

Joseph Bryant Rotherham (1828-1910) was born at New Buckenham, Norfolk in the United Kingdom. His father was a Methodist preacher, and Rotherham followed in his footsteps, pastoring churches in Woolwich, Charlton and Stockton-on-Tees. However he soon developed differences with Methodism regarding infant baptism and, at the same time, became interested in the writings of the American preacher Alexander Campbell, one of the early leaders of the Restoration Movement. Rotherham eventually joined the movement in 1854 and became a well-known evangelist and biblical scholar with the Churches of Christ.

During the 1860s Rotherham began work on a translation of the Bible. In 1872 his *New Testament Critically Emphasized* was published, with the Old Testament appearing in 1902. From 1885 to 1887 he was also editor of *The Rainbow*, a monthly magazine of Christian literature. Rotherham was a friend of several prominent Christian leaders of his day. One of his correspondents was Pastor C. T. Russell. In Volume 1 page 175, Pastor Russell calls Rotherham “one of the most scrupulous translators.” In the December 15, 1902 and again in November 1, 1903 the original Towers ran ads for the second and even “better” translation.

Upon the release of “The Divine Plan of the Ages” in 1886, Rotherham ran a review of this book in his journal: *The Rainbow*. The opening and closing comments of a 10 page article are complementary. His opening and closing comments are:

THIS is a notable book—bold, broad, and breezy; very refreshing after the stereotyped dogmas and platitudes which pass current in the theological world. It is a book for men and not for children—at least, not for English children. The American child is supposed to be a more precocious phenomenon, and we are not sure that a dose of this book might not take a little of the sceptical bounce out of *him*—and such as he. But for the ordinary, hesitating, uninstructed child in theology, who as yet knows not his right hand from his left, and who may crave for some one to do his thinking for him, and be rather too ready to be carried about by every wind of teaching, and too timidly willing to cast anchor in the confident conclusions of a stronger mind,—we cannot recommend this volume... “The Plan of the Ages” is a valuable production, and is probably destined to furnish material assistance in shaking down old walls and building up new.

[closing paragraph:]

Only those who read dispassionately for themselves “The Plan of the Ages” will perhaps believe us when we assure them that enough in any case remains that is unimpeachable to render this volume such as is likely to repay abundantly any discreet man’s perusal. The Chapter on “The Permission of Evil” is alone more than worth the price of the whole volume, and is the fullest discussion of this great mystery, and the nearest approximation to a probably correct solution of it, with which we are acquainted.

However, in this 1886 review, while respecting the motive and logic of the author, Rotherham still presents a number of doubts, questions and challenges to many premises in the volume. These include: the millennium, ages and dispensations, restitution, the person of Christ, the nature of man, the judgment day and the prophetic word. **Yet by 1902 in two appendices to the Old and New Testament, he has entirely resolved his reservation on these matters. Apparently having read at least volumes 1-5 and possibly collaboration with Pastor Russell, now had cleared all his doubts and presents scholarly support for many elements of present truth.** See some sections below: SCAPE GOAT, PROPITIATORY COVERING, SIN OFFERING, AGE, AGE ABIDING, CHRIST, COVENANT, GEHENNA, HADES, JESUS, KINGDOM, MYSTERY-PRESENCE (*PAROUSIA*), SOUL, SPIRIT and more.

DEUTERONOMY, AUTHORSHIP OF

AT first sight it might seem as though the translator of THE EMPHASISED BIBLE had no need to trouble himself about the authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy. There it is: simply translate it, and leave all such questions to commentators and the higher critics. Even had this self-excusing policy prevailed, however, that would not have obliterated the impression naturally received in the process of rendering the book. It is true that the remanding of that impression into silence might have entailed no loss to the world. But there was another reason for offering an opinion, which was this. The design of this Bible—to give effect, among other things, to the interesting distinction between “narrative and speech”—made it imperative to take a definite attitude as to the literary question involved in this discussion. That is to say, it demanded of the translator not only an exercise of his own judgment as to what portions of the book of Deuteronomy were probably editorial, so that he might differentiate them in the margin, setting fully out to the left hand of the column portions that were *not* “speech”; but the very fact of doing this was sure to draw the inquisitive reader into the problem, by provoking the obvious question why some parts of Deuteronomy are marginally distinguished from other parts; why, for example, chaps. i. 1-5; ii. 10-12, 20-23; iii. 11, 13-14; iv. 41-43, 44-49, are thus separated from their contexts. It seemed better, therefore, to take the reader into confidence; and, first, by a few notes subjoined to the book itself, as at chaps. iv. 13; vi. 5; vii. 17; viii. 2, &c., and then by the present connected statement, to employ the book of Deuteronomy as a very elementary object-lesson, offered once for all, in that legitimate higher criticism which no honest man of reverent judgment needs fear to study.

