

BULLETIN

No. 12

October 1947

C O N T E N T S

1. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Society, held in Wycliffe College, Toronto, on May 13 and 14, 1947.

2. The Presidential Address delivered by Professor John Dow

3. Summaries of Papers read before the Society

Marcion's Gospel - Professor S. MacLean Gilmour

The Text of Amos 2: 13-16 - Professor D.K. Andrews

A Brief Comment on Genesis 37: 22 - Professor F.V. Winnett

This Bulletin is published annually by the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. The address of the Secretary-Treasurer is 1583 Dufferin St., Toronto, Canada.

BULLETIN NO. 12

1. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies.

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held concurrently with the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in Wycliffe College, Toronto, on the evening of May 13, and the morning and afternoon of May 14, 1947. The President, Professor John Dow of Emmanuel College was in the chair at all sessions.

First Session, Tuesday evening, May 13

The meeting was opened with prayer by Dr. F.H. Cosgrave. Thirty-one members were present. On the motion of the Secretary, duly carried, the publication of the proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting on May 14, and 15, 1946, as found in the Eleventh Annual Bulletin of the Society were taken as the reading of the minutes of the last Annual Meeting.

The secretary read a letter from Principal W.A. Ferguson of Montreal Diocesan College, expressing regrets for absence. It was reported that the membership of the Society now stands at 68 of whom 41 paid the fee for the year thus ending; that 90 copies of the Eleventh Annual Bulletin were published in October, 1946; that the treasury had a credit balance of \$27.56, with all accounts paid.

The secretary further reported that the Society had suffered a loss in the sudden death on April 2nd, 1947 of the Reverend Canon George Abbott-Smith, D.D., D.C.L., formerly Principal of Montreal Diocesan Theological College. Canon Abbott-Smith was a Charter Member of the Society, was its first Vice-President, in 1933, and its second President, in 1935.

Auditors appointed were Rev. C. de Catanzaro and Professor B.W. Horan. Nominating committee appointed were Professors R.B.Y. Scott, F.V. Winnett and F. Beare.

The following were nominated to membership in the Society

The Reverend R.C. Chalmers

The Reverend B. Maura

Professor J.S. Glen

The Reverend C.J. de Catanzaro

A list of papers to be read at the sessions on Wednesday was announced.

Professor B.W. Horan on behalf of Principal Armitage and Wycliffe College extended a warm welcome to the college.

Professor John Dow delivered the annual presidential address on some trends of Biblical Theology from E. Renan onwards. This address is printed in full in the bulletin.

The meeting adjourned to the Principal's House for refreshments and the thanks of the Society were extended to Principal and Mrs. Armitage for their hospitality.

Second Session, Wednesday morning, May 14

Thirty-two members were present.

The Nominating Committee brought in the following report:

"Your Committee begs to report as follows:

(a) The Constitution makes no provision for the office of Honorary President. Nevertheless the Society has established a precedent in the repeated election of Sir Robert Falconer to this office. The Committee feels that the Society ought not to elect an Honorary President year by year as a matter of course, but that from time to time it might well honour one of its distinguished members in this way. We therefore beg to nominate as Honorary President of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies for the year 1947-48 the Reverend Professor J.H. Michael, D.D.

(b) Our nominations for the Executive Committee are the following:

Honorary President - Professor J.H. Michael
President - Professor W.S. McCullough
Vice-President - The Very Reverend K.C. Evans
Secretary-treasurer - The Reverend G.H. Johnson
Other members of the Executive - Professor David Hay,
Rabbi H.A. Fischel, Professor H.L. MacNeill"

The Committee's report was adopted and those so nominated were declared elected.

Professor R.F. Hettlinger was nominated to membership and those nominated at the two sessions were elected to the society's membership.

The authority was granted to the Secretary to supplement, if necessary, the Travel Pool by a reasonable sum of money from the general funds and that the payments be made to claimants pro rata.

