
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

JANUARY 1965

Symposium: The Old Testament in the Church Today

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS

Four Shillings and Sixpence Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

EDITORIAL

IN THE PAST eighteen months Church relations have been much influenced by two Faith and Order Conferences, one Congress, and one Council.

The *Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order*, the Report from Montreal 1963, edited by P. C. Rodger and L. Vischer was published last April (S.C.M. greenbacks, 12*s.* 6*d.*). It begins with David Paton's diary of those crowded days with their familiar pattern of worship and Bible study, long prepared speeches, sectional discussions, and reports. Into the last is concentrated some good theological thinking on 'The Church in the Purpose of God', 'Scripture, Tradition, and Traditions', 'The Redemptive Work of Christ and the Ministry of His Church', 'Worship and the Oneness of Christ's Church', and ' "All in Each Place", the Process of Growing Together'. These are well worth careful study in Ministers' Fraternals and local groups, but I doubt if they have managed to capture much of the fascinating exchanges in the various sections.

Anglican Congress 1963, Report of Proceedings—August 13th-23rd, Toronto, Canada, ed. E. R. Fairweather (S.P.C.K., 15*s.*), is a much more vivid production because, instead of smooth reports, it gives the theme addresses and summaries of what was said later. As we peruse the pages, we are able to share the encounter of mind with mind, and although the style lacks the elegance and grace expected from Anglicans, the book is brimming over with ideas, some of which crack and strain the capacity of the speakers to express them.

Some of us have been inclined to charge the Anglican communion with undue self-consciousness, introversion, and a putting of second things first. Sometimes it has seemed as though what mattered most was the colour of a vestment, or the splitting of a hair. But in this Report there is a tremendous awareness of world mission and its problems.

It is invidious to single out contributions, but many months after a first reading I can still recall Max Warren's powerful insistence on God everywhere and inescapable, his sympathy for *Honest to God*, and his controversial plea for the co-existence of religions; Kenneth Cragg's clear and expert exposition of the challenge of Islam; Howard Johnson's forthright, realistic account, illustrated from his 'Global Odyssey', of the vocation of Anglicanism as the *coincidence of opposites*; and Alan Richardson's concern that the ministry should be trained to preach honest, theological, indeed high-brow sermons that the intellectual case for the Gospel go not by default.

One of the most provocative papers was from Canon F. C. Synge, now of Christchurch, New Zealand. He was once Chaplain to the Bishop of

London (then Geoffrey Fisher), and wrote a 'theological commentary' on Ephesians. I remember him, also, for an interesting article in the *Scottish Journal of Theology* (Vol. 6, No. 1, March 1953) on The Holy Spirit and the Sacraments, in which he argued for three sacraments, Baptism, Eucharist and Preaching. At Toronto, Canon Synge was concerned not with the number of the sacraments but with the number of ministerial orders. There are not three—bishops, priests and deacons, or four—these three plus the laity—but two, bishop and laity. From this he develops a very high doctrine of the episcopate, but cuts the presbyters down to size. The bishop alone has power to celebrate the eucharist (Synge coins a hideous word, 'eucharistizer'), but, in fact, in the Anglican communion 'the bishop's eucharist extends as far as the furthest presbyter in his diocese and no further'. So Synge suggests that in remote areas where clergy are few the bishop should delegate his power to celebrate the eucharist to laymen. The task of the presbyters should be to teach and preach.

The Congress was apparently rather puzzled by Canon Synge. The obvious question immediately arose, 'What is the difference between delegation and ordination?' and the Canon was not very sure, though he replied that he had chosen the former word to remove any suggestion that his laymen authorized to administer the sacraments would be 'mass priests'.

Many of us will not be happy with talk of the 'bishop's Eucharist'. We thought it was Christ's. But we are not on very safe historical ground here, since it was those churches most anxious to undermine priestly pretensions which insisted that the sacraments belonged to the church. (Dr Hildebrandt's famous question, 'Lord's Table or Church's Table?', would have been answered by most English nonconformists in the way he deplores as Anglo-Catholic.) And Synge is anxious to exalt the episcopate in order to curb the clergy and set the people free, just as the Roman reformers in Vatican II see a strong and authoritative college of bishops as a safeguard against ultra-montanism. So his revolutionary idea is not so alarming as it sounds, provided we accept the scandalous belief (and for some it will be an insuperable rock of offence) that Christ's own ministry is carried on in His church and in those appointed to His own especial ministries as shepherds and overseers. Those who were at Nottingham will recognize some affinities between Canon Synge's understanding of episcopacy, and that of Father Paul Verghese, who felt that in our thought about the ministry we must begin with the bishop.

What is less foreign to our ethos is the implication that we may have to revise our notions of what a layman can do, and what demands specialist training. We are apt to feel that any man may be called to preach, but that administration of the sacraments should be reserved for those set apart for the purpose by lifelong ordination. Ought we not to begin to recognize that far fewer are gifted for preaching than we fondly imagine, that if we want better preachers there may have to be fewer preachers, but that many more ordinary church members, as we slightingly call them, could be taught to lead the people's prayer and praise? It's an intriguing thought anyhow!

* * *

The Nottingham Faith and Order Conference, September 12th-19th, 1964, was a British Montreal. The Report, *Unity begins at Home*, is now published, edited by Rupert E. Davies and David L. Edwards (S.C.M., 3*s.* 6*d.*). Nottingham was particularly valuable because there was a real attempt to engage representatives of the local churches, and those not sympathetic to the ecumenical movement. The sectional reports are brief but less ridden with jargon and expertise than usual.

The discussions and reports revealed once again that many of our divisions are horizontal rather than vertical, and that some of our most intractable and divisive problems will only be solved when we tackle them together instead of in separation. This is true of Baptism, and the controversy between believers and paedo-baptists; it is true of scripture and tradition.

There was a great desire to listen to the questions the world is asking, and to which the ceaseless chatter of of our own controversies often deafens us. 'How is our knowledge of Christ related to anything that the world recognizes as knowledge and what form of expressions in the Churches' speaking, doing and serving will enable the doctrines referred to in the Creeds to become meaningful for men in this age?'

The 1980 resolution caused pain to some. There is a genuine dilemma involved. 'He that believeth shall not make haste', and yet we live in an age of revolutions. Is it better to rush into unity as unprepared as some of the African States were for independence, or to go on with the persistent exploration of differences, and patient teaching until the most bigoted sectarian is converted? The danger of delay is that it may be indefinite, and unity be postponed until the Greek Kalends. By which time God's hour will have long struck.

It is interesting to observe how the protagonists in the Anglican-Methodist matter are using the 1980 resolution to further their own cause. My impression was that most of those Methodists at Nottingham who were unhappy about the unity proposals voted with the minority against the fixing of a date; but there are some dissentients who feel that this bold resolution makes it all the more important that Methodists should be cautious in 1965 in order that 1980 be not sabotaged by an Anglican-Methodist scheme which does not win the approval of the other member churches of the British Council. They would probably call a halt to the Anglican-Methodist negotiations and initiate fresh talks between all the churches, with 1980 in mind.

Others are convinced that unless Anglicans and Methodists can move speedily on the basis of the present proposals there is little hope of wider union. This seems to be the Archbishop of Canterbury's view. And there is no doubt that two million Anglicans and seven hundred thousand Methodists do account for the overwhelming majority of non-Roman Christians in England, and the impact of their union would be hard to resist.

There is a deeper concern. What do we mean by unity? It is hard to avoid the suspicion that for many of us it is nothing more than a Pan-Protestant alliance, and we fail to understand how indigenous to authentic Anglicanism the High Church element is. We regard it as an aberration which must either capitulate or go to Rome. But the only true unity between Christians is that which loves, honours and seeks to understand all who love Our Lord, and

whose works have been owned by Him. And the real and glorious hope of the ecumenical movement is not that the heirs of the Reformation may adjust their polities and somehow merge into one, but that the age-old gulf between Catholic and Protestant may be bridged. Only a scheme which does this is worth our toil and tears.

And, let us make no mistake, in spite of all its grandeur, Reformed Christianity is deficient. It is hungry and impoverished for that which only those who call themselves Catholics can supply. (We may be convinced that they need us equally, but that is not for us to say.) There are churches more ancient, more universal than ours. True, Catholic Christianity can be rigid, corrupt, degenerate, with more faith in outward forms than in gospel grace. (The great new fact of recent years, which we ignore at our peril, is that its best scholars and leaders are well aware of this.) But beyond all the abuse and imprisoning tyrannies of bigotry and superstition there is the glorious, mystical Body of the Lord.

* * *

And so we come to the Council, for the shadow of the dome of St Peter's is henceforth cast over all our ecumenical deliberations. It would be foolish to imagine that there is as yet any prospect of unity with Rome in the foreseeable future. But it ought to be crystal clear that we can no longer regard this great Church as a monolith of reaction. We must beware the mistake which Americans so often made with regard to Communists in the Dulles era; they treated them as everywhere the same, and everywhere the enemy, and were not, so it seemed, ready to take advantage of liberal tempers and to encourage them.

We in England are in peculiar difficulties, because there does seem to be an acute division in the Roman community, and it would be so easy for Protestants out of blundering goodwill to do great harm. It may be, too, that in some areas, we shall make advances and be rebuffed. Do not let us forget that, while Archbishop Heenan seems usually to have sided with the conservatives at Rome, he is probably the most liberal of all the holders of his see, except Hinsley, whose biography he wrote.

Our hearts go out in sympathy to the brave authors of *Objections to Roman Catholicism* (Constable, 18*s*.). We are bound to feel that their cause is ours, and that it must in the end prevail. But a bitter conflict within the English Roman Church should give us no satisfaction.

It is just here that the sincerity of our dedication to the ecumenical movement is put to the test. Can our charity comprehend even those whom we believe to be in error? Do we pray for them and for ourselves as bound with them—

Enable with perpetual light
The dullness of our blinded sight?

And are we able to face the question which the Bishop of Ripon intervened to pose at Nottingham:

'Do we or do we not believe in Christian *Unity*, that it is God's will that ALL should be ONE?'

GORDON S. WAKEFIELD

THE PROBLEM OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

Bernhard W. Anderson

THE OLD TESTAMENT bristles with many problems for the historian who attempts to write a history of ancient Israel. To take just one example, the major part of the period of post-exilic Judaism—from Ezra's Reform to the outbreak of the Maccabean wars—is so poorly documented that the Jewish community is almost lost in oblivion. In the future, the plurality of problems will undoubtedly be reduced in number and significance as our knowledge of the Biblical period increases. But there is one fundamental problem which underlies all the specific problems of Old Testament history and which becomes more and more acute with the advance of historical studies. This singular problem is well stated by Walther Eichrodt: 'The discrepancy between the picture of history constructed by critical study and the salvation-history portrayed in the utterances of Old Testament faith has emerged ever more clearly in the researches of the last hundred years, and has long constituted an urgent problem for the understanding of the message of the Old Testament.'[1]

I

This 'discrepancy' points to the new situation in which the Church finds itself as it reads the Bible today. For centuries the picture of history presented in the Old Testament was accepted as a credible account of the actual course of history, from Creation onward. The movement of historical criticism, however, has brought us to the 'point of no return'. No longer can we read the Old Testament history in the same way as Calvin, Aquinas, Augustine, Paul or Ezra. The Biblical view of history is confronted with the picture of history presented by historical criticism. The discrepancy between the two becomes a dilemma: on the one hand, the historian is committed to a critical method which requires that he retell the history in terms of human causality, that is, as a chain of human events; and on the other hand, the Old Testament itself presents the history as a *Heilsgeschichte*, that is, as the story of the actions of God.

Admittedly, this discrepancy does not have to become a sharp alternative. The historian has been emancipated from the historicism of the late nineteenth century with its concern to recover 'what really happened', apart from theological embellishments. History is meaningful occurrence, not naked event (a contradiction in terms). Accordingly, one cannot disregard the testimony of contemporary witnesses that particular events, like the

crossing of the Reed Sea (Ex. 15[21]), were experienced as theophanic occurrences, or that a sequence of events was united by divine purpose. Nevertheless, the modern historian does not write history in the same way as the Old Testament, that is, as a confessional recital of the actions of God. He has to retell or reconstruct the history as a causal chain of human events within which, at best, the divine action is subtly manifest.

It is not surprising, then, that historians have extolled the early source of the Books of Samuel, especially the Davidic Court History (II Sam. 9-20; I Kings 1-2), as an example of sober, factual historiography.[2] In contrast to other historical presentations, this source does not stress God's miraculous intervention into the course of events. Rather, his word, spoken through the prophet Nathan, operates subtly in the sphere of interpersonal relationships to bring upon David the consequence of his deed. This realistic historiography is said to reflect the 'Enlightenment' of the Solomonic era which, compared with Israel during the days of the Confederacy, was characterized by a new secularity.

It would be a great boon if the Old Testament contained more source material of this kind, written by contemporaries of the events and presented with historical sobriety. Unfortunately, such material is fairly meagre. Even the Davidic Court History is embraced within the large Deuteronomic History whose dominating purpose is to trace the salvation-history from the Mosaic period to the fall of the nation. Gerhard von Rad writes of this theological picture of history: 'What is decisive for Israel is not what commonly makes "the tumult and the shouting" in history. Decisive for the life and death of the people of God is the word of God injected into history.'[3] So within the Old Testament itself the historian finds illustrations of the fundamental historical problem: the discrepancy between a historiography which is akin to modern historical understanding, and the portrayal of Israel's history in terms of *Heilsgeschichte*.

II

This historical problem becomes especially acute in the period of Israel's early history, the period roughly covered by the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch). Old Testament scholars are in general agreement that the event of the Exodus from Egypt was fundamental for the radically historical faith of ancient Israel. The traditions of the Old Testament testify that the Exodus was *the* crucial event, to which previous events were related as preparation and subsequent events as outcome. The historian who attempts to penetrate this creative period, however, is immediately confronted with two major difficulties. First, at least three centuries of oral transmission of the traditions separate the Exodus from the earliest literary source in which it is reported. And second, the historical meaning of the Exodus is presented as a dramatic story of the mighty acts of Yahweh, the God of Israel. The purpose of the traditions is primarily to glorify God, not to relate sober history.

Wellhausen proposed an attractive solution to the discrepancy between the theological picture of Israel's early history and modern historical understanding. According to his view, the sources of the Pentateuch reflect the spiritual situation of the time in which they were written; and the Penta-

teuch in its final form, with its grand portrayal of salvation-history from the Creation to the Conquest, was the construction of the priests of Judaism. Thus the *Heilsgeschichte* was a late and artificial way of viewing Israel's early history, which could be set aside in favour of an historical reconstruction along evolutionary lines.[4] It is to be noted that Wellhausen and his followers did not challenge the fundamental outline of Israel's early history, including the period of the patriarchs, the Exodus, the revelation at Sinai, the wanderings in the wilderness, the invasion of Canaan; rather, they rejected the understanding of this sequence of events in terms of *Heilsgeschichte*.

The Wellhausen reconstruction of Israel's history collapsed primarily because of internal weaknesses which became evident as historical critics renewed their efforts to penetrate and understand the Biblical period. During the past thirty years or so fresh historical study has been devoted to the early period of Israel. The result has been a 'decisive reversal' of the Wellhausen solution 'by tracing the roots of the post-exilic law and of the interpretation of Israel's historical origins in terms of *Heilsgeschichte* back into the period of Israelite origins itself'.[5] The new approach to Old Testament history has taken different forms on both sides of the Atlantic: on the one side, the German form-critical school of Albrecht Alt and his followers, and on the other side, the American school of William F. Albright and his students. Distinguished representatives of both schools have produced a *History of Israel*, in which the different historical treatment of the early period becomes clear to the thoughtful reader.[6]

The German school has been profoundly influenced by Hermann Gunkel, who opened a new era for both Old and New Testament studies by developing the study of oral tradition. Critical of the Wellhausen reconstruction, Gunkel insisted that the early period, when speech found expression in oral forms, was the creative time in the history of literature, and he advocated a method (form-criticism) for pushing back into the pre-literary tradition. Space permits only a brief mention of the directions in which German form-critical research has moved out from Gunkel's position. In his study of the *God of the Fathers*, Albrecht Alt showed that behind the theological harmonization of the present Book of Genesis are vestiges of patriarchal times, when a deity entered into special relationship with a patriarch and promised his clan fertility and immediate acquisition of land.[7] Martin Noth analysed the basic themes of the Pentateuch in the attempt to show how independent traditions grew and merged during the period when Israel was united as a Twelve-tribe Confederacy.[8] And Gerhard von Rad showed that the literary sources of the Hexateuch are dependent upon a canon of faith summarized in the 'little historical credo' (cf. Deut. 26^{5-9}) and that the extensive complexes of material such as the Sinai pericope or the Exodus-Conquest narratives were shaped in early religious festivals.[9] These lines of investigation converge to show that the picture of Israel's history in terms of *Heilsgeschichte* was not a late construction but was actually rooted in the period of oral tradition.

The American school is equally critical of the Wellhausen reconstruction of Israel's history, as is clear from Albright's monumental *From the Stone*

Age to Christianity (first edition, 1944). In this case, however, the major influence has been the new horizons opened up by archæological investigation. Thanks to the new data from external sources, the history of Israel as presented in the Old Testament can now be understood within the larger context of the ancient Near East. No longer need it be said, as in the Wellhausen heyday, that the Pentateuchal sources are primarily valuable for the historical times in which they were written. Nor need one be confined to the method of the form-critical and tradition-historical scholars which leads to no surer results for Israel's early history, for 'such internal methodologies can never really assess the historical in the traditional'.[10] The great value of archæology for Biblical studies is that it has provided 'external sources of information' which can serve as a check upon the early Biblical traditions. Although archæology does not prove the Biblical record to be true (contrary to the assumption based on Werner Keller's popular book *The Bible as History: Archæology Confirms the Book of Books*, 1956), it does help us to understand that there is a real connection between the Biblical *Heilsgeschichte* and the events which occurred on the plane of secular history during the second millennium B.C. It is altogether consistent with this approach that G. Ernest Wright has written a monograph *God Who Acts* (1952), the title of which paraphrases what the German school would call *Heilsgeschichte*.

III

It remains to be seen, however, whether historical critics can escape being driven to the conclusion that the *Heilsgeschichte*, even though early in origin, is essentially a theological construction unrelated to the factual course of history. Wellhausen rejected the Pentateuchal picture of Israel's history but held on to the sequence of events; now the question is whether post-Wellhausen scholars, having restored the primacy of the *Heilsgeschichte*, will disavow its relation to the actual course of historical events.

The seriousness of this question is evident in the debate which has been waged over the past years between the American and the German schools.[11] As an illustration we may take the exchange of articles on 'History and the Patriarchs' by G. Ernest Wright and Gerhard von Rad.[12] Wright defends the thesis that '*Biblical Heilsgeschichte* is a celebration of events which Biblical man thought really happened'. European form-criticism, he argues, issues in a 'negativism' which threatens the historical foundations of Israel's faith. For the form-critic fixes his attention on the fragment, which usually proves to be a cult legend, and argues that the historical sequence which links the fragments together is not derived from historical experience but from the theological perspectives of the later cultic community. Wright then asks his central question: 'By what objective criteria can it be presumed to be more probable that the later cultic tradition which now holds the various items of the epic together is the more or less artificial construction of the cultus out of disparate themes from different cultic centres, but that it is less probable that there was always one central confessional story connected not so much with a cult *place* as with a particular group of *people* who found in it the explanation of their existence?' (p. 294). This is a 'historical conclusion'

which form-criticism and tradition history are incapable of making alone. Hence this methodology, in his judgement, is not on a par with the historical method which relies upon data gleaned from archæological investigations and which supports the view that 'the patriarchal period is at least authentic in the sense that it can be fitted into an actual historical era of ancient history'.

In his reply, von Rad asserts that he and Martin Noth have no intention of denying that 'very concrete historical experiences of Israel lie behind the framework in which the individual traditions are embedded'. Indeed, form-critical studies show that some of the traditions, for instance the old covenant ceremony in Gen. $15^{7ff.}$, belong to a very ancient time. But he insists that investigation of the traditions must be the first task, precisely because 'we do not find immediately behind the texts the events they speak about, but rather a long, complicated process of tradition to which the stories of Genesis (or of Exodus to Numbers) owe their present form' (p. 213n). Careful study of the Abraham and Jacob traditions, for instance, discloses a number of individual units which were originally associated with southern or northern sanctuaries; it was only at a relatively late stage in the process of tradition that these disparate materials were unified on the basis of the *Leitmotif* of the promise to the fathers. Thus critical study of the traditions refutes Wright's hypothesis that during the patriarchal period there was 'one central confessional story' which formed the basis of a people's self-understanding. Von Rad then puts his central question: 'Such a homogeneous historical tradition would presuppose a corresponding historical bearer of the tradition. But where can we find the bearer of such a comprehensive and unified tradition?' (p. 214). The traditions of Genesis presuppose small groups whose own traditions were gradually mixed with the indigenous traditions of the land into which they moved. In any case, 'the possibilities of obtaining authentic history about Abraham, Isaac and Jacob out of this very complex source material are soon exhausted. We do not have the necessary objective criteria to untangle the historically authentic material from its inextricable intermixture with other material' (p. 214). Besides, concludes von Rad, the traditions have been so completely transformed in meaning within the realm of the Yahweh faith that it is not very profitable to push back into older stages of tradition which are 'theologically speechless'.

IV

If this debate up to now has not led to any scholarly consensus, it has at least focused attention upon the fundamental problem of Old Testament history. Surely any definition of 'history' must include a *sequence* of events remembered by a group of people who finds the meaning of its existence therein. For the Old Testament the question is whether the meaning inheres in a group's shared history or whether it is imputed to historical traditions by theological revisers.

Wright has some difficulty defending the thesis that the traditions of Genesis reflect the shared history of a particular people. He admits that in regard to Genesis 'archæology cannot contribute as much to the direct solution of issues posed by the form-critic as it can for the thirteenth century

and the Mosaic era' (p. 294). In this instance he chose to defend his thesis in a context which easily lends itself to the method of form criticism. One might more readily assent to dissolving pariarchal tradition into fragments which have a cultic provenance if the form-critic's conclusions were essentially different in regard to the events which cluster around the crucial event of the Exodus. Here Wright's question is decisively important. Martin Noth does not doubt that the tradition has preserved real historical experiences but asserts that these events were 'unrelated to one another in time or content'. Originally, unrelated events have been put into a unified historical framework during the period of the Israelite amphictyony.[13] Similarly, von Rad grants the historicity of individual events (Exodus, crossing of the Reed Sea, sojourn at Kadesh) but insists that the sequence has been made to conform to 'a preconceived theological picture of the saving history already long established in the form of a cultic confession'. In other words, the unity of the tradition was not based on the 'direct historical memories' of a tradition-bearing group; rather 'it was Israel herself who arranged the sequence of events in a cultic confession'.[14]

It may be, as Père R. de Vaux suggests, that these two schools are moving toward one another from different starting points, one emphasizing the gains which archæological investigation has brought to our historical understanding, and the other stressing the limitations upon our historical knowledge owing to the nature of the traditions.[15] He draws attention, for instance, to certain modifications in Noth's position on the contributions of archæology, which apparently lead him away from the extreme scepticism of his *History*. It is unfortunate, however, that the impression is sometimes created that there are two different approaches to the history of Israel, championed by each of these schools. If, as all admit, the faith of Israel truly rests upon events of history, and not upon a *Heilsgeschichte* that merely hovers in the air, both archæological investigation and form-critical investigation must go hand in hand. Just as archæology does not serve the purpose of proving that the Biblical tradition is true, so form-criticism does not necessarily lead to historical negativism. If major excavations have been conducted at only *two per cent* of potential sites in Palestine, surely we may expect much more light to be shed in the future from archæology.[16] And the further pursuit of form-critical studies will undoubtedly show that individual units of tradition, especially those emanating from the period of the Exodus, wilderness wandering, and invasion of Canaan, witness to a marvellous sequence of events, rooted not in the cult but in the historical experience of a tradition-bearing group, which was finally appropriated as the shared history of all the tribes of Israel and became the nucleus around which independent and widely separated traditions were organized. Then the 'discrepancy' between believed history and factual history will be accepted as a tension, not a hiatus.

[1] Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I (1961), trans. by J. A. Baker, p. 512.

[2] Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1948), who acclaims the author of the early Samuel source as ' "the father of history" in a much truer sense than Herodotus half a millennium later' (p. 357).

[3] Gerhard von Rad, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I (1962), trans. by D. M. G. Stalker, p. 144.
[4] See the remarks by James M. Robinson, 'The Historical Question', *New Directions in Biblical Thought* (1960), ed. by Martin E. Marty, pp. 73-94.
[5] James Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
[6] For the German school, Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, trans. from the second German edition by Stanley Godman (1958); for the American school, John Bright, *A History of Israel* (1959).
[7] Albrecht Alt, *Der Gott der Väter* (1929), republished in his *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. I (1959), pp. 1-72. See now the reconsideration of this subject by Frank M. Cross, Jr., 'Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs', *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. LV (1962), pp. 225-59.
[8] See especially his study of the oral tradition, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (1948).
[9] See especially his *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (1938), reprinted in his *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (1958).
[10] G. Ernest Wright, 'History and the Patriarchs', *Expository Times*, Vol. 71 (1959-60), p. 292. See further his book *Biblical Archæology* (1957).
[11] See, for instance, John Bright's vigorous criticism of Martin Noth in *Early Israel in Recent History Writing* (1956) and Martin Noth's review of Bright's *History of Israel* in *Interpretation*, Vol. XV (1961), pp. 61-6.
[12] Wright, *Expository Times*, Vol. 71 (1959-60), pp. 292-96; von Rad, Vol. 72 (1960-61), pp. 213-16.
[13] Martin Noth, *History*, p. 136.
[14] von Rad, *Theology*, Vol. I, pp. 2, 3.
[15] R. de Vaux, O.P., 'Les patriarches hebreux et l'histoire', *Studii Biblici Franciscani* (Liber Annuus: XIII, 1962-63), pp. 287-97.
[16] See Paul W. Lapp, 'Palestine: Known but Mostly Unknown', *The Biblical Archæologist*, Vol. xxvi, No. 4, (December 1963), pp. 121-34.

THE PROBLEM OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Ronald E. Clements

THE PROBLEM of Old Testament theology has become very largely a problem of methodology, and the need to find a suitable arrangement by means of which the contents of the Old Testament can be presented theologically. Once the deficiencies became apparent of a simple historical description of the development of Israelite religion, the starting-point for an Old Testament theology seemed to be provided by the needs of the systematic theologian, with his interest in the doctrines of God, Man and Redemption. Thus the task of the Old Testament theologian is to present the religious ideas which the Old Testament contains, suitably arranged under these, or closely allied, headings, so that the basic groundwork of systematic theology can be shown to be provided by the religion of Ancient Israel. Since the New Testament writings very largely presuppose these religious ideas, such an undertaking is undoubtedly indispensable to an understanding of the Bible as a whole. This systematic presentation of Old Testament theology is basically that advocated by W. Eichrodt in his *Theologie des Alten Testaments*,[1] whose threefold division of God and Nation, God and the World, God and Man reflect the requirements of systematic theology. Such requirements also govern the presentation adopted

by T. C. Vriezen in his *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*,[2] whose most valuable contribution is a long and stimulating introduction, dealing with the problems of methodology.

Of the theologies of the Old Testament, which find their starting-point in the basic arrangement of systematic theology, the first to appear, and certainly the most significant in achievement, is that of W. Eichrodt. His work shines all the brighter for having pointed the way for others. Such a systematic approach to the subject has to accept two basic presuppositions. The first is that the Old Testament contains a central point of reference, which gives unity to the diverse materials, and the second is that throughout the millenium of change and development reflected in the Old Testament, the fundamental notions of religion did not radically alter their character. Eichrodt finds the central point of reference in the idea of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, which he regards as fundamental to the whole Old Testament. He then seeks to obviate the difficulties created by historical movement and change, which led both E. Sellin and O. Procksch to offer a dual presentation of Israelite theology, one historical and one systematic, by taking a cross-section of the religious development. Thus he endeavours to understand the basic religious doctrines at the point of their characteristic expression, and thereby to avoid the misleading notions of a religious evolution, or of an uncritical and unhistorical uniformity.