The purpose thus defined may perhaps be most effectively attained by first presenting, substantially as it was written, a paper which appeared in a weekly magazine two years ago, and by then submitting such further observations as may appear to be called for.

In this book we hear the voice of “the old man eloquent.” As an author, there may be more or less of Moses the man of God in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; but here we come within the sound of his living voice, and listen to his impassioned pleadings with Israel. No later writer could have so completely entered into the situation. Moses himself, as revealed in the foregoing history, now stands before us. We perceive in the Speaker, the teachings of the past, the realisation of the present, the fears for the future,—revealing themselves in a manner perfectly inimitable. Such, at least, was the impression made on the mind of the translator when some years ago he wrote out his rendering of the book.

This impression was decidedly deepened when, later on, he carefully revised his translation. It is true that his previous conviction became slightly qualified, yet only in such wise as to strengthen the conclusion to which he had previously come. The more one became familiar with the mannerisms of the speaker’s living voice, the more evident it was that here and there editorial annotations had been subsequently added. The rush and passion and vehement urgency that we feel as we hearken to Moses’ voice are not easily to be reconciled with the deliberate presentation of antiquarian notes, as to the former dwellers in Edom and the other lands through which Israel had passed; far less with the measurements and present location of the bedstead of Og, king of Bashan. Granted here and there an editorial addition, and these things easily fall into their place. They do but momentarily interrupt the flowing periods of the living Moses; but assuredly they formed no part of the original spoken discourse. They enrich the book as we have it, but they would have marred the discourses as actually delivered by a man shortly to die.—This

then is the modification to which the translator's first persuasion readily submitted itself.

But now, after a third survey of the book of Deuteronomy, how does the question of Authorship present itself? Briefly, as follows: That a little further extension of the supposed editorship goes a long way towards placing the first main impression upon an immovable basis. Not antiquarian notes alone betray editorship; but historical introductions, and at least one historical appendix. The historical appendix is, of course, seen and known of all men. Moses certainly did not record his own death and burial; and only a considerably later hand could have finally told how much greater Moses was than any who came after him. The historical introductions—of which there are principally two—are worthy of further attention. There is nothing to show that those introductions may not have been written by Joshua, Eleazar or Phineas, or some other contemporary of the great Prophet, within a few years of his death. The introductions referred to are, first, a general one to the whole book (chap. i. 1-5); and, second, an introduction to Moses' account of the "ten words" given on Horeb (chap. iv. 41—v. 1). In both of these are found tokens of editorship which challenge our confidence, inasmuch as, in them, two distinct lines of evidence are seen converging to the conclusion that these portions are editorial. The first line consists in this—that, when the *Editor* writes, he refers to Moses in the third person: "Moses" said or did this or that; whereas when *Moses himself speaks*, he naturally alludes to himself as "I" or "me"; to Israel, including himself, as "we" or "us"; directly addressing his hearers as "ye" or "you." This of itself is clear enough as marking a distinction between the principal spoken addresses and any editorial supplements. Singularly enough, the line thus drawn is confirmed by the simple word "over" in relation to the river Jordan. Moses we know did not enter "the good land": Joshua and others did. To him, "over the Jordan" meant to the west: to them, after they had entered, "over the Jordan" meant to the east, or, as the Editor of Moses is accustomed to add, "towards the rising of the sun." Now the persuasive coincidence is just this: That in those portions where we presume the Editor is writing because he refers to Moses in the third person,—in them we find that "over the Jordan" means to the east: on the other hand, where we feel sure that Moses himself is speaking, by the clear sign that he says "I," "we," "ye," "you,"—in those very portions "over the Jordan" means to the west. There is but one exception, and that occurs in chap. iii. 8 in the midst of a sentence which by the usual token was spoken by Moses; whereas the phrase "over the Jordan" which occurs in that sentence must mean eastward, as the locality spoken of conclusively shows. The difficulty is at once removed by the very easy hypothesis that that particular clause in the sentence was added as an editorial explanation. Then all is plain, and the exception proves the rule; which rule being a second one, and coinciding with a first entirely independent of it, generates an amount of confidence not easily shaken.

But the evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the speeches—of which, be it noted, the book of Deuteronomy is mainly composed—springs from something more subtle and more conclusive than the aforesaid converging lines of evidence, however satisfactory in themselves those lines may be. It springs from the manner in which the speaker enters into the entire situation, leading us to exclaim, None but Moses could have *done* it! Coupled with this, and constituting an especial form of it, is the profound emotionalism—in a word, the psychology which pervades the book, prompting us to say, None but Moses could have *felt* all this!