The following papers were read:

Professor S. MacLean Gilmour - Marcion's Gospel
Professor F. Beare - The Christology of the Synoptic Evangelists
Principal W.R. Taylor - The Revised Standard Version of the
New Testament
Professor J.H. Michael - The Text and Translation of
Revelation 1: 9a

Third Session, Wednesday afternoon, May 14

Twenty-two members present.

It was reported that the Treasurer's accounts had been examined and found correct.

The following papers were read:

The Reverend J.W.E. Newbery - Isaiah 25: 6-10 as a pattern
of the work of Christ

Professor D.K. Andrews - The Conclusion of Amos' Introductory
Sermon, 2: 13-16
Professor R.B.Y. Scott - The Oracle Titles "massā" and "nē'um"
Professor F.V. Winnett - A Brief Comment on Genesis 37: 22

An invitation was extended through the Secretary to the Society to hold their Sixteenth Annual Meeting at Trinity College.

The benediction was said by the Honorary President and the meeting adjourned.

The following members were present at one or more sessions:

Andrews	Hay	Newbery
Beare	Hettlinger	Newby
Chalmers	Hiltz	Parker
Cosgrave	Horan	Schnell
Currie	Jackson	Scott
de Catanzaro	Johnson	Staples
Dow	McCullough	Taylor
Fairweather	MacNeill	J.W.W. Wilkinson
Feilding	Meek	F.H. Wilkinson
G.P. Gilmour	Mellow	Williams
S.M. Gilmour	Michael	Winnett

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS
Professor John Dow

"One day in the autumn of 1845, a certain French priest of the Roman Catholic Church made a momentous descent down the steps of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, in Paris, "never again to remount them", he tells us, "in priestly dress." This priest, some twenty-two years of age, was Ernest Renan, a fastidious, critical, and disenchanting young man who had found it no longer possible to accept dogmatic Christianity, or to submit his mind to the authority of his Church. He was later to gain world-wide renown for books which, for many of his readers, dealt graceful but devastating blows to the orthodox view of the origins of Christianity, the book of Job, the life of Jesus. His departure from St. Sulpice, on that 6th of October, was a quiet but epoch-shaping event. Across the English Channel, just two days later, another similarly quiet but pregnant event was occurring, in the village of Littlemore, near Oxford. On the night of October 8, while the rain fell in torrents, John Henry Newman, England's greatest Anglican leader of the day, fell at the feet of the Passionist Father Dominic, whom he implored to receive him into "the one fold of Christ." Like Renan, he had made a long intellectual and spiritual journey. But unlike the great French critic, Newman's quest had taken him from the armchair liberalism of the Oxford "Noetics" of the 1820's, through a grueling study of the early Anglican divines and the Church Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, to his present Roman Catholic certitudes, expressed in his uncompleted book, The Development of Christian Doctrine. As the cold October rain fell on the little village that night, Newman made his general confession. After it was over, he could not walk. His friends, Richard Stanton and

Ambrose St. John, took him by the arms and helped him, stumbling and half fainting, to his bed. "- (Harrold on J.H.N.)

These two great names Renan and Newman portray the dilemma of Christianity one hundred years ago. The leaders of Protestantism, after momentary confusion and dismay, followed on in the general direction of Renan, and so opened up before mankind the century of Liberalism -- in Biblical study and in theological thought. The man who was to spearhead that advance of Liberalism among English-speaking peoples was ushered into an unsuspecting world in the cold North-East of Scotland, in Aberdeenshire, under the shadow of Bennachie, on Sunday, 8th November 1846. William Robertson Smith was born into the Evangelical tradition, his father having given up a teaching career of opening promise with comfort and a competency before him to take a small country charge with no reward but penury and a good conscience that religion might be free from state interference. Young Robertson Smith illustrated at once his own quickness of mind and the position of the Bible in the faith of men of that time in an incident recorded of his childhood. With his young playmates he was one day in the manse parlour building castles with books. Bibles were forbidden to be used for such a worldly purpose. But at hand to squarely base a castle lay an inviting volume-- Scott's commentary on the Bible. Could it be used? The budding theologian paused for a moment and made a significant decision. It could not be used, because, though it was not exactly the Bible, the Bible was in it.