There can be no question of the greatness of Eichrodt's achievement, which provides a remarkably comprehensive and illuminating summary of the religious ideas contained in the Old Testament. It is certainly not, however, invulnerable to criticism, and this concerns not merely details of interpretation, but reaches down to the very foundations of the whole presentation. Since the Old Testament is not a collection of writings which set out to provide a systematic summary of religious doctrines, Eichrodt is forced to proceed by a method of inference. Thus, for example, the importance of the great Deuteronomistic historical work (Joshua—II Kings) is found not in the history with which it deals, nor in the interpretation which it places upon this history, but in the incidental allusions to the religious ideas of its leading characters, and, indirectly, of its author. What can be inferred about the beliefs of ancient Israelites becomes more significant than the plain statements which the Old Testament contains. Eichrodt's theology is, at bottom, an attempt to reconstruct the basic ideas current in ancient Israelite religion, rather than an assessment of the theological meaning of the Old Testament in the literary form in which we now possess it. The method of approach to the subject as a whole greatly affects the detailed interpretation of the Old Testament material. Eichrodt accepts, for example, that there is basically one essential covenant doctrine in the Old Testament, pointing to Moses and Mount Sinai, and he makes little or no attempt to assess the very different covenant theologies that the Old Testament contains. The historical relationships, and ideological differences, of the Abrahamic, Mosaic and Davidic covenants are glossed over in the necessity to subordinate the entire Old Testament material to the one covenant of Mount Sinai. Similarly, it is doubtful whether early Israelites were always as conscious of the Sinai covenant in their worship, as Eichrodt

claims. The interpretation of sacrifice as a renewal of the covenant sacrifice on Mount Sinai would appear to have been a very late development. By starting with the basic interests of the systematic theologian, Eichrodt tends to prejudge the material with which he deals. Most of all we must object that what Eichrodt offers is not a theology of the Old Testament, but a reconstruction of the theological ideas of Ancient Israel.

The problem arises, then, that if the contents of the Old Testament cannot be adequately dealt with by summarizing its implicit religious ideas according to the canons of systematic theology, how else can its theological significance be presented? The most thorough and stimulating answer to this problem is that given by Gerhard von Rad in the two volumes of his *Theologie des Alten Testaments*.[3] Von Rad renounces the possibility of assembling a comprehensive systematic theology of Ancient Israel. In the first place the Old Testament does not contain such a unified system of religious ideas; it contains a series of theologies, rather than one single theology. Secondly, even if such a unified theology could be written, it could only have a very indirect significance for the modern Christian, who can never escape the historical fact that he is not an ancient Israelite, but a twentieth-century Christian. Here it is apparent that the problem of hermeneutics is not a matter of homiletics only, but a fundamental problem concerning the nature of biblical revelation, which must inevitably be taken into consideration by an Old Testament theology.

In order to understand the method of von Rad's theology, it is essential to bear in mind his earlier studies using the traditio-historical approach to the Old Testament literature. These most especially concerned the Hexateuch and the historical books,[4] although Von Rad makes considerable use of similar studies by L. Rost[5] and M. Noth.[6] Von Rad claims that the kernel of the Pentateuch is to be found in the brief credo-like summaries of Yahweh's gracious acts towards Israel (esp. Deut. 26^{5-9}; Jos. 24^{2-13}). Through God's intervention in history Israel was given life and faith, and in response Israel repeatedly re-affirmed its faith in its God, by recalling his mighty acts of the past. At first this took place in a cultic recital, but eventually the material was freed from its cultic roots, and taken up into more comprehensive historical writings, which were subsequently used to form the present historical books of the Old Testament. In this regard the Pentateuch (von Rad is more concerned with the Hexateuch, to include the account of the conquest of Canaan) must be regarded as an historical work. Israel's faith in Yahweh, therefore, was essentially an affirmation of his gracious deeds towards Israel, with a promise of obedience to his revealed demands as Israel's response. The fundamental nature of the Old Testament is determined by this *kerygma*, declaring Yahweh's saving acts, to which is added literary evidence of Israel's response in the Psalter and the Wisdom literature. The problem of Old Testament theology is then essentially a problem about history, and its presentation must be kerygmatic rather than systematic.

The first volume of von Rad's theology deals with the historical traditions, with a concluding section on the literature of Israel's response. It is the historical works, however, which determine the character of Old Testament theology, especially the Hexateuch, which is the gospel of the Old Testament.

The second volume deals with the prophets, and here von Rad traces the influence on the prophets of the earlier cultic traditions of Israel. The significance of the prophets is specially to be found in the way in which they adapted and reinterpreted these earlier traditions in the situation of crisis which culminated in the exile of 587 B.C. The prophets also, therefore, find their ultimate significance in their particular interpretation, or more precisely reinterpretation, of Yahweh's saving action towards Israel. The second volume concludes with a long and instructive section on the nature of Old Testament theology, and its relationship to the New Testament. The Old Testament contains not one theology, but several, each of which seeks to comprehend and interpret the events by which God called Israel into being, and to show the meaning of this election for Israel's future. The events which the *kerygma* interprets take on a kind of typical significance by which further events may be understood. The progressive reinterpretation of the original events is therefore at the same time an attempt to understand the continuing action of God towards Israel. Yet the Old Testament contains no final and complete interpretation of the saving events in Israel's history, but points to the future for the full manifestation of the divine purpose. The fact that it is 'open to the future' is a distinctive characteristic of the Old Testament, which ever points beyond itself for the confirmation of its truth. It is in the events of the Gospel, and in the life and work of Jesus Christ, that a new, and for the Christian, final, interpretation of the saving action of God towards Israel is to be found. Old Testament theology must, therefore, be kerygmatic, and be concerned not with reconstructing a system of ideas, but with the interpretation of a people's history.

The greatness and originality of von Rad's treatment is undeniable, and its dissimilarity to Eichrodt's approach is fundamental. Whereas Eichrodt proceeds by inference to reconstruct Ancient Israel's religious ideas and beliefs, von Rad deals directly with the Old Testament as literature, and seeks to understand the history and interests which have given it its present shape. The lack of any systematic ordering of theological doctrines in von Rad's theology is regarded as a necessary consequence of the special nature of the Old Testament itself. The systematic theologian, however, may wonder where he is to begin in assessing the significance of such a work. If Eichrodt may be accused of too hurriedly forcing the material of the Old Testament into the mould of Christian dogmatics, von Rad is surely guilty of breaking off too soon, and disregarding the legitimate requirements of systematic theology. The pattern of continuity in the Old Testament is more than just a historical accident, and the unity of its faith is as real as the variety of its expressions. Von Rad's work, therefore, whilst it brings many insights and advances, is still more in the nature of a prolegomena to Old Testament theology, rather than the finished theology itself.

The problems raised by von Rad's work must be the starting-point for future investigation and study. Central to all such questions is that concerning the nature of God's action in Israel's history. Von Rad asserts that the heart of the Old Testament is a credo-like confession of faith in Yahweh's actions on Israel's behalf. This is the kernel around which the whole Hexateuch is formed, and which provided the essential datum for the preaching of the

prophets. Von Rad, however, makes no attempt to assess how this confessional recital was related to the actual historical events. Only the interpretation of faith gives significance to the events, which in themselves are now unknowable. It is not surprising, therefore, that he has been sharply criticized by F. Hesse[7] on the grounds that the actual events never actually happened in the way that Israel believed. Hesse wants to lay greater stress on the actual history of Israel, culminating in the event of the Incarnation, as proof of the divine control of history. Whilst this is a legitimate claim, there are clearly limits to the assertion that God's revelation is through historical events, since, as Hesse admits, the development of Israel's faith and piety is an essential component of an Old Testament theology. We cannot be satisfied with a plain historical record, since a mere summary of events can become a dull and lifeless catalogue. It is not simply the event that has significance, but the character and will of the One controlling the event, and the way in which this comes to be understood. Whilst it is unsatisfactory to limit the range of theology to the study of actual historical events, it is equally unsatisfactory to accept Israel's confessional recital of history, without inquiring as to its relationship with the occurrences on which it was based. Such only results in a new kind of docetism. The attempt to make subtle distinctions between different kinds of 'history' offers no real advance here,[8] and the theologian has to be content with a degree of tension between what actually happened, and what faith understood to have happened.

In a very different direction two pupils of von Rad have sought to find significance in Israel's history. These are K. Koch and R. Rendtorff, whose work is strongly influenced by the systematic theologian W. Pannenberg.[9] Pannenberg argues that the significance of history is determined not by the character of a few isolated events, but by the goal to which the whole history leads.[10] From such a background K. Koch asserts, in an essay entitled 'The Death of the Founder of Religion',[11] that Israel's religion was not the creation of one man, nor of one brief series of events, but was gradually developed over a long period, in a process of mutual interaction with Canaanite religion, and the spiritual life of the whole Ancient Near East. This is amply justified on the basis of critical study of the origins of Israel's religion, and, since this religion prepared for the advent of Jesus Christ, we cannot deny that the hand of God has been at work within its development. A similar approach is advocated by R. Rendtorff.[12] Whilst there is value in this claim, it virtually canonizes the whole religious movement of the Ancient Near East, which is certainly not what the Jews intended to do at the council of Jamnia.

The distinctive character of the Old Testament, as a product of Israel's religion, and thus, in part, of the religions of the Ancient Near East, is a factor of immense theological importance. The critical attitude which much of the Old Testament displays towards Israel's religion as well as the religions of neighbouring nations, especially the Canaanites, is full of significance. Within Israel's faith there emerged what has been termed very aptly the 'canonical principle',[13] by which Israel sought to defend its religion from corruption, and to establish some kind of norm of faith. By means of a single authoritative interpretation of the Israelite

religious tradition, Israel endeavoured to secure its faith against dilution, and to show who really constituted Israel. It is out of this normative interpretation of the Israelite religious tradition that the Old Testament was formed, and it is the great merit of von Rad to have drawn attention to the various spiritual influences which served in this way to create a literature out of a number of cultic, prophetic and didactic traditions. The literary formation of the Old Testament, and the purpose that such a collection of religious literature was intended to fulfil, are both facts of great importance for theology.

There are several fields where further exact historical research can be of particular help in carrying forward the theological debate about the Old Testament. In the first place there is need for further inquiry into the theological influences which led to the creation of an Old Testament canon, a development about which surprisingly little is known. What did Judaism itself intend to achieve by establishing a canon, and how was this related to earlier movements towards fixing a normative collection of scriptures? Secondly, within the Old Testament itself, a great deal of work remains to be done in investigating the origin, nature and purpose of the great collections, or complexes, of literature which make up the Old Testament. Von Rad and Noth have begun to show the way here, in the form-critical study of the Hexateuch and historical books. Their conclusions are fundamental to the way in which von Rad has presented Old Testament theology. That Israel's historiography did arise in the way that these scholars claim, however, must be further examined, and the theological impulses which governed its appearance require to be more fully explained. Here mention may be made of a recent essay by S. Mowinckel on early Israelite historiography.[14] The question of the influence of the monarchy on the development of Israel's historiography must also be considered, and given fuller attention, since the earliest epic histories almost certainly originated in the royal court of Judah.

The Old Testament interest in history, as a manifestation of the divine will, inevitably leads to the inclusion of the method, aims and achievements of history-writing in early Israel in a study of Old Testament theology. The movement of the Bible from promise to fulfilment and the historical 'openness' of the Old Testament towards a future manifestation of God are all of great significance. Ultimately, however, this biblical material has got to be related to the doctrinal interests of systematic theology, and the initial stages of its arrangement ought to take place within Old Testament theology itself.

The problem of Old Testament theology has tended to resolve itself largely into a problem of methodology, which can have great dangers of its own, since no theology of the Old Testament can be satisfactory if it is dependent on a preconceived approach. Theology must arise out of the Old Testament itself, with its distinctive witness to the call, nature and destiny of God's people Israel. It cannot, therefore, be indifferent to the goal to which Israel's history leads, whether this is found in the Judaism of the Rabbis, or in the Church of Jesus Christ.

[1] W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Teil I (5 Aufl.), Stuttgart, 1957; Teil II-III (4 Aufl.), Stuttgart, 1961. Eng. tr. of Vol. I, London, 1962.
[2] T. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, Oxford, 1958; cf. also E. Jacob,

Theology of the Old Testament, London, 1957. The second half of the posthumous publication of O. Procksch, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Gütersloh, 1950, is also arranged systematically. The works of L. Köhler (*Old Testament Theology*, London, 1956) and G. A. F. Knight (*A Christian Theology of the Old Testament*, London, 1959) are presented systematically, but have various deficiencies.

[3] G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Bd. I, Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels*, München, 1957; *Bd. II, Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels*, München, 1960. Eng. tr. of Vol. I as *Old Testament Theology*, Edinburgh, 1962.

[4] G. von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch* (BWANT IV: 13), Stuttgart, 1934; *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (BWANT IV: 3), Stuttgart, 1930; *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (BWANT IV: 26), Stuttgart, 1938, rep. in *Ges. Stud. zum A.T.*, München, 1958, pp. 9-86.

[5] L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (BWANT III:6), Stuttgart, 1926.

[6] M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, Stuttgart, 1948; *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I*, Halle, 1943.

[7] F. Hesse, 'Die Erforschung der Geschichte Israels als theologische Aufgabe', *Kerygma und Dogma 4*, 1958, pp. 1-19, and 'Kerygma oder geschichtliche Wirklichkeit', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 57*, 1960, pp. 17-26.

[8] Cf. J. M. Robinson, 'The Historicality of Biblical Language', *The Old Testament and Christian Faith*, ed. by B. W. Anderson, London, 1964, pp. 124-58.

[9] Cf. especially the studies W. Pannenberg, 'Redemptive Event and History', *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, ed. C. Westermann, London, 1964, pp. 314-35, and 'Dogmatische Thesen zur Lehre von der Offenbarung', *Offenbarung als Geschichte*, ed. by W. Pannenberg, Göttingen, 1961, pp. 91-114.

[10] Cf. 'Dogmatische Thesen zur Lehre von der Offenbarung', p. 95, 'Revelation takes place, not at the beginning, but at the end of the revelatory history'.

[11] K. Koch, 'Der Tod des Religionsstifters', *Kerygma und Dogma 8*, 1962, pp. 100-23, and the critical rejoinder by F. Baumgärtel in *Kerygma und Dogma 9*, 1963, pp. 223-33.

[12] R. Rendtorff, 'Die Entstehung der israelitischen Religion als religionsgeschichtliches und theologisches Problem', *Theol. Lit. Zeitung 88*, 1963, clmns. 735-46.

[13] P. R. Ackroyd, *Continuity. A Contribution to the Study of the O.T. Religious Tradition*, Oxford, 1962, p. 26.

[14] S. Mowinckel, 'Israelite Historiography', *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, ed. H. Kosmala, Vol. II, Leiden, 1963, pp. 4-26.

HERMENEUTICS AND TYPOLOGY

G. W. H. Lampe

'TYPOLOGY', like 'eschatology', is a term which has come to be used so imprecisely and with so wide a variety of meanings that, unless it can be carefully defined, its use serves only to confuse a theological argument. Professor Alan Richardson, in his *History, Sacred and Profane*, gives it a very wide meaning indeed; so wide, in fact, as to embrace every kind of historical writing. 'All historical writing as such necessarily involves the seeing of the significance of the beginning from the end. This is the very character of the biblical writings as historical documents. . . . This is what is meant in theological language by typology. . . . It is essentially what all history "in the full sense" unavoidably is.' In other words, 'typology' means an interpretation of history which seeks to make sense of an otherwise chaotic assortment of disconnected events by interpreting the significance of the past in the light of later developments and, in turn, explaining the meaning of the

latter by reference to what preceded them. History is then seen as a pattern of 'fulfilments'. Professor Richardson offers an example: 'Bismarck . . . can be historically appraised only in the light of 1933 and 1945.'

In this extremely general sense typology is a necessary principle for the historian, including the historian of Israel and the Church. For this principle, however, to deserve the theological designation of 'typology' a vitally important qualification has to be added. Typology depends upon a particular interpretation of history, according to which the present is related to the past not merely by a process of development which, although the historian may discern in it a certain inner logic, could have happened otherwise, but by the consistent and unchanging will of a personal God. The pattern of fulfilment is consciously determined; fulfilment corresponds to divine promise. This is the prophetic view of God's self-revelation in history which is the foundation of all the historical writing in the Scriptures. Typology is a method of applying the prophetic interpretation to historical events by discerning the relationship of fulfilment to promise in an analogy between present events and those of the past. The consistent purpose of God, determined by his own steadfast faithfulness, is revealed in a correspondence in history between one event and another. This kind of typology, or, as perhaps we ought rather to say, this aspect of the typology of the New Testament and the later Christian exegetes, is the only one which can be of any value for biblical hermeneutics today.

From very early times, however, this interpretation of history in terms of promise and fulfilment, with a corresponding analogy between the present and the past, was combined in Christian thought with another aspect of typology. This is both more limited and more complex. In part it arises out of the prophetic view of history. Jesus himself saw his mission as the climax and the end of the prophetic succession in which God had declared his judgement and mercy towards Israel; his death was the necessary fulfilment of the divine purpose declared in the Scriptures; it is probable, though disputed, that he identified himself, in some sense, with the figure of the Son of Man in Daniel's vision. His followers, believing that the promises of God had been uniquely brought to completion in him, interpreted his Lordship, declared to them in their experience of the Resurrection, in terms of what they read in the Scriptures. In the light of the Law and the Prophets they sought to interpret the paradoxical tradition of the earthly abasement of him whom they now knew through the Spirit to be the glorified Lord of all the world. They came thus to believe that they were taught by the risen Christ himself to understand the Scriptures in a new way: that his life of obscurity and particularly the scandal of his crucifixion happened in fulfilment of what had been written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, because these things were written about *him*. In his story of the exposition by the risen Christ of the things concerning himself in all the Scriptures, beginning from Moses and all the prophets, Luke condenses the complex but rapid process by which the primitive Church came to read the Old Testament as a book about Jesus. The Church's testimony was based upon the Scriptures, where it claimed that it found 'written' the divine purpose which included, as Luke 24^{46-7} expresses it, the suffering of the Messiah, his

resurrection on the third day, and the proclamation in his name of repentance for remission of sins to all the nations.

The Church's own understanding of itself and of the gospel by which it lived was drawn from the Scriptures. Even more essential to its mission was the use of the Old Testament for its apologetic. Its preaching to Jewish audiences had to be carried on in terms of the promises of God and their fulfilment in Christ as these were both to be discerned in the sacred writings. The Christian claim was that 'these are they which testify' about Jesus, and the Lucan picture of the Jews at Beroea examining the Scriptures to test the truth of the apostolic preaching is typical of the entire missionary approach to Jews in the first century and for long afterwards, as Justin's *Dialogue* and Cyprian's *Testimonia*, among a great quantity of other Christian literature, bear witness.

At the point, however, where the Old Testament has become a Christian book, the prophetic view of history has come to ally itself with a particular attitude to the written word of the Old Testament which exercised a profound influence on hermeneutics, of a highly unsatisfactory kind. This attitude rests on four main assumptions. The first of these is that the Scriptures are a collection of divine oracles. They are a library of divine truth, communicated through the external form of historical narrative, legal enactments, prophetic utterances, psalms and wisdom sayings. The variety of outward forms means that the oracles of God are often presented in symbols and riddles. The exegete, however, who can penetrate behind the literal sense can discern the underlying unity of the entire body of the sacred oracles. This unity consists in the fact that the whole is a system of spiritual truth, often presented under the disguise of symbolism in which the inner meaning has to be apprehended through the recognition that the apparent sense of a passage, its place in its context, and the original intention of the author in applying it to his contemporary situation are all at best of secondary importance and that beneath the outward 'letter' every part of Scripture contains a hidden truth of religion or morality which the Spirit who inspired the writings can reveal to those whom he enlightens to perceive it.

This attitude to the Scriptures is, of course, the basis of allegorical exegesis. For the allegorist the prophetic interpretation of history has ceased to matter. It is no longer the principle which gives unity to the Scriptures. Scripture is no longer primarily the record of divine purpose and fulfilment. In consequence of this the exegete no longer looks for actual correspondence between the events of the past and those of later times to illustrate the analogy between God's self-revelation in his promises and his disclosure of their full meaning in the events which bring them to completion. His concern is rather with the relation of the earthly counterpart, the outward or literal sense, to the eternal spiritual truth which it embodies. The text of Scripture has become a quasi-sacramental mystery. Such exegesis is grounded not upon the biblical writer's own prophetic understanding of the historical process, but rather upon Platonizing notions about the relation of the sensible to the intelligible, upon the tradition of the Alexandrian allegorists in their interpretation of Greek mythology and the Homeric poems (an apologetic weapon for the adherents of philosophical schools), upon Philo's ethical and cosmo-

logical interpretations of the Old Testament, and to a lesser extent upon the rabbinic appeal to Scripture in disregard of the original meaning and the historical context of particular passages.

In the New Testament itself there is little pure allegory of this kind. Paul's application of the Mosaic prohibition against the muzzling of the threshing ox so as to make it the ground for his directions about the proper financial support for Christian missionaries is one of the rare examples. What is much more common is a combination of the assumption that the whole Bible is, in every part, oracular with the belief that it is, in every part, a book about Christ. The prophetic-historical interpretation of events which sees Christ as the climax of God's fulfilment of the promises in the Old Testament, and so as the key to the true meaning of Israel's history, comes to be combined with the idea that the scriptural writings conceal a spiritual meaning under the apparent sense. Allegory of the purely unhistorical kind is uninterested in the correspondence of events: Philo's analogy between the wanderings of Abraham and the spiritual progress of the individual, or between the high-priest's robe and the cosmos, rests upon symbolism which has nothing to do with history. It could therefore be applied to any literature and need not be confined to the Bible. Some of the Gnostics in fact employed pagan mythology for this purpose. The combination, however, of the presuppositions of allegory with the assumption that all Scripture speaks directly of Christ is common in the New Testament as well as in the later Christian literature. It springs from the biblical belief in promise and fulfilment; it cannot be applied outside the Scriptures; but its method is unhistorical. It attempts to discern correspondences which are not between the Old Testament records, understood in their literal sense, and their fulfilment in the gospel, but are rather between the shadow and the reality, the symbol in the Old Testament oracles and the truth of the gospel to which it points.

Examples of this method of exegesis abound in the New Testament itself as well as in the Fathers. The use by the writer to the Hebrews of Melchizedek as a type of Christ offers a good illustration. It cannot be maintained that any real analogy between them is suggested by the prophetical interpretation of history. Christ does not recapitulate, or renew and repeat in some more profound sense, any work done by the Old Testament priest-king. Elsewhere, the same writer does employ typology to demonstrate a genuine fulfilment in the gospel of the purposes of God disclosed in Israel's history; Christ does recapitulate and renew in a far more profound sense the restoration of fellowship between God and sinful men which it was the object of the ancient priesthood and sacrifices to effect. The work of Moses as the human agent of God in saving his people and bringing them into a covenant with himself is parallel, though inferior, to that of Christ as the mediator of a new covenant. The only correspondence between Melchizedek and Christ, on the other hand, lies in the fact that the former is described as being king of Salem and priest of God Most High. It was proper for Christians to recognize Christ as their king, and to find in him the one true priest; but this does not constitute any historical analogy between the two. Still less is there any historical relationship, in terms of promise and fulfilment, between the absence of any genealogy of Melchizedek in Genesis and the uniqueness and eternity of

Christ's priesthood. It is only on the basis of an allegorizing exegesis that any correspondence can be discovered, and this allegorism rests in turn on the idea that the Scriptures are a complex of symbolism which can be made to yield oracular indications of Christ at any point irrespective of the literal historical sense. The artificiality of this particular instance of typology becomes still more marked when the symbolism is extended to make 'Salem' denote 'peace', Abraham's payment of tithes indicate the superiority of Melchizedek over Levi and his priestly descendants, and the bread and wine brought forth by Melchizedek prefigure the Eucharist.

Not only, on this view, does the whole of Scripture speak about Christ, so that any and every text can be interpreted Christologically (as the writer to the Hebrews applies Psalm 102 to Christ, apparently on the ground that any saying addressed to *Kyrios* may be referred to him); it can also be applied directly to the Christian Church and the individual believer. The Old Testament is a book about the Church as well as about Christ. Hence Clement of Rome can find direct authority in the prophecies of Isaiah for the institution of bishops and deacons in the Christian communities of the end of the first century. Anything, therefore, in the Old Testament which suggests the slightest verbal or pictorial association with the person and work of Christ or with the life of the Church or its members can be legitimately applied to them, whether in preaching and teaching directed to Christian believers or in apologetic, especially against Jewish opponents. It is on the basis of this principle that the scarlet thread of Rahab becomes a symbol of the blood of Christ, the 318 servants of Abraham a type of Jesus and the Cross, the rod of Moses a prefiguration of the Cross, and the stages of the wanderings of Israel in the desert are seen in Origen's Philonic allegory of the Book of Numbers as depicting the progress of the Christian in his spiritual life.

In exegesis of this kind it is extremely hard to draw a firm line of demarcation between typology and allegory. For the most part the ancient Christian writers combine the two. The Antiochene theologians tried to preserve the distinction between a typology based on the prophetic interpretation of history, in which the literal sense of Scripture is vitally important because it is a record of actual events which are fulfilled by God's acts in Christ, and, on the other hand, allegorism which ignores the literal meaning in favour of the supposed spiritual truth which it conceals. Yet even an Antiochene such as Theodoret reproduces what had become by his time the familiar equation of the water from the rock with the blood of Christ, the rod of Moses with the Cross, the Egyptians overthrown at the Red Sea with the demons drowned in the font. Given the double assumption that the Old Testament refers at every point to Christ and the Church, because Christ and the Church fulfil God's purposes disclosed in the Scriptures, and that every part of Scripture contains a spiritual meaning, it was virtually inevitable that typology should become artificially strained and pass over almost imperceptibly into a form of typically Hellenistic allegory.

The danger that typology of this kind might eliminate the literal sense of Scripture altogether was partly realized in the early Church: not, with the exception of certain Antiochene exegetes such as Theodore of Mopsuestia, in respect of the interpretation of the Old Testament, but in relation to the

problem of the New Testament itself. On the Platonic principle that the literal and historical sense is but a cloak, or perhaps a vehicle, for an inward spiritual meaning, the gospels themselves were as fruitful a source of allegory as the Old Testament, as we can see from the well-known interpretation of the parable of the Good Samaritan in terms of Christ, the Church and the sacraments. Origen himself was aware of the danger, at least to some extent, and, unlike Heracleon with his Gnostic interpretation of the woman of Samaria as a figure of the æon Sophia, he was careful not to deny that the historicity of the gospel narratives was fundamentally important. Nevertheless, if correspondences may properly be discerned between the acts of God in the Old Testament and those recorded in the New it is not easy to deny that there may be similar analogies between the acts of God in the ministry of Jesus and his acts in the ongoing life and mission of the Church. The former then tend to be regarded as no more than foreshadowings and anticipations of the latter. Thus Christian apologists, from Origen onwards, hard pressed by their opponents on the argument from Christ's miracles, tend to assert that the miracles, especially the healings and raisings from the dead, are a kind of symbolical anticipation of the greater works which Christ performs at the present time, through the Spirit, in raising men from the death of sin and imparting to them new life. From this position it is no long step to the view that the miracle-stories of the gospels are parabolic; pictures, in the form of historical narratives, of the present spiritual experience of the believer. Such an interpretation is in many ways attractive. It may seem to harmonize well with the New Testament, and especially Johannine, belief that the works of Jesus are reproduced in a greater degree in the Church through the power of the Spirit. It accords well, too, with the insight of form-criticism that the gospel narratives read back into the life of Jesus the situation and the experience of his people in the post-Pentecostal age, and that in a sense they are therefore types to which the Church and the believer, in their present communion with the ascended Lord, provide the antitypes.

The prophetic view of history can rightly allow us to see a typological correspondence between the events of the gospels and the life of the Church and its members. In this way we are led to interpret the New Testament existentially. The danger, once again, however, is that a non-historical typology, passing over into allegory, may dissolve the literal sense altogether, and the question of historicity, even in respect of the central gospel event of the Resurrection, may come to be dismissed as irrelevant.

