

CANADIAN
BIBLICAL STUDIES



1967

CANADIAN BIBLICAL STUDIES

Edited by NORMAN E. WAGNER

for

The Canadian Society of Biblical Studies

1967

PREFACE

On April 15, 1933, Professor R. B. Y. Scott mailed notices to interested persons suggesting the formation of a society of scholars concerned with Biblical Studies in Canada. Two weeks later an organizational meeting was held in Toronto with symposia on "The Problem of the Exile" and "The Lukan Documents". The Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was born.

It is not to be forgotten that much research had been carried out by individuals in Canada prior to the formation of a learned society. For example, the formal teaching of Hebrew in Canada in at least three Universities can be traced to the early 1840's. Because of the emphasis on Biblical Studies in theological training in Canada, the influence on a large segment of the population should not be underestimated.

In 1966 the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies instructed the Secretary to prepare a modest booklet to mark Canada's Centennial, paying tribute to our legacy in Biblical Studies. It seemed appropriate to select several key papers delivered to the Society and printed in its Bulletin. In this way we would not only pay respect to the scholars of the past, but also permit the younger scholars among us to become acquainted with our predecessors through this limited sampling, since the Bulletins from the past are no longer available.

Our choice was limited almost entirely to Presidential Addresses, since it is only in the past few years that even brief abstracts of all papers have been printed. To restrict our choice even more, it must be recalled that during several periods no Bulletin appeared and it required some effort to determine even the name of the President for a given year and the title of his paper! Some addresses were subsequently published in journals or incorporated in books. Since these papers are readily available, it seemed less necessary to reprint them. These factors have resulted in the present volume which we hope is reasonably balanced.

Professor John Macpherson's 1962 Presidential Address was a natural choice since it provides an historical survey which will be read with keen interest. This is the only paper which was modified for publication. In its up-

dated form this contribution is even more valuable.

The first President was Sir Robert Falconer and the debt the Society owes him is indeed great. His Presidential Address did not survive since the Bulletin first appeared the following year. The first Bulletin (1935), however, contains the full text of a paper he read that year.

Many students and scholars knew and respected Professor W. R. Taylor. His insight into human nature as well as scholarly ability is readily seen in the Presidential Address of 1937.

Professor N. H. Parker was intimately concerned with the practical aspects of education and his Presidential Address of 1943 comes to grips with the relevance of Biblical Studies in the theological curriculum. In these days much is made of "renewal" in theological education. This challenging paper is still fresh.

One of the Society's most regular contributors was Professor W. E. Staples. He stirred more debate than most and no survey would be complete without a contribution of his. His Presidential Address of 1946 is as stimulating and controversial today as it must have been twenty years ago when he read it.

The Very Rev. K. C. Evans delivered the Presidential Address in 1949 and his views on Eschatology provide a forward-looking dimension to our volume.

It is only fitting that R. B. Y. Scott pen a word of greeting. We are grateful for this greeting. It speaks for itself.

A list of Presidents and the titles of their addresses is also provided. Hopefully it will be of interest to the reader. To those who have heard most of these addresses, this list will likely provide a touch of nostalgia. Many more papers could have been included. Our apologies are extended to members who are offended at not being included and to those who would have made different choices. The task of reading all the Bulletins prior to making a selection proved to be an enjoyable and enlightening experience.

My wife, Catherine, is responsible for considerable research and organization in this project. The technical production was in the hands of Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Armbruster to whom we are indebted. The cover design is the work of Margaret Bimm. We extend a word of thanks to them all.

Waterloo Lutheran University,
March, 1967

NORMAN E. WAGNER

GREETING

It is an honour to be invited, as the sole surviving member of the original executive committee of the Society, to contribute a few words of greeting to this Centennial booklet.

When the Society was organized in 1933, the then senior Biblical scholars in Canada readily responded to the suggestion that a society be formed to encourage Canadian Biblical scholarship, and they generously supported the younger group whose idea this was. We felt that too few were able to enjoy the stimulus of the meetings in the United States of the long-established Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and that Canadian scholarship would be encouraged if there were in existence also an organization of our own.

The long-term results have certainly justified this hope. Although in the early days it was often like pulling their teeth to get papers out of potential contributors, the meetings were always worth the trouble. The new vigour displayed by the Society under its recent and present leadership shows that there is indeed a place for a Canadian Society, associated with its American counterpart but making its distinctive contribution. May it continue to foster Biblical scholarship in Canada on a broad and ecumenical scale as our country enters her second century of Confederation.

Jerusalem, Jordan,
October, 1966

R. B. Y. SCOTT

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	11
GREETING	iv
A HISTORY OF THE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES--John Macpherson	1
EUSEBEIA, PIETY, GODLINESS--R. A. Falconer	17
THE SPIRIT OF HEBREW LITERATURE--W. R. Taylor	24
TEACHING THE OLD TESTAMENT TO THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS--N. H. Parker	35
SOME ASPECTS OF SIN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT--W. E. Staples	53
SOME ASPECTS OF ESCHATOLOGY--K. C. Evans	72
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES, 1933-1966	86

A HISTORY OF THE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF
BIBLICAL STUDIES

(1962
Presentational
Address)

In the autumn of 1932, subscribers to the Canadian Journal of Religious Thought read the following statement at the conclusion of the final editorial of the last issue they were to receive: "Meantime, during the depression, various alternatives are being considered . . . to provide for at least partial continuance of the work of the Journal" (Vol. IX, p. 247). The death notice of that quarterly magazine was the moment of conception for our society, which, like the fabled phoenix, began its flight with energy derived from the ashes of its progenitor. For an earlier editorial in the final year of that Journal had suggested the creation of a Canadian theological society (Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, Vol. IX, p. 168); and prominent among the group who met in early March the following year "to consider the suggested organization of a Canadian Society of Biblical Studies" (Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, Minutes, p. 1) were several who had contributed articles and reviews to the defunct Journal. The names of our founding fathers, who met in Emmanuel College, Toronto, on the third of March, 1933, are the following: "Principal Davidson, Professors Pilcher, Lowe, Dow, Michael, Meek and Scott, and Messrs. McCullough and Winnett." Of these enterprising nine, only the last three survive in Canada's centennial year. Professor R. B. Y. Scott is now chairman of the Department of Religion in Princeton University, Professor W. S. McCullough is Professor of Near Eastern Studies, University College, University of Toronto, and Professor F. V. Winnett is Head of the Graduate Department of Near Eastern and Islamic Studies of the University of Toronto.

These pioneers appointed four of their number, Professors Michael, Meek, Lowe and Scott, to plan the first meeting for May, and to draft a constitution. Following a second meeting of the planning committee, the inaugural meeting of the Society was held in Burwash Hall, Victoria University, on May 2 and 3, under the chairmanship of Sir Robert Falconer, who had the previous year retired from a twenty-five year presidency of the University of Toronto. The amended constitution which was adopted by the twenty-one original members on the evening of Tuesday, May 2 (in the first line of the first page of the Minutes of the first general meeting, the date is erroneously given as May 3), has remained unaltered, save that the original fee of one

dollar has now been doubled; but since the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar has been greatly reduced in three decades, membership in the Society is now less expensive than it has ever been. The chairman of that evening was elected the first president, and the secretary of the planning committee, Rev. Professor R. B. Y. Scott, became the first secretary-treasurer. Of those first twenty-one (the secretary neglected to count himself!), fourteen were active, and three retired, professors; the other four were clergymen having no collegiate responsibilities. As a result of correspondence, twenty-four were added to the membership by July 10, of whom the majority resided outside of Toronto: the extremes of geographical distribution were represented by three from Vancouver, one from Halifax, and one each from New York and Chicago. These two residents of the United States had shortly before been teaching in Canada: Prof. E. F. Scott at Queen's University and Prof. W. A. Irwin in University College, Toronto. Four of these charter members were Jewish scholars in the Rabbinate: three from Montreal, and one of Toronto. Miss Gertrude Rutherford was the only woman among the membership. The great majority were Protestant Christian clergy.

The first annual programme was arranged with impressive symmetry: the morning given to the presentation of four papers on the "Exile", and the afternoon devoted to four on "the Lukan documents". Two of these eight papers were presented by authors who were not in attendance, a precedent too rarely followed in subsequent years.

As the editor of the Canadian Journal of Religious Thought had remarked, in mooted the idea of a national theological society, "It is not a propitious time for the formation of a new organization" (Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, Vol. IX, p. 91). Yet in the face of mass bankruptcy in business, and in spite of all the other discouragements of the Depression, these enthusiasts confidently organized the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. Why were these scholars so presumptuous? One stimulus was doubtless economic in origin. There were at that time very few agencies with funds to assist members of the academic community to attend meetings of learned societies; and limited salaries prevented at least the younger scholars from travelling to professional associations abroad. Only eleven of the charter members belonged to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis of New York. A partial explanation was to be found in the youthful enthusiasm of some of the pioneers; for although most of the older members of 1933 had been trained abroad, several of their younger colleagues were representatives of the first generation of Canadian-trained Biblical scholars. Another stimulus doubtless derived from the pioneer nature of the project itself.

This was the first Canadian, inter-confessional, scholarly society concerned with the religious sciences, deliberately aiming from the outset to be national in scope. Though it was a theological society which had been earlier envisaged, it was (perhaps providentially) a Biblical society which emerged first. Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik had not then appeared in English (the first volume of the English translation was published in 1936), nor had the "Divino Afflante Spiritu" yet been promulgated (this encyclical was published on September 30, 1943); and the new Canadian society helped to direct attention to the Biblical basis of theology several years before these two powerful stimuli began to exert their extensive influence.

The young society displayed exemplary energy. Under the date of June 23, only six weeks after the inaugural meeting, a mimeographed letter began: "In planning for the Second Annual Meeting . . . in May, 1934". This solicitation of papers concluded: "The title may be sent in later, preferably by September 30th". The response to this early enquiry resulted in a list of fifteen promised papers, with titles, which was mailed on April 18, 1934 as the programme for the second meeting. When the Society met on the first of May, twenty-one members were present and seventeen papers were read; but the geographical distribution represented by the authors of the papers was more extensive than that represented in the attendance. Professor G. P. King came from Winnipeg, Professor H. L. MacNeill and Chancellor H. P. Whidden came from Hamilton, and the Secretary represented Montreal, but the rest were Toronto residents. Yet with papers submitted from Edmonton, Saskatoon, Chicago and Dalhousie, N. B., as well as from those in attendance, the new Society was securely established.

At the third annual meeting, held again in Toronto, on April 30 and May 1, 1935, an important new venture was undertaken, the publication of an annual bulletin. This was not the first publication of our Society, however; for in the minutes of that meeting, there is reference to a book list which had been circulated in January not only to all members but also "to the libraries of fifty universities and colleges in Canada". Regrettably, no copy survives in the files of the Society. The policy then adopted, and since followed with few exceptions, was to publish in the bulletin the presidential address and "one to three other papers for the benefit of members who were unable to attend the meetings". The significance of this programme of publication must be measured by the contemporary scarcity of comparable publications. At that time those interested in following the development of Biblical scholarship in Canada had nothing to read except denominational and college announcements. Only a very few Canadian scholars had published in the

available American professional journals. The Journal of Biblical Literature had already carried several of Dr. Meek's many contributions, and the American Journal of Semitic Languages had printed two substantial articles of Dr. Staples. Moreover, these two were about the only technical journals on this continent open to Biblical scholars; for our C.S.B.S. Bulletin appeared before Catholic Biblical Quarterly (1938), the Journal of Bible and Religion (1937) and Interpretation (1946).

To what extent did the young Society reflect contemporary scholarly issues? As one index, we may recall that the fourth presidential address was entitled "Form-criticism and Faith"; and at the same meeting Professor W. L. Taylor spoke on "Aramaic Gospels and Form-criticism". The former issue was precipitated by the stimulating work of Martin Dibelius, made available in English two years previously; and C. C. Torrey's publication of The Four Gospels in 1933 was the source of the second. Both of these problems were to engage New Testament scholars for a decade. At the same time, new textual materials were being brought to the notice of the Society by the second presidential address, delivered by Canon G. Abbott-Smith, and by a series of papers offered by Professor F. Beare, at the third, fourth, sixth, eighth and ninth meetings, dealing with the Chester Beatty manuscripts. Alertness to contemporary issues was especially exemplified in 1940, when the Society sent a memorial to the Palestine Exploration Fund, protesting the presence in Toronto of a "quack" Biblical scholar and archaeologist.

Certain adjustments in organization and procedure were made during the first decade. For example, a limitation on the time allowed for each paper was fixed at the close of the fourth meeting, because three papers had to be presented by title only, due to the expiry of the available time. Five papers had been read from 10:00 to 12:30 P.M. (there was, of course, no coffee break in those stern times), and four more were presented from 2:00 to 4:45 P.M., in addition to the business which was transacted during that afternoon. The same problem of rationing time was also considered at the fifth and sixth meetings. The large proportion of Torontonians among the active membership led to the adoption at the fourth meeting of a measure first proposed two years earlier, that the expenses of members who came from a distance should be reduced through the operation of a travel-pool. A dollar contribution from each member in attendance created this fund. Nevertheless, several significant resignations from membership seem to have been due to remoteness from Toronto; others, however, were occasioned by a divergence of professional interests. Yet by regular additions of new members annually the list published in 1939 indicated a total of 92; but since the average attendance

during the first decade of the Society's existence was 22, this total appears rather unrealistic. Three years later the total was reduced to 73; but even then the number of members who paid the annual fee regularly was less than fifty.

Other changes affected the form of the Bulletin and the office of Secretary. After five issues the printed form had to yield to the less impressive mimeographed and stapled sheets, because the cost of commercial printing proved to be beyond the resources of the Society. Professor R. B. Y. Scott, whose interest and energy had contributed so significantly to the birth and growth of the Society, was succeeded as Secretary-Treasurer in 1941 by Professor W. S. McCullough.

Perhaps the most important of such structural developments came in (1939), when a Canadian branch of the Society of Biblical Literature was established at the seventh annual meeting. In consequence of enquiries raised the previous year, "thirty-three members of the Society had expressed their willingness to join in the formation of a Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis" (CSBS Minutes for 1939, p. 1). Since the same Secretary kept the minutes for both, and since the two societies met jointly, no significant changes appeared. This Canadian branch was the second to be recognized by the New York society: there are now seven branches.

Only one lost opportunity can be detected among all the adventurous achievements of the first decade. An extract from the minutes of the ninth meeting reads: "The executive being of the opinion that the present membership fee of one dollar a year was excessive, the secretary moved that the fee be reduced to fifty cents per year. After some discussion, the motion was lost".

The beginning of the second decade found the Society in the middle of the War years. Changes in the world around were reflected in the operations of the C.S.B.S. "Owing to present conditions, it had been impossible to arrange a luncheon on the campus." So read the minutes for May 10, 1943. Yet eight papers, in addition to the presidential address, were read to this eleventh meeting. The twelfth and thirteenth meetings were both held at Toronto in the last week of December; but, with the close of hostilities, the Society reverted to May as the month for meeting. Military titles appeared in the list of those members who wrote of their inability to attend the thirteenth meeting. Government restrictions on travel probably explain the fact that only five members from outside of Toronto were present at these two mid-winter meetings, the radius of representation thus being reduced to two hundred miles.

Although no military casualties were experienced, the Society suffered some serious losses by death during the War years. The first president died in November, 1943, having remained an active member of the group he had helped to organize as recently as May of that year, when he had contributed a paper which he read to the eleventh meeting. Principal Davidson, the fifth president, died in 1944, having been present at the spring meeting a year before his death. Several other links with the birth of the C.S.B.S. were broken during this decade. The second president, Canon Abbott-Smith, died in 1947; and four years later the fourth president, Principal W. R. Taylor, died suddenly. Memorial resolutions for each of these, with one exception, may be read in the Society's Minutes: regrettably, no memorial tribute to Canon Abbott-Smith can be found, although such a resolution was adopted by the fifteenth meeting. He probably became known to more students of the New Testament than any other member of the Society, through his widely-distributed Manual Greek Lexicon. One charter member severed his connection by resignation in 1948, presumably finding after fifteen years that the activities of his Biblical colleagues contributed little to his work as a Church historian.

Perhaps more significant than individual losses are certain trends observable with respect to the membership. As has been noted (p. 2), four of the charter members were Jewish scholars; and several of these Rabbis had played an active part in the earlier years through the presentation of papers. The president of the eighth annual session was Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath; and the elected president of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis for 1948 was Rabbi H. A. Fischel, who had read papers at the twelfth, thirteenth and sixteenth meetings. He did not exercise his office, however, owing to a change of residence which occurred during the year. Only one other member of the Jewish faith became a member, having been elected in 1946; but he did not retain his membership for long. On the other hand, remarkably tenacious loyalty was displayed by two charter members of this group of four, both of whom, though never present at any meeting, continued to forward the annual fee for over fifteen years.

Indeed, the financial support of some absentee charter members forms a most impressive record. Professor W. A. Irwin, though never present at any meeting, has sustained his membership for over three decades; and Prof. R. B. Y. Scott, though resident in Princeton University for the past decade, has not only continued his financial contribution, but has also attended more than one annual meeting.

In general, however, inability to be present at the annual meetings was the cause of most lapsed memberships.

A policy had been adopted at the sixth meeting, that failure to pay the fee for three consecutive years would result in suspension from membership, and this was amended by the twentieth meeting to apply after two years of non-payment. From time to time a few members would write to indicate their intention to resign because of transfer of residence; but most of those who moved any considerable distance from Toronto simply allowed their membership to lapse. So in spite of the accession of new members each year, the membership list did not grow, but varied between the broad limits of fifty and seventy-five. The average annual attendance, however, excluding visitors, remained less than twenty-five. Was the Society still justified in claiming to be national in scope?

At the eighteenth meeting, held in 1950, a motion was passed "that the Society sponsor local meetings of a public nature", but there has never been evidence of the implementation of this policy, beyond the event which provoked that motion. On the afternoon of January 13, a Friday, in 1950, a public lecture, attended by several hundred persons, had been delivered by Principal W. R. Taylor in Trinity College, Toronto, on the very timely subject: "The Dead Sea Scrolls". This was the only occasion when the Society purchased newspaper advertising, the cost being \$36.28: apart from this single instance, the Society never sought to relate itself to the general public.

Indeed, its failure to communicate with any but academic specialists is reflected in some discussions recorded in the minutes. In December, 1944, "Professor John Dow raised the question of broadening the basis of the Society so that theological interests, other than those exclusively Biblical, might be represented in both its membership and (in) the annual presentation of papers." At the next meeting, in May, 1946, the executive reported in a twenty-four line statement, in which they referred to the Constitution as already providing the basis desired, and further suggested "that one session of the annual meeting . . . be reserved for the less technical papers . . . of special interest and value to parish ministers." In 1950 Professor Hettlinger asked that attention be given to communicating knowledge of "the meetings and aims of the Society" to students of theological colleges.

In some ways, to be sure, the area of the Society's contact had become more limited. During the formative years, several members who lived beyond Toronto sent papers to be read by proxy: two did so at the inaugural meeting, seven at the second, four at the third, six at the fourth, two at the fifth and four at the sixth. Professor Irwin made a notable contribution in this way, having sent four papers

from Chicago to be presented at the C.S.B.S. After this early period, however, this pattern of communication unfortunately ceased. Thenceforth those who were unable to be present sent their dollar to the Treasurer, in return for which they received the Bulletin.

In other respects, however, the outreach of the organization was extending. Having negotiated the right to be recognized as a section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, those of our members who belonged to both societies requested that the Journal of Biblical Literature be made available to students at half price. This request of the sixteenth meeting was refused at the time: but the S.B.L.E. does now regularly offer this reduction. Did the Canadians pioneer in urging this policy of the American society? A more ambitious overture was in the form of an invitation sent by President Sidney Smith of the University of Toronto, at the request of the Canadian Section, that the S.B.L.E. hold its annual meeting in 1953 at Toronto; but in this we were outbid by an institution then celebrating its centenary. Some suggestions were also advanced seeking to relate the Society officially to other groups. At the seventeenth meeting, in May, 1949, Professor S. M. Gilmour was requested to "represent the National Association of Biblical Instructors informally" at the Society's meetings. This same meeting asked the executive to explore the possibility of "affiliation with the Humanities Association." Whether the executive ever gave this matter the requested "sympathetic consideration" has not been recorded in any subsequent minute.

If the Society's corporate effectiveness was not as great as some desired, some of its members certainly compensated for the group's deficiencies. It would be invidious to cite specific examples, for the limits of this survey would certainly invite distortion; moreover, the criteria of effectiveness must always be conditioned by the legitimate variety of scholarly objectives. A few examples must, however, be adduced to indicate the international status of some of the members. Professor Winnett, the eighteenth president, was congratulated by the members "on his appointment as Director of the American Schools of Oriental Research at Jerusalem". Five years earlier, in 1945, Professor T. J. Meek enjoyed the great distinction of being the president of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, an internationally respected organization then having a membership of over six hundred in its eightieth year of usefulness. Three other members of the Canadian society were subsequently to enjoy the same honour; but two of them, W. A. Irwin (1958) and R. B. Y. Scott (1960), had for some years been on the faculties of two great universities of the United States.

In spite of its limitations, a generally accepted criterion of scholarly achievement is volume of publication. In the decade under consideration, fourteen articles written by ten different members of the C.S.B.S. were printed in the Journal of Biblical Literature; and during the same period only one other article contributed by a Canadian was published by this quarterly. The same number of articles from four of our members appeared in the Journal of Near Eastern Studies during these same years; but eight of them came from scholars not resident in Canada at the time. No other Canadian scholar published in this journal during the decade. In the previous decade of the Society's existence, seventeen articles written by members of the C.S.B.S. appeared in the American Journal of Semitic Languages, the antecedent of the Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Of this number, however, nine came from one non-resident member, Professor W. A. Irwin. The most prolific of the other four Canadian contributors was Professor W. E. Staples, who was the author of five articles.

