between science and religion must be built from both ends. 'The only possible solution of the conflict between science and religion,' says Sir Julian Huxley, 'is for religion to admit the intellectual methods of science to be as valid in theology as everywhere else, while science admits the psychological basis of religion as an ultimate fact.'²⁹ It is along these lines of mutual respect, and mutual recognition, and mutual accommodation, that the road to a better understanding is to be constructed.

But when we speak of 'the intellectual methods of science' there is an important caveat. We are not bound to accept the latest scientific theories as necessarily true. If we did, we should soon be in difficulties, for science itself is in the melting pot. 'Hardly any man of science, nowadays,' says Bertrand Russell, 'sits down to write a great work, because he knows that, while he is writing it, others will discover new things that will make it obsolete before it appears.'³⁰

As against this feature of science, its swift changefulness, it must be borne in mind that religion, on the other hand, deals with realities which in their very nature are eternal and unchangeable.

Haldane, after alleging that 'all religions are full of obsolete science of various kinds, especially obsolete cosmology and obsolete psychology', goes on to say – and his words are the more noteworthy as coming from an avowed agnostic – that 'it may be that there is a core in religion which is independent of scientific criticism. I am rather inclined to take that view'.³¹

It is this 'independent core' in religion that is the vital thing

²⁸ F. Younghusband, B.B.C. Address, Feb. 8, 1952.

²⁹ *Religion Without Revelation*, p. 116.

³⁰ *Unpopular Essays*, p. 90.

³¹ *The Inequality of Man*, p. 132 (Pelican Edn.).

about it. It is independent not only of scientific criticism but of all the acids of modernity. These acids may dissolve the superstitious accretions which have gathered about theological speculation through the ages, but nothing can destroy the basic need which led to the emergence of religion, and is a guarantee of its continuance.

With reference to the destructive agency of science, some words of an eminent Gifford Lecturer of a former day are apposite: 'Science has been a destroying spirit, and has filled the temple of truth with ruins. But the things she has destroyed were only idols. Religion . . . she has placed on a firmer throne than ever'.³²

This may not always have been her conscious purpose, but certainly, when all allowance has been made to the contrary, this has been the ultimate result of her efforts.

One ominous feature of the human situation in this mid-twentieth century is often pointed out, and its importance in relation to our subject calls for a mention of it here. Progress in physical science has given to man powers he is at present morally unfitted to use. His advance in technical attainment has stripped his spiritual capability, and the outcome is the state of the world as we see it today – torn with apprehension and dread lest the future may involve mankind in wholesale destruction.

At the beginning of the century George Gissing spoke of science as 'the remorseless enemy of mankind, restoring barbarism under the mask of civilization, darkening men's minds and hardening their hearts'.³³ At the time this was regarded as the gloomy jeremiad of a disappointed man. Nowadays we can see that it was a remarkable instance of insight and foresight. Equally remarkable was the prescience of Samuel Butler a generation earlier. In his *Erewhon*, machines were rigorously suppressed on the ground that they were bound to evolve and destroy their makers. Butler's first readers thought he was having a joke at the expense of Darwin, with whom he loved to cross swords. But Butler was nearer the mark than his contemporaries dreamed, or than he himself knew, for modern man is being

³² Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, ii. p. 278.

³³ *Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*, p. 268.

mastered by the machines of his own devising. He is in the lamentable predicament of seeking ways of escape from the terrors of his own inventions. Even Qoheleth in the Old Testament seems to have had a pre-view of what has come to pass in our day, or at any rate his ironic words may be quoted in this connection: 'God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions'.³⁴

There is no other way of escape from this tragic modern dilemma than a resolute determination to give religion the priority in human endeavour. Gone are the days, as surely everybody must now realize, when men were so obsessed with scientific achievement that they imagined that by bigger and better technical strides all the problems of the world would be solved. The truth is, and all except the wilfully blind can see it, that these problems are only aggravated by technological advance *per se*.

'Seek ye first the kingdom of God,' said Jesus, 'and all these things shall be added unto you.'³⁵ That is a word of ultimate wisdom. All else will fall into place when religion has the first place. Not immediately, of course – there is no quick road to the millenium – and not for a long time it may be, but inevitably all the same. And the function of science, its *raison d'être*, is to act as religion's lieutenant, its co-worker in bringing in a better day.