The third assumption which underlies the combination of typology with non-historical allegory is that the New Testament stands in a relationship of absolute continuity with the Old. Thus there need be no hesitation in applying any and every passage of the Old Testament indiscriminately to Christ and the Church. The consequences of this assumption can be very clearly seen in the Fathers when, for example, the Old Testament priesthood comes to be identified *simpliciter* with the Christian ministry, so that what is said in the Scriptures about the high priest can be referred directly to the bishop, or when the Christian Eucharist comes to be expounded in terms of the Old Testament sacrifices. The roots of this identification, which in post-

Reformation times has produced the idea that the new Covenant is a kind of republication in modified form of the old Covenant, so that the two are really one and indivisible, are to be discerned even in the New Testament. A sound historical typology could properly see a fulfilment of the ancient sacrifices in the death of Christ; but the tendency is already present to take the former as a sufficient category for the interpretation of the latter and to try to fit the meaning of the Cross into a pattern of Old Testament thought.

In fact, of course, the New Testament is a record of discontinuity as well as of continuity. The divine purposes for Israel are fulfilled in it, but in paradoxical and unforeseen ways. The old is superseded as well as brought to completion, and much in Israel's past was judged and condemned by God's act in Christ. Indeed, in the light of the fulfilment it could be clearly seen that the Old Testament was in part a record of man's rejection of God's plan and his frustration of the divine purpose. New Testament writers therefore discern a typology of rebellion and judgement as well as of promise and fulfilment. The speech of Stephen points to a false succession as well as a true. There is a correspondence in history between Joseph's brethren, those who rejected Moses, the idolaters in the wilderness, Solomon who built the static permanent Temple, and the spiritually uncircumcised leaders of contemporary Judaism, as well as a correspondence between Joseph, Moses, the prophets and Christ himself. This sharp distinction has tended to be overlooked, and from early times the continuity of the two covenants has been over-emphasized. A typology has thus been evolved which presupposes a uniform pattern of divine acts in history. 'Pattern,' indeed, though a favourite term among writers on this subject (and I must admit to my own fondness for it), is probably better avoided. There is a pattern to be discerned in the promises of God and their fulfilment; but it is not uniform or smooth. It involves sharp contrasts as well as harmonies; and its consistency is determined by the steadfastness and faithfulness of God, over-ruling in his mercy the disobedience of men and their rejection of his counsels. The underlying unity of the 'pattern' is not, as it were, a built-in necessity unrelated to the sovereign freedom of God and the freedom of the human will to hinder the divine plan. God, throughout history, is continually bringing in the new and unexpected, and he has done this, above all, in his new covenant in Christ. The types of the Old Testament cannot usually be referred to the New Testament fulfilments on the same level at which they originally stood. Fulfilment involves transformation as well as similarity. Even those Old Testament images which dominate all Christian interpretation of Christ and his work, such as the Levitical priesthood, the Passover, and the sin-offering, have to receive a new and more profound content if they are to prove adequate to interpret the gospel. Especially is this true of the type or image of 'messiah'.

The last of the assumptions which support this sort of typology is the belief that certain historical events were pre-ordained by God in order to represent what was to come afterwards. In themselves and in their own historical context they are of no importance. They were designed, in the providence of God, as symbols. This theory could sometimes serve to overcome the difficulty presented by those Old Testament passages whose literal

sense would cause scandal: such as the polygamy of the patriarchs, which had already been allegorized by Philo. Following the same general line of thought, the Epistle of Barnabas regards the literal interpretation of the mosaic food-laws as foolishness; God never intended the prohibitions against eating unclean animals to be understood literally, for these laws had been given, from the first, as symbols of spiritual truths which the *gnosis* of the Christian exegete could enable him, unlike the Jew, to understand correctly. God forbade the eating of pork, not because to abstain from doing so was of any value but to teach us not to associate with swinish men. History, again, has been eliminated.

Such unhistorical typology is useless for hermeneutics. The study of the methods of the ancient typologists is, of course, of immense value for the exegete and for the student of all early and mediæval Christian literature, for without it neither the New Testament nor the later commentaries on it can be understood. To study it in order to gain insight into the minds of past generations is one thing. To use it today is quite another; and even to employ it for sermon illustrations is to mishandle Scripture. This is because it denies, in the last resort, the reality of authentic history as the medium of God's self-revelation.

It is otherwise with that more general form of typology which deals with historical events themselves rather than with the text of the Bible, and which finds analogies between events rather than between words and phrases. For typology, in this sense, is an expression of the prophetic view of history. It discerns in history a revelation of the constant faithfulness of God. Successive events disclose the activity of a God who acts consistently in judgement and mercy. His purpose does not take effect automatically. It must not be supposed that the working out of his plan is predictable in the sense that man can take it for granted and presume on it; this is the constant error of false prophets. It is only faith which can discern the acts of God in history. Yet faith may build upon present and past experience; and prophetic faith may make the revelation of God's judgement and mercy in past and present events a ground of hope and confidence that the God who is faithful to his promises will fulfil them by similar acts of judgement and mercy in the future.

The prophet looks in faith to the future; but the basis of his faith is the history of the past acts of God, such as Israel commemorated, and in a sense re-lived, in its round of liturgical festivals. Thus the prophet is a typologist, in the historical sense, seeing past, present and future linked in a series of correspondences which reflect the steadfast consistency of the living God. So the Second Isaiah sees the coming redemption from exile as a repetition of God's great act of redemption in the Exodus, and redemption in turn as a renewal of his original act of creation. The Christian sees God's supreme act in Christ as the central point in history which determines the interpretation of all that preceded it and all that has happened or will happen after it. The Christian is a typologist, in this sense, like the Old Testament prophet, seeing history as determined by promise and fulfilment and interpreting the past so as to evoke the response of repentance and faith towards the judgement and mercy of God which encounter him in his present situation. As the preacher, or his hearers, look in this way to the past to awaken

faith in the present and hope for the future, they can properly discern correspondences that are relevant to their life as Christian disciples. Without misrepresenting the historical situation of Israel in the desert, they can find a parallel between that situation and their own, as members of the pilgrim people of God. Trust and obedience, and refusal to tempt God, are demanded of them because, like Israel, they are called to follow the guidance of God in faith. To go beyond this, however, and imagine a correspondence in detail is to reduce the Old Testament history to the status of an edifying fanstasy, comparable with *Pilgrim's Progress*; and to do this is to falsify the Word of God.

OUR PRESENT UNDERSTANDING OF THE PSALMS

A. S. Herbert

IN THE INTRODUCTION to *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1951), the editor, H. H. Rowley, wrote (p. xxiv): 'Of few books of the Old Testament has recent study been so profoundly modified as the Psalter'—a statement that is demonstrated by the contribution to this volume by A. R. Johnson, 'The Psalms' (pp. 162-209). Neither is this a matter of academic interest only. The results of recent study are a matter of concern, and have much to contribute, to all who find themselves drawn to the Psalter, even when at times the language or sentiments in the psalms are difficult of assimilation. Here we may refer to three recent publications which, though they are securely based on sound scholarship, are addressed to the non-specialist reader. They are: A. B. Rhodes, *Psalms* (Layman's Bible Commentaries), S.C.M. Press, 1960; H. Ringgren, *The Faith of the Psalmists*, S.C.M. Press, 1963; C. S. Rodd, *Psalms* (2 vols. Epworth Preacher's Commentaries), Epworth Press, 1963-4. (We understand that S.C.M. Press will shortly be publishing a commentary in the Torch series by J. H. Eaton). Those who have made use of these books will recognize a common approach to the psalms which was hardly apparent in commentaries published earlier in this century. No longer do writers look to the psalms primarily as expressions of individual piety or seek to assign a precise date of composition. This is not to deny the fact and importance of individual piety in Israel, nor their value in the cultivation of personal religion. Further, some psalms are clearly related to a particular historical situation, e.g. 74, 79, 137, which reflect the devastating experience of the Babylonian invasion and exile. The chief focus of interest is, however, on the cultic situation and the ritual purpose to which most of the psalms were

related. Even psalms which have an obvious historical reference were, as the form indicates, used by the community at worship. This emphasis on the worshipping community has important consequences both in the use of the psalms in the life of the Church and for an appreciation of Biblical theology. This last point is attractively developed by Professor G. W. Anderson in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 1963, pp. 277-85, 'Israel's Creed: Sung, not Signed'.

The significant names in connection with recent study of the Psalter are Hermann Gunkel and Sigmund Mowinckel, although many scholars have contributed. A notable example is the commentary by Artur Weiser, a translation of the fifth edition of which, by H. Hartwell, has been published by S.C.M. Press (1962). Gunkel's *Die Psalmen* and Mowinckel's *Psalmenstudien* have not appeared in English, but the latter's *Offersang og Sangoffer* has been translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas as *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Blackwell, 2 vols., 1962). There are naturally differences in the details of interpretation, but the main lines of study have been so widely adopted that we can briefly summarize.

First there is the recognition that the original setting and function of the psalms was in the cultus. They were associated with, and integrally related to, ritual acts and celebrations of important occasions at the shrine. The many references to the king, especially to the Davidic dynasty, indicate the important function of the king in cultus, and further require us to accept a pre-exilic origin of many of the psalms, though some may have been modified to meet the needs of the post-exilic days when the Davidic king ceased to rule. This view is strengthened by the recognition of similarities of form and content with extra-biblical psalmody, notably from Mesopotamia and from later discoveries at Ras Shamra/Ugarit. Psalm material is also to be found in many parts of the Old Testament, e.g. Ex. 15^{1-18}; Deut. 33^{1-43}; 1 Sam. 2^{1-10}, frequently in the Prophets, and of course the Book of Lamentations. It is possible in many instances to infer the occasion in the ecclesiastical year for which a psalm was composed, e.g. Psalm 81 at the Feast of Booths. Now this, the supreme public festival in Israel's life, would seem to be the Israelite counterpart of the Babylonian New Year Festival, and a comparison of the language of Hebrew and Babylonian psalms show some points of resemblance. The theme in psalms 47, 93, 95-99, 'The Lord reigns' (Yahweh is, or has become, King) may reflect a ritual, annually performed to celebrate the Sovereignty of God, perhaps dramatically represented in an act of enthronement. With this in mind we may see the significance that the psalms attach to a series of events in history, the events which began in Egypt and culminated in the entry into Canaan. These are presented as the mighty acts of the Lord (Yahweh), the demonstration of His covenant-love for the people He has chosen to be the bearer of His revelation to the nations (cf. Psalm 136, especially in RSV). This emphasis on an historic act of salvation is one of the distinctive features of Israelite psalmody, an intrusive and yet dominating factor in recitals that in other respects have close parallels in the ancient world. That God should act in the world of Nature is a commonplace of religious belief throughout the world in which Israel lived; there are Old Testament psalms which may well have

had their origin in the pre-Israelite religion of Canaan (much of Psalm 104 is strikingly similar to the Pharaoh Iknnaton's 'Hymn to Aton'). But that God should act redemptively and decisively in history is what differentiates Israel's faith. This is what gives its distinctive quality to Israel's New Year Festival; it was primarily a celebration of Yahweh's saving work, and of the wonderful and gracious relationship (the Covenant) that He had made (cf. the credal confession used at a Harvest Festival service in Deut. 26^{5-9}). The 'Nature Psalms' would find their appropriate setting in a ritual which celebrated Yahweh's Sovereignty. In terms of faith, the true Israelite thought of Yahweh as ruling from everlasting to everlasting; it was entirely appropriate that that Rule should be celebrated anew at the end of the year, which was also the beginning of the new year (cf. the Christian Good Friday and Easter, or the original significance of Sunday as the Lord's Day, celebrating His victory over sin and death). This would be the occasion at which the Covenant was renewed and reaffirmed, a solemn 'remembrance' of Yahweh's unmerited grace in giving and maintaining that covenant, and Israel's obligation to keep that which was once and for all made (cf. psalms 25, 50, 89, 105). The frequent references to the Temple, to sacrifice (with the same criticism of unworthy sacrifice as we find in the Prophets), to festal procession (68^{24-5}) and to music and dancing (149^{3}; $150^{3, 5}$) all point to a cultic setting.

Next we may observe that the psalms can be divided into a number of more or less clearly defined types or categories (*Gattungen*). This is more than a statistical study, for it throws light on their original usage. Of these we may consider five main types: Hymns of Praise and Adoration, Communal Laments, Royal Psalms, Individual Laments, Individual Thanksgivings. There are some smaller groups and some psalms (cf. 36 and 40) which can hardly be fitted into a clearly defined group.

1. To the first group, the Hymns of Praise, some thirty-two psalms may be assigned; they include 8, 19, 29, 145-150, the Songs of Sion, 46, 48, 76, 87 and the hymns specifically celebrating Yahweh's kingship, 47, 93, 95-99. These, it is suggested, accompanied a ritual drama in which Yahweh's sovereignty over the primeval Cahos, and therefore over hostile nations and iniquitous social conditions which threaten to bring 'chaos' into the life of His people, is celebrated. Such psalms would tend, especially in post-exilic days, to have an eschatological meaning.

2. Communal Laments, i.e. psalms that express grief and distress in the presence, or at the threat, of calamity, famine or invasion, to the society. The normal pattern is an invocation, lamentation over the grievous condition of the society, prayer for help and forgiveness, and a vow of thanksgiving (sacrifice). Examples may be found in psalms 44, 74, 79, 80, 83. About a dozen psalms may be assigned to this category. Since the Feast of Ingathering at the end of the year was the occasion on which 'all Israel' was gathered at the shrine, this would be the appropriate setting for the use of such a lament: Chaos threatens to overwhelm the community; only Yahweh can avert the threat (cf. especially Psalm 74 with its recital of the ancient creation combat in verses 13-17, but in Israel's psalm firmly held within the covenant faith, vv. 12, 20. A literal translation of v. 11 may point to some dramatic

action accompanying the words: 'Why wouldst thou turn back thy hand, even thy right hand? Out from thy bosom! Consume!)

3. Royal Psalms, i.e. psalms relating to the king and in which he is the central figure, e.g. 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 101, 110, 132. In considering these psalms, we need to remember that the king in the ancient world, and in the life of Israel particularly, was more than a political figure or military leader. He was the focus of the whole life of the people and so in a peculiarly intimate relationship with Yahweh, the Covenant God. Through his 'righteous' rule, the covenant love of Yahweh (Hebrew 'hesed', AV usually 'loving-kindness' or 'mercy') extends throughout the life of the covenant community and maintains its total welfare (shālôm, 'peace'). A very important contribution to our understanding of this whole subject, in which a number of psalms are discussed in detail, is A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel.* It will be evident that there is a close relationship between these psalms and the account given in II Samuel of the Kingship entrusted to the Davidic dynasty, cf. especially II Sam. 7^{8-29}; 23^{1-7}. The king had a central place in the Temple cultus, concentrating, as it were, the life of Israel within himself before Yahweh and receiving for his people the divine blessing by which alone their life could be maintained.

4. Individual Laments; this contains the largest number of psalms, some thirty-nine, to which may be added, as associated with them, seven psalms which express the confidence that Yahweh will hear and act appropriately. These 'Laments' describe the distress in vigorous and (to our minds) extravagant language. Yet the phrases are stereotyped and traditional. Distress of soul, bodily sickness and enemy hostility are referred to within the same psalm (cf. psalms 38 and 102). The description of the suffering is accompanied by the profound conviction that Yahweh hears and knows and will come to the help of the distressed sufferer. The experience of suffering leads to a confession of sin and a seeking of divine forgiveness. It is in these psalms that the fear of death is expressed most vividly (28^{1}; $69^{1-2, 14-15}$), yet the fear was of such a kind that eventually fear was destroyed. For the real dread was that death separated from God, the God of life (6^{5}; 30^{9}; $88^{10ff.}$), and when at last it was recognized that fellowship with God was God's unchanging gift, there arose the confident hope in resurrection from the dead. Normally in the Psalter the hope is expressed that God will act to restore the sufferer to health and renewal in this life; perhaps, though the exegesis of these texts is by no means certain, a larger hope is suggested in 49^{15} and 73^{24} with the word 'receive'.

5. Individual Songs of Thanksgiving, e.g. 30, 32, 34 and cf. Isaiah 38^{10-20} and Jonah 2^{2-9}. Such psalms would seem to be related to the individual laments and were appointed to be used by the one whose welfare was restored. The sufferer's prayer would be accompanied by a vow, and the thanksgiving would be associated with the fulfilment of the vow. In this connection we may note that the Hebrew word for 'thanksgiving' also means 'thanksgiving sacrifice'. The point is that thanksgiving, word and sacrifice, celebrates the restoration of a man to the covenant relationship with God which the condition of weakness and suffering appears to deny.

There are, as we have observed, psalms which do not readily fall into

any of these categories, and among them we may note some in which the divine voice appears to break in, or interrupt the movement of the liturgy, and speaks in the first person to the congregation, presumably through the agency of a prophet or levite. Among them we may note psalms 81 and 95, where the AV translation and punctuation obscures the vividness and indeed shock of the original. At 81[5] we should have a full-stop after 'Egypt', and then translate:

'A speaking that I do not know (recognize) I can hear . . .'

At 95[7] we should translate:

'Today! O that you would listen to his voice . . .'

In both instances, what follows is in direct speech. The earlier verses of these psalms make it evident that they are a call to worship at the Feast of Booths, and we can almost hear for ourselves the majestic voice thundering through the Temple courts! Psalm 82 is of a somewhat similar character, cf. also Psalm 50. Other psalms are of a more liturgical character, e.g. 15 and 107, while Psalm 24 almost compels us to see the procession of worshippers going up to the Temple with the Ark, perhaps after some victory.

One of the important results of observing the important place assigned to the king in the psalms is to see the appropriateness of many a New Testament reference which to our modern ears seems forced. For the King was Yahweh's Anointed (Messiah), and especially endowed with the Spirit. From him issued righteousness and peace and life for the people of God. He was a kind of extension of the divine personality, and could be called at his anointing 'My Son' (Psalm 2) and 'Priest after the order of Melchizidek' (Psalm 110). Through him the covenant-relationship was maintained and the divine work of salvation actualized. This was the Hope of Israel. That the hope was all too little regarded by the kings in Israel's history, we know. Yet that hope was retained, strengthened indeed by the very prophets who most vigorously brought those kings under judgement. It was precisely that hope that the New Testament writers saw to be realized in Jesus. In a strange way, the psalms were providing language and thought forms for which even the Greeks had no word. Of course, even the language of the psalms is less than adequate. There is no thought that the Anointed, through suffering and death, should be the Mediator of redemption; and taken by themselves the psalms would lead to an adoptionist theology. The inspired hope of the psalmists could only be actualized in Jesus who thus gave their full depth and richness to the inspired words.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Basil Hall

IT WAS THE ecumenically-minded Basel theologian of the eighteenth century, Samuel Werenfels, weary of the theological controversies of his time and of the way in which men insisted on their particular views of what the Bible meant, who summed up the situation in an epigram: 'Men go to the Bible seeking their own dogmas, and find them there.' But it might also be salutary to remember that the Old Testament, by the nature of its long formation and re-editings before it reached us in its present form, poses for us problems of interpretation which are not due to the obtuseness of particular periods of the Church's life but to the variety of content and expression in the books of the Old Testament themselves. Moreover, the letter of Scripture once written is final and belongs to a certain period of time, but life and history go on and from this basic fact alone springs the need to ask what Scripture—and for this article, the Old Testament—means to each succeeding generation.

The Old Testament posed a threefold problem for the Church: what parts of the Old Testament were to be considered canonical by the Church; in what way could the sacred book of Judaism be regarded as the sacred book of the Christian Church; and, following upon this, what principles of interpretation could be used? While it may be thought to be unusual to take this threefold problem in this order, yet, in a short article giving no more than a general survey, it may prove to be a useful arrangement in calling attention to the issues. It is fundamental in beginning this inquiry to remember that in the early Church, among the Christians of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic period, the great majority of believers were of Jewish race and were converts from orthodox Judaism, from Jewish sects, or, if not Jewish by race, then proselytes of the Synagogue. The Old Testament was familiar to them from the Synagogue, either from the Hebrew or Aramaic exposition, or more generally from the Greek version. There is hardly a page of the Greek New Testament on which the Old Testament is not quoted or paraphrased or referred to. The Old Testament Scriptures were regarded without dispute as divine, as the Word of the living God the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. But the question of the Canon, of what constitutes by name the inspired books of the Old Testament, is not easy to answer for the first period of the Christian Church. The origins of the Greek translation are obscure (for the books constituting the Septuagint were translated over a wide period of time), as is also the extent of its use among believing Jews, but there can be no doubt of its use from the beginning in the Christian Church. This Greek translation of the Old

Testament, containing as it did books additional to the classical Hebrew text, leaves us with the question: How far did the first Christians regard these 'Apocrypha' (as they were to be called later) as Scripture in the same sense as the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings could be regarded as Scripture? Jewish tradition stated that the men of the Great Synagogue in the time of Ezra and during the reign of the Persian Artaxerxes had fixed the list of books to the number of twenty-four; but 'fixed' should not be given too close precision. A more historically probable assumption is that Rabbinical Judaism decided at Jamnia about A.D. 100 upon the Hebrew Canon in twenty-four books. Nevertheless, it seems that Josephus was not entirely clear about the extent of the canonical contents of the Writings (*Hagiographa*). For the early Christians precision about what was and what was not canonical was not a primary need; the general assumption appears to have been that the Law and the Prophets received higher status as the indubitable revelation of God, whereas the other books were less obviously inspired though they could be used for practical religious teaching. In Alexandria and in the Egyptian Churches the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament were commonly used, but Melito of Sardis in the second century discarded them. The *Codex Vaticanus*, dating from the fourth century, is regarded as one of the earliest surviving manuscripts of the Septuagint and gives the Alexandrine canon which included the Apocrypha. But elsewhere in the Church the position was not yet final. While Augustine gave his authoritative support for the Alexandrine canon in Proconsular Africa, Jerome emphasized the Hebrew canon and described the Apocrypha as ecclesiastical rather than canonical books.

All this development did not mean that the Greek text was fixed and sacred as was the Hebrew text for the Rabbis: there is considerable textual variation in the different surviving manuscripts of the Septuagint used in the Church. This fact helped later to give authority to the Vulgate Latin text of Jerome because this presented a uniform and widely received text. The weight of Augustine's authority meant that the Council of Carthage in 397 held to the Alexandrine Canon. But this was not so final a definition of what was canonical in the Western Church as that decision might imply. For from the sixth century to the sixteenth century there were not lacking distinguished theologians in the Western Church who re-affirmed the distinction which had been made by Jerome between the canonical books and those ecclesiastical books of less authority; for example, Gregory the Great, Bede, Alcuin, Hugh of St Victor, Nicholas of Lyra (the greatest of medieval biblical commentators) and Occam. Not long before the calling of the Council of Trent, which gave full authority to the Alexandrine Canon, Cardinal Ximenes in the preface to the great *Complutensian Polyglot* wrote of 'the books which are without the Canon which the Church reads for edification'; and Cardinal Cajetan, the Thomist scholar and biblical expositor who had sought to limit Luther's developing career, could write 'the whole Latin Church owes much to Jerome for his separation of uncanonical from canonical books'. It was at the Council of Trent in the Decree on the Canonical Scriptures in 1546 that what had been until then a comparatively open question became a finally closed one, when it declared that the books of

the Alexandrine Canon were all to receive 'equal veneration' and anathematized those who refused to receive the entire books with all their parts, in the Latin text, as sacred and canonical. It is not sufficiently realized that this represented a new development from the earlier views of many scholars of the Western Church. The Protestants, making their appeal to the Word of God as given in the original languages, and rejecting the Vulgate on the ground demonstrated by Erasmus and others that the text had become gravely corrupted in the course of its manuscript transmission through the centuries (there was no really thorough revision of the text of the Vulgate before the end of the sixteenth century), followed the Hebrew Canon as it had been known to Jerome. It is sometimes forgotten, however, that there were different ways of expressing this loyalty to the principles of Jerome. Luther included the books of the Old Testament Apocrypha in his German translation of the Bible and described them as books 'which are not held in the same way as Holy Scripture, and yet are profitable and good for reading', though he rejected 3 and 4 *Esdras*. In the Reformed Church led by men of the second generation of Reformers, faced with the consequences of the Decree of the Council of Trent on canonical Scripture, there was greater precision in the Confessions of Faith on what books were to be considered as canonical and the Word of God, and what were not: 'The other ecclesiastical books are useful, yet not such that any article of faith could be established from them.' The *Westminster Confession of Faith* of 1646 states: 'The Books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.' Article 6 of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, after listing the canonical books, says: 'And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine'—this list of Apocrypha includes 3 and 4 *Esdras* and the *Prayer of Manasses*. But for Protestantism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the subject of the Canon was not a great issue—it either accepted Jerome's view or else came to narrow it to the exclusion of the Apocrypha even for edification. The question, What is canonical?, was replaced in fact by the question, What is inspired?, since it is not canonicity (for this tended to be associated with reliance on the judgement of the Church on what is Scripture), nor history, nor linguistic studies, nor tradition, but the Holy Spirit which makes the Bible authentic. The discussion now revolved on what the nature and extent of the inspiration of Scripture was. What follows from this development when it was subjected to the Higher and Lower Criticism from the late eighteenth century and through the nineteenth century belongs to the history of interpretation and not to the history of the Canon of Scripture.

In the contrast with the treatment of canonicity in the Western Churches from Jerome onwards, the Eastern or Orthodox Churches show a less rigid conception of canonical Scripture. The historian Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, refused to accept *Maccabees* as canonical and writes of *Ecclesiasticus* and *Wisdom* as books of doubtful status as 'Divine Scriptures', for he regarded the Hebrew Canon as clearly acknowledged Scripture. It is interest-

ing to note that he felt under no compulsion from previous decisions of the Church (indeed where had there been a universal and authoritative decision?) or from tradition to accept clearly what was canonical or not, nor is it fully clear that he accepted the authority of *Esther*. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in a pastoral letter in 365 which he issued because of the dangers arising from heretical use of uncannoical books, stated what those twenty-two books of the Old Testament were which were 'delivered to us and are believed to be divine'. He added that there were other books not included in the Canon which may be read with benefit—*Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Esther, Judith, Tobit*—but he does not mention *Maccabees*. However, the Council of Laodicea in 363, following the view of Cyril of Jerusalem, had declared for including in the Canon *Baruch* and *The Letter of Jeremiah*, as well as *Esther*. In the Byzantine Church the Bible was called The Sixty Books, that is of the Old and New Testaments, and for the Old Testament adopts Jerome's canon and sets outside of it *Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Esther, Judith, Tobit* and the *Maccabees*. The Russian Church took over the definition of what was canonical from Athanasius. Precision on what was and what was not canonical does not appear to have been essential in the Eastern Churches: there is no equivalent of the Tridentine decree, unless we accept the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, held expressly to reject the views of 'the Calvinists' including Cyril Lucar's restriction of canonicity to the Hebrew Canon. But this Synod was not influential later in the Orthodox Churches.

Today the question of canonicity is not of primary importance in the Church, not least in view of the development already described. The essential discussion today lies in the authority of the Bible and the nature of its revelation; even the question of the inspiration of the Bible has an old-fashioned ring. It is significant that the most biblically grounded theology of our time, Karl Barth's *Dogmatics*, has very little to say about canonicity (partly because this is a matter for historical study and therefore in Barth's eyes of doubtful value in a theology of Revelation). Barth simply concludes that 'the Bible is the Canon because it is so, it is so because it imposes itself as such.'

