

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR CHEYNE'S *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* has been translated into German by Pfarrer Böhmer. In his preface the translator guards himself against being supposed to identify himself with all the matter of the book, and calls the criticism 'radical,' but remarks that the work 'is fitted, like scarcely any other, to give an idea of the manifold and many-sided problems which present themselves, of the difficulties with which the exposition of the Book of Isaiah has to contend, and of the pains and diligence, the ingenuity and skill which during many centuries, notably during the last of these, and not least by our author, have been devoted to this book. It is equally successful in its effort to bring the light of history and of biblical theology to bear upon the contents of these prophecies.' The translation is published by J. Ricker of Giessen.

The first volume of the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE will be published in February. At that time it will be four years since the Editor began his work upon it. And as the remaining volumes are fairly well advanced, and there is every expectation that they will be issued at regular and reasonable intervals thereafter, no one will think the time spent too long.

Every generation ought to have at least one new Dictionary of the Bible. It is much more
VOL. IX.—3.

than a generation since there was published in this country a wholly new and complete dictionary. And in that time the progress of biblical science has probably been greater than during any previous period of equal length in the history of the Church. In the field of the Old Testament, in particular the dictionaries which our fathers found sufficient are now quite out of date.

The purpose of a Dictionary is to furnish an explanation of all the words that fall within its province. A Dictionary of the English language explains the words in the English language. A Dictionary of the Bible ought to provide an explanation of all the words in the Bible that are not intelligible of themselves. To what extent the new dictionary will seek to fulfil that reasonable expectation, will be told in a forthcoming issue. At present it is enough to say that the attempt is made. Therefore it is not the antiquities of the Bible only, nor only its geography, biography, and science that will be covered, but even the language of the English versions themselves, so far as it is misleading or unintelligible, and especially the biblical theology.

For in a Dictionary of the Bible men look for these three things—fulness, accuracy, and accessibility. They look for fulness. If only a selection

of the topics is made, the chances are that the word sought will not be found. The word in question may have seemed to the editor of less importance. But it is not the words of greatest consequence that are most frequently sought for in a dictionary. Experience has taught the most of us that it is just the words an editor **thinks** he easily may leave out. Again, when the word is one of great importance it ought to receive the space that its importance is entitled to. A mere summary of the events in the life of our Lord may be had in any school book. The forthcoming dictionary will extend to four volumes, and each volume will contain as much matter as a volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It will therefore afford reasonable space both for the number and for the size of the articles.

But men must not only find the word they want, they must find it readily. In just as many cases as it was possible to furnish it, the information will be found under the natural heading. The very few exceptions are due to the impossibility of preventing repetition. But even when some trifling repetition is the consequence, articles are written under their own expected titles. And for the rest, the cross references are made as complete and serviceable as could be thought of.

Still, the greatest necessity in a Dictionary of the Bible is accuracy. In order to secure the utmost accuracy possible, the first thing was to secure the best scholars to write the several articles; the next, to secure the best scholars to revise them. No trouble, it will be found, has been spared in either respect. So far as can be known, every article is written by a man (sometimes *the* man) who has made the subject his special study. And it is enough at present to say that the Editor has been assisted in every department of the work by one of the most accurate scholars of the younger generation, while four of the most distinguished scholars in the country

have had the proofs passed steadily through their hands.

It is the opinion of Principal King, of Winnipeg, that two different Gospels are being preached at present. The one he calls the 'Ethical Gospel.' The other he does not name.

The Ethical Gospel is mainly preached on the continent of Europe. Especially is it preached in Halle, says Principal King, and from that Chair where forty years ago was heard the thoroughly evangelical and profoundly spiritual teaching of Julius Müller. But it is also preached in America and in Britain. Indeed, the only book which Dr. King names throughout his article (which is found in the current number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*) is Dr. Watson's *Mind of the Master*.

Now Principal King believes that if a gospel is not ethical it is not a gospel. For the person of Christ must be central in the system of truth which bears His name; and no view of His person can be maintained in harmony with the gospel narratives, in which the moral element, as distinguished from the metaphysical, is not made prominent. He even believes that the supreme glory of Christ for us is ethical. He believes that the highest which we are permitted to discern in Christ, as distinct from that which we can only believe, is His abiding consciousness of God and of oneness with Him; His entire devotion to God's will, even when that disclosed to Him the Cross with its shame and pain; His intense and untiring compassion for the sinful and the suffering. In short, he believes that the highest attributes of the Redeemer lay in those qualities which we may share with Him—His ethical qualities—rather than in the supernatural attributes which are exclusively His own.