In studying the past, says Arnold Toynbee – perhaps our chief living authority on this theme – we should 'relegate economic and political history to a subordinate place, and give religious history the primacy'. And then he gives his reason for this dictum: 'For religion, after all, is the serious business of the human race'.³⁶

When religion is so regarded, and science enlists under its banner, and marches forward in step with it, we shall have real reason for optimism concerning the future of mankind.

At the same time religion must manifest a reciprocal respect for the ministry of its fellow-worker. Every new theory advanced by science, even while it is unproved and unlikely, should be

³⁴ *Ecclesiastes*, vii. 29.

³⁵ *Matthew*, vi. 33.

³⁶ *Civilization on Trial*, p. 94.

welcomed with trustfulness and open-minded expectation. Not only as a possible addition to our knowledge of the wonder of the universe, but also as an enhancement of our conception of what St Paul calls 'the manifold (Πολυποικιλως, much varied, many sided, infinitely diverse) wisdom of God',³⁷ as seen in the marvel and complexity of His works in nature.

By way of illustration, we may mention Prof. Hoyle's recent hypothesis of 'continuous creation', a theory which had a dubious reception on its introduction, especially from religious critics. It is not enough to say, in the words of one who was equally gifted both as scientist and theologian, that this theory 'presents no difficulties for Christian people, and is in no way irreconcilable with Christian doctrine'.³⁸ That is true, but it is not the whole truth. Surely Hoyle's conception gives a wider and deeper idea of the activity of God. It suggests that the travail of His creative energy did not cease with the sixth day of the Genesis 'week', but has continued through all the aeons of time. It underlies, may we not say, the truth enunciated by the great Teacher when he said 'My Father worketh even until now' (John v. 17, R.V. Cf. Moffatt: 'My Father has continued working to this hour'. R.S.V.: 'Is working still'. N.E.B.: 'Has never yet ceased His work.').

One of the truest things ever said concerning the conflict between science and religion comes from the pen of Sir William Bragg: 'Some people say that religion and science are opposed; so they are, but only in the same sense as that in which my thumb and forefinger are opposed – and between the two one can grasp everything'.³⁹

To 'grasp everything' opens up an alluring prospect. There really seems no limit to the possibilities of the future of mankind if these two ancient enemies could come together as allies. E.g., one of the foremost of present-day scientists, who is also a convinced Christian, has this to say about the international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy held at Geneva in 1955: 'When the report of that conference was published, in

³⁷ *Ephesians*, iii. 10.

³⁸ A. F. Smethurst, *Op. cit.*, p. 95.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

sixteen volumes, it became possible to see, as never before, some of the many ways in which atomic energy can be used for human welfare'.⁴⁰ Not only atomic energy, but all other forms of energy, and the outcome of all the investigations and discoveries of science in every field of its activity, could likewise be 'used for human welfare', if only human vision and goodwill, not to say human commonsense, made it possible.

It is along these lines that the long conflict between religion and science could be succeeded by an era of co-operation which would be the prelude to a golden age for mankind. Alfred Noyes has some noble lines in which he glimpses the possibilities of science if thus regarded:

'What is all science then
But pure religion, seeking everywhere
The true commandments, and through many forms
The eternal power that binds all worlds in one?
It is man's age-long struggle to draw near
His maker, learn His thoughts, discern His law.'⁴¹

This magnificent conception of the mission of science, its place and function, may seem a long way from being justified by present attainment. But it constitutes a glorious ideal to inspire the endeavour of all who love their fellow-men, and earnestly desire their well-being.

'If we have grown by natural evolution out of the cave-man, and even less human forms of life', writes the genial Oliver Wendell Holmes, 'we have everything to hope from the future.'⁴² This heartening deduction from the past is strengthened when we remember that the human race is as yet in its infancy. Compared with the vast age of the earth, man is but a recent arrival, a child of yesterday. Geologists spell out from the evidence of the rocks a duration of several thousand million years for our planet. But man has existed on it for a bare half million years, and anything deserving to be called civilization for only a fraction of that relatively short period. It all points to the fact that we are just at the beginning of things. We ought not then to

⁴⁰ Prof. C. A. Coulson, *Some Problems of the Atomic Age*, p. 32.

