

3. That God chooses the weak, and makes them strong to deliver.

And now from the career of the righteous sufferer we may add a fourth.

4. That the greatest deliverance of all, that from *moral* evil, comes through suffering.

The younger Isaiah was then, in the truest sense, a forerunner of Jesus Christ.

He calls the attention of all who at any time read his book to just those principles of divine working which governed the redeeming work of Christ on earth. As we study his prophecies, we see that the coming of the Lord Jesus was not an

interruption, but an integral part of God's providential government.

In these days of doubt and stress, it is indeed a helpful thought that the revelation contained in the Old and New Testaments, though given at many times and in many parts through many minds of men, speaks from first to last with one unflinching voice of one unchanging, all-ruling providence of God, of one redeeming love manifested through all ages, and of one teaching and comforting Spirit of God, which ever pleads with the spirit of man, calling it out of darkness into His marvellous light.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Among the Periodicals.

The Lord of Hosts (יהוה צבאות).

IN spite of all that has been written upon the above Divine title, Pfarrer BORCHERT (in the current number of *Studien u. Kritiken*) maintains that its meaning is still an open question. At one time the prevailing notion was that the 'hosts' (*Zeba'ôth*) mean the hosts of heaven, *i.e.* either the stars or the angels. Latterly, under the influence of such scholars as Robertson Smith, Reuss, and Kautzsch, this explanation has been giving place to another, which identifies the 'hosts' with the armies of Israel. According to this theory, the title *Jahweh Zeba'ôth* came down from a period when war and battle were the order of the day, although finally, and especially in the hands of some of the prophets, it lost its martial sense. Still another explanation is proposed by Smend, who takes *Zeba'ôth* as equivalent to all 'the forces and elements of the Cosmos.' Unfortunately, the question of the meaning of the expression is complicated by uncertainty as to the date when it came into use. Smend declares the formula to be characteristic of the prophetic literature, and agrees with Wellhausen that it probably originated with Amos, and that its occurrence in the older historical literature, such as the Books of Samuel and Kings, must be set down to the score of interpolation. What appears to be the original and fullest form of the title is found twice in Amos (iii. 13, vi. 14) and once in Hosea (xii. 6). In these passages we have 'Jahweh, the God of hosts' (*Jahweh 'elohê hazzeba'ôth*). According to

Borchert, however, it is plain that the title cannot have been used by Amos or Hosea for the first time, else the expression would be completed by the addition of *shamayim* (heaven) or of *Israel*. This argument is further strengthened by the occurrence of the shorter form *Jahweh 'elohê Zeba'ôth* (Am. iv. 13, v. 14, 15, 16, 27, vi. 8) and even *Jahweh Zeba'ôth* (ix. 5). Moreover the formula occurs in sources older than Amos, and where Borchert sees no ground for suspecting interpolation (2 Sam. v. 10, vi. 2, 18, both from the *Judean* document, *c.* B.C. 950, and 1 Sam. iv. 4, from the *Ephraimitic* document, *c.* 850). And even in some of these passages we have the *shortened* form *Jahweh Zeba'ôth*, which seems to imply that the expression had been long in use. Nothing but personal preference will, according to Borchert, account for the use of the expression by one writer and its avoidance by some of his contemporaries (*e.g.* it occurs in Isaiah, but not in Micah; it is used by Jeremiah no fewer than seventy-nine times, by Ezekiel not once). As to the *meaning* of the title, Smend holds that this must be sought in those passages where we read 'Jahweh (the God) of hosts is His name' (Isa. li. 15; Jer. xxxi. 35; Am. iv. 13, etc.). But Borchert protests that it would be as reasonable to seek for an explanation of the name *Jahweh* itself in Ex. xv. 3 or Jer. xxxiii. 2, where we read 'Jahweh is His name.' He considers that alike linguistic usage and the antiquity which upon any reasonable theory we have to assign to the expression, are fatal to Smend's explanation. Nor can he see his way to accept of the identification of the 'hosts'