Let us turn now to the second part of the threefold problem posed by the Old Testament. How could the Church take over the inspired Scriptures of Judaism and make them the inspired Scriptures (together with the Apostolic writings) of the Church? Those inspired Scriptures contained the elaborate code of ritual found in the *Torah*, and also was intimately associated with a full and elaborate interpretation of Judaism in the *Haggadah* and the *Halaka*. The former could not be kept in the literal sense but had to be spiritualized as the foreshadowing of Christ, the influence of the latter had to be set aside as mysteries and commandments extra to the Written Word —Paul had had to fight off both these problems in Galatia and elsewhere. As in Hebrews 10^{1}, the law must be seen as the shadow of things to come, and as in John 5^{41} the Old Testament must be seen as prophetic of the new. But from New Testament times to the present day the theological question persists, by what methods of interpretation can the complex variety of the Jewish books of faith be given a Christian relevance? The problem implicit

in using a Jewish book was twofold: the Jews attacked the Christians for taking up a book to which they were not entitled since they were not the true Israel of God, and, partly in consequence of this attack and of the attack by Pagan writers on its poor style and confusing anthropomorphisms, some Christians wished to set aside some parts of the Old Testament—one went further and wished to discard it altogether. Marcion, about A.D. 140, challenged the anthropomorphisms in the Old Testament and rejected the God of Israel as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, since the God of Israel is the God of this world, cruel and changeable and very human in his anger. For Marcion the intricacies of allegorical exegesis could not turn the Old Testament into Christian Scripture, and the attempt was futile since Christ had come to save men from the God of this world who is the God of the Jews. It was not that Marcion thought that the Old Testament was untrue; it was all too true and thoroughly deplorable. While this attack came out of the early Gnostic attempt to strangle the Church before it had organized its counter-measures, and has not been repeated in that form, yet the less radical opinion that the Old Testament is a Jewish book and of no great relevance to the Christian faith has not lacked support from time to time among those who wish to simplify the faith, or to find a different *preparatio evangelica* in the ancient Scriptures of, for example, India or China. It was a profound and essential insight of the early Church to insist on the Old Testament as the Word of God who is the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, God the Creator who in his Providence rules the world, who has chosen a people, Israel, to know him and to obey his Word, from whom, in the fullness of time, was born the Saviour of mankind who has established in the world from among all nations the new Israel of God. The Church might have been eclectic in what it decided was to be taken over from the Old Testament, but it was not. Having decided that the Old Testament was Scripture for the Church, and having decided with less clear-cut certainty what was to be accepted as canonical among the Jewish writings, it still had the most difficult problem of interpreting it—not merely as a Christian book, but even for understanding parts of it at all. They had a starting point in the fact that they had not only inherited a Jewish book, they had also inherited something of Jewish methods of interpretation, since the Rabbis had already faced the difficulties in such disparate material by going beyond the literal meaning to typology and allegory, both of which were to find a place in the New Testament in discussing the Old. In the *Epistle to the Hebrews* Melchizedek is a type of the eternal Christ, and patriarchs and prophets foreshadow Christ's coming —this Epistle was to provide a great stimulus to the allegorists of the Alexandrine school. For the writer of Matthew's gospel the Old Testament is essential to the understanding of Christ's actions, and John's Gospel shows that the Old Testament is prophetic of Christ. But the Church added two further principles of interpretation which the Rabbis tended not to emphasize, and which were consequences of Christian understanding of the Incarnation. First, there was recourse to using the central articles of the faith as the doctrinal basis for interpreting difficult passages; this was hardly a rabbinical method and the Jews have shown no interest in writing a 'Theology of the Old Testament'; secondly, there was the appeal to the

authority of the Church in rejecting certain interpretations or accepting others.

Tertullian, in his reply to Marcion, stated that the teachings of the Apostles might be called in question if they were not supported by the authority of the Old Testament which had prophesied about Christ. The first systematic attempt to provide the rules of Hermeneutics was that of Origen at Alexandria in the fourth book of his *De Principiis* where he adopted something of the Platonizing method of the Jewish interpreter, Philo. Origen described Scripture as having a body, its literal meaning; a soul, its moral meaning; and a spirit, its mystical meaning for the deepest Christian insights. When to this threefold method an eschatological sense of Scripture was added, especially under the influence of Augustine in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, the way was made plain for the fourfold interpretation characteristic of the Scholastics. But it should be remembered that the insistence of the Antiochene school of interpretations, whose chief exegete was Theodore of Mopsuestia, on the literal sense in opposition to the Origenists and the tendency to excess in allegorization, was not entirely lost sight of. Nicholas of Lyra, the greatest of the medieval exegetes, was a converted Jew, and he insisted that the literal or historical meaning of the Old Testament must be primary or else there could be no stability in exegetical method—and it is not without point to remember that there was a large Jewish community at Antioch which long before had influenced the Antiochene exegesis.

After the scholastics had overworked the fourfold sense (in spite of the protest of Nicholas of Lyra), the Reformers of the sixteenth century, under the influence of the Biblical Humanists' return to the Hebrew and Greek texts, insisted that exegesis must be properly founded on the historical sense. The Tridentine repristination of scholasticism and its successful and far-reaching theological authoritarianism heavily influenced the rise of Protestant scholasticism. Indeed, it may have originated it through reaction. By the mid-seventeenth century this had put exegesis once again in bondage to dogmatic orthodoxy. Pietism did something to restore a more living exegesis, reaching the great achievement of scholarly depth and concentrated simplicity of expression in the *Gnomon* of Bengel. It was under the impact of rationalism and Higher Criticism in the century 1780 to 1880 that a profound departure from traditional methods of interpretation took place. At Oxford, for example, Jowett's decision that the Bible should be given the same kind of scholarly treatment, and on the same terms, as other ancient texts, was salutary in the age of Darwin and of the critical methods begun for Roman history by Niebuhr; not least when we remember the sheer fundamentalism and traditionalist allegorizing of Jowett's contemporary, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, Pusey. The consequences of this century of change may be seen in the ways in which it affected three scholarly and thorough Dictionaries of the Bible which appeared at the end of the nineteenth century, and sought to organize the vast changes in approach to the biblical books, especially those of the Old Testament. These were the Roman Catholic *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, edited by Vigoroux, which used the new archaeological studies, but very cautiously, in view of the declarations on biblical

study of Pope Leo; the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, which showed in some articles an excessive zeal in rooting up old exegetical traditions in the name of objective critical methods; and the Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*, which sought to give a more moderate account of the consequences of these same critical methods, while providing for the 'spiritually perplexed' a full use of that moralistic interpretation based on critical insights associated, for example, with the name of George Adam Smith. Apart from the first of these works, typology was no longer regarded as a suitable method in exegesis. Today we seem to veer between the outlook foreshadowed by the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (for example, in the work of Mowinckel) and that foreshadowed in Hastings' *Dictionary* (for example, in the various recent series of biblical commentaries originating in Britain). But the time may well be ripe for a return to the use of a measured typology and a theological interpretation by means of the Analogy of Faith (so long feared as the great question-begging term in exegesis). These methods will not prove to be easy—but they have been used throughout the ages by the Apostles, the Fathers, the Scholastics, the Reformers, the Pietists and, with subtleties that are *sui generis*, by Karl Barth. Can the preacher of the word do without them?

ON UNDERSTANDING EZEKIEL

H. McKeating

NOBODY IS QUITE FAIR to Ezekiel. This isn't anybody's fault. It just happens that of all the prophets Ezekiel is 'the one who is psychologically most remote from ourselves'.[1] What I want to do in this article is to probe into this state of affairs and suggest one or two reasons why this lack of sympathy, this remoteness, obtains. I shall, in passing, point out how it is that this same lack of sympathy leads to quite a number of wrong conclusions about what Ezekiel is trying to say.

The question of Ezekiel's personality is fundamental to all other questions raised by his book. The critical problems of the book are formidable, and have been discussed *ad nauseam* for something like seventy years. The odd thing is that these seventy years have produced no unanimity at all. There are no 'assured results of criticism' as far as Ezekiel is concerned. We have not even reached the stage where the chaos of opinion has reduced itself to a small number of competing theories, commanding between them the bulk of critical support. The only thing that is clear is the reason why this extraordinary state of affairs exists. The answers to even these critical problems depend largely on the subjective response of the critic to the personality of the prophet. For example, if the critic rejects the unity of authorship of the book of Ezekiel it is principally because he has decided that the author who could be responsible for such widely divergent kinds of material *is not a credible personality*. This is not always the avowed reason for his conclusion,

but it is the real root of the matter.[2] Similarly, if the critic decides that Ezekiel did not spend all his ministry in Babylon and utter all his prophecies from there it is because the man who could have done so, who could be acutely aware of what was going on in Jerusalem, *is not a credible personality.*

This last matter involves another question which, together with that of the personality of the prophet, is basic to the whole critical issue. Are such phenomena as clairvoyance and telepathy to be taken seriously or not? The answer we give to this question affects our approach to all the Old Testament prophets, but none raises it in so sharp a form as Ezekiel. Many of the answers given to the questions of literary criticism depend directly on the answer given to this prior question. They depend, that is to say, on the answer that the critic has already given to a question which is not itself a literary critical question at all.

There can be no doubt that to the older generation of scholars this was an additional reason for an unsympathetic approach to Ezekiel. As far as most other prophets were concerned, the 'clairvoyant' element was less obtrusive, perhaps easier to explain away. Ezekiel is an unashamed and intractable supernaturalist. Cooke says of Hölscher and Herntrich that they 'declare that no scientific person nowadays believes in such a thing' [as second sight]. More recent writers are less inclined to be dogmatic on this point. J. Lindblom, for example, appears to accept these 'supernatural' elements in prophecy virtually at their face value.

I shall not pursue further the matter of the critical problems. I raise it simply to show that the question of Ezekiel's personality is the real *Hauptproblem*, and that if we solve this one we are well on the way to solving many others that are at first sight unrelated. My chief interest is in the relevance of Ezekiel's personality to the understanding of his theology.

The shortest way to the heart of the matter is to take a quick look at Ezekiel's imagery, and in particular to compare his use of certain key images with the use of the same by some other prophets. There are two images which nearly all the prophets resort to at some point or other, and which make a useful point of comparison. These two are the images of father and child, on the one hand, and husband and wife, on the other.

It is Hosea who first develops these two intimate human relationships as images of the relationship between God and his people. Ephraim is the Lord's son, whom he calls out of Egypt (11^1). When he was a small child God carried him in his arms, taught him to walk (11^3). Ephraim, however, has become a rebellious son, a delinquent (11^2), and yet his father's natural affection for him will not allow him to take the measures which law and custom sanction. 'How can I give you up, O Ephraim? How can I hand you over, O Israel? . . . My heart recoils within me, my compassion grows warm and tender' (11^8). What the same prophet makes of the husband/wife image is too well known to need recounting.

Jeremiah takes up both figures from Hosea. In 31^{20} he speaks in words very strongly reminiscent of Hosea. 'Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he my darling child? For as often as I speak against him, I do remember him still. Therefore my heart yearns for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, says the Lord.' Borrowing Hosea's bridal image, Jeremiah speaks of the wilderness

period of Israel's history, a period which he idealizes, as her honeymoon. He looks back nostalgically to the idyllic past of a marriage now broken (2^2).

Now look at what Ezekiel does with these same two themes. In a remarkable chapter (c. 16) he manages to synthesize them and treat them as different phases of the same relationship. Israel began, he says, as a foundling. The Lord discovered her, new-born and abandoned, and he took her and brought her up. Immediately we have a drastic change from Hosea and Jeremiah. The child for Ezekiel is an adopted child. She had no natural claim on God at all. She was not his. She was foreign to him, of suspect parentage. 'Your origin and your birth are of the land of the Canaanites: your father was an Amorite and your mother a Hittite' (16^3). The Lord found her spurned, loathsome, and helpless. 'On the day you were born your navel string was not cut, nor were you washed with water to cleanse you, nor rubbed with salt, nor swathed in bands. No eye pitied you, to do any of these things to you out of compassion for you: but you were cast out on the open field, for you were abhorred, on the day that you were born' (16^{4-5}).

One important fact to note about this passage is that it does not make on us the impression that it is designed to make. Ezekiel's description of the baby does not move us with the disgust which it evidently aroused in its author. The feelings of physical revulsion were strongly developed in Ezekiel and he resorts with characteristic frequency to metaphors involving filth, dirt, and loathsome matter. These feelings were clearly aroused in him by his own picture of the foundling.

Ezekiel is trying to convey to us a sense of the utter worthlessness of Israel and of the amazing generosity which God has shown her. Here is a baby, found in a field, still attached to its afterbirth, and with the mucous and blood of its birth upon it. The man who found it touched this repulsive thing. Not only rescued her (a girl, at that) but adopted her. He actually treated her as his own child and not as a slave. To Ezekiel this action from start to finish is remarkable. To us, any other action would be unthinkable.

Thus, in one of the few passages in which Ezekiel does manage to make a real emotional impact it is for the twentieth-century reader the wrong impact, not the one that Ezekiel hoped to make. He has in any case drastically reworked his predecessors' picture of the relationship between God the father and Israel the child.

Even having thus radically revised the picture Ezekiel is evidently not quite happy with it. He soon transmutes Israel the abandoned baby into Israel the promiscuous adolescent. Again we find him emphasizing her lack of native charm. If the adolescent Israel had any beauty to commend her it was only because of what her foster father had done for her. 'And your renown went forth among the nations because of your beauty, for it was perfect *through the splendour which I had bestowed upon you*' (16^4).

Again it might be noted in passing that we have a statement that does not carry conviction in the twentieth century. In the days when all women can afford cosmetics and pretty clothes we are well aware that cosmetics and pretty clothes do not make beauty. But in ancient times the beautiful women were those who could afford to be beautiful. Beauty was less a matter of natural endowment than of opportunity. It is really quite logical that in

fairy stories princesses are always beautiful, because once upon a time only princesses had the leisure for such things.

The other passage in which Ezekiel develops the theme of the adulterous wife is chapter 23, the tale of Oholah and Oholibah. He is again unfortunate in getting off on the wrong foot with his modern readers. The precise relationship between God and the two sisters is not clear. We do not know whether they are envisaged as having the status of wives or that of concubines. Ezekiel simply puts into God's mouth the words 'They became mine, and they bore sons and daughters' (23[4]). But whichever way it is, we are immediately put off by the fact that there are two of them. We are so conditioned to thinking of sexual love as something that only operates ideally between one man and one woman, that when Ezekiel asks us to accept that here is someone in a genuine and legitimate emotional relationship with *two* women we simply are not able to respond to him.

There are therefore some quite accidental reasons why Ezekiel's use of the two images, father/child and husband/wife, does not make the impression on our minds which it is intended to do. These are exacerbating factors, but they are not the only ones. Even if these accidents are allowed for, Ezekiel's use of these two figures contrasts strongly with that of his predecessors in one important respect. There is some quality of feeling that Ezekiel lacks. His words have far less emotional force than those of Hosea or Jeremiah.

Hosea's descriptions, as they have come down to us, of his relations with women, are full of gaps and anomalies. They are so lacking in precision that we are still arguing such fundamental questions as: were there two women, or only one? Was Gomer really unfaithful to her husband or not? Did Hosea marry a woman whom he knew to be immoral before he married her, or did he only find out afterwards? Are Hosea's descriptions fact or fiction? Yet despite the vagueness, the anomalies and the loose ends, Hosea's *involvement* with his theme carries the day, and through even the vicissitudes of translation and textual corruption conveys across twenty-seven centuries the feelings of the man for the woman and hence of God for his folk.

Jeremiah, though he does not sustain or develop the imagery of sexual unfaithfulness as either Hosea or Ezekiel do, but uses it rather as a brief lightning flash to illuminate the scene, also betrays a degree of involvement with his imagery. Possibly the frustrations of Jeremiah's bachelorhood had the same effect as the disappointments of Hosea's marriage, in sharpening his appreciation of imagery of this kind.

Where Ezekiel is employing the same images as his predecessors we miss in him just this involvement which is so characteristic of them. The feelings of Yahweh for the foundling are less those of the father than of the social worker. His attitude to Oholah and Oholibah is less that of the husband than of the probation officer. These are profound enough, but they are not the same.

Ezekiel fails to convey emotion. This is the most important fact to grasp if we wish to understand him at all. This deficiency is not without parallel, Ezekiel simply does not feel strongly. It is not likely that he is incapable of and some of the parallels suggest that we would be unwise to conclude that

emotion. His failure may not really be a failure of sympathy, but a failure of expression, a literary failure. He feels, but does not know how to move us to feel with him.[3]

To take just one parallel example, let us look at the case of Mr John Wesley. It appears to me that Mr Wesley would be just as worthy of the accusation I have just levelled at Ezekiel as is Ezekiel himself.

Wesley's sermons are not now read at all, except by Methodist preachers strictly for examination purposes. They are not without admirers, and yet even their admirers would scarcely say that they appeal much to the affections. The sermons are orderly, well argued (if one accepts their premises), inclined to be pedantic. They are theologically very instructive, but they do not move us much at all.

Do we conclude that Mr Wesley was a man of straitened emotions? We can hardly do that. The early Methodism which he founded was heavily criticized because it appealed *too much* to the emotions. It was the religion of the 'warmed heart'. Moreover, not only must Wesley have been capable of feeling, he must have been capable on some occasions of conveying feeling. The evangelical revival is a little difficult to account for otherwise. Nevertheless, he certainly does not succeed in communicating feeling in print. The failure in his case is certainly a literary failure. The same may well be true of Ezekiel.

It is relevant here to mention Ezekiel's interest in the cultus. Even if we ignore the last nine chapters of his book, there is enough evidence in the rest of it of his disposition to use cultic phraseology and imagery. This disposition is not merely the result of his being a priest. Jeremiah too had priestly antecedents, yet ritual seems to have had little meaning for him, though it must have been familiar. For Ezekiel the cultic ritual is not only familiar but meaningful. It is possible that it is the dramatic activity of the cultus that most readily moves him.

Now it is true that there are in any age men who are simply not moved by ritual enactment; men who belong to a species of congenital protestant. And to such men the high drama of cultic action is not drama at all, but a series of mechanical and unfeeling gestures. Such men, if they speak of ritual at all, invariably characterize it as '*mere* ritual', thus revealing their assumption that all ritual is of course meaningless. Jeremiah and Amos may both have been men of this type.

Ezekiel clearly is not. And if it is in the realm of ritual action that Ezekiel's emotions are most naturally engaged, this would help to explain why so little of his feelings are conveyable on the flat page. What Ezekiel needs in order to express himself is action, not words. The two do not necessarily exclude each other, of course, but not all of us express ourselves equally readily in all media. The written word may be the medium that Ezekiel is least adept at using. Perhaps he is a dramatist *manqué*. The Israelite cultural tradition had no place for drama, except in the cult, and to the cult Ezekiel turns. If he had been a Greek he would have put his theology into a play. He cannot do this, so he attempts the next best thing, an essay in the writing of liturgy.

The only other outlet for dramatic talent in Israel was indulgence in the

so-called 'prophetic symbolism'. And Ezekiel makes freer use of this medium than any other prophet.

Thus Ezekiel, when he wishes to convey his message to his contemporaries, chooses for preference two methods of expression. He 'acts out' his message in front of them and leaves to us the mere flat record of what he did; and he writes a liturgical drama which we shall never seen enacted. The delivery of oracular poetry is the method he fell back on only as a last resort, and the one for which he probably had the least talent. It would do none of our great dramatists justice if we knew them only from their non-dramatic works. This is not quite our situation in regard to Ezekiel but something approximating to it.

There are several reasons, then, for the failure of communication between Ezekiel and ourselves, and what gets lost in transit is in the first instance the *feelings* of the prophet. What moves him may not easily move us, and the ways in which he most naturally and ably expresses himself are ways which circumstances will not allow to operate. We thus have a defective picture of the prophet's personality. It is a picture that lacks warmth and humanity.

Now this has more serious results yet, for the failure to communicate the emotional force of the prophet's utterances means that we do not succeed in grasping accurately even the intellectual content of what he is saying. Since our picture of Ezekiel is harsh and repellent the prophet seems to be speaking of a harsh and repellent God. We are conditioned by the apparent remoteness and severity of the prophet into seeing in his God these same qualities.[4]

Let us take one or two key phrases of Ezekiel and see how they are generally interpreted. One that the commentators have made much of is the phrase 'for my name's sake' or 'for my own sake'. God acts for his own sake and not for the sake of Israel (20^{9}, 14^{22}, 36^{22}). Most interpreters say that this means that God is only interested in defending his own reputation, and does not act out of any love for Israel herself. A typical comment is: 'He could never conceive of Yahweh forgiving his people through motives of compassion or love.'[5]

If this is true it is indeed a repellent idea, but does Ezekiel mean this? It is interesting to note that Deutero-Isaiah uses precisely the same phrases and almost as frequently as Ezekiel does (43^{25}, $48^{9, 11}$) yet no one seems to interpret them when they come from his mouth as harshly as when they come from Ezekiel's. Why is this? It can only be that the total impression made by this prophet's writings is different from that made by Ezekiel's, and this total impression imparts radically different colouring to the critic's exegesis of the individual phrase.

If God saves 'for his own sake' or 'for his name's sake' it is because only this saving action is in keeping with his character. He saves because of what *he* is, not because of what Israel is. There is nothing repulsive about this doctrine if it is sympathetically stated.

Ezekiel also employs the phrase 'that they may know that I am the Lord'. This has been interpreted on the same lines as 'for my name's sake'. God is concerned, they say, whether in judgement or salvation, simply to demonstrate his power. But again, what the Lord is demonstrating is not simply

his power, but his name, his character. Everything turns on what sort of character it is that is being demonstrated. And unfortunately Ezekiel has not succeeded in conveying to us the warmth and tenderness which he sees in the character of God.

Finally, we look at the phrase with which Ezekiel justifies his own activities as watchman. He speaks the word God gives him in order that he might 'deliver his own soul', or, as we might more accurately translate it, 'to save his own life'. Once more, these words have been taken unfavourably to mean that Ezekiel is not interested in the people to whom he speaks, but is concerned simply to earn his own salvation. The words have been interpreted as yet another expression of his excessive individualism.

But is Ezekiel doing or saying here anything that is not done or said or implied by virtually all other prophets? Every prophet must come to terms with the fact that the majority of people ignore as irrelevant the word that seems to him so authoritative and compelling. Amos and Jeremiah are both incredulous that people should deny or fail to see what seems to them, the prophets, so obvious, that Israel is deep in sin and judgement is imminent. Isaiah is so amazed at the unresponsiveness of Israel that he can only draw the conclusion that God himself must have hardened the people's hearts and made them incapable of responding. The prophets each in his own way raise the human question: Why must I be 'a man of strife and contention to the whole earth'? How long must I go on preaching when nobody is listening? What is the use of going on sowing this seed when most of it demonstrably falls by the wayside, or on rocky ground, or among thorns? And the answer arrived at, though expressed in different words, is always the same. It is not the prophet's job to worry about results, which the Lord has set in his own hand. It is his to sow and perhaps to water but God will take care of any increase. He must patiently give his back to the smiters and his cheeks to those who pluck out the hair, and go on to the end though all men forsake him and flee. And if in the far future God wills to appoint him a portion with the great and allow him to divide the spoil with the strong, then that is a matter for God alone.

Ezekiel is facing the question common to prophets, and he arrives at a similar answer to the rest. He must do the job which God has given him, 'whether they will hear or whether they forbear'. It is not his job to inquire further, but it *is* his job to do what God has given him to do. Do the words *le-hasil 'eth-naphsho* mean any more than 'to discharge his own responsibility'? Ezekiel, here as elsewhere, says what the other prophets say, only he is unfortunate enough, here as elsewhere, in choosing to say it in phrases that his critics can turn against him.

Finally, we ought to note that what Ezekiel is trying to say is in any case something very difficult to communicate without giving rise to misunderstanding. Ezekiel's emphasis is all on grace, and it is difficult to emphasize strongly the grace of God without facing the accusation that one's presentation is grossly one-sided, one's picture of God inhuman and mechanical, and that one has an exaggerated notion of divine transcendence. A strong doctrine of grace is nearly always found repulsive by the majority. Few theologians have such a bad 'public image' as Calvin. Those who know

nothing else about him have heard of his doctrine of election, and regard it as damnable. Yet virtually all the most detested features of Calvinism spring directly from Calvin's extreme desire to emphasize grace. St Augustine has fallen to some extent under the same condemnation, and largely for the same reasons. Fortunately in his case some pleasanter aspects of his theology are also widely appreciated.

It would be interesting to explore the reasons why it is so difficult to express a strong doctrine of grace in acceptable terms, but for the present let it suffice to observe the fact that it is so.

We may summarize, then, as follows. An understanding of Ezekiel's personality is fundamental to the understanding of his book. This understanding is made difficult by a number of peculiar factors. One of these is that Ezekiel fails to communicate emotion readily. This is perhaps largely a literary failure. He finds it easier to express feeling and ideas in dramatic action and in ritual than in the written word. But the failure to 'put across' his own personality results in a failure to present adequately his conception of the personality of God, and this in turn leads to a serious misunderstanding of his message.

[1] e.g., Weiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 223.

[2] Lofthouse, *Clarendon Bible*, Vol. IV, p. 67f., and H. Knight, *Expository Times*, 59 (1947-8), pp. 115ff, both perceive this quite clearly.

[3] Many interpreters assume that the weakness is in the prophet's personality itself. e.g., Th. H. Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets*, p. 151. 'There is a harshness, almost a brutality, about Ezekiel, which contrasts unfavourably with the tenderness of his great predecessors.' H. W. Robinson, *Two Hebrew Prophets*, p. 95. 'I cannot conceive of Ezekiel as feeling sorrow in the same way as his more sensitive contemporary, much less as revealing the struggle within him.' Henshaw, *The Latter Prophets*, p. 207. 'There was, however, something about him that was harsh and forbidding.... We feel that he was never deeply moved at the thought of human suffering.'

[4] Th. H. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 151-4. Robinson's whole treatment of Ezekiel's personality and theology is very typical of the unsympathetic approach I have in mind. 'There is in his presentation [of God] something that suggests the rigidity of the machine.' Cf. Weiser, op. cit., p. 229. 'He presents a conception of God that is harshly theocentric and contains no comfort.'

[5] Henshaw, op. cit., p. 207.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE HISTORICITY OF THE GOSPELS

John S. Roberts

EARLY CHRISTIAN apologetic and doctrine were both developed with constant reference to the Old Testament scriptures. The primitive Church's explanation of its own existence and its evolving interpretation of the person and work of its Lord were influenced by the Old Testament more deeply than we can easily realize.

An assessment of the historicity of the gospels must depend upon the extent to which both the 'typology' and the 'testimonies to Christ' found in the Old Testament have led the evangelists to create, or at least to elaborate, events and sayings.

By 'typology' is meant explicit or allusive reference to the pattern of events and symbols associated with the dominating characters of the Old Testament, in particular Moses, Joshua, Joseph, David and Elijah.[1] The growing knowledge of Jewish writings of the inter-testament period has emphasized how deeply ingrained was such typology; a wealth of widely-understood symbolic allusion was at hand for the evangelists to draw upon. By the 'testimonies' are meant those portions of the Old Testament, mainly in the Psalms and the Prophets, which were seen by the primitive Church as key passages where Christ's birth, baptism, ministry, cross and resurrection were pre-figured, sometimes in literal detail.[2]

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPOLOGY

The more recent major commentaries on Mark, while fully recognizing the many detailed Old Testament parallels and allusions, do not appear to have done justice to the insight of Austin Farrer concerning typology in this gospel.[3] Thus Vincent Taylor comments only that Farrer 'exaggerates the extent and importance of this element' (of pre-figuring or typology) and Nineham refers to Farrer's work only by way of a few brief footnotes.[4]

Farrer, in the early 1950s, made a most convincing case that the key to Mark's scheme is to be found in the cycles of healings in the gospel; the scheme of these cycles involves the number and the types of the cleansings and restorations and prepares for the culmination in the Resurrection. Interwoven with the pattern of healings is the pattern of the calling of the disciples and both these patterns are linked with the symbolism of the tribes of Israel. Many features of Mark, for example the arithmetic of the loaves and the feeding of the thousands, are explained as part of the same scheme. Farrer also put forward, apart from his main thesis but with much convincing evidence, a detailed scheme of the tribal symbolism, in which the names of places and persons in the gospel are seen as 'tribal signatures'. It is probable that the evangelist was familiar with a compilation, probably

of the Maccabean period, of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; this had enlarged imaginatively upon the characters of the patriarchs and the events and places associated with them and thus provided a rich background for Mark's typological allusions. One of the most important influences is the typology of Joseph:

> ... Joseph is himself a manifest type and token of the resurrection. Buried in an Egyptian prison and supposed dead by his kindred, he came upon the rest of the twelve as alive from the grave in the splendour of his royal power, and they were troubled at his presence, for they had betrayed him; but he comforted them and told them not to fear.[5]

The typology of Joseph (and his sons Ephraim and Manasseh) is shown to appear in a very concentrated form in chapters 5 and 6 of Mark. The story of the woman twelve years afflicted are seen to be pre-figured in the bers Jair—'JAH' awakens'—was a Manassite judge) and the interwoven story of the woman twelve years afflicted are seen to be pre-figured in the story of the blessing of Joseph's sons; there are many other features in these chapters consistent with this typology. The Ephraimite typology provides a link with the important typology of Joshua, son of Nun, who belonged to the tribe of Ephraim.[6]

The symmetry and unity of the Marcon economy emerge most strikingly from Farrer's studies. It is notorious that a given typology can be extracted from almost any book by a determined advocate, but the whole atmosphere of Farrer's approach is far removed from such forced interpretation. At least the main patterns which Farrer discerns in Mark demand more serious consideration than most critics have accorded them. It seems most unjust of J. M. Robinson to imply that Farrer's work is one of the 'eccentric monographs on Mark' and to say that Farrer discovers 'complicated cycles and epicycles hardly discernible even to the initiated eye'.[7] Perhaps the very wealth of supporting detail has tended to hinder general acceptance of Farrer's main thesis. Those who do accept that thesis will probably be inclined to go further than Farrer himself in assessing the 'creative' influence of the Marcan typological scheme.

