

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *American Journal of Theology* for April contains an article entitled 'A New Theory as to the Use of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch.' It is not a hopeful title. We have had theories enough. What we want now is a little fact. But the writer's name—'Henry A. Redpath, Oxford University,' in severe simplicity—makes us stop and read.

For the Rev. Henry A. Redpath, D.Litt., M.A., is the editor of the great Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint, and has been Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford since 1901. The compiler of a Concordance is not to be dismissed as a theorist. We are surprised to find that he harbours any theories at all. If he avows the possession of a theory, we may be sure that he will bring it face to face with facts.

It is a theory as to the use of the divine names in the Pentateuch. The prevailing theory at present is that the different divine names imply different sources. And then arises a most complex and forbidding array of algebraical-looking symbols. Dr. Redpath takes the latest and most scholarly book as witness—Dr. Buchanan Gray's *Numbers*, in the 'International Critical Commentary.' Dr. Gray discovers that the documentary sources of the Book of Numbers are (in alphabetical order) D, E, H, J, JE, P; and P is

subdivided into P^g, P^s, and P^x. There are eight in all. Dr. Redpath is astonished. 'Can anything more complicated be imagined?'

Dr. Redpath has no fault to find with Professor Gray's *Numbers*. 'It is a book full of most important matter, and, in particular, his illustrations from other religions are extremely valuable.' His quarrel is with the 'Critical' composition of the Pentateuch. He thinks it is too complicated and insecure. Now, it rests on the use of the divine names Yahweh and Elohim. If another account could be given of the use of these names, he believes that a fresh point of departure might be made in the study of the Pentateuch. His theory furnishes the fresh point of departure.

Look at Psalms 14 and 53 together. It is the same Psalm. There are differences certainly. The most striking difference is in the use of the divine names. In Psalm 14 Elohim occurs three times, and Yahweh four times. In Psalm 53 Elohim occurs seven times and Yahweh not at all. How would that be explained in the case of, say, a modern collection of hymns? It would be said at once that Psalms 14 and 53 were two versions of one and the same Psalm. Dr. Redpath knows of nothing to hinder us from saying the same of those two Psalms in this very ancient collection of hymns. And so his theory is that before the

Psalter assumed its present form, there existed two different editions of the Psalms; and so with the Pentateuch, and perhaps much else. The variation in the divine names is due to the fact that the collection from which Psalm 14 was taken was intended perhaps for the priests. They would take care not to pronounce the sacred name Yahweh when they saw it, and so the name occurs in their collection freely, though not exclusively. But Psalm 53 was taken from a popular collection, out of which the incommunicable name had been carefully removed, because the people could not be trusted not to utter it.

There is no case in the Pentateuch so clear as this case in the Psalter. But if there were two editions of the Psalter, or any part of it, it is probable that there were two editions of the Pentateuch, or at least of some parts of it. And if there were, then some curious things which occur in the Pentateuch itself can be very simply explained.

For instance. In the account in Gn 19 of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, the name of Yahweh is used throughout. In the last verse of the chapter, however, there suddenly intrudes the name of Elohim. What is the explanation? The documentary hypothesis answers, A new document by a new writer. Dr. Redpath thinks his explanation is more natural than that. We all know how parts of manuscripts, especially the ends of them, get eaten away by time or fire or worm or water. What could be simpler than that the compiler of the present text used the manuscript of one edition till he came to a corner which was illegible, and then turned to the other? The edition from which he took the most of the story was the learned one; the end of it he took from the popular edition, from which the name of Yahweh had been carefully removed.

In the next chapter (Gn 20) it is all the other way. Now Elohim is used throughout, and Yahweh comes in at the very end. Driver says

19²⁹ belongs to P and 20¹⁸ appears to be due to the compiler of JE. Dr. Redpath holds that the same compiler compiled it all, but in the one case he used the edition of the learned, in the other the edition of the people.

