

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

Hence we see the worthiness of the phrase to express the dignity of his eternal origin who could declare his oneness with the Father in essential life,<sup>1</sup> in unceasing work,<sup>2</sup> and in the fulness of that Divine nature<sup>3</sup> of which we are made partakers through Him—*sons of God*, with a loving dependence, filial resemblance, free obedience, and glorious expectation, which, not τέκνον, but υἱός is all-sufficient to comprehend.

JOHN MASSIE.

---

BRIEF NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE TO THE BIBLE, by *Dr. Robert Young* (London: Hodder and Stoughton), is a monument of patient research and industry. To say that it is by far the most complete and serviceable Concordance in the language is to give but a faint conception of its worth. It is also a pronouncing dictionary, and a vast index to "parallel passages" that are really parallel; it is in some sense a Hebrew and a Greek lexicon for English use; and, still further, it is, so far as a Concordance can be, a dictionary of the geography, history, and antiquities of the Bible, though, it must be confessed, these latter subjects are but touched in passing and as with the point of a finger. The main value of the work consists in this: (1) It is an unrivalled Concordance, containing many thousand more references than Cruden, and arranging them on a far better plan; and (2) it not only gives all the passages in which any English word is used in the Authorized Version, but classifies these passages under the several Hebrew or Greek words which it is used to translate, having first defined (hardly as thoroughly as need be, however) the distinctive meanings of these words. Even the different numbers of the Original noun and the tenses of the verb are marked, while the words of the Original are printed in English characters as well as in Greek or Hebrew; so that by a diligent and skilful use of this volume even the English reader, who will take the pains, may recover for himself the meaning of any passage in the Original Scriptures.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to convey a conception of the

<sup>1</sup> John v. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* v. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* x. 30.

manifold uses to which the book may be put by a general description of it. But an illustration or two—and we will take the simplest—may furnish a hint of some of the ways in which it may be turned to account. If, for instance, you want to know, as a student of Job xxviii. should want to know, how many words the Hebrew has for gold, and of these how many Job employs, you have but to look to the word GOLD, and you are referred to all the passages in which *betsar* or *betser* (wealth as a defence) occur; then to those in which *dehab* or *zehab* (shining gold) are employed; then to those which indicate the *best* gold (*charuts*), *pure* gold (*kethem*), and *refined* gold (*segor*). By simply going through the list you not only discover that Job weaves into his description four out of the seven Hebrew words for gold, but also what is the special shade of meaning in each of the words he employs. By a similar examination of the lists under the headings GOD and the LORD you may get, besides much else, all the materials of the Elohist and Jehovistic controversy into your hands, if you care to have them; though that, it should be added, is a controversy in which it is not wise of those to intermeddle who are not familiar with the original documents of Scripture and have little need whether of dictionary or concordance.

Again, if you are struck as you read St. Luke xxii. 32, with our Lord's strange use of a word in the phrase, "And when thou art *converted*, strengthen thy brethren," which seems to imply that even a believer and an apostle may still need conversion, you will probably be tempted to suspect that the English is not a fair equivalent of the Greek of this passage. You turn up the word CONVERT, therefore, in your Concordance, and under it you see "CONVERTED to be;" and here you find the reference to the passage in St. Luke. You look for the Greek word at the head of the list, and see it is *epistrephō*, the very word used by St. James in the familiar passage, "He that *converteth* a sinner from the error of his ways shall save his soul from death," and by St. Peter in his exhortation to the murderers of Christ, "Repent ye therefore, and be *converted*, that your sins may be blotted out,"—the one only word, indeed, employed for this spiritual experience and change throughout the New Testament. And as you meditate on that fact, you get perhaps a new conception of what may be included under the spiritual process known as conversion.

Of course, the real value of such a work as this must depend on its accuracy; and we do not pretend to vouch for the accuracy of a book whose definitions are to be counted by the thousand and its references by the hundred thousand. But we have kept it by us and

worked with it for a couple of months—not half long enough for the critic, though possibly too long for the author's patience—and can honestly report that so far it has stood the test very well. The one point at which it seems most open to improvement is a more copious and precise definition of the shades of difference between Hebrew words which are translated by the same English word in our Version. On the whole, Dr. Young's work—an immense advance in every way on that of Cruden—will be found, we believe, to be of great and sterling value.