The annual Bulletin continued to carry the scholarly contributions of these and other writers; but its form caused some concern, reflected in the motion passed at the fourteenth meeting, in May, 1946: "to explore the possibility of a printed rather than a mimeographed Bulletin". The relative penury of the Society, which had forced the adoption of this form seven years before, was to continue for the following twenty years, at least insofar as it determined the form of its published proceedings. Some lapses in membership may, perhaps, have been occasioned by the modification in this significant status symbol; yet at least one University Library valued the periodical sufficiently, despite its degraded form, to write concerning its failure to receive copies over a three-year period, dating from 1949 (letter from Queen's University Library, Kingston, Ontario, May 23, 1952).

Whatever the significance of its form, few would despise its content. Several of the articles referred to above, as written by Canadians and published in journals in the United States, presented to a wider audience by print materials which had first been communicated to this Society. Among such was the fourteenth presidential address, which appeared in mimeographed form in the eleventh Bulletin six months before it donned the more dignified dress of the printer (Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. VI [April, 1947], pp. 65-79). Other papers read to the Society conveyed the products of research which subsequently appeared, in more developed form, in a published volume.

The plea for more theological emphasis in the Society's transactions, which was expressed at the thirteenth

annual meeting, was answered (to judge from the time lag) only after careful scholarly deliberation; for seven years later a professor of systematic theology was elected to the presidency in 1951. Another innovation of this meeting, which has served as a precedent for some later executives, was the visit of Professor T. W. Manson, the distinguished British New Testament scholar. As a result of postcard invitations mailed to more than three hundred Toronto clergy, about seventy-five members and visitors were present at a fourth (evening) session, to hear Dr. Manson speak on "Realized Eschatology".

The third decade in the history of our society introduced several changes, as might be expected of any institution which has survived to become potentially data-processed and automated. The most conspicuous change related to the place of meeting. It took twenty years for the Society to move from the stagnation of Toronto: once made mobile, however, it was stimulated by the refreshing environment of two other ancient centres of Canadian learning. Queen's University became the first host to the Society outside Toronto, for the sessions of the twenty-first annual meeting were held in Kingston in May, 1953. Three years later the twenty-fourth annual meeting was held at McGill, in Divinity Hall, which again welcomed the Society for its twenty-ninth sessions.

Paralleling this territorial extension there developed a new breadth in representation. A list of members, which was compiled in April, 1953, showed that, of the eighty-seven names, all but five were Protestant Christian clergymen; and of those five three were university professors, one was a woman, and the fifth was the loyal charter member from Montreal, Rabbi H. J. Stern. The major denominations were all represented: Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian and United Church. Professors outnumbered parish clergy two to one, there being fifty-four of the former and twenty-eight of the latter. This restricted representation, characteristic of the second decade, was significantly extended by the election in 1954 of a new member who was doubly representative, Rev. Adrien Brunet, O.P. In his person he brought to the Society the first representative of Roman Catholic Biblical scholarship and of the French-speaking part of Canada. At the next annual meeting, the twenty-third, the list of newcomers included the names of two professors of the Society of Jesus; and with the election of two French Roman Catholic clergy from Montreal at the following meeting, the Society might at last claim to have fulfilled the essential significance of the first word of its name. At least the Secretary, Rev. C. deCatanzaro, felt that the time had come to employ "les deux langues" in the notice of meeting: those for the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth were accordingly bilingual. Three

women members were present at the twenty-fifth meeting, and two scholars from the United States, not émigré Canadians, were elected to membership. The outreach of the C.S.B.S. was indeed expanding.

The most visibly comprehensive meeting up to this time was that held in Toronto in the spring of 1960, at which papers were personally presented by members from Saskatoon, Montreal and Drummondville, Quebec. Such extended representation led to a slight increase in the average attendance: thirty being normal for meetings held in Toronto, but at meetings held elsewhere the attendance was less than twenty.

The Society was prompt to recognize this more inclusive representation. A second professor of theology, Rev. E. R. Fairweather (presently editor of the Canadian Journal of Theology), became president in 1955; his successor was a professor of public worship; and the twenty-seventh president was a Roman Catholic professor of New Testament, Rev. D. M. Stanley, S.J. Yet this wholesome diversity was accompanied by a probably accidental disproportion of Old Testament presidents during the third decade: six of the ten being specialists in the Hebrew half of Biblical studies.

Against a background of increasingly widespread use of nuclear fission in physics, our Society also experienced a form of fission. At its twenty-third meeting, in the spring of 1955, reference was made to the formation of the "Canadian Theological Society". Since two of the recent presidents of the C.S.B.S. were theologians, and some of the older members were primarily interested in this discipline, the emergence of the new society implied the prospect of some losses in our membership. There might be some compensation, of course, in the possibility of more precise definition of the interests and activities proper to the older society. For those who professed competence and concern for both areas, Bible and theology, a dilemma was avoided by scheduling the annual meetings consecutively, so that both groups, meeting in the same week and at the same host institution, might even gain in attendance, and thus mutually be strengthened.

Experience has made it apparent, however, that the consequences of fission can be violently destructive, as well as creative. The destructive potential of another announcement made at this same twenty-third meeting seriously affected our Bulletin. The relevant minute deals with the first issue of "the newly established Canadian Journal of Theology". When one of our founding fathers "raised the question of enlarging the bulletin", the reply "pointed out that in the future, papers of the Society contributed to the Canadian Journal of Theology might be available in offprints".

This was, in fact, the form in which the twenty-third and twenty-sixth presidential addresses were distributed to the subscribing members of the Society, offprints having accompanied the mimeographed minutes of the twenty-sixth meeting. In addition, the twenty-first presidential paper was later reprinted in the Journal (adequately identified in C.J.T., Vol. II, pp. 14-25), having earlier been distributed in mimeographed form following its delivery to the Kingston meeting. Moreover, some other papers read to the Society were later printed in the Canadian Journal of Theology (e.g., C.J.T., Vol. III, pp. 211-218). A reader of this journal would have difficulty in identifying the twenty-sixth presidential address, however; thirty-seven pages before the opening of Professor Caird's article a sentence embedded in a prefatory note evidently intends to link the article with the Society, whose name was mutilated by the theological editor (C.J.T., Vol. V, pp. 44-51; and, for the faulty name, see the bottom of p. 6: "Canadian Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis" [sic!]). To be sure, such slight confusion probably presented no problem in the early years of the Journal's existence, because of the close liaison between our Society and the editors.

For here, too, the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies might rightfully claim a share in supplying some of the initial stimulus which eventuated in this Canadian quarterly publication. In the first year of its issue, the secretary of its board, as well as the chairman and secretary of the editorial committee were members, as were also five of the eighteen authors who contributed to the first volume. A higher proportion is seen in volume two, in which eleven of the twenty-three contributors were our colleagues, and in volume three, with nine out of twenty-one. Such statistics surely give us some satisfaction: where, then, were the noxious products of fission?

The regular publication of the Bulletin, which neither the Depression nor the War had interrupted, now ceased. For a few years, the Society's communications were limited to the circulation of abbreviated minutes of the annual meetings; and we thereby forfeited one of the best claims on the interest of those members who were unable to meet annually in May. The disappearance of the Bulletin dissolved one of the tangible bonds which tied together some serious and sympathetic students of the Scriptures, who necessarily must study in isolation in this vast country. It may be unjust thus to imply that the publication of the Canadian Journal of Theology was responsible for the interruption of the Society's own publication. Other factors must be considered. Among the most relevant was the appearance of a number of new journals, of which the Canadian Journal of Theology was only one. During the twenty years

following 1938, at least seven journals related to the field which is the concern of our Society began regular and sustained publication (Catholic Biblical Quarterly, first published in 1938; Interpretation, first published in 1946; Vetus Testamentum, first published in 1951; New Testament Studies, first published in 1954; Journal of Semitic Studies, first published in 1956; Novum Testamentum, first published in 1957; Revue de Qumran, first published in 1958). As we observed, at the time our first Bulletin appeared in 1935, there were very few publications open to Canadian Biblical scholars; but now, in this greatly changed situation, it is readily understandable that when a scholar feels he has something significant to say he should seek to communicate it to the most sensitive audience available, no matter how far it may be diffused in the total community. Hence, though we may be the first to whom some new insight is conveyed by a colleague, our Bulletin may not be the most effective medium for maximizing its distribution.

A survey of these periodicals shows that our Society comprises a very high proportion of the creative Biblical scholars who now work in Canada. During the first quarter century of the Catholic Biblical Quarterly's life, it published twenty-one contributions from Canadians, and all but two of these came from our fellow members. The only two Canadian scholars with articles in its special twenty-fifth anniversary issue were members of the Society (C.B.Q., Vol. XXV, pp. 60-70, Fr. R. A. F. Mackenzie being one of eleven invited contributors to the Old Testament fascicle; and Fr. D. M. Stanley similarly being one of eleven with articles in the New Testament fascicle, pp. 387-400). All of the Canadian contributors to Vetus Testamentum during the first decade of its history were members, although some of those eleven scholars were quite recently domiciled. Apparently only three Canadian contributions were published in Revue Biblique during the third decade of our Society's existence, and two of these were from one of its members (Fr. A. M. Brunet, in Vol. 60, pp. 481-508, and in Vol. 61, pp. 349-386). The only Canadian contributor to the Revue de Qumran so far is also a fellow-member (Prof. E. J. Revell, in Vol. 3, pp. 559-569, and in Vol. 5, pp. 3-22).

Not only as contributors are members of the Society active in relation to these journals; several also carry editorial responsibilities. We may remark, incidentally, that all three members of the present editorial board of the Canadian Journal of Theology are members of the C.S.B.S., two of them being former presidents. Professor Winnett is the only Canadian member of the fifteen-member editorial committee of the Journal of Biblical Literature, as was the late Dr. Meek five years ago: in 1963, however, three of the fifteen were members of our Society (Dr. T. J. Meek,

Prof. F. Beare and Prof. S. McL. Gilmour). Similarly, the only Canadian among nine associate editors of the Catholic Biblical Quarterly is a former president, Father D. M. Stanley, as was Father R. A. F. Mackenzie five years ago, before he moved to Rome to become rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Apart from the distinguished roles of individual members, however, the Society has recently experienced a period of renewed vitality, which is manifested in a number of developments. This constructive release of energy has been ably channelled by the secretary who was elected in 1963, Professor N. E. Wagner. His organizational skill was so convincingly demonstrated in the happy arrangements made for the visitors to Waterloo, that this has continued to be the pattern followed for subsequent meetings. A committee, which had been constituted to consider the mutual relationship of the three societies (Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, Canadian Theological Society, and Canadian Church History Society), recommended inter alia "that the practice of meeting at the same time and place each year be continued", and "that part of the programme would be shared in common by all three societies; but there would be separate meetings for business purposes as well as (for) special concerns of each society." By this interlocking of programmes, the attendance, which previous experience has shown declined as a consequence of meeting away from Toronto, has been well sustained. So for each of the five years culminating in Canada's centennial, the birthplace of our Society has been bypassed; and we have in turn enjoyed the hospitality of Waterloo Lutheran University, Queen's Theological College, Huron College, McMaster Divinity College, and anticipate meeting this year at McGill University. This diversification of meeting-place has enabled more of the membership to become involved in at least some of the annual meetings, and has helped to reduce the danger of allowing a national society to be dominated by a regional group--a development which is especially welcome on this significant anniversary of Canadian Confederation.

After a five-year gap, the C.S.B.S. Bulletin has been revived. The need for such a channel of communication became evident from the circumstance that only half of the presidential addresses delivered during the last fifteen years have ever been made available to all members. As observed earlier, the Canadian Journal of Theology published two of the addresses, offprints of which accompanied the minutes of meeting distributed in 1958. Two other presidential papers were printed, but not distributed: Professor G. Johnston's appeared in New Testament Studies, Vol. X, pp. 352-362, accompanied by a footnote which identifies it with our Society (the identifying note erroneously refers to

the "Canadian Society for [sic!] Biblical Studies), but regrettably Professor C. Blackman's, which was printed in the Canadian Journal of Theology, Vol. XI, pp. 124-134, has not a hint of its first presentation to the Society of which he was the president. The revived Bulletin, which has now appeared regularly for the past three years, follows the primitive pattern, including the full text of the presidential address and the minutes of the annual meeting: it improves on precedent, however, by also publishing abstracts of all papers read at the meeting.

The close relationship of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies with the Society of Biblical Literature, recognizable from the very beginning, and now formally affirmed for over a quarter of a century, is still clearly attested. In 1964 Professor F. V. Winnett became the second resident Canadian to be elected to the presidency of the larger society, thereby being the fourth member of our Society to be so honoured. In 1962 Professor F. Beare was the only Canadian among the nine associates in Council of the S.B.L., and Professor W. S. McCullough now has the same distinction. Rev. Frank North, another charter member of the C.S.B.S., is the only one of our number at present listed among the Life Members of the S.B.L. Within the last five years, eight of our membership have published in that society's Journal of Biblical Literature.

Of course, only a few of those courageous charter members are able to share in this revived vigour of the thirty-fifth year: the names of these five have been encountered in previous pages: Irwin, McCullough, North, Scott and Winnett. Rev. Professor H. L. MacNeill, whose name is second on the original roll, was a participant in the proceedings when the Society was the guest of his college in 1966. Two others, whose support of the Society was active and sustained, have died in recent years. Dr. Meek, who was honoured by being elected Honorary President of the Society in 1963, survived only two years; and Dr. Staples survived only a few months after sharing in the thirty-second annual meeting.

The basis laid by these respected pioneers thirty-five years ago has proven to be a sound foundation for a still vigorous and growing society. Biblical interests have moved from Ugarit to Qumran, through Formgeschichte and Entmythologisierung, documentary analysis and theological synthesis. The papers presented to the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies through more than three decades have reflected these developments, giving evidence of the alert adjustment to changing interests which must characterize any living society. New energy is being infused into its life by the active participation of several enthusiastic younger

scholars, many of whom became members while still pursuing programmes of study under the direction of some of our pioneers. While the formidable distances of our country still greatly limit the proper regional representation, it is encouraging to see even these barriers overcome in recent meetings: Biblical scholars from Atlantic and Pacific provinces met in Hamilton last year. Even more encouraging is the increasing diversity of credal communities represented. May such symptoms of growth and vigour increase in this era of jubilant Canadianism and expanding ecumenism.

JOHN MACPHERSON

EUSEBEIA, PIETY, GODLINESS

Eusebeia is one of the ruling terms, along with its associated forms, eusebeo, eusebos, theosebeia, in the Pastoral Epistles. Elsewhere in the New Testament, these words, except eusebos, are found only in Acts and 2 Peter.

Eusebeia, sebeo, semnos, all have the same root. Eusebeia expresses a fundamental idea in religion, awe in the presence of the supernatural, reverence by the worshipper for the Divine majesty; this reverence involves readiness to obey the Divine will. In Sophocles, reverence to the Gods (eusebein ta pros tous theous) is man's highest duty, and from it flows all virtue. It shows itself in outward acts of service (thouosa kai eusebousa tois theois) as well as in living and acting piously and dutifully in all relations, with filial respect towards parents and loyalty to all who deserve it (Antig. 731). Dusebeia, impiety, associated in Aeschylus with hubris, insolence, follows on koros, a state of material prosperity or avarice. He who performs the duties of religion becomes semnos, worthy of respect, constraining deference by the gravity of his character. This Greek ideal of the religious man was seen in Socrates: "So pious and devoutly religious that he would take no step apart from the will of heaven; so just and upright that he never did even a trifling injury to a living soul; so self-controlled, so temperate, that he never at any time chose the sweeter in place of the better; so sensible and wise and prudent that in distinguishing the better from the worse he never erred" (Memorabilia, iv. 8. 11, as in Adam, The Religious Teachers of Greece, p. 352).

By the Peripatetics diesidaimonia is contrasted with eusebeia. The Stoics taught that essential eusebeia was of the spirit, but they did not, as a rule, refuse to observe the outward service to the Gods as commonly practised. In hellenistic inscriptions, eusebeia denotes not only "operative, cultive piety", but whatever springs from reverence for the will of God. It goes often with arete, virtue, dikaosune justice, kalokagathia goodness, as being conduct well pleasing to God. It is used also of loyalty to the emperor.

"Classical Greek has no word which covers religion as we use the term. Eusebeia approximates to it, but in essence means no more than the regular performance of due

worship in the proper spirit, while hosiotetes describes ritual purity. The place of faith was taken by myth and ritual. These things implied an attitude rather than a conviction" (Nock, Conversion, p. 10).

In the Greek tradition eusebeia has a fuller content than our "religion". "Piety" is a better translation, with its connotation, "habitual reverence and obedience to God, and faithfulness to the duties naturally owed to parents and relatives, superiors, etc." (Shorter Oxford Dict.). By etymology, "godliness" is nearer the root idea, and in both "godliness" and "piety" there is a suggestion of worship. In Latin pietas approximates closely to eusebeia: closer than religio. "The quality known to the Romans as pietas, rises in spite of trial and danger, superior to the enticements of individual passion and selfish ease. Aeneas's pietas became a sense of duty to the will of the gods, as well as to his father, his son, his people; and this duty never leaves him" (Warde Fowler, Religious Experience of the Roman People; see also Death of Turnus, pp. 146 ff.).

Turning now to the use of the word in Jewish writings, it is rare in the LXX, occurring only five times, the adjective ten times, the verb only once, theosebeia with its adjective five times. In Isa. xl. 2 eusebeia is the translation of vir'ath, "the fear of the Lord giving itself up to adoration", and it is accompanied by the spirit of knowledge. This "fear of the Lord" (often better translated "reverence", G. F. Moore) is equivalent to the words of Mic. vi. 8: "to walk humbly with thy God", i.e. to respect Jahwe's claims, and to fulfill without question the justice and mercy which He demands of man. In Job xxviii. 28 theosebeia the "fear of the Lord" is "wisdom", and is a practical departing from evil.

The words are seldom found also in Wisdom, Sirach, 2 and 3 Macc. But in 4 Macc. eusebeia occurs forty-seven times, eusebos eleven times, eusebeo five times, theosebeia four times and theosebeas twice. In this book, therefore, quite a new situation arises. The author was probably a Pharisaic Quietist, writing from Alexandria in the first half of the first century A.D. The Law in its ritual aspect dominated the Jewish piety of that period; but this writer holds by the four cardinal Greek virtues, which are to be cultivated by instruction and discipline in the Law. The fundamental note of the book is that ho eusebes logismos, "pious reason", is mistress of the passions, and "piety" lies in the active obedience, even to persecution, of the Law: "Those who with their whole heart give heed to piety, alone are able to overcome the passions of the flesh, in the faith that like our patriarchs, Abram, Isaac and Jacob, we are not dead to God but live to God. For is it actually

possible that anyone who philosophizes piously according to the complete rule of philosophy, who believes also in God, and who knows that it is blessedness to endure any affliction on behalf of virtue, will not get mastery over his passions by his piety?" (vii. 18-22). Stoic influence is seen in v. 22-25 where Eleasar says to the tyrant Antiochus: "Thou mockest at our philosophy, as though it is owing to lack of reasonable consideration that we direct our lives by it; but it teaches us self-restraint (sophrosune), so that we can control all our pleasures and passions, and it gives us practice in courage (andreia) so that we can willingly endure pain, and it disciplines us in righteousness (dikaio-sune), so that we can control all our pleasures and passions, and it gives us practice in courage (andreia) so that we can willingly endure pain, and it disciplines us in righteousness (dikaio-sune), so that in all moods we may act with moderation; it instructs us in godliness (eusebeia), so that we may worship the only living God in a manner befitting His majesty."

As might be expected this common hellenistic word occurs frequently in Philo and Josephus.

It is remarkable that a word with such a history and found so often in contemporary language occurs so seldom in the New Testament. In Acts it appears in iii. 12: "as though by our own power or godliness we had made him to walk". The populace thought that Peter and John had become channels of divine power by reason of their piety, but the apostle disclaims any meriting cause with God from his own good works; only faith brought healing to the man. Cornelius (Ac. x. 2, 7) is "a devout (eusebes) man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway", a fine example of a Gentile, who though not circumcised took part in the worship of the synagogue, sharing its belief in God and following His moral law, though debarred from full fellowship with the Jews. These "godfearers" (hoi sebomenoi ton theon, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, 17, xviii. 7) had found in Jehovah the true God, and worshipped Him in truth, though they had not assumed the full obligations of the Jewish Law. The verb eusebeo appears in xvii. 23: "what ye worship in ignorance", an "unknown god". There were also in Athens, sebasmata, sacred places or objects for worship, such as temples, altars, idols. The verb sebomai occurs in Ac. xviii. 13, where the Jews charge Paul with alienating the Jews from true worship based on the Law; and in xix. 27 it is applied to the worship of Artemis. Thus in Acts the fundamental idea of the words derived from the root seb is piety based upon reverence for and worship of God, as in the hellenistic world.

In Rom. i. 25 Paul uses sebazomai, a rare form of sebomai, the only occurrence of either word in his epistles, of the heathen who "worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator".

The ten occurrences of eusebeia, eusebeo, and theosebeia in I Tim. are: ii. 2; prayers are to be made for all men, among them for kings and rulers, in order that "we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity". This linking of eusebeia and semmotes is familiar in Greek usage. ii. 10; "which becometh women professing godliness (theosebeian), "following (ver. 9) "that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness (aidos) and sobriety (sophrosune); these last two terms are nearly synonymous in hellenistic Greek, though the former involves also an attitude towards God. iii. 16; "great is the mystery of godliness"; the motive power for eusebeia is in the mystery of a Person who became incarnate, was proclaimed among the nations, believed on throughout the world, and triumphantly received up into glory. iv. 7, 8; "exercise thyself unto godliness . . . godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is and of that which is to come"; for this the Christian must labour and strive, setting his hope on the living God who is the Saviour of all men.

v. 4; "let them learn first 'to show piety' towards their own family"; a classical use of eusebeo for the loyal performance of family obligations.

vi. 3; "the doctrine which is according to godliness"; sound doctrine is in accord with the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to His teaching Christian piety will conform. Wicked teachers make only a pretence of piety (2 Tim. iii. 5). A life of piety and sound doctrine go hand in hand.

vi. 5, 6; "godliness is a way of gain . . . but godliness with contentment is great gain"; true eusebeia will keep the man of God from the love of riches into which the false teachers fall; he will, with a sufficiency, find in his piety real wealth.

vi. 11; "follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness"; godliness, a comprehensive activity of the Christian life seems out of place in this list of virtues; it is omitted from the similar list in 2 Tim. ii. 22. It is evidently not an equivalent for faith.