It must be supposed, though Dr. Redpath does not seem to mention it, that the *new* text was not intended for the people. But Dr. Redpath does not think that its compiler was utterly indifferent whether he used Yahweh or Elohim. In the first chapter of Genesis the creation is ascribed to Elohim. This goes on to the middle of the fourth verse of the second chapter. At that point the compound name of Yahweh-Elohim begins to be used. Dr. Redpath understands that the compiler (or somebody) deliberately added the Elohim now, in order to show that Elohim, the God of Nature, who created the world, was identical with Yahweh, the God of Revelation and of Israel.

Who produced these two editions, and when were they produced? Dr. Redpath does not know. He thinks that the Yahwistic was the earlier, but he will not say more. Nor does he know when the new compilation was made which fused the two editions together and gave us our present text.

But Dr. Redpath believes that there is a passage in the Book of Nehemiah which preserves the occasion upon which it was first authoritatively declared that the name of Yahweh was not to be pronounced by priest or people any more. In Neh 8⁸ it is said that 'they read in the book in the law of God distinctly.' Now the adverb 'distinctly' represents a verb in Hebrew, and this verb occurs only twice outside this passage in all the Bible (though it occurs once also in the Aramaic, Ezra 4¹⁸), its occurrence in Ezk 34² being a misreading. One of the two occurrences is Lev 24¹², the passage about blaspheming the Name, the other is a passage of similar import in Numbers (15³⁴). Dr. Redpath understands that what Ezra did was to read the Law and *not* pronounce the

name Yahweh, and that from that time such reading was *authoritative*.

In Professor A. B. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament*, now happily published under the editorship of Principal Salmond, and reviewed on another page, one is sometimes arrested by a question without an answer. These unanswered questions do not occur often, for Professor Davidson was no mere examiner, and he had no delight in puzzling. But when they occur, they leave one thinking.

The section on the Redemptive Righteousness in Deutero-Isaiah has some questions in it. It ends with this one, 'Why are "a righteous God" and "a Saviour" identical expressions?' There is no answer. The section ends. The next section is, 'General considerations on the Eschatology of the Old Testament.' We are left thinking.

It is not 'Are they identical?' He has told us enough of the second Isaiah, he has sufficiently separated the second Isaiah from the first, and indeed from all who went before or who followed after him, to let us see that with him a righteous God and a Saviour *are* identical. Why are they identical? That is what he asks.

We are left thinking. We try the answer of experience. That was Isaiah's way of answering it, of getting at the very idea. He had found that God had redeemed Israel in sending them into captivity. At the moment of the captivity they all thought that He had cast them off. And they were compelled to acknowledge that for their sins He had done it. His righteousness had brought the Chaldean to the gates of Jerusalem. But the end of the Captivity has now come. Isaiah sees that the captivity has been the salvation of Israel. God had led them into a strange land that He might lead them captive to His own mind and purposes. In His righteousness He had been their Saviour. The words are identical, because experience has proved them so. Isaiah saw that.

But even Isaiah saw more than that. He saw that God is Himself. He saw that He is Himself always. He saw that God cannot be separated into parts. You cannot say, This is His righteousness, that is His mercy. Nor can you say He is righteous to-day, and will by no means spare the guilty; to-morrow He may be gracious and pass the transgression by. Even Isaiah saw that God is one and cannot deny Himself. He is righteous because He is a Saviour; He is a Saviour because He is righteous.

But Isaiah passed away before the final answer came. It came in the Cross of Christ. Why are a righteous God and a Saviour identical expressions? Listen. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' That is God's righteousness in its great display; it is also the great display of the Saviour. Both are seen in God as Father; both are seen in God as Son. And both are seen in Both at one and the same moment. But why? The question is, Why? The final answer is, Because God is love.

Mr. F. C. Burkitt has written a notable article to the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April. Its uncommittal title, 'The Early Church and the Synoptic Gospels,' might be chosen by any student who had got up enough to pass an examination and must at once write an article for a theological magazine. But it has distinction. It has that atmosphere of fulness, of saturation in the study of the Gospels, which only a scholar here and there carries with him. And it makes progress. We read those fifteen pages and feel that things which we held must go, and things which were floating have now become fixed.