Nor is it of Christ's person only that the highest aspect is ethical; ethical also is the supreme importance of His work. Take the Gospels for

witness, or take the Epistles, the great aim of the work of Christ is deliverance of men from indwelling sin, their restoration to personal righteousness. 'I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in me should not abide in darkness'; 'The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously, and godly in this present world.' Moreover, the means Christ uses to accomplish His aim are largely ethical also. His teaching, His example, the charm of His person, the love that must be loved again. Yet Principal King believes that the Gospel which is called the Ethical Gospel deserves the 'anathema' of the Apostle Paul.

For even when we take it at its best, say as we find it in *The Mind of the Master*, it is not a gospel at all, and usurps the gospel's place. The ethical gospel of St. Paul is in these words: 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in him.' But Dr. Watson's ethical gospel is this: 'The death of Jesus was an act of utter devotion to the will of God, and a power of emancipation in the hearts of His disciples. As they entered into His spirit, they would be loosened from bondage and escape into liberty.' Both are ethical, but only one is a gospel. The other fails to deal with the impassable barrier of sin. It mocks the shrunk arm with an invitation to stretch itself out, imparting no power to do it.

This that we have come upon at once is, in fact, the radical defect of the ethical gospel. It takes no sufficient account of sin. The ethical gospel has many forms. Its attitude to sin varies with all its own variety. Sometimes sin is a beneficent means to accomplish a noble end. Sometimes it is a necessary step in an upward ethical movement. Sometimes it is a misfortune, a weakness, or even a somewhat culpable deficiency. But the ethical gospel never reckons with sin, never faces it, never wrestles with it and throws it, as does the

gospel of the grace of God. Where is the ethical preacher who is heard to say that the whole world lieth in the evil one, or that the children of this world are the children of the devil? The ethical preacher says that the children of this world are the children of God. Even so moderate an ethical preacher as the author of *The Mind of the Master* says: 'Jesus' message was, You are a son. As soon as it was believed, Jesus gave power to live as a son.'

Where does the ethical preacher find his gospel? Principal King makes search and discovers it in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Does not Jesus represent the father as still the father, though the prodigal is in the far country, spending his substance with riotous living? Therefore, the ethical preacher concludes, God is the Father of all men, especially of those that disbelieve. But Jesus did not say that God was the father of this prodigal. He said, 'A certain *man* had two sons.' That man was the prodigal's father. Though the prodigal should wander into the farthest country of sensuality upon earth, and never return to his home, that man was his father still. But God is not his father. And God is like his father only in this, that He is as ready to receive the repenting and returning sinner.

'If ye love Me, ye will keep My commandments. And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth. I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you.'

In those words was made the great revelation of the New Covenant. Earlier than this the hints were few and meagre. There was the word of the Baptist that Jesus would baptize in the Spirit; there was the bewildering assertion to Nicodemus that the true birth is of water and the Spirit, and there was the promise, which only one of the gospels has recorded, that the Father would give the Holy Spirit to them that asked Him. These were the earlier hints; they are few and meagre.

Now in a quiet conversation with the Twelve, without preliminary or preparation, He makes the grand revelation. And He makes it all at once.

For those words contain the whole doctrine of the Spirit. If there had been no more words than those, we might have made little of the doctrine of the Spirit, it is true. But it is also true that when we find the words that follow and gather the whole doctrine together, we find that it is all in those two sentences: 'I will give you the Comforter, the Spirit of truth; I come to you.'

Now, when those two sentences are placed together, the one and only difficulty in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit stands naked and open before us. If Jesus had simply said, 'I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter,' we should have been content to think of the Comforter as the third Person in the Blessed Trinity, who comes to take the Master's place upon earth when He has gone to heaven. And about the three Persons we should have had no doubt, though the one God might have puzzled us. But if Jesus had simply said that, would the Twelve have been content? Would *any* substitute have been sufficient to fill His place? Was this not the very trouble with which their hearts were troubled, that *He* was about to leave them? If He had simply said, 'I go away, but let not your heart be troubled, I will send you another,' would it not have mocked the desolation of their heart? So He did not say that alone. He added, 'I will not leave you orphans: I come to you.' And as He comforted the Twelve He gave the world the greatest difficulty in the doctrine of the Trinity to think about and solve.