The two occurrences in 2 Tim. are:

iii. 5; "holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof"; of people who seem to have

professed the Christian religion.

iii. 12; "all that would live godly (eusebos) in Christ Jesus".

Those in Titus are:

i. 1; "the knowledge of the truth is according to godliness"; true knowledge of the faith shows itself in piety.

ii. 12; "we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world". It is remarkable how much more prominent the idea of "piety" is in 1 Tim. than in the other two Pastorals.

While the words as used in these epistles, are true to their historic meaning, and are associated with virtues which were held in the highest regard in the contemporary non-Christian world, they differ from the Greek and the Jewish conceptions both in their motive power ("without controversy a great mystery") and in the absence of any appeal to the moral law either as written on the heart, or in the Mosaic code. The "commandment" (vi. 14) is a new law, healthy doctrine based on the Gospel. In 1 Tim. the heart of eusebeia is the conception of God. He is the one and only God, a Being of supreme majesty and unapproachable glory, to whom all honour is to be paid (i. 17, ii. 5, vi. 15, 16); but He is also the Saviour (i. 1, ii. 4, iv. 10) as well as the Creator and Ruler of all (vi. 13, 15). He is not a national God, nor does He belong to any exclusive mystery religion. Except, however, in the formal benediction of i. 2, there is no mention of God as Father. We hear nothing like, "to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him" (1 Cor. viii. 6), nor "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby ye cry, Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15). The conception of God in 1 Tim., for all its magnificence and Christian tone, lacks the warmth of that of the Pauline divine Father who draws to Himself the love of His children. As the Creator and Saviour, dwelling in light unapproachable, He receives the adoration of those who set their hope on Him (iv. 10, vi. 17). Proportionately there is a larger Jewish element in the idea of God of 1 Tim. than of Paul; some aspects, not expressed in Pauline language, are probably emphasized to meet pagan views prevalent in the contemporary world (vi. 15, 16, ii. 5, iv. 10).

The motive power for eusebeia is the historic salvation that came through the incarnation of Jesus Christ, a Man who is the Mediator between God and men; He came into

the world to save sinners (i. 15, ii. 5, 6). The drama of salvation is set forth in a creedal hymn in which the Church adores Him who is the source of her piety. Christ, the Redeemer faithful unto death in the presence of the power of Rome, made the same confession as that to which the Church still adheres (vi. 12-13).

Fine though these conceptions are, they are not so powerful as those of Paul. We miss his devotion to his Lord, and his rejoicing in fellowship with Him in the Holy Spirit. Eusebeia in 1 Tim. expresses itself in worship of the ascended, triumphant Christ. It is not based on the vivid mystical experience of the risen Christ, present and united with the believer through faith, but is grounded upon the historical facts of redemption, as they have been accepted by the Church.

The moral content of eusebeia, as outlined in 1 Tim., is based upon that of the Pauline epistles, and consists of the same essential virtues of the Christian life, faith, love, sanctification, purity, patience, meekness (i. 5, 14, ii. 15, iv. 12, vi. 11), but emphasis is also laid, as in Titus too, on sobriety, shamefastness, gravity, integrity, contentment, submission on the part of women (Pauline) and faithfulness in domestic duties. The Christian family was to be a hearth of godliness, married life to be held in honour, children to be kept under discipline, practical kindness to be shown even to slaves; all were to be contented with little of this world's goods, but if any were rich, they were to be ready to distribute to those in need. None of this was strange to the heathen moralist. The Christian was to practise that serene and self-controlled habit of life which was an ideal in the highest character of contemporary society (1 Tim. ii. 9, 11, 15, iii. 2, 8, 11, v. 14, vi. 1, 6, 10, Tit. ii. 2-9). This character was to be won by discipline and effort (1 Tim. iv. 8), and progress in virtue should be manifest, ideas familiar in the schools of philosophy, especially Stoicism. Like the Stoic, the Christian was to be no ascetic, but saw no value in the physical training of the athletic contests (1 Tim. iv. 1-4, 8, 15, v. 23).

While eusebeia is broader than faith, involving conduct and worship as well as belief, it goes deeper than threskeia, i.e., religion, worship on its external side (Ac. xxvi. 5, Col. ii. 18, Ja. i. 27). One important aspect of eusebeia is "cultive piety", active reverence of God as it manifests itself in worship. In the Christian assemblies prayers are to be offered, and the reading of the Scriptures is to be practised by persons who will command respect; their direction is to be in the hands of persons of high moral character, bishops or presbyters and deacons, who will

cause no reproach from outsiders to fall upon the Church. To sum up, Eusebeia is a reverent, worshipful attitude, expressed in constant and varied prayer, in adoration of the transcendent God and Saviour of all men through Christ Jesus, as well as in obedience to His will by personal virtue and loyalty to the family and rulers. The earlier rapture of mystical faith, as it is heard in the great epistles of Paul, is passing into eclipse; creedal expression of the historic salvation accompanied by a new law of high moral conduct is tempering the first brilliancy. Gospels--either ours or their sources--of the incarnate Christ and the historic Jesus, whose words are healthy doctrine, seem to lie behind this life of practical piety. The needs of a later age are being met in 1 Timothy, as the nature of Christian eusebeia is unfolded; the new religion has filled the hellenistic and the Jewish conceptions of piety with renovating content, and has given the ancient word a pregnant and transforming meaning. (Note.--"The Roman pius strictly conforms his life to the jus divinum; he knows the will of the gods, and adjusts himself thereto whether in the family or as a citizen of the state. The new religion was morality itself. In Christianity morality became an active pietas of universal love, consecrated by an appeal to the life and death of the Master. The Roman did not really know the meaning of prayer. In the new religion one striking fact was that prayer superseded the religion of ceremonies and invocation of the gods. Prayer was the motive power of moral renewal and inward civilization, and the means of maintaining the universal law of love" [Warde Fowler, op. cit., ch. xx]).

R. A. FALCONER

THE SPIRIT OF HEBREW LITERATURE

When we speak of the spirit of a man, we mean those qualities of head and of heart which both mark him off from other men and give direction and significance to his life. So when we are asked to deal with the spirit of Hebrew Literature I assume that we are required to set forth those features of the Literature which somehow bind it into a unity and give it enduring significance among the literatures of the race. We need not waste much time at the outset debating whether the Hebrews at any time wrote anything that is worthy to be designated literature, and whether whatever treasure they gave to the world was held in earthen vessels. Mr. J. Middleton Murry in his "Problems of Style" makes the sweeping statement--"When we consider style in the larger sense, it seems to me scarcely an exaggeration to say that the style of one-half of the (English) Bible is atrocious. A great part of the historical books of the Old Testament, the Gospels in the New, are examples of all that writing should not be: and nothing the translators might have done would have altered this. The "Life of Jesus" by Ernest Renan is, as a whole, infinitely superior in point of style to the narrative of the Authorized Version of the Gospels. . . ." With such a wave of the hand, Mr. Murry dismisses the bulk of the Bible as literature. His quarrel with what the Hebrews wrote is that they failed herein to present the facts which they recorded in their full setting, and vividly and with artistic unity. In other words that they did not write as a modern journalist would write. But somehow we feel that the literature of the Hebrews will be read long after the works of modern professional literary artists have been forgotten. And this power of survival is owed not only to the soul which it enshrines but to its own singular qualities. What these singular qualities are, we shall seek to define later. But for the moment it is sufficient to say that neither thought alone nor style alone creates literature and gives it immortality but that the two are for these ends as interdependent as the convex and concave sides of a circle. John Morley once said that "literature consists of all the books (--and they are not so many--) where moral truth and human passion are touched with a certain largeness, sanity and attraction of form." If this be our gauge then the Hebrews not only produced literature but great literature.

And yet, that the Hebrews produced a literature at

all--even a mean literature--must be regarded as one of the most puzzling riddles of history. The country was small, one-half the area of Nova Scotia, one-tenth of that of England--; it was cut off from the sea by a harborless coast and ringed round by deserts on the landward side; it possessed no wealth in soil or in minerals--obliged to import even most of its salt; drought, blights and locust-plagues at frequent intervals reduced its normal poverty to starvation and desolation. It was little more than a highway over which rolled the armies of Asia and Africa; successive conquerors coveted it as a point of vantage in their schemes for empire and robbed it of its independence even as they do now. All the conditions which we believe are necessary to the creation of an independent culture--resources, leisure, and freedom from molestation were wanting to these Hebrews. Off this great trunk-road between the two continents its hills and valleys were just back-bays and retreats in which a loose and fitful unity was maintained.

The literature itself exhibits the helplessness of the Hebrews to withstand the consequences of their history. On almost every page we see that the common denominator of their modes of life and thought was that which they shared in common with all the peoples of the Ancient Near East. The Ionian colonies of Asia Minor when robbed of their independence and civic freedom by the Persians, left with nothing on which to exercise their minds but themselves and the cosmos, proceeded to speculate on the nature of things, to construct theories as to their original substance and to explore the meaning of unity in a world of change or phenomena. Babylonian mythology, mediated through the Persians or others, very probably gave the initial impetus to this Ionian philosophy, since in its earliest forms it seems to be doing little more than to rationalize the Eastern myths. But the Hebrews in a political situation similar to that of the Ionians took over from their neighbours at least four creation myths, a Babylonian which we meet in Genesis I, a Syrian which is preserved in Genesis II, a third which is concealed behind the references to the dragon Rahab in various parts of the Old Testament, and a fourth preserved most completely in Psalm 74 in which the dragon mastered at creation by the god of order was the many-headed monster Leviathan. The Hebrews accepted these contradictory views of the cosmos in respect to its origin and order with so little criticism that they did not even seek to harmonize them.

And if we pass from mythology to matters of form in literature, we meet the same conditions. For a long time men who were accustomed to the Greek modes of poetry were perplexed by the phenomena with which they were confronted in Hebrew poetry. Josephus out of a desire to magnify it

tried to force anapaests and dactyls and other such measures on it. The apology of Josephus was unsuccessful. But as the poetry of the Old Testament seemed to be *sui generis*, later writers thought that it must be viewed as a creation of the Holy Ghost. John Donne, for example, says, "If we should take all those Figures and Tropes which are collected out of secular Poets and Orators we may give higher and livelier examples of every one of those Figures out of the Scriptures than out of all the Greek and Latin Poets and Orators: and they mistake it much who think that the Holy Ghost hath chosen a low and barbarous and homely style rather than an eloquent and powerful manner of expressing itself." It remained for later men to show that Hebrew poetry followed definite laws and forms.

Until quite a recent date, it was thought that this poetic art was an invention of the Hebrews, a product of their culture. But now it is known that it was employed in the hymns of Babylonians and Egyptians, and even of the Canaanites who preceded them in the land of Palestine. To illustrate this we quote three examples of Synonymous Parallelism drawn from three different sources.

Hebrew (Ps. 36:6)--

"O Yahweh, thy mercy reaches to the heavens
And thy faithfulness to the clouds."

(Babylonian)--

"Be pleased that my prayers may be heard,
That the words of my cry may be heard."

(Egyptian)--

"The ever-moving stars sing aloud to thee
And the constellations that never set adore thee."

It is obvious that there is something common in the origin of the poetry of all these peoples. As the forms of rhythm in Greek poetry were determined for all its history in some dim past when words were matched to the pipe or the strings, so the measure of rhythm in the poetry of the Ancient East may have been early determined by the swing of the camel's stride as men sang to one another on long journeys through the desert steppes. But whatever the origin was, the Hebrews were not inventors of any form of metrical composition but heirs with all their neighbours to some common tradition.

These cultural defects of the Hebrews of which I have just spoken are still more impressively revealed in the results of Palestinian Archaeology. Within the last quarter of a century the excavations have brought to light a wealth of material which helps us to estimate from a new angle the economic, religious and artistic life of the people. And

the evidences presented by the excavations are quite conclusive in respect to the ineptitude of the Hebrews for technical invention and artistic expression. In the six or eight centuries before the Hebrew invasion of Palestine, the pottery types which we meet in Middle Bronze Age and Late Bronze Age levels exhibit progress in technique, and increasing gracefulness in design and decoration. The potters of those ancient times loved their work and made many experiments to increase the beauty of the lip of the jar, the delicacy of the base and the curves of the shoulder and the sides, and crowning all this endeavour came the imported Cypriote bowls and the Philistine wares with their designs of plants, and birds and animals tastefully executed. But with the arrival of the Hebrews a change is met. The graceful shapes of the Middle Bronze Age and the splendid technique and decorative schemes of the Cypriote and Philistine pottery give place to a coarse undecorated reddish type of which the general mould of lip, shoulder and base is devoid of artistic merit. The fact that this type was produced without modification, century after century, for nine hundred years constitutes the most damning verdict ever pronounced in history on the artistry of a civilized people. The Hebrew artisan really did not love his work as Minoans, Cypriotes and Greeks did and so he never raised his craft to the dignity of an art. He invented no pattern or decorative scheme and made no improvements in technique. He was at best only a copyist with a short memory. When models failed him, his skill languished, and models came and went without leaving any marks of abiding influence on his work. There is a curious confirmation of this in the levels of the second and third centuries B.C. For some reason Palestine at that time was importing wine from Rhodes. The excavator finds frequently the fragments of those beautiful and stately amphorae the handles of which bear in Greek letters the date and the name of the merchant. Everyone of these Rhodian jars must have challenged a true artisan to emulation. But in Palestine they came and they went, and the native-wines continued to be stored in jars as graceless as before their advent.

We have spoken at length of Hebrew pottery because it is illustrative of all Hebrew crafts. Like the pottery, the architecture of the houses is without form or beauty; the chapels or shrines are roughly constructed and on a small scale. The sacred stones are little better than boulders and beside them one finds small altars and diminutive incense-burners. Within the walls of the house, one may uncover a few beads, scarabs, loom weights of baked clay, ballistae, lamps, bits of agricultural implements, and a toy or a sacred image and things of that order. One is surprised at the lack of inscriptions and scripts of any kind and more generally at the amazing lack of all things. It is

evident that the people must have been as poor as the fellahin of today and for hundreds of years it made little difference in their material fortunes whether a native-born prince or a foreign-conqueror lorded it over them. So far as material culture is concerned, we can say there was none. It could not advance for reasons we have already given, and it did not recede because it could not be much simpler. Whether an excavation of Jerusalem would show some traces of luxury and refinement remains to be seen. The excavations at the rival capital of Samaria do not warrant us to believe that the results at Jerusalem would be much better. The history of the country makes it clear that a few kings like Solomon and Ahab did attempt to import foreign workmen and artisans and thereby to stimulate the culture of the country. But for every such departure from the narrow conditions which the natural poverty of the land imposed on kings and subjects alike there was regularly a bitter price to pay in the form of overtaxation, social unrest and revolt.

Such are the conditions out of which a great literature came and such are the people who produced it. It seems a paradox that the Hebrews presumed to believe and to say that

"Out of Zion shall come the teaching for the nations
And out of Jerusalem the word of the Eternal."

No group of people seem at first sight to have been less equipped in resources, material and immaterial, to say a word that could survive the ages. It is, as I said a moment ago, one of the most puzzling riddles in the history of the race--the superlative example of the assertion that "God chooses the weak things of the world to confound the mighty and the nobodies to set at naught the somebodies". And yet on second thought, one perceives that the Ancient World supplies us with more than one such riddle to resolve. We have been too long accustomed to look at the people of ancient times according to certain modes that tradition dictates. For a long time we have been picturing "the Greeks as an Olympian humanity living in an ideal world whose very passions were tranquil and profound". But how ideal in reality was the Greek world and how many of them rejoiced in passions that were tranquil and profound? The modern traveller observes that the masses of the common people of the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt live on about the same low cultural level. And for economic reasons this condition must have prevailed in ancient times. The excavations seem to confirm us in this belief, and the literature from Homer to Aristotle does not suggest that the slaves and hirelings and peasants were living in their lands a less drab and cramped life than their fellows in Syria and Palestine. Plato says that his

citizens had "an unsatiable love of money and that in their lawsuits half the people were perjured" (Laws 831, 948). And if I had not mentioned Plato's name you might have attributed the statement to Hosea. And who among these Greeks created what we call Hellenism? Was it not the product of a Pindar from Thebes, a Thales from Asia Minor, an Aristotle from Stagira, a Homer from heaven-knows where, and a very small, select group from Athens. As they belong to quite an extent of time and a rather large area, the number of Greeks who lived Olympian lives in an ideal world were rather few per century, per city or per thousand of the population. How is it that out of those conditions there arose a literature of such timeless qualities? If we can solve this riddle, we can attack that of the Hebrew genius. In an age such as ours when men believe that organization, comfort and leisure are necessary for creative results, the springs of the culture of ancient times must always be a baffling mystery.

Hebrew literature, we must assume then, is the product of a very small fraction of the Hebrew people. It resembles Greek literature in this respect and in one other, it is bound together by one spirit. But here the resemblances cease because the spirit that binds together Hebrew literature is different from that of Greek. The great peoples that preceded the Hebrews, Assyrians, Babylonians and Egyptians, were held together like "waters behind a dam--and not like the fibrous matter of a tree." "No inner loyalty to an ultimate truth made them one or fashioned their civilization." But the Hebrews were the first people to be organized around a structural idea which penetrated through the life of the group and gave it a spiritual unity. They were therefore the first people to achieve a sense of selfhood and hence the first people to write history.

What this structural idea was is very easy to see if we compare the Hebrew historical writing with the parallel documents of their neighbours. The expedition of Amenophis II (1448-1420 B.C.) of Egypt into Syria-Palestine is described in part as follows:

"His Majesty crossed the ford of the Orontes on this day. His Majesty bent his arm in order to see the limits of the land. His Majesty caught sight of some Asiatics who sprang to horse. Behold, His Majesty was armed with his weapons of war, his majesty gave them chase, mightily as the God Reseph, immediately. They betook themselves in flight at the sight of His Majesty and one tried to outstrip the other in flight. Then His Majesty brought their leader to the ground by means of his dagger. Behold, he brought the Asiatic back with him--and his chariot and horses and all his weapons. His Majesty turned with joy back to his (divine)

father Amon--The list of what His Majesty took in the form of plunder on this day is a chief, two horses, a chariot, a suit of armor, two bows, a quiver filled with arrows."

Beside this Egyptian record, we can place one of the Assyrian king Shalmeneser III (860-825), concerning an expedition against Damascus.

"In the second year of my reign I set out from Niniveh. For the ninth time I crossed the Euphrates at high water. At Sangar I captured ninety-seven cities. One hundred cities of the Aramaeans I took, plundered, wasted and burned up. I moved along Mount Hamanu. I passed through the Yarak mountains. I descended toward the cities of the region of Hamath. The city of Astamaku along with ninety-nine others I took. I made a massacre among them. I collected their booty. At that time Hadadidri of Damascus and Irmuleni of Hamath along with twelve kings of the coastal region relied on their mutual military forces. They proceeded against me to offer battle. I joined battle with them and defeated them. Their chariots, their horsemen and their implements of war I took away." And now for the purpose of comparison we can quote a selection from the historical books of the Hebrews. Almost any selection will serve our ends but because of its conciseness let us cite the incident described in II Kings 8:7-15.

"Now Elisha came to Damascus. And Benhadad, the king of Syria, was sick. And when it was told him,

"The man of God has come thither",
The king said to Hazael,

"Take with you a present and go to meet the man of God, and inquire of Jahweh through him whether I shall recover from this illness?"

So Hazael went to meet him and took a present with him, specimens of all the wares of Damascus as much as forty camels could carry. When he reached Elisha, he stood before him and said,

"Your son Benhadad, King of Syria, has sent me to ask you whether he will recover from his illness."

Elisha answered, "Go and tell him that he will certainly recover--though Jahweh has revealed to me that he will certainly die." As he spoke the face of the man of God became fixed with horror--utter horror. Then he burst into tears.

"Why does my lord weep?" said Hazael.

"Because," Elisha answered, "I know the cruelties you will practice on the Israelites, setting fortresses ablaze, murdering young men, dashing children to pieces, and ripping up pregnant women!"

"But your servant is but a dog," said Hazael; "how can he achieve all this?"

Elisha answered, "Jahweh has let me see you reigning over Syria!"

Then leaving Elisha, he went back to his master, who asked, "What did Elisha say to you?" Hazael replied, "He told me that you would certainly recover". Next day he took the bath-towel, soaked it, and spread it over the king's face till he was dead. Then Hazael reigned instead of him."

The difference between the last selection and the two preceding ones is immediately felt. Babylonians, Assyrians and Egyptians have left us records of events but nothing more. The words of the Egyptians are, as we see, bombastic accounts composed to flatter the vanity of the Pharaoh. The full story of a campaign is reduced to an empty account of his personal exploits. One is often left wondering why he needed an army at all. The Assyrian records are more impersonal but they give a very dry recitation of the successive movements in a campaign. Both Egyptians and Assyrians view campaigns as isolated incidents; we miss in their accounts any conception of a deeper causality, a development in events, something that links the matter of their records together or gives them meaning. We miss them because they never felt it and therefore they never attempted to produce out of their records a history. But the Hebrews did not believe that the life of men and of nations was just a flux of unrelated happenings; rather wars were waged, kingdoms rose and fell because Jahweh was ceaselessly at work in the affairs of men, in order to realize in the world a Divine purpose. This is the structural idea about which their thought is organized. Because of their possession of such an idea, they must write History.