⁴¹ *The Torch Bearers*, I. p. 230.

⁴² *Poet at Breakfast Table*, p. 194.

be unduly concerned at the condition of the world at present. The strife and jealousy of the nations may be likened to the bickerings and quarrelsomeness of the adolescent stage in the growth of the individual, or even to the instability and immaturity of infancy. In the one case as in the other a calmer and more ordered period may be surely looked for, as wisdom increases with the growth of experience.

The human race is still climbing
 'Upon the ladder of life, that mounts
 through Time,
 From plants and beasts, and up, through
 man, to God.'⁴³

In one sense, when we think of man's origins, he has come a long way. But in another and truer sense, when we consider how far he has to go before he achieves his Maker's purpose in creating him, he is only on the early rungs of the ladder. In the words of Sir James Jeans: 'As inhabitants of a civilized earth, we are living at the very beginning of time . . . and a day of almost unthinkable length stretches before us with unimaginable opportunities for accomplishment. Our descendants of far-off ages . . . will see our present age as the misty morning of the world's history'.⁴⁴ Or as one great English poet put it:

This fine old world of ours is but a child
 Yet in the go-cart. Patience! Give it time
 To learn its limbs: there is a hand that guides.⁴⁵

⁴³ Noyes, *Op. cit.*

⁴⁴ *The Universe Around Us*, p. 289.

⁴⁵ Tennyson, *The Princess*, p. 217 (Globe Edn.).

BOOK REVIEWS

Freedom of Action in a Mechanistic Universe

BY DONALD M. MACKEY

Cambridge University Press, pp.40, 5s

This little paper-covered booklet is a publication of the Eddington Memorial Lecture for 1967. Eddington's interest in the mind-matter problem is well-known and so is Professor MacKAY's. In inviting him to give the lecture the Trustees made an obvious and appropriate choice.

MacKAY has written before on the 'Principle of Logical Indeterminacy' (*cf.* Heisenberg's Principle) and no doubt some of his conclusions are as surprising as were those resulting from the 'Physical Principle of Indeterminacy'. It is very good therefore to have this carefully presented account. MacKAY summarizes his conclusions as follows 'I am suggesting that fears of mechanistic explanations of brain function are groundless, not because we can be sure that the brain is not a machine, but because even if it were, the whole constellation of claims regarding our inner nature and significance and destiny expressed in our moral tradition and the Christian religion would remain unaffected. It is not people, but brains, that may, or may not, be machines. It is not brains, but people, that choose, freely or otherwise, and in so doing determine their eternal destiny'.

R. L. F. BOYD

The Christian Stake in Science

BY ROBERT E. D. CLARK

Exeter, The Paternoster Press, pp.160, 16s

Probably most people today consider the relationship between Christianity and Science still to be one of tension and conflict. Indeed all too many, ignorant of true Christianity or the real nature of science see the conflict as a mere mopping up operation after a war won by science. On the other hand, as Dr. Clark says, 'A common Christian argument runs like this: Victorian Christians were exceedingly foolish to get their science and their religion mixed up in the way they did – they should have realized from the start that science and religion deal with separate spheres which cannot mix. Today we need to recognize once and for all, Christianity has no stake in Science . . .'. Dr. Clark belongs to neither of these groups. In his final conclusion he says of Christianity 'We cannot "prove" it true. But we can say "If it is true we may expect this or that to follow"'. And when it does follow – not only once but again and again – faith is strengthened and confirmed. It is this matter, of the expectations in Science that might be expected to follow from Christian Faith, that is the main subject of the book.

Dr. Clark has a well deserved reputation for an immense breadth of reading and a popular style which guides the non-scientist through the realms of science as if he were a native. The theme is not closely debated and the preponderance of 'post hoc' arguments will probably leave the unconverted unconvinced. Nevertheless it may at least leave them unsettled.