with the armies of Israel. Kautzsch indeed argues that linguistic usage pleads in favour of this explanation. 'Zeba'ôth almost uniformly refers to the hosts of Israel, whereas heaven's host is represented by the sing. Zaba.' And even Schultz, who rejects Kautzsch's explanation of the title, admits that 'the word Zeba'ôth is undoubtedly used originally of the hosts of Israel.' Borchert would substitute 'finally' for Schultz' 'originally.' He shows that the numerous passages in the Hexateuch where we hear of the hosts (Zib'ôth) of Israel, belong without exception to P or R, and are thus characteristic of only a single and that a late source. The only other relevant citation is the complaint, 'Thou goest not forth with our hosts,' which occurs in identical terms in three psalms (xliv., lx., cviii.), all of which are of very recent date. The circumstance then that Zeba'ôth came to be applied to the hosts of Israel, is an insufficient datum from which to infer the original meaning of Jahweh Zeba'ôth. More than this, Borchert denies that P's references to the hosts (Zib'ôth) of Israel must necessarily be understood of armies. Rather is the word employed generally to designate the whole multitude (πλήθος) of Israel. The martial sense he thinks would be better expressed by the singular Zaba'. Support for the reference to the armies of Israel is sometimes found in the way in which the title Jahweh of hosts is brought into connexion with the ark, the palladium of ancient Israel (1 Sam. iv. 4). But Borchert will have it that the cherubim, which are mentioned in the same verse, have far more to do than the ark with the introduction here of the designation (cf. 2 Sam. vi. 2). But what of 1 Sam. xvii. 45? Is not 'Jahweh of hosts' explained by the following, 'God of the armies of Israel'? Borchert thinks not, partly because instead of Zib'ôth it is a different word, ma'arakhôth, that is used in the parallel expressions in vers. 26 and 36. One of the strongest arguments against referring the word to the armies of Israel is drawn by Borchert from the fact that the title does not occur precisely in those passages where, if this were its meaning, we should expect to find it, e.g. Ex. xv., Num. x. 35 f., and, above all, Judg. v. Borchert's own opinion is that the reference is to heavenly 'hosts,' by which he understands the angels, not the stars. The latter form but one host, and are always in the Old Testament the host of heaven, not of God. Our

author contends that in such passages as Hos. xii. 6, Ps. lxxxix. 8, where 'Jahweh of hosts' occurs, the whole context suggests a reference to angels (cf. Ps. lxxx. 2, 4, 7, 14, 19, and Isa. vi., where, after the seraphim have been mentioned, we encounter the title in vers. 3 and 5). These 'hosts' are not to be thought of exclusively from the martial point of view, but as the ministers who execute the commands of God whatever be the character of these, and whose presence contributes to the glory of the Almighty. 'Jahweh Zeba'ôth always denotes the heavenly King, who is surrounded by innumerable hosts of angels as His suite and servants.' If this conclusion be correct, it materially affects our conception of the history of religion in Israel. Instead of the war-god of a tribe or a conglomeration of tribes, Israel's God meets us even in early days as the supramundane Lord of the heavenly hosts. In conclusion, Borchert suggests that the Old Testament 'Lord of hosts' reappears transfigured in the New Testament 'Our Father which art in heaven.' An allusion to angels may be discovered in the petition 'Thy will . . . as it is in heaven,' while the 'power' (δύναμις) and the 'glory' (δόξα) of the doxology recall Ps. xxix. 1, 2 (cf. Matt. xxiv. 30 μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης, xxv. 31; 2 Thess. i. 7, 9).

The Four Empires of Daniel.