THE HEBREW UTOPIA: a Study of Messianic Prophecy, *by* Walter F. Adeney, M.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton), is a bright, thoughtful, well-written Essay, to which the author has done some injustice by the title he has given it; although, to the initiated, this very title will be significant of the position he assumes and defends. To the popular mind the word Utopia carries some suggestion of unreality, of a world at least unrealized, if not unrealizable—a suggestion very far from his intention: his intention being, as experts will suspect, to contend that, in place of distinct foresight of the Man Christ Jesus and of the details of the work He came to do, the Hebrew prophets had an ideal of the true King of men and of the kingdom He came to set up floating before their minds, vague in outline at first, but gradually assuming a more definite shape as the Spirit of God moved over the brooding thoughts of one Hebrew man of genius after another. This thesis he works out with much force and beauty, illustrating it by a careful examination of the leading Messianic prophecies in their historical order, and shewing how, in the event, the Christ of God at once fulfilled and exceeded all that the ancient seers had afore written of Him. If the work be that of a young man and author, it is of good performance and of still better promise. The style has certain "vital signs" in it, and the cast of thought is broad and generous.

*Messrs. F. R. Conder and C. R. Conder, R.E.*, do themselves an injustice in another way. If Mr. Adeney in his title promises less than he gives us, they promise somewhat more. A HANDBOOK TO THE BIBLE (London: Longmans) is a somewhat pretentious name to give to a small volume of some four hundred pages, since a handbook should contain much that cannot be crowded into so small a compass, much even—as, for example, the linguistic and literary aspects of the Bible—with which the special studies of its authors.

have not qualified them to deal. Nor is the matter mended by a hint in the Preface that much pains have been taken with the Index in the hope that the volume may be "used as a Bible *Dictionary!*"—not a modest hope, to say the least of it. Nevertheless, the book is a good book, and cannot fail to be useful; within its own limits, indeed, there is none better. All will do well to keep it at hand, among their books of reference, who wish to possess, in brief compass and succinct form, the best and most recent information to be had on the chronology of the Bible, its weights and measures and coins, and, above all, on its geography. Mr. C. R. Conder's services on the Trigonometrical Survey of Palestine and in the excavations recently conducted by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, qualify him to speak with authority on the geography of the country and on the topography of Jerusalem and the Temple area. The main value of the book lies in its capital summaries of the latest information on these points. And if these services do not raise it to the dignity of a Bible Dictionary, or even make it a complete Handbook to the Bible, they nevertheless render it a very convenient and valuable book of reference.

*The Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A.*, has made a valuable addition to THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS in his brief commentary on the EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. The "Notes" are very good, and lean, as the notes of a School Bible should, to the most commonly accepted and orthodox view of the inspired author's meaning; while the Introduction, and especially the Sketch of the Life of St. Paul, is a model of condensation. It is as lively and pleasant to read as if two or three facts had not been crowded into well-nigh every sentence.

---

The *Theological Review* is dead, but the *Modern Review* has sprung into life. And in the first number of this new Unitarian Quarterly there are three capital papers: "The Force behind Nature," by Dr. Carpenter; "In the Name of Christ," by Mr. Picton; and, above all, "Fervent Atheism," by Professor Upton. There are also two allusions to THE EXPOSITOR which are somewhat curious, and, to speak plainly, absurd. The first is made by Dr. Vance Smith, who, in an article on "A Recent Discussion on Romans ix. 5," very naturally refers to THE EXPOSITOR, since that Discussion appeared in our issue of last year. His article contains an argument against