What, then, was the *situation* into which the speaker so completely enters? It was a situation created by time, place, event, and personality; and, naturally, owing to the concurrence of these causes, a situation that had never existed before and could never exist again. The *time* was after the forty years' wanderings, after the conquest of Sihon, king of Heshbon, and Og, king of Bashan; and just before the passage of the Jordan into Canaan: a momentous time, crowded with memories, throbbing with exciting expectations. The *place* was the Arabah of Moab, near the Jordan, over against Jericho,

the centre of the whole east of Canaan, along which the people had skirted or into which they had penetrated—a place, therefore, which invited them to cross, to enter, to possess, without more delay. And what unique *events* had already happened: the sullen acquiescence in Israel's transit by Edom, Moab and Ammon, at the terrible cost of the slain over the matter of Baal-peor with which the names of Balak and Balaam are dishonourably associated; the unexpected conquest of the magnificent lands of Gilead and Bashan, with all the stir of war whetting the swords of Israel's warriors with keen eagerness for the great invasion. Then, finally, look at the *personalities* which enter into the situation: Caleb is there, and Joshua, both of whom knew personally something, still vivid in their memories, which, as spies, they had seen—of the inhabitants and cities and products of the land; and there are Eleazar and Phineas, son and grandson of Aaron, Moses' brother; there, also, the generation whose memories, many of them, reached back to the early days of the wanderings, who had seen that great and terrible desert, who had skirted Edom and Moab and Ammon, and penetrated Gilead and Bashan, many of whom had lost near relatives in the fearful revolt of Baal-peor; and towering above them all was the commanding personality of Moses himself. Now the contention here submitted is, that the speaker of those discourses, which constitute the chief portion of the book of Deuteronomy, so completely enters into the situation created by the time, the place, the events, and the personalities, that he could be no other than Moses himself. Only the man who lived then, and stood there, who had passed through those stirring events, who knew and confronted that generation, could possibly speak in the strain that here greets our eyes.

For note, finally, the marked psychology of this book. What a profound emotionalism the speaker displays! All the forms of speech that betoken depth of feeling are present here—repetitions, as if the speaker could not make sure enough of having effected his purpose; digressions, caused by vivid memories crowding in upon him while he was speaking; appeals, remonstrances, recriminations, which none but Moses could have dared; and, especially confessions of disappointment and regret—so keen, so bitter, as if his heart would break—that he might not himself enter into the good land. Note well, also, the extremes that meet, and are melted into a living whole, by the intense feeling with which the speaker is borne along: “What nation so great!” . . . “Oh foolish people and unwise!” Note also the labour—the travail—for the people's well-being into which his passionate love urges him. He speaks, and speaks; he must surely have spoken from day to day! When he has done speaking, then he writes, and writes on: adding perhaps a little, towards the end, which he had not actually spoken, but in penning which he feels as if he were still speaking. And when he has written all—all the law, all his repetition of the law, all his own recollections about the giving of the law, including perhaps variations (most natural in one who spoke and wrote from memory, but very unlikely to have been indulged in by anyone else), when he has done all this, then, Is there anything else he can do, any further stone he can turn, to stem and stay his people's apostasy? Yes, there is one thing he can do. He can resolve his passion into song—a song for the tongue, for the ear, for the memory; a song to live among the people, to be recited in their gatherings, to be accompanied by the harp. He has harangued them, he has warned them; now he will bewitch them. Thus is born his Witnessing Song (chap, xxxii.). This is not the place to analyse that marvellous composition. Read it; get into sympathy with it. Against the doubt whether Moses could have composed it, let it be enough to say, Could anyone else have composed it? With regard to the Song of “Blessing” which stands in the next chapter (chap, xxxiii.), the case in many ways is very different. Instead of seeming to grow out of the speeches which have gone before, it is couched in a totally opposite strain. It is blessing only—admiration only—felicitation only. What then! Shall we contradict Moses' editor, who records that “This is the blessing wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the sons of Israel before his death”? There is no need! One of two suppositions is open

to us, both of which are perfectly rational, either of which would naturally account for the altered mood of the prophet-poet. We may conceive of the “Blessing” as in the main composed long years before these parting scenes, though only now publicly produced. Or we may form another hypothesis: we may conclude that the mind of Moses passed into a serener atmosphere after the excitement and strain of the admonitory speeches and song were over—that his fears having found adequate expression, the man of God rested in the consciousness that he had done his duty: knowing, moreover, that, after all, there was hope in the end for Israel, how many soever her sins would be, how terrible soever the sufferings must be which should follow those sins (chap. xxxii. 43),—knowing this, his profound love for his people, his unshaken confidence in their destiny, stirred and guided by divine afflatus, now moved him to excogitate his most glowing idealisations of Israel’s unique position, and to cast his thoughts into the form of a most lovely and loving song. And so, having prepared and pronounced his “Paradise Regained,” he is parted from the beloved tribes—almost literally—with a “blessing” on his lips.

