

# 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,<sup>1</sup> has an important indeed, but, in the first instance at least,<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

## HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

*Deliverance: The Freeing of the Spirit in the Ancient World.* By HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR, Litt.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915. 12mo, pp. VII, 294. \$1.25 net.

To most readers familiar with Dr. Taylor's works, especially his two volumes on *The Mediaeval Mind*—that most admirable history of the development of thought and emotion in the Middle Ages—, the book before us will quite likely prove somewhat disappointing. To be sure, it frequently and at times even impressively reveals the same penetration of insight, breadth of sympathy, balance of judgment and charm of poetic treatment that mark all the author's studies in history and philosophy. But some of the chapters are quite too brief and superficial to have much value, while others, in spite of their ample proportions, are too vague to be satisfactory. Indeed, it requires more energy of thought than most readers will care to expend in order to ascertain just what the writer's purpose may have been in stringing together what he has called "these 'night thoughts.'" According to his own account he has here attempted "some ordering and statement of the ways in which our spiritual ancestors of all times and countries adjusted themselves to the fears and hopes of their natures, thus reaching a freedom of action in which they accomplished their lives, or it may be they did but find peace; yet brought it forth from such depth of conviction that their peace became peace for thousands and for millions. . . . I would set forth rather in themselves, and simply, those individuals who most clearly illustrate phases of human adjustment with life, its limitations, aspirations, and conceived determining powers, working within or from without."

With so general a proposition as his only guide, it is not strange that the author practically discards in the text the terms "Deliverance" and "Freeing," used in the title, and sticks by preference to the altogether hazy conception of mere "adjustment"; with "love of the best" coming in at the conclusion (p. 278) as a sufficiently "universal element" to account for about everything that may need explanation in the whole vast field of the religious life of the ancients. The consequence is that few readers will be inclined to regard the three chapters on Jesus, Paul, and Augustine, as containing anything like an adequate treatment of distinctively Christian teaching on redemption conceived as salvation from sin, or the chapters on "China: Duty and Detachment" and on "The Indian Annihilation of Individuality" as having enough in common with the principles of revealed religion to make it seem natural or desirable to coordinate such "adjustments" with the views (chapter V) of "The Prophets of Israel."

Doubtless, however, we are in danger of doing the author an injustice, if we take his work seriously as a systematic treatise on ancient religions. We ought rather to regard it—and this we are quite willing to do—as a somewhat heterogeneous collection of interesting and withal

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-