We shall not spend time in discussing at length how they arrived at it. Enough is it to say that the Greeks made their gods; as Euhemerus said the gods were pale reflections of themselves, because, as they assumed, man is the measure of everything; but the Hebrews were the people of a God who said "You have not chosen me but I have chosen you". The Greek looked out on the world, dared to understand it and believed he could understand it. The Hebrew looked in himself and was awed by the moral urge that he discovered there as the voice of a supreme Moral Will without. As this moral order was both without and within, his God was both

near and far--known as well as unknown. The sublimest Greek prayer was in the words of Euripides:

"Thou deep Base of the World, and thou high Throne,
Above the World, whose'er thou art, unknown
And hard of surmise, Chain of Things that be
Or Reason of our Reason.
. . . I lift to thee my praise." (Troades 884 ff.
tr. Murray)

But only one of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament contains such sentiments as these. The Hebrew creed is in the words of Psalm 139:

"O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me.
Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising
Thou understandest my thought afar off.
Thou hast beset me behind and before
and laid thine hand upon me.
How precious also are thy thoughts unto me, O God!
How great is the sum of them.
Search me, O God, and know my heart.
And see if there be any wicked in me.
And lead me in the way everlasting."

It is easy to understand therefore that Greek literature is preoccupied with the problems of the reason, and that it has given us the finest interpretation of the world from the approach by reason, and that Hebrew is obsessed with the problem of the Moral Will, as the Prophetic Literature witnesses. The Greek beatitudes are "Blessed is he who is sound in limb, free from disease, free from misfortune, happy in his children and himself good looking; and who ends his life well" (Solon--Herod. 1.32. cp. Aristotle Rhet. 1360 b. 14); the Hebrew Beatitudes you well know, "Blessed are the pure in heart, the peacemakers and those that hunger and thirst after righteousness".

This Hebrew confidence in the moral governance of things met its greatest test when they awoke to the problem of human pain. At first they believed that suffering and sin had a direct causal relation but the examples of suffering innocence became in the wake of the years too insistent in their appeal to be overpassed. The Psalms provide many instances of the baffled attempt of men to find concord between their view of the Divine Justice and their afflictions. The Book of Job comes passionately to grip with the problem. Its conclusions are in harmony with the Hebrew point of view. All the array of solutions of the problem of pain that the human mind has seriously or flippantly proposed are set out in order--that God is limited in power or knowledge, that He is short lived, that He is capricious,

that He is a maniac, that He is a devil, that He possesses neither reason nor moral power. All these are stated only to be summarily dismissed as axiomatically untenable propositions. "The Judge of all the earth must do right". But man because of his humanity is so ignorant of all things, even those near at hand as well as those far off, that he cannot compass with his mind the plan of the Almighty. But if he could sit on the throne of the Universe for a day, decking himself with Divine majesty and thundering with a voice like God, and view all things sub specie aeternitatis then he would see that even in the suffering of the innocent there is a purpose that is not only just but kind. Such a conclusion is, if hardly won, nevertheless a natural deduction for a people whose life was penetrated by the structural idea of which I have spoken.

But how differently the Greeks deal with a problem fairly parallel to that of Job. Prometheus is impaled on the rocks for being a kind man, a lover of his fellows such as Job was. And his punishment is directed not by Satan but by Zeus Himself in his jealous rage. In the end, if we can read aright the concluding fragments of Aeschylus' Prometheus, the Greek brings his God to the bar of reason and there gives him no clear acquittal. The Almighty and Prometheus are brought to a compromise such as the human law-courts must often have witnessed. No Hebrew could have conceived such a plot, since "equity and justice are the feet of thy throne, O Jahweh, mercy and truth are thine attendants" (Ps. 89:14).

It will now be evident why the Hebrews never wrote a tragedy. They did not lack passion or sympathy to enter into the experiences of others, as their love and marriage songs, their drinking songs, and also their dirges evidence, nor did they lack dramatic gifts since many of the prophetic addresses were highly dramatized, but tragedy can be produced only when life is viewed on a background of grim, dark mystery. The Hebrew was haunted with the mystery of things but the mystery was neither grim nor dark because within it was enfolded a Providence.

And in conclusion let me say that the Hebrew attitude to things of which we have been speaking is consistently reflected in their language and their literary style. You will have observed that in the standard translations of this literature there are few subordinate clauses introduced by conjunctions of cause, result, and purpose and so on. The Hebrew says everything immediately and directly, and he sees much, for the world is overflowing with suggestions to his sensitive mind, but he never stops to study the relations of these suggestions which stir his emotions and to construct them through a study of time and of cause and effect

into a theory of life. If he had, the world would have had one more philosophy to discard. The Hebrew thinks intuitively, and senses vividly the truth which he finds per saltum. When the Greek sees a landscape he describes it as it is, but the Hebrew scarcely halts at the landscape because of what he senses beyond it.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers
The moon and the stars thou hast ordained
(I say to myself), What is man that thou art mindful of him".
(Pss. 8:4; 19:1)
"The heavens are singing the glory of God
One day madly pours it forth to the next."

Because the Hebrews were the first great thinkers, and therefore were under no obligation to pay court to the sanctions of tradition in literature, their language has the freshness and the force of youth, telling human experiences through the words and concrete symbols by which man first translated them into speech. They never say--"Exact justice must be done" but "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth"--that life is transient or evanescent but "man is like the flower of the field" or "the days of man are like a weaver's shuttle". When they wish to sum up the virtues of a man, they assemble those experiences in which defence and shelter and comfort are most vividly sensed. "A man shall be as an hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a desert land". And so great thoughts wedded to simple words, striking imagery and strong emotion produced the gold of literature.

The Hebrews lived with their feet in two worlds, one foot in this world of hard, baffling and cruel events and the other in that realm to which our emotions, our finest instincts and our deepest feelings continually bear witness. But since their hearts were more simple than ours, or any that have succeeded them, the second world was to them the world of reality. Their words strike us as singularly sincere, and free from cant when they say:

"The Lord is the strength of my life
And my portion forever".

In a long survey of the centuries we must ask ourselves whether Humanism or Hebrew mysticism has done most to keep pure the fountains of the life of the race.

W. R. TAYLOR

TEACHING THE OLD TESTAMENT TO THEOLOGICAL
STUDENTS

For my subject I have chosen the teaching of Old Testament to Theological students. What I shall say should apply equally well in most respects to the New Testament; but since I propose to draw largely upon personal experience for my remarks I prefer to keep them as close to my own special field as possible. Part of this paper is a critique upon the present-day pulpit; part of it is gentle satire upon the professorate in general and upon myself in particular; part of it is a review of my own experience in the attempt to make an effective teacher of myself; and all of it represents a deliberate effort to start discussions in which the cumulative wisdom of this body may reveal itself both by indicating higher ideals than I have chosen for myself and by suggesting more practical methods of attaining them.

I. Why Discuss the Status of Old Testament Studies at all?

If perchance my major premise is false, then most of what I shall say hereafter is condemned in advance. Aware that my hearers may promptly pass such a judgment upon me, I hasten to raise the issue and be done with it. In brief, I have long been almost obsessed by the unhappy conviction that relatively few ministers of the Gospel in Canada and the United States ever attain to anything like a thorough knowledge of the Bible and that fewer still make intelligent use of it in their preaching and teaching. According to my observation of ministers during the last twenty-five years most of them are pathetically poor preachers and almost none are capable of teaching the Scriptures with point and purpose. I am also haunted by the suspicion that the reason for this unfortunate state of affairs may be found quite as much in their training as in themselves. That is to say, we professors may be largely to blame.

This pessimistic conclusion is based upon evidence from several sources. First, I have occasionally had my own old students confide in me, without complaint against anyone, that their theological studies failed to prepare them for a virile pulpit ministry. These men usually blame themselves for having been dilatory as students, but they are also apt to mention some particular course as having been especially

profitable, thereby casually indicating the kind of training they should have had in greater quantity and condemning the barren weeks spent upon sterile subjects. Second, numerous personal interviews with prominent ministers whom I have not taught have revealed that none of them really possesses a whole Bible. In every case I have found that vast sections of both the Old Testament and the New are as dead and fruitless for them as the mountains on the moon. I shall never forget my astonishment at hearing two brilliant ministers confess simultaneously that they knew nothing whatever about the book of Job except for a few catchy texts like "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him." The reference to this verse prompted me to say, "Then you may as well omit the exceptions, for the text you are quoting is a mistranslation." Third, frequent experience with ministerial conferences and retreats has taught me that no type of lectures on such occasions is so much appreciated as those which provide the hearer with homiletical material--what the men call "preaching values". And several book-sellers have told me that a good volume of sermons or sermon helps is sure of large sales to ministers. Many men preach more than eighty times to the same congregation in the run of a year, and it takes a freely flowing well to provide so much for drawing; consequently, every minister must be constantly alert for pulpit material. With some this insatiable hunger for the stuff which sermons are made of may denote laziness; with all it is natural and understandable; but with many it denotes either mental and spiritual poverty or the fear of it. Fourth, as a sermon taster, it is my judgment that the preaching I have heard from Protestant pulpits during the past fifteen years is definitely inferior to what we have a right to expect. One seldom hears a really good sermon. Yet, it would be both unfair and inaccurate to explain the situation by ascribing a low average of intelligence to the preachers themselves; indeed I think the average mental capacity of the ministry to be quite high. Nevertheless, they commonly create the impression of having cudgelled their brains for something to say but with little success. The sanction of God is invariably invoked upon what is said, but God Himself has no chance to say anything because the sermons are so seldom drawn from the Bible. Their sermons seldom inform the mind, warm the heart, or bend the will. Like Mark Twain's mule, they have neither pride of ancestry nor hope of offspring. Fifth, according to my observation, the ministry in general has proved itself incapable of coping with elementary Biblical questions such as are raised by the exotic sects--British-Israelism for instance, and the charismatic groups who claim to possess extraordinary spiritual powers like glossalalia, and the gift of healing. It is a rare minister who knows enough Old Testament history to stand up boldly and say to a British-Israelite, "In the first place there were not ten tribes in the northern Hebrew

kingdom; and in the second no more than about ten per cent. of the northern population was ever deported by the Assyrians." Sixth, it is disturbing to see how ill-prepared the incumbent ministry is for teaching the Bible in the public schools, now that we have the opportunity. I fully realize that it is not always the best Bible teacher in a given town or district who receives the appointment--or has it thrust upon him--and that sometimes the most undesirable sort of man seeks and obtains the assignment. What distresses me is the sense of incompetence and fear of failure which causes numerous good men to evade the task. If those men had been trained to teach the Bible to their own congregations they would be equally prepared for teaching it to school children. Seventh, an examination of the curricula of numerous theological colleges convinces me that it is well nigh impossible for a student to complete the ordinary undergraduate course in any of them with reasonable chances of acquiring much Biblical knowledge in the process. Theological education is no longer Bibliocentric on this continent, nor has it been for a number of years. In order to avoid even the appearance of criticizing my colleagues or the sister institutions of my own university I shall cite illustrations from the published curricula of theological colleges and seminaries in the United States. I am not attempting to start either a fight or a reformation; at most I am only endeavouring to induce you to join me in a bit of serious self-criticism and, if needed, self-improvement. The following statistics are typical of what has happened to theological education in the States and provide a horrible example of what may yet happen to us. Naturally I am interested most in Old Testament studies.

- College A: - Thirteen courses in Old Testament, exclusive of some in Aramaic. One course has to do with Hebrew inscriptions. One is offered only in the summer, and, as far as I can tell, covers everything offered in the field of wisdom and poetry.
- College B: - Eleven courses in Old Testament, apart from some in Aramaic and Syriac. Casual attention to wisdom and poetry.
- College C: - Fourteen courses in Old Testament, apart from some in the LXX, Syriac, Coptic, and Akkadian. One course deals with a single book--Daniel.
- College D: - Eleven courses in Old Testament, of which four are seminars or graduate courses. The Psalms and Job are relegated to seminars. One course deals with the Hebrew family.

- College E: - Ten courses, fairly well distributed, but with relatively slight attention to wisdom and poetry.
- College F: - Twenty-one courses exclusive of one in Biblical Aramaic. One is based on the Old Testament text and canon; one on Deuteronomy; one on Daniel; two on the Psalms; one on the social teachings of the Old Testament; one on the great teachings of the Old Testament; and one, a minor, on the Old Testament as material for the preacher. Incidentally, the calendar names five professors in the department of Old Testament.
- College G: - Twenty-three courses, of which three are in Hebrew, one in "research"--whatever that is--and quite a number on single books of the Old Testament.

All of these colleges offer what they call a well balanced curriculum with instruction in sociology, church management, and church music, as well as in the older fields of Biblical languages, English Bible, Theology, and Church History. Few give much attention to Hebrew wisdom and poetry or to anything in the post-exilic period of Old Testament history. And all offer a wide choice of electives. This means that only the specialists in Old Testament take as many as six of the courses offered in their respective colleges, while the average man takes two. In the college which offers only ten courses the specialist would at least cover half of his Old Testament, but in those which offer more than twenty even specialization must be merely a matter of sampling the professors. A survey published in 1934 under the title of "The Education of American Ministers" contains tables based upon the analysis of some fifty-eight theological curricula in the United States. Twenty per cent of the courses offered in those fifty-eight colleges were in English Bible, while 17.7 per cent were in Biblical Greek and Hebrew. That makes it look as if approximately 38 per cent of the average American student's work is based upon the Bible. The same figures show that English Bible ranks highest everywhere amongst required courses. But there are two jokers in the figures. In the first place, the Greek and Hebrew courses include those in elementary grammar--which are not Biblical at all; and in the second place, the amount of Bible study undertaken would not be very great if all the required courses were in that field. To say that it outranks other required subjects is to say that it is the largest fraction of a fraction. Professor William Adams Brown, who assisted in making the survey and then published the results, has this significant comment to make:

"As a consequence of the multiplication of courses the elective system has been adopted by a large number of seminaries with the result that the time given to the older studies such as biblical interpretation, church history, and theology has been either curtailed in amount or divided into a number of detailed courses, no one of which covers the subject as a whole. In consequence many students are graduating from our seminaries who, in spite of the time they have given to the study of the Bible and of theology, have only the most superficial mastery of either."

It is at least gratifying to observe that students themselves have no hesitation in naming English Bible as the most profitable of their studies, for 78.2 per cent of those canvassed by the survey assigned first place in importance to that subject.

Now, it is no matter of the pride and prejudice of a Hebraist, but a demonstrable fact that no man, however clever, can understand his Bible thoroughly without a knowledge of Greek and Hebrew; but that is a counsel of perfection; in the language of the psalmist such knowledge is too wonderful for them; it is high, they cannot attain unto it. Surely, however, it is possible to teach any normal man all that he really ought to know about the English Bible. Personally, I feel that for theological colleges to fail at this point is an injustice to the men themselves and to the churches they are destined to serve. What if a medical college were to send out young doctors with but a smattering of anatomy or pathology? Some subjects cannot be made optional. Education on this continent has elected itself into a state of scatterbrained half-ignorance. Canada has not gone as far as the United States in this respect, but we are guilty enough.

Never before has so much been known about the Bible either in volume or in value by the few who are specialists, but I doubt that less has ever been known about it by the rank and file of church membership. As recently as seventy-five years ago there was no such thing as an accurate map of Palestine, and the history of the ancient East was merely beginning to emerge from the fog of vacuous legend. Now, however, we possess a vast store of information which is both valuable and interesting for the layman--who is sublimely unaware of its existence. The only logical way to reach him is through his pastor; but, have we succeeded in teaching even the pastor? Is it not an indictment against us in the colleges that so little of the new knowledge about the Bible has ever broadened down to the laity? Who, may I ask, has proved that a hortatory oration is more edifying than a good Bible lecture, anyway? Certainly nobody has

ever said it was more interesting.

If a man is unable to make use of his Bible in his pulpit and church school, then that is almost certainly the fault of his training. Lacking any desire to do so may be a personal eccentricity; yet, even this may suggest that his theological course failed to open his eyes upon the wealth of the Scriptures and grip his soul with a sense of their power. The question of why he feels no overwhelming sense of responsibility for a Biblical ministry may lead to the door of his teachers. We know that the church of Christ was built upon the Scriptures and those things of which they speak; so do we know that it will flourish only insofar as it continually draws its nourishment from the Scriptures. The Bible is demanded even by those who misinterpret it most egregiously. And if there is a more pathetic fraud than the pulpit which abuses the Scriptures it is the one which ignores them. For the professor of theology it must always be a solemn thought that the minister with no awesome reverence for the Word of God may have missed his burning bush experience while in college.

Before leaving this section of my paper I would also like to suggest that the insufficient and ineffectual use of the Scriptures by the clergy has some bearing upon two other problems now vexing the Church, namely, the scarcity of recruits for the ministry and the discouraging reports of church attendance in numerous places. Any profession, any calling or occupation which creates a popular impression of virility and effectiveness is ordinarily assured thereby of attracting sufficient young men to perpetuate itself. Why is the ministry of religion threatened with failure to do so? Does the explanation lie largely in the failure of those in the ministry to recommend their calling by their example? We have made serious attempts to improve the ministers by adding new and practical courses to their training programme. We have made advertising men of them, and philosophers, and psychiatrists, and sociologists; but have we not neglected to make of them the very thing which is first and most urgently demanded by the public, namely, expositors of the Scripture?

Insofar as dwindling congregations are concerned we do well to cease blaming the lure of secular interests. Like the poor, secular interests have always been with us. Men were no more anxious for spiritual light and leadership and consolation in years past than they are now. Let us grant that people demand more of a pulpiteer today than when the level of public education was lower and the rating of a religious service as entertainment was higher; but let us also be honest enough to confess that most of those who drift away from the church now do so for the same old

reason--they have found the services dull and unprofitable. The large and wealthy congregation may maintain a musical programme sufficiently attractive to guarantee good attendance, but the test is seldom applied because such a church usually has an excellent preacher also. The common run of churches depends almost entirely upon the drawing power of the pulpit. Brilliance in the pulpit alone may be no complete assurance of success; yet few men accomplish anything without it. Personal elements, like the now copyrighted ability to win friends and influence people, are little affected by formal discipline, but they play an important part in the minister's success or failure. Nevertheless, he is usually called to a new charge because of his reputation as a preacher, and he will stay there only until he becomes an intolerable bore.

The inevitable question arises immediately. How can we make a silk purse out of a sow's ear? How can we turn the intolerable bore into a spell-binder? The answer is that we may not be able to make any complete transformation at all. Fortunately, however, the congregations to be afflicted with the dull fellows would be delighted to compromise for reasonable improvements. The best we can do for such men is to teach them to preach the Bible. They ordinarily have the will to do that, if only for want of creative imagination enough to "go awhoring" after "issues of the day". Although obliged to talk, they have nothing to say; hence their chronic wool-gathering. They need both content and form, and we should give it to them. They might even become enthusiastic if we helped them to light up the grey drabness of their imagination.

Several years ago I saw an unforgettable cartoon in "Punch". It depicted a little man preaching in a village church. His congregation consisted of one tradesman (sound asleep), one sweet little old lady with an ear trumpet (somewhat bewildered), one bearded old gentleman who might have been a retired professor (obviously interested), and one small girl (busily arranging the loose leaves in a dilapidated hymn book). The preacher was leaning over the pulpit and saying with great animation, "Ah, I know what you are thinking; you are saying to yourselves, 'Now that is downright Sebellianism'." Well, I was thinking to myself, "If that lad could have been steered into the subject of the sacrifice of Isaac he might have accomplished something." I showed the cartoon to a ministerial friend. He simply granted and said, "A professor of divinity supplying a vacant pulpit."

II. The Sins which so Easily Beset Us

I assume that this body would agree without argument

that the comprehensive aim and purpose of theological colleges is to train ministers for the denominations which support and control them. Even those divinity schools which are entirely independent or which form parts of large non-sectarian universities usually espouse the same ideal, only without the denominational emphasis. In our particular case we know, for instance, that the staff of the Orientals Department in University College are loyal churchmen who do not forget the claims of the future upon such of their students as are destined to serve the Church. The purely denominational divinity colleges make little or no attempt to train recruits for the professorate, give a minimum of attention to post-graduate study, and have no interest in the purely academic pursuit of learning for learning's sake alone. Strictly speaking, they are technical and professional training schools.

So much for the matter of aims. The point on which we may expect to differ both in outlook and experience is the reason why we fail--if fail we do--to achieve our aims. By no means all causes of failure can be charged against us as faults. The professor of theology is like the sower in our Lord's parable. Much of his seed falls by the wayside, and girls and parties, and athletics, and plays and operettas, and a whole flock of other "extra-curricular" fowl quickly come and devour it. Some falls upon the stony ground of dull minds, minds inadequately prepared by previous study--without Hebrew, or Greek, or Logic, or History, or even English Composition, alas--minds without imagination coupled with hearts devoid of passion. Conscious of their poverty such students receive the professor's words gladly--and sometimes try to use them the next Sunday as sermonic materials, whether appropriate for that purpose or not. Classroom notes on the date and authorship of the Decalogue have put more than one congregation to sleep. Some seed falls upon good ground, only to be choked by the domestic and financial worries of students who have foolishly got married before graduation, by the cares of student pastorates, and now by the demands of military training. Finally, there is that seed which falls upon good soil to bring forth a hundred-fold. During eighteen years in the classroom I have taught only two classes in which there was nobody at all of whom I could be justly proud. Yet other factors in the equation are as difficult to control as the quality of student timber. Some professors have more work than they can do well; and at best the time is short in which we must endeavour to conduct the student through an extensive course of instruction and discipline. I pass to a survey of the professional pitfalls which it is possible to evade.

1. There is the danger of losing intimate contact with the churches and the working ministry. Theological colleges

are wise in recruiting their faculties from the active clergy; but some quondam parsons in the classroom are unlike the proverbial elephant: they soon forget; they remember not that they were once bondservants in the land of Egypt. Life in the academic world is a sequestered existence. The professor is always in danger of becoming a sort of Saint Simeon Stylites, slowly raising his own little tower and himself with it above the heads of an increasingly indifferent world round about. If he be in theology it is a wholesome thing for him to go in and out amongst the churches as a preacher and to attend ministerial retreats and conferences. We at McMaster are exceedingly fortunate because Baptist churches have a well established custom of keeping us busy on Sundays. Seven of us--including the Chancellor--usually visit more than a hundred different churches in the run of a year. Some are not Baptist churches--which makes the situation all the more desirable. At my own old theological seminary in Kentucky some members of the faculty have always been pastors themselves. It tends to keep them on their toes. Cases have been heard of wherein a church seeking a minister has brazenly chosen a student and rejected a professor. Although temporarily embarrassing to all concerned, such incidents have invariably had a salutary effect upon the professorate.

