

measure to qualify Him for the full and efficient exercise of His office as the Revealer of God. Here also we must add that a view of inspiration which would make the character or truth of Scripture depend on the subjective state or moral character and progress of the recipients and writers would not only vitiate and invalidate all Scripture, and be inconsistent with the confessional doctrine of its infallible truth and Divine authority, but also that, as the Supreme Teacher, He Himself wrote nothing, but left His work to be done by fallible men, an inerrant or infallible revelation, written or spoken, except the Decalogue itself, would be impossible.

Professor Watts is careful to notice in this connection that the supplementary corrective of the down-grade theologians to their view of the primary errancy of Scripture, viz., the testimony of the Holy Spirit, is not only absurd, as implying that the Spirit was more necessary to the reception than to the record of a Divine revelation, but is also a misconception of His work, which is in this respect to deal with men's minds, and not with the matter or form of Scripture. The work of the Spirit is not directly to prove the truth of Scripture, but to give a fuller persuasion of its truths, which is said in the Confession to rest on prior external and internal evidence sufficient to convince unbelievers, by which also the Spirit bears witness to our spirits, and apart from which our belief of the infallible truth of Scripture would rest on mere authority without evidence, and the grand basis or bulwark of our holy faith would be the logical fallacy of *hysteron proteron*, or assurance first and evidence next; while the religious consciousness, which is ecclesiastical Mysticism and neological Rationalism, would become the ultimate test of the truth of revelation.

The author then examines the way in which the

New Apologists deal not only with Scripture itself but with Scripture facts and doctrines, specially their denial or at least disparagement of the primary perfection of man and of an objective historical temptation and fall; of the penal satisfaction of Christ for sin to the justice of God, which is more than a mere moral atonement or display of God's love to sinners; and justification by faith in the objective and imputed righteousness of Christ, and not as Arminians say, by our subjective faith accepted for righteousness, or, as Bushnell states, by the character of God imparted to us, or by our subjective repentance and faith as in themselves righteousness. All these methods of justification by subjective feeling are as baseless and false as justification by works, and nothing less than mere forms of Rationalism or Socinianism, the articles of declining theologians and falling Churches.

Professor Watts evidently believes that the Confession of Faith needs no revision of substance or form; that this proposal springs from Arminian and rationalistic sympathies, which will not long maintain the Calvinistic system of doctrine; that the Revisionists are not superior in real learning to the authors of the Confession, but are often ludicrously ignorant of the history of the Standards, and thereby of the Standards themselves.

This volume is the work of a master in Israel, who has a giant's strength but does not exercise it, like a giant, tyrannously. If Dr. Watts, in concert with other defenders of the faith, should succeed in arresting the present down-grade in theology, he will be the honoured instrument of Britain's rescue from Rationalism, as the late noble Dr. Cooke and others were of Ireland's deliverance from Arianism in the North and Unitarianism in the South and West.

JAMES SCOTT.

Exegetical Papers.

Gen. i. 2 compared With 1 Kings xvii. 21.

BY THE REV. A. H. WRATISLAW, M.A.

It has often been remarked that controversialists of the Reformation epoch, and indeed controversialists of all times, appear to have a strong tendency to use the Scriptures rather as a storehouse from which to draw proofs for their own views, than as documents from which their views

themselves have to be drawn. This reading of theology into Scripture has had a baneful effect upon the science of theology itself, in that it has caused current views on revelation to be taken and accepted for revelation itself, and orthodoxy has come to be tested, not by what the Bible really says, but by what people, in their eagerness to know more than is actually told, have thought fit to read into it.

It may not unreasonably be contended that an instance of this is found in the treatment which

the last clause of the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis has received. It is well known that רִיחַ in Hebrew and πνεῦμα in Greek are ambiguous or equivocal words, admitting equally of the translations "wind" and "spirit," spirit itself being an abbreviation of the Latin "spiritus," which—from the root of "spirare"—signifies a breathing or blowing of air.

