

The third person in the Trinity of science is Energy. Now there is no movement in theology that is more promising to-day than the movement, hinted at by Mr. Inge, which gathers all the forces in the spiritual life of man into one place and calls them by the name of Holy Ghost. And there is no more assured result of modern science than the gathering together of the varied forces of nature—light, heat, sound, electricity, magnetism, molar motion, and so forth—and calling them by the name of Energy. What, said our scientific forefathers, can the blinding lightning and the gentle warmth of the home fireside have in common? What community, said our theological forefathers, can there be between the peace which passeth understanding and the passage of the soul in deep agony through the waters? It is the one Energy; it is the one Holy Spirit. To-day we pass through the deep waters, to-morrow we abide under the shadow of the Almighty; just as every mode of motion in the physical world may be turned in a moment

into any other. And more than that. The third person of the physical Trinity may be denied or quenched, as we know the Third Person of the blessed Trinity may be. Shut your eyes and the landscape before you is no longer flooded with light; deafen your ear and the song of the bird is but 'a few tardy waves of movement passing through the air.' Yet the song is not made by the ear, nor the landscape by the eye. And while men deny the existence of the Holy Spirit of God, He is knocking at the door,—the Light of the World,—and if any man will open the door He will come in and sup with him.

Ether, Matter, Energy—these are the three of the physicist's Trinity, and these three are one. Haeckel's creed is Monism; the Christian's creed is Monotheism. Ether, Matter, Energy—yes, yes, says Haeckel impatiently, but I believe in only one Nature. 'Hear, O Israel,' repeats the Christian reverently, 'the Lord our God is one Lord.'

---

## Professor A. B. Davidson's 'Theology of the Old Testament.'

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., MARYCULTER.

It was well known that for a good many years before his death Professor Davidson had been preparing a volume on *The Theology of the Old Testament* for Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'International Theological Library.' After his death it became known that he had left the work practically complete, although not ready for publication. Its appearance has been awaited with eagerness by all students of the Old Testament, an eagerness which, in view of recent experiences, was mingled in some minds with misgivings. These misgivings were not shared by those of us who were aware

<sup>1</sup> *The Theology of the Old Testament.* By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the New College, Edinburgh. Edited from the author's manuscripts by S. D. F. Salmund, D.D., Principal of the United Free Church College, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904. Price 12s.

that *this* volume was to be edited by Principal Salmund of Aberdeen, and no one will rise from a study of the book without feeling that the work could not have been intrusted to more capable hands. It is not only that the editor has regarded the task as a labour of love and a pious service to the memory of a dear friend, but that he *has appreciated the importance of the work* in a way that some editors of posthumous works have utterly failed to do. The duty assigned to Principal Salmund was not an easy one, as readers of his Preface will learn; but the difficulties have been cheerfully faced and overcome. It may be true that, if Professor Davidson had been spared to carry the book through the press, 'its statements at some points would have been more condensed,' and 'it would have had less of that element of itera-

tion, of which he made such effective use in his class-room.' Yet who will grudge this iteration in view of the increased clearness it gives to the exposition? Principal Salmond has also wisely introduced editorial notes here and there which are very helpful, and which prevent that sense of bewilderment which, we fear, occasionally fills the minds of non-expert readers of the *Old Testament Prophecy*. The editor's thorough acquaintance with the subject-matter, his sympathy with the spirit of the author, his genius for taking pains, his practised literary aptitude, and his unflinching judgment have combined to produce a volume which is worthy of Professor Davidson, and by which we are willing that the world should judge one of whom Scotland is so proud.

By the time this notice is read the Extra Volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* will have been published. The Theology of the Old Testament, as treated by Professor Davidson, really amounts to the same thing as the Religion of Israel, a subject on which a very elaborate article has been written for that Extra Volume by Professor Kautzsch of Halle. To the present writer the reading of *The Theology of the Old Testament* has been all the more interesting, owing to the somewhat close attention which he has had recently to give to the article in question. We can hardly imagine anything more instructive or more reassuring than a careful study of these two masterpieces, produced by two men representing the highest scholarship of Great Britain and Germany, both thoroughly imbued with the genuine critical spirit, while at the same time handling their great subject with admirable caution and unflinching reverence.