We owe the Gospels to the early Church. And Mr. Burkitt's desire is to discover what fitness the Early Church had for giving us Gospels. Now, in the first place, there is not very much importance to be attached to the question, Who wrote the several Gospels? For it is evident to Mr. Burkitt that the Gospels express no single man's

convictions or memories. They are *memorabilia of the Church*. 'The Gospel record,' he says, 'had passed through a full generation of pious reflexion and meditation before it began to be written down and so fixed for all time.' Even the Second Gospel is not St. Mark's own nor wholly St. Peter's recollection. It is a record of how the things of Christ came to be told in Jerusalem among the disciples twenty or thirty years after the events took place.

The question then is not, How was St. Mark fitted for his task? At least the more important question is, How were the early disciples equipped for it? And this at once raises a definite issue. Were the early Christians capable of giving us Gospels? Mr. Burkitt shows with convincing clearness that at any rate they were not capable of inventing them. For they had no interest in history. They had no interest in biography. Their interests were in theology and in edification.

Mr. Burkitt takes Justin Martyr as an example. He might have taken St. Paul. For neither St. Paul nor Justin has any interest in the details of the life of Jesus upon earth. They quote His ethical sayings a little. They are almost wholly absorbed with the few events that have a theological significance. They describe and explain the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension. They do not once mention Capernaum; the house in Bethany has no warm associations for them.

The early Christians could not have invented the Gospels. And it is not a question of literary skill. The dispute about St. Peter's knowledge of Greek is not in it. Of immeasurably more consequence than literary skill is human interest. They could not have invented the Gospels, because the things which make up nine-tenths of the Gospels have not sufficient worth in their eyes to be once mentioned in the course of many writings.

If, then, the early disciples could not have invented the Gospels, what qualifications had they

for writing them? Their main qualification was what Mr. Burkitt calls *ethical sensitiveness*. They were not careful to criticise, but they were careful to be true. They had not the modern scientific sense, but they had the mind of the Spirit. There may be details in the Gospel narrative which were never described as they actually historically occurred. There may be details which got altered somewhat in the process of oral transmission. But from first to last, from the first telling by him who saw, to the last telling by him who wrote down, there was an ethical sensitiveness present in the Christian community. They would countenance nothing which departed from the truth as it was in Jesus.

Mr. Burkitt dramatically introduces one striking example. A gospel had been written which for the purposes of the early disciples, the purposes of edification, was of less value than St. Matthew or St. Luke. It did not contain the narratives of the supernatural birth and infancy; it was, to say the least, meagre on the narrative of the resurrection. So it was neglected. It was so greatly neglected that at last only a single mutilated copy of it was in existence. Yet the early Christians preserved that Gospel. They admitted it into the Canon. Says Mr. Burkitt: 'The fine instinct—may we not call it *inspiration*?—which prompted the inclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark among the books of the New Testament, showed the Catholic Church to have been wiser than her own writers, wiser than the heretics, wiser finally than most biblical critics from St. Augustine to Ferdinand Christian Baur.'

What was it that led the early Church to give us the Gospels? Mr. Burkitt calls it *ethical sensitiveness*. But now it appears that ethical sensitiveness is a name—a modern scientific name—for the very thing which we used to know by the name of *inspiration*.

'Commentators,' says Professor Davidson (to refer once more to his *Theology of the Old Testa-*

ment) 'complain that nobody reads Ezekiel now.' He is not sure that 'now' is the word, for there is no evidence that St. Paul read him. At least he nowhere quotes him. And yet there is a passage in Ezekiel which anticipates all the great doctrines of grace that are found in St. Paul, and even gives them in their proper order.

What is the passage, and what are the doctrines of grace? The passage is 36¹⁷⁻³⁸, beginning 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you,' and the doctrines of grace are these: (1) Forgiveness—'I will sprinkle clean water upon you'; (2) Regeneration—'A new heart and spirit'; (3) The spirit of God as the ruling power in the new life—'I will put my spirit within you'; (4) The issue of this new principle of life, the keeping of the requirements of God's law—'That the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit' (Ro 8⁴); (5) The effect of living 'under grace' in softening the human heart and leading to obedience—'Ye shall remember your evil ways, and loathe yourselves.'