In the Hebrew the clause runs as follows:—

וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֵף עַל-פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם

'And wind or spirit of God moving upon the surface of the waters.' In the LXX. we read, καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, "And wind or spirit of God was moving over the water."

Josephus, *Ant.* i. i. 1, alters the construction of the sentences, and in his paraphrase writes: πνεύματος δ' αὐτοῦ [evidently τῆν γῆν] ἀνωθεν ἐπιθέουστος. This is, of course, a traditional view of the passage current in his day. And, it must be remembered, that he was a Pharisee, not inclined to deny the existence of angel or spirit, but to confess both (*Acts* xxiii. 8).

Now, in the Hebrew and in the LXX. the "spirit of God" and the "wind of God" are grammatically equally admissible, whereas the paraphrase of Josephus allows only of the translation "wind." I translate the passage of Josephus *in extenso*. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And this [latter] not coming under sight, but being concealed by deep darkness, and wind coursing over it from above, God commanded light to come into existence."

As to the expression "wind of God," it would probably mean a "mighty wind," just as in *1 Sam.* xiv. 15 a "trembling of God" is used for an "exceeding great trembling." I do not cite the well-known expressions "mountains of God" and "cedars of God" for lofty mountains and cedars, because in them the word for God is *El*, not *Elohim*, as in the passage under discussion and in *1 Sam.* xiv. 15.

The paraphrase of Josephus would seem to indicate a word-painted picture, representing a kind of "darkness visible," in which there was nothing distinguishable but land and water, not yet separated, and wind moving or coursing over them. In the Hebrew and LXX. water is represented as being above the earth and "wind moving upon the surface of the waters."

Now, is this a fitting passage for us to read into it the doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity, who is supposed to be represented as visibly brooding, moving, or hovering over the surface of the waters? To me it appears entirely out of keeping with the passage itself and with the series of word-painted scenes representing the days of creation which follow it.

It is not necessary for my purpose to raise a

special discussion upon the word מְרַחֵף, which will bear more translations than one without, in the slightest degree, affecting my argument, and that the more as I do not pretend that I can add anything of moment to what has been already said about it.

Let us compare the use of רִיחַ here, as suggested

by Josephus's paraphrase, with another passage, in which, unfortunately, we shall not obtain any assistance from Josephus. That passage is *1 Kings* xxii. 21. There the A.V. and R.V. give in the text the self-same words, but the latter adds a marginal note, which completely upsets what it places in the text. I transcribe the whole as given by the R.V.

Michaiah said to Ahab: "Therefore hear thou the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth *a spirit*, and stood before the Lord, and said: I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And He said, Thou shalt entice him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets; and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." "There came forth *a spirit* and stood before the Lord." Here the margin of the R.V. calmly says, "Heb. *the spirit*." I am quite at a loss to understand how *a spirit* and *the spirit* can be of identical signification. The LXX. certainly gives πνεῦμα without the article, and Josephus, unfortunately, omits the entire scene in heaven. But if we are to take the Hebrew as our guide, we must cast about for some other way of taking the passage, which shall not force us to defy grammar by making "*a spirit*" and "*the spirit*" identical. It is abhorrent to propriety to understand "*the spirit*" as the Holy Spirit of God; we must therefore betake ourselves to the only other course left open to us, and translate, "And there came forth *the wind*, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And He said, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth and will be a lying wind [*or spirit*] in the mouth of all his prophets."

Here we have as marked a transition from the sense of *wind* to that of *spirit*, as in the conversation between our Lord and Nicodemus (*John* iii. 8). No propriety either of sense or grammar is outraged, and we have merely the wind personified in the vision and allowed to go on a message of delusion.

One of the most striking passages, in which

wind is made to denote the failure of prophecy and the delusion of the prophets, is Jer. v. 13: "And the prophets shall become *wind*, and the word is not in them."

For the appearance of the *wind* before God, I may cite Zech. vi. 5, where, when the prophet inquires the meaning of the vision of the four chariots with differently coloured horses, the angel replies: "These are the four *winds* (R.V.) of heaven, which go forth from *standing before* the Lord of all the earth."