*The Theology of the Old Testament* is divided into twelve chapters, of whose contents we propose to give a general account, selecting some points for special notice.

Chapter i., 'The Science of O.T. Theology,' defines clearly the scope of the subject, its relation to O.T. history, etc., and the bearing of literary and historical criticism upon it. Full justice is done by Professor Davidson to the idea of a progressive development of doctrine in the O.T., and to the necessity of revising some former conceptions of what is ancient and what is recent in the text, for instance, of the prophets. But with characteristic caution he reminds us that—

'The literature is very limited. An idea that is found now only in a late writing might really belong to an earlier

time, if we only had a more extensive literature covering that time. But the effect of the criticism [he is probably thinking chiefly of Duhm and Cheyne] referred to is to cut up the writings, particularly the prophecies, into a multitude of fragments, and to introduce the greatest uncertainty into the exegesis. I cannot help thinking that this kind of criticism has gone to extremes in recent times, and has had the effect of discrediting the criticism which is legitimate' (p. 30).

Chapter ii., 'The Doctrine of God,' and the following three chapters dealing respectively with 'The Divine Nature,' 'The Spirit,' and 'The Divine Attributes,' are of fundamental importance. The difference between the modern standpoint and that of the O.T. comes out in the fact that 'it never occurred to any prophet or writer of the O.T. to prove the existence of God.' This, which is a favourite theme with Professor Davidson, is thoroughly elaborated. The important *theologoumenon* of the divine 'name' is next handled. This leads naturally to the discussion of particular names of God: אלהים, יהוה, אלהי, etc. The uncertainty attaching to the original meaning of all these names is evidenced by the circumstance that Professor Davidson declines to formulate a definite conclusion regarding any one of them. If this result should be rather disappointing to eager minds, we can at least assure them that all the material available for reaching a conclusion is set forth by our author. Moreover, the rich spiritual contents that are discovered in the name יהוה, as used from the time of Moses onwards, are of more value than mere etymological inquiries (see p. 45 ff.). By the way, there is a valuable editorial note on p. 52 relating to the claim of Hommel and others to have discovered Assyrian forms of the name יהוה.

Some readers may be disposed to question whether Professor Davidson does not claim rather too high a character for the earlier stages of the Israelitish religion, and to accuse him of treating somewhat cavalierly the supposition that 'henotheism' or 'monolatry' prevailed in Israel till a comparatively late period. His right will be disputed to speak of David as 'certainly a monotheist,' and to lay so little weight on 1 S 26<sup>19</sup>, where banishment from the land of Israel is identified with the worship of other gods (p. 64). It need hardly be said that our author offers weighty arguments for his conclusions on this point, as well as for refusing to yield to the evidence (which is sufficient for Professor Kautzsch) that for a considerable period the belief lingered on

in Israel that Jahweh had a bodily form, and that down to a late period in the history of Judah even the temple contained an image or images of Jahweh. His view on the latter question is in harmony with the fact that throughout the volume he appears to admit of no doubt that the Second Commandment, like the rest of the Ten Words, is Mosaic.

In speaking of the personality and spirituality of God, Professor Davidson writes :

'The idea of some modern writers that the conception of God among the people of Israel was first that of some power external to themselves, which they perceived in the world, a power making for a moral order or identical with it, and which they afterwards endowed with personality and named God; inverts the O.T. representation, according to which the personality of God was the primary idea, and the secondary idea the moral character of this person; for this latter idea, no doubt, became clearer and more elevated. This representation of modern writers to which I have referred is not a historical account of the origin of the conception of God's personality among the people of Israel,—at all events in the historical period which the O.T. embraces. It is rather a description of movements of thought in regard to God; peculiar to modern times, when men, having lost the idea of God's personality which once prevailed, are making a new effort to regain it' (p. 106 f.).