This old problem forms the subject of a study by M. BRUSTON in the *Revue de Théologie* for July. It is generally recognised by commentators that the four empires of Dan. ii. are identical with the four beasts of ch. vii., and that the first of these is the Babylonian empire. At this point, however, agreement ends. In particular a difference of opinion prevails as to whether the fourth beast represents the Roman or the Macedonian empire. For reasons connected with Messianic expectations, the Jews naturally accepted the Roman reference, but Bruston expresses surprise that such an interpretation should ever have found favour in Christian circles. He considers it perfectly clear that the fourth is not the Roman empire, but the one that preceded it. The eleventh horn he denies to be Antiochus Epiphanes. It rather symbolises the Seleucid dynasty, while Antiochus is alluded to in the 'eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.' The ten horns stand for the ten satrapies set up after the death of Alexander the Great, namely—(1) Egypt under Ptolemy,

(2) Syria under Laomedon, (3) Cilicia under Phloxenus, (4) Cappadocia under Nikanor, (5) Great Phrygia and Lycia under Antigonos, (6) Caria under Asander, (7) Lydia under Clitus, (8) Hellespontine Phrygia under Arrhidæus, (9) Macedonia and Greece under Antipater, (10) Thrace under Lysimachus. The eleventh horn came up 'among them, and before it three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots' (Dan. vii. 8). The latter statement, according to Bruston, refers to the successive defeats of Nikanor, Antigonos, and Lysimachus by Seleucus Nikator, the founder of the Seleucid dynasty. The first empire then being the Babylonian and the fourth the Greek, what are the second and third empires, represented respectively by a bear and by a four-headed leopard with the wings of a fowl? Two interpretations have been proposed, either that the second is the Medo-Persian empire and the third that of Alexander, or that the second is the Median power before the accession of Cyrus, and the third the Medo-Persian empire subsequent to that event. To the first interpretation Bruston objects (1) that the four heads manifestly denote four kings and not one (Alexander), just as in the Apocalypse the seven heads of the beast represent the first seven Roman emperors; (2) that Alexander cannot be separated from his successors, he is the head of the terrible beast from which the ten horns spring, and cannot be identified with the preceding beast. Moreover, the winged leopard with four heads is a very suitable figure for the Medo-Persian empire. The four heads are the first four kings,—Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes,—while the wings symbolise their rapid conquests and distant expeditions. The variegated skin of the leopard may be an emblem of the union of two peoples under the sceptre of Cyrus. On the other hand, the *bear*, a slow, heavy animal, scarcely ever leaving its mountain fastnesses, is surely a most inappropriate symbol for an empire which extended itself rapidly—to Asia Minor and Babylon under Cyrus, to Egypt under Cambyses, to Greece under Darius and Xerxes. The bear, however, suits excellently the case of Media, a *mountainous* country with a *half-civilised* population, and whose conquests lay for the most part along its frontiers. Moreover, according to ch. ii. the second empire is *inferior to the first*. This was true of the Median empire in relation to the Babylonian, but surely not of the *Medo-Persian*,

which might rather be said to bear rule over the whole earth (Dan. ii. 39). The reference of the bear to Media is confirmed by Dan. vii. 5, if Bruston's interpretation of the obscure words, 'It was raised up on one side,' is correct. (The reader will find it well worth his while to refer to the original article for the discussion of this passage as well as of vii. 4, where the giving of a 'man's heart' to the Babylonian lion is illustrated by the kindness shown by Evil-Merodach to the captive king Jehoiachin). The author of Daniel expected the establishment of the Messianic kingdom during the epoch that followed the death of Epiphanes. His expectations were fulfilled, not literally, but in a higher form, by the foundation, two hundred years later, of the Christian Church. The kingdom of Jesus was not indeed of this world, but it was as far superior to earthly empires as human intelligence (cf. 'son of man' in Dan. vii. 13) is superior to brute force.

The Authority of Tradition.

