

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 32—October, 1897.

I.

THE ETHICAL GOSPEL.

IT may be admitted that no conception of Christianity is even approximately correct, in which ethical considerations do not obtain a large place. Obviously 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. One may hold with the firmest conviction of their truth the facts of Christ's supernatural birth, His resurrection from the dead and the presence of constantly recurring miracle in His ministry, and have besides a due sense of the great though varying significance of these facts, and yet maintain that they do not constitute the chief glory of that wondrous life. We seem to be justified in saying, in the light of the four gospels, that the supreme glory of Christ for us, the highest which we are permitted to discern as distinct from that in 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 ; that it lay more in His possession in absolute perfection of qualities which we may and should share in part with Him, than in the supernatural attributes which are exclusively His own. And while this is true of Christ's person, the same principle—the supreme importance of the moral—holds good of His work. No view of it can be maintained, in the light either of the gospels or of the epistles, which does not make the deliverance of men from

have his *Life and Letters* now, and the volume of *Poems* which reveals how his heart was feeling during these years of inward struggle. The "thoughts" are meagre enough, and are of an apologetical value of the slightest. They were written, if by an eminent thinker on scientific matters, yet by a novice in Christianity, professedly from the standpoint of an investigator, and are very fragmentary in form. Their interest resides in their emanation from a mind just emerging from denial and in their registering the first thoughts of a trained mind making its hesitant way to a full confession of faith.—*Pseudo-Philosophy at the End of the Nineteenth Century*. By Hugh Mortimer Cecil. I. An Irrationalist Trio: Kidd—Drummond—Balfour. 8vo, pp. xvi, 308. (London: The University Press, 1897.) The author of this clearly and even trenchantly written book is endowed with an acute mind, prepared by a very considerable acquaintance with philosophical thought, and wields a fluent pen, which he has cut very sharp and dips sometimes in a fluid more acrid than ordinary ink. He comes forward as a convinced rationalist in frank defense of naturalism, and takes as his target, in this first instance, the three authors named in his title page, who appear to him to embody the latest attempt of religion—which is the same to him as irrationalism—to escape from the to it destructive conclusions of science—which is to him but another name for rationalism. He does not look upon these three books as presenting anything essentially new or important, or as in themselves more than the phenomena of a moment, scarcely worth detailed criticism. "To state the matter briefly," he says, "Mr. Drummond's book is just a variation upon the old theological theme that God is Love, while the works of Mr. Balfour and Mr. Kidd are variations upon the equally old theme that the emotions are nobler than the intellect, the 'heart' more excellent than the 'head.'" But he thinks the amazing popularity of such works entails on the rationalist the duty of exposing the weakness of their reasoned foundations and the futility of their constructions. He comes to his work, it must be confessed, *con amore*: and we shall be the last to say that what he says is not worthy of consideration. With him we are thoroughly at one in believing that the proper way to meet rationalism is frankly to plead the whole case at the bar of reason. Mr. Cecil is welcome to flay his "irrationalist trio" all he pleases, so far as we are concerned,—or irrationalism of any kind wherever he can find it. We cheerfully submit Dr. Drummond, for example, to his castigation. We do not doubt that Dr. Drummond's intention was, as Dr. Robertson Nicoll in his *Contemporary Review* article (April, 1897) represents it, to come to the defense of Christianity by showing that it could assimilate the doctrine of evolution. But we do not doubt, either, that he actually took his dialectic stand, not on Christianity, but on evolution; and we do not care how thoroughly Mr. Cecil exposes the inconsistencies into which he was thereby led. Christians must take their stand on the complete system of Christianity, and work out from that: nor will they have any difficulty in vindicating the rationality of this proceeding. For theology, too, is a science, the most complete of the sciences, the most sure of the sciences: and any other science will come into conflict with it at its own peril. Mr. Cecil misapprehends the nature of the claim of theology to rest on "a higher faculty than reason." This is only an appeal from reason drunk to reason sober. Richard Rothe was wont to remark that when we say all men have reason, we need to condition the statement by adding "in proportion as they use it." The "faith" that theology appeals to is but a purified "reason" as contrasted with an obfuscated "reason." Theology does not wish any one to accept an irrational conclusion; but it recommends men born with impaired eyesight to use spectacles, and it declines to accept their meiopic sight as the best test of

reality. The reading of Mr. Cecil's book will, in any case, be of great advantage to theologians in clarifying their own sight as to the real issues at stake, and in enabling them to estimate rightly what is the true work of apologetics.

II.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

A CONCORDANCE TO THE SEPTUAGINT, and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books). By the late EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., and HENRY A. REDPATH, M.A., assisted by other Scholars. Parts i-vi. Oxford and London: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde, 1892-7. Two vols., 4vo, pp. 1504.

A CONCORDANCE TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers. Edited by Rev. W. P. MOULTON, M.A., D.D., Member of the New Testament Revision Committee, Editor of the English Edition of Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, and Rev. A. S. GEDEN, M.A., Tutor in Biblical Literature, Exegesis and Classics, Wesleyan College, Richmond; Author of *Hebrew Exercises to Accompany the Grammar of Gesenius-Kautsch*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. 4vo, pp. xii, 1037.

Our day has certainly been remarkable for the multiplication of "instruments for the accurate investigation" of the Biblical texts, as Dr. Moulton phrases it, and there are few of these instruments which were more needed or will be more widely welcomed than this brace of concordances, which together cover the Greek Bible. Hitherto we have had indeed for the study of the text of the New Testament the standard work of Bruder, the excellence of which left little to be desired, except that it was based upon and gave little more than the readings of the *Textus Receptus*, a fault said to be only partially corrected in the latest issue (1888). But for the study of the Greek texts of the Old Testament we have had to rely on old Trommius, a book which every student has had occasion to look upon alternately with the highest gratitude and the deepest disappointment; and the shortcomings of which are oddly illustrated by the list given in Mr. Geden's "Addenda et Corrigenda" (p. 1035) of New Testament words, the LXX. usage of which has been wrongly indicated in his concordance because, Hatch and Redpath failing him after p. 860, he had nothing to rely on except Trommius. From this list we learn that from the letter O on, Trommius has omitted at least seventy-five New Testament words which occur in the LXX. There was a much more serious call for a new concordance to the Greek Old Testament therefore, than for one to the Greek New Testament. The need of the latter, however, was sufficiently great: and the simultaneous appearance of the two books in their completed form places for the first time in the hands of scholars "instruments of precision" for the prosecution of their study of the critical texts.

With reference to the noble work of Dr. Hatch, and Mr. Redpath, we do not need to do more now than to give a hearty welcome to the last part, the appearance of which completes the work. It has, in its earlier parts, been before the public for some few years; and its plan and performance are already well known to all students of the Greek Old Testament. It is intended to give the words not only of the LXX, including the Apocrypha, but also of the extant fragments of the other versions found in Origen's *Hexapla*: and it seeks its text in codices A, B, and the corrected Sixtine edition