The O.T. doctrine of the 'Spirit of God' is the subject of a very valuable study. At the outset comes a caution which some theologians would do well to ponder :

'The question whether the O.T. teaches the *personality* of the Spirit of God is not one that should be raised apart from the other—What is its *conception* of the Spirit of God? We are very apt to raise these formal questions when we ought first to raise the material ones. The sphere of the O.T. is the practical religious sphere, out of which it never wanders into the sphere of ontology. The whole question is the question of the relation of a living, active, moral, personal God to the world and men. It asks as little what the essence of God is as it asks what the essence of man is' (p. 115).

When he comes to speak of the 'Righteousness of God' (p. 129 ff.), Professor Davidson offers some very useful and wholesome remarks on God's righteousness in relation to His sovereignty, and corrects some very common but mistaken inferences from the illustration of the potter in Jer 18. He is especially careful to point out also that there is no antithesis between righteousness and grace. We often speak of God as righteous or just and yet a Saviour, but the O.T. speaks of God as righteous and therefore a Saviour (p. 144). Regarding the 'Holiness of God' a number of pro-

positions, derived from a careful induction of O.T. passages, are formulated and illustrated. The rise in meaning from a physical and non-moral connotation to the full ethical content of the expression, as employed by the later prophets, is clearly traced, as well as its development along æsthetic and ceremonial lines. In the latter connexion we have the following important pronouncement :

'There was no distinction in the Law between moral and what we have been accustomed to call ceremonial. The idea of ceremonial, *i.e.* rites, such as washings, etc., which have no meaning in themselves, but are performed in order to express or suggest moral ideas, has strictly no existence in the Old Testament. The offences which we call ceremonial were not symbolical, they were real offences to Jahweh, against which His nature reacted; and the purifications from them were real purifications and not merely symbolical. That is, what might be called æsthetic or physical unholiness was held offensive to the nature of God in the real sense, in a sense as real as moral offences were offensive to Him; and the purifications were true removals of these real causes of offence. This æsthetic or physical holiness is an ancient idea. But the prophets made little of it, insisting on moral holiness. On the other hand, the idea receives a great extension in the Law' (p. 159).

Chapters vii. and viii. deal with 'The Doctrine of Man,' and treat first of the O.T. conception of human nature and then of its doctrine of Sin. In examining the sense in which a Biblical Psychology may be spoken of, Professor Davidson expresses doubt whether even in the New Testament the trichotomy of 'body,' 'soul,' and 'spirit,' contended for by many theologians, is anything more than rhetorical. In this matter some will wish that the weight of the great teacher's authority had been thrown on the other side, but there will be only one opinion as to his skillful and informing treatment of the terms 'body,' 'flesh,' 'soul,' and 'spirit.'

Professor Davidson discovers two main lines upon which men in O.T. times thought of what we call 'sin.' These were (1) failure to correspond to an objective standard (this failure being typified by words like *חטא*), and (2) the assuming of an improper attitude towards another person who is one's superior (this attitude being typified by *עשה*). The latter is the more profoundly ethical idea: 'Sin has reference to God the *Person*, not to His *will* or His *law* as formulated externally' (p. 213). The O.T. notions about universal sinfulness and the connexion between this and the first sin receive very careful and cautious treatment. In this connexion we may note the masterly analysis of Ps 51 (p. 231 ff.).

Chapters viii.-x. are devoted to 'The Doctrine of Redemption.' We have first of all an examination of the signification of the *בְּרִית* or 'covenant' relation in which Israel is represented as standing to Jahweh. It will be very instructive if our readers will compare for themselves Professor Davidson's treatment of this subject with Professor Kautzsch's in the Extra Volume of the *D.B.* (p. 630 ff.).

