
A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship* (TSF) *Bulletin* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin_01.php

Secondly, evangelicalism is characterized by a passion to win men for Christ. Knowing by personal experience the saving power of the crucified and risen Lord, convinced that only through His atoning death can men know salvation, and obeying the clarion call in the Scriptures to evangelize, the Evangelical is a man consumed with a desire to bring others to the Saviour. He knows that men must be told of their great need of Christ and of the love which He has for them, and therefore he dwells much on the need for conversion and woos people to Christ. Hence the central aim of an evangelical ministry is to save men and women from their sins and bring them to a personal saving experience of Christ. It needs little reflection to show what a difference will be made to the life of a church if that is the supreme aim of its ministry. The church's concern will not be to raise money, or to build new halls, or to cultivate social activities, except in so far as these aims can conduce to winning men to personal faith in Christ. Nor will the preaching consist of pious platitudes or moral disquisitions; it will deal with the cross of Christ and the need for repentance and faith. For it will be the exposition of the Word of God.

Thirdly, evangelicalism is characterized by a passion for personal holiness. Nothing is more untrue than to say that evangelical religion stops at conversion or is unconcerned with social righteousness. For conversion finds its expression in individual and social holiness. The grace of God experienced through the saving work of Christ makes it possible to live a new life in which the dominion of sin is broken. Evangelicals assert that this new standard of life is high and they press on to perfection. The goal is obedience to God, the pattern is Christ. That is why Evangelicals are led to refrain from 'worldliness', not because they desire to retreat from the world, but because they must abstain from all that is sinful: they are concerned to be pure in heart, even at the cost of being dubbed 'narrow'. Yet their attitude is by no means negative. It is based upon a positive fact; they are called to mirror forth the life of Christ in the world, and He knew no sin. He lived unto God and Christians must do likewise.

Such is evangelicalism, inevitably sketched too briefly to do it justice. It is a system of belief and behaviour which springs from an experience of God's saving work in Christ and expresses itself in a determination to reverence and obey God's Word in Scripture, to preach the saving gospel, and to live a life free from sin. Such a conception of Christian faith and practice means a fight, a struggle to obey God's Word in one's life and thought. This is not easy, and if left to please ourselves we might easily relapse into a more 'comfy' type of religion. But we know that God has called us, and all men, to live in obedience to His Word and in dependence upon His saving grace, and therefore we cannot turn aside from the effort to be truly Christian. In words which may be apocryphal but express the spirit of the great Reformer and of all who seek to obey God's Word: 'Here we stand: we can do no other.'

University of Aberdeen. I. HOWARD MARSHALL.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AGAINST ITS ENVIRONMENT

DURING the classic period of the modern criticism of the Old Testament, it was concerned almost exclusively with the contents of the Old Testament itself. The only extra-biblical evidence that was drawn on to any extent was our fragmentary knowledge of pre-Islamic religion in Arabia. This was due to the almost universal conviction that the Bedouin tribes are the nearest parallel to the Israelite tribes before the Conquest. Though this idea has often been challenged in recent years on various grounds, one of the most important being the increasing acceptance of the accuracy of the patriarchal tradition in Genesis, it is still dominant, and is perhaps the most important single factor leading to a perverted understanding of the early pages of the Bible. This preoccupation with the Old Testament led even to a fanciful reconstruction of early Canaanite religion from the effects it was supposed to have had on Israel. Much of the earlier part of Oesterley and Robinson's *Hebrew Religion* is based on this mistaken view, which is still all too often met with, though it has been outdated by the discoveries at Ugarit.

Towards the end of last century the steady increase in archaeological know-

ledge led to a growing understanding that there had been to a great extent and over a long period, antedating the biblical period, a community of culture within the Fertile Crescent, and that between Mesopotamia and Egypt there had been more contacts in religion and thought generally than had earlier been considered possible. The wildly exaggerated pan-Babylonian theory of Winckler and his school was generally rejected after some brisk controversy, but it had opened the way for the much more balanced views of Gunkel and Gressmann.

They tried to establish that certain mythological and eschatological concepts, which Wellhausen and his school had considered late imports into the religion of Israel, had been in fact widely held in the Fertile Crescent and in Egypt at a very early date and so formed part of the background against which the religion of Israel must have grown up; presumably therefore they had formed part of it from an early period. Oesterley and Robinson's treatment of Messianic thought and especially of eschatology shows clear marks of the influence of this religio-historical school.