We have assumed that Moses was a poet. Why not! He was an Oriental—he was an educated man—he had been in love—he had enjoyed forty years of learned leisure in Midian. What wonder if the soul of a poet had been awakened within him, and the stylus of a poet had been trained to commit to papyrus or to parchment the musical numbers with which he had beguiled many a waiting hour during his banishment from his land and his people!

And even in this second song there are, if we mistake not, internal evidences of no small force that no one was ever so fitted to write it as Moses himself. If we wished to cite an example, we would say: The opening lines (chap. xxxiii. 2) descriptive of the Divine Appearing, when Yahweh came forth to meet Israel; Moses going forth at the head of his people, Yahweh advancing to meet them in a pillar of light and fire. Can we think of any human imagination so likely to have been profoundly and permanently impressed by that Theophany as that of Moses himself! What surprise if, before he died, he perpetuated his recollections in one of the most magnificent poems ever written!

In fine: the book of Deuteronomy must have had an author. Making reasonable allowances for editorial preservation and annotation, no man comes before us out of all the centuries of Hebrew history so fitted to be, so likely to have been, that author as Moses, the man of God, the leader of Israel out of Egypt to the confines of the promised land.

Such is the paper as it originally appeared in print. There is little to add. Since it was written some attention has been given to what the critics who treat of the Literature of the Old Testament have to say,—without changing the general persuasion of the present writer. It is still conceived that, full allowance being made for the necessary editing of the Sacred Books, it is needless to disturb the internal claim to Authorship where, as in this case, it is plainly made in the writing itself, and where that claim is seen to rest on broad and general grounds of inherent probability. It is, of course, undesirable to get involved in technicalities. It matters little whether the term “author” is applied to Moses or to his Editors, provided it is well understood what is intended. The one weighty question is whether the great Lawgiver did actually deliver the substance of what is here put into his mouth, and whether his speeches have been honestly and competently edited for the purpose, and during the process, of being handed down to us.

ESCAPE GOAT, THE—(FOR AZAZEL).

“AND one lot for Azazel” (Lev. xvi. 8).—It seems impossible to dissent from the opinion that “Azazel,” instead of being a name for the (e)scape goat, is the name or title of an evil Being, opposed to Yahweh, to whom the live goat on the great Day of

Propitiation was sent. Admitting so much, it still remains to inquire into the meaning of this very peculiar but impressive ceremony of sending the living goat to Azazel. Assuming that Satan is represented by Azazel—and there does not appear anything else which biblically we can assume—it is most important to observe that there is here no sacrifice offered to the evil spirit. The second goat is not slain, but in marked contrast to its fellow is preserved alive, and remains the living goat to the end. It is true it is led away to or towards the desert, and goes thither bearing the sins of the people which have been symbolically laid upon its head. But it has been too much overlooked, that it carries into the desert something else besides the sins of the congregation. It bears the death of its companion, which has been just as truly put upon it as have the sins of the people (ver. 10). The death thus put upon it was the death of the people's sin-bearer. Therefore, the only sin it bears into the desert is atoned-for sin—sin for which death has already been exacted. And, unless we stultify the whole transaction of that solemn day, we must admit that, if the sins resting upon the live goat proclaimed to Azazel, "Slay me if thou canst," the death of its fellow, which covered it, as loudly cried, "Slay me if thou durst! I claim to live! I have already died in my companion whose death is accounted mine!" In point of fact, no hint is given of any harm befalling the goat that was dismissed; and despite the romance of the book of Enoch, preceded or followed by Jewish tradition, to the effect that the goat was precipitated from steep rocks and so killed, it is far more respectful to the Levitical appointment to stop where it closes than to add a sequel which mars the whole symbolical transaction. As well imagine an untimely end to the living bird dipped in the blood of its fellow and then let go free (chap. xiv. 33) as to pursue the escaped goat with any such morbid imagination. That it was taken, by the man appointed, into a lone land is excellent symbology; and may well have pictured the dismissal of the past year's offences into the land of forgetfulness—into utter oblivion. Instead of fancying anything further, rather let common sense suggest that the released goat could (just as well as its conductor) find its way back to the haunts of men, to be indistinguishably lost in the crowd of its natural congeners. Delivered once and for all from this mistaken dream, and reverting once more to Azazel, it is enough to say that this particular feature, instead of suggesting any sacrifice to Satan, much rather amounts to a triumphant defiance of "him that held the dominion of death, that is, the Adversary" (Heb. ii. 14); all the more so when the trend of such passages as Isa. i. 8, Rom. viii. 33, 34, and Rev. xii. 10, 11, is patiently considered.—From the above it may rightly be inferred that the meaning of *'azâ`zel* given in O.G. ("entire removal") is regarded by the present translator as unsatisfactory.