2. There is the temptation to spend too much time and energy upon literary introduction. Now, literary introduction is quite necessary to a thorough understanding of the Old Testament, but like the young cowbird in the sparrow's nest, this "son of the law" often waxes strong and crowds out "the children of the covenant". As a form of analysis it is congenial to the tutorial mind and liable to monopolize it. Moreover, it has a pernicious habit of hardening into what someone has called "problemitis". Worse yet, it is a field in which fundamentalist factions in all churches have harassed Biblical scholarship with charges of heresy and modernism; consequently, the professor finds himself working with students who are at best bewildered and at worst either biased or downright truculent about anything smelling of "higher criticism". What could be more natural than for him to spend much time vindicating Biblical scholarship, straightening out mental kinks, and making sure that his students will not demean themselves by extremist attitudes in their ministry? I have had that experience constantly, but have learned, I hope, to prevent even Pentateuchal criticism from robbing me of a chance for proper attention to historical and religious values. Nor has it been a matter of Pentateuchal criticism alone. The Psalms, Second and Third Isaiah, Habakkuk, Daniel, and Ezekiel have all provided occasion for elaborate excursions into higher criticism. After reading each of the latest books on Ezekiel I have felt like the man who took the two-mile

running start to jump a twenty-foot ditch. About a year ago I picked up Pfeiffer's new book on the literature of the Old Testament and happened to open it at Ezekiel. For pages on end I waded through a summary of what has been thought and said about the subject by all and sundry. Eventually I arrived at the author's opinions and found them almost sufficiently good and interesting to wake me up. I know of one course in Old Testament where that book was the only text. Alas, the present generation of Old Testament students has been introduced to the point of spiritual suffocation. I confess my part of the guilt. But it is time for someone with a loud voice to stand up and shout, "Son of man, prophesy unto these bones that they may live."

3. There is another danger which lurks in the sheer fascination of new discoveries. All fresh knowledge is interesting, some of it is highly important, and none of it ever appears in the fine old works of reference which our students are using--Tyle's commentary on Genesis, for instance, or Driver's on Joel and Amos. He is an extraordinary professor who can resist the temptation to add and digress and supplement, simply because most professors are themselves keen students, avidly interested in research, and consumed with a desire to know everything about their subject--and its neighbours. By the same test we are apt to become bored with repeating elementary lessons, precept upon precept. We are apt to send the students off to read up the religious teachings of the book of Judges, let us say, and forget that it is far easier for them to find out who the Midianites were or what kind of religion Gideon's Shechemite concubine had, than to prepare an intelligent and edifying sermon or Sunday School lesson on the story of Gideon selecting his chosen band of three hundred men. But start a discussion on the Ras Shamra texts or the excavations at Megiddo and we are like Saul amongst the prophets. We become wellnigh ecstatic when we take up the subject of Canaanitish cult objects or the possible connection between the Samson stories and the Gilgamesh epic. I know the situation from experience, for I have been through it--on both ends of the academic log. I also know that lectures under such conditions grow longer and longer by the endless process of adding details. Nothing is ever thrown away and every new acquisition is fitted on somehow or other until the course resembles the equipage of the white knight in "Through the Looking Glass". You will recall that the knight's horse was literally covered with everything from bee hives and mouse traps on up (or down) to fire tongs and bunches of green vegetables. All of these things had meaning and importance in his eyes, but they made no sense to Alice--Alice being the student. You will also recall that the knight was very chatty--just as we sometimes are in our lectures--and that he could not stay on his horse any better

than a professor can stay on his subject. Alas, is it any wonder that some of us never finish our syllabi? I know of one man who sets out bravely to lecture on the Pentateuch and finishes only Deuteronomy, and another who has a course of lectures on the Fourth Gospel which seldom passes the second chapter. It is a good thing for us that students are stupid; otherwise they might organize against us and demand their money's worth. They might put an end to the professorial custom of frittering away the precious time and opportunity of those for whom the day of preparation is already far spent and there is yet far to go. Students so taught may have a devastating knowledge of certain spots in the Bible, but on the whole they resemble the famous

" . . . young man of devices,
Whose ears were of different sizes.
The one that was small was no good at all,
But the other won several prizes."

The world of research and discovery has been too much with us Old Testament professors during the past twenty-five years. New knowledge about everything in our field has been rushing over us like the stratified tornado which Mark Twain describes in "Roughing It". The first and lowest stratum of our whirlwind was composed of very heavy objects which never quite left the ground but rolled along like a herd of elephants playing leapfrog and somersault. These were winged bulls with human heads, royal sarcophagi, obelisks, inscribed columns, temple walls with bas-reliefs, stelae, dolmens, and massebahs, with all manner of miscellaneous statuary weaving in and out. The stratum above that was composed of such whirling debris as clay tablets, human skeletons, bronze and stone implements, painted and unpainted pottery, kernos rings and incense altars, cylinder seals, figurines, and cult objects of all kinds. Still higher up the sky was filled with printed pages in all the languages of mankind--books, journals, museum publications, and the proceedings of learned societies. The whole maelstrom was peppered by a hailstorm of rings, scarabs, beads, jewels, and inscribed potsherds, and drenched with a rainstorm of drink offerings for the dead--all magical in one way or another. Who can blame a professor for losing his sense of proportion in the midst of weather like that?

III. What Can Be Done About It?

Having glanced at the problems and difficulties which beset us as teachers of the Bible--and more especially of the Old Testament--I should like to speak now of my experience in the attempt to overcome them. I disavow in advance all prejudice in favour of my own methods; all I can say for them is that they are better than those to which I was subjected

as a student, and better than those with which I began as an instructor.

About ten years ago our curriculum at McMaster was revised and the Old Testament courses were reconstructed according to the combined wisdom of the entire faculty. Since then I have incessantly sought means of improving both the choice of topics and the manner of presenting them. First, I sought the advice of other men and got none whatever. Then I began experimenting cautiously and modestly, sometimes changing the lectures and sometimes the work demanded of the students. Like Qoheleth in the book of Ecclesiastes, I tried both wisdom and folly; but unlike him I did at least derive a profit. I have made no attempt to apply pedagogy as a science in itself; in fact I confess to a serious distrust of anything which smacks of "education" as the term is understood in American colleges. If I have learned anything worthy of recommendation to this society it has been a little about the arrangement of courses, something about teaching methods, and something about making the transfer from classroom to pastorate. Some of what I now proceed to say is self-evident and always has been; it represents common sense rather than discovery. With such a point I begin the summary:

1. The first and most important requirement for success in teaching the Bible to prospective ministers is the sincere self-consecration of the professor to a religious task, namely that of inflaming his students with devotion to the Scriptures and with zeal for preaching them. He must be able to impart the spirit as well as the letter of learning, otherwise he will kill more than he makes alive. Every classroom should resemble the tomb of Elisha; it should bring dead men to life when they are cast into it. The professor should feel himself responsible for answering the student's question, "What shall I preach?" Before he can accomplish this he must himself accept the Bible as the Word of God and be ready to teach it as such. In what sense the Bible is the Word of God and how to interpret it may be open questions; but one point admits of no debate: unless the professor approaches the Scriptures as a divine revelation he can never be anything more than a mere antiquarian classifying and exhibiting the curiosities of a faith which has no power over his own soul. Academic interest is not enough: a primarily religious interest is indispensable to him who would teach preachers. That is merely a way of saying that the instructor should be honest with his students and with the churches which have set him at his task.

2. The student should always be provided with syllabi and bibliographies which concisely indicate the work to be done, the manner in which it is to be done, and when. A

proper syllabus is more than a term assignment; it is a guarantee against wasted time, barren reading, the use of second-rate reference matter, and the omission of important knowledge. It should be issued and thereafter treated as the text of a contract between professor and students to complete a reasonable piece of work in a satisfactory manner by a given date. Only by such a procedure can the most and best work be done in the short time available. Bibliographies should indicate what books may be useful in the preparation of the various topics. I count it no virtuous act to make my students "search the library" as I was sometimes compelled to do. My students are studying Old Testament and not the contents of the library. I have found that in a course in Old Testament Theology (vary the name as you will) where I undertake to cover about twelve topics and make use of some twenty books, that I can seldom place more than four or five titles on the list which are really helpful on any given topic. Let us say that a man is preparing a seminar paper on Persian influence upon post-exilic Hebrew religion. Unless I foresee and forestall his mistake he is likely to apply at the reserve desk for such old standbys as Davidson, Smith, Peters, and Knudsen, wait a day or two to get them, and then spend another day finding out that they give him no help. I sometimes require my students to write a term essay on Jerusalem in the time of David and Solomon. Unless I delineate the field carefully and specify the references to be used, half of the class will fail to discover that the site of ancient Jebus now lies entirely outside the modern city walls and has been excavated, while the other half will locate the site on the western hill. I have also learned much from rebukes unconsciously administered in poor examination papers by men who have been wandering in a wilderness under the leadership of a negligent Moses. Except in rare cases the failure of the student is the failure of the professor.

3. Let introduction, and more especially that which we call "higher criticism", be reduced to a minimum. Let the professor be clear and be quick about it. Personally, I have found that the best way to approach the subject of Pentateuchal criticism, for instance, is by means of a lecture on methods of book-making in the ancient world. It always stimulates and enlightens a student to give him a harmony of the Gospels, for instance, and a Hebrew manuscript (or reasonable facsimile thereof) and say, "Now, how would you go about publishing that harmony in that sort of manuscript? How could your reader tell when he had passed from one document into the next? Where would you put footnotes and other subsidiary matter?" In dealing with the composition of the book of Isaiah I always begin by having the class calculate the number of pages in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve, Isaiah 1-39, and 40-66 respectively--using what-

ever Bible they happen to have in hand. Then I reduce the figure for Jeremiah by one-eighth to restore the length it had before its late expansion in the Hebrew text. In a wink the student can see that by adding the two pieces of Isaiah he gets a fourth roll almost exactly the size of his other three--and to make the bargain better has four rolls of latter prophets to match his four former prophets. I still resent being made to waste hours of time and effort trying to see some fancied doctrinal or stylistic basis for the union of Isaiah 1-39 and 40-66. Of course there is more than this to the composition of Isaiah; but what I have suggested does at least help the student over the main hurdle and that quickly. For supplementary reading in literary introduction my motto is "the simpler the better." My standbys now are Simpson's Pentateuchal Criticism, Kirkpatrick's Divine Library of the Old Testament, and McFadyen's Introduction to the Old Testament. Driver, Chapman, Pfeiffer, and other such meticulous works, I reserve for special students. Naturally, there are some Old Testament books which cannot be so lightly dismissed--Ezra-Nehemiah, for instance; and there are some which when properly "introduced" need little further by way of exposition--like Lamentations, Ruth, Jonah, Canticles, and Esther, and I am tempted to add Daniel.

4. Whatever the Biblical area being covered, be it legislation, history, prophets, or wisdom and poetry, let the professor be sure to make each book stand out as a unit in itself. It will seem artificial to him to think of Exodus apart from the rest of the Pentateuch, but he must remember that his students are going out to deal with congregations which never think in terms of the Pentateuch, or the post-exilic prophets, or Old Testament apocalypse. Such phrases are mere gibberish to them. They think in terms of Genesis and Exodus, of Amos and Isaiah, of the Psalms and of Daniel. Some Old Testament books will never be anything more than names to them--unless they happen to have a teaching pastor. So, let the student be taught to present each book by itself in a manner calculated to interest and edify a congregation, a young people's society, or an adult Sunday School class. That is what every Bible college tries to do. Where is our vaunted superiority to such schools unless we do our work better? Never shall I forget hearing one of a series of Sunday evening "lecture-sermons" on the books of the Bible. The topic for that night happened to be Ezra. To put it mildly, it was an excruciating experience--all the worse because the congregation was visibly grateful for the rubbish it received. I went away pondering the tale of the man who put green spectacles on his mule and fed him shavings. No student for the ministry should be allowed to leave the study of a Biblical book without a short and accurate introduction, a mastery of the contents in analyti-

cal outline, and a summary of the religious teachings--all memorized for at least once in his life and well recorded in notes to which he can return when he needs to. In addition to this he should have spent at least one or more lecture hours under the competent guidance of his professor in surveying the resources of that book for the pulpit. It is not necessary for him to store up enough corn to last through seven years of famine--and idleness--but it is important for him to learn that there is corn to be had for a price in every book in the Old Testament. The department of homiletics may teach a man the art of grinding, but the Bible departments should provide the grain.

5. Insofar as arrangement of courses is concerned, let the student begin with Old Testament history and literature. Historical knowledge is basic in Bible study; moreover it may be easily and logically combined with literary introduction. What better time to explain the composition of the Pentateuch or Samuel than when the relevant history is under discussion? One can always come back to Deuteronomy and the Priestly document when he reaches the seventh century or the post-exilic period. And here, also, even though dealing with historical books, let us give time and thought to religious teachings and sermonic materials. Such an exercise is often the more easy in historical studies simply because the so-called "former prophets" are more like preachers than historians anyway. Finding moral sermons in J and D and the former prophets is like finding water in a river; one can hardly avoid it; E and P are more fruitful for theological topics. Incidentally, I always encourage my men to be expositors; rarely do I suggest a topical sermon except in teaching the book of Proverbs.

6. When he has had his course in history let the student proceed to a study of the prophets, and here let him be required to read extensively in reviewing the historical setting, personal characteristics, and religious teachings of each man. More important than parallel reading is the careful analysis of the text. I now require that each book be carefully read and analyzed. In order to help the student along I furnish him an outline of my own making along with a resume of each prophet's teaching. I confine lectures to short introductions and the exposition of such passages as are not likely to be understood without assistance. Naturally, I am obliged to omit the leaner portions of the long books; yet in the course of a major I manage to cover most of the writing prophets pretty thoroughly. Instead of essays I prescribe written tests on the text of each book as soon as it is finished. Woe betide the student who is unable to read a given passage, give it a comprehensive title, and then point out what the prophet has said on the subject. After marking the test papers I go over them with the

student--and vice versa.

7. The poetic and wisdom literature of the Old Testament presents difficulties in carrying out such a purpose as I advocate. The Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes have little or no unity, and it is difficult to preach from one text in Job without preaching from the whole book. Moreover, all of these books require more than a casual introduction. Yet, I have found that by judicious selection of parallel reading assignments I can reduce introduction to one lecture on the nature of Hebrew Poetry, one on Hebrew wisdom as such, and one for each of the separate Biblical books. Canticles and Lamentations are frequently omitted. For a first term essay I require the study of ten psalms in which the student prepared for each a short introduction, and outline, and the skeleton of an expository sermon (on the whole or a part thereof). Meanwhile I devote ten lectures to the exposition of as many more psalms. To Job I devote seven lectures in which it is possible to analyze the book and make sure that the class understands it at least once in their lives. Incidentally, it is the pastor rather than the preacher who benefits most from Job, for it is a penetrating study of the religious phenomena related to suffering and misfortune--including the stupidity and asininity of which the narrow-minded and inflexibly orthodox minister can be guilty. Proverbs and Ecclesiastes fall into the second half of the academic year and receive only four lectures each, but I make amends for the slight by setting the second term essay on them. Choosing twelve topics which receive fairly frequent mention in Proverbs, I compile a list of from four to ten references for each. The student examines the references with a commentary and then constructs the outline of a sermon on each topic in which the three or four homiletical "points" are contributed by such of the proverbs as appeal to his judgment. Next in the paper I set a list of forty proverbs chosen at random. The student examines them with his commentary and decides upon a proper sermon topic for each of them. Finally, the essay requires that the outline of an expository sermon be prepared on each of five or six passages in Ecclesiastes. The boys moan at first, as only students contemplating an essay topic can moan, but when their work is done they turn and bless me. This final major which begins with wisdom and poetry is topped off by a resume in which we review the development of some twelve of the great religious ideas of the Old Testament. Parallel reading for that is some book on Old Testament theology. Frequently I choose Oesterley and Robinson's Hebrew Religion.

In all of my teaching I labour for one supreme objective, namely, to make my men discover, appreciate and interpret the religious experiences of the Old Testament saints. Consequently we always seek to analyze the personality and

evaluate the accomplishments of every great Bible character. And one other thing I do which time prevents me from discussing. I compel my men to buy as many standard commentaries as possible. No professor ever saw a commentary which suited him entirely--unless he wrote it--but if he is wise he will give hostages to necessity and make sure that his students spend their money for that which is bread. The man who does not learn to use and to respect good reference books in college will be like Balaam as long as he lives--wandering from one hilltop to another in search of enchantments--the hilltops being Guthrie, Boreham, Weatherhead, and all the rest who publish sermons.

Now, by way of conclusion, let me refer to something which is brewing in my courses. Several times during the last two years I have been approached by student preachers and pastors with requests for practical assistance in preparing difficult subjects for presentation to various church groups--the congregation as a whole, the young people's society, or perhaps some advanced class in Sunday School. The result is that I am now seriously considering the wisdom of setting up an elective minor open to all second and third year students in which we shall do nothing but prepare vexatious topics for presentation to lay groups. It will require close co-operation with the department of Practical Theology. The topics have been suggested by the students themselves; I have merely recorded them. Here is the list up to date: the composition of the Pentateuch; the problems of Old Testament Chronology (and more especially the dates on the margin of the Authorized Version); the inferiority of the Authorized Version; the problem of ethics in the Old Testament (massacre of women and children, the law of blood vengeance, the ban, the solidarity of the family, etc.); the value of the liturgical sections of the Pentateuch; the literary beauty of the Bible as literature, the imprecatory passages in Psalms and Jeremiah; the opening chapters of Genesis; the puzzling fact that God should ever desire and require animal sacrifice. The men are not themselves troubled by any of these topics. What they want is practical assistance in removing them from the classroom to the local church. To whom should they go if their professor hath not the words of life?

The twentieth chapter of II Kings records a story which keeps intruding upon my thoughts. I hesitate about using it because it involves King Ahab, of evil odour; but the urge is insistent. Here is part of the story.

"And behold, a prophet came near unto Ahab the king of Israel, and said, Thus saith the Lord, hast thou seen all this great multitude? Behold, I will deliver it unto thy hand this day; and thou shalt know that I am

the Lord. And Ahab said, By whom? And he said, Thus saith the Lord, by the young men of the princes of the provinces. Then he said, Who shall begin the battle? And he answered, Thou. And he mustered the young men of the princes of the provinces, and they were two hundred and thirty and two."

The parallel I wish to draw is this. I do not pose as any sort of giant killer myself. I have no conceit about my prowess as a preacher or a teacher. I am only attempting to begin the battle by mustering "the young men of the princes of the provinces"--others more competent than myself. I hope to have started a discussion from which we all may benefit. In justice to the text I should remind you that Ahab attacked promptly in the heat of the day and capitalized upon the element of surprise. He also gained some advantage from the fortunate coincidence that Ben-Hadad was drunk, but that is a part of the tale which I am at a loss to apply.

N. H. PARKER

SOME ASPECTS OF SIN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

According to the Oxford Dictionary, sin is a transgression against a divine or moral law. A philosopher would define sin as an act of an individual which if practiced by everyone would be contrary to reason and undesirable; or a transgression against a social convention; or an act which would detract from the individual's purpose in life.

In modern Western society, however, there are certain essential hypotheses underlying the idea of sin. The deity has given men freedom of will to choose the evil, that they may be at liberty to choose the good. Man as an individual is personally responsible for his acts. Man, before, or in the process of carrying out a wrong act, is conscious that what he is about to do, or is doing, is wrong, or at least, is not for the highest good for himself or for others. Wrong-doing merits punishment for the wrong-doer himself, and only for himself. Sin in itself is wrong, and cannot be used as a vehicle for good, or perhaps we may say: if the end is good, the means toward that end cannot be sin.

In Hebrew society there were undoubtedly certain essential hypotheses underlying their idea of sin. Nowhere are these set forth in any logical fashion. We can only classify the various uses of the word and its cognates, and from this classification make some attempt to determine the hypotheses of the Hebrews.

Even a casual reading of the Old Testament must impress us with the idea that Yahweh manipulated the movements of his people, and individuals among them for his own ends. Such an idea is directly contrary to our first hypothesis. Only in the latter part of the seventh century and the early part of the sixth century was there any idea of personal and individual responsibility. The Deuteronomist advocated the punishment of the sinner for his sin after being convicted by a court. Jeremiah and Ezekiel emphasized the idea of the individual responsibility in the eyes of God. It is only in this period of stress that we find any break in the concept of tribal or national responsibility. Even at that time, these revelations were mere flashes of inspiration, and were not universally accepted. The group concept continued to have active support not only in Deuteronomy, Isaiah, but with the separatists, Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah. Only when we come to the wisdom literature do we find the

responsibility of the individual taken for granted. When we consider that the hypothesis of individual responsibility is an essential element in our definition of sin, we must recognize that the Hebrew concept differed. When we consider, too, that the deity in Ecclesiastes directed man's activities through his ruah or spirit, we must assume that to the Hebrews, man was not a free agent, even at the end of the Old Testament period.

It is clearly demonstrated in Old Testament writings that the doer of sin was not conscious that his act was of a sinful nature until the unpleasant after-effects were felt. Since he was not conscious of wrong-doing before or at the time of his act, under our definition we cannot consider him a sinner.

The idea of family or national responsibility is frequently demonstrated by the assertion that the children or grandchildren suffer for the deed of their progenitor, or that the nation at large suffers for the sin of a king. To the Old Testament authors there is a very close relationship between punishment and sin. The divine instruments of punishment which includes famine, war, drought, hail, locusts, storm, plagues and flood, cannot under any circumstances be considered as discriminatory in regard to the persons afflicted, and it is persons who sin. This tribal or national responsibility was probably the basis for the statement in Gen. 8:21, that man was evil from his youth, the period at which he became a tribal member, and as such bore his portion of the sin of the tribe. While this idea of the nation or group as a unit may have been the basis for the development of the idea of vicarious suffering, it is quite in contrast with our idea of individual responsibility, an element essential to our concept of sin.