Suppose that we pass in review these hundred years. It has been an era glorious in our thought as the era of discovery, man's expanding knowledge of the universe and growing control over its forces. Its watchword has been evolution, and the methods of rationalism and scientific inquiry have been applied to all areas of knowledge. Darwin's epochmaking discovery roused men from quiescence in the standards and accepted principles of the past, and stirred a fury of effort, research, and advance. Protestantism has never been allowed to spend its days behind the battlements controlled by a conservative Vatican. It has never sought shelter in the quiet valley of devotional sanctity. It is the faith of man who has struck his tents and headed for the far horizon. It must expect to suffer from the furies of wind and weather. The true place for Protestant theological colleges is on a campus where the blustering of academic tempests can penetrate its halls and upset its traditional decorum. It is an error that comes from the Vulgate that there is one fold and one shepherd as if the Church were a place of shelter. The true reading is one flock one shepherd, and calls up the image of a moving company, an eager flock on the march in quest of green pastures. Its unity is not in walls that resist, but in a leader who goes ever forward.

Liberal Protestantism has known roughly four phases or trends - the Catholic critic might call them four false moves.

First there was the Life of Jesus period, headed by Strauss and Renan.

Secondly, there was the Ethical School of Harnack.

Thirdly, there was the Eschatological School of Schweitzer.

Fourthly, there is the Form Critical School of to-day.

Let us look at their typical positions. These movements have to some extent cancelled each other out. There has been more than one swing of the pendulum. But maybe in the course of our review we shall discover some of the dangers

of the Liberal Movement and some of its excellence.

The career of David Friedrich Strauss is the "awful example" to the world of what happens when a born philosopher is left free to roam instead of being chained to a university chair where he can delight the student mind by spinning his cobwebs over things in the abstract. Strauss was just too brilliant a young lecturer on Hegel for the liking of his seniors, and he found himself edged off into theology, where in a little room overlooking the university gateway at Tübingen he began to busy himself with the writing of a Life of Jesus as a mere prologue to an ambitious treatise on Christian Theology in its Historical Development. He was still a young man of 27 when he awoke to find himself famous with the publication of the Life in 1835. But with fame came abuse, dismissal, and tangled story of a tragic life.

His primary error has proved a frequent failing of Liberalism to bring to the writing of history pre-conceived ideas and to compel the material into harmony with these ideas. He redrafted the Life of Jesus according to Hegel. God manhood, the highest idea conceived by human thought, is actually realized in Jesus Christ. But true thought knows that no idea can realize itself perfectly on the human plane. Creative reminiscence moreover has been at work on the historical data; historical material has been intermingled with myth. To Strauss myth was but the clothing in historic form of religious ideas. But with all the subtlety and delicacy of his thought the total effect was to depict a Jesus so enveloped in myth that the historic features could no longer be recognised by the faithful.

No man brought to the writing of the life of Jesus a more obviously rich equipment than Ernest Renan. The imagination of the painter, the knowledge of the Semitic scholar, an inexhaustible artistry in words, religious sentiment, fostered since childhood -- all these were his to make the past live again. And he did present to the world the illusion of a real portrait.

"Men's attention was arrested and they thought to see Jesus because Renan had the skill to make them see blue skies, seas of waving corn, distant mountains, gleaming lilies, in a landscape with the Lake of Gennesareth for its centre, and to hear with him in the whispering of the reeds the eternal melody of the Sermon on the Mount" (Schweitzer, Quest). But we never see the Saviour and in the presence of this Dreamer from Galilee we do not discover a heart-broken Peter or the tragic depths of Mary Magdalene the sinner nor do we ourselves start as the searchlight plays upon us. We do not call out, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."

The judgment of Amiel on Renan expresses the truth of the matter when he claims: "...The most characteristic feature of this analysis of Christianity is that sin plays no part in it at all. Now, if anything explains the success of the Gospel among men, it is that it brought them deliverance from sin -- in a word, salvation. A man, however, is bound to explain a religion seriously, and not to shirk the very centre of his subject. This white-marble Christ is not the Christ who inspired the martyrs and has dried so many tears. The author lacks moral seriousness, and confounds nobility of character with holiness. He speaks as an artist conscious of a pathetic subject, but his moral sense is not interested in the question...."