the doctrine of the Sacred Trinity which he says, quite truly, that I did not "consider admissible" to the pages of this Magazine. And he congratulates himself and the Editor of the *Modern Review* on its advantage over THE EXPOSITOR, in that he can "allow to his contributors a little more of 'the liberty of prophesying'" than I can, or do, to mine. Now it is very possible that the Editor of the new Quarterly may enjoy a wider liberty than I, and be able to give a freer scope to his colleagues; though I would venture to remind both him and them that it is not those who say the bitterest things against sectarianism who are always the most unsectarian, nor those who are always boasting of their freedom who are most free. But surely Dr. Smith is very unlucky in the modern instance by which he illustrates that ancient saw of "the liberty of prophesying." Mr. Armstrong, an Unitarian, and the Editor of an Unitarian Magazine, admits an argument against the Trinity, which I, a Trinitarian, and the Editor of a Trinitarian Magazine, had declined. How does that prove that the Editor of the *Modern Review* has, or gives, a wider liberty than I? So far as it goes, it would rather seem to prove that we both of us quite naturally and reasonably, insert arguments for that which we hold to be true, and decline to insert arguments for what we hold to be untrue. My main motive for declining Dr. Smith's argument, however, was that I did not think it well to suffer a critical discussion to degenerate into a doctrinal polemic for which I had neither space nor taste. I am very glad, however, that his argument should be given to the world in an appropriate organ; for, now, if I should want any justification of the course I took beyond my disinclination to insert an attack on the Trinitarian conception of God in a Trinitarian Magazine, and my reluctance to being drawn into a doctrinal polemic, I can appeal to his argument itself; which, as *The Scotsman* very justly observes, "adds nothing that is really material to his former statements."

But the Editor himself also alludes to THE EXPOSITOR, and that in a way still more curious. At the close of his opening article he sings quite a little pæan over himself and his excellent intentions. And in the course of it, while enumerating in a somewhat Pindaric mood the objects which he has set before himself as Editor of the new Magazine, he says: "The scholar shall entice the reader into the practice of that criticism which, to many who have not understood its spirit or its aim, appears 'malicious,'\* but to us seems beneficently 'Reconstructive,'" &c. The reference indicated by the star over the word "malicious" is given thus at the foot of the page: "*The*

*Expositor*, No. I. p. 1," and is likely, of course, to generate the impression that, in a formal enunciation of the principles on which THE EXPOSITOR was to be conducted, a certain kind of "reconstructive" criticism was branded as "malicious." Now if the reader will turn to page 1 of No. I. of THE EXPOSITOR, he will discover, with some natural surprise, that the word criticism is not once used; that the word "malicious" is used only in speaking of the "malicious delight" with which "those who hold the Christian Faith to be an outworn creed," pounce on certain passages of Scripture, and make fun of them: while, if he reads on for a page or two, he will find, with deepening surprise, that the passage I had mainly in view was one in which, as I tried to shew, certain opponents of the Christian Faith first insert "an extraordinary and exorbitant miracle," and then proceed to ridicule the miracle which they themselves have thrust upon the Bible. For what criticism is it, then, that the Editor of the *Modern Review* is so jealous that he rebukes me for having misunderstood and misrepresented it? Is it the criticism of those who "reject the Christian Faith as an outworn creed"? That cannot be; for he himself has just affirmed that "the modern spirit," which is to animate the *Modern Review*, "shall not quench the flame of faith, but fan it to a ruddier blaze;" and, as I understand his somewhat dithyrambic utterance, it is a leading object of his *Review* to reconcile Reason and Faith—a noble enterprise in which I heartily wish him all success. I am quite unable, therefore, to determine what the offence is with which I am charged: and, until I know my sin, how can I seek any place of repentance? It is very possible, of course, that I may have failed to "understand either the spirit or the aim" of a certain criticism which, whatever it may be, is very dear to the valiant and poetic Editor who has taken me publicly to task for my ignorance. But surely it is quite certain either that he, in his turn, has altogether failed to understand the spirit and the aim of the sentence in THE EXPOSITOR to which he refers; or that there is but one word which will adequately characterize his reference to this Magazine, and that the word which he himself quotes from it and misquotes. Meantime is it not rather a pity that, if we are both set for the defence and furtherance of the Christian Faith, though from very different points of view, that time and energy should be wasted on brief and baseless insinuations which cannot be so briefly met?

EDITOR.