But, fortunately for us, St. Paul saw it at once, thought it out and solved it. Did St. Paul know this conversation? On any theory of the origin of the Gospels we may believe he did. Is your theory that St. John's was the first written Gospel, and that it was written within some ten or twenty years of the Ascension, when the scenes were

fresh and the words were warm in the memory of every disciple? Then you may believe that St. Paul had *read* those words, that he carried a copy of St. John's Gospel with him as he went. Is your theory that the words were kept alive by oral teaching, systematic and apostolic, and written down at last, when the last apostolic witness seemed ready to depart and be with Christ? Then you may believe that St. Paul did not miss the heritage of every common catechumen. Or is your theory that the Master's teaching was at first written down in morsels, here a little and there a little as it occurred to one to do it? You may still believe that the grand gift of the New Covenant was embodied in writing early and found by the Apostle Paul; you may again believe that he read it. On any theory of the origin of the Gospels we must believe that St. Paul knew how Jesus made the promise of the Comforter and introduced the great difficulty as He made it.

For St. Paul works directly on the lines of the promise, and gives his solution of the difficulty. What was St. Paul's solution? The clearest and boldest statement of it will be found in the recently published 'Cunningham Lectures' of the Rev. David Somerville, M.A., entitled *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*. The difficulty is how the Comforter is to take Christ's place in the hearts of the disciples and Christ be there Himself. St. Paul, says Mr. Somerville, identified the Spirit of God, bestowed on believers under the gospel, with the Spirit of Christ. When Jesus prayed the Father to send the disciples another Comforter, the Father sent Himself.

The solution is sufficiently striking. But St. Paul had historical fact for it. The Spirit of the historic Jesus, the Spirit that was stamped on all He said and did, was recognised as the Spirit of God. By the gift of the Father, the Spirit of God descended upon the Son and abode upon Him while He was on earth. When He ascended up on high and gave gifts unto men, this is the gift He gave. But He could not give the Spirit

away. His by possession and by right, the Spirit of God can never be separated from Him. And now that He has entered upon the perfection of fellowship with the Father, the Spirit that is His, is in the most absolute and real sense the Spirit of the living God. Whereupon St. Paul identifies the two; the Spirit of God is the Spirit of the Son of God, the Son of God in the Spirit: 'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father' (Gal 4⁶); 'But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His' (Ro 8⁹). The Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ—in the Apostle's mind they stand for one another; they stand for the Holy Spirit. When the ascended Lord gave the gift of the Holy Spirit to men He simply gave Himself in the Spirit.

Mr. Somerville holds that this was the Apostle's own solution. It was 'an advance on the primitive doctrine; for while it was the original belief that the Divine Spirit is given to men *through* Christ, it does not seem to have been held, till Paul taught it, that the Divine Gift is itself the Spirit of Christ, the actual principle of His Personality.' And the value of this contribution to the true understanding of the gift of the Spirit, he believes to have been very great. For as long as the connexion in men's minds, between the Person of Christ and the gift of the Spirit, was loose and uncertain, manifestations of mere enthusiasm, originating in unsanctified human nature, might be declared to be the outcome of the Spirit of God. But when the Spirit of God was identified with the personal life of Jesus, a test was furnished for distinguishing true Spiritual phenomena from spurious. That which comes from the Spirit of God must be in harmony with the Spirit of Christ, with the Spirit that was seen in the character and deeds of Jesus of Nazareth.

But the great step forward made by the Apostle Paul was not the identification of the Spirit of God

with the Spirit of Christ, it was the identification of both with Christ's person. He says 'the Lord is the Spirit,' and again he says 'we are changed into the same image by the Lord, the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{17, 18}). Now, in St. Paul's own language, 'the Lord' is always Jesus Christ. And what he means here is that 'at the Resurrection Christ became a life-giving Spirit to mankind, and by the heightening of the powers of His Personality that then took place, He was so made one with the very life of God as to be constituted a perfect medium through whom the Spirit of God could act upon us; and His personal influence and working being, to the entire exclusion of every lower element, the influence and working of the Holy Spirit, He Himself personally might be spoken of as the Lord the Spirit.'