This lack of moral earnestness would seem to have been the flaw in Renan as a student of Scripture. He looked out upon the anguishing world and enjoyed the balcony view of life. There is a story that he tells against himself, the valuation of his mathematical master who found him one day on a seat in the park cosily wrapped in a thick overcoat; "Oh", he exclaimed, "the dear little treasure! How nicely it is wrapped up! Do not for any sake disturb him! And that is how he will always be - always at his studies; and when the care of poor folk calls him, he will reply: Let me alone! leave me here in quiet." He lived through the critical days of the Commune in Paris, himself standing aloof while berating the political leaders and posturing before the deceptive mirror of his own imagination: "I should have wished to show myself with something on my back to speak to men's eyes, like the yoke which Jeremiah bore on his shoulders." No, the Bible will not yield up its deepest treasure to one who can write: "For sixty-four years I have been a spectator of this admirable show - the universe; I have had a comfortable arm-chair and footstool, and I have watched the world at one of the most interesting moments of its development."

Adolf Harnack was a historian first and foremost. He was concerned to conserve a living faith for his students who at the turn of the century (1899-1900) were crowding his lecture room at Berlin. He had no liking for Dogmatic, though he wrote the History of Dogma, and he reacted against Metaphysics and Pietism. Round the original stem of the teaching of Jesus he saw clustered parasitic growths -- metaphysic, mysticism, dogma. He believed that Jewish thought forms and Greek interpretations had come to obscure the authentic Gospel. He would re-discover the heart of the faith: the original message of Jesus, the Kingdom of God and its coming, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul, the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.

This was Christianity distilled to the uttermost. Have faith in God and love your fellow-man. The good Catholic Loisy, schooled in the dogmatic and the churchly views of Romanism, would not have it so. Instead of exposing by peeling a precious kernel, he had left nothing of virtue.

Strange that a student of history should have failed to see that apocalyptic was of the essence of Jewish first century thought. Still more strange that the historian of Christian dogma should have eliminated the whole mass of Christological speculation and all the treasured truth of soteriology. Christian theologians heretofore had always found the distinctive thing in Christianity in the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, and "So far as the teaching of Jesus was concerned, in what he said about his personal relation to God and his mission in the world, not in what he thought and taught about God, nor in the form of his personal piety and its supposed perpetuation in Christianity. The historian can only characterize the notion that the fatherhood of God is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity and its cardinal difference from Judaism as a misrepresentation of historical Christianity no less than of Judaism."

It is false to imagine that by conserving the idea of the Fatherhood of God the believing mind of the Jesus of the first century has been carried into our modern thought world. For modern man's ideas of what the Father can do for him are strictly limited to what is scientifically possible.

Dr. T.W. Manson makes this point: "We should naturally suppose that the Fatherhood of God, whatever else it may mean, must at least mean the loving and providential care exercised by God over all his children. And such is the impression conveyed by the Gospels. There is joy in heaven over the individual sinner who repents. The very hairs of the disciple's head are all catalogued. There is, in fact, a detailed and meticulous oversight of the interest of men, and, indeed, of all living things down to the sparrows and the roadside weeds. But that is not what is meant when Liberal Theology speaks of the Fatherhood of God. For we have to come to terms with still more fundamental dogmas: the steel-and-concrete order of Nature, and the impossibility of special revelations. God must not meddle in his world either by deed or word. In what sense, then, can we continue to speak of the Fatherhood of God, or to think of it in terms of providential care? Clearly the only thing left is to realise that the hairs of our heads are all numbered and their colour, growth, and loss, if any, determined in the order of Nature. By the eye of faith God may be discerned behind the order of Nature as the Creator who made it what it is."