Farrer himself regards the arrangement of material in Mark essentially as a *selection* from the mass of material, such as healing narratives, available to the evangelist. It seems difficult, however, to account for the appropriateness of so many names and places in the narratives entirely by a process of selection; this appears to be a special case of the tendency for persons in the narratives to be named at a relatively late stage in the tradition.[8]

Farrer makes a distinction between two sorts of pattern in Mark, a 'pattern of event' and a 'pattern of exposition'; he insists that Mark's exposition was worked out within the framework of a pattern of event which was controlled by the historical knowledge of the apostolic community and was not allowed to grow unchecked. The difficulty lies in the vagueness of Farrer's definition of the essential pattern of events. How much detail can be eroded from the pattern before it loses the right to be called historical? Has Mark (a) simply changed the sequence of selected events which he believed to be factually accurate; (b) altered details, such as names and

places, to suit his typology better; or (c) sometimes created events to accord with his own patterns of 'what must have happened'? Such questions are raised by T. A. Roberts in what appears to be the only adequately detailed critique of Farrer's methods.[9] Nineham has emphasized the difficulty of assuming the existence in the early Church of even a skeleton outline of the ministry of Jesus.[10]

The structures of Matthew and of Luke have been shown to be influenced by Pentateuchal typology. Matthew's arrangement of the teaching of Jesus into five discourses is immediately obvious; Farrer, however, sees Matthew's scheme not in these discourses but in a pattern starting with the genealogy (Genesis) and working in order through 'set pieces' of the type of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua.[11]

C. F. Evans has set out in detail the many parallels to Deuteronomy found in the central third of Luke (the most characteristic Lucan section of the gospel).[12] Not only are parallels and allusions found in almost all the events, sayings and parables in this section, but the order of themes in Deuteronomy is reproduced in the gospel; there can be little doubt that the material was arranged in a Deuteronomic sequence by the Evangelist. There is no difficulty in explaining such an arrangement of the teaching of Jesus—whether seen as fulfilment or as contrast the teaching would have natural links with Deuteronomy. It is more difficult to decide how Luke's scheme affects the historicity of the events in this section. Did Jesus, for example, send out the Seventy as a deliberate sign of the 'prophet like Moses' or was this incident created by the demands of the evangelist's scheme?

The typology of Moses (and the associated wilderness imagery) in the Fourth Gospel has recently been examined by T. F. Glasson, who shows how the Moses/Christ parallelism is a prominent, recurring feature throughout the gospel.[13] Several of the most important themes in John are open to typological explanation. The sign at Cana is reminiscent of the turning of water into blood in Exodus, and the scene at the well has echoes of the story of Jacob's well. The sign of the flowing water and blood, peculiar to John's Passion narrative, may have been influenced by the Rabbinical tradition which had elaborated the story of the striking of the rock by Moses. Glasson's opinion on the effect of the Moses typology on the historicity of John is similar to that of Farrer concerning typology in Mark. Thus Glasson considers that:

> ... the Evangelist is not necessarily inventing incidents to correspond with the Mosaic tradition; he rather selects those happenings which belong to this scheme. Moreover, it is probable that the Moses/Christ parallelism did not originate with the early Church, but goes back to our Lord himself and to the way in which he regarded and interpreted his mission.[14]

The Moses typology in John emerges most openly in the scene of the feeding of the thousands in the wilderness and the sequel to that sign. A question here, not specifically raised by Glasson, is whether the sayings of Jesus associated with the sign are wholly the commentary of the evangelist or whether Jesus himself made explicit reference to Moses, thus consciously and deliberately drawing upon the typology which was so readily at hand.

Although this possible basis of historicity in the Johannine sayings cannot be dismissed, the more we are impressed by the evangelist's pervading use of typology, the more we shall be inclined to regard the 'claims of Jesus', in particular the 'I am' sayings, as the evangelist's own meditations.

The farewell discourse and prayer have always presented the greatest difficulty to those who would retain a clear historical basis for the sayings of Jesus in John's gospel. Glasson brings out the many parallels between the themes, and often the words, used in these chapters of John and the farewell discourse of Moses in Deuteronomy. There are also many detailed points of resemblance to the developed Rabbinical tradition about the last days of Moses.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE TESTIMONIES

The association of the Old Testament testimonies with the events of the gospels may have had two opposite results: (a) the interpretation of the testimonies may have been changed to make the testimonies accord better with the known facts about Jesus; or (b) the detailed facts may have been changed to accord with a testimony originally used because of its appropriateness on more general grounds. There is also the question of whether some of the testimonies were actually used by Jesus himself as purported by the gospels.

C. H. Dodd, in collecting and systematizing the use of the testimonies, calls them the 'sub-structure of New Testament Theology'.[15] He considers that the testimonies were not quoted from an anthology of proof-texts but were drawn from those whole passages which the Church regarded as especially important. Dodd sees no reason to doubt that 'it was Jesus himself who first directed the minds of his followers to certain parts of the scriptures as those in which they might find illumination upon the meaning of his mission and destiny'.[16]

More recently the way in which the New Testament uses the testimonies has been analysed in detail by B. Lindars.[17] The opening verse of Psalm 110 ('The Lord says to my Lord; Sit at my right hand') is regarded by Lindars as 'perhaps the most important of the scriptures used with the argument from literal fulfilment'; the history of its use in the New Testament is traced as an example of the shift in interest in the application of a testimony. Originally this was used as a purely Messianic text (as in Acts in *proclaiming* the Messiahship of Jesus), but in the gospels it has become involved in the controversy about whether Jesus was of Davidic descent (Mark 12^{36}). Lindars concludes, as does Nineham, that the incident in the gospel, where Jesus is represented as quoting this text, is a product of Christian apologetic and not part of the authentic gospel tradition. The Davidic controversy has clearly influenced the stories of the Birth and Infancy in Luke and Matthew, with the need to establish the connection of Jesus with Bethlehem. Another prominent testimony, quoted by Jesus in Mark (the stone that the builders rejected), also appears to be Christian proclamation rather than a genuine saying of Jesus.

Lindars examines the difficult question of the historicity of the predictions of the Resurrection (Mark 8^{31}, 9^{31}, 10^{34}) and concludes that the use of

the prophecy did not lead to the tradition of the third day; rather it was the fact of Resurrection that caused the literal interpretation of the passage in Hosea (6^{2}) in which 'on the third day' need only mean 'in a little while'.

The testimony from Isaiah (7^{14}) which came to be applied to the Virgin Birth was probably first used independently of this doctrine as part of the Messianic proclamation of 'Immanuel—God with us'.

Lindars observes that the series of incidents in chapter 2 of Matthew can be seen as 'portents presaging the great acts of redemption at the close of the Gospel. Jesus is treated as a king, yet rejected by Herod; he is thrust out to Egypt, the house of bondage and the symbol of death; but Herod's evil intentions are defeated, so that Jesus is able to return and live in Galilee.'[18]

This is one of the places where we cannot distinguish between the influences of typology and of testimonies; here we can almost watch the typology crystallizing into the more specific testimonies as the primitive Church searches the scriptures.

In his recent large-scale work on the historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Dodd has considered in some detail the bearing of the testimonies upon the historicity of the gospel narratives. The probability of elaboration of many narratives is admitted, but Dodd concludes that 'the extent to which the element of fulfilled prophecy has stimulated a legend-making tendency in primitive Christianity is strictly limited'.[19]

Dodd's main argument for limiting the influence of the testimonies is that a rigorous selection process has evidently been applied by the evangelists in making use of the testimonies material. Thus when a particular psalm is used as a quarry for testimonies much material is rejected and many likely prophecies are not, in fact, worked into the gospel narratives. Some of the examples of unused prophecies can, however, be explained in other ways. Dodd quotes Psalm 22 as containing the testimonies corresponding to the cry of dereliction, the division of the garments and the mockery of Jesus and points out that the Passion narratives do not contain an 'ideal scene' in which Jesus is exposed to wild beasts; such a scene would correspond to another possible prophecy which could have been extracted from the same psalm. In this case, however, it is clear that the psalmist is speaking metaphorically when he refers to the beasts that have beset him.[20] Even if an evangelist were more literally-minded than either the Old Testament writers or ourselves he would not have needed to introduce an encounter with wild beasts into the Passion narrative, because the 'ideal scene' already existed in the narrative of the Temptation (Mark 1^{13}). Similarly, in considering the use of Psalm 69, another of the 'Passion Psalms', Dodd points out that the danger of drowning which appears in the psalm has not influenced the Gospel narratives. Here again, the deep waters and the floods overwhelming the psalmist would surely be well understood as metaphorical; the theme is used as such in the words of Jesus about his having a baptism to be baptized with.

The recurring dilemma in assessing the extent of the creative influence of the testimonies is that an evangelist, if he were simply creating incidents on the principle that the prophecies *must* have been fulfilled, would select incidents fitting the traditional outline in an unforced way. It is probable

that the influence of the testimonies is still underestimated, at least in so far as they affect incidents over which Jesus had no control; many of the details of the Passion narrative are in this category. On the other hand, a stricter selection process would govern testimonies applied to events over which Jesus did exert control, the selection being governed by the memory not only of the particular incidents but of the whole personality of Jesus.[21]

In assessing the historicity of the sayings of Jesus, full allowance must be made for the efficiency of the Rabbinic techniques of imparting teaching and preserving tradition in a pure form.[22] No doubt some of the Old Testament quotations and allusions attributed to Jesus do at least reflect his use of these passages in exposition and controversy.[23] Only a small proportion of the sayings are strictly 'testimonies' but in these instances the historicity must be acknowledged to be much more doubtful than that of the other sayings.[24]

[1] G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, *Essays in Typology*, 1957; R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 1959.
[2] C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 1952.
[3] Austin Farrer, *A Study in St Mark*, 1951; *St Matthew and St Mark*, 1954.
[4] Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, 1955; D. E. Nineham, *Saint Mark* (Pelican Gospel Commentaries), 1963; this latter commentary, which must surely now become the standard work on the English text, deals fully with many of the problems of historicity.
[5] Farrer, *A Study in St Mark*, p. 333. On the typology of Joseph, see A. W. Argyle, *Expository Times*, 1956, p. 199.
[6] On the typology of Joshua, see F. C. Synge, *Hebrews and the Scriptures*, 1959.
[7] J. M. Robinson, *The Problem of History in Mark*, 1957, p. 12.
[8] C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, 1963.
[9] T. A. Roberts, *History and Christian Apologetic*, 1960.
[10] D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels*, 1955, p. 223.
[11] Austin Farrer, *Studies in the Gospels* (ed. Nineham), p. 55.
[12] C. F. Evans, *Studies in the Gospels* (ed. Nineham), p. 37. On the typology of Luke see M. D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts*, 1964.
[13] T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, 1963.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 83.
[15] C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures.*
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 1961.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 218.
[19] C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel.*
[20] Cf. Psalm 22^{12} with Amos 4^{1}.
[21] T. T. Rowe, *London Quarterly & Holborn Review*, 1963, p. 46.
[22] H. Riesenfield, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*, 1957.
[23] C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, 1962, p. 57.
[24] On the 'claims of Jesus' see John Knox, *The Death of Christ*, 1959.

JOHN WYCLIF AND THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD

John Stacey

JOHN WYCLIF had strong views about most things, and preaching was not excluded. His convictions on this subject, as on others, he sought to justify by an appeal to primitive Christianity which he regarded as the golden age. 'Christ effected more by the proclamation of the Gospel by means of the Apostles, than by all the miracles that he performed himself in Judea.'[1] The Apostles left the 'bysynesse of worldly occupacion' in order that they could concentrate on the 'trewe techynge of the gospel' and this was the right tradition for the church to follow. 'Crist preched the gospel and charged alle his apostolis and disciplis to goo and preche the gospel to alle men.'[2] It was Christ himself who spoke in and through the preacher both in the first century and the fourteenth and through the sermon brought to birth his spiritual children. More than that, the whole Trinity was at work in the words that were preached (*Tota Trinitas loquitur omnia ista verba*).[3] Consequently, the ministry of the Word was something that the church ought never to neglect.

With these convictions Wyclif could not look at the fourteenth-century church with any great enthusiasm. To his mind the centrality of the mass and the proliferation of rites and ceremonies which were characteristic of the Ecclesia Anglicana at that time diverted her from her true business, the preaching of the gospel. He complained of 'matynys and masse and euen song, placebo and dirige and commendacion and matynes of oure lady'[4] and their adverse effect on the duty 'to studie and preche the gospel'.[5] He could even say 'praying is gode, but not so gode as prechyng'.[6]

It is possible that some might be tempted to jump to the conclusion that Wyclif was a Bible Christian born out of due season, emphasizing the evangelical to the exclusion of the sacramental, and anxious to remove all high altars and replace them with high pulpits, but this would be an exaggeration. He held a strong doctrine of the real presence which was not only a generalized presence, but a localized one as well. It was fundamental to his eucharistic theology that 'in the consecrated host there is the body of Christ'.[7] 'God's body in the form of bread'[8] was his English rendering. He was sacramentalist enough to distinguish in one work[9] between mattins and evensong 'that synful men han ordeyned' and the mass 'that God comaundid him self'. It is not without significance that Wyclif was hearing mass at Lutterworth when he received the stroke from which he died. It is true that in seeking to redress the balance he said that 'Crist preiseth more preching of the Gospel . . . than gendring of his oune body', but he was careful to add, 'al zif (although) they both ben gode werkis'.[10] The importance he gave to the eucharist must not be overlooked, otherwise his pleas for a right emphasis

on preaching will cause him to be classified, wrongly, with those latter-day evangelicals who would have preaching at the expense of the sacraments.

Many of Wyclif's assertions about the place of preaching in the life of the church are to be found in his comments on the proper function of a priest. He said in this context that 'the preaching of the Word of God is an act more solemn than the making of the sacrament'[11] and that both priests and deacons ought *praedicare verbum Dei*[12] rather than say the canonical hours. The chief duty of the priest was to preach. Such preaching more effectively destroys *mortalia* than does the eucharist and it produces 'a great closeness to the Son of God'.[13] So all clergy ought to be skilled in *ars ewangelizandi* and take pains to perfect that 'rizt preching of goddis word' which is 'the mooste worthy dede that prestis don heere among men'.[14] This is the true pastoral office, for 'bi this werk a prest getith goddis children and makith hem to come to heuene'.[15] 'More fruyt cometh of good preching than of any other work.'[16] Wyclif poured out invective, at which occupation he was a past master, on the priests who were defaulters in this matter and the prelates who were too fat to preach and 'thus their bisynesse is stoppid to gete hem more of worldly muc'.[17]

Wyclif was by no means enamoured of much that passed for preaching in the fourteenth century. This latter is a subject which G. R. Owst has made his own and he comments that 'on its purely doctrinal side . . . the English pulpit of the waning Middle Ages has little inspiration to offer'.[18] There were learned sermons preached in the schools, but they were as dry as dust. Wyclif, however, could have little quarrel with them for though he might wish to question points of doctrine their general form was one he used extensively himself. His antipathy was to popular preaching; to the sermons which, as Beryl Smalley says, 'graced many social as well as liturgical occasions'.[19] But Wyclif's *bête noire* was the friar—perhaps because he believed in the ideals of the movement and the corruption of them aroused more hostility than movements, like the monastic, which were basically alien to his spirit—and some of his most scornful comments were directed at the friars' preaching. He referred to it as 'cronyclis and fablis to pleese the puple'[20] and in *De Officio Pastorali* he went further and called the friars 'adulterers of the Word of God in prostitutes' robes and coloured veils'.[21] They 'preach feigned words and poems in rhyme'.[22]

As is usual with Wyclif, he exaggerates a real truth for polemical purposes. The friars took their preaching seriously and it was to them that Dom David Knowles was referring when he wrote, in contradistinction to Owst, that 'the golden age of the popular sermon in medieval England appears to have been the middle and latter half of the fourteenth century'.[23] In the friary schools, to which even monks were sent, the *artes praedicandi* received much attention, but so often when faced with an audience 'critical, eager for novelty and hopeful of entertainment, wanting to be stimulated or amused'[24] the temptation was too much for the friar preachers. They fell to 'ventilating and satirizing public wrongs'[25] which in itself was no bad thing, but they embellished and titivated their sermons with extraneous material. One such embellishment was the tale of the Northumberland woman who was so moved by the preacher's words that she died. On being resuscitated, the

words 'Ave Maria' were found inscribed on her tongue. This can be capped with the story of the lady's pet monkey that strayed into church, swallowed the Host and was burnt by its god-fearing mistress. The Host was rescued from the animal's stomach unchanged. It would not be fair to pretend that the preaching of the friars consisted only in such apocryphal tales, for they were often 'messengers to bid men come to heven, as doctors and prechers of the word of God',[26] but it was the presence of such material in their sermons that made Wyclif write of the friars, *Sunt enim pleni mendaciis, scandalis atque blasphemiis et per ypocrisim suam seducunt ecclesiam.*[27]

Nothing is easier than to condemn, and the friar particularly was fair game, but what positive conception of preaching did Wyclif have? His basic principle was that it must be rooted in the Word of God, in the sacred book, 'Goddis lawe' as he called it. Scripture was to him the *magistrum optimum*, higher than reason or tradition, and doctrines were to be preached only if they agreed with holy scripture. Hence the insistence of Wyclif that not only must all priests have *officium predicandi* but also that this office was quite impossible to fulfil without *sciencia scripture sacre.*[28] In all preaching the biblical truth must shine forth and one of the reasons why Wyclif instigated the famous translations associated with his name was to make this possible. Tradition, scholastic arguments and extraneous stories had to be set aside so that preaching was preaching of the Word and nothing else but that. As Owst says: 'The first point to be noticed in the general contribution of Wycliffe to English medieval preaching is his insistence on "the naked text" or exposition of the Gospel message *per nudum textum*, freed of the accumulation of foreign matter from without.'[29] In his sermon *Circuibat Jesus civitates et castella docens in synagogis* Wyclif made it clear that in his judgement the gospel was the all-sufficient source of sermon material for every kind of sermon. Hence his strong assertion that all sermons except those which treat of the gospel (*illas quas explicat ut plane innuit fides scripture*)[30] ought to be rejected. This is understandable from one who in his *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae* referred to 'sacred Scripture which is the Catholic faith'[31] and to the Bible as 'one perfect Word proceeding from the mouth of God'.[32]

To follow the example of Christ seemed to Wyclif to be an important consideration, and in the second volume of *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, after stating yet again that to preach the Word of God was a holier work than to celebrate the eucharist and advocating that not only priests but people as well should do it, for it was *opus dignissimum creature*,[33] he went on to say that 'this is confirmed by the words and actions of Christ and we ought to imitate him as much as possible'. He expressed the same convictions in English. 'And herfore Jesus Crist occupyed hym mooste in tho werke of prechyng, and laft other werkes; and this diden his apostils, and herfore God loved hom . . . and herfore Jesus Crist, when he steyghe to heven, enjoyned specialy to all his apostils to preche tho gospel frely to iche man.'[34] To be a preacher was to follow in the steps of the Master, and to be obedient to his command.

Part of Wyclif's enthusiasm for preaching can be attributed to his concern for the poor peasants of England and his desire that the gospel should be

made both intelligible and relevant to them. That he had this concern is evident from the kindly references he made to them and is substantiated by the wild accusations that his social teaching was a significant factor in the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. In fact it was not, because the famous 'doctrine of dominion' was quite incomprehensible to the common people, but it did reveal where the sympathies of Wyclif lay. And behind both the translations of the Bible made by his school and the sending out of the Poor Priests, though more through the latter than the former, was his desire that the poor should have the gospel preached to them. Such preaching had to be in the vernacular (*euangelium in vulgari*), for 'only a sermon in the mother-tongue could be edifying'.[35] The Poor Priests, walking along the roads of England barefooted and dressed in their simple, russet cassocks, preaching as they went, soon became, as Buddensieg puts it, 'the mightiest champions of the new doctrine'.[36] Often using sermon material provided by Wyclif himself, these first Lollards were his answer to the need of the people as he saw it.

Wyclif's own sermons reflect these emphases. As Dr Loserth says: 'It cannot be denied that Wyclif complies in his own sermons with the rather severe demands which he makes upon preachers.'[37] If, as Wyclif said, all sermons other than those that treat of Scripture ought to be rejected, then his own would be retained, for usually the first section of every sermon was concerned with elucidating the meaning of the text. Sometimes, following the accepted procedure in the medieval schools, the literal or historical meaning was treated first, then the mystical, the latter covering what a modern preacher would understand by 'applying the text'. Often before coming to the mystical meaning Wyclif dealt with what he thought might be doubts in the minds of his hearers, and under this heading his views on disendowment, the mendicants, 'Caesarean clergy', the pope of Rome and other controversial themes were bluntly and sometimes violently stated. If it were argued against him that these diatribes could not be considered a reasonable exegesis of the text, doubtless his reply would have been that having expounded the text in the first section, he was furthering biblical religion in a more general sense by denouncing those institutions and people that were plainly contrary to it.

His concern for the people and his desire that they should hear the gospel is shown by the fact that he turned from preaching in Latin to preaching in English. And not only did he change the language; he changed the content and the style. For example, *Sermo* XXV of the Latin sermons has amongst its sub-headings 'Relation of faith to natural reason', 'The errors of philosophers are intellectual', 'All intuitive knowledge comes from God', 'Natural reason does not prevent faith being meritorious but without faith it is not meritorious'. It is true that occasionally in the English sermons one meets with headings like 'Double procession of the Holy Ghost', but most are of the kind 'We are commanded to be hopeful and of good courage', 'The test of the love of Christians is obedience' and 'Repinings, how to be corrected'. Still there is the castigating of the friars, the prelates and the pope—they would not be Wyclif sermons without this—but the themes appeal more to the simple peasant and less to the professional schoolman, and the style is

correspondingly more simple and direct. In this Wyclif would have contended that he was following the example of Christ who spoke plain words in the language of the people.

In his own preaching, in his advocacy of the importance of the ministry of the Word and in the activities of the Poor Priests whom he inspired, Wyclif sought an answer to that neglect and inadequacy of preaching in the fourteenth century against which he protested so strongly. The immediate effects of what he did were limited, for as McFarlane has reminded us, this was 'the Reformation that did not come off'.[38] But nevertheless Wyclif anticipated the time when the ministry of the Word was to come into its own.

[1] *Sermones*, Ed. Dr I. Loserth, p. iv, f.n. 5.
[2] *Of Feigned Contemplative Life, The English Works of Wyclif*, Ed. F. D. Matthew, p. 188.
[3] *Sermo*, XXXIV. *Sermones*, II, p. 247.
[4] Matthew, p. 191.
[5] Matthew, p. 191.
[6] *Select English Works*, ed. T. Arnold, III, 144.
[7] *De Blasphemia*, p. 248.
[8] *Select English Works*, ed. T. Arnold, III, 403.
[9] Matthew, pp. 193-4.
[10] Matthew, p. 441.
[11] *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, II, 156.
[12] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 409.
[13] *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, II, 157.
[14] *De Officio Pastorali*, Matthew, p. 441.
[15] Matthew, p. 441.
[16] Matthew, p. 441.
[17] Matthew, p. 445.
[18] *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, p. 54.
[19] *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century*, p. 29.
[20] *Select English Works*, ed. T. Arnold, III, 376.
[21] Trans. Ford Lewis Battles, Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XIV, p. 52.
[22] *Opera Minora*, p. 331.
[23] *The Religious Orders in England*, Vol. II: 'The End of the Middle Ages', p. 153.
[24] *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century*, p. 29.
[25] G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, p. 220.
[26] John Bromyard, *Summa Predicantium*. Quoted by G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England*, p. 70.
[27] *Sermones*, I, 403.
[28] *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, II, 161.
[29] G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England*, p. 132.
[30] *Sermones*, I, 262.
[31] *Idem*, I, 34.
[32] *Idem*, I, 268.
[33] P. 157.
[34] *Select English Works*, ed. T. Arnold, III, 144.
[35] *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, II, 243.
[36] *Johann Wiclif und seine Zeit*, pp. 169-170.
[37] *Sermones*, I, xi.
[38] *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity*, K. B. McFarlane, p. 188.

THE SERVICE BOOK—ARE WE READY FOR REVISION?

B. Kingston Soper

FEW TASKS ARE MORE URGENT for the Church in this, our pre-Reformation, state than the careful examination of worship. Our theological ferment is of importance, of course, but only because it will eventually filter through to the great body of worshipping Christians by its influence on the background of the preachers' thought; but worship, as Gordon Wakefield says, is the corporate activity of the Church, and so it involves all Christians directly and immediately.[1]

Because of this direct importance, it is necessary for the collective reason of the Church to be exercised fully. All sources of knowledge need to be explored and, in the prevailing climate of mental liberty, we dare not dismiss any facts which may become relevant. It is possible to argue that most of our thinking about worship is still far too narrowly limited, that we are so concentrating on the traditional patterns of the Christian Church—patterns which could themselves be critically examined as, in the Dissentient phrase, 'the worldliness of the Church'[2]—that our thinking is crippled and insights of great value are being refused. I do not say this is so, but I am arguing that experts in hitherto neglected fields of knowledge should tell us if this is so in their opinion.

That the modern derivations from traditional Christian worship, both free and liturgical, are failing to be effective needs no arguing. Church services are hardly ever the psychic events they should be. Two possibilities are crying out to be explored: first, can the sciences of psychology and parapsychology throw light on this failure and, secondly are other, non-Christian, forms of worship serving the needs of their theologies in ways which Christians could also learn to use?

For the first we need a full report from the psychologists themselves. The layman (even the ministerial layman fed on a diet of Pelicans) can only see possible questions, not the answers to them. What practical effect have architecture and furnishings on the experience of worship, for instance? Morton Prince in his study of the multiple personality case of Miss Beauchamp is able to give a full account of a conversation experience: 'The Church was empty, and, as she communed with herself, her feeling of self-despair and hopelessness deepened. Then, of a sudden, all was changed, without her knowing how or why.'[3] But in this case the process had been observed by another personality within the same *psyche*, and it *is* possible to say how and why it happened: 'While Miss Beauchamp was communing with herself, her eyes became fixed upon one of the shining brass lamps in the Church. She went into a hypnotic or trance-like state.... After a short time, Miss Beauchamp awoke, and in waking all the memories which made

up the consciousness of the hypnotic state were forgotten. At first her mind was a blank as far as logical ideas were concerned . . . yet she was filled with emotion: they were the same emotions which belonged to the different memories of the hypnotic state. These emotions persisted.'

These memories and their related emotions Morton Prince was able to tabulate. There is the apparently similar case of M. Ratisbonne, reported by William James.[4] Another example: has anyone followed up Dr Frank Lake's very tentative identification, in depth psychology, between pulpit and male organ, and between altar and female breast? This might explain the different emotional emphases of 'Protestant' and 'Catholic' worship—and of their protagonists. Or, in the realm of parapsychology: if, as Rhine and others have established, telepathy is a verifiable fact, how far is this a factor in creating the 'atmosphere' of a service? The modern English witches believe that, by forming a 'cone of power' through group concentration, they can plant an irresistible suggestion telepathically in the mind of a victim;[5] has this any bearing on the prayer in the vestry before service—or, if not, could it have if we knew what we were doing? Then again, if Jung was right to assert the existence of archetypal patterns of thought, expressed in images, has this any possible bearing on the verbal images used in God's self-revelation in the Scriptures?

Faced by our present failure in worship, we dare not refuse the knowledge the new sciences are now offering to us. To revise our worship without reference to the findings of psychologists is to take up an attitude of almost medieval obscurantism. One prolegomenon urgently needed is the compilation of a list of questions to be put to all the schools of psychology, and a reasoned catalogue of their replies to those questions.