Note on Genesis i. 2.

We often speak of the Six Days of *Creation* as given in the Mosaic account, and thereby fall into very serious error (as I conceive) regarding the entire biblical cosmogony. The mistake arises from the mistranslation of one short Hebrew word, rendered in our version "was" (verse 2). But היתה in the Hebrew signifies "became," not "was,"—which very considerably modifies the meaning of the whole passage. It is true that the LXX. render ἦν, and the Vulgate by *erat*, but this should not stand in the way of an accurate translation being given.

I would render the first three verses, then, thus:

Originally (cf. John i. 1) *God created the Heaven and the Earth.*

2 ¶ *And the Earth became waste and unfurnished, and darkness was over the face of the abyss.*

3 *And the Spirit of God moved upon the waters' face.*

Now we have an entirely different picture. God "created" all things, "originally," in a state of *perfection*; for we have no warrant to conceive otherwise. This is the subject-matter of verse 1. Then—and no hint is given as to how long that original state may have lasted—the earth became waste and unfurnished [LXX. ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκευάστος; Vulgate, "inanis et vacua"], emptied (so to say) of all its first perfection, probably by sin and its terrible results. This is the subject-matter of verse 2. Aeons untold may have elapsed between the creation of "things seen," by the hand of the King—eternal, immortal, invisible—and the subsequent confounding of that goodly work by the agency of some awful sin, which brought about the catastrophe. We are not told *what* caused it precisely; but, from several hints scattered up and down the Bible, we may conjecture that in all probability the fall of the angels ("that kept not their first estate"), with Satan at their head, was the real reason. But this has not definitely been revealed, and therefore it is not needful for us to trouble much about the matter.

What are called the "Six Days of *Creation*" will now more rightly be named the "Six Days of

Restitution;" when the light of God, long withdrawn from the ruins of a creation that had been stained by sin, returned, and Chaos became Cosmos. (Cf. the strikingly confirmative passage in Isaiah xlv. 18, God created it [*i.e.* the earth] not a *waste*.)

It is by this interpretation that, finally, I believe Science and Scripture may be reconciled; the ordinary interpretations are absolutely helpless to bring about such an end. Any way, this interpretation throws a new light upon much that is obscure, as I venture to think; and as it has been of real value to myself in understanding—or trying to understand better—the earlier verses of Genesis, it is given herewith, in case it may prove of use to others.

EDWARD HENRY BLAKENEY.

Trin. Coll. Camb.

Ephesians vi. 14.

"Having girded your loins with truth."—R.V.

Why should the girdle be first mentioned? And why should it be identified with truth?

Let us first understand our Greek. The aorist participle points, of course, to a single action done once for all. The girding done once is to be done for good. In other words, truth is to be our constant companion. ὀσφύς I should be inclined to consider as almost equivalent to the "small" of the back (Hdt. 2. 40, Aesch. Pr. 1. 497, where opposed to ὦμοι, v. Liddell and Scott s.v. Yet note that application in both cases to *animals*). It is meant to represent the most important part—the pivot, so to speak, of the body—which most needs wrapping up and protection, and so is used for the whole. Compare, for a curious analogy, the provincialism—to "put your back into" anything. Truth again (ἀλήθεια) is etymologically = openness or frankness, that which leads one to have nothing hidden or concealed (ἀ λανθάνω).

To sum up then the whole phrase: (1) we are to be girt once for all (not requiring constant renewal); (2) the part we are to gird is at once one of the most important of the human frame, and one which requires the most assistance; (3) the girdle is to be an open and a frank spirit—truth is to give to the soul what the girdle does to the body, assistance and comfort.

Once more. In the East we must remember that the girdle is of primary importance. To the Oriental with his flowing robe to be ungirt is practically the same as to be useless. The girdle is here mentioned first because it is the first necessity for Eastern activity. Compare, for instance, the story of Elijah, who, *after girding himself*, runs before Ahab's chariot to the gates of Jezreel.