PHARAOH'S HEART, THE HARDENING OF.

In his commentary on this place (Exo. iv. 21) Kalisch says: "As the external, often accidental, occasion of an event is mostly more obvious, even to the reflecting mind, than its primary cause or its true (often hidden) originator, it has become a linguistic peculiarity in most ancient, especially the Semitic, languages, to use indiscriminately the former instead of the latter, so that the phrase. 'I shall harden the heart of Pharaoh' means: 'I know that I shall be the *cause* of Pharaoh's obstinacy; my commands and wonders will be an *occasion*, an *inducement* to an increasing obduration of his heart.' And the compassionate leniency of God, who, instead of crushing the haughtiness of the refractory king with one powerful blow, first tried to reform him by various less awful punishments, and who generally announced the time of the occurrence of the plagues by the words, 'Behold, I shall afflict to-morrow,' in order to grant him time for reflection and repentance; this clemency on the part of God increased Pharaoh's refractoriness; it was to him a *cause* of prolonged and renewed resistance."

The importance of the question thus suggested, coupled with a consideration of the translator's responsibility to do all he fairly can to guard his readers from going astray, may render a few further facts and observations of practical interest. Is it right, on the part

of the translator of The EMPHASISED BIBLE, that he has endeavoured to avoid representing God as the author or instigator of wickedness?

In furnishing materials for answering this question, it will be sufficient, in this article, to submit two facts. The first is, that words in the original usually expressive of *cause* are every now and then employed to denote *occasion*, and may be legitimately rendered in the latter sense. The second is, that even *positive commands* are occasionally to be accepted as meaning no more than permission.

1. That Hebrew Grammarians distinctly avow *occasion* or *permission* to be sometimes the sense of verbs which ordinarily signify *cause* can be verified by a reference to the Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius, say in the admirable translation of Dr. Benjamin Davies (p. 120). After stating that the verbal form (conjugation) called *piel* denotes *intensity* and *repetition*, this grammar adds: "It often takes the modifications expressed by *permit*, *to declare* or *hold as*, *to help*." Of this, a good example is found in the verb *shalach*, "to send." Notice its modification with reference to the raven and the dove in Gen. viii. 7, 8. Noah "sent" them "forth"; that is, he simply "let them go." The only *cause* was *permission*, the removal of restraint. Again, when Eliezer said (Gen. xxiv. 54), "Send me away," all he meant was, "Let me go," "Do not hinder me." So with regard to *hayah*, "to live"; in *piel*, "to cause to live." The historian says that the midwives (literally) "caused the male children to live" (Exo. i. 17)—plainly, "permitted them," "refrained from putting them to death." To the same effect in the following verses. Pharaoh asked, "Wherefore have ye done this thing, to *let* (not really make) the male children live?" (verse 18) and then gave command, "Every daughter shall ye (not *cause*, but) *suffer* to live" (verse 22).

In the *hiphil* conjugation, the same modification occasionally obtains. Deu. viii. 3 (literally) "*caused* thee to hunger," in fact, "*suffered* thee to hunger" (as in both A.V. and R. V.); S. Song ii. 14, "*Cause* me to see thy form," that is, "*Let* me see thy form," in one word, "Appear": "*cause* me to hear thy voice," "*let* me hear thy voice," "speak"; Isa. lv. 6, "Seek Yahweh while he *causeth* himself to be found," more freely, but quite correctly, "while he *letteth* himself be found." And so on, through a considerable number of examples in the aggregate, though still a minority when all the occurrences of the words are surveyed.

If it be asked. How are we to judge whether, in a particular instance, we have come upon an exception to the general rule? the answer is, You can only decide from context and circumstance—taking care to employ upon these as much common-sense as possible. Do I *cause* this book to fall to the table? Loosely speaking, yes; strictly, no: I merely *let* it fall; I merely take away the restraint of my grasping hand, and so yield up the book to the causative force of gravitation. God permitted Pharaoh to harden his own heart—spared him—gave him the opportunity, the occasion, of working out the wickedness that was in him. That is all.

If the further enquiry be urged. How are we to make up for the want of "context"? how are we to be sure that we are sufficiently acquainted with the "circumstances" of a particular case, to decide whether we are justified in concluding that here, in any given instance, we may rightfully subdue the apparent *cause* into the mere *occasion* or *permission*?—if this be the tenour of our enquiry—well, we must do our best, and leave the remainder. Generally, we shall only need to revert to the known nature of things, or the known character of persons, to find clear guidance. We know, for instance, that a liberated bird likes to fly away; and, furthermore, that its liberator has no power to attach an impelling force to the winged creature; therefore, it is quite enough for Noah to *let go* the raven and the dove (Gen. viii. 7, 8); though, with the Hebrew, we can say he *sent* them *forth*, knowing that no one can be misled thereby. And we can so well understand the eagerness of Eliezer to depart with the bride he had secured for Isaac, as to feel sure that he needed neither physical force nor insult to *send* him back to his master: it was enough to be allowed to go. It is true there may be cases we do not so readily comprehend as we

do these. But in all such instances as that whereunto these minor ones are designed to lead up, we do positively know enough to settle them with reference to the one question now in hand. We know that God is holy. We know that He hates all sin. We know that there is in Him no complicity with wickedness. And, therefore, we know that, however much and however long He permits iniquity and rebellion. He never is the efficient cause of it. And so, finally, we know that He Himself put no wicked motive force into Pharaoh's heart, to impel him to defy his Maker.

