

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1916

THE DIVINE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The question whether the Old Testament has any testimony to give as to the Deity of our Lord, when strictly taken, resolves itself into the question whether the Old Testament holds out the promise of a Divine Messiah. To gather the intimations of a multiplicity in the Divine unity which may be thought to be discoverable in the Old Testament,¹ has an important indeed, but, in the first instance at least,² only an indirect bearing on this precise question. It may render, it is true, the primary service of removing any antecedent presumption against the witness of the Old Testament to the Deity of the Messiah, which may be supposed to arise from the strict monadism of Old Testament monotheism. It is quite conceivable, however, that the Messiah might be thought to be Divine, and yet God not be conceived pluralistically. And certainly there is no reason why, in the delivery of doctrine, the Deity of the Messiah might not be taught before the multiplicity in the unity of the Godhead had been revealed. In the history of Christian

¹ As H. P. Liddon does in the former portion of the lecture in which he deals with the "Anticipations of Christ's Divinity in the Old Testament" (*The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ*. Bampton Lectures for 1866. Ed. 4, 1869, pp. 44 ff.). Similarly E. W. Hengstenberg gives by far the greater part of his essay on "The Divinity of the Messiah in the Old Testament" (*Christology of the Old Testament*, 1829, E. T. of ed. 2, 1865, pp. 282-331),—namely from p. 284 on—to a discussion of the Angel of Jehovah.

² For such questions remain as, for example, whether the Angel of Jehovah be not identified in the Old Testament itself with the Messiah (Daniel, Malachi). So G. F. Oehler (art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencyc.*, p. 41; *Theol. des A. T.*, ii, pp. 144, 265; *The Theology of the Old Testament*, E. T. American ed., pp. 446, 528), A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, pp. 47 ff. Cf. E. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, E. T. pp. 195, 282, who cites these references in order to oppose them.

stimulating "night thoughts" on selected phases of some of the ancient religions.

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER

Princeton, N. J.

The Blackest Page of Modern History: Events in Armenia in 1915: The Facts and the Responsibilities. By HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, Ph.D., author of "The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire," "The New Map of Europe," etc. G. P. Putman's Sons, 1916. 12mo, pp. 71. 75 cents.

Dr. Gibbons has had unusual opportunities for acquainting himself with the facts regarding the treatment of the Armenians by the Ottoman Government, and his account of the massacre of 1915, in which almost a million of these subjects of the Empire were killed, is no doubt a trustworthy statement of the appalling and hideous facts. And it is well that the large public to whose confidence the author has so highly commended himself by his excellent books and articles on the war, should know the truth, sickeningly repulsive though it be, touching the fate of this unfortunate race.

But when Dr. Gibbons abandons the rôle of narrator for that of judge he enters upon an exceedingly difficult task, and we cannot but feel that some of his statements have so little connection with "the facts," that many readers will be unable to concur with him in his fixing of "the responsibilities." Can any open and fair mind accept the logic of the following sentences (pp. 59 f., 62) as final?—"Since Germany refused to intervene before the extermination of the Armenians started, is she not accessory before the fact to the murder by sword, by starvation and thirst, by exposure, by beating, by rape, of nearly a million human beings, whose fault was that they were 'in the way,' and whose vulnerability and defencelessness lay in the sole fact that they were Christians? Since Germany has persisted in refusing to intervene during the process of extermination, is she not *particeps criminis*?" . . . "That they kept quiet, and refused to act, when they alone could have saved the Armenians from destruction, is the first count in the case against the Germans. It is serious. The second is sinister. When we try to find the purpose behind the Armenian massacres, we are confronted with what is, under the circumstances, an eloquent accusation against the German Government and the German people. *The Germans, and the Germans alone, will benefit by the extermination of the Armenians*" (the italics are the author's). With about as much propriety one may hold Great Britain and France, or the British and French people, responsible for the shocking atrocities inflicted by Russian armies upon the civil population of East Prussia.

"The Blackest Page of Modern History" presents many difficulties to the candid inquirer. That the author's summary shifting of the blame upon Germany is, to say the least, not the only possibility in the case, is clear in the light of the confession he has felt himself con-

strained to make (p. 47 f.): "The trans-Caucasian policy of Russia, and the Balkan policy of all the Great Powers first awakened, and has since been the exciting cause of, the fanaticism of the Moslems of Turkey against the Armenians. Before there was an acute 'Question of the Orient,' did we ever have great Armenian massacres? And yet, Christian Europe never made a concerted effort to save this unhappy race from the results of Europe's own dealings with the Turks."

FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER.

Princeton, N. J.

John Wesley's Place in History. By WOODROW WILSON, President of the United States. New York. The Abingdon Press. 12mo, pp. 48; 50 cents net.

This is an address delivered by President Wilson at Wesleyan University on the occasion of the Wesley Bicentennial.

It is a noble discourse worthy alike of the theme, the occasion, and the distinguished speaker. Wesley's character is clearly and distinctly portrayed and his life and work skilfully interpreted in the light of the outstanding features of the eighteenth century. The historian, the literateur, and "the preacher" in the President reveal themselves in happy combination in these pages. We may transcribe a few sentences as being characteristic of the author's style of treatment and of his judgment concerning Wesley: "Unquestionably this man altered and in his day governed the spiritual history of England and the English-speaking race on both sides of the sea." "The church was dead and Wesley awakened it; the poor were neglected and Wesley sought them out; the gospel was shrunken into formulas and Wesley flung it fresh upon the air once more in the speech of common men; the air was stagnant and fetid; he cleared and purified it by speaking always and everywhere the word of God; and men's spirits responded, leaped at the message, and were made wholesome as they comprehended it." "No doubt he played no small part in saving England from the madness which fell upon France ere the century ended."

And having ventured to quote so much we cannot forbear adding an excerpt from the closing paragraph: the familiar truth is none the truer because of the eminence of the station occupied by the speaker; but such words are ever timely, and the message of the President may inspire some minister of the gospel to cultivate a more intimate and helpful acquaintance with the great religious leader of the eighteenth century and to see his own duty and high privilege in a new and more favorable light: "John Wesley's place in history is the place of the evangelist who is also a master of affairs. The evangelization of the world will always be the road to fame and power, but only to those who take it seeking, not these things, but the kingdom of God; and if the evangelist be what John Wesley was, a man poised in spirit, deeply conversant with the natures of his fellow-men, studious of the truth, sober to think, prompt and yet not rash to act, apt to speak