Finally, *truth* is mentioned as being the foundation of all other virtues, and of the first necessity in approaching GOD. Before we can come before HIM we must put off self (lies, hypocrisy, etc.), and put on truth. Without the guileless nature which hideth nothing, we have not taken the first step towards communion with HIM.

Zoroaster saw this many years before the coming of Christ, and the beauty of his cult lies in the stress laid upon this virtue. The Egyptians understood it, for their priests wore the sapphire image of truth around their necks. And what is, in any case, the most ancient, if not the most correct, interpretation of the mysterious Urim and Thummim of the old dispensation points them out as signifying respectively light and truth (LXX. *δῆλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια*).

L. L. BARCLAY.

Genesis ii. 16, 17.

"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The revealed will of God is a restraint on men.

In the case of Adam the restraint was in *one* thing. With us, the restraint is in *many* things.

From the text I observe—

1. *That God restrains man from nothing that is essential to his well-being or enjoyment.*—The fruit allowed to Adam was abundant, and in great variety. Only one tree was forbidden, and that he

did not require. Everything is lawful that is good for us. We have liberty, but not licence. The use of things, but not their abuse. What is forbidden is harmful; licentiousness, covetousness, theft; selfishness in all its forms.

2. *That things forbidden stand in the midst of things allowed.*—The tree of knowledge was in the *midst* of the garden, easy of access. The bad ever lies near to the good. A thing in moderation is good; in excess bad. Covetousness lurks behind frugality; severity behind duty; a vain ambition lies near the lawful desire to serve; lying is often near to kindness; formalism to reverence; abuse to use.—Discretion and watchfulness are always necessary.

3. *That the penalty of violating God's law is death.*—The words, "the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," are probably a warning, not a threat. They were uttered in kindness. As water drowns, fire burns, so sin kills. We need not assume that there was poison in the fruit of the tree. Taking the fruit would be disobedience, unbelief, defiance, sin, which is deadly poison. Disobedience is death, killing the soul first, and through the soul the body. An act of transgression separates the soul from God; beclouds and confuses the moral nature; is destructive of innocence, purity, and self-respect; and obliterates heaven from the soul's prospect. This, in Bible phraseology, is death. "The wages of sin is death."

J. GASKELL.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

Three Great Fathers.

MESSRS. LONGMANS have published *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, by William Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford (crown 8vo, 6s.). The three great Fathers are Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine, who receive forty-eight, sixty-one, and seventy-four pages respectively, after which there come one hundred and twenty-eight pages of valuable appendices. The book opens with a singularly clumsy preface, containing single sentences which fill whole pages, and in one of which we have counted, not without labour, ten separate statements. But when the subject proper is entered upon, all this is speedily forgotten. There is energy in the writing, delicate sympathetic insight in the thought, and proportion in the arrangement. It proves itself a most pleasant and helpful guide to the study of these three mighty ones.

The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse.

From MESSRS. LONGMANS there comes also *The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse*, by the Rev. G. V. Garland,

Rector of Binstead, Isle of Wight (8vo, 16s.). It is a handsome octavo, whose 498 pages are made up of thirty-six chapters, and two short appendices on the "Eternity of Matter" and the "Symbolic Meanings of the Apocalyptic Numbers." For the most part each chapter of the Apocalypse receives a chapter of the book to its elucidation, and special points are dealt with separately. There is no discussion of authorship, date, or composition. The moral and spiritual lessons of the Apocalypse are brought to bear upon modern times and modern places by a large and generous application of the symbolical method of interpretation. No one will deny the justice of applying that principle of interpretation to any book of Scripture, and least of all to this. But is there any other that demands the same rigorous self-restraint in its application? Mr. Garland presses into his service elements of doubtful advantage. Thus etymology plays some considerable part; but it is etymology of a bewildering description. "*Amnos*, a lamb, appears to be derived from the Hebrew *Amen*, the truth." "The Keltic London, 'the fort in the marsh,' may bear also another interpretation, in its possible derivation from the Hebrew, 'the lodging-place of judgment,'" and so become identified