2. A very few words on the second point will suffice. Commands, even when positive in form, are sometimes clearly seen to be *permissive only* in sense. Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, desired of Joab that he might run with tidings of Absalom's death to King David. Joab refused. Ahimaaz renewed his request, till at length his general said, "Run." That was Joab's permission—no more! (2 Sam. xviii. 23). Again, the sons of the prophets at Jericho asked leave of their new master, Elisha, to send fifty men to seek the lost Elijah "on the mountains or in the valleys." At first Elisha replied, "Ye shall not send." But, when they urged him until he was ashamed, he said, "Send." A command, you may say! But did Elisha himself regard it in that light? On the contrary, when the seekers for Elijah returned without success, he exclaimed, "Did I not say unto you. Do not go?" (2 Kings ii. 16-18.) Why multiply illustrations? Let it suffice to apply those already given. There is at least a single case in which the Most High appears to have commanded an act of deception (1 Kings xxii. 22). How ought that to be understood? In reply we need not take advantage of the highly dramatic form of the representation of which this forms a single item—we need not urge that the prophet Micaiah was in peril of his life, daring to oppose two absolute monarchs, one of whom mortally hated him; though all that is worth remembering. We can go straight to the ultimate mark by declaring that the words of God to the seducing spirit can and must be regarded as absolutely neither more nor less than a permission to deceive. Either this, or the holiness of God is a myth, and the Bible has been written in vain. In fine, on the revealed character of God we rest.

"A Rock! faultless his work,
For all his ways are just,—
A God of faithfulness, and without perversity,
Right and fair is he!"—(Deu. xxxii. 4.)

PROPITIATORY COVERING.

INSTEAD of "make atonement for" this translation has, mostly, "put a propitiatory covering over"; and this is undeniably a more adequate rendering of the original *kipper*. The verb *kipper* is the intensive (*pi`el*) form of *kâphar*, which by general consent means *to cover*. And though *kipper* is set apart to denote moral covering, generally by sacrifice, yet it does not follow that the mental conception of covering is thereby lost. Indeed the prevailing reference of this species of covering to persons as its object, and the favourite construction of the verb with *`al* "upon" and *ba`ad* "about," point clearly to the wisdom of preserving the more graphic rendering which has here been ventured, and which preserves the striking idealism of the Hebrew. Speaking of the application of *kipper* to various classes of offerings, the Oxford Gesenius (p. 498) says: "Underlying all these offerings there is the conception that the persons offering are covered by that which is regarded as sufficient and satisfactory by Yahweh." Although this thought may be held to abate something of its picturesqueness when the action is regarded as taking effect on inanimate objects such as the "altar," "the tent of meeting," &c.—yet these merely derived applications can scarcely be taken to efface the deeper idealism, where that aptly holds good. *Kipper* may easily be said to signify "to atone," but the question arises, what is the radical O.T. conception of "atonement"? Or, the word in question may be held to denote "forgiveness," but still the question is pertinent, Has this great "atoning" word

nothing to say regarding the means by which forgiveness is secured? The more must this question be pressed, that in many instances (till it becomes the standing formula in the book of Leviticus) forgiveness is spoken of as a sequel to the atoning act rather than that act itself. The atoning lies behind the forgiving. Even where the verb “to forgive” would seem an apt rendering of the Hebrew *kipper*, it will generally be found that the more graphic translation which keeps up a filament of connection with the sacrificial means by which forgiveness is secured, is to be preferred. The great gain of this rendering, however, most clearly comes in throughout those numerous cases in which there is an undeniable surrender of *life for life*. The sacrifice *covers* the sinner—how? By dying in his stead. One life covers another when one is surrendered and the other therefore spared. The blow must fall; for the wages of sin is death, and without the shedding of blood there is no remission. But it falls on the substituted life. The dead covers the living. The living is ransomed—pardoned—set free. Such covering is essentially propitiatory covering. Substitution is of its essence. Any possible abuse of this fundamental Hebrew concept, will be averted by doing careful and equal justice to the entire Levitical ritual. The offerer consents to the substitution; and by himself or his representative takes an essential part in the transfer of the penalty of the sin which he confesses. Man consents; God consents. The substitutionary death is granted by God: it is accepted by man. It is accepted under the solemn stipulation that the spared life shall be wholly consecrated to the holy and merciful God who brings near this costly salvation. One thing is wanting in the ritual—the consent of the substitute. Nay, a second thing is missing—adequacy of value in the substituted. Be it so! Then when a substitute shall appear who shall willingly bear the sin of the world, and be worthy to bear it; and God consents and ordains; and man consents and accepts; then the whole Ideal of Propitiatory Covering will be complete. It remains for the World and for the Individual to carry the matter to its practical consummation.