A personal and individual consciousness that an act is not for the best is an essential element in our concept of sin. There are numerous instances in the Old Testament which would indicate that the doer of an act was in doubt as to its being in accord with the divine will. The feeling of the necessity for an infallible medium is the result of this uncertainty. The use of Urim and Thummim, necromancy, omens, priests, seers, and prophets as this infallible medium is a denial of the validity of personal conscience and reason as a guide to human conduct, and hence a denial of ethics in our sense of the word.

With us, there is the idea that sin may be forgiven, wiped out. This idea is reached only in the latest books of the Old Testament. Punishment is only withheld temporarily or passed on to others, but it is never cancelled.

There is evidence in the Old Testament of the presence of social conventions, the breach of which we would consider a sin. In the story of Abimelech and Abraham as told in Gen. 20, Abimelech told Abraham that he had done to him things not customarily done. Yet the breach of the social convention is not considered a sin on the part of Abraham. Deut. 12:8 indicates that certain conventions were in vogue before entering Canaan, but that now these must give place to divine ordinances. It may be claimed that since several of the laws of the code of the covenant have their parallels in the code of Hammurabi this code represents what were originally social conventions. That these laws or at least some of them were in vogue at a very early date, there is no doubt; on the other hand, there is no doubt but that the editor has raised them to the status of divine ordinances, and as such they must be considered in their context in the Old Testament.

It has become apparent, therefore, that the Hebrew concept of sin and ours does not coincide. This should be a sufficient reason for our study.

In certain of the late writings such as Job, Proverbs and exilic Judges the word for sin has some resemblance to the Greek *amartano*, "to miss the mark". However, in these passages the context would suggest "to lose" rather than "to miss", in such combinations as "he who finds me ----- he who loses me" (Prov. 8:35 f.), or in conjunction with *nepheš*, "to lose one's life" (Prov. 20:2), or used with "hastey of feet", "to lose a race" (Prov. 19:2), or used in contrast with *shālôm*, a state in which everything is complete and present, "to lose something or to miss something in a home from which one has been absent for a time". In Jd. 20:16, it is used of causing a stone "to miss a hair". This idea of sin as used by the Hebrews was attained only after a development of centuries. The phases through which the word passed before it attained that force are interesting. It seldom had a moral force in our sense of the word, throughout that history.

The simplest concept of the word is found in I Kgs. 1:22. Bathsheba tells David that should Adonijah become king after David's death, she and her son Solomon would become sinners. This can only mean that they would occupy inferior positions.

When Shimei cursed David fleeing from Jerusalem, the king told Abishai that Yahweh had said to Shimei, "Curse David!" This is an acknowledgment that Shimei was in the right. But when David was returning to Jerusalem, Shimei greeted him: "Let not my lord impute to me iniquity, let him not remember how your servant acted perversely when the

king left Jerusalem that the king should take it to heart. Your servant knows he has sinned" (II Sa. 19:20). The position of the two men has been reversed. Shimei is in an inferior position, and in danger of the king's anger. There may be here also an example of man's uncertainty as to whether he has sinned or not until he has noted the final outcome of his act.

In the story of Moses and Pharaoh (Ex. 9:27 etc.), as a result of suffering from the plagues sent by Yahweh, Pharaoh said to Moses and Aaron, "I have sinned this time; Yahweh is righteous, while I and my people are the wicked ones." Pharaoh felt that he and his people had proved unequal to the contest with Yahweh. He felt his inferiority in relation to Yahweh, not any consciousness of having done wrong. The editor recognizes that any other action on the part of the pharaoh had been impossible, for Yahweh made Pharaoh obstinate in order further to show his miraculous powers. The sin of Pharaoh then may be the expression of Pharaoh's feeling of inferiority; the stubbornness incited by the deity was to further his divine purpose.

In the story of the butler and the baker (Gen. 40:1), who had been incarcerated in Joseph's prison because they had sinned against Pharaoh, we are not told of what the sin consisted. The ultimate awards, however, show all the whimsical characteristics of the eastern potentate: One was restored to his position, and the other hanged. Verses 9 f. seem to substantiate this idea: The butler says, "My sins, I remember today, Pharaoh was angry with his servants." The sin and Pharaoh's anger are connected. Pharaoh was angry, my position was inferior to his; he sent me to prison; later he restored me and hanged the baker.

The same inferiority was implied in Ex. 5:16 which relates the story of the Hebrews making bricks without straw. Pharaoh was annoyed because Moses had suggested a religious holiday for his people, and so forced them to work harder to produce the same number of bricks each day, at the same time gathering their own straw. Straw is not given to thy servants, yet they say unto us, Make bricks; and lo, thy servants are smitten, so thy people have sinned. The position of the Hebrews was so inferior to that of the Pharaoh that he could do as he would with them.

This idea of inferiority persisted in Israel. Owing to the siege of Jerusalem, Hezekiah sent a message to the king of Assyria at Lachish. "I have sinned; leave me alone; what you place upon me I will bear." Hezekiah recognized that he was not strong enough to compete with the Assyrian king, and confessed that feeling when he said, "I have sinned." He felt his inferiority in military strength;

certainly not in moral right.

It was only when the Philistines were afflicted with a plague of tumours that they became conscious of any guilt (I Sa. 6). They had no assurance whence the plague came, and sought to discover this by experiment. They felt themselves incapable of overcoming the affliction, hence that the source of affliction was more powerful than they. They felt their inferiority.

In Nu. 22, Balaam insisted that for no cause would he transgress the command of Yahweh. When Balak sent messengers to Balaam, God told Balaam to go with the men, and to say what he told him to say. While enroute the anger of Yahweh burned because he went, and the angel of Yahweh stood in his way. When Balaam realized the situation he said, "I have sinned, and now if it be evil in your eyes, let me turn back." But the angel told Balaam to continue on his way. In this passage the sin of Balaam is morally inexplicable. It is closely allied to the anger of Yahweh, just as the sin of the butler was closely allied with the anger of Pharaoh. Balaam could only have meant to infer his inferiority in regard to the deity and reiterate his willingness to do his will.

Closely connected with this idea of a feeling of inferiority is that of debt. The Hebrews expressed the ideal state, the state in which there is no debt on either side as being shalam, the state of perfection. This was the state that existed between David and Yahweh in the eyes of his later admirers (cf. I Kgs. 11:4, 15:3). The idea of a state of perfection in which debts are paid is reinforced by the use of the pi'el of the word shalam to mean "to pay back". It is used of paying vows (Prov. 7:17); of recompensing (Jer. 16:18); of making restitution (Ex. 22:2 etc.). Based on this fundamental idea of repayment is the whole spirit of the Hebrew law: an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life, etc. Only when debts are fully paid can there be peace. The debtor is in an inferior position. To restore himself to that of an equal the debt must be paid.

When Laban pursued and overtook Jacob (Gen. 31:36 ff.) Jacob denied any sin or transgression in regard to Laban, and contended that he had served Laban's interests faithfully for twenty years. He continued, "That which was torn of beasts I brought not to you. I used to repay its equivalent to you (pi'el of hata), of my hand you were wont to require it." The pi'el of hata, "to sin", is used in parallel construction with "you were wont to require it at my hand". Usually it is translated, "stood the loss", but more specifically it is to pay back an equivalent to a loss. The animals were in his charge; even if through no fault of his

own, a beast was torn, he had to return its equivalent to Laban, and Laban expected it. In the code of Hammurabi, law 263, we find the case of a herdsman who lets an ass or an ox confided to his care escape. The herdsman must make restitution (i-ri-ab), an ox for an ox, an ass for an ass. The holiness code uses the word yeshalle to express this idea of restitution. One must restore the state of perfection.

In Gen. 43:9, Judah pleads with his father to place Benjamin under his protection. It is I who will go surety for him. From my hand shall you seek him. If I do not bring him to you, and place him before you, I shall be sinning (gal of hata) against you always. Jacob is to place Benjamin in Judah's hands, just as Laban placed his sheep in the hands of Jacob. If he does not restore him (he cannot restore an equivalent), he will be indebted to Jacob forever. To sin against one is therefore to become his debtor.

Closely connected with this idea of debt which demands a repayment is the idea that repayment may take the form of a substitute. Jacob had given Laban a substitute for an animal that had been torn; Judah could not give a substitute for Benjamin, hence his perpetual debt. Just as a tooth must be given in payment for a tooth, so a sin must be given in payment for a sin, and an iniquity in payment for an iniquity. The payment given for a sin is usually translated as sin-offering and that of iniquity as punishment; but the Hebrew word did not distinguish between the sin and the payment for it, nor between the iniquity and the payment for it. They were looked upon as equivalents; the payment of an equivalent was essential to bring about the perfect state again. It was probably because of this basic characteristic of Hebrew thought that equivalent payments must be made, that they identified the payment with the debt, and so were forced to conclude that where there was payment, there must have been a corresponding debt.

To be morally responsible for a debt, the debtor must have accepted responsibility for that debt before it was incurred. It may be assumed that Jacob accepted that responsibility to make good any losses to Laban's flock, when he accepted his contract; and that Judah accepted the responsibility for Benjamin's safe return before Jacob entrusted him to him. It must be added, however, that while these two men accepted responsibility for the loss of animal or boy under their protection, the actual loss was quite beyond the power of either of them. While the loss of one or the other would constitute a debt in our sense of the word, it would not constitute a sin. Neither Jacob or Judah had any intention of losing their charges.

A sin must be paid for by a sin, that is to say, by

a payment in keeping with the debt. II Sa. 4:11, "If a slayer must pay for his deed by his blood, how much more a wicked man who slays a righteous man in his house in his bed." In this passage David is comparing the guilt and punishment due to the slayer of Saul and that of Ishbosheth. The slayers of both these men were perfectly aware that they had killed a man, but they believed that they were doing deeds which David would commend. Condemnation of the act of a subject by Chieftain or Deity makes him a sinner. It is this sense of the necessity of an equable payment for debts in order to preserve an even justice that impels the one making an oath to pray Yahweh to increase the injury to him if he does not carry out his vow.

Jonathan contended with Saul on behalf of David. He insisted that if Saul killed David who was innocent of any hostile move toward Saul, that Saul would have sinned. That is, Saul would have become indebted to David. He moreover claimed that Saul was already indebted to David because David had done good to him (I Sa. 19:4 f., cf. I Sa. 20:1, 7). When Saul realized that David could have slain him and did not, he recognized that he owed his life to David. He added, "I will not harm you more because my life was precious in your eyes today" (I Sa. 26:21). When Hezekiah was hard pressed by Sennacherib he said, "I have sinned, what you place on me I will bear" (II Kgs. 18:14). The phrase "I have sinned" may be used to acknowledge a debt. In Nu. 12:11 ff. Miriam was stricken with leprosy because she and Aaron were envious of Moses' preferred position in regard to the deity. Aaron said to Moses, "O my lord, do not impose upon us a sin in which we have done foolishly and in which we have sinned." In this both Miriam and Aaron were equally guilty, but only Miriam suffered. It was not the sin that Moses imposed, but the payment of sin, which was an equivalent to the Hebrew. The payment exacted was that awarded a daughter who had offended her father, a seven-day ostracism. The extent to which the persons noted in these passages are morally culpable depends upon how far they were conscious of doing wrong at the time of the offence. Saul, doubtless, looked upon David as a traitor to his dynasty; Hezekiah dreamed of independence from Assyria; Miriam and Aaron must have considered their complaint justified at the time.

Obadiah feared to announce to Ahab the arrival of Elijah, lest Elijah should not keep the rendezvous. He said, "How have I sinned?" i.e., what is my debt to you that you should bring about my death? Obadiah would infer that had he wronged Elijah in any way, then Elijah had been justified in bringing about his death. It was natural that debts should be paid.

The story of Abimelech and Abraham as narrated in

Gen. 20 (and its parallels in Gen. 12 and 26) gives some insight into the conception of sin as a debt imposed upon a morally innocent individual. In this case the "debt" is more nearly related to our word "fine", where ignorance of the law is not considered an excuse. Abimelech has taken Sarah whom he believes to be Abraham's sister into his harem. He is prevented from consummating his marriage, and breaking a sex taboo, by a divine revelation. In the morning he called Abraham and said to him, "what have you done to us? how have I sinned against you, that you have brought upon me and my kingdom a great sin?" Ordinarily a sin must be paid for by a sin. In this case Abimelech has incurred no debt to Abraham, yet Abraham has imposed upon him a payment of a debt, or a fine, which is only wiped out by the payment of considerable wealth. Thus one may impose a sin which must be repaid (i.e., a fine) upon a supposedly innocent person. The person has done no culpable act, yet he must pay the debt or fine imposed by the other. This idea is further reinforced by the passage in Ex. 32:20 ff. in which Moses, having destroyed the golden calf, said to Aaron, "what has this people done to you that you have brought upon them this great sin." The people were innocent of any sin against Aaron, but Aaron has imposed it upon them, and they must pay it. Some three thousand were slain.

There is a subtle difference between doing evil to another and sinning against him. In many passages the words are used practically synonymously. Jephthah said to the king of Ammon, "I have not sinned against you, but you have done evil to me to fight against me" (Jd. 11:27). The men of Sodom were evil, great sinners against Yahweh. A man may sin against another or he may do evil to another. A man can sin against God but he can only do evil in his eyes. God may do evil to man, or he may do evil in the eyes of man, but he never sins against man. God is so far above man that man cannot harm him, and God can never be indebted to man.

This difference between the relationship of man to man, and man to God is brought out in I Sa. 2:24 f. in which Eli remonstrates with his sons, "If a man sin against man, God will act as arbiter, but if a man sin against God who will act as arbiter?" It is interesting in this respect that Jephthah (Jd. 11:27) asks Yahweh to act as arbiter between Israel and Ammon; that David asked Yahweh to decide between him and Saul. In his prayer at the dedication of the temple Solomon asked Yahweh to decide on the innocence or guilt of any man accused of a sin, when he makes oath before the altar that he is innocent (I Kgs. 8:21). Yahweh may decide an issue between men, but in the case of an issue between man and God, man is always guilty and must pay. There are a few passages, however, that suggest that man could at least mediate, if not arbitrate between God and man.

In I Sa. 7:3, when the people have acknowledged their sin against Yahweh, Samuel acted as arbiter (shaphat), and a victory over the Philistines resulted. Moses frequently acted as a mediator in causes that arose between deity and people; but not always successfully. Amos and succeeding prophets followed suit.

In the Old Testament, most of the sins noted were acts which were not recognized as sins until after the event. Usually they were recognized as sins because of an unfortunate result. However, it seems possible that a sin could actually be a great advantage to not only the doer of the act, but to an entire people. Such an act is still considered as a debt to the deity which demands repayment by a life or by a ransom for that life. This is shown in the story of Saul's curse which he laid upon any who should eat during the day. Jonathan actually benefitted by eating of the honey, and a military victory resulted. However, when the guilt of Jonathan was discovered by lot, he admitted his sin and his readiness to pay for it. The people, however, insisted on ransoming his life.

Sin was acting contrary to the divine will. However, the Israelites were never quite sure of what was the divine will. As a result they sometimes had recourse to trial and error. Sin was always a croucher at the door; one never knew when the beast would overtake him. This is clearly illustrated in the stories of the ark. Evidently the Philistines could handle it without great danger to themselves. According to II Sa. 6:7, Uzzah was slain by divine wrath because he tried to steady it. Later, 50,070 men of Bethshemesh died because they looked into it. After the death of Uzzah, David decided to leave it at the home of Obed Edom, the Gittite, because he feared contact with it. When Obed Edom prospered, David took a chance and brought it to Jerusalem.

In the war with Ammon, when Joab was surrounded by the enemy, he encouraged the troops to do their best, to fight for themselves and for God . . . and Yahweh will do what is good in his eyes (II Sa. 10:12). When the son of Bathsheba was ill, David fasted and wept because he thought there was a chance Yahweh might be gracious to him (II Sa. 12:22). When David fled from Jerusalem he said: If I find favor in the eyes of Yahweh, he will restore me . . . if he say, I find no delight in you, . . . he will do with me as is good in his eyes (II Sa. 15:25).

We find numerous passages which seem to indicate that the Hebrews believed their deity instigated a sin on the part of persons in order to carry out his purpose logically. It may be noted that God told Abraham to go down to

Egypt, and later to Gerar, and he told Isaac to go down to Gerar. These three passages are probably versions of the same incident. As a natural result of the presence of Sarah and Rebecca who were beautiful women, the king took them into his harem, discovered the truth of their relationship to their husbands, and paid the patriarchs considerable wealth. The sole purpose of these journeys seems to have been to enrich the friends of God.

The Joseph story is another case in point. In Gen. 50:20, we have the incident in which the brothers feared Joseph would requite them, on the death of their father, for what they had done to him. Joseph replied, "you thought evil against me, but God meant it for good, to bring to pass as it is today to save much people alive." Thus we must conclude that each incident in the story of Joseph was divinely inspired to bring about the final consummation. The envy of the brothers sent Joseph to Egypt; the temptation of Joseph by Potiphar's wife and his refusal to accede brought him to prison; the butler and the baker's sin against the pharaoh brought them in touch with Joseph. The restoration of the butler to his former post brought Joseph and Pharaoh together.

It was Yahweh who hardened Pharaoh's heart so that he would not send the Israelites away, to the end that Yahweh might manifest his great powers in Egypt. This idea was entertained by E in 10:20, and by the redactor in other passages. This would indicate that this idea was prevalent for some time.

One is tempted to see in the various murmurings and rebellions of the Israelites in the desert the same idea-- that Yahweh might show his great powers. Ezekiel's idea of the Exodus was in keeping with this idea, "I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the nations in whose sight I brought them out."

Yahweh has promised the descendants of Abraham the land of Canaan which was peopled with Amorites. Since it would take four hundred years for the iniquity of the Amorites to be fulfilled (Gen. 15:16), the settlement of the Israelites must be delayed until the four hundred years are up. Whether the deity has initiated this iniquity or not, he made full use of it for his own ends.

Yahweh sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the Shechemites in order to get rid of Abimelech (Jd. 9:23). Yahweh may create a situation which would cause a king to oppress his people in order to incite them to leave Egypt.

Transgression is allied to sin. When Yahweh decided

to divide the kingdom, he incited Jeroboam to revolt and transgress against Rehoboam, his anointed.

Another case in which the deity seems to have instigated a sin in order to get men to carry out his will may be noted in the story of David's census (II Sa. 24). Yahweh became angry against Israel, and incited David to take the census. When David repented and confessed that he had sinned greatly, he asked the deity to cause the required payment for the sin to pass. Of three penalties suggested, David preferred a three-day plague in which seventy thousand people died. David then reiterated that he had sinned, and insisted upon the innocence of his people, "Let thine hand be against me and my father's house." The prophet Gad suggested the purchase of a site for a sanctuary, the erection of an altar, and animals for sacrifice. When David insisted on purchasing these things himself, he recognized that he, himself, must pay the debt or the fine imposed. Thereupon Yahweh permitted himself to be entreated and the plague was stopped. Yahweh, evidently, had two aims in inciting David to take the census: punishment of the people with whom he was angry, but whom David insisted to be innocent, and the possession of a sacred shrine on Mount Zion.

The sons of Eli hearkened not to the voice of their father, for God wished to slay them, probably to make way for Samuel.

Allied to the idea of sin as a debt that demands a suitable payment is the idea of forgiveness. Nu. 14:18 ff., in describing the attributes of Yahweh, says that he pardons iniquity and transgression, without holding innocent (or without leaving it completely unpunished), visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children. ". . . Pardon, I pray thee, the iniquity of this people according to the greatness of thy kindness as thou hast pardoned this people from the time they left Egypt unto now." And Yahweh said, "I have pardoned them as you have asked, but as I live, they [the people] shall not see the land I promised their fathers." The words used for pardon are *nāsā* and *sālah*. They are used in such a way that *sālah* must be considered as practically synonymous with *nāsā*. Yahweh pardons their iniquities and transgressions, but lays them ("visits them") upon their descendants. Or again Yahweh pardons but sentences the people to spend the remainder of their lives in the desert. The debt must be paid, if not by the sinner, by a descendant or someone else. There is no pardon in our sense of the word, which would mean to blot out. This idea of blotting out of sin is only reached in Isaiah 43:23, 25 and Psalm 51:3. *Nāsā* means literally "to lift up", "to bear". Someone must bear the sin or its payment; it cannot be wiped out. When Cain is sentenced, he says, "my iniquity [i.e.,

the punishment or payment for my iniquity] is greater than I can bear." Aaron made the golden calf, but three thousand Israelites paid the penalty of the sin he placed upon them. When Hezekiah admitted his sin to Sennacherib, he promised to bear (*nāsā*) whatever payment for that sin Sennacherib should place upon him. In this case the sinner bears the penalty for sin. The forgiver is asked to bear (*nāsā*) the iniquity or sin, not to place it upon the sinner. The sin is therefore not wiped out in any way: it is carried either by the sinner or the one sinned against. If by the latter, it can be imposed at any time upon the sinner or upon another.

When David's treatment of Uriah was brought home to him by Nathan, David replied, "I have sinned against Yahweh." Then Nathan said, "Yahweh has caused thy sin to pass on, thou shalt not die, the son born to thee shall surely die." It is significant that David, the king, did not sin against Uriah, but against God; it was a debt that must be paid by a life. But Yahweh causes the debt to pass over to the son whose life pays for the debt of his father. That the debt was now considered fully paid by the death of the son is shown by the fact that Yahweh loved the next son born to Bathsheba (II Sa. 12).

The deity may send a famine from which the entire nation suffers in order to impress upon them that a sin has been committed. The cause of the famine in the reign of David was the unrecorded slaughter of the Gibeonites by Saul. This is obviously an interpretation by a supporter of David. In order to stop the famine Saul's descendants had to die (II Sa. 21).