Observe moreover where leads this line of thought, what doors it opens. To reduce the essence of religion to an humanitarian ethic is to invite the Church to fall back and leave the way open for a friendly human association with aims of goodwill merely or a political party with a definite and constructive programme of political action. There is no longer any need of a Messiah. The State is able to turn stones into bread and through peace treaties to establish a commonwealth of mankind transmuted by commerce into an harmonious antheap. Instead of the ancient pieties and mystic devotion let men practise the sciences of biology and psychology and, having thus eliminated the Church and supernaturalism, set the stage for the Communistic republic.

Suddenly the pendulum swung back, and mystery and mysticism were rediscovered in Christianity. It was the student of Bach, the soul that was wide open to the higher harmonies, Schweitzer, who brought us back under Hebrew skies to see with the eyes of the first century man the Son of Man coming on the clouds of Heaven. The Christ must be the God-intoxicated man, his mind filled with the awful solemnities of prophecy. Jesus of Nazareth now emerged as a man of his age dominated by a predestination: idea of a new order coming in his own lifetime in cataclysmic upheaval, and the birth pangs of the new era were to be concentrated in his own soul. But this disillusioned, God-possessed man had not lived in vain. He kept returning to haunt the shores of present reality.

"He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lake-side, He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word: "Follow thou me!" and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be simple or wise, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience Who He is."

The historical method had here surely vindicated itself. By making Jesus a completely first-century Jew Schweitzer restored him to all the centuries as more than a teacher, as Judge.

But "in reality that which is eternal in the words of Jesus is due to the very fact that they are based on an eschatological world-view, and contain the expression of a mind for which the contemporary world with its historical and social circumstances no longer had any existence. They are appropriate, therefore, to any world, for in every world they raise the man who dares to meet their challenge, and does not turn and twist them into meaninglessness, above his world and his time, making him inwardly free, so that he is fitted to be, in his own world and in his own time, a simple channel of the power of Jesus."

Schweitzer showed that this mode of argument is not simple casuistry. He found the Parable of Dives and Lazarus spoken directly to us of this modern day: "We are Dives, for, through the advances of medical science, we now know a great deal about disease and pain, and have innumerable means of fighting them: yet we take as a matter of course the incalculable advantages which this new wealth gives us! Out there in the colonies, however, sits wretched Lazarus, the coloured folk, who suffers from illness and pain just as much as we do, nay much more, and has absolutely no means of fighting them. And just as Dives sinned against the poor man at his gate because for want of thought he never put himself in his place and let his heart and conscience tell him what he ought to do, so do we sin against the poor man at our gate."

And now we live in the Atomic Age of Form Criticism. At first it appeared to be a new kind of literary nihilism: there exists, not even in Mark, any continuous coherent history of Jesus, but only a shapeless mass of unconnected sayings and episodes loosely strung together like beads on a necklace: the axe of Bultmann left hardly a tree standing in the wood of the Gospels. But, applying the same analytic methods and penetrating the same unlit shadowland -- the oral stage of tradition before the Gospels took shape out of the darkness -- other form critics have come back with positive assertions showing that, imbedded in the pre-writing era, there was already a Christology. Prior to 60 A.D. in the Christian preaching Christ was being proclaimed as a Saviour, the Suffering Servant of God, the Messiah and Son of God.

What the saner Form Critics present to us is the fact that in the Gospels we have the living testimony of a living Church; we have not mere dry documents, but the faith of redeemed men, a deposit that had formed round the name of Jesus within twenty to thirty years of his death in which can be detected the central affirmations of our Christian doctrine of to-day. It is too soon yet to affirm positive and abiding results. But at least it is a gain to be delivered from an analysis of MSS to an encounter with men who within the short span of a lifetime were crowning with many crowns the Man of Nazareth.

Each historical movement has had a cleansing and clarifying power that has more than compensated for the exaggeration and inadequacies. Theology learns from the mistakes of history and the cry goes out for another quest on the venture in discovery of God's truth.

The historical method for all its unveiling of the face of Christ, for all its illuminating of the background of that ancient world where our faith

was cradled, has failed to give the certainties for which humanity craves. Hence to-day we hear voices heralding a new approach to the study of the Bible.