The July and August numbers of the *Revue Chrétienne* contain two papers entitled *Du Traditionalisme*. These, it is explained in a footnote, are extracted from the forthcoming *Introduction à la Dogmatique*, by Professor JALAGUIER. The standpoint of the latter is revealed clearly by his opening words, 'Since the Bible is a book of revelations, it is the Rule of Faith, the sovereign Law of the Church, and the fundamental Basis of Theology.' Rationalism denies the inference by denying the premiss, it robs Scripture of its authority by robbing it of its inspiration. Illuminism and Catholicism admit the premiss but deny the inference, they refuse to admit that Scripture *alone* is a sufficient guide. Catholicism in particular claims to possess a superior light derived from apostolic tradition as guarded and interpreted by the Church. Jalaguiet distinguishes between the 'conservative' traditionalism of Bellarmine and Bossuet and the 'progressive' traditionalism of Möhler and Newman. The paralogsms of the old system are forcibly exposed. Its advocates when hard pressed in the sphere of Tradition, fall back on the authority of the Church; when the pretensions of the Church are called in question, they cite the testimony of Scripture; and when the support of Scripture is lacking, they call in the aid of Tradition. The instinctive tendency to avail oneself of this last

support is seen in the case of not a few of the Reformers who, while theoretically asserting the sole authority of Scripture, were not slow to invoke also the consent of the Church. Most of them did not care to carry this appeal to a tribunal later than the third or fourth century, although some came down as late as the fifth or even the seventh. Thus we find frequent citations of the decisions of œcumenical Councils, at least of such as could be considered to express freely and correctly the general sentiment of the Church. On the other hand, there is an ultra-Protestantism which will hear nothing of an appeal to tradition. Yet it is surely evident that a belief or a practice which can be traced back uninterruptedly to primitive times, and is found to be generally prevalent then, derives strong support from such a circumstance, whereas an opinion or a custom of which we hear nothing prior to the third or fourth century has correspondingly little claim upon our acceptance. The total rejection of ecclesiastical tradition is, however, pronounced by Jalaguier to be fraught with less peril than the erecting of tradition into an authority collateral with Scripture. The proper course is to treat tradition as a *witness* not as a *judge*, to allow it a *historical* but not a *dogmatic* authority.

The second paper presents more especially Jalaguier's views regarding what he calls *Traditionnalisme Évolutive*, a theory which originally found its way into German theology under the influence of the Hegelian philosophy, and which has passed from Protestantism to Roman Catholicism. It views tradition not as a supplement to the written word or as an interpreter of Scripture, but rather as the development of the Christian idea in the Church, corresponding to what Hegelianism called the evolution of the divine idea in nature and in history. It does not *ascend*, like its predecessors, to the fountainhead, the primitive Church, in order to show that such and such a belief or practice has apostolic or divine sanction; but it *descends* the current of history, in order to note the providential growth of the germs sown by the founders of Christianity. Far from contending that the Church has merely conserved what she originally received, this theory expressly admits that she has added to this store, that dogma has been not merely defined but enlarged in the course of the Church's history, notably through her conflicts with various heresies. And to these final

results practically the same value is attached as to the primitive teaching of the New Testament. The only privilege—a great one no doubt—enjoyed by the writers of the latter, was that of having seen and heard the Lord, or at least of having received from eye- and ear-witnesses impressions of His life and words. The Spirit was with them doubtless, but only as He has been and always will be with all believers who submit to His guidance. This *Traditionnalisme Évolutive* has, according to Jalaguier, affinities with Roman Catholicism, with mysticism, and with rationalism. For instance, Möhler speaks of a spiritual sense, a common feeling of the eternal verities, created by the Holy Spirit in the Church, constituting the authority of the latter, and sanctioning the development which her worship and doctrine have undergone. It was precisely in the same way that Newman in his *History of the Development of Christian Doctrine* sought to justify his going over to the Roman Catholic Church. Mysticism, too, from the Montanists down to the Swedenborgians and Irvingites, practically adopts the same theory, when it claims to have received new revelations or new interpretations of the old. *Traditionnalisme Évolutive* is finally a kind of high rationalism. If the old rationalism, basing itself upon the Deistic philosophy then prevalent, denied any immediate action of God upon the world or upon man, the new rationalism, basing itself upon the modern pantheistic philosophy, sees in the course of nature and in the history of man and of the Church an incessant divine revelation. Jalaguier closely examines the various forms of this theory, which he finally pronounces to amount to 'a sort of Christian pantheism which, were it to gain a firm footing in the Church, would produce the same results there as were produced in the realm of science by Hegelian pantheism, with which it has secret and profound affinities.'