Though many of the specific views of this school have been proved wrong or exaggerated, we must not underestimate its importance. We owe to it the passing of exclusive preoccupation with literary problems and of the desire to find within the Old Testament a complete evolution of religion from primitive animism to full monotheism. Its chief exponents were, however, until recently Continentals, few of whose works were translated into English, and so the earlier stages of its concepts had relatively small influence in Britain, as may be seen from the average more popular textbook that still circulates in many a theological college.

It should be obvious that there must be a considerable element of truth in the views of the school. When we consider how much transformed paganism there is in popular Christian thought, we cannot doubt that Israel, taking its rise in the Fertile Crescent and linked with its neighbours by common language and, to a great extent, culture, must have been deeply influenced by the background of the Fertile Crescent in general. There is a growing acceptance of Welch's insistence that even before Sinai Israel must have had a clearly developed traditional sacrificial system, and Ezekiel bears witness to the extent to which Israel's religion had been corrupted by its neighbours right throughout its history.

Possibly the most important work of the religio-historical school was its development of *Gattungsforschung*, not quite satisfactorily rendered 'form criticism'; Bentzen's 'examination of types' is clumsy but more easily understood. Gunkel pointed out the lack of literary originality in the Fertile Crescent, virtually all the extant examples falling into clearly marked types. It is easy to show that most of the sources lying behind the Old Testament can be fitted into them. This was linked with the attempt to discover the purpose of these types, their *Sitz im Leben* (situation or place in life).

It is outside the scope of this article to consider the far-reaching effects of this approach on many aspects of the literary criticism of the Old Testament, effects which in this country are often far from being realized. Equally we cannot consider the manner in which some documents have had their historical value rehabilitated by this approach.

No part of the Old Testament is more suited to this approach than the Psalter. Gunkel's study of the psalms and their division into types has become standard today. He claimed that the psalms could not be regarded merely as expressions of individual piety, but that most of them were cultic hymns, and that their respective place in the cultus was normally easy to establish. Psalms which the earlier literary criticism had confidently called post-exilic were now equally confidently called pre-exilic, and others, though still regarded as post-exilic, were considered as based on pre-exilic psalms.

Gunkel's work was carried forward by Mowinckel in his *Psalmenstudien* between 1921 and 1924. The only suggestion that we can concern ourselves with here is his discovery that certain psalms are accession psalms used in the enthronement feast of Yahweh, celebrated at the New Year's festival (Tabernacles).

But where was the evidence for this enthronement feast, described by Mowinckel in some detail? Certainly not elsewhere in the Old Testament, though vague references have been found in passages like Isaiah vi, and hardly even in the 'accession psalms'. The most that can be said of them

is that if such a feast ever existed, they would have suited it. From Babylon we have evidence in detail for the great New Year festival, the greatest in Babylon, in which Merodach was enthroned anew, and the renewed triumph of order over chaos affirmed. In it the chief role was played by the king — it could not be celebrated in his absence — who was supremely the representative of the gods. We have similar, though not identical, evidence for such a festival from other Mesopotamian cities, and what is most important, there was a festival of analogous significance in Egypt. From this Mowinckel assumed that a festival of this type must have existed in Israel.

The fact that the *Psalmenstudien* were not translated and that they involved the rejection of Wellhausen's main views on the Psalter, which were still dominant, prevented Mowinckel's views in general from influencing more than narrow circles in Britain. But his concept of the Enthronement Feast was carried on into a wider scheme by a group of British scholars who approached the Old Testament largely from the standpoint of insights gained from anthropology. In two symposia edited by Hooke, *Myth and Ritual* (1933) and *The Labyrinth* (1935), we have the concept expounded of a common religious pattern in the Near East, expressed by a common pattern of myth and ritual. They recognized that the main myths were cultic in nature and that their recital was accompanied by suitable ritual; they were 'magic' in nature, though their purpose was not to compel but to aid the gods of order in their never-ending struggle against the powers of chaos. The central figure in the ritual was the 'divine' king. One of the most important contributions was that of Aubrey Johnson in *The Labyrinth* — now superseded by his *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (1955) — in which he maintained that the Jerusalem kings had played to a great extent the same role in Judah.

It is difficult to say what effect these works would have had in Britain, had it not been for the light thrown on Canaanite mythology by the excavations at Ugarit. It immediately became clear, that with all its differences it did fit into a common pattern with that of Mesopotamia. This tended to make the concept of a cult pattern generally respectable, even where its applicability to the religion of Israel was rejected. In Scandinavia they acted as an encouragement to further advance along the lines already suggested by Mowinckel and others, and some of the suggestions coming from there have been startling. It is a pity that a third symposium edited by Hooke and promised for 1956, *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*, has not yet appeared. There can be no doubt that in it some of the views expounded in the earlier works will be much modified; on the other hand it will go much further in some directions.