Craig, J.B.L. Dec. 1943, pt. iv. p. 290: "Since history knows only probabilities, not certainties, and finds nothing that is not related to the whole endless flow of events, how can a firm faith be founded thereon?"

What standards of value can survive when we historicize our thinking after naturalizing our approach to the world?"

There is "a uniqueness, an originality, and a finality to the Christian faith which somehow slipped through the mesh of this historicizing approach."

H.R. Mackintosh, asking the question, Does the historical Study of Religion yield a Dogmatic Theology?. answers thus: "The point of view does not restate a Christian theology, but denies the possibility of one." (Am. Journ. of Theol. 13.505)

Recall the verdict of Walther Eichrodt on Fosdick's Guide to the Understanding of the Bible:

"In his book the author has, to speak candidly, written the obituary of a whole scholarly approach and method of investigation, making both their inherent merits and their limitations clear to the thoughtful student."

The evolutionary principle in history, important as it is, is under criticism. To assume unilinear evolution of institutions or ideas is to be in danger of:

- (1) reconstructing history to suit hypotheses a priori of the direction of development.
- (2) identifying description of evolutionary stages with insight into the true meaning of these successive stages.

There can be no doubt that Karl Barth's Romans started a movement on the top of the Swiss Alps and the debris gathering in volume and power has halted the train of unlicensed criticism. As I read Dodd and Rowley, Brunner and Burrows, I find myself perplexed by a certain vagueness and uncertainty of direction so that I am reminded of a story of A.B. Davidson when he was asked what he thought of Henry Drummond's pronouncements on the region between Religion and Science:

"One evening his partner at a dinner-table started conversation by asking what he thought of Natural Law in the Spiritual World. He took a spoonful of soup, and said, 'Sometimes I think there is nothing in it'; a second spoonful, and said, 'Sometimes I think there is something in it'; a third spoonful, and said, 'I feel sure that if there is anything in it, it is something bad'." (A.B.D., p. 271)

The most significant example of a Biblical Theology in English is associated with the Rabbi we have just mentioned. We should observe, however, that the title is not his and probably never would have been his. The editors who ran riot with his MSS did him much injustice. His own words therefore should be recalled:

"A theology of the Old Testament is really an impossibility, because the Old Testament is not a homogeneous whole. We see the religious truths or beliefs presented there coming into existence in connection with historical events extending over a thousand years. Instead of an Old Testament theology, the utmost that can be given is, a historical view of the religion of Israel; or, of the religion of Revelation during the Old Testament period. The truths can neither be exhibited nor understood apart from the history."

This movement represents a real threat to scholarship and to faith alike if it means a retreat from man's expanding universe of thought. Amid the titanic convulsions of our time there is a widespread temptation for theology to retreat from the open campus to the cloistered cell.

There are signs, however, that these fears are false. The old-fashioned introduction to the New Testament led into the morass of the Canon in the early centuries and dumped you there bewildered in the bog. But Dodd carries his discussion in *The Bible To-Day* right into the contemporary world where we have seen "Mein Kampf" threaten our Scriptures and where Marx contends with Christ.

It would be foolish to deny that "the historical study of the Bible has sometimes worn the appearance of a cold-blooded antiquarianism, with no obvious relevance to the spiritual needs of the individual" or to the tumultuous times through which nations must pass. Likewise the study of theology has often been a tedious and cold-blooded tearing apart of creeds and dead documents without sustenance for saint or sinner. But the close knitting together of the literary records of divine confrontations and the resultant historical affirmations should vitalize both studies. Such at least is the promise held out by this definition of Emil Brunner:

"'Saving history' is not a history of 'development'. The story which the Bible tells is our essential concern: that is the revelation. Faith, indeed, is concerned with the fact that we have to do with the God of history, with the God who not merely 'is' and 'exists', but who acts, who marches along a road with the human race. This God is a very different God from one postulated by a theory of timelessness; we know the difference in our own experience. The revelation of God is not like a row of pictures of eternal truths, hanging on a wall, to be contemplated and worshipped in a mystical sense. It shows us God as the One who has come to us, who is now coming to us, and who will yet come to us." (*Revelation and Reason*, p. 194)