Here is a passage which may give pause to some. It occurs in connexion with an attempt to reach the original meaning of the root *קָרַשׁ* (p. 257; cf. also what is said in a similar way about the root *נָרַק* on p. 265):

'Etymology is rarely a safe guide to the real meaning of words. Language, as we have it in any literature, has already drifted away far from the primary sense of its words. Usage is the only safe guide. When usage is ascertained, then we may inquire into derivation and radical signification. Hence the Concordance is always a safer companion than the Lexicon.'

The objective value of the O.T. statements about angels, and the precise interpretation to be placed on these statements, are difficult questions, which Professor Davidson handles with characteristic caution. The 'Angel of the Lord' and the 'Satan' afford him an excellent opportunity of exhibiting his power of penetrating into the genesis and development of O.T. conceptions. As a protest against the practical dualism that still prevails in many circles, the following is well timed:

'The element in our idea of a fallen spirit, namely, that he is filled with hatred of God Himself, and an eager desire to counteract His designs, is nowhere visible in the O.T. Perhaps in our popular theology we exaggerate this idea, and give to the kingdom of evil an independence of the divine will, and assign to it an antagonism to God who is over all, which goes beyond what Scripture warrants' (p. 303). Even in the N.T., where there is a greatly developed idea of the power and the malignity of Satan, 'there is no dualism, no power of evil co-ordinate with God: "Greater is He that is in us than he that is in the world" (1 Jn 4<sup>th</sup>). And this view prevails very strongly in the O.T., and it is not amiss for us to recur to it when weary or like to faint in our minds' (p. 306).

The reader will find it instructive to compare the two following passages regarding the position of the O.T. priest. The first is quoted from Professor Davidson (p. 308), the second is from Professor Kautzsch (see footnote on p. 719a of the Extra Volume of the *D.B.*):

'The parallel may be drawn between the condition of things in Israel and that in the Christian Church. Worship

and mutual edification are the objects had in view by the Christian people, and for these ends they meet in public worship. But it is manifest that the general body must, so to speak, resolve or condense itself into a smaller body of persons who become in a manner its representatives, if these great ends are to be carried out. It was the same in Israel. The priestly body were the representatives of the people. But the existence of the priestly class as representatives of the people did not supersede or absorb the priestly privileges of the individual, any more than the ministry of the Church supersedes the ministry in prayer and exhortation of the father and the individual' (Davidson).

'It needs no argument to show that the parallel it was once customary to draw between the O.T. and the Catholic conception of the priesthood is quite a mistaken one. According to the latter, the priest acts the part of God over against the people, and hence in God's name gives absolution and imparts blessing. On the other hand, in P the high priest is nothing more than a representative—highly exalted and dignified, indeed—of the God-consecrated people. He represents it before God in every regard. Any (ritual) shortcoming on his part involves the whole people in guilt. As to the blessing of Jahweh, again, the high priest, like the other priests, cannot impart this of himself, but must supplicate it of God (cf. Nu 6<sup>23ff.</sup>, especially v. 27)' (Kautzsch).

The attempt to trace *sacrifice* to a divine institution, instead of regarding it as a natural expression of man's sense of his relation to God, is of course abandoned by Professor Davidson. The primitive idea underlying the custom of sacrifice is examined, various objections being indicated to the different theories that have been propounded. In this connexion we may mention that our author interprets the famous passage, Jer 7<sup>21f.</sup>, as not amounting to a condemnation of sacrifice in itself, but only of the exaggerated weight laid on it by the people. We confess that we have never been able to convince ourselves that this is all that prophets like Jeremiah mean, or that Hos 6<sup>6</sup> means only to exalt goodness *above* sacrifice and knowledge of God *above* burnt-offerings. In fact, we are perfectly certain they meant more than this, although we admit that our *hope* that they did may have something to do with our *conviction*.

We would call special attention to the important discussion of the term *כַּפָּר* on p. 320 f. and 327 ff. By the way, is it quite legitimate, in view of some of the offences specified in Lv 6<sup>1ff.</sup>, to assert without qualification that only sins of ignorance were capable of being atoned for by sacrifice?