There can be little doubt that, however much it may be modified in detail, the theory of the common cult pattern has come to stay. It has offered a better explanation of the mythology and developed polytheism of the Fertile Crescent than any previous hypothesis, and it has the further advantage of making this polytheism reasonably rational from our standpoint. It enables us also to understand the grip and attraction of the cultus for the worshippers. We must beware, however, of interpreting the theory as though it maintained that there was a uniformity in myth and ritual throughout the Near Eastern cultural area, or that it remained unchanged throughout the period from the beginning of the second millennium until the victories of Cyrus. Not only was there varying stress and expression in different areas, but the impact of new cultures penetrating into the area produced far-reaching changes and even decay.

But what of Israel? We should find it easier to answer this question, if we were able to define the term 'Canaanization of Yahweh worship' more accurately. There is no doubt that the *popular* religion of Israel was in great measure assimilated to that of its neighbours, but even at the worst it was different. G. E. Wright's insistence that archaeology has found no evidence for an image of Yahweh points to one notable example. We may reasonably assume that, if we could be present either at the ordinary cultus or the great festivals of the Baalized Yahweh religion, we would not notice any immediately striking difference between them and the corresponding ceremonies of the Canaanites, etc.

This being so, it is virtually certain that Tabernacles, the New Year festival — there is now no doubt that for the bulk of the pre-exilic period Tabernacles was the most important festival and that of the New Year —

was largely assimilated to the New Year celebrations of Israel's neighbours. I consider it to be as good as certain that the sovereignty of Yahweh was in some way celebrated at it, though not necessarily in the form of an enthronement feast.

Probably the most emphatic attack on Mowinckel's theory in Britain has been in Snaith's *The Jewish New Year Festival*, especially in chapter 7. He does show clearly enough that the use of those portions of the *Rosh Hashanah* liturgy that make special reference to the sovereignty of God cannot be traced back beyond the beginning of our era and are probably later than A.D. 70. If, however, the modification of Mowinckel's theory to be mentioned later has any truth in it, it is easy enough to see why the exile meant a clean break with the old tradition. The royal ritual of Tabernacles vanished with the monarchy; the memory that Tabernacles was the festival of the sovereignty of Yahweh remained, but, when the rabbis after the destruction of the Temple wished to stress this, they had to create a new ritual for the purpose. The linking of *Rosh Hashanah* with the sovereignty of God had lived on, even if the old ritual had vanished. Snaith's rejection of Mowinckel's theory of accession psalms boils down to his statement (p. 200) that they ' are so thoroughly dependent upon Is. xl-lv that if the Deutero-Isaianic elements are removed the residue is negligible '. Aubrey Johnson in *The Old Testament and Modern Studies* remarks very fairly (p. 194f.) that ' the evidence which he cites may be used, rather, to support the view that the dependence is really on the side of Deutero-Isaiah '.

The real objection to Mowinckel's view is twofold. On the one hand it is literally incredible that the chief festival of Israel, if he is to be believed, left no clear mark in the Old Testament. How much it would have meant may be seen in his *He That Cometh* (p. 98) — this work makes it easy for the ordinary student to study Mowinckel's views for himself. On the other it assumes that pre-exilic Israel considered Yahweh to be a god of the same type as the chief gods of their neighbours. Behind the myth and ritual of the Fertile Crescent lay the understanding that the gods were the personification of the waxing and waning powers and life of nature. The paramount position of the Exodus in Israel's religion brought Yahweh into history as the controller of history. There could be no question of re-enthronement, where He was concerned.

Modern research has made it clear that the king's position in Israel was unique, and that the disappearance of the monarchy after the exile must have made a major change in the cultus. Most of Johnson's *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* may be accepted without serious question. The most doubtful section, where incidentally the argument is outstandingly weak, is II (p. 57 *seq.*). It is the attempt to show that when David captured Jerusalem he took over the standing of the Jebusite kings and became to all intents and purposes a ' divine ' king. His presentation is, however, quite moderate compared with that of some of the Scandinavians, e.g. Widengren's *Sakrales Königtum in Alten Testament und in Judentum*, and, less extremely, Bentzen's *King and Messiah*, Ringgren's *The Messiah in the Old Testament*, as well as many passages in Mowinckel's *He That Cometh*. Here the invincible argument against the view is that it has to be based, apart from pure assumption, almost entirely on certain psalms, which are equally open to another interpretation. If any such view was ever widely held in Israel, it seems incredible that there is no attack on it in the prophets. This is particularly true of Ezekiel. As I have tried to show in my study of his book, he condemns not merely the bad kings, but all of them. For all that there is no suggestion that they had usurped a position to which they had no right.