SIN = SIN-OFFERING = SIN-BEARER.

ONE of the most striking and significant facts in the language of Leviticus and of the O.T. generally is that the sin-offering and the guilt-offering are in Hebrew called simply “sin” and “guilt”—the victim being called by the name of the offence which it bears and for which it dies. As this usage could not have been intended to confound moral delinquency or abnormal moral condition with an innocent and unoffending animal, the usage can only be regarded as vividly setting forth the close connection between sin and death—the doom of sin to end in death—the destiny of the sin-bearer to carry the sin unto death and realise its termination in death. The sacrifice thus becomes an impressive object-lesson—a dramatic representation of pathetic moral instructiveness. The victim is put in the offender’s place, and is then slain. One sins; another dies. Between these two facts is interposed the symbolical ceremony of the laying-on (or more exactly, the leaning-on) of the hands of the sinner upon the head of the sin-bearer. The sin is thereby represented as transferred from the former to the latter: the sin, not indeed in its moral blame-worthiness, but in its legal answerableness. To render such a transference possible, Divine sanction is essential. It is chiefly and ultimately against God that sin is committed. His primal law is that the person who sins—the same shall die (Eze. xviii. 4); and he (Yahweh himself) alone can commute or transfer the penalty. Besides, all life is his gift and care. No animal can be lawfully slain without his permission. Hence, in divinely-appointed sacrifice, his permission is seen—a fact formally and solemnly enunciated in Leviticus xvii. 11. He grants, within certain limits what he alone could rightfully grant, the substitution of life for life upon the altar of sacrifice. But although, this divine sanction is essential to acceptable substitutionary sacrifice, the interest and obligation of the offender must not be overlooked. He has done the wrong, and it is for him to make amends, if he can, and if he may. And it is worthy of note that between him and his substitute a near relation is presupposed or secured. To die for me, the lamb must

be mine. Accordingly the pascal lamb was to be selected and brought to the offerer's home, there to be petted and pitied—so as to render the offering of it the offering of his own heart—of himself (Exo. xii. 3—6). In like manner, on the great Day of Propitiation, when all the sacrifices of the year were summed up and completed, it was *from the people* that the priest was instructed to accept the sin-bearers which were to be offered in their behalf (Lev. xvi. 5). It is of course conceivable that the sinner may be unable to provide an acceptable sacrifice; in which case it is possible that God himself may provide the Lamb (Gen. xxii. 8); and indeed a glimmering perception of the possible need of some notable Divine provision seems to have prophetically carried away the patriarch Abraham into the bestowal, upon Mount Moriah, of the name “Yahweh-yireh” (“Yahweh will provide”), and to have induced others to prolong the anticipation in the saying, “In the mountain of Yahweh shall provision be made” (Gen. xxii. 14). The need of Divine Sanction to the constitution of efficacious Substitution attains its most weighty expression when we read in the prophets: “YAHWEH caused to light upon him the iniquity of us all” (Isa. liii. 6). No other than He could make that transference—be the Suffering Servant who he may. In view of the impressive lesson thus afforded, and which is so prominent in the book of Leviticus (where the word *hattath*—for nineteen times it means sin—fifty-three times stands for the sin-victim) the translator would fain have followed the severity of the Hebrew and used the one name “sin” throughout. Doubting the intelligibility of such a terminology at present, he has not ventured on that course. He has, however, preferred “sin-bearer” to “sin-offering,” as penetrating just a little further into the heart of the matter. “Sin-bearer,” meantime, may aptly remind us not only of Isa. liii. 6, but of I. Pet. ii. 24; but if we should ever be able to “homologate” the one term “sin” (for *hattath*) throughout the book of Leviticus, we should assuredly have climbed the high level which would conduct us triumphantly into the great Pauline utterance of 2 Cor. v. 21. The translator is pleased (on reviewing the three editions of his N.T.) to see that he has hitherto resisted the temptation to substitute “sin-offering” for “sin” (“made him to be sin”) in that passage, and he traces it to the influence over him of this remarkable usage in Leviticus: “sin-offering”—yes! but what constitutes a “sin-offering” save the imputation of “sin”? The ancient usage was intensely dramatic; it led the offerer, as he viewed his substitute, to exclaim, “There goes—there dies—my Sin!”