'The difficulties which surround the doctrine of divine immanence have been largely increased by that unscriptural, unphilosophical, and unscientific distinction between natural and supernatural, which I hope will receive its *coup de grâce* from the theology of the twentieth century.'

The sentence deserves to stand alone. Who has written it? The worth of it lies in that. If it had been written by one of our ordinary heretics, it would be worth nothing. We should know that all the meaning it contained was that there is no supernatural, that miracles do not occur and never did. But it is written by Mr. W. R. Inge.

The sentence is found in a sermon in Mr Inge's new volume, *Faith and Knowledge*. Mr Inge's sermons are not meant for our congregations, but for us. He can preach to the peasant, but he preaches best to preachers. It is the preacher that has to

give this distinction between natural and supernatural its *coup de grâce*. When we have made up our minds, the people will acquiesce.

The sentence occurs in a sermon on 'The Inspiration of the Individual.' For Mr. Inge is interested, as we are, not in the miracles that took place in Galilee in the first century, but in the miracles that take place in his own life and ours today. What hath God wrought? No. What is God working? That question must be answered first. If it has no answer; if, as Carlyle once complained, 'God does nothing,' then the miracles of Galilee cease to have interest or value. What sign showest thou that the Spirit of God is alive and energetic within thee?

And what Mr. Inge urges is that the only true signs are natural signs. In the world around us, the lower aspect of reality, that of which science takes cognisance, is in one sense coextensive with the higher, of which it is the symbol. It does not fully express the higher; it is limited by the very conditions of phenomenal existence. So is it in our own lives. 'God does not begin where we leave off. We need not swoon into an ecstasy to allow Him to work upon us. We need not "annihilate our will" or reduce our minds to a blank vacancy, that He may take the place of our will and thoughts. We need not sit with our arms folded to hearken what He will say to us. All such quietistic methods are pure delusion, and so is the expectation of any stormy irruption of a mysterious force into our consciousness. Such experiences are not suprarational, but pathological. I doubt whether a healthy mind ever has them. Even the sudden conversions, which in some Protestant sects the young are taught to expect, occur with suspicious regularity about the age of puberty, when the nervous system in both sexes is often temporarily disturbed.'

Is there then no such thing as personal inspiration? There is. But it is normal, natural, intelligible. Abnormal, violent, or mysterious

experiences of the soul may waken a new life or bring to the surface hidden strata of the subconscious life; but generally, says Mr Inge, generally it is by the still small voice that God speaks to us, not by the earthquake or the fire. And the cry, 'O to be nothing,' is a mistake. It is when we are most ourselves that we are nearest to God. For God is always the God of the living, not of the dead.

A curious illustration of Mr. Inge's belief that the time has come when the distinction between the natural and the supernatural should be abolished is offered in one of the Manchester lectures on the question, 'Is Christianity True?' It is curious, because it is so modern and because it is so scientific. The author of the lecture is Mr. Arthur T. Wilkinson, B.A., B.Sc., M.D., of the Manchester Infirmary. The title is, 'The Witness of Physical Science to the Triune God' (Kelly).

The doctrine of the triune God. It is the last of all the doctrines that we believe. It is the doctrine of all doctrines which men of science lose their patience with. 'Some men of science,' says Mr. Wilkinson, 'look askance at theology as if the man who enters her domain must leave reason behind, shut his eyes, and be prepared to swallow both gnat and camel.' Not equally in all parts of theology, however. In that part which deals with the Trinity most of all. Three in One and One in Three—it is neither arithmetic nor common sense. And yet Mr. Wilkinson has revealed a witness to the triune God in physical science.

In physical science he finds this witness, in the sciences of physics and chemistry. For, to speak theologically, the three great gods of physical science are Ether, Matter, and Energy, and these three are One.

There is Ether first. And no man hath seen Ether at any time, it is Matter that reveals it. At first it seems as though Ether were not one

but many, so various are its properties and so seeming contradictory, just as at the beginning man imagined from the variety and the seeming contradictoriness of God's ways that there were gods many. But now Ether is known to be one. And it is apparently omnipresent and unchanging in its being. Yet we say no man hath seen Ether at any time. It is faith, the faith of the man of science, that makes it ours. But the revelation has been made through Matter, the second person in this strange Trinity.