What has been devoted to Yahweh is his. If a man take of it for his own use, he has sinned; he has become a debtor to Yahweh, and must pay the price. Contact with *berem* makes him *berem*. Not only the individual involved, but also his family must die. Even though there is a confession, there is no forgiveness (Jos. 7:11 ff.). With this compare the sin of Hophni and Phineas who took the fat of the offerings devoted to Yahweh (I Sa. 2:17).

We have now dealt with the elements connected with the idea of sin in the J, E and Historical works. The ideas portrayed in these sections must reflect the ideas of the thinkers of the period of the eighth-century prophets, although each prophet may have contributed something to the problem individually. If we examine the problem as envisaged by the members of the Deuteronomic school we should obtain some idea of the basic ideas of sin as held by the religious leaders at the period of the exile and later.

The basic concept of these writers is that the worship of Yahweh can be carried out only in Jerusalem, and only in accordance with the ritual sanctified there. The worship of any other deity is the great sin, and the worship of Yahweh in any other shrine is equally a sign of rank apostasy. The author of Deuteronomy begins his discourse by explaining why Israel should worship Yahweh. "Since I, Yahweh your God, am the one who brought you out from the land of Egypt, from bondage, you shall have no other gods before me." The only way a slave could be removed from the possession of an owner was by purchase, or as a piece of loot from a military campaign. Since Yahweh brought Israel from bondage, he has become its new owner. In Dt. 6:4, the author continues to impress upon his readers the idea of this new ownership. "Hear, O Israel, since Yahweh your God is Yahweh alone, you must love Yahweh your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength." Therefore, Israel as a nation owed allegiance to only one God, the God who had come to her aid in Egypt, in the wilderness, and in the period of settlement in Canaan. It was a debt which Israel should accept according to this author. Worship of any other God was withholding Yahweh's property, and as such a sin which must be repaid. According to Dt. 7:8, Yahweh redeemed Israel from bondage in Egypt. The idea of redemption is the paying of a ransom to the holder, and thereby becoming the new owner of the person, persons or thing. This gave Yahweh a legal claim to Israel. This concept would infer that the redeemed had no say in the matter. The worship of Yahweh in a shrine outside Jerusalem by rites other than those practiced in Jerusalem, or the worship of another God would be the equivalent of theft from Yahweh, and the supreme penalty of death is the only fitting payment that can be made. The relationship between abad, "a slave, or devotee", and abad, "to worship", is revealing. Both forms denote an ownership of real property.

Since apostasy is the supreme sin of the Deuteronomic school, it was considered a sign of apostasy for the people to demand a king (I Sa. 8:6, 18). The king, himself, however would exact payment for this sin because Yahweh would refuse to hear them when they find themselves oppressed by the king they have chosen.

The perfect state, that in which all debts are paid, can be attained only by those who worship Yahweh in Jerusalem. Only they can attain a happy and prosperous existence. All others must be destroyed.

When our authors are giving an interpretation of history they are forced to conclude that Yahweh did not forgive sins such as disobedience or rebellion, even when a righteous mediator prays for it. In chap. 1, even though

the Israelites confessed their sins and repented, they had to die in the wilderness. In chap. 3, Yahweh refused to listen to Moses. In chap. 4, Moses was prevented from entering the promised land because of the words of the Israelites. In this section the sinners presumably enter the promised land, while their righteous mediator is refused permission.

As the Deuteronomist looks into past history, he finds repeatedly that Yahweh does not forgive without exacting a payment. There is always the hope, however, that he may. The author would suggest that even an apostate, by turning to Yahweh in his trouble, may find Yahweh merciful (4:8). In the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple in I Kgs. 8, he asks that Yahweh pardon Israel as a nation or as individuals when they have confessed their sins, recognized as such only after some misfortune has befallen them, such as defeat, drought, famine, plague, when they have made their prayers in the temple or in a foreign land, but according to the custom sanctified by its use in the temple. It is interesting that their interpretation of the past does not preclude them from hoping for something better in the future.

The Deuteronomist still retains some of the ideas of the older writers in regard to the divine character. Just as Yahweh made Pharaoh refuse to let Israel go that he might continue to manifest his powers, so he made Sihon refuse to let Israel pass through his land, that Israel might be able to defeat Sihon's forces and so attain glory. Yahweh still visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, but evidently only upon the children of apostates (5:9).

Moral conduct is not yet a matter of conscience. If a problem is too difficult for local authorities to decide, the people involved must take the matter to the priest at the central shrine in Jerusalem, and his decision must be carried out carefully. The man who behaves presumptuously, not hearkening to the priest, who continuously serves Yahweh thy God, or to the judge, that man shall die, so shalt thou destroy evil from Israel. And when all the people hear it, they shall fear, and never act presumptuously again. To act presumptuously, therefore, is to decide a question contrary to the dictum of the priestly authority, to decide a matter according to one's own conscience or reason.

To act presumptuously is therefore to sin. Death is the penalty. The death of such a man became an example to the rest of the people. The death of such a sinner, therefore, has a divine purpose over and above that of punishment of an individual. In a society in which the nation is a unit, the life of an individual cannot be highly considered

over against the benefit his death might bring to the community as an example. His death has become a warning to the rest of the people, and therefore a means by which they gain knowledge of the right way.

We have noted the priests as the conscience of the people. According to chap. 8, the conscience of the people had been magicians, soothsayers, necromancers; Yahweh, however, insisted that he himself should be their conscience. In the wilderness Moses had acted as such, but according to Deut. 34, there will be no more prophet in Israel like Moses. Other means were required. Although Deuteronomy is usually considered as the work of a prophetic school, possibly descendants of the disciples of Isaiah, because of his fondness for the temple ritual exemplified in Jerusalem, other prophets than Moses are only mentioned twice, each time as divinely appointed consciences of the people. This was a device decided by the deity in Horeb when the people insisted that Moses be their mediator with the deity (Dt. 18:16). People were required to obey this prophet for his word came directly from Yahweh. Samuel showed himself a true descendant of Moses. He became the mediator between God and people, and the conscience of Israel, in that he taught them the upright way (I Sa. 14). It was a way not delimited by human reason.

The prophet who presumptuously speaks a word in my name that which I did not command him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other Gods, shall die. A prophet who speaks according to the reason of his own heart is a sinner worthy of death. The true prophet, therefore, is divinely appointed to become the conscience of the people. Since there may be true prophets as well as prophets who follow their own consciences or reason, there must be some form by which the people may know the true prophet of Yahweh. The test is given in 18:22. "When a prophet speaks in the name of Yahweh and the thing does not come to pass and does not happen, that is an oracle which Yahweh has not spoken. That prophet has spoken presumptuously, you need not fear him." This would infer that historical events follow the oracle of Yahweh. They cannot be inferred beforehand through rational processes. History is, therefore, the proof of a divine oracle. The prophet, therefore, like the priest, is a divinely appointed conscience of the people. "When a prophet or a dreamer of dreams shall arise in your midst, and give you a sign or a wonder, and that sign or wonder which he gives you comes to pass . . .", this is proof that he is a true prophet (cf. 18:22). "If, however, that prophet encourage the people to worship other gods, you must not obey him. That prophet must be put to death for he has spoken rebellion against Yahweh." It is rather startling to find a proven prophet speaking rebellion, but verse 4

explains it. Yahweh, your God, is using this prophet to test you, that you may know that you are properly worshipping Yahweh.

The idea of testing in order to teach the people is found also in the earlier work. At the giving of the decalogue in Ex. 20:20, the people feared the manifestations of Yahweh and asked Moses to be their mediator. And Moses said unto the people, "Fear not, for in order to test you (na~~ss~~oth) God has come, and that his fear may be before you that you sin not." Here, obviously, the testing was for the benefit of the people and not of the deity. So in Deuteronomy, the proven prophet was raised up to entice the people from Yahweh, that they might know the better, that they worship Yahweh truly. The death of the prophet is the natural result of his act, but Yahweh has taught his people a lesson; he has raised up another indicator for their guidance. It cannot be mere coincidence that the following verses deal with the enticement to apostasy by a friend or kinsman, and with the base fellows who would entice a city to apostasy. These, like the prophet, were to be divine instruments to act as guides to the Israelite conscience. Their deaths will serve as a lesson to Israel. The affliction and testing in the wilderness mentioned in Dt. 8 must have been for a similar purpose, that the people might have another guidepost, a conscience to direct their course aright. It is of interest that in the following verse the afflicting is continued to cause you to know etc. (cf. this prophet with the Kings of Israel who made Israel to sin).

Yahweh was always testing his people, not for his benefit but for theirs. Whenever they were oppressed by their enemies they must have sinned. Whenever they were victorious, Yahweh was pleased with them. By noting in retrospect their activities which resulted in failure or success, they had a guide to their future conduct. It should be pointed out that this method of instruction leads rather to a conduct of expediency rather than morality. Israel would learn to do what would not bring disaster in its train.

Samuel proved his divine mission, and hence the truth of his words that Israel had sinned in asking a king, by foretelling the coming of a thunderstorm at a season when such was not usual. In I Sa. 15, we note that Samuel persists in being the conscience of Saul, while Saul is inclined to behave rationally. He saved Agag, king of Amalek, and some of his choice possessions as loot. Samuel, thereupon, announced that Yahweh had rejected Saul as King, and Saul admits his sin and transgression against the word of God as spoken by Samuel. In one line Samuel announces that Yahweh had repented making Saul king, and soon after that he will not repent for he is not a man that he should repent.

Evidently Yahweh's refusal to forgive Saul was that events must make way for David. It was probably the same author who conceived the idea that Yahweh instigated the sin of Hophni and Phineas because he wished to slay them.

The prophet, having completed the task assigned may suffer death through divine decree. This was true in Dt. 13. The Judaeen prophet proved the authenticity of his mission to condemn the altar of Bethel, the existence of which was contrary to the Deuteronomic ideal of centralized worship, by paralyzing Jeroboam's hand. The Bethel prophet proved his authentic mission by foretelling the death of the Judaeen prophet. Thus both prophets were of Yahweh. The Judaeen prophet had been ordered home without stopping to eat in Bethel. The Bethel prophet induced him to return and eat with him by revealing to the Judaeen prophet orders to return to Bethel. While eating in Bethel the local prophet revealed a new decree foretelling the death of the Judaeen. The Judaeen prophet was in a quandary. Had he refused to return he would have disobeyed the orders sent to the Bethel prophet. By returning he disobeyed the orders sent to himself. It seems that the Judaeen prophet was doomed (I Kgs. 13).

Like the earlier authors, the Deuteronomist conceived that it was not always the sinner who suffered for a sin. In I Kgs., the deity replies to Solomon's prayer, and promises him an everlasting kingdom should he remain true to the law of Yahweh. However, if Solomon should not remain true, Israel will be cut off from its heritage. Even in the promise, Israel is the one who pays for Solomon's apostasy. In chap. 11, when Solomon has become apostate through the influence of foreign wives, the intermarriage with whom was contrary to Deuteronomic teaching, Yahweh promises to take the kingdom from Solomon and give it to Jeroboam. The sufferer is the son of the sinner. This was true also in the case of Jeroboam whose son Nadab suffered and of Baasha for whom Elah suffered.

Finally there is the sin insinuated solely by the editor who insisted that history support his ideas on people in question. In I Sa. 14:47, we learn that Saul fought all the enemies of Israel, and wherever he turned he was wont to do wickedness (וַיַּעַשׂ "was defeated"). To the editor it was quite distasteful to admit any good of Saul. (He simply changed a waw to a resh. The original must have read וַיִּשְׁרַף "he was victorious".)

The Deuteronomist insisted on centralized worship in Jerusalem, carried out by duly appointed priests or levites. Jeroboam's sin was in erecting altars outside Jerusalem and appointing priests from his own borders. Such actions

constituted a sin which would bring destruction to his house (I Kgs. 13). Jeroboam died peacefully, it was his descendant that paid. Baasha was raised up to destroy the house of Jeroboam; Baasha's sin was the same as that of Jeroboam. That these statements pertaining to the sin of Jeroboam and his successors were purely a literary device is shown by the fact that although Zimri reigned only seven days, and that only over a very limited area his fate was sealed for causing Israel to sin in the manner of Jeroboam the son of Nebat.

It was natural, therefore, for the Deuteronomist to interpret the destruction of Northern Israel as divine retribution for apostasy (II Kgs. 17:7) while Judah remained secure with its central shrine. Although the Deuteronomic editor reiterates the idea that Yahweh's prophets continually acted as the conscience of the kings of the North in this respect, it is significant that neither Elijah nor Elisha worshipped at Jerusalem, or even recognized it as the house of Yahweh.

In this study I have tried to assess and classify the various Hebrew concepts of sin which must have been current from the eighth to the sixth centuries. A comparison between the hypotheses which underlie our concepts of sin with those that seem to have formed a basis for the Hebrew concept shows very little in common. Superficially the debt principle as noted somewhat resembles our concept. However, in most of the incidents noted the debt was only recognized as such after the deed had been accomplished, and its unpleasant effects noted. With us, it seems to me that a debt is only morally payable when the debtor is conscious of the debt at the time he accepts it. Of the incidents in the Old Testament the only cases in which this was true were those of Jacob and Laban, and Judah and Jacob. In both cases, when the contract was made, Jacob and Judah hoped that the debt would never materialize. They simply want surety for the animals and the boy placed in their charge. It is significant, too, that these cases which most clearly represent our concept of a debt could never be described by a westerner as sin.

The Deuteronomic idea of punishment for sin as an example to others that they might steer clear of similar sins can only lead to a conduct of expediency. That it did so is shown by the author of Job when he said, "Does Job fear God for nought?"

It would appear, therefore, that we should either find another word for the Hebrew "sin", which would reflect the significance of the word as used by the Hebrews or we should carefully define it in such a way as to give the reader some grasp of its significance. As it is, it must

cause a certain consternation to the casual reader to learn that the deity incites men to sin to carry out his divine purpose.

W. E. STAPLES

SOME ASPECTS OF ESCHATOLOGY

One of the significant developments in contemporary thought is the revival of interest in Eschatology, and the new appraisal that events compel us to put upon the subject. Writers on this subject in the past have pointed to the need of discrimination between Prophecy and Apocalyptic, and this important insight has led to a better understanding of both types of utterance.

Writers of the so-called "Eschatological School" have certainly exaggerated the importance of Apocalyptic for the understanding of the life and ethic of the Early Church. Many writers have classified and studied eschatological references according to the symbolism employed, for example, "The Day of the Lord", or "The Son of Man".

Yet for all this my distinct impression is that recently the attitude of theologians towards Eschatology was more or less contemptuous. Eschatology and Apocalyptic are frequently treated as counterfeits of genuine Ethical Prophecy, or as a degenerate form of it; an imitation rather than an inspiration. The low regard in which Eschatology has been held is most strongly attested by the currency of the cliché that "Prophecy is forth-telling rather than fore-telling"; the criticism of events, the appraisal of current trends, being considered more strictly the work of the genuine prophet than the announcement of future events. This seems to imply that the sharp distinction that has been drawn between Ethical Prophecy and Apocalyptic (already referred to) and which has enabled us to obtain fresh insights into the work of the Prophets, has unfortunately led us to a stricter and narrower definition both of Prophecy, and also of Revelation than was held by earlier theologians. Revelation has become almost synonymous with flashes of critical, ethical and social insight. It is the sharp, two-edged sword that pierces "even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit", and is "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Hebrews 4:12).

In contrast with the incisiveness of Ethical Prophecy, the utterances of Apocalyptists are vague; perhaps even intentionally obscure.

As far as I am aware it has never been suggested that this vagueness and symbolism was due to the fact that

the apocalyptist was attempting something more difficult than the Prophet. The incisiveness that we appreciate in the Prophet was due to a simplification. The Prophet considered all events, and all lives as examples of a very simple pattern with three factors or phases: (i) Divine Initiative, (ii) Human Response, and (iii) Divine Judgment.

In this scheme or pattern of things, the world, this universe about us, is not a vital factor. We pass, however, from that simple prophetic pattern into the complex and vague realm of apocalyptic when the pattern is broadened so as to include other factors, natural, supernatural, angelic and demonic. Thus St. Paul in one of his unexpected flashes of thought brings us to the very edge of the mystery, and enables us to see apocalyptically and eschatologically in those familiar words in Romans 8, verses 22 and following: "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own WILL but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

Eschatology embraces all factors. In some of those factors, namely the Human and the Divine, knowledge is prophetic; in others, for example the natural, knowledge is merely systematic and practical. We, therefore, just must not expect the same incisiveness in Eschatology that we find in Prophecy.

It is my intention and hope that in this paper I shall set before you the elements or factors in the pattern which seem to belong more strictly to Eschatology than to Prophecy or to the classical form of Hebrew Prophecy, and what has been called Ethical Prophecy. But before going on to this task, I wish to review the current trend that has brought Eschatology back into the very centre of our thought (as it apparently was in the thought of the Primitive church) with the idea that from contemporary thought we may gain confirmation of the view, already hinted at, with regard to the nature of Eschatology.

Now for a long time past, and until very recently, what took first place in the interest and study of Christians, both scholars and lay thinkers, was the endeavour to recover and to make crystal clear the Biblical principles and ideals applicable to man and society. That concern for Biblical Principles and Ideals led inevitably to a great, a tremendous intensification of the study of the Prophets in the Old Testament, and of Jesus, as Prophet in the New.

Every form of study designed to revitalize the Prophet; to set him in the midst of his own contemporary conditions and personalities; and to understand the message, the word, he was called upon to deliver, was pursued with a thoroughness and with a methodology that was characteristic of the very best in science. The matter did not end there, however. Modern social prophets and idealists applied the principles to the modern situation, and the rank and file of the ministers of the gospel took the ethical prophet as their example.

The life and work of the late William Temple may be considered to be the culmination and also the apogee of this whole religious movement.

But, if I am not mistaken, the position formerly awarded without dispute to the Social Idealist and Utopian is now being taken more and more by the Prophet of Doom. At this early stage, one must speak with caution. The appearance of the Modern Prophet of Doom may be brief. The heavy shadow he casts might herald a new dawn. But that he is himself no mere phantom of a mind, temporarily deranged by the War, seems to be certain. Qualified observers who have visited Europe assure us that social Idealism awakes no response at all at present. Social Idealism put forward in the name of Christ is viewed cynically as just another example of imperialism masquerading in disguise. And, of course, Stalinist-Communism lumps together liberalism, social idealism and utopianism indiscriminately, as reactionary, diversionist and thoroughly reprehensible.

Apart, however, from these broad trends some of the most epoch-making books in the fields of history are written by men who are modern counterparts of the Ancient Prophets of Doom. I refer to historians like Spengler, to economists or perhaps one should say agronomists like William Vogt, the author of The Road to Survival who has brought Malthus back to life, and above all to Junger, the author of a book which appeared first in Germany under the title of The Perfection of Technology, but is known in its American translation as The Failure of Technology.

What justified the change in the title from "Perfection" to "Failure" is the conviction of the author that Technology must inevitably struggle for its own perfection, for wider and wider application of its principle of rationalization, and that in the perfection of Technology there lies the petrification of the human spirit, and that as rationalization spreads reason and civilization vanish. In other words, according to the views of both Junger and Vogt in the progressive perfection of Science and Technology, the pride of our modern civilization, there looms the awful possibility of the End. Of course, the Prophet of Doom is

not to be identified with the Apocalyptist. But he does take a position mid-way between him and the Ethical Prophet, and it is often very difficult to tell where Doom Prophecy ends and Eschatology begins. Both of these forms of utterance are concerned with catastrophe. Broadly speaking, Doom Prophecy is concerned with limited catastrophe, for example the fall and desecration of a city, while Eschatology predicts complete catastrophe. However, since complete catastrophe is beyond the power of description (at least, unless one puts forward a series of negative statements, and negative statements are Indo-European, not Hebraic) the apocalyptist constantly uses the language of limited catastrophe to describe complete catastrophe.

Furthermore, both in Doom Prophecy and in Eschatology there is a tendency to allegorize History. In converting History into allegory, the prophet constantly employs words and phrases that belong to Cosmology, in fact, belonging to the oriental Mythology of Creation, rather than to the rational account of Creation found in the Bible. Since this allegorical symbolism is derived from cosmology, from an epoch or a state that is considered as prehistoric "Urzeit", its use in describing future history suggests an apocalyptic "Endzeit". But whether this allegorized History is strictly to be considered as Doom Prophecy or Eschatology is often hard to decide. Thus in particular the books of "Daniel" and "Revelation" are apocalyptic. The greater part of them takes the form of allegorized history. How much Eschatology, strictly so-called, they contain is a very difficult question. Before I reach the end of this paper I hope to have established my own criterion for the determination of the answer. But to come back to our own times, and to the change that is passing over our religious thought, is it not significant that modern prophets of Doom are again evincing this same tendency to allegorize history? To describe tragedy or catastrophe of the present they are bringing back mythological words like "Götterdämmerung", "Untergang" (Sunset), "Titanic forces", "Demoniac powers", and "Diabolic wickedness".

Some of the most significant books now appearing bear titles that proclaim this shift of accent in contemporary thinking. Instance, for example, Toynbee's Civilization on Trial, which recalls the prophetic and eschatological theme of judgment, and the Comte de Nouy's epoch-making book, Human Destiny. This whole movement, I believe, furnishes us with a key for the understanding of a similar displacement from Ethical Prophecy to Doom Prophecy and Eschatology in Biblical times.

However, if modern Eschatology is fathered by Pessimism, it is mothered by Science. Its natal star is the Atom,

and its birthday the day on which the problem of nuclear fission was solved. This discovery has led or is leading to a remarkable revolution in thought.

For a long time, mankind had lived in a certain security, in spite of the steadily increasing scope and destructiveness of modern warfare. Actually, while culture and civilization deteriorated very appreciably between the two world wars, world population increased, technical skill advanced. But the real cause of our feeling of security was the assurance given us by physical scientists that natural law was all-pervasive; real catastrophe was therefore impossible; and that the radioactive energy of the earth on which our life is said to depend was being used so slowly as to last us for billions of years.

