

*DR. HASTINGS' DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.*

It is a pleasure to add one voice more to the chorus of congratulation which greets Dr. Hastings on the successful conclusion of his anxious and arduous task. We say "conclusion," for, although a supplementary volume is promised, the Editor in chief has already performed all he undertook and has furnished the public with a Bible Dictionary which adequately discusses and explains all relevant topics, illuminating each with that wealth of exact information and keen insight which only the expert possesses. The editorial work has been done with extraordinary knowledge and efficiency. Dr. Hastings has shown something of the magical instinct of the water-finder and has tapped springs of information hitherto unknown and unsuspected, but which have responded to his appeal with streams that vivify and fertilize common knowledge. In such articles as Prof. Warfield's on "*Predestination*" the gusto of liberty to utter is manifest, and indeed there is little in the volume that can be called "hack-work." For even where experts are going over ground with which they are familiar, as in Kenyon's article on "*Writing*," there is communicated to the reader that interest in his subject which never forsakes the true scholar. The only improvement which might be suggested in the editorial management is the fuller treatment of certain subjects. For example, there is no question which at present requires fuller or more careful treatment than that of Revelation, but this subject which underlies the whole Dictionary is only incidentally and briefly treated in the article *Bible*. Neither is there any separate article on *Papyri*, an unaccountable omission, considering the abundance and significance of recent finds and decipherments and their bearing on New Testament study. Possibly it is such omissions which have made it seem advisable to produce a supplementary volume.

The Editor has, we think judiciously, relied chiefly upon English-speaking contributors, although some of the most important articles have been furnished by German scholars. Thus Graf von Baudissin has been allowed thirty pages in which to discuss "*Priests and Levites*," while Budde writes on "*Hebrew Poetry*" at considerable length. It was to be expected that Prof. Nestle would be a large contributor, and we find much

admirable work from his facile pen. The much-vexed question of the authenticity of the Cairene Hebrew text of the Book of Sirach is elaborately discussed by him, but remains unsettled. Prof. Nestle has also written on the Text of the New Testament, the Syriac Versions, and the Septuagint. The Vulgate has necessarily been allotted to Mr. H. J. White; and, as necessarily, the localities of Asia Minor to Prof. W. M. Ramsay. A rich vein of recondite information identifies several articles as the production of the many-sided, all-accomplished Prof. Alexander Macalister; while Dr. J. A. Selbie contributes a large amount of knowledge from his stores of well-digested learning. The Books of the New Testament are adequately treated, the Epistle to the Romans by Principal Robertson, those to the Thessalonians by Prof. Walter Lock. A remarkable article on the Book of Revelation is contributed by Prof. Porter of Yale, whose criticism throughout is candid and impartial. He concludes that the authorship remains problematic, although he counts it little less than a certainty that it did not proceed from the Author of the fourth gospel. The books of the Old Testament are handled by men who know, such as Dr. Selbie, Nowack, and Prof. W. T. Davison. To the last-named scholar the Book of Psalms has been assigned. Of the Davidic authorship he says: "It cannot certainly be proved that David wrote any psalms; the probability is that he wrote many; it is not likely that all these were lost; some of those extant which are ascribed to him are appropriate in his lips; external evidence ascribes the 18th Psalm to David; and if it be his, it is probable that others also should be attributed to him; and in determining the number of these, internal evidence drawn from contents, style, allusion, etc., is the sole criterion. The judgment of critics proceeding upon these lines naturally varies considerably. The arguments above adduced would lead to the conclusion that from ten to twenty psalms—including 3, 4, 7, 8, 15, 18, 23, 24, 32, and perhaps 101 and 110—*may* have come down to us from David's pen, but that the number can hardly be greater and may be still less."

Some of the most instructive articles are on theological subjects. Conspicuous among these are Prof. Sanday's on "Son of God," in which, however, there is some debatable matter, and Prof. Driver's on "Son of Man." In the latter article the difficulties recently raised from a consideration of Aramaic linguistic

usage are lucidly stated and discussed. Jesus, as a rule, if not always, spoke Aramaic, but "son of man" in Aramaic is a common expression in which the force of "son" "has been so weakened by time as virtually to have disappeared, so that it practically means nothing more nor less than *man*." Was it possible then for Jesus speaking in Aramaic to call Himself "the Son of Man"? Prof. Driver gives reasons for believing that notwithstanding all that has been alleged by Wellhausen, Lietzmann and others, it was not impossible that Jesus may have spoken of Himself in Aramaic (or even occasionally in Greek) as "the Son of Man." The further question, What did He mean by the designation? receives the answer which may be said to be that which commends itself to the majority of modern critics: that He used it to veil rather than to reveal His Messiahship. "Christ's use of the term was *paedagogic*. It veiled his Messiahship during the earlier part of His ministry, till the time was ripe for Him to avow it openly." This article, if it cannot be called final, since no position is nowadays allowed to be undisturbed and uncontested, may yet be said to supersede the numberless brochures which this subject has recently evoked.

Other articles of interest are those by Canon E. R. Bernard. In his treatment of the Resurrection he seems indeed to minimize the inconsistency of St. Paul's later view with his earlier, and thereby to induce some misunderstanding, but his account of the same Apostle's doctrine of Sin is bolder and more Pauline than appears in any of the New Testament theologies. Of these theological contributions, however, it will probably be admitted by most readers that Prof. W. P. Paterson's on Sacrifice contains the greatest wealth of thinking which is at once original and solid. Very deserving of attention is his discussion of the theory which lies at the basis of Old Testament sacrifice, and his exposition of the probability that the idea of penal substitution underlay the ritual of the sin-offering. "That the idea of substitution was already familiar appears from Gen. 22. 13 (offering of a ram in place of Isaac) and at a late stage the vicarious idea is used to explain the sufferings of the righteous servant of Jehovah (Is. 53.). And given the doctrine that sin entailed death, and that one being might suffer in room of another, it was a highly natural if not an inevitable step, to go on to suppose that the rite of sacrifice combined the two ideas, and that the slain victim

bore the penalty due to the sinner." Of course this idea is not novel. Outram long ago demonstrated from Jewish sources that the Hebrews themselves consciously held this view; and Robertson Smith traces its development. But Prof. Paterson gives it the most lucid and convincing statement. Passing to the New Testament he brings out the significance of Christ's death as a sacrifice, examining first our Lord's own statements and then those of the Apostles. He finds that St. Paul makes a large contribution to a theory of the Atonement. "It is vain to deny that St. Paul freely employs the category of substitution, involving the conception of the imputation or transference of moral qualities. . . From his reference to Christ as a means of propitiation (Rom. 3. 25), it is probable that the Apostle conceived of Christ as expiating guilt through the vicarious endurance of its characteristic penalty." The writer to the Hebrews, according to Prof. Paterson, finds the atoning virtue of Christ's death rather in its being the offering to God of a perfected obedience than in its being the penalty of sin. The Epistle, it is true, knows nothing of a sacrifice which does not involve suffering and death as an essential element of it, but it lays greater stress on the spirit of self-sacrificing obedience in which Christ offered Himself. The satisfaction rendered by Christ was not so much the death to which He voluntarily submitted as the life-long obedience which found in the death its highest expression. There is much in this article which will materially aid all who are in search of clear views of the significance of Christ's death.

Many other articles in this rich volume deserve careful consideration, and the illustrations and maps are worthy of the letter-press, although those who have mentally erected a tabernacle will receive a shock when they see it represented here as flat-roofed.

MARCUS DODS.