The study of history as revelation, however, has been made difficult by Barth's view of the fallen state of man and the worldly cosmos. With his excessive emphasis on the total otherness of God and the destruction of any bridge between God and man he has reduced the wonder of the Incarnation to a mere skeletal framework, and the Jesus of history disappears from view. It was the glory of Liberalism that Jesus lived out the divine life in daily acts of graciousness upon our common earth. But it would seem to be Barth's view - I speak hesitatingly as one of the mystified and uninitiated - that "the doing of God's will by Jesus in a human and humanly perceivable way is a worldly phenomenon and out of the question as revelation." "The humanity of Christ being our humanity must be regarded as something which the divinity disqualifies and negates as such." "The significant thing is not that He lived but that He died." "If Christ is the Word in the flesh He still cannot be the Word through the flesh." (Canfield)

If only the transcendent aspect of Christ can be revelation, the Incarnation becomes a blanched thing without unique character or value. It means that all the insights into the divine working through study of the consciousness of Jesus are taken from us and we are left with dogmatic assertions to be blindly accepted. How much we lose when we are not allowed to think His thoughts after Him and look at His sacrifice from the inside -- as declared by His own words. Consider for example the inadequate way that Brunner deals with the chasm between the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and the teaching of Paul and the Apostles in *Revelation and Reason* pp. 288-9. Contrast with that the insight into the death of Jesus that Wm. Manson gains from the Synoptic narrative.

"To history belongs not the suffering of Jesus only but the mind with which he approached that suffering and the interpretation which he put upon it. At the heart of the Synoptic tradition there stands, as we have seen, an irreducible core of words of Jesus about the 'cup' which he must drink, the 'baptism' which he must undergo, the rejection and death which the Son of Man must endure, and so forth. Words such as these are not easily put down to ex post facto invention on the part of the Christian community, nor can this be done without the consequence of denying to Jesus all part in the making of ChristianityThe redemptive significance of his death lies not in its effects, in the spiritual reactions induced in our souls by the tragedy, but in the prevenient will or intention by which Christ related his dying to our forgiveness at a time when, in St. Paul's words, 'we were yet sinners.'"

My contention is that to focus the mind, solely on the act of God, the Divine Irruption into history and the triumph of the Resurrection -- to the subordination or exclusion of the Gospel story with all its wealth of psychological detail is to prune the living tree down to a dead or dying stump.

There will always be room for divergent interpretation of Scripture. The believing mind will find there what the cold disinterested analyst never can. To see in the heart of the Old Testament record a divine intervention, the establishment of a historic covenant, and the continued operation of a will to call a people to be the bearers of the Divine Law to the end of the earth -- that is to determine one's reading of the whole. To go farther and to see the culmination of that will to redeem in the Word made flesh is to gild the page with a new glory. Most of us see in this book the locus of revelation. To open it is to stand within the glow of the burning bush.

"Art and literature", asserted Alfred Noyes, "are confronted here by a Presence that shrivels them into insignificance; and there is no answer to its instant question 'Whom say ye that I am?' but the answer of Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God!'" Or as Heim expresses it "In the long succession of historical personalities who rise up majestically like pillars of smoke, and then disappear in a higher stratum of air, leaving behind only the lustre of memory, there is one sole exception. There is One Who can say, 'I am with you always'. We attempt intellectually to examine His Person; we find that He is spiritually examining us. Nineteen centuries have bowed before that scrutiny. Stand outside the personal relationship with Jesus, and Christology is an

insoluble problem. Cross the threshold, and it is the solution of all problems. God is the God Who sent Jesus. Given that as an axiom, faith can work out anything."