Secondly, have we made any serious attempt to learn from other religions? I am not happy with Wakefield's brief dismissal of Aldous Huxley's mescalin experiences as 'profoundly unchristian',[6] for mescalin is, in fact, used by the Native American Christian Church in their Agapes.[7] This Church may be a deviant form of Christianity, but Slotkin has said of their Agape: 'I have never been in any white man's house of worship where there is either so much religious feeling or decorum.'[8] Wakefield finely says: 'There must be a greater humility, a readiness to learn from "those without" . . . so that 'through our corporate life and praise, something of the supernatural may penetrate our drab subtopias.' But how much serious effort has been used to learn from the worship of non-Christians? They may well have discovered ways of opening the door to the supernatural (which we Christians believe to be an existent fact, and therefore observable by non-Christians, however much they may misinterpret their observations) which we have never practised.

Whatever worship is (perhaps we need a philosophical prolegomenon too?), one of its ends is transcendence of the individual ego. That is one mark of 'corporateness', which must consist in more than mere outward participation in activity. G. M. Tyrrell puts it well: 'The human being is greater than its normal consciousness' for 'the "normal" self is a highly specialized abstraction from the total human personality and is adapted for existence under special circumstances.'[9] Criticisms of worship which aim at

'other-worldly' experiences have mostly been superficial and vapid because they have been based on an unreal opposition between the 'real' world of our conscious minds and a supposedly subjective, non-utilitarian world of fantasy; but it is the 'real' world which is only an abstraction, made by our minds to serve the purposes of our biological survival, from the totality of reality, of which it forms only a few ego-centred aspects. The 'world' from which the New Testament would have us rescued is an artificial construction of thoughts and mental processes which has no need of the hypothesis of a living God; the human *psyche* may be 'naturally Christian' but the conscious ego certainly is not. Is it not possible, then, that those religions which include in their worship techniques whereby the domination of the conscious ego can be relaxed have something to teach us? Does not the Christian soul need, in worship, to 'transcend the ordinary visible world of time'[10] and to meet God in the whole of reality sometimes, instead of exclusively in that abstraction we have made from it?

Such techniques exist in abundance. They exist even in Christianity, but we have used them ignorantly and haphazardly. The dissociation of consciousness caused by elaborate ritual and trance-inducing Church furniture, such as dimly-lit altars and softly gleaming symbols, or the cathartic experience of emotional group-consciousness in old-fashioned revivalism, are valid experiences of transcendance. But overfamiliarity with æsthetic influences in an affluent society on the one hand, and the failure of nerve which now inhibits emotional expression on the other, have reduced the traditional Christian techniques to near impotence. Should we not ask if Zen methods of inducing *satori* by mental enlightenment can help us to recapture the experience of transcendence? Or, if the Tibetans are right in teaching that the intelligent use of rhythms, in music and in speech, can lift the worshipper out of the self-isolation of his conscious and habitual frame of mind? Dare we, faced with our failure, simply assume that the collective dance-activity of Voodoo (however repulsive its theology) is irrelevant to Europeans, or that the physical-mental discoveries of the more sophisticated Sufi dervish-dancers need not be considered when studying worship? Are we quite sure that we have nothing to learn from Tantric Hinduism about the Christian use of sex experience as a method of transcendence? Can we even ignore the Menomini mescalin-eaters, or the toadstool-using Portuguese witches or the effect of tobacco-juice on the Peeayman of British Guiana? If ego-transcendence is part of the activity of worship, the experiences and experiments of other worshippers must be compared with our own.

Christian worship as it has evolved is no less a human activity—part of the 'worldliness of the Church', to quote the Dissentients' provocative phrase again—than the ways of the heathen. If we do not believe in the verbal inspiration of Cranmer's, in many ways excellent, Prayer-Book, or that the hymn-sandwich is bread from heaven in more than a metaphorical sense, we need—desperately—to compare the effectiveness of our forms of worship with all others. This is not to deny the uniqueness of Christian worship, but, to avoid the danger of idolatry, we need to remember that only the Divine side of its dialogue, God's self-revelation through His Word, is unique. The traditional form of our response can legitimately be compared with the

forms used in other religions, and we should not revise our worship before we have seen if we can learn from them.

A second prolegomenon is urgently needed, therefore: a comparative study of all techniques of worship, together with a judgement on the permissibility and utility of each according to the principles of Holy Scripture. Until this is done, revisers of the Book of Offices may well be only one-eyed men in the kingdom of the blind.

It is not satisfactory to end the article here, but a Circuit Minister normally has neither the time nor the opportunity to do more than ask questions. Let me end with a few more.

Could Conference give two or three brethren a sabbatical year, during which they could produce at least some answers to the question: How can psychology and parapsychology help us to evaluate the effectiveness of our forms of worship? And could two or three more be allowed time to answer the equally relevant question: What forms of worship, if any, used by other religions could profitably be added to the Christian vocabulary of worship? And could someone with more knowledge of both psychology and of comparative religion formulate these two questions more exactly than the present writer can do, as an introduction to these two studies? Then this article could be regarded as the foreword to an as-yet-unwritten introduction to two yet-to-be produced prolegomena to the preparation of a new Service Book. These are the thoughts which prompt me to ask if we are ready to begin the actual revision yet.

[1] Gordon S. Wakefield, 'The Rationale of Public Worship', *London Quarterly & Holborn Review*, July 1964.
[2] *Report on the Conversations*, p. 58.
[3] Morton Prince. *The Dissociation of a Personality*, Ch. 21.
[4] W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, Lecture X.
[5] Perhaps the best-known claim concerning this was made by Doris Hughes, Priestess of the late Dr Gardner's Coven, who, with several other covens, met in the New Forest in 1940 and influenced Hitler's mind to avert invasion, according to their own account.
[6] Gordon S. Wakefield, op. cit.
[7] Aldous Huxley, *The Doors of Perception*, Pelican, p. 57.
[8] Quoted Huxley, op. cit.
[9] G. M. Tyrrell, *The Nature of Human Personality*, p. 61.
[10] Evelyn Underhill, *Worship*, p. 2.

THE ULTIMATE PURPOSE OF SCIENCE
Reflections of a Non-Scientist

William E. Spruce

A POPULAR SCIENCE MAGAZINE recently invited essays on the question 'What is Science For?'. Questions and answers begetting still more questions are inherent in the pursuit of science, and it is only right that, with the answers leaping forward spectacularly and their application impinging more and more on people's lives, the people, who cannot expect to cope with the knowledge acquired by the scientists, should ask, 'To What Purpose?'.

The solution of any scientific problem depends, primarily, on the clarity with which the problem is stated. The word 'science' itself has different meanings for different people and should be qualified to indicate the precise meaning intended. For this purpose the short dictionary definition 'knowledge systematically arranged', seems adequate, but knowledge and the systematic arrangement of knowledge are continually changing as further knowledge is acquired. Consequently, inquiry into the purpose of science as here defined must be restricted to the science of the present time, while seeking to adumbrate its future course. Therefore, the question underlying this inquiry will require to be very precisely worded as 'For what ultimate purpose is science engaged, here and now, in the systematic arrangement of knowledge?'.

Nevertheless, the present being born out of the past, it will be advisable, as a preliminary approach, to review, briefly, the significant changes which have occurred in the main conclusions drawn from the results of scientific investigation throughout the history of science.

Since the days when abstract speculation declined in Greece and science was founded, as it is generally agreed, by Aristotle, there has been built up an imposing series of intellectual answers to intellectual questions. The main feature of these, for the non-scientist, is that the questions have become progressively more incisive as the answers revealed a progressively increasing percipience. Aristotle saw nature as essentially animal and gave to matter springs of action driven by an obstinate animal will. Earthy masses were driven to find rest at the centre of the earth. Air was driven upwards. The universe was kept going by the tension of the elements. It was an idea of nature striving to attain to an ideal order, which, once achieved, would bring such striving to an end. This idea of a disorderly world striving to achieve the ideal of how it ought to be persisted up to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Galileo overthrew the physical conceptions of Aristotle, but it was left to Newton to show that motion between masses was produced by gravitational forces which held the universe together—a very different picture from that of Aristotle's disorderly world, and for three

hundred years the idea of the inevitability of cause and effect, to which the laws of gravity gave birth, held sway and became the general approach to all scientific problems. Indeed, the question with which we are concerned here must inevitably involve a searching for the effects of engaging in scientific activities. It should be pointed out, however, that for branches of science which are concerned with human behaviour, such as economics or psychology, insistence on a causal system has not always brought good results. Causality, although still powerful in scientific thought, received a severe shaking when, early this century, Einstein overthrew the laws of gravity. Newton had assumed a time and space alike for all observers, whereas there can only be a 'here and now' for each observer, with space and time inextricably interwoven. Another discovery which upset causality as the infallible scientific law was quantum physics, which could not be made to fit the classical mechanics of small particles. In quantum theory energy is not continuous, but discharged in quanta or discrete units. It is not possible to describe the present and future of these particles when sending out or taking up a quantum of energy, and this gave rise to the principle of uncertainty. What is important about this discovery is that these events about which quantum physics is concerned are the sort of events which happen in the nerves and brain and the molecules which determine the qualities we inherit. The laws of gravitation had proved most useful in arriving at an excellent approximation to truth, but it has required the law of uncertainty to achieve still more accurate results. Uncertainty may seem to be a strange basis on which to attempt to formulate more accurate results, but it must be conceded that once it had been proved that the laws of gravitation were not infallible, uncertainty had to be accepted as a fact, and provided for.

The aim of science today is not only to arrange knowledge in a systematic order, but also to predict, as accurately as possible, the foreseeable results of a choice of actions based on that knowledge. Uncertainty may seem to have upset the inevitability of causality, and yet it can be formulated with as much rigour as the old laws of cause and effect. The inevitable effect becomes the probable trend and the possible fluctuations from that trend, which can be stated as definite statistical differences. It is indeed fortunate that, with the ever-increasing momentum of scientific discovery, scientists are now learning to use the law of uncertainty and design their method to fit the law. It is much better to be almost sure, knowing the precise scope of the 'almost', than to be completely sure and eventually find one is not quite right. It is in this sense that statistics and the computer are coming into their own as tools of science, covering a much wider field of human experience than has hitherto been possible. Plato despised machines as degrading the science of geometry. Gödel, however, in 1931, proved it was possible to formulate theorems which could not be definitely said to be true or false, even in such an accurate science as geometry, and science had to prepare for measuring uncertainties. Computers have been constructed and elaborated as the complexities of the required information grew, to cope with the needs of scientific prediction. They are fed with knowledge systematically arranged by the human intellect, and, as such,

are not only tools of science but also of the intellect itself. If the intellect makes a mistake in the information fed to the machine, the mistake is inevitably repeated in the machine. Nevertheless, within this uncertainty deriving from the intellect's fallibility, computers can assimilate knowledge, and still further knowledge, as it becomes known, and thus furnish predictions which can be continually brought into line with the growth of knowledge. The computer helps the scientist in his aim of predicting by combining fact and knowledge scientifically arranged by the human intellect, at much greater speed and accuracy than would otherwise be possible.

Even so, there will always remain the additional uncertainties deriving from the unpredictable future. So long as science remains true to its purpose, however, of ascertaining provable truth, scientific predictions will remain useful and reliable guides to the future ordering of our lives, based on reliable knowledge of the known uncertainties. The unknown uncertainties which remain can thus become minimal, and perhaps restricted to the unpredictable vagaries of human behaviour. Jules Verne and H. G. Wells were once thought of as writers of science *fiction*. It is not too fanciful today to conceive of some planet being discovered to be so congenial to human living that a mass emigration from our own world ensues. Or our political fears might drive us so to pollute the atmosphere with nuclear bomb testing that it becomes impossible to carry out further experiments even for peaceful purposes. Such events would derive from human behaviour in its use of scientific knowledge, and the science of today cannot predict uncertainties of this nature. They would represent pyrrhic victories for science, yet they would in no way alter or deflect the purpose of science so to order the knowledge gained thereby as to be able to predict, within the then known limits, what to expect in the future.

It has been pointed out that the effective solution of any scientific problem demands clarity of statement in setting out the problem in the first place. This involves clarity and simplicity in the language used, and emphasizes the need for science to implement its aim of orderly description and explanation of the universe, and all that can be observed within its vast scope, in unambiguous terms. Scientific phraseology should be so clear that every facet of every observation can be seen in its true relationship to the problem under consideration. The interrelationships of bodies, particles, micro-organisms and men are so infinite in variety that it has been necessary for science to specialize increasingly to enable each subject to be comprehensively studied. These specialized studies may enable the specialist to become well versed in his own particular subject, but at the expense of acquiring only a very general knowledge of other subjects, even within his own branch of science. This has led to the building up of a specialist jargon. This scientific jargon represents a formidable barrier between what are known as the two cultures. On one side of the barrier are the specialist scientists, tirelessly working in and pushing forward their own particular furrows, sometimes duplicating research on overlapping problems, sometimes coming into violent conflict with furrows which cross their path (e.g. Dr P. F. Browne's recent challenge to the widely-held view

that the universe is expanding; he contends that the universe is a self-contained object, in which matter is being constantly created and destroyed). On this side of the barrier there is a rapidly increasing growth of specialized knowledge (systematically arranged in scientific jargon), and a decreasing ability to handle the whole of this vast accumulation of knowledge and explain it to those on the other side of the barrier. If one of the purposes of science is to describe the universe and its integral parts in orderly language, it will require to set its own house in order in this respect. A pointer in this direction is the work that is at present being done on machines to codify the existing written work of science, and a combining of these with 'teaching machines' may eventually make it much easier to arrange and integrate the bewildering profusion of scientific knowledge. On the other side of the barrier is the non-scientist, wanting to understand, but not provided with the means of understanding. In some respects, science is becoming an international language, with scientists of all nations pooling their ideas and knowledge. Yet the non-scientist is left on the other side of the barrier, ignorant and fearful; ignorant because he cannot interpret scientific jargon—fearful, because of his ignorance, and this fear of science can easily lead to a subjective hatred of scientists.

In the world of today, with the vast increase in the application of scientific method, the purpose of science should more than ever include the dissemination of truth in clearly understandable phraseology. Thus from science as the expression of ideas in provable form, man may improve his art, or acquired skill, in living. The scientist should continue to insist on the 'truths' he discovers being rigorously tested and proved by observation, and subject them to the principle of uncertainty. Then, by his use of these truths made freely known to him, man will enter a fuller life.

Scientists are aware that the truths they discover, although based on factual observations, are not necessarily the whole truth. Facts are not 'truth' in the sense of that which is eternally true. What we know as the facts of life merely describe the results of scientific observations. Appearances are often deceptive, as scientists well know. The observations which supported the laws of gravitation were held to be true for three hundred years and were then proved to be wrong. Scientists know that the truths they discover were there all the time, awaiting their discovery, and that these truths themselves lead to, and will be eventually overshadowed by, higher truths, through an infinity of time and space. Scientists are dimly aware of spiritual truths in the realm of the mind, even the threshold of which they have barely commenced to cross. Religion says that we can only prove spiritual truths by faith. Can they be proved eventually by science? The lights at the road crossing are a simple example of man's use of the results of scientific experiment: but the pedestrian crosses the road, not because he has faith in the lights, but because he has faith in the drivers on the road observing the lights, and in his own judgement of their intentions. Is this an example of science working in conjunction with spiritual faith? The scientists seeking a cure for cancer would not continue to submit themselves to the exacting disciplines of research and still further research unless they had a supreme faith in their ability eventually to discover the means of saving mankind from this par-

ticular scourge. Their purpose is not only to discover the means, but also the much deeper, spiritual purpose of expressing love for their fellow men by the alleviation of physical suffering. If scientists are today aiming for the moon, it is not only because it is there, a challenging object to be aimed at, but principally because of the 'challenge' which, once overcome, will enable man to gain a more comprehensive knowledge of his place in the cosmos (and no doubt a deeper sense of spiritual humility).

Within the self-imposed disciplines of rigorously testing and re-testing every scientific truth revealed by scientific method, the one ultimate purpose of science, transcending all the minor but so important purposes of the various branches of science (space exploration, curative medicine, anthropological research, etc.), remains philosophical, spiritual—Man's inescapable, unceasing, spiritual endeavour *to satisfy his eternal desire to know himself* in his relationship to the infinity of the Universe.

SHEPHERDS OF THE FLOCK AND STEWARDS IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD

Wilfred Tooley

THE METAPHORS steward and shepherd play a large part in describing the functions of a Methodist Minister. The Deed of Union (para. 30) asserts that 'Christ's ministers in the Church are Stewards in the Household of God and Shepherds of his flock . . .' and this is constantly reflected in the Ordination Service (q.v.). The purpose of this article is to examine briefly the biblical content of these images. We begin with the term 'steward' (Greek—*oikonomos*).

The noun *oikonomos* is not frequent in the New Testament, and is almost entirely Pauline or deutero-pauline. It is used literally of a household servant (Luke 16^{1-8}) and a city treasurer (Rom. 16^{23}), while in Galatians it is used as a synonym for the term *epitropos*, a guardian. There are, however, three significant passages where the metaphor is related to the work of a leader in the Christian Church.

1. *Corinthians* 4^{1-2}

The immediate significance here is seen in the association with '*uperetes*' where the common factor is that both terms emphasize the subordinate status of a Christian leader, a theme underlying the whole of the previous chapter where the pre-eminence of God is reiterated in a succession of metaphors (e.g. vv. 6-7, 11). The cardinal sin of the Corinthians is that being offered the gospel has become a source of pride rather than humility (4^{8}).

The subordinate status of the Christian leader is further underlined in the term 'musterion' used in 4^{1}. The term first appears in 2^{1} where it is 'another term for the gospel' and thus something to be proclaimed.[1] For Paul it is nothing less than an insight into the innermost depths of the Godhead (2^{9-10}) which has been revealed by the Spirit who alone can search 'the depths of God'. Clearly any Christian ministry depends on how a man responds to this revelation.

The true sign of the steward, therefore, is that he will faithfully proclaim God's '*musterion*', which at this point must be translated into words and actions; 'we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit . . .'. Thus the 'tradition' of the Church is born and it must be guarded and transmitted meticulously by faithful men empowered by God's Spirit. This is the significance of the adjective *pistos* (faithful) in 4^{2}, and the term occurs frequently in conjunction with the metaphor (note for example in the appended homiletic morals to Luke 16^{1-8} the adage in v. 10). We can see Paul discharging his duty as a steward in chapters 5-7 of this epistle and his authority is expressed in 7^{25}, 'I give my opinion as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy' (*pistos*).

2. *Titus 1*[7]

By the time of the pastorals the bishop is being described as God's steward and the general theme is the careful oversight and organization of the Church's life (1[5]) and the guarding of its doctrines (1[9]). As steward, the bishop must be of impeccable character and 'he must hold firm to the sure word as taught so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also to confute those who contradict it'. Since the Church is 'the pillar and bulwark of truth' there is throughout the Pastorals a pregnant use of the adjective '*pistos*'; there are the 'faithful sayings' which seem to be related to doctrinal formulae (e.g. 1. Tim. 1[15] and not surely meaning, as Bernard, 'worthy of universal acceptation')[2] and significantly the 'faithful men' of 2 Tim. 2[2]; 'and what you have heard from me before many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also'. The work of these leaders may be identified with that of the bishop in Titus and it underlines the paramount concern of the Pastorals with guarding the Church against error.

3. *1 Peter 4*[10]

The metaphor is part of the wider 'family' metaphor of this epistle. The steward is responsible for sharing the gifts given him by God and such gifts fall into two simple categories, teaching and practical ministry. Those entrusted with teaching must speak as uttering 'oracles of God', not, we may add, as purveyors of their own notions.

We may at this stage, therefore, say three things of the metaphor; it emphasizes the subordinate and derivative character of every ministry, it involves proclaiming the gospel entrusted to men by God, and this in turn involves guarding the doctrine of the Church and preserving the quality of its life and worship. In this latter regard, Paul's insistence on 'imitation' (e.g. 1 Cor. 4[16] and especially 1 and 2 Thess.) is significant. In these epistles, he is as a Christian Rabbi charged to be a steward of a Torah which he must expound, interpret and transmit.

The term *oikonomia* is clearly associated with the metaphor and again is generally restricted to the Pauline corpus.[3] There is a distinct development in its content. In 1 Cor. 9[17] it means simply 'assignment', the steward's task to preach the gospel. In Colossians and Ephesians, however, the meaning is much wider and eventually the term covers the whole *Heilsgeschichte* of God (Eph. 1[10] and 3[2, 9]).[4] At the same time, this fuller interpretation is related most intimately to the Church and to be a proclaimer of God's 'plan for the fullness of time' involves being a minister (*diakonos*) of the Church. This is most clearly affirmed in Col. 1[24–25] but it also underlies the whole argument of Eph. 1-3. The faithful interpretation and proclamation of God's eternal purposes depend upon the fidelity of those called to lead in the Church of God. Proclaiming God's cosmic purpose and guarding the life and teaching of the Church are one and the same task. We only add that if *oikonomia* in 1 Tim. 1[4] also means 'divine plan' this reflects the theme of Colossians and Ephesians.[5] Thus Timothy is urged not to permit members of the Christian family 'to occupy themselves with myths and endless

genealogies which promote speculations' but to concentrate on the 'master plan' of God entrusted to the Church.

We must note again that this metaphor is basically Pauline, and its application to the Christian ministry and the proclamation and worship of the Church suggests that it can only be understood in the light of Paul's rabbinic training and how he assessed the status and function of the authoritative interpreters of Torah. Paul's own attitude to the Law is well reflected in his epistles; in Romans 2[20] he declares it to be the 'embodiment of knowledge and truth' and he was intensely aware of the privilege accorded his kinsmen who had been 'entrusted with the oracles of God' (3[2]). Paul himself remained a Pharisee observing the Law throughout his life (e.g. Acts 16[3]; 21[26]; 23[6]). This in no way clashed with his allegiance to Christ, for Paul believed himself to be living in the Messianic Age when the Mosaic Law would be fulfilled. Thus Paul could obey the Torah of Jesus without being disloyal to the Torah of his fathers. For Paul, Christ was the new Torah to be obeyed, interpreted and expounded, the Church was the new Israel.

While all Christians share the Spirit and so have insight into 'the depths of God' there are those (as in the old Israel) who are entrusted with the interpretation and communication of the 'tradition'.[6]

Shepherds of the Flock

In contrast to 'steward', this metaphor shows no pattern of use except that it plays no part in Paul's theology. The verb 'to shepherd' does, however, occur in Acts 20[28] (Paul's speech to the elders at Ephesus) where it is used in close association with the non *episkopos* and in the context of preaching and teaching (note verses 27 and 30-31). The only other deutero-pauline reference is Eph. 4[11]; 'and his gifts were that some . . . should be . . . pastors and teachers', where the terms are synonymous 'teacher' simply specifying the content of the less explicit 'pastor'. Paul himself never uses the latter title and refers to teachers (Rom. 12[7]; 1 Cor. 12[28]). The teachers' functions would no doubt be to interpret and hand on the Church's tradition, they would be local leaders, contrasting with the itinerant prophets whose concern was with the apocalyptic secrets of the future (e.g. Rev. 22[6]).

The most extensive pastoral application of the metaphor is in 1 Peter 5[1–5] and several features are reminiscent of Acts 20[28], particularly the relation with the noun *episkospos* (see 1 Peter 2[25]) and its cognate verb.

We must note the term 'Chief Shepherd' used of Christ, as it has certain implications in the relation of Christ to those who have pastoral charge in the Christian community. Such men share Christ's functions, and the term 'Chief Shepherd' of itself implies the existence of under-shepherds, so that we must postulate an order of under-shepherds standing, as it were, between Christ and the flock. The under-shepherds here are the presbyters and it is clear from other New Testament occurrences that such men possessed some kind of authorized pastoral office. We may compare them with the 'leaders' mentioned in 1 Thess. 5[12]. Their work (to tend) must be interpreted in the widest sense as general care of the flock, an interpretation supported by the epexegetical participle *episkopountes* in verse 2. The nature of the oversight is of course dominated by the theme of the epistle, the meekness of

Christ and the *imitatio Christi*. The term '*kleroi*' which occurs in the passage probably refers to the spheres of pastoral care assigned to the presbyters.

The only other passage where the metaphor has distinct pastoral reference is John 21[15ff.] which deals with the vindication of Peter after his three-fold denial. Since the episode is cast in the pastoral image and related to Peter, one expects some affinity with John 10 and earlier Petrine references; neither is lacking. The *point d'appui* of this episode and Ch. 10 is that the shepherd gives his life for the flock. As the Good Shepherd lays down his life so Peter will 'stretch out (his) hands'. This is a clear reference to crucifixion and is further clarified in verse 19. It is after this prediction of death that Christ says to Peter, 'Follow me', and this must be appreciated in terms of 13[36–38], 'Where I am going you cannot follow me now but you shall follow afterward'. Peter's response is, 'Lord, why cannot I follow you now? I will lay down my life for you.' For Peter, following and dying are intrinsically related and 21[15f.] is written to substantiate this.

All other non-synoptic uses of the metaphor centre in Christ as the Messiah who dies for his people. John 10, a symbolic discourse on the death of Christ, expounds this most clearly. The theme is that Christ alone 'is the only means of entry into the messianic community' and thus only those who trust him are assured of God's salvation. The whole discourse is clearly Messianic (v. 24: 'If you are the Messiah say so plainly', *N.E.B.*) and the outstanding feature is the assertion that the messianic shepherd must die *in order to protect* the flock. This assertion obviously has no Old Testament background and must arise from the author's meditation on the crucifixion. Jesus' messianic claims have been proved authentic and those who believe in him 'shall never perish'. He is the true messianic shepherd who will indeed save his people.

The shepherd reference of Heb. 13[20–21] follows the same theme, viz, God's salvation secured by 'the great shepherd of the sheep'. This is seen in the description of God as the 'God of peace' (the Hebrew *shalom* means salvation). The God of salvation exercises his power in raising Jesus from the dead and Jesus thus becomes the leader of those who, animated by the same power, are enabled to do God's will; He is thus the 'Great Shepherd of the Sheep', a title equivalent to 'high priest of the good things that have come' (9[11]; cf. 10[21]) and 'pioneer of man's salvation' (12[2]). When one notes how in the Apocalypse the verb 'to shepherd' is always used of the consummation, i.e. God's salvation, one realizes that for the early church the metaphor was used primarily to assert the genuine messiahship of Jesus, the titles 'Good Shepherd', 'Great Shepherd', and 'Chief Shepherd' witness to this.

How then did Jesus use the metaphor? Here the evidence is complex and can only be assessed by careful analysis of the synoptic occurrences. We give here only a brief résumé of the evidence which can be placed in three categories.

1. *Christ's Mission*

This theme is reflected in the best authenticated sayings of Jesus. Thus in Mark 6[34] (cf. Matt. 9[36]) Jesus has compassion on the untaught and therefore unprepared people who are as sheep without a shepherd; the original reference here is to Christ's teaching ministry. The theme is continued when

Christ calls men and sends them to 'the lost sheep of the House of Israel' (Matt. 10^{6}; 15^{24}). All this is restricted to Israel, i.e. God's flock; its leaders have failed and God is calling new shepherds to tend his people. This aspect of the metaphor is further developed *à propos* the Church. The Church itself becomes the flock and we have the warning of false teachers who will attempt to destroy it (Matt. 7^{15}; cf. Acts 20^{29}), the warning of persecution (Matt. 10^{16}; Lk. 10^{3} and there is no evidence that the disciples were ever in peril) and the promise of the Kingdom to be given to the flock at the consummation (Lk. 12^{32}).

2. *Christ's death*

The crucial text is Mk. 14^{27-28}/Matt. 26^{31} and whether the words are *verba Christi* is far from clear. The O.T. reference is to Zech. 13^{7}, which probably refers to a high priest, and simply reflects the basic O.T. association of the image, the activity of ruling. Although Dr V. Taylor asserts 'to trace the quotation to later Christian reflection is unnecessary in view of the frequent use by Jesus of imagery connected with sheep and shepherds'[7] this use is not as frequent as generally supposed; moreover, this is the only synoptic reference to the death of the shepherd and may well be later Christian reflection on the death of Jesus.