Our recognition that the kings in Israel never held the position that their royal contemporaries held elsewhere in the Fertile Crescent, however much many of them may have wished to, will also keep us from an unduly close identification of the ritual of the New Year festival in Jerusalem with that current in Babylon or elsewhere in the Fertile Crescent.

Apart from a few scholars like Pfeiffer, there is general recognition that the oracle in 2 Samuel vii — irrespective of whether it or Psalm lxxxix is the earlier in its present form — had a tremendous influence on the pre-exilic worship of Jerusalem. Hans-Joachim Kraus in his *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament* (1951) and *Gottesdienst in Israel* (1954) has attempted to show that, in spite of the plausibility of Wellhausen's theory that

it started purely as a harvest festival, Tabernacles was from the first linked with the Exodus, thereby celebrating Yahweh's sovereignty not merely in nature but also in history. When the Davidic dynasty was established in Jerusalem, it became the festival of the royal house as well, for the sovereignty of Yahweh was manifested in His maintenance of the Davidic dynasty. In others words, if there was an enthronement festival, it was not of the 'divine' king taking the place of Yahweh, but of the human king, who was the abiding evidence of the unaltered rule of Yahweh.

I believe that though this theory is probably incapable of definite proof it does do justice to the evidence that Mowinckel and others have tried to force into another mould, and I expect it will win increasing support. It does justice to the background against which Israel's religion was lived out, but also to those elements in it, where it clearly broke with the thought of its environment. We need not empty many of the royal psalms of their obvious force, but we need not accept Mowinckel's view that the Messianic hope is of necessity post-monarchical. On the contrary it will make the Messianic hope a necessary concomitant of the monarchy.

Finally we would do well to note that these lines of study, and others we have not had space to list, have carried us to a position in which the classical literary approach, though not written off, has become largely irrelevant. Provided that we approach them with a reasonable spice of scepticism, they can carry us into a far deeper understanding of Israel's cultus and ritual than the older critical approach was ever able to do. On the other hand we should never approach them in the hope that they will re-establish the conservative position. Though they may help the conservative to a truer understanding of the Old Testament, they are just as based on an a-revelational attitude to Scripture as the classical Higher Criticism.

Wallington. H. L. ELLISON, B.A., B.D.

CHRONICLE: RECENT LITERATURE ON QUMRAN

THERE was a time when the only books in English which could be recommended to inquirers who wished to be guided to literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls were Professor H. H. Rowley's excellent study, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Blackwell, 1952), and translations of two books by Professor A. Dupont-Summer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Blackwell, 1952) and *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes* (Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1954). Professor Rowley's book had all the marks of scholarship and good judgment which characterize his work; Professor Dupont-Sommer's books were also marked by fine scholarship, but judicial qualities were not so much in evidence, and the second volume presents a skilfully conducted 'phased withdrawal' from an untenable position taken up in the earlier book, where he suggested that the Servant Songs in Isaiah might actually have been composed in the light of the experiences of the Teacher of Righteousness, who (he was disposed to believe) suffered a martyr's death shortly before 63 B.C. The palaeographical evidence for dating the manuscript Isaiah A in the 2nd century B.C. would be sufficient to put this theory out of court. Still, the cause of learning has often been advanced by scholars who were prepared to take a risk and expose a brain-wave to the public scrutiny of others.

More recently, however, books on the Scrolls have been appearing in ever-increasing abundance, and there is no doubt that there is a public appetite for them at present. This appetite was largely whetted by the appearance of Edmund Wilson's *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (W. H. Allen, 1955). Mr. Wilson is a well-known literary critic, and his book (an expanded version of a long article which he contributed to *The New Yorker* of May 14, 1955) provides a vivid account of the exploration of the caves and the finding of the scrolls, with vigorous pen-pictures of such personalities as Father de Vaux and the Syrian Archbishop Athanasius Yeshue Samuel. When he comes to an interpretation of the discoveries, he shows a decided preference for the views of Professor Dupont-Sommer, but agrees that the criticism of scholarly theories must be left to scholars. He has, however, a firm suspicion that scholars who are committed to the Christian or the Jewish faith (especially ministers) are beset by inhibitions which make it very difficult for them to appraise the significance of the discoveries objectively, and he has a curious