MARCION'S GOSPEL
Professor S. MacLean Gilmour

From very early times it has been assumed that Marcion issued an abbreviated and tendentious edition of Luke. Professor John Knox has recently demonstrated ("Marcion and the New Testament," 1942) that this assumption is far from proven, but it is still the most plausible hypothesis. There is no compelling reason to accept Knox's late dating of Luke-Acts, and the "proto-Luke" that he postulates as a source for both Marcion and Luke is superfluous in the source reconstruction of the Third Gospel.

THE TEXT OF AMOS 2: 13-16
Professor D.K. Andrews

There are no important textual variants in this passage, yet various commentators have questioned the integrity of the MT. Vs. 13 appears too long from a metrical point of view. Moreover, the fact that carts were not ordinarily used for carrying in the harvest casts further doubt on the phrase "full of sheaves." The reference may be to a threshing cart (cf. Is. 28: 27 f.); threshing is a good metaphor for military disaster (cf. Amos 1: 3). In vs. 14-16 there is a great deal of repetition, the same classes of soldiers being mentioned two or more times.

It is possible that the present text is a combination of two recensions of the original oracle. If the text of vs. 13c, 14 is written above that of vs. 15 f for comparison, the similarity is striking. The consonants of vs. 13c (hmlh^hl^h m^hyr) may be plausibly explained as a corruption of hmrh l^h y^hmd, "the archer shall not stand," and a doublet of vs. 15a. "The swift" and "the swift of foot" are identical. "The rider of the horse" is a special type of gibbor, or heavily-armed soldier. The words of vs. 16a seem to come from vs. 14b,c, and the whole verse may be a gloss.

If these considerations are justified, the original text of this passage forms a stanza of three lines, comparable to the conclusion of

earlier strophes in Amos' introductory address (see 1: 4 f., 7f., 14 f.; 2: 2 f.). It would run as follows:

hinneh anokhi me^hiq tahtekhem
ka^hasher ta^hiq ha^hagal^halah
we^hammoreh lo^h ya^hmodh
we^habadh manos miqqal
we^hhazaq lo^h y^hammes ko^hho
we^hgibbor^h lo^h y^hmallet naphsho.

A BRIEF COMMENT ON GEN. 37: 32
Professor F.V. Winnett

32: Then they sent (Pi^hel of shalah) the coat of many colours and brought it to their father and said, "We found this. Examine it. Is it thy son's coat or not?" 33: And he examined and said, "It is my son's coat. Some evil beast has devoured him. Joseph must have been torn in pieces."

A difficulty is raised by the statement that Joseph's brothers both "sent" and "brought" the coat. Skinner (Genesis, I.C.C.) sees in it evidence of a combination of two literary sources, J and E. Gunkel proposes altering "brought" to "came" (by reading the Qal rather than the Hiph^hil of bo^h). A simpler solution is to take the verb shalah (rendered by "send") as the Hebrew equivalent of the Aramaic t^hlah, Pa. tallah, "to tear". (The correspondence of Heb. sh to Aram. t is well known). This solution of the problem is supported by the fact that the story actually requires a tearing up of the coat. A mere smearing with blood might have suggested foul play at human hands. It was the torn condition of the garment which suggested to Jacob's mind that his son had been mangled by a wild animal.

The word passim, used to describe Joseph's coat and rendered in AV (following LXX) by "of many colours" is probably to be explained from Arabic shaff, used to denote cloth of exceptionally fine texture, especially transparent cloth. The later Greek and Syriac Versions derived passim from Aramaic passatha, "palm of the hand or sole of the foot" and hence rendered it by "reaching to the ankles" (Aq.) or "with long sleeves" (Symm. and Syr.). Josephus (Antiq., vii 171) combines both ideas and speaks of Joseph's coat as "having sleeves and reaching down to the ankles." But the expression "a coat of hands (or feet)" does not sound natural. We should expect a word describing the kind of material of which the coat was made. Arabic shaff meets the requirements of the context. Since Arab. shin normally corresponds to Heb. sin, it is necessary to assume that, in Heb., pass should properly be spelled with a sin rather than with the samekh which is actually employed. But Hebrew writers employed sin and samekh interchangeably, as many words testify. (The metathesis of the sibilant and labial creates no problem.)