3. *The Consummation*

We need only comment that such passages as Lk. 12^{32} and Matt. 25^{31} reflect two aspects of the consummation, the final security of the flock (a theme developed in John 10) and the final separation in judgement.

The Old Testament

The shepherd metaphor is frequent in the O.T. where the basic association is the activity of ruling which includes leading, protecting and delivering. It is therefore used for God's salvation effected either by God directly (Jer. 23^{3}; Ezek. 34) or through his agent (e.g. Cyrus Isa. 44^{28}). It is also used of false shepherds who do not protect the people of Israel (Jer. 50^{6-7}).

We would agree therefore with Dr Jeremias when he asserts that 'the metaphor reflects the security of Israel under its God as scarcely does any other expression'.[8] We must add, however, that this protection and security is conceived in political and military terms (e.g. Isa. 40^{29} and Ezek. 37^{24} where the prophet 'wants a partial political understanding of the form of the future leader').[9] This is significant because in the N.T. the title becomes wholly 'religious'. God's rule is deliverance from sin not from military domination (Lk. 15^{3-7}) and Jesus leads men not into political freedom but into the presence of God. Similarly, his protection is not from death or persecution but from sin and the devil and these are the facts which the infant Church asserts.

Conclusion

The aim of this survey has been to examine two metaphors relating to the Christian ministry and our conclusions therefore do not attempt any

'theology of ordination' so much as to point out directions for thought.

We may note one fact of immediate interest: neither metaphor is given any missionary connotation. Indeed, such metaphors as the Church may have used in this regard, e.g. fishers of men, remain undeveloped. Perhaps this is because the work of mission was from the outset regarded as the work of the whole Church and not of any 'order' within it. The first responsibility of leadership, therefore, is (under God) to the Church and any calling within the Church (as, for example, that recognized in ordination) only has meaning in that reference. Neither metaphor would support that interpretation of ministry which isolates it from the whole Christian community. At the same time both metaphors imply a form of 'separated' ministry. This is most clearly seen in the ideas associated with the steward metaphor, with its strong rabbinic background, and a fuller survey than we have given here suggests that in some parts of the early Church there may have been a parallel development with the Jewish tannaitic system which differentiated between those scribes able and not able to expound Torah.

We must assert, however, that the whole weight of the steward metaphor centres on Christ, and when first used (in 1 Cor.) it is to assert the subordinate and derivative ministry of the Christian leader. This ministry has its origin in receiving from God an insight into his being and purpose and the steward is accordingly responsible to God for the way he guards and hands on this truth which is proclaimed in two supreme ways, preaching (which includes teaching) and the good ordering of the Church's life which will involve such diverse aspects as the healing of disputes and the proper celebrating of the Lord's Supper, though these are not unrelated, as can well be seen in 1 Cor. 11^{17ff}. When Paul speaks of himself as a steward it is to be a rabbi of the new Torah of Christ, a Torah which must be guarded, expounded and interpreted, a task which is still relevant today.

With the shepherd metaphor the emphasis is again on Christ; men become shepherds of the flock because Christ is the 'Chief Shepherd', 'Great Shepherd', and 'Good Shepherd', and again teaching is the paramount theme. Shepherd is a synonym for teacher (Eph. 5^{11}) and the majority of Christ's uses of the metaphor refer to his teaching ministry to those who had been forsaken by their spiritual leaders. This metaphor also emphasizes the purpose of teaching, which is to reveal the salvation (or in terms of the metaphor, the security) of God. The shepherd's work is to ensure that by sound teaching God's people will not fall prey to the false securities of religious quacks and misguided fanatics—the wiles of the devil. The only real security for men is that offered by Jesus Christ and paradoxically by a dying Christ who promises to the flock that it will enter God's Kingdom. This security is therefore wholly religious (not physical or political, as in the Old Testament) and the 'under-shepherds' have to share the suffering and sacrifice of the Good Shepherd in order to witness to the final security which rests in Christ. Clearly they must call the Church to the same way of self-renunciation in order to witness to God's salvation. This way of self-denial is the theme of John 10 and of John 21, where it is related to the pastoral ministry. The same theme of salvation is seen in the Apocalypse where the verb 'to shepherd' describes the final security of the faithful at the consumma-

tion (7[17]) or, conversely, the final destruction of evil (2[27]; 12[5]; 19[15]). This salvation is for those who 'have come out of the great tribulation', i.e. those who have emerged faithful from suffering and death and now find their true security in the presence of Christ.

When addressing the ordinands, the President exhorts them to 'consider with yourselves the end of your ministry' an exercise which it may be hoped will be constant for those called to lead the Church of God. The promises made by ordinands to such questions as 'Are you determined . . . to instruct the people committed to your charge?' 'Will you be ready . . . to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines?' are basic to fulfilling their calling as stewards and shepherds of the Church. Similarly it is right that the authority for this task is symbolized in receiving the Bible, for steward or shepherd must be a teacher, i.e. a propounder of the salvation offered by Christ through his Word, and he must be one who is called and prepared to lead God's people in the dangerous path of self-renunciation to prove that life itself is only finally secure in the presence of God; 'Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you should follow in his steps'. He did this as 'Shepherd and Guardian' of men's souls. The authority of the Christian leader will not be found in any formal act of recognition, but will be revealed (and accepted) in so far as he shares in the ministry of the one who out of his compassion for men taught them the reality of God and also walked the way of suffering and self-giving to prove that life is finally secure when placed in the hand of God. If a man does this as Christ did it, he will be both steward in God's household and shepherd of God's flock.

[1] J. Moffatt, 1 *Corinthians*, M.N.T.C., 1951, p. 23.
[2] J. H. Bernard, *The Pastoral Epistles*, C.G.T., 1922, p. 32.
[3] It occurs in 1 Cor., Col., Eph. and 1 Tim.
[4] Note the close association with '*musterion*' and cf. 1. Cor. 4.
[5] C. Spicq (*Epitres Pastorales*, Paris, 1947, p. 21) maintains this interpretation, though most commentators disagree.
[6] The origin of Paul's metaphor may thus be traced to Jesus' use of 'the keys' metaphor (Matt. 16[19]; 23[13]; Lk. 11[52]). This image was a significant one in Rabbinic Theology.
[7] *St Mark*, 1957, p. 548.
[8] *Theologisches Worterbuch zum N.T.*, Vol. vi, 1959, p. 501, n. 22.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 487.

Background information and further evidence for statements and conclusions in this article are contained in the dissertation *The Nature and Function of the primitive Christian ministry from an examination of the relevant N.T. metaphors*, deposited in the libraries of Didsbury College and the University of Bristol.

SHORTER SURVEY

John T. Wilkinson

THE Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961 (Oxford University Press, 45*s.*) from the prolific pen of Bishop Stephen Neil contains the Firth Lectures delivered in the University of Nottingham in 1962. Balanced in judgement and characteristically lucid, it proves fascinating reading. Covering the wide field of New Testament criticism from the revolution in New Testament study associated with Strauss and F. C. Baur, and passing through the intricacies of German scholarship and the pressures of Form-Criticism to the bearing of the Qumran Scrolls upon the New Testament, it is a masterly survey of the history of modern scholarship on the subject, and reveals the astonishing range of the writer's knowledge. Written with great insight deliberately for the non-specialist rather than the expert, it affords the right perspective for a thorough understanding of the New Testament, and should be required reading for every theological student. It is an excellent book.

Students of patristic literature will welcome two books. An additional volume—*De Baptismo*—to the number of Tertullian's treatises already translated by Dr Ernest Evans. *Tertullian's Homily on Baptism* (S.P.C.K., 35*s.*) contains the Latin and English texts side by side with an introduction and commentary. Also *God in Patristic Thought*, by G. L. Prestige, first published in 1936 and now reprinted in a paper edition (S.P.C.K., 17*s.* 6*d.*), 'assembles the evidence for what the Greek Fathers, the men whose constructive thought underlies the Creeds, really thought and taught about God'.

For the Western world the three and a half centuries between the sack of Rome in 410 by Alaric and the Visigoths and the accession of Charlemagne in 786 formed a period of crisis which gravely threatened civilization. In the midst of the confusion the Church was a stronghold and the developing monastic movement played an important part in its preservation. *Monks and Civilisation*, by Jean Decarreaux (Allen & Unwin, 50*s.*)—a translation by Charlotte Haldane of *Les Moines et la Civilisation* (Paris, 1962)—is a most readable account of the monastic influence during this period. The author treats his subject within a geographical framework, bringing into highlight certain outstanding figures associated with 'these missionary enterprises that were in due course to become missions of civilization'. This altogether attractive book contains excellently produced plates, a number of maps showing monastic distribution and also a useful chronological table.

The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, edited by Charles S. Dessain (Vol. XIII), and with Vincent F. Blehl. S.J. (Vol. XV) (Nelson, 80*s.* each). The letters in Volume XIII (January 1849 to June 1850) are chiefly concerned with the problems arising out of the foundation of the two

Oratories, in Birmingham and London, the movement having been concentrated until the beginning of 1849 at St Wilfrid's, Cheadle, in Staffordshire, where Fr Faber still remained as master of novices. Moving to Alcester Street, Birmingham, Newman opened a chapel early in February and became deeply immersed in pastoral labours amongst the poor Irish driven over by the Great Famine. In April he found it necessary to divide the Oratorians into two groups, and Faber departed from St. Wilfrid's for London. These letters reveal Newman's skill in endeavouring to control these new developments, subject as they were to personal strains, not least in the case of Faber himself. In particular they show Newman's insistence upon the importance of the intellectual and literary side of the religious life. Amidst the stresses of his pastoral labours he wrote *Discourses to Mixed Congregations* (1849) and delivered the *Lectures on Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans* (1850). The year saw the early stages of the Newman-Achilli crisis with which Vol. XIV (noted in the October issue of the present *Review*) was much occupied. Volume XV (January 1852 to December 1853) is largely concerned with the complexities of the trial in June 1852. During these months the threat of imprisonment hung over Newman. Unexpectedly his leading counsel asked for a new trial, which was refused, and at last, in January 1853, Newman was sentenced to a fine of £100 with imprisonment till it should be paid. Despite the stress Newman delivered the first five of his *Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education*, and in innumerable letters expounded his views on the purpose of a Catholic University. In the autumn of 1853 he was invited to Dublin to establish the Catholic University of Ireland. Upon all these important issues these letters shed great illumination.

The Reformation in its own Words, by H. J. Hillerbrand (S.C.M., 60*s*.) should prove an invaluable volume for all students of this period. It undertakes to tell the story of the Reformation by a collection of extracts from contemporary sources, and contains a wealth of letters, official documents, pamphlets and sermons, together with excellent and well-chosen illustrations. The approach is historical rather than theological, and this accounts for certain omissions. The chapters (each with a useful introduction and followed by excellent book-lists) are grouped around the main figures—Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, the Radical Reformers, the consolidation of the Reformation in Germany, the developments in England and Scotland, and finally, the Counter-Reformation. Containing an immense amount of information arranged with great skill, this notable anthology leaves a vivid impression of the whole movement.

The declared aim of the 'Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics' is 'to let Christians of the sixteenth century speak to those of the twentieth'. The first volume to be published is *William Tyndale* (Sutton Courtenay Press, 36*s*.), edited by G. E. Duffield, a distinguished Anglican layman, who supplies a useful introduction. The book contains an extensive selection from Tyndale's biblical writings—the first for more than a century—together with material from his theological treatises never previously reprinted. The publication of a translation of John Calvin's *Commentaries* on the New Testament, under the editorship of Drs D. E. and T. F. Torrance, makes

available a rich deposit of exegetical material for the preaching and teaching of the Gospel. Translated by T. A. Smail, the volume on *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: The Epistles of Paul to Timothy, Titus and Philemon* (Oliver & Boyd, 30*s.*) has just been issued. *Zwingli, A Reformed Theologian* (the A. K. Warfield lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary), by Jaques Courvoisier (Epworth Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*), forms an excellent introduction for those unacquainted with this great reformer.

The Grace of the Law: A Study in Puritan Theology, by E. F. Kevan (Carey Kingsgate Press, 30*s.*), is a doctoral thesis and a distinct contribution to the study of religion in the seventeenth century. The Puritans stemmed the tide of moral indifference in their own time by an unyielding stress upon the authority of the Mosaic Law. The object of this book is to explore the place which this 'Law of God' must take in the life of the believer, and to show its relation to Christ as 'the End of the Law'. A final chapter shows how the Puritans defended themselves against a charge of legalism by asserting 'evangelical ability' and 'spiritual freedom'. The book is not easy reading—its arrangement bears the marks of an academic thesis—but it reveals the author's wide and deep researches into primary sources in Puritan literature, and in these days of moral decline is a salutary reminder of the authority of the Law of God.

Dr G. R. Cragg, Professor of Historical Theology in the Andover Newton Theological School, Newton, Massachusetts, has added to his already secure reputation by his new book, *Reason and Authority in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 42*s.*), which forms a sequel to his earlier works: *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason* (1950) and *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution* (1957). In his new work Prof. Cragg begins with an estimate of the powerful influence of Locke and Newton upon eighteenth-century thought, and then passes to a summary of the orthodox position of reason confirmed by revelation. He then considers the deist writers and their critics—Law, Berkeley and Bishop Butler—and follows on with a discussion of scepticism and its challenge to authority by Hume. This portion of the book concludes with a consideration of 'the authority of a revitalized faith' under Wesley and the Evangelicals. Dr Cragg next examines the authority of the State and the claims of the Church, and then proceeds to discuss the effect of the scientific outlook: 'it seemed imperative to re-examine the nature of man.' But the demand for reform was bound to come, and to this Dr Cragg devotes his final chapter. This is a mature book.

To the General Assembly of 1561 John Knox declared: 'Without Assemblies how shall good ordour and unitie in doctrine be keept.' Rather surprisingly until now there has been no complete examination of the constitutional and ecclesiastical doctrine which created the 'generall assemblies of this haill Realme' of Scotland, arising out of the Reformation and by means of which the Reformers sought to establish a Christian commonwealth within the land. This omission has now been remedied in *The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, 1560-1600*, by Dr Duncan Shaw (St Andrew's Press, 42*s.*). Every aspect of the origin and structure of the General Assemblies, together with their outreaching into the civic and academic

life of Scotland, is examined. Exceedingly well annotated, and with an extensive bibliography, this book is of great importance to the historian and theologian as well as for the general reader.

Three books on Christian Missions are to hand. *The Responsible Church and the Foreign Mission* (World Dominion Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*) contains the substance of Peter Beyerhaus' *Die Selbständigkeit der jungen Kirchen als missionarisches Problem*, now presented in English by Dr Henry Lefever, Professor of Missions in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham. This challenging study faces the problem of mission today, which is to see 'how the responsibility of the local church is to be related to the equally deep sense of responsibility especially for mission still held by the churches from which the majority of missionaries come' (pp. 11-12). The Beckly Lecture for 1964 is entitled *Christian Missions and Social Ferment*, by Norman Goodall (Epworth Press, 13*s.* 6*d.*), and is a skilful survey of European and American Missionary movements, together with an assessment of the present missionary obligation 'to be involved in the great secular discoveries and advances of this revolutionary period' (p. 110), and this within an ecumenical context. *Church and Challenge in a New Africa* (Epworth Press, 12*s.* 6*d.*) is a series of 'political' sermons by Colin Morris (who recently so heroically faced the tribal crisis in Northern Rhodesia) in which with great lucidity and fearlessness he sets forth, upon the foundation of biblical principles, the relationship between Church and State. Both disturbing and provocative, these three books call for serious consideration.

The Advent Lectures for 1963, given by Canon Max Warren in Westminster Abbey, form the substance of *The Functions of a National Church* (Epworth Press, 5*s.*), and are exceedingly pertinent to our time. He declares such function to be threefold: 'to prophesy . . . to purify . . . to prepare'—and this involves the necessity of unity. 'We need to be far more eager to see the growth of United Churches in different parts of the world, and in our own nation, and much less preoccupied with our world-wide denominational allegiances' (p. 42).

The Articles of the Church of England, edited by Canon H. E. W. Turner (Mowbrays, 8*s.* 6*d.*), contains four outstanding essays covering the composition of the Articles, their status, their place in history and finally the question of their revision. In this last paper Professor G. W. H. Lampe argues cogently that they should be retained 'as a highly important historical document', but should not be treated 'as an official exposition of the doctrinal position of the Church of England at this present time': clerical subscription to them should not be required, nor should 'new' articles be substituted. This is an important book for Anglicans and non-Anglicans alike. *Admission to Holy Communion* (Marsham Manor Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*), by G. E. Duffield, a distinguished lay member of the Church Assembly, is a vigorous criticism of the principle behind the Draft Canon B.15, which accepts the rubric requiring confirmation (or readiness to be confirmed) before admission to Communion. Taking what he regards as 'the classical Anglican position', confirmation, in his view, is a domestic rite by which baptismal vows are ratified, and is not required as a pre-requisite for Communion. By careful

argument he declares that the Church of England 'has historically maintained an open communion table' (p. 26).

Inside the Free Churches (Epworth Press, 8*s.* 6*d.*), by G. Thompson Brake, is thought-provoking, informative and critical. 'The most obvious thing to say about the Free Churches today is that they are in a state of confusion. Historically far removed from their origins, they are not finding it easy to interpret the principles upon which their churches were founded in an ecclesiastical and social situation that bears no resemblance to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.'

Written in crisp style and with characteristic forcefulness, the standpoint of *Their Finest Hour: Methodists and Anglicans* (Epworth Press, 6*s.*), by David Foot Nash, can be summarized in the following sentence: 'Let us go into this Union to make the Church *in* England a lively vehicle of the gospel', 'an effective and economical instrument of evangelism', 'a centre of missionary resolution' and 'a power-house of radical dissent from the values of the world' (p. 124). The opposite point of view is set forth by Dr Franz Hildebrandt in his scholarly *Critique of Two Reports* (Epworth Press, 5*s.*). 'The proposed merger . . . will be the dissolution of the Wesley Heritage in a purely national union, the abandonment of Methodism in Scotland and Wales, the separation of the Irish Conference and the disintegration of World Methodism—the end of true ecumenicity, and, ironically, the establishment of a "formal sect" within an enlarged Church of England' (pp. 51-2). Both these statements warrant careful examination. So the debate continues.

For fourteen years R. T. Brooks has been a member of the BBC Religious Broadcasting Department, and in the A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture for 1964, entitled *Person to Person* (Epworth Press, 10*s.* 6*d.*), he deals effectively with the problem of Christian communication in the modern world, the secret of which lies in human relationships—'person to person'—rather than in mere techniques, however valuable. This book has great relevance for every Christian, preacher or layman, today.

Upon a carefully examined theological background, *The Ordeal of Wonder* (Oxford University Press, 25*s.*), by E. H. Morgan, formerly Bishop of Truro, contains the mature reflections on the subject of physical and spiritual healing, and in particular seeks to help the clergy and those of the medical profession in mutual understanding of problems common to both. 'It is as we submit ourselves to the ordeal of wonder that we shall come together. . . . The attempt to understand the truth that is beyond us demands discipline, humility, the denial of self and the research that is akin to contemplation.' This is a book to be pondered deeply.

The Philosophy of Albert Schweitzer, by Henry Clark (Methuen, 25*s.*), will yield most to those who have some familiarity with philosophical terminology, but the general reader will gain a great deal from these pages. The two focal points in Schweitzer's thought emerge with great clarity—'the decay and restoration of civilization' and 'reverence for life'—and these convictions are set upon the background of ethical mysticism. Some have questioned the soundness of Schweitzer's Christology, but this book affords a satisfying exposition of his thought. One valuable feature is the extensive

quotation from his own writings, and there are two articles from his pen. The bibliography is extensive.

The third issue of *Vox Evangelica* (Epworth Press, 6*s.*) contains five scholarly biblical and historical essays by members of the staff of London Bible College. (1) The Old Testament in Romans i-viii. (2) Antecedents of the Monarchy in Ancient Israel. (3) A Footnote to Pliny's Account of Christian Worship. (4) The Changing Emphasis in the Doctrine of Providence. (5) Secessions from the Established Church in the Nineteenth Century.

In 1658 the Congregationalists issued the 'Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order' so that 'others, especially the Churches of Christ, may judge of us accordingly'. Under very different circumstances *A Declaration of Faith* (Independent Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*) now appears, being the Interim Report of a Commission appointed by the Congregational Union of England and Wales. A notable document, it is to be sent down to the churches for consideration.

The Sacred Journey, by Ahmad Kamal (Allen & Unwin, 25*s.*), is the official guide to the Pilgrimage to Mecca for the five hundred million who embrace Islam, and for the non-Muslims the first complete picture of Islam as it appears to followers of the Prophet. Both Arabic and English texts are printed, and in view of the present revival of Islam it is important.

Three volumes of sermons from the Epworth Press are to be commended: *Thy Wise Design* (12*s.* 6*d.*) forms a choice collection of sermons by the late Dr J. Alan Kay, the much-loved editor of this *Review*. Chosen by his wife, they show the richness of his mind. *Oxford Sermons* (15*s.*), by Benjamin Drewery, preached to town and gown at the Wesley Memorial Church, Oxford, contains penetrating theological discourses. *Sermons I should like to have preached* (15*s.*), selected by Ian Macpherson, contains fourteen discourses which to one man proved memorable and to be passed on to others.

RECENT LITERATURE

Edited by John T. Wilkinson

Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Edited by Claus Westermann. (The Preacher's Library Series.) (S.C.M. Press, 45*s.*)

This book is a clear indication of the virile but grave conflict of views which underlies German Biblical scholarship today. Thirteen essays by leading European scholars such as Westermann, Von Rad, Noth, Eichrodt and others revolve around two particular essays by Bultmann and Baumgärtel. A vital battle of words is fought over the body of the Bible, with Bultmann and Baumgärtel arguing for the separation of the Old Testament, by reason of its 'failure' and 'miscarriage', from the New Testament, while others build bridges, typological and Christological, to make the Bible into an indivisible unit. Few of the writers have refrained from pressing their point to excess and there seems in places to be an overwidening of terms, e.g. those of 'history' and 'prophecy'. The binding (or disrupting) forces, promise, prophecy, fulfilment, typology, soteriology, theocracy, covenant, are all thoroughly examined from different angles, and questions of vital importance are raised, such as 'Is the God of the Old Testament the Father of Jesus of Nazareth?' and 'Does the Old Testament behold the Christ?' The existentialist emphasis in some of the essays is a worthy effort on the part of those who want to 'lose' the Old Testament thereby to 'find' it again. Two of the essays are devoted to a discussion of Van Ruler's book, *The Christian Church and the Old Testament.* The excellence of the treatment lies in the fact that these matters are not treated as academic exercises, but as of vital concern for our faith today.

GWYLFA H. MORGAN

The Text of the New Testament, by Bruce M. Metzger. (Oxford University Press, 42*s.*)

'To teach another how to become a textual critic,' writes Professor Metzger, 'is like teaching another how to become a poet.' Many theories of textual criticism are discussed in this book, but the author decides in favour of no particular theory. He regards textual criticism as an art, and stresses the need to avoid becoming too enamoured of any single method or criterion of critical analysis. He sets forward the fundamental principles of textual criticism, and demonstrates his own approach by a plentiful selection of examples of textual analysis. But he insists that the final decision about any disputed text 'rests upon the student's own sagacity and insight'. This is a well-documented book. By no means the most elementary of introductions to the subject, it is clearly written, gives an account of all the main witnesses to the New Testament text, and summarizes the history of textual criticism to the present day. It brings the story right up to date by discussing the most recent approaches to the subject, including such varied ones as those of Professors Kilpatrick, Dearing and Colwell. Textual criticism is not the most popular branch of New Testament scholarship, but Professor Metzger shows that it can be both relevant and interesting. His book has a good introductory chapter on methods of writing in the ancient world, with a memorable account of the sheer physical discomfort of the task of copying manuscripts. The book includes photographs of a representative selection of ancient manuscripts.

ARTHUR W. WAINWRIGHT

John the Baptist, by Charles H. Scobie. (S.C.M. Press, 22*s.* 6*d.*)
There is not a great deal about John the Baptist in the Bible even if the Magnificat and Benedictus are regarded as songs concerning his infancy rather than that of Jesus. Nor does extra-Biblical literature add greatly to our knowledge, but this book gathers together conveniently the widely scattered material and patiently separates the grain from the chaff. It may well be, as Dr Scobie claims, that John's baptism has closest affinities with the rites of the Qumran sects. Certainly there are difficulties in finding the antecedents for John's baptism in the admission of proselytes. But some of the evidence cited by Dr Scobie against proselyte baptism appears less decisive than he supposes. Thus that Josephus 'often mentions the admission of proselytes: but where the method of admission is given it is by circumcision only' must certainly be taken into account, but equally certainly it cannot be regarded as a complete picture or else no woman could ever have been admitted. Dr Scobie suggests that, despite the hostility which existed between Samaritans and orthodox Jews, there were Samaritan sects with close affinities with Jewish sects, and this enables him to identify Aenon near Salim with the village of Ainum, about seven miles from the Salim in Samaria. If John exercised a ministry in Samaria he and his disciples, as Dr Scobie points out, may have been the 'others' of John 4^{38} and their preparation may have contributed to the early success of the Christian Church in Samaria. Occasionally, as in the statement about the baptism of Jesus and his temptation on p. 146, the book displays that happy pre-Bultmann attitude said to characterize British scholarship, but Dr Scobie is never less than interesting and informative.

VINCENT PARKIN

The Art and Truth of the Parables, by Geraint Vaughan Jones. (S.P.C.K., 35*s.*)
In a valuable account of the ways in which the parables have been interpreted, the importance of Jülicher's work is rightly stressed. The author examines alleged uses of allegory in the parables and, after distinguishing clearly between symbolism and allegory, concludes that although the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen is as near to an allegory as anything in the Gospels, it is nevertheless not an allegory in the sense that *Pilgrim's Progress* is allegory. Yet, he says, there is no reason why Jesus should not have told allegorical tales. 'That he could not and therefore did not, as seems to have been assumed by Jülicher and others, is not demonstrable.' G. V. Jones urges that to insist, as many have, that no parable can make more than one point unnecessarily limits the significance of these stories, while to confine them to their setting-in-life (when that can be discovered) shows a failure to recognize that the parables are works of art and as such have significance beyond their original occasions. Even among those parables which are strictly limited by their historical reference there are many which, the author says, have an existential significance. Then there follows a lengthy treatment of the parable of the Prodigal Son as an essay in existential interpretation. This is a rich and rewarding section for the preacher, although many may regret that the vocabulary and style of the interpretation lack the simplicity which marks that of the parable. The brevity of the parable is in sharp contrast with the wordiness of sentences such as 'This nostalgia, this homesickness, can be awakened by the memory of the scent of the heather, the tang of the sea, of the peat burning in the hearth, the singing of a song impregnated with the memories of generations'. In any case is it not the scent rather than 'the memory of the scent' which evokes the nostalgia? But it would be wrong to end on a querulous note, for there is so much in the book which is well said.

VINCENT PARKIN

Royal Theology: Our Lord's Teaching About God, by Ronald A. Ward. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 18*s*. 6*d*.)

Seeing who are the publishers of this book, some may pass it by as a fundamentalist production. This would be a mistake. Dr Ward, the author, is a scholar, described by Professor F. F. Bruce in his foreword as 'a classical student turned biblical exegete. He reads his Greek Testament in the wider context of Greek literature.' This book reveals him as 'a conservative', yet not opposed to biblical criticism, as such, and obviously well abreast of modern biblical scholarship. The purpose of the book is to set forth elements in the teaching of Jesus concerning God which reveal His 'severity', then elements which reveal His 'kindness'; and finally to show how these apparently contradictory elements are reconciled in our Lord's atoning death. We believe that in the main the author has succeeded. In a day when purely sentimental conceptions of the Divine Love abound, conceptions which exclude wrath, punishment and any sacrificial view of the Atonement, it is refreshing, to say the least of it, to find one who calls us to behold the severity of God as well as His goodness, and yet at the same time is so faithful to our Lord's teaching about God. Preachers will find new light on many texts in the author's learned word-studies, and much help generally in their treatment of the great New Testament themes. Scholars, who are unable to 'take the canonical Gospels as they stand', as the author does, will nevertheless feel the challenge of what Professor Bruce describes as Dr Ward's 'self-consistent portrayal of Jesus'. The book is most certainly relevant to our time.

HENRY T. WIGLEY

Basis and Belief, by James Henry Collins. (Epworth Press, 25*s*.)