The second person in the Trinity of the man of science is Matter. The second article of his creed is, 'I believe in Matter.' And he does believe in it. Says Mr. Wilkinson: 'If the corresponding creed of Christianity were as firmly grasped by Christians, it would transform the Church of to-day.' We can see Matter. We can say of it as the disciples said of the Son of God, 'That which we have seen with our eyes and handled.' Nevertheless the same question is asked about Matter as was asked about the Son of God, 'What then is this?' Men used to say Matter is made up of atoms, and thought they had answered the question. Is not this the carpenter's son? But now Professor Larmor experiments on atoms, and suggests that the atom may be a miniature star cluster! It is true that there are men of science who deny the existence of Matter. The only physical reality they say is Ether, just as those old Pharisees said, 'Give God the praise—as for this man we know not from whence he is.' But the very highest authorities among modern physicists have come to the conclusion that Matter is derived from Ether. Years ago Lord Kelvin—we knew him then as Sir William Thomson—suggested that the atoms of chemistry were vortex rings of ether,—ether that had taken form and begun, so to speak, to dwell among us. And a modification of this theory holds the ground to-day. One thing at any rate is true of Matter, it has a universal power of attraction. And the Second Person in the Christian Trinity has this power also: 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.'

The third person in the Trinity of science is Energy. Now there is no movement in theology that is more promising to-day than the movement, hinted at by Mr. Inge, which gathers all the forces in the spiritual life of man into one place and calls them by the name of Holy Ghost. And there is no more assured result of modern science than the gathering together of the varied forces of nature—light, heat, sound, electricity, magnetism, molar motion, and so forth—and calling them by the name of Energy. What, said our scientific forefathers, can the blinding lightning and the gentle warmth of the home fireside have in common? What community, said our theological forefathers, can there be between the peace which passeth understanding and the passage of the soul in deep agony through the waters? It is the one Energy; it is the one Holy Spirit. To-day we pass through the deep waters, to-morrow we abide under the shadow of the Almighty; just as every mode of motion in the physical world may be turned in a moment

into any other. And more than that. The third person of the physical Trinity may be denied or quenched, as we know the Third Person of the blessed Trinity may be. Shut your eyes and the landscape before you is no longer flooded with light; deafen your ear and the song of the bird is but 'a few tardy waves of movement passing through the air.' Yet the song is not made by the ear, nor the landscape by the eye. And while men deny the existence of the Holy Spirit of God, He is knocking at the door,—the Light of the World,—and if any man will open the door He will come in and sup with him.

Ether, Matter, Energy—these are the three of the physicist's Trinity, and these three are one. Haeckel's creed is Monism; the Christian's creed is Monotheism. Ether, Matter, Energy—yes, yes, says Haeckel impatiently, but I believe in only one Nature. 'Hear, O Israel,' repeats the Christian reverently, 'the Lord our God is one Lord.'

Professor A. B. Davidson's 'Theology of the Old Testament.'

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER.

It was well known that for a good many years before his death Professor Davidson had been preparing a volume on *The Theology of the Old Testament* for Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'International Theological Library.' After his death it became known that he had left the work practically complete, although not ready for publication. Its appearance has been awaited with eagerness by all students of the Old Testament, an eagerness which, in view of recent experiences, was mingled in some minds with misgivings. These misgivings were not shared by those of us who were aware

¹ *The Theology of the Old Testament.* By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the New College, Edinburgh. Edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmund, D.D., Principal of the United Free Church College, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904. Price 12s.

that *this* volume was to be edited by Principal Salmund of Aberdeen, and no one will rise from a study of the book without feeling that the work could not have been intrusted to more capable hands. It is not only that the editor has regarded the task as a labour of love and a pious service to the memory of a dear friend, but that he *has appreciated the importance of the work* in a way that some editors of posthumous works have utterly failed to do. The duty assigned to Principal Salmund was not an easy one, as readers of his Preface will learn; but the difficulties have been cheerfully faced and overcome. It may be true that, if Professor Davidson had been spared to carry the book through the press, 'its statements at some points would have been more condensed,' and 'it would have had less of that element of itera-