Dr. Clark's position is frankly supernaturalist and metaphysical. He affirms 'that science itself cannot get along without metaphysics' and, in the opinion of this reviewer, is inclined to place the stakes higher than he should. Some Christians today would demur from the mark 'the Christian also thinks that *some* unexplained events are due to real intervention by God or spiritual beings' on the ground that it does not do justice to the Biblical emphasis on God's activity in the mundane. There is room for debate here. In a similar vein, it is said 'Christians have always held that telepathy is possible', and 'prayer implies that a kind of telepathy can exist between men and God'. But, one wonders, is the relationship and interaction between Creator and creature to be thought of in terms of intervention or telepathy?

On flying saucer or other communication from distant parts of our galaxy, Dr. Clark wisely puts this topical speculation in perspective by pointing out for how little a fraction of this Earth's history civilization has existed and how great the range of coincidences (if coincidences they be called) is necessary for the occurrence of life. Statistically very few out of millions of planets capable of supporting life could be expected to be in a phase of development comparable to ours. Equally wisely however Dr. Clark does not suggest that the Christian has any stake in affirming or denying the existence of such 'heavenly hosts'.

Certainly Dr. Clark intended this book as a stimulant for thought not as a set of knock down arguments. That is how it should be read.

R. L. F. BOYD

Mito E Fede

ED. BY ENRICO CASTELLI

Padova, Istituto Di Studi Filosofici, 1966, pp. 585.

This volume comprises parts two and three of the Annual *Archivio Di Filosofia*. and contains some twenty-six essays, most of which are followed up by discussion. In the Introduction by the Editor, provided in French as well as the original Italian, the scope of the symposium is outlined as touching upon the problem of myth as it is represented in the thought of historians, philosophers and theologians, especially in relation to the Biblical world, and the world of the Greeks, particularly Epimenides.

Between Faith and Thought

BY RICHARD KRONER

Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 203, 35s.

Professor Kroner, formerly of the University of Kiel, is now Professor Emeritus of the Philosophy of Religion at Union Theological Seminary, New York. This book is devoted to a discussion of some of the older problems which obstructed the paths linking revelation and thought. The main thesis of the author is that the heart of the matter lies in a faulty understanding of the nature of faith. Any bridge-building, he concludes, between the world of speculative reason and revelation must take into account the performance of faith in bringing together the human and divine.

Ezekiel: The Man and His Message

BY H. L. ELLISON

The Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1967, pp. 144, 6s.

A new edition of Mr Ellison's original study of Ezekiel, first published in 1956, and now as one of the *Mount Radford Reprints*. This book sets out to give the reader who cannot cope with the critical problems of Ezekiel, or read it in the original a clearer grasp of Ezekiel's unique contribution to the corpus of prophetic literature. Mr Ellison has not paused to make comment where, as he says, 'The Revised Version seemed to make the sense tolerably clear,' or where critical questions do not have an immediate bearing on interpretation. Consequently, the author has left more room for those passages in the book which trap the unwary. This new and popular edition of Mr Ellison's book provides an excellent opportunity for all to take up the study of Ezekiel who have not had the author's guidance before.

From Tragedy to Triumph

BY H. L. ELLISON

The Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1967, pp. 127, 5s.

Another of the *Mount Radford Reprints*. This penetrating commentary on the Book of Job was first published in 1958. Unlike many other commentaries on the Old Testament books, this was born out of the author's own sharing of the experience of its subject, and for that reason alone the reader will find that Mr Ellison brings out into the open some of the deepest problems associated with human suffering which scarcely occur to others who have not had to tread the same road. It is a book which is not read once, but returned to time and time again.

Books received

Essere E Alterita in Martin Buber By Albino Babolin. Padova, Editrice Gregoriana.

Mito Potere E Dialogo By Luigi Bagolini. Bologna, Societa Editrice Il Mulino.

Insearch By James Hillman. London, Hodder and Stoughton.

The Essene Heritage By Martin A. Larson. New York, Philosophical Library.

The War Against the Jew By Dagobert D. Runes. New York, Philosophical Library.

Beyond Theology By Alan Watts. London, Hodder and Stoughton.

The Case for Creation By W. Frair and P. W. Davis. Chicago, Moody Press.