The last two chapters of the book deal with 'The Doctrine of the Last Things,' chapter xi. having for its subject 'The Messianic Idea,' while

chapter xii. is devoted to 'Immortality.' Professor Davidson illustrates very clearly the varying character of the *Messianic* in different ages, the prominent figure being at one time Jahweh Himself, at another the people, at another the Davidic king, at another the priest. The 'Day of the Lord' receives full treatment, special attention being bestowed on the character in which this conception appears in Deutero-Isaiah allied with that of *redemption*. We naturally turn with much interest to Professor Davidson's examination of the development of the O.T. teaching on a *Future Life*. How clearly the difference is brought out between the O.T. ways of thinking of man's future and our ways:

'The chief difference perhaps lies in this, that when the O.T. speaks of immortality, eternal felicity, or what is equivalent to heaven, it usually speaks of the immortality and eternal felicity of the nation. This immortality and felicity shall be entered upon at the manifestation of Jahweh, at the Day of the Lord and His judgment. We, on the other hand, think of the individual and immortality, and apply the latter term to the individual's destiny after death. But in the O.T. the immortality of the people does not raise the question of *death*. There is a change, a being made perfect, an entrance upon a new age—but only a change' (p. 403f.).

Various considerations are urged which help to remove the strangeness of the circumstance that the teaching of the O.T. regarding Immortality is so obscure, or at least so indirect and inexplicit. In particular, we would call attention to the exposition of how the doctrine of retribution, which bulks so largely in our thoughts of a future life, was connected by Israel with the present life ('Behold the righteous shall be recompensed on the earth, much more the ungodly and the sinner,' Pr 11<sup>31</sup>; cf. Ps 1). How suggestive again are the following remarks:

'We are surprised that the O.T. saint seemed satisfied with the conditions, necessarily imperfect, of a religious life with God upon the earth; that he did not feel the need of a closer fellowship with God than is possible amidst the imperfections of earth; and that dissatisfaction with earth did not lead him to demand, and to believe in, a more perfect condition of existence and a nearer vision of God. Now, in this there may be some imperfection in the manner of thought and feeling of the O.T. saints. Here at least we touch upon a point in which we have been taught to diverge from them, and which in some respects is just the point of difference between the Old Testament and the New. In order to judge these Hebrew saints fairly, however, we must look closely at their way of thinking; and if we do so, perhaps we shall be prepared to admit that we may have diverged

from them, not indeed in fundamental faith, but practically, further than was necessary. We have come to feel strongly the imperfections of the most perfect life upon the earth, and to believe that only in a world that is another can full fellowship with God be found. However true this may be, it is possible that the very axiomatic nature of the truth leads occasionally to an unnecessary disparaging of the possibilities it offers in the way of living to God. . . . The consciousness [which the O.T. saints have] of God's nearness and fellowship seems to exceed that which men ordinarily have now. We might speculate to what it was due' (p. 411 f.).

The conception of Sheol is exhaustively treated. Our author thinks it very doubtful, whether in the O.T. any traces can be discovered of a distinction between the treatment in Sheol of the righteous and the wicked. In answer to the important question whether the O.T. goes any way towards solving the question of the final destiny of the wicked, Professor Davidson finds no indication that it favours either Universalism or Conditional Immortality, or even the notion of a place of repentance and a sphere of development beyond the grave—

'The manner of dying fixes the condition of the dead, and this condition abides. All is yet general; only great principles of moral government appear. But, so far as the O.T. is concerned, no change seems indicated in the state of the unjust, either in the way of release or in the way of an intensification of the evils of Sheol. They die estranged from God, they remain estranged; the estrangement does not appear aggravated into positive misery' (p. 438).

