

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.

'the last watch of the night.' We know in which watch our Lord will come, for there is no other in which he could come" (p. 6); and we are "not only in the last fourth, but in the last seventh division of the Church's path," as outlined in Rev. ii. and iii. (p. 7). The inevitable deduction from prophecy is that "a compromise will probably end the war" (p. 19). What "extraordinary event, possibly some divine interposition, may by the very terror and wonder it would excite, lead to that compromise?" The second coming of Christ.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

Princeton, N. J.

The Law of Human Life. The Scriptures in the Light of the Science of Psychology. By ELIJAH V. BROOKSHIRE. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press. 1916. 8vo: pp. xlv, 471. \$2.50 net.

History was recorded by the writers of the Scriptures, not for its own sake, but for its religious teaching. Parable also was spoken, not for its own sake as literature, but for a religious purpose. In a word, "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope." The author evidently accepts this doctrine of the apostle as true. He is, however, indifferent to the actual occurrence of the events. One and all they may be history or fable. Everything is interpreted as allegory, or as the author prefers to say psychologically. The book is characterized by moral earnestness; but in our judgment readers will find the treatment fanciful in the extreme and the interpretation put upon the words of Jesus and Paul usually forced and strained indeed.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

Princeton, N. J.

Tekst en Uitleg. Practische Verklaring van het Nieuwe Testament door Prof. Dr. A. van Veldhuizen met medewerking von Prof. Dr. J. A. C. van Leeuwen, Prof. Dr. J. W. Pont, Prof. Dr. J. de Zwaan e. a.

Het Evangelie van Markus door Dr. A. van Veldhuizen, Hoogleeraar vanwege de Ned. Herv. Kerk aan de Ryks Universiteit te Groningen. 1914. pp. 143.

Het Evangelie van Mattheus door Dr. J. A. C. van Leeuwen, Hoogleeraar aan de Ryks-Universiteit te Utrecht. 1915. Pp. 172. Te Groningen by J. B. Wolter's U. M.

We here receive two little volumes in a proposed series of popular, practical expositions of the books of the New Testament. Part of the collaborators are also engaged in preparing a new Dutch translation of the Scriptures. In that, however, not individual opinions but a consensus and compromise of collective scholarship will find expression, and a long period is required for its precipitation. In order not to keep

the public waiting till then, in the present series the individual writers are offered free scope for submitting their favorite personal views and conclusions. The processes by which these have been reached are to be entirely kept from the reader. Only results will be presented, and these in the most untechnical form without the introduction of Greek words or theological terminology. Whether the entire absence of the last-named element will contribute to the popularity of the series may seem doubtful, for the Dutch are still on the whole a theologically-inclined people and hardly ever study the Scriptures without reflection upon doctrinal issues.

The plan of the separate volumes is uniform, each consisting of an introduction, the translation, based on Nestle's Greek text, and a brief running commentary. From the nature of the case the last occupies most of the space. A possible more scientific impulse on the part of some readers is met by a select bibliography at the close of the introductory section.

The attitude of the authors both in isagogical and in theological questions is a moderately conservative one. That the Evangelists made mistakes is conceded. Mark in his one quotation Chap. i, 2 made one, and another in connection with Abiathar, ii. 26. The tradition about Mark as the author is accepted and the date is placed about 70. Matthew also is from the Apostle whose name it bears, in preference to the view that the name Matthew was attached originally to the Logia and only passed over from that source to the First Gospel. Our Greek text of Matthew is the translation of an Aramaic original. The two-document hypothesis, specifically the dependence of Matthew on Mark or on an Ur-Markus, is not favored. Dr. van Leeuwen regards Matthew as older (in its Aramaic form) than Mark and assumes that Mark made use of it in writing his Gospel. As a tentative date for the Aramaic Matthew the period from 50-60 is named.

The expository comments are on the whole in keeping with the purpose of the work to give instruction of a popular kind. Here and there the resolve to exclude all reference to scientific processes and debates has interfered with the intelligibility of the statements. It is exceedingly doubtful whether from the casual references to Wrede's "Messianic secrecy" the average reader will be able to form any clear view of Wrede's hypothesis, and yet without such a view, the introduction of this critic's name is wholly useless. Apt to mislead is the statement on p. 28 of the introduction to Mark that "even Wrede brings out the metaphysical and divine aspect of Jesus in Mark." That Wrede brings this out is not out of keeping but wholly in line with his theory.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

Princeton, N. J.

Israel en de Baäls Afval of Ontwikkeling. Rede gehouden by de overdracht van het Rectoraat der Theologische School van de Gereform-