This is an extremely interesting attempt to examine the status of religious authority from a philosophical rather than a theological viewpoint. The author recognizes the difficulty of achieving a neutral attitude in this sort of discussion, but, at least to a Christian reader, he seems to succeed admirably. The first five chapters of the book provide a useful though selective summary of the main contributions on the subject of authority by leading philosophers and theologians from the Greeks to the moderns. The discussion which follows in two chapters consists of 'a critique of religious authority' and an examination of 'the legitimacy and limitations of the method of authority in religion'. It is not easy in a brief review to convey the intricacy of the argument in these last chapters, but the author distinguishes clearly between an authority which is merely disciplinary, expository or informatory, and an authority which is evocative of belief and faith. It is this last which is the real concern of Christians, and it meets us in the life of the Church, both present and past, and in the impact of the dogmatically basic events of Christian history. These come to us as a presentation and as evidence which is 'concentrated and systematized' and 'lived in', and the conclusion is: 'They are no longer neutral presentations. It may be true, as we have suggested, that they can carry no guarantee of truth, but that is no loss if what is needed is an evocative basis for religious experience.' The whole argument deserves careful attention, and the book is a most valuable contribution to the discussion of its subject.

H. MORLEY RATTENBURY

The Rationality of Faith, by Carl Michalson. (S.C.M. Press, 18*s*.)

The sub-title of this work is *A Critique of the Theological Reason*. It is not, so Prof. Michalson describes it, an exposition of Christian Doctrine, but a prolegomenon to systematic theology, the suggestion of a method of thinking of the

Christian faith. As such it is philosophical in its approach and presupposes an acquaintance with the terminology of philosophy, and shows wide discourse with the work of modern (especially German) philosophers. This may make it a somewhat difficult book for the ordinary reader. Its thesis is that the Christian faith is of the structure of 'history', in a special sense of the term. History is not a mere record of verifiable happenings. It is the quest for meaning in events for historian or participant. Similarly, faith is not the mere acceptance of recorded happenings, but the quest for personal meaning in historic events. Prof. Michalson refutes the charge of subjectivity in two ways. First, due regard is paid to 'tradition', the inheritance of faith or 'sediment' of history, a deposit of meaning received from other participants or believers, in which we share; and 'dogma', the faith of the Church, the deposit of its corporate experience, is interpreted in the same way. Secondly, meaning for the participant cannot be separated from the meaningful event, i.e. the meaning given in the divine purpose and action in history. Prof. Michalson regards every such meaningful event as a 'word' of God (he prefers 'word' to 'act' in this context) and Christ as His supreme word in history. Thus Christian faith offers the final meaning of history. It is 'eschatological', not in the sense that its chief interest is in a remote future, nor is it the acceptance of past happenings, but in that it offers God's final word about the 'end' of history, which gives it meaning, and by which men in every age can live meaningfully in this world. We may offer one criticism. Is the separation between 'nature' and 'history' and between the disciplines of science on the one hand and history and theology on the other as absolute as Prof. Michalson maintains? Is not science, too, a 'dialogue' between the scientist and nature, as Polonyi (see p. 30) would contend, to which the scientist brings his own faith in the rational structure of nature? Is not a hypothesis just such a leap of faith, to be tested by subsequent experiment? And is there not an integrity of the human mind, a faith in the oneness of reality, which refuses to be compartmented into hermetically sealed divisions between its activities and achievements in science or art or religion, or even in the creative work of the technologist?

A. N. ROSE

Contemporary Perspectives in Philosophy:
Minds and Machines, by Alan Ross Anderson. (Prentice-Hall, 18*s.*)
Ordinary Language, by V. C. Chappell. (Prentice-Hall, 18*s.*)
God and Evil, by Nelson Pike. (Prentice-Hall, 18*s.*)
Truth, by George Pitcher. (Prentice-Hall, 18*s.*)
Creativity in the Arts, by Vincent Tomas. (Prentice-Hall, 18*s.*)

From time to time valuable articles are published in the learned journals and are then inaccessible except to those who have ready access to the bound volumes. Students are referred to them, but all too often no reprints are available. In the Prentice-Hall Contemporary Perspectives in Philosophy Series under the general editorship of Joel Feinberg and Wesley C. Salmon, a number of articles and excerpts from longer works have been gathered together under various titles. Alan Ross Anderson has collated a series of articles on *Minds and Machines*, dealing with the fascinating problems arising from the invention of machines with the ability to 'think'. V. C. Chappell's symposium is concerned with *Ordinary Language* and includes an important article of the same title by Gilbert Ryle. George Pitcher's *Truth* includes a discussion from the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, in which P. F. Strawson's essays are prominent. One of the most interesting articles in Vincent Tomas's *Creativity in the Arts* is by

Stephen Spender, who describes his own particular method of writing a poem. Also included is Etienne Gilson's essay on *Creation—Artistic, Natural and Divine*, which will be new to most English readers. *God and Evil*, edited by Nelson Pike, opens with a well-known chapter from Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, illustrating the utter depravity of the human character. No possible good, it is suggested, could justify the existence of such cruelty. God's omnipotence and his goodness appear to be incompatible. The discussion is continued with an exerpt from Hume's *Dialogues* and an essay by John Stuart Mill. The contemporary essays by J. L. Mackie, H. J. McClosky, Ninian Smart and Nelson Pike himself re-examine the problems posed by Hume and Dostoyevsky. Those who set out to deal with this problem in a twenty-minute sermon would do well to read these articles before they start their preparation. Some of the usual facile answers are torn to shreds, but the way to an answer through faith is not completely barred. While each of the volumes is useful in its own sphere, *God and Evil* is of particular interest to ministers of religion, who so often face the problems raised, but in a pastoral context. At the end of each volume there is a select bibliography of further works on the particular subject.

BERNARD E. JONES

Knowledge and Experience in the Philosophy of F. H. Bradley, by T. S. Eliot. (Faber & Faber, 30*s*.)

It is not often that a book is published nearly half a century after its preparation, and we owe the publication of this volume to Professor Anne Bolgan of the University of Alaska who discovered the script in the archives at Harvard. Mr T. S. Eliot prepared this work as a thesis for a Doctorate in Philosophy and it was submitted in 1916. At that time Josiah Royce spoke of it 'as the work of an expert'. The whole face of philosophy has changed in the intervening years and the main interest of the book lies in the fact that it comprises the early philosophizing of one who has become the philosopher-poet of the century. In the later work of T. S. Eliot there are echoes of the thought of Bradley and, as Eliot himself points out, his own prose style was formed to some extent on that of Bradley. The commentary on Bradley has its own interest and appeal. Coming from a time when the commonwealth of Idealism was about to be broken up into self-governing positivisms, logical and theological, the reminder that it is the business of philosophy to keep frontiers open is timely.

BERNARD E. JONES

The Problem of Catholicism, by Vittoria Subilia. (S.C.M. Press, English Translation, 30*s*.)

With an impressive apparatus of footnotes the Dean of the Waldensian Faculty of Theology in Rome investigates several aspects of Roman Catholicism which have lately been undergoing internal challenge and change, especially during the pontificate of Pope John. His general conclusion is that there have indeed been changes, but that these are greatly exaggerated by optimistic and sentimental ecumenists, and that in any case the changes are not of a fundamental character. Its new ecumenism is only the old imperialism disguised with charitable diplomacy: she is 'making a superhuman effort to draw anything under her ægis—heretics, unbelievers, separated Christians and godless peoples'. So Hans Küng and Karl Barth are quite mistaken in thinking that they have reached agreement about justification by faith. Again, 'any reappraisal of the relationship of papacy to episcopate is likely to produce only relative changes such as could not substantially alter the Catholic conception of the Church'. The new emphasis

upon the role of the laity represents only a superficial change because its main purpose seems to be merely to make the laity more efficient instruments of the clergy. The attempts by Küng and others to distinguish between the essence and the form of dogmas is futile and misleading. 'The Catholic mind is inspired by a quite positive and—we frankly admit—loving (in the Catholic sense of the word) desire to come out and meet us and remove obstacles, but it does not realize that reasonings and gestures of this kind, however magnanimous in intent, produce only pain and disappointment to the Protestant spirit. . . . Sentimentalists in ecumenism are in for a rude awakening when brotherhood is regimented and subordinated to a legal casuistry that makes the question of truth or falsehood depend on the entire and exclusive interests of Catholicism. . . . In general, it is quite forseeable that certain doctrines which Protestants are accustomed to reject as non-biblical will tomorrow be decked out in a biblicity that makes them at first sight unrecognizable. But the change would in reality be only "the affirming of an abiding identity".' The second half of the book attempts to provide a theological explanation as to why no real change can ever be expected. It is a sustained attack upon Catholicism which Dr Subilia applies to Roman Catholicism alone, but which is some ways would apply to Orthodoxy and Anglicanism as well. He puts forward the old familiar thesis that Catholicism began in the 'margins' of the New Testament; it isn't at all clear whether he regards the Canon as free from such a taint, or whether he would agree with Käsemann and his school in finding the beginnings of Catholicism in the Acts of the Apostles. A Gnostic infection spread very early through the Early Fathers like Clement, Ignatius, Irenaeus and Cyprian. But St Augustine is chiefly to blame; it was his perversion of the Pauline Totus Christus that opened the door to 'irreversible error'. (Such a drastic rejection of a large area of seminal Church History, and even of elements in the Canon itself, is of course the inevitable obverse of the thesis that the true Protestant Gospel was lost or overlaid almost before the ink was dry, and was only recovered 1,500 years later by the Reformers—a thesis which, through Form Criticism, is now more than ever untenable.) There is a good deal of truth in his criticism that Roman Catholicism has minimized the humanity of the Church and maximized its divine nature—the same criticism is being frequently made from within Roman Catholicism itself. But for Dr Subilia, Roman Catholicism does not seem to be a communion of fellow-Christians with whom he is in fruitful disagreement, but rather a corrupted and corrupting organism that makes it easy to understand the description of it as Anti-Christ. The book has a very hard polemical centre. A Christian not of the Roman obedience who reads Küng or Congar finds himself always addressed as a fellow-Christian, and is moved to confess his own faults by their readiness to confess those of Roman Catholicism. The Roman Catholic who reads this book finds himself treated as the pitiable victim of a perverted system, the more dangerous for having resemblances to and elements of true Christianity. His English translator writes that Dr Subilia 'casts a no less devastating look at contemporary Protestantism'. This is quite untrue. It is difficult to know whether to be more distressed by his complacency about Protestantism or his hard, detached, suspicious polemic. For him, Protestantism is already reformed, and its weaknesses are purely superficial; inevitably, therefore, he is as suspicious of mutual dialogue leading to mutual change as the most reactionary Roman Catholic. 'Catholicism does not appreciate what great capacities for recovery are latent in Protestantism through its contact with the gospel', he writes, as though Roman Catholics themselves had little or no contact with the Gospel.

ALAN B. WILKINSON

Under Four Tudors, by Edith Weir Perry. (George Allen & Unwin, 30*s*.)
The last biography of Matthew Parker was published in 1908, and, like its two predecessors, is now out of print. Elizabeth's first Archbishop is thus a character who, for all his extraordinary importance, has been and is strangely neglected by historians. Scattered paragraphs in general histories hardly provide the detailed treatment which such an Archbishop, unique in his place in history, would seem to merit. His contribution to the affairs both of his own and of subsequent times is oddly slighted, and he is by far the least known man of influence of his critical period of history. This book, a new edition of a work first published in 1940 with an introduction by the then Archbishop of Canterbury, is an attempt to fill in some of the gaps of our knowledge. The sub-title on the dust-cover—'being the true story of Matthew Parker and Margaret'—indicates its scope. It is the story of a man and his wife rather than a fully rounded biography of a maker of history. The earlier part of the book is the more successful. Great pains have clearly been taken through years of research to discover what sort of man he was—moderate reformer and scholar—and a consistant portrait begins to emerge. But the later part is less satisfactory and hardly gives us an adequate picture of Parker as Archbishop. The book, moreover, is spoilt by peculiar grammar and, at times, a magazine style. The author, an American member of the Anglican Church, has, therefore, aroused our interest. But the definitive biography of Archbishop Parker remains to be written.

H. MORLEY RATTENBURY

I Launch at Paradise, A Consideration of John Donne, Poet and Preacher (Fernley-Hartley Lecture, 1964), by Frederick A. Rowe. (Epworth Press, 45*s*.)
John Donne was Dean of St Paul's Cathedral from 1621 to 1631. Brought up as a Roman Catholic, ordained as an Anglican priest, he had wide religious sympathies. He was familiar with the Fathers, scholastic theology and Ignatian methods of meditation, but he owed much to the Reformation. 'You know I never fettered nor imprisoned the word Religion, not straightening it . . . nor immuring it in a Rome, or a Wittemberg or a Geneva.' He had high convictions about the role of the preacher. 'Who but myselfe can conceive the sweetnesse of that salutation, when the Spirit of God sayes to me in a morning, Go forth to day and preach. . . . What a Coronation is our taking of Orders, by which God makes us a Royall Priesthood? And what inthronization is the comming up into a Pulpit.' But in his sermons, as in his poetry, Donne's wit and common sense earthed his eloquence into common life, and so it was always preserved from pomposity by his stringent self-awareness: 'I am speaking to you, and yet I consider by the way, in the same instant, what it is likely you will say to one another, when I have done. You are not all here neither; you are here now, hearing me, and yet you are thinking that you have heard a better Sermon somewhere else of this text before.' Mr Rowe's study reads as though it is a re-working of separate addresses about various aspects of Donne, for it is discursive, rather repetitious and has no obvious plan. But the patient reader who roots about will learn and benefit much. The reading behind it is impressively extensive, and there is a large bibliography of twenty-one pages with comments by Mr Rowe on many of the items. As a guide to the poems, Mr Rowe provides some valuable annotations, but he is more successful when paraphrasing their prose content than at indicating his total response to the poems themselves. The book ends with five sermons preached by Mr Rowe which incorporated and expounded extensive passages from Donne; one would like to know to whom they were preached, and how far they were comprehensible to an average congregation. A good deal of Donne's concern with the

doctrine of creation is quoted; modern theologians of both neo-orthodox and neo-pantheist schools would read these passages with profit. For Donne the doctrine of the creation of man in the image of God is the true foundation of social compassion. He expounded with conviction the biblical sense of the corporateness of man both in Adam and in Christ: 'Religion is not a melancholy; the spirit of God is not a dampe; the Church is not a grave: it is a fold, it is an Arke, it is a net, it is a city . . . it is a plurall thing.' 'The Church is Catholike, universall, so are all her Actions; All that she does, belongs to all. When she baptizes a child, that action concernes mee; for that child is thereby connected to that Head which is my Head too.' Donne's theology was also deeply Trinitarian; he speaks always of the Trinity acting whether in creation or redemption. He constantly recurs to Genesis 1[26] ('Let *us* make man in *our* image'): 'From the beginning God intimated a detestation, a dislike of singularity'—bad exegesis, but excellent theology. Above all, Donne was always astonished by God, he preached compellingly because he knew how to pray with awe: 'My God, my God, Thou art a direct God . . . (but) thou art a figurative, a metaphoricall God too.' 'I shall be short, and rather leave you to walk with God in the cool of the Evening, to meditate of the sufferings of Christ, when you are gone, than to pretend to expresse them here. The position of Christ Jesus is rather an amazement, an astonishment, an extasie, a consternation, than an instruction.'

ALAN B. WILKINSON

The God-Man: The Life, Journeys and Work of Meher Baba with an Interpretation of his Silence and Spiritual Teaching, by C. B. Purdom. (George Allen & Unwin, 42*s*.)

A Western disciple gives in this book a detailed biography, some of the main discourses, and a theological appraisal of Meher Baba, a 'holy man' who was born in India to Persian parents about seventy years ago, who has a small group of deeply-committed disciples and thousands of other followers all over the world, and whose most striking characteristics are a technique of silence and emphatic claims to identity with God. Until its final chapters, the book gives little explanation of the Indian background; hence Meher Baba's mode of life and his claims may appear to most Western readers more extraordinary than they actually are. *Darśan, prasād*, 'poor-feeding', ritual bathing, prolonged silences, kaleidoscopic changes of plans, are commonplaces of a *sādhu's* life-pattern. The same is true even of a claim to Deity. Despite his Zoroastrian origins, Meher Baba's spiritual training has been mainly by the poems of the Muslim *Sufīs* and by personal contacts with Hindu *gurus*; and for both Sufism and Hinduism every man is in his true nature Divine, and the whole meaning of the religious life is the realization of this implicit Deity. Even by these standards, however, the assertion of his Divinity, in the form in which Meher Baba makes it, is both peculiar and extreme. Can it be substantiated? His pronouncements so far (though a more startling one is constantly being promised for the future) do not—apart from the reiterated personal claims and many unfulfilled prophecies not very convincingly explained away and a few detailed dogmas like a distinction between the 'Perfect Master' and the '*Avatār*'—seem to contain anything beyond theosophical commonplaces. In his personality, he clearly has a true gift of spontaneous friendliness, which becomes most dramatically apparent in his dealings with *masts* (an Eastern type of religious madman); and he has a great sense of sheer fun, which is, alas, the rarest of the virtues in the 'spiritual': but I for one feel no sense of divine perfection coming through the account in this book. On the contrary, there are many seeming peevishnesses, though in justice one must add

that Meher Baba himself offers an explanation of them, as methods towards a mysterious spiritual 'work' which is being done by them for those who appear to be their victims. Nevertheless, it could be wished that some major Christian theologian would undertake a full study of Meher Baba alongside that Jesus Christ with whom he explicitly claims identity or equality, under such heads as their assertions of oneness with God, the development of those claims in their self-consciousnesses, the records of occasional miracles, their choice and training of disciples, alternations ' 'twixt the mount and multitude', attitudes to anxiety and to suffering. From such a comparative study there might well emerge an advance in our understanding of the Incarnation far greater than from further mulling-over of our isolated Western Christologies.

JOHN F. BUTLER

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Drew Gateway, Spring 1964.
The Central Jurisdiction: Dilemma and Opportunity, by J. S. Thomas.
The Negro in the Unification of American Methodism, by L. O. Kline.
Early Methodism and Slavery: The Roots of a Tradition, by W. B. Gravely.
The Expository Times, July 1964.
Concerning the Ministry—Three Addresses to Ordinands: II. Vows, by W. David Stacey.
History and the Four Gospels, by H. Hogarth.
Theologians of our Time: XVI: Karl Heim, by E. P. Dickie.
The Expository Times, August 1964.
Theologians of our Time: XVII. Paul Tillich, by W. B. Green.
Important Moral Issues—VII. The Censorship of Books, Radio and Television, by Henry Jones.
The Two Bibles, by N. H. Snaith.
The Expository Times, September 1964.
Second Thoughts—VI. *Formgeschichte*, by Vincent Taylor.
Miguel de Unanumo: A Hundred Years, by Geraint V. Jones.
Important Moral Issues—VIII. Marriage, by Kenneth G. Greet.
The Furtherance of the Gospel: From A.D. 60-1964, by John Foster.
The Harvard Theological Review, July 1964.
A Sacrifice without a Deity in the Athenian State Calendar, by R. F. Healey, S.J.
Tatian and his Discourse to the Greeks, by G. F. Hawthorne.
Cranmer and Nominalism, by E. K. McGee.
Renaissance and Modern Views on Hell, by C. A. Patrides.
International Review of Missions, July 1964.
Missionary Work and Healing, by M. Scheel.
The Contribution of the Church to National Unity in Nigeria, by Edmund Ilogu.
The Ideal and Symbol of the Saviour in a Gabon Syncretistic Cult, by J. W. Fernandez.
The Church and Israel will meet One Day, by Axel Torm.
Laymen in World Mission, by Paul Loffler.
Asian Mission.
Interpretation, July 1964.
The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4^{16-30} in Light of Recent Critical Trends, by Hugh Anderson.
The Centrality of Jesus for Thought and Life, by P. E. Davies.
The Present State of New Testament Interpretation, by G. R. Edwards.
Theological Wordbooks: Tools for the Preacher.
Interpretation in Contemporary Theology: III. The Proclamation-History: Hermann Diem and the Historical-Theological Problem, by G. C. Chapman, Jr.
Studies in Philology, May 1964.
Literature of the Renaissance in 1963: A Bibliography.
Scottish Journal of Theology, September 1964.
The Debate about *Honest to God*, by J. A. B. Holland.
Analogical Thinking in Theology, by W. S. Taylor.
Kierkegaard on Sin, by K. M. Hamilton.
An Unresolved Tension in the Christology of D. M. Baillie, by J. L. M. Haire.
Justice and Immortality, by N. H. Snaith.
The Wars of Israel, by A. Gelston.
History and Eschatology in the Lazarus Narrative, John 11^{1-44}, by J. P. Martin.
Common Factor, a new monthly journal written by professional philosophers, psychologists and theologians. Contains 16 articles. 3*s*. 9*d*. monthly.

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALLEN & UNWIN: Swani Prabhavananda, *The Sermon on the Mount according to the Vedanta*, pp. 110, 16*s*. Margaret Isherwood, *Faith without Dogma; In Quest of Meaning*, pp. 126, 16*s*. Edith W. Perry, *Under Four Tudors*, pp. 315, 30*s*. G. N. A. Vesey (ed.), *Body and Mind*, pp. 472, 52*s*. 6*d*. S. Demczynski, *Automation and the Future of Man*, pp. 238, 32*s*. C. B. Purdom, *The God-Man: The Life, Journeys and Work of Meher Baba*, pp. 463, 42*s*.

ATHLONE PRESS (UNIVERSITY OF LONDON): G. F. Woods, *Contemporary Cynicism* (John Coffin Memorial Lecture, 1963), pp. 23, 4*s*. 6*d*. C. F. D. Moule, *Man and Nature in the New Testament* (E. M. Wood Lecture), pp. 22, 4*s*. 6*d*.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. R. Cragg, *Reason and Authority in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 349, 42*s*.

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: E. F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law: A Study in Puritan Theology*, pp. 294, 30*s*.

DARTON, LONGMAN & TODD: Ronald Breck, *Planning Prosperity: A Synoptic Model for Growth*, pp. 189, 25*s*.

DUCKWORTH: H. Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth: An Introduction* (Studies in Theology Series), pp. 201, 15*s*.

EPWORTH PRESS: R. T. Brooks, *Person to Person* (A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture), pp. 84, 10*s*. 6*d*. G. Thompson Brake, *Inside the Free Churches*, pp. 154, 8*s*. 6*d*. Normal Goodall, *Christian Mission and Social Ferment* (Beckly Lecture), pp. 123, 13*s*. 6*d*. Colin Morris, *Church and Challenge in a New Africa*, pp. 155, 12*s*. 6*d*. Ian Macpherson (ed.), *Sermons I Should Like to Have Preached*, pp. 132, 15*s*. F. A. Rowe, *I Launch at Paradise; A Consideration of John Donne, Poet and Preacher* (Fernley Hartley Lecture), pp. 253, 45*s*. D. Foot Nash, *Their Finest Hour: Methodists and Anglicans*, pp. 176, 6*s*. Karl Barth, *The Heidelberg Catechism for Today*, pp. 141, 12*s*. 6*d*. E. Brunner, *Sowing and Reaping: The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 92, 10*s*. 6*d*. W. H. Bridge, *The Anvil of Faith*, pp. 176, 16*s*. A. Clifford Morris (ed.), *A Sangster Anthology*, pp. 157, 16*s*. J. Alan Kay, *Thy Wise Design*, pp. 144, 12*s*. 6*d*. Floyd V. Filson, *Three Crucial Decades: Studies in the Book of Acts*, pp. 118, 10*s*. 6*d*. Franz Hildebrandt, *Critique of Two Reports*, pp. 64, 5*s*. Eduard Thurneysen, *Dostoevsky: A Theological Study*, pp. 84, 7*s*. 6*d*. E. G. Loosley, *The Challenge from the Mount*, pp. 78, 10*s*. 6*d*. D. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Doctrine of the Church: A Symposium under Direction of the World Council*, pp. 215, 25*s*. Norman Hook, *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, pp. 158, 16*s*.

HODDER & STOUGHTON: A. Q. Morton and G. H. C. Macgregor, *The Structure of Luke and Acts*, pp. 155, 21*s*.

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: H. M. Casson, *Roman Catholicism Today*, pp. 128, 4*s*.

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: John Stacey, *John Wyclif and Reform*, pp. 169, 25*s*.

MACMILLAN: John Hick (ed.), *Faith and the Philosophers*, pp. 256, 35*s*.

MARSHALL, MORGAN & SCOTT: Ronald A. Ward, *Royal Theology: Our Lord's Teaching about God*, pp. 227, 18*s*. 6*d*.

MOWBRAY: J. C. de Satge, J. I. Packer, H. G. Herklots, G. W. H. Lampe and H. E. W. Turner, *The Articles of the Church of England*, pp. 113, 8*s*. 6*d*.

NELSON, THOMAS, & SONS: V. H. H. Green, *John Wesley*, pp. 168, 25*s*. C. S. Dessain and V. F. Blehl, S. J. (ed.), *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, Vol. XIII, pp. 520, 80*s*.; Vol. XV, pp. 568, 80*s*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: David Daiches, *The Paradox of Scottish Culture: The Eighteenth-century Experience*, pp. 97, 10*s*. 6*d*. E. R. Fairweather (ed.), *The Oxford Movement* (Library of Protestant Thought), pp. 400, 50*s*. A. C. Outler (ed.), *John Wesley* (Library of Protestant Thought), pp. 516, 52*s*.

PITMAN: J. H. Jones, *Joseph Stamp: Public Servant*, pp. 365, plates, 50*s*.

S.C.M. PRESS: Edward Rogers, *Living Standards*, pp. 127, 9*s*. 6*d*. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (paper-back), pp. 318, 17*s*. 6*d*. Ernst Käsemann, *Essays in New Testament Themes* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 41), pp. 200, 18*s*. Ernst Fuchs, *Studies in the Historical Jesus* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 42), pp. 239, 21*s*. H. Waddams, *A New Introduction to Moral Theology*, pp. 240, 16*s*. Alan Richardson, *University and Humanity*, pp. 40, 2*s*. 6*d*. H. J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *The Reformation in its own Words*, pp. 195, 60*s*. D. T. Niles, *As Seeing the Invisible* (paper-back reprint), pp. 192, 10*s*. 6*d*. D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Old Testament Library), pp. 464, 60*s*.

S.P.C.K.: I. T. Ramsay, G. H. Boobyer, F. N. Davey, M. C. Perry and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Miracles and the Resurrection* (Theological Collections No. 3), pp. 104, 13*s*. 6*d*. Ernest Evans (ed.), *Tertullian's Homily on Baptism*, pp. 122, 35*s*. M. A. Goulder, *Type in History and Acts*, pp. 252, 27*s*. 6*d*.

TYNDALE PRESS: D. Kidder, *Proverbs: An Introduction and Commentary*, pp. 192, 8*s*. 6*d*.

UNIVERSITY OF WALES PRESS: R. S. Thomas, *Words and the Poet* (W. D. Thomas Memorial Lecture), pp. 25, 2*s*. 6*d*.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

BERNHARD W. ANDERSON is Professor of Biblical Theology, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey.

RONALD E. CLEMENTS is Lecturer in Old Testament Theology, University of Edinburgh.

BASIL HALL is Professor of Church History, Westminster College, Cambridge, and Lecturer in Church History, Cambridge University.

A. S. HERBERT is Professor of Old Testament Literature and Religion in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

G. W. H. LAMPE is Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and author of *The Seal of the Spirit*, etc.

HENRY MCKEATING is Lecturer in Christian Theology, University of Nottingham.

JOHN S. ROBERTS is a Methodist layman, local preacher in Liverpool.

B. KINGSTON SOPER is Superintendent Minister of the Rawtenstall circuit, Lancashire.

WILLIAM E. SPRUCE is a layman from Mundesley, Norfolk, who writes on economics and scientific subjects.

JOHN STACEY is Methodist Minister in Greenford, Middlesex, author of *John Wyclif and Reform.*

WILFRED TOOLEY is Methodist Minister in Cheadle, Cheshire.

Printed in Great Britain by The Sidney Press Ltd., Bedford, and published by
The Epworth Press (Frank H. Cumbers), 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1.
Price 4*s.* 6*d.* net per copy (postage 6*d*) or 20*s.* per annum, post free.