To the current issue of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* Professor Cheyne contributes 'Notes on some suspected passages in the Poetical Books of the Old Testament.' The note of widest interest concerns the great immortality passage in the Book of Job (19²⁵⁻²⁹). Alas, Professor Cheyne no longer believes that there is any immortality in it.

Four years ago Professor Bickell startled the world with a double Old Testament discovery. He had discovered the original version of the Book of Job and the laws of Hebrew poetry. His discoveries were announced to the English-speaking world by his friend Dr. Dillon. They were somewhat prematurely and somewhat pompously announced. The English-speaking world did not take to them. No part of the theological world seemed to take to them. But now at last Professor Cheyne comes and says that enough credit has hardly been given here by any recent writer to Bickell's insight and critical sagacity. 'In the most important respects I follow him.'

Now when we read Dr. Dillon as he expounded Bickell in advance, and when we came to this great passage in the Book of Job, we found that it

was not only shorn of its hope of immortality, but it was almost shorn away. This was Dr. Dillon's translation—

But I know that my avenger liveth,
Though it be at the end upon my dust;
My witness will avenge these things,
And a curse alight upon mine enemies.

My reins within me are consumed.

Dr. Dillon reached that translation by the use of Professor Bickell's double discovery. On the one hand he followed the law of Hebrew poetry, which, applied to the Book of Job, gave stanzas of four lines each in ordinary iambic metre. On the other, he followed a 'wretched' manuscript of the Saidic version of Job which had been found in the Library of the Propaganda. Professor Cheyne follows Professor Bickell 'in the most important respects.' He follows him in finding the four-lined stanza. He follows him in finding no reference to a hope of immortality. But he does

not follow him in all. For he preserves the poem in something like its entirety. This is Professor Cheyne's Hebrew text and translation—

וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גַאֲלֵי חַי 1
וְאֶחָוֶנָה עַל־עַפְרָיִקִים
עָרִי יִפֶּק תְּאוֹתַי
וּמִשְׁרָרֵי יֶאֱחָזֶה אֱלֹהִים

כִּלּוֹ כְלִיִּי בַחֲקֵי 2
בִּי תִאֲמָרוּ מִה־נִּדְרָה־לִּי
נִגְרָו לָכֶם מִפְּנֵי־חֶרֶב
כִּי חָמָה עַל־עוֹלָם

1. But I know that my Avenger lives,
And that at last he will appear above (my) grave;
My Witness will bring to pass my desire,
And a curse will take hold of my foes.
2. My inner man is consumed with longing,
For ye say, How (keenly) we will persecute him!
Have terror because of the sword,
For (God's) anger falls on the unjust.

David Brown, D.D., LL.D.

By PROFESSOR THE REV. S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., F.E.I.S., ABERDEEN.

ON Saturday, the 3rd July of the present year, the Rev. Dr. David Brown, Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen, passed peacefully to his rest in his own home after a brief illness. By his decease the Scottish Churches have lost one of their best known men, and his own Church the most venerable of its theologians. Like another Nestor, he could look back on the events of three generations of men. His life was almost coextensive with our century. He first saw the light when the century was less than four years old, and he survived till it was within two years and a half of its close. Through this rare fulness of days he led a busy life, devoted to the service of the Church of his choice and to the good of Christ's kingdom at home and abroad. He was a witness of many great changes in the political, ecclesiastical, and social circumstances of his country. He took his part in some of the most remarkable religious

movements of the Victorian era. He made his contribution to the religious life and literature of our time. And almost to his last day he retained an alertness of mind, a zest of life, a quick interest in all that happened in Church or in State, that seemed to defy the infirmities of a great weight of years.

He was born in Aberdeen, on the 17th August 1803, and most of his long life was spent in that city. He came of a stock from which some capable men have sprung, and in which certain marked qualities—musical taste, an exceptional agility both of mind and of body, and strong religious feeling—have run from generation to generation. Dr. Brown inherited these gifts in more than usual measure. He had a nice ear for melody, a keen sense of literary style, deep evangelical instincts, and a quickness of mind with which the body seemed to strive to keep pace by an unusual