Of Professor Davidson's wonderful power to penetrate into the meaning of the O.T. writers, we have a notable instance in his profound exegesis of Ps 16 (p. 445 ff.). The ideas of an after-life in Psalms 17, 37, 49, and 73 are also subjected to careful scrutiny, and their various solutions of the problem of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked are clearly characterized. When he passes to the idea of an after-life in Job, our author contributes a very welcome analysis of the contents, and a statement of the problem of the book. Perhaps readers will turn with most interest to see what he discovers in the famous and much controverted passage, Job 19<sup>25</sup> ('But I know that my Redeemer liveth,' etc.). It would be impossible in the space at our disposal to give a full account of his explanation, but the following two quotations will indicate the main drift of his conclusions:

'If, as seems necessary, we assume that Job expected this appearance of God on his behalf not previous to his death, we must not attempt to fill up the outlines which he has drawn. We must take care not to complete the sketch out

of events that have transpired long after his day, or out of beliefs reposing on these events that are now current among ourselves. The English version has done so at the expense of the original' (p. 492). 'The vision of his meeting God in peace so absorbed Job's mind, that the preliminaries which would occur to a mind in a calmer condition, and which immediately occur to us, were not present to his thoughts. Yet I do not know but that to Job's mind all the religious essentials were present which we associate with the future life. And though the ancient and traditional interpretation of the passage was in many respects exegetically false, and imposed on Job's mind our more particular conceptions, it seems to me that it seized the true elements of Job's situation in a manner truer to the reality than can be said of some modern expositions' (p. 495).

The twelfth chapter contains, finally, a singularly felicitous and subtle treatment of the Hebrew ideas of Life and Death, the moral meaning of Death, and the reconciliation between the idea of Death and the idea of Life. The volume closes with a classified Bibliography, which will be useful

to the student of O.T. Theology; and two Indexes, the one of Scripture passages, the other of Subjects.

This is probably the volume with which the name of Professor Davidson will come to be most identified. It contains the fully matured fruits of many years' study of the Old Testament, and of practical experience in teaching its theology. Moreover, it is the work of one who brought to the accomplishment of his task a powerful intellect, a well-balanced judgment, and an unsurpassed capacity for entering sympathetically into the thoughts of the writers of Scripture, and for reproducing these in clear and felicitous language. *The Theology of the Old Testament* will take its place in English theological literature as marking the highest level both of scholarship and of religious thought and feeling. It is truly a great work on a great subject.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Harnack's 'Chronologie.'<sup>1</sup>

THE first part of Harnack's extremely important work, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* was published as long ago as 1893. Its subject was 'Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand' (price M.35, bound M.38). The second part, 'Die Chronologie,' commenced with the publication in 1897 of a first volume, under the title, 'Die Litteratur (einschliesslich der neutestamentlichen Schriften) bis zum Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts' (price M.25, bound M.28). And now we have before us the second volume of the *Chronologie*, which deals with the literature from Irenæus to Eusebius. The character of the previous parts of the work is well known to students of Church History and of Dogma, and the conclusions of Harnack have met with the attention and the discussion to which the eminence of their author entitles them. The same eager study will be given

to the present volume. We had at first intended to go pretty fully into some of Professor Harnack's results, for the information of our readers. For instance, Geffcken's researches on the Sibylline Oracles have led our author to examine afresh the conclusions he had formerly announced regarding the date of the Christian Sibyllines, with the result that he still sees no reason for holding that any of these can be demonstrated to date earlier than the second half of the third century. It will be more fair, however, simply to call attention to the publication of the book before us and leave students to make acquaintance with its contents for themselves. There is no fear of Harnack's monumental work being neglected.

### The Works of Eusebius.

THE great edition of the Greek Fathers of the First Three Centuries, published under the auspices of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, continues to make steady progress. The volumes that have already appeared include the works of Adamantius (edited by van de Sande Bakhuyzen), the Book of Enoch (ed. by J. Flemming and L. Radermacher),

<sup>1</sup> *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. By Professor A. Harnack, Berlin. Zweiter Band: 'Die Chronologie der Litteratur von Irenæus bis Eusebius.' Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904. Price M.14.40, bound M.17.40.