St. Francis of Assisi.

To the *Revue Chrétienne* for August, M. SABATIER contributes a very interesting paper on a new chapter in the life of St. Francis. The year 1216, hitherto one of the most obscure in the history of the latter, has had a flood of light poured upon it by the discovery of a letter of Jacques de Vitry belonging to that date. The writer refers to the death of Pope Innocent III., the election of Honorius III. which he witnessed, and the part

played at this juncture by St. Francis and the *Fratres Minores*. We have in Sabatier's article a vivid description of the selfishness and ambition of the rival cardinals, and of the causes that led to the selection of Honorius as a sort of stop-gap pontiff. The chief interest of the article lies, however, in its account of how St. Francis obtained from the new pope liberty to proclaim a *gratis* indulgence to all who should be present on the opening day of the dedication of a certain church, provided they were penitent for their sins, and had made confession and received absolution. The request met with some opposition, but the indulgence was granted in perpetuity, to be available one day in each year. The article closes with a remarkable prayer of St. Francis, which is based on Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, and whose language would have been specially appropriate on the occasion above referred to.

Biblical Aramaic.

This forms the subject of a short article in the July number of the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, by Dr. DE GOEJE. Apart from his criticisms of the recently-published Aramaic grammars of Strack and Marti, the writer's remarks on the Aramaic sources that may be supposed to underlie our present Greek gospels are of much interest. He is well aware of the difficulty of reproducing these sources, still there are instances in which we certainly appear to have recovered the original meaning of a text, where the Greek does not correctly represent the Aramaic, or in which we have light thrown upon a text which is correctly enough translated, but whose point is evident only in Aramaic. We have space to note only one or two of these. In Matt. vii. 6, 'Give

not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine,' the parallel between 'that which is holy' and 'pearls' has always been felt to be an imperfect one. It is quite possible that אֲשֵׁרִי (holiness) and אֲשֵׁרִי (ring) have changed places, an occurrence all the more likely to happen as the word would be written without vowel-signs. The law is a ring according to the Rabbins, and their teaching the pearls that adorn it. So in Matt. xx. 22, Mark x. 38, 'Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?' it is possible that in the latter question there is a mistranslation of an Aramaic word denoting the *bitter herbs* used at the Paschal meal. The question would then be, 'Can ye dip your bread in the same dish as I do?'

Historical Theology.

This forms the contents of the second *Abtheilung* of the *Theol. Jahresbericht*. We have only space this month to note its appearance and its arrangement of the subject-matter:—(1) Church History down to the Council of Nicæa, by Lüdemann; (2) From Nicæa to the Middle Ages, by Krüger; (3) Middle Ages, by Böhringer; (4) From beginning of Reformation to 1648, by Loesche; (5) From 1648 onwards, by Werner. The last division is supplemented by a notice of works in Inter-confessional Theology by Kohlschmidt, and of works on the history of Religions by Furrer. The labour and care expended on the whole work render it eminently worthy of the confidence of the student, to whom for purposes of reference it is indispensable.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

JOHN vi. 68.

'Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'

EXPOSITION.

'Simon Peter.'—St. Peter occupies the same representative place in St. John's narrative as in the others. Comp. xiii. 6 ff., 24, 36, xviii. 10, xx. 2, xxi. 3.—WESTCOTT.

St. Peter's forwardness in this case was noble, and to the wounded spirit of his Lord doubtless very grateful.—BROWN.

'To whom shall we go?'—As if to say, Admitting there is difficulty here, where shall we be better off? Who will do more for us? Who will give clearer guidance,—show us the Father? The personal experience which Peter had of his Lord when he first met Him, was for him, as it must be for all, the immovable ground on which to rest