Thus the End of the World, as foreseen by science, was placed in such a distant future, as to have no significance to the mind of man. But now, for the first time in history scientists themselves live in imminent fear or expectation of the end of the world; or if they do not live in fear of the END, they do, at least, admit the possibility of it, at any time!!

When to nuclear fission there are added the destructive potentialities of bacteriological and chemical warfare it is easy to realize how strongly the force of modern physical science favours the shift from social idealism to Doom Prophecy and Eschatology.

There is another aspect in the change of thought resulting from the achievement of nuclear fission. Not only is the end made imminent, instead of distant, but now it is understood that it may be realized in a manner fundamentally different from the manner that was universally held by scientists only a few years ago. Until scientists learned to split the Atom, they foresaw the END as coming only through the slow exhaustion of the energies latent in matter, that is, through what the early Greeks and the Christian Fathers would have described as a slow process of deprivation of the virtues (the word being used in its Greek sense) inherent in matter.

But now we see the possibility of the End coming instantaneously like a flash of lightning, through the release of energies, and through a sudden, spectacular exercise or realization of the power inherent in matter. The End is in the beginning; the End is in the nature of things. The End will come about by a sudden Liberation of Energies and a consequent consummation of Creation in Eschatology. Creation is inherently endowed with the possibility of its own destruction; Eschatology is, therefore,

implicit in Creation; it is the Corollary of Creation.

Eschatology, if we are to be guided by this scientific discovery, is to be viewed as the reverse of the same fact or reality of which Creation is the obverse. Right understanding of Creation requires knowledge of the End; the End is understood aright only if we study it in the light of the Doctrine of Creation.

Before passing on to a closer examination of this point allow me to recapitulate and review this phase of my argument. I suggest that in a very brief space of time we moderns have passed through a revolution of thought closely comparable to that which Biblical writers passed through, and it seems did pass through on more than one occasion--from Ethical Prophecy, through Doom Prophecy to Eschatology. And I should add, that having experienced this great change or re-ordering of thought, we are in a better position to understand and appraise Eschatology than we were only a few years ago. Particularly shall we avoid the error of expecting the same directness and incisiveness from the apocalypticist as we can observe in the Ethical Prophet. We shall appreciate the apocalypticist's effort to escape from the simple pattern in which the Prophet has cast his analysis of events--into (i) Divine Initiative, (ii) Human Response, and (iii) Divine Judgment. That analysis had been, and always will be a wonderful help in reaching an understanding of the most fundamental moral problems. But it was a simplification. For besides God as the Prime Mover, man found himself confronted by Nature. The question that man is bound to ask when he reflects is--Does morality hold in the material and natural world? Among the Hebrews, the first answers to these questions were formulated by apocalypticists, and we are deeply indebted to them for their efforts. If they failed to give a full solution to the riddle of moral man in a material world, they have at least done much to alleviate the "Burthen of the mystery", or to give us the will and strength to bear it.

We now proceed to consider whether apocalyptic and eschatological references in the Bible afford sufficient allusions to support the view suggested by Modern Physical potentialities. This section of the paper merits more study, I should frankly admit, than I have been able to give to it. Years ago I had in my hand, and looked over quickly, Hermann Gunkel's book *Urzeit und Endzeit*, but I have not been able to review his references before putting my views down on paper. Rabbinic literature also affords evidence of the search by early Jewish Rabbis for eschatological allusions and symbolism in the Creation story. But this also has not been in my hands recently. However, both the studies of Gunkel and of the Rabbis do at least testify to an urge to

unite Beginning and End, and do afford Biblical evidence in support of this union. However, besides looking for references to Creation in the Apocalyptic and Eschatological passages in the Bible, we must discover what the references have to show with regard to the nature of the connection between Creation and Eschatology, and whether they can bear an interpretation that will support that view of the connection which modern physical science favours--that nature is endued with the potentiality of its own consummation.

First, I should introduce the passage previously referred to: St. Paul's remarkable statement in Romans 8:22 and following, that all Creation is waiting in earnest expectation of the revealing of the Sons of God--namely in expectation of the End. This passage offers an excellent example of what I have already described as the "broadening of the Prophetic Pattern of thought by the introductions of other factors". Paul's main concern is the fulfillment of that whole action which includes (i) Divine Initiative, (ii) Human Response, and (iii) Divine Judgment. But into this pattern he has introduced the whole Natural Creation, and he has brought it in not as a passive bystander witnessing the soul's agonizing struggle to reach the End, but as an active participator and beneficiary in the act of Adoption by God.

The beginning is involved in the End; it shares in the final consummation.

I suppose that many would deny that the Flood Story is eschatology. It is usually supposed to be a story in the sources of J and P which was remoulded and fitted into the plan of these writers. However, the more I have pondered over the matter the more convinced I am that it is eschatology. "The End of all Flesh has come before me" is a very striking and one might say "awe-inspiring expression". The Flood was not the End. In fact, we are told at the end of the story that the End will not be a flood. There is contained in the account the assurance of God that while Earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest would not fail. But the Flood Story was calculated to prove that civilization, life, and the earth itself are not eternal, nor autarchic. The End is a possibility. Year by year, the story reminds us, primitive man lived in fear or expectation of the End just as our modern scientists do. In the story itself and in the two original strands of tradition from which it is woven, there are clear references to the creation story--"I will destroy . . . both man and beast and creeping thing and fowl of the air." And while the text of the 13th verse (Genesis 6) is uncertain, the MSS support the reading "I will destroy man with the earth." The so-called chaos poem of Jeremiah (chapter 4, verses 23-26) is an excellent example for our

purpose, for the references to Creation are unmistakable. This is all the more remarkable because its composition if it is to be attributed to the Prophet himself, antedates the Creation Story of the Writer P. But this only emphasizes the fact that from very early times, before thought about Creation had advanced to the point attained by the Priestly writer, it was fully apprehended that the work of the Creator could be dissolved. We are, therefore, not to take literally the words of the author of Psalm 104 that God "laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be moved for ever."

In the "Little Apocalyptic" of the Synoptic Gospels, there is the prophetic utterance "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but my words shall never pass away". This is an evident reference to Genesis I (i) and implies that all Creation as outlined in the following verses of that chapter will be undone.

Besides these few well-known references, it should be pointed out that some of the symbols employed by apocalyptic writers to describe the End are evidently derived, either from the Creation Story itself, or from the oriental accounts of pre-temporal and mythical warfare. In this connection, references to the Dragon, the Monster or Beast, and the abyss will readily come to mind. The threat of darkness covering the earth in the last days has sometimes been taken to refer to actual eclipses. But the first distich in the chaos poem of Jeremiah brings "tohū wabohū" into parallelism with "an or", and that suggests that the failure of light is to be understood as the dissolution of the Creator's work in the heaven, and one of the principle effects at the End.

The "Son of Man" is a very important symbol in eschatology; his appearance heralds Judgment and the End. I would not suggest for a moment that this Supernatural Being is derived from the Creation Story. However, it is typical of this tendency in ancient writers to find the End in the Beginning, eschatology in creation, that St. Paul draws a parallel between this second man, the Lord from Heaven, and the first man, Adam, his earthly counterpart.

Furthermore, in one notable reference, Matthew 24:30, reference is made to "The Sign of the Son of Man", which in fact could be rendered "the sign" namely the Son of Man". Now Rabbinic scholars had speculated upon the remarkable description in the Creation Story of the Sun and Moon as Signs. There is, therefore, in this peculiar expression, "The sign of the Son" a vague allusion that seems to point to the Creation Story.

I have so far introduced only a few passages, but I

believe that they are characteristic. On the basis of the evidence that they contain I would say that Eschatology has as its principle object Man; it is the fulfillment of his Destiny. This is made very clear in the quotation from Romans 8, but is also plain in the context if not in the text itself, of the other quotations.

But its effect is very far-reaching, overthrowing the whole natural order, and abolishing, as it is stated in Revelation 10:6, even Time itself. However, I believe that we shall look in vain in Hebrew writings (and, I say Hebrew so as to exclude Hellenistic) for the suggestion that the END will come through the exercise of powers and virtues latent and inherent in matter itself. If the Eschatology and Creationism are united in the Biblical writings (from what has been shown in these passages, the union is superficial), the nature of the union is different from what it is supposed to be by modern scientists. What the difference is between the Hebraic and the Greek and scientific views on this question I will now proceed to consider. I have already suggested that if Eschatology and Creation are to be united, whatever the nature and form of the union, the one subject will illuminate the other. Now it has become the prevailing fashion among theologians in discussing Creation to devote one chapter to Oriental cosmogonies; the second to the Old Testament; a third to the New Testament and the Early Fathers; others to Augustine and St. Thomas; and then to set the subject in the light of modern science. Under these circumstances one must look far for a thorough study of the purely Hebraic conception of Creation, as distinct from the oriental Mythology on the one hand, the Greek Philosophy or Modern Science on the other. But if Eschatology is of such great importance today, and if Eschatology has a deep, inner relationship with Creation, and in fact, throws light upon it, as well as deriving light from it, then it is most important to keep clearly before our minds the Hebraic idea of Creation.

Let us, therefore, proceed to consider certain aspects of the Hebrew idea of Creation that may enable us better to understand the Doctrine of the End.

In the first place, it should be observed the Biblical writers never did conceive of Creation as a Process. In Genesis I, one stage of Creation follows the other; but in no way as developing out of the other. Each stage involved a fresh Creative act on the part of God. Presumably, to the Priestly author, it would have been possible for God to have reversed the order, and to have made man first and the animal creation, and his natural environment later. In fact, in Genesis II there is just such a reversal of order in the Creation of Man before Woman, for from a purely logical

point of view woman exists before man.

Nor is there any clear conception of Nature in the sense that we understand it; nature being a form of process. This is all the more remarkable considering the Hebrew love of Nature, and their practical understanding of it, which made them excellent agronomists. God touches the mountains and they melt, or they smoke. This is the characteristic explanation for volcano or earthquake.

Empedocles, the Greek philosopher, climbs Aetna and throws himself into the smouldering crater, drawn to identify himself with Nature. Elijah at the mouth of the cave on Horeb witnesses the earthquake, wind and fire, expecting momentarily the Appearance of God, and listening for his Word.

In the story of the Fall there is a phrase which suggests the conception of a natural cycle of life. The sentence, "Dust thou art; To dust shalt thou return", was perhaps a piece of gnostic wisdom of great antiquity. If that is so its original meaning was very different from the force given it by the Biblical author. Originally, it was perhaps calculated to set down a Natural Law, or express a Natural process. In that case originally it was pure eschatology, personal eschatology, of course. Yet the Biblical author gives it an entirely different force through his treatment of it as a punishment. "Death", says science, "is the NATURAL end". "Death", says the Bible, is "Divine punishment". The writer of Psalm 104 also refuses to treat death as the Natural end, though his treatment of the subject is quite distinct from that of the author of Genesis III--

"Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled:
Thou takest away their breath, they die,
And return to their dust."

Death here, as in the earlier writing, is a supernatural event. Considering that not only Death, but that Birth itself, is repeatedly treated as a Divine act, and it must be admitted that Biblical Thought has no place for a genuine naturalism.

Better to understand Creation as conceived by Biblical writers something must be said on the subject of the "Word". Now Alexandrine philosophers, both Jewish and Christian, might appear to have effected a synthesis between Hebraic and Greek ideas with regard to the Logos. More specifically, since the "Word" is the agent of Creation in the Bible, as several references both in Old and New Testaments show, a synthesis might be effected between it and the Stoic theory of spermatikos logos. It certainly is possible

to trace the development of the idea of the "word" in the two different traditions, and to show that later theologians were influenced by both ideas. Yet it would be wrong to suppose that there was, or ever could be, any real fusion of these two traditions. Greek philosophy never loses sight of the problem of Epistemology, and inevitably the Logos, though it is distinguishable from the material world, is actually inseparable from it. The inherence of the Logos in the material world makes it possible to describe it as a Kosmos. In Plato's philosophy, the ideal world can be viewed as quite distinct and separate from the physical world, but, on the other hand, the physical world cannot be viewed as separate from the ideal. In the philosophy of Aristotle, the connection between Logos (Form) and Matter is closer than it is in Plato's thought, for while in the scale of Being Aristotle puts Pure Form and Pure Matter at the two ends, yet he takes the positions that these are not objects of cognition. In the Biblical writings the matter stands otherwise. The inspired writers were not concerned with Epistemology as were the Greeks, and therefore, were not looking for a rational principle in the Universe. This is most clearly proven in the treatment of wisdom, which is described as the Creative Agent in some references, as "The fear of the Lord" in others, but never as a rational principle. In the second place, among the Hebrews the Word is a form of Divine activity (hypostatized, admittedly and therefore capable of further development) and so real to the Hebrew mind was the Divine Initiative that it was quite impossible to identify the "word" with the rational principle, or with some natural energy, or force latent in the physical world.

Philo of Alexandria in one well-known reference describes the Logos as denteros theos tis. This has been taken as anticipation of the doctrine fully developed in the Prologue of the Gospel according to St. John. Probably, however, Philo intended in these words to repudiate the idea that the Logos was to be taken as it was commonly understood as a principle, imminent and inherent in Creation. The Logos in Philonic thought, as in Hebraic thought generally, is still a transcendent force, reality or being, even if it is brought into close association with the material world.

It seems clear, even on such a sketchy study of the subject, that certain ideas, which to the modern mind are necessarily associated with the Physical world have no place in the Biblical Conception of Creation. Since by our hypothesis, Eschatology and Creation are co-related, we must be on our guard lest these same ideas of process, nature and rational principle find their place in our Eschatology. And it should be observed that the difference between Biblical Eschatology and modern scientific eschatology does not lie

only in the presence or absence of these ideas. The presence or absence of these ideas are important enough in themselves, but even more important may be the implied difference of emphasis resulting from the reform. To be particular, in the Hebraic scheme of creation, owing to the absence of these factors, Man and his Destiny are the central and focal point of Creation. He is not just the climax of the Creator's work. He is the centre of it and lord of it. In philosophies which include these ideas, an imminent Logos or the Natural Process occupy a position of greater importance than man. But having eliminated the factors which philosophers have thought of as giving unity and coherence to the world order, what is there in the Universe that sustains it? The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Chapter 1:3) states that all things are upheld by the word of God's power, or perhaps better, by God's powerful word. There can, however, be little doubt that this is an early example of introduction of Greek ideas, and not a strictly Hebraic account.

An answer to this question is suggested by the phrase recorded in the Apocalypse, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord." But if this is taken to mean that the universe subsists in God, it seems clearly to imply that it enjoys the eternity of God, and that contradicts the plain intention of many Biblical references. Rather it suggests that the timelessness and simultaneity of God surrounds the successiveness and transience of the world. If the universe is not sustained by the Divine Word, and is not grounded in the eternal and immutable nature of God, it seems clear that Creation is grounded in the Will of God. I fully realize that this view is put forward without sufficient argument to overthrow the view so often expressed that Creation is sustained by "The Word". It is a subject that requires far more thorough treatment than I shall be able to give it in this paper. But recalling again the hypothesis that Creation must be considered as the corollary of Eschatology, and vice versa, I believe that a study of the grounds of Eschatology will disclose the ground of Creation. Now, in introducing the subject of Eschatology writers do not employ the "Logos" idea excepting perhaps as in that characteristic phrase, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, my words shall not pass away", which does anything but imply that the words carry destructive force. In fact, one might say that generally speaking the Divine Word is creative, beneficial and saving. I may be mistaken, but I doubt whether there is one Biblical reference which sets forth the Word as the Agency of Destruction, or as a destructive force. The cause of Destruction is variously described, for example, in the Flood Story, as the Repentance of God, and in the Chaos Poem, and elsewhere as the Wrath of God. Expressions like these are expressions of emotion and will. They support, and in fact, they prove the contention that Creation, like

Eschatology, is grounded in the Divine Will. We exist, we are born, we live, we die, in a volitional universe. Surely, that is what is meant when we speak of a universe of moral ends. Surely, it is only in such a universe, grounded in the Will of God, that judgment and salvation, the two forms of Eschatology, can have their fulfillment. It is only in such a universe that Personal eschatology with the Destiny of Man as the object, be brought into harmony with the Universal purpose. Once we accept the Will of God, as the very ground and basis of Creation, we can understand the place of Eschatology in Revelation, or to be more particular, the place of the Flood Story in the account of J and P. Read the story of Creation in the first chapter of Genesis, and one sees the Universe develop in a series of stages in accordance with the Will of God, indicated by a series of imperatives. But is Creation eternal? Or should we take the position of the Deist and suggest that it possesses properties and exhibits natural processes quite independent of the immediate care of the Creator? The answer is in the negative.

It is given in a most graphic way, in story and poem, that we describe as Eschatology. Eschatology is necessary so as to complete the account of Creation.

Thus the union between Eschatology and Creation is just as real and close in the Scriptures as it is in the view of our Modern physical scientists. But the nature of the union is vastly different; Science emphasizing the inherent forces in Matter that through being released bring about the End, while the Biblical writers emphasizing that everything, the human spirit and all natural forces, are subordinate to the Will of God, and find their consummation in Him. The classical expression of this truth is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians I (9) and (10), "Having made known unto us the mystery of His WILL . . . that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth--even in Him."

In conclusion, it should perhaps be remarked that close as Eschatology is related to Creation, it is apparent that it is still under the influence or spell of Prophecy. Prophets used a very simple pattern for the analysis of human activity: (i) Divine Initiative, (ii) Human Response, and (iii) Divine Judgment. The apocalyptists introduced new elements, natural, supernatural, angelic, and demonic, into the pattern, but never in such a way as to destroy the Pattern. They were perplexed by the problem of Moral Man in what was perhaps an amoral or immoral universe. Actually, they point towards the solution in setting forth the truth in their vivid, and often weird language, that all things,

Alpha and Omega, beginning and end, subsist in the Will of the Holy One of Israel. Creation and Eschatology are the obverse and the reverse of the one and same reality, namely, the Will of God, the Sovereign of all things.

K. C. EVANS

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES, 1933-1966

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| 1933 | Organizational Meeting (May 2, 1933) | |
| 1934 | Sir Robert A. Falconer,
University of Toronto | The Pastoral Epistles |
| 1935 | Canon G. Abbott-Smith,
Diocesan Theol. College,
Montreal | Two Uncharted Leaves of
Gospel Parchment Miniscule
MSS. |
| 1936 | Prof. H. L. MacNeill,
McMaster University,
Hamilton | Form-Criticism and Faith |
| 1937 | Prof. W. R. Taylor,
University College,
Toronto | The Spirit of Hebrew
Literature |
| 1938 | Principal Richard Davidson,
Emmanuel College,
Toronto | The Prayers of the Bible,
Their Form and Content |
| 1939 | Rev. F. H. Cosgrave,
Provost of Trinity Col-
lege, Toronto | Recent Studies on the
Psalms |
| 1940 | Rabbi M. Eisendrath,
Holy Blossom Synagogue,
Toronto | The Biblical Basis of
Democracy's Present
Struggle |
| 1941 | Prof. J. H. Michael,
Emmanuel College,
Toronto | Some Memories of Two Great
Biblical Scholars (Profs.
J. H. Moulton and G. G.
Findlay) |
| 1942 | Prof. F. W. Beare,
Montreal Presbyterian
College | Dura-Europos on the
Euphrates |
| 1943
(May) | Prof. N. H. Parker,
McMaster University,
Hamilton | No address due to ill
health |
| 1943
(Dec.) | Prof. N. H. Parker,
McMaster University,
Hamilton | Teaching the Old Testament
to Theological Students |

- 1944 Prof. S. M. Gilmour, Queen's Theol. College, Kingston St. Paul and the Primitive Church
- 1946 Prof. W. E. Staples, Victoria College, Toronto Some Aspects of Sin in the Old Testament
- 1947 Prof. John Dow, Emmanuel College, Toronto Some Trends of Biblical Theology from E. Renan Onwards
- 1948 Prof. W. S. McCullough, University College, Toronto Roman Policy towards the Jews from 63 B.C. to 135 A.D.
- 1949 Very Rev. K. C. Evans, Trinity College, Toronto Some Aspects of Eschatology
- 1950 Prof. F. V. Winnett, University College, Toronto Abraham, the Friend of God
- 1951 Prof. D. K. Andrews, Knox College, Toronto Jahweh: God of the Heavens
- 1952 Prof. David Hay, Knox College, Toronto Miracle: A Theological Discussion
- 1953 Prof. R. J. Williams, University College, Toronto Theodicy in the Ancient Near East
- 1954 Principal R. Lennox, Montreal Presbyterian College The Theological Character of the Septuagint of Ezekiel
- 1955 Prof. E. R. Fairweather, Trinity College, Toronto The Use of the Bible in Christian Theology
- 1956 Prof. W. Morison Kelly, Emmanuel College, Toronto The Preacher and the Kerygma
- (Canadian Section S.B.L.)
Prof. J. W. Wevers, University College Toronto The Qumran Scrolls and New Testament Studies

- 1957 Prof. M. T. Newby, Trinity College, Toronto Hebrew Thought and Style: Reversals and Antitheses
- 1958 Principal G. B. Caird, United Theol. College, Montreal The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews
- 1959 Rev. David M. Stanley, S.J., Jesuit Seminary, Toronto A Problem of Integration in the Primitive Church
- 1960 Prof. R. Dobbie, Emmanuel College, Toronto The Idea of Atonement: Priests and Prophets
- 1961 Dean S. B. Frost, Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, Montreal The English Bible Translations
- 1962 Prof. J. Macpherson, Victoria College, Toronto Thirty Years of the C. S. B. S.
- 1963 Principal G. Johnston, United Theol. College, Montreal Oikoumene and Kosmos in the New Testament
- 1964 Prof. E. Cyril Blackman, Emmanuel College, Toronto Divine Sovereignty and Missionary Strategy
- 1965 Père Adrien Brunet, O.P., Couvent des Dominicains, Montreal The Theology of the Chronicler
- 1966 Prof. G. H. Parke-Taylor, Huron College, London Some Reflections on the Interpretation of Genesis 22:1-19