ERRATA

Deuteronomy xxxii. 5: *for* “son,” *read* “sons.”

Isaiah i. 9: *for* “left as,” *read* “left us.”

Isaiah lxv. 20: *for* “accused,” *read* “accursed.”

ABYSS.

It is easy to say that this word, according to its derivation signifies “bottomless”; and that it is sometimes employed, more generally, to denote “unfathomed,” “boundless,” “enormous”; but its chief interest, as a N.T. word, lies in the question how far it is synonymous with “hades.” Suffice it here to connect it with that larger subject, and to observe that in the Christian Writings it occurs only in the following places: Lu. viii. 31; Ro. x. 7; Rev. ix. 1, 2, 11; xi. 7; xvii. 8; xx. 1, 3.

AGE.

To trace the Biblical development of the Ages is to gain a point from which many far-reaching observations may be made. The *first* thing to note is, that the idea of an “age” is one of comparatively slow growth. The Biblical parent of the Greek *aion* is the Hebrew *olâm*, and the root conception of *olâm* is concealed duration. Concealed duration is naturally unknown and unbounded; and it should be carefully remembered that it is from this radical conception of the nouns *olâm* and *aion* that the force of the qualifying terms *l’olâm* and *aiônios* springs. (See below on Age-abiding.) The *second* thing to observe is, that duration does not fall into “ages” until it acquires character, and there is a transition of the times from one character into another. Only by degrees can a period round itself off into a “golden age,” and then, by some observable transition, the time become so changed as to appear as only a “silver age” in comparison; or “an age of barbarism” undergo such an amelioration as to become gradually merged into “an age of civilisation.” Accordingly it is not till we get far on in the O.T. that we meet with *olâmim* in the plural. The *third* thing to notice is, that “ages” may be so modified by local conditions as to vary with country and sphere; so that the ages in different lands may be far from simultaneous. While one country is advancing in civilisation or religion, another may be receding. A golden age may not be world-wide; a barbaric period may not afflict all lands at once and an age of activity in one direction may be an age of stagnation or retrogression in another. In fine, ages may overlap and interlace and interchange; and the result may be one of the utmost complexity, calling for the most thoughtful and guarded discrimination. “The patriarchal age” may, for the Hebrews, be changed into “the Mosaic,” and yet for other nations remain patriarchal still. “The Mosaic age” naturally affects those only who come under Moses. It is folly for Gentiles to speak as if they had once been under Moses if they never were. The *fourth* point of importance is, that only as a change of age is supernaturally superinduced can we assume to characterise a given age as a divine dispensation. It cannot be affirmed that God has placed under Moses nations whom at the same time he is “suffering to walk after their own ways “ (Ac. xiv. 16). The *fifth* consideration that arises is, that larger ages may include smaller ones. The larger age of Mosaism may embrace the smaller ages of the Judges, of the Kings, of the Dispersions. The final Christian age may resolve itself into the age of the Church, to be followed by the age of the Kingdom. Nay, we may go further and affirm, that all ages, up to a given point, may be predominantly evil, and then, from that point onward, be wholly or prevailingly good. When the foregoing factors of thought have been patiently digested, the student to whom the subject is new may find it comparatively easy to accommodate his mind to the crowning discrimination which can be traced in the Christian Scriptures, and in tracing which the eye will rest on the following land-marks. “This age” and “the coming” are terms which describe a distinction which runs through the New Testament (Mt. xii. 32; Eph. i. 21). (i.) “This Age” is characterised as one of anxieties (Mk. iv. 19); of a commingling of good seed and bad in the field sown by the Son of Man (Mt. xiii. 24-30, 36-43); of persecutions (Mk. x. 30); of need for nonconformity (Ro. xii. 2; Tt. ii. 12); of the crucifying of the Lord of glory by its rulers (1 Co. ii. 8); or the deification of

Satan (2 Co. iv. 4); of the prevalence of evil (Gal. i. 4, cp. Eph. ii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 10). (ii.) “The coming age” will be signalled by the forthshining of the glory of the Lord (Tt. ii. 13; 1 Co. xv. 23); the resurrection from among the dead (Lu. xx. 35); the bestowal of age-abiding life (Mk. x. 30; Lu. xviii. 30); and the forthshining of the righteous in the kingdom (Mt. xiii. 39, 43).—“The conclusion of the age” is spoken of in Mt. xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20; “the conjunction of the ages,” Heb. ix. 26; and “the ends of the ages,” 1 Co. x. 11. (Cp. note on “Age-abiding” below.)

AGE-ABIDING.

Age-abiding: that is, lasting for an indefinite or perpetual age; or abiding from age to age. The reasons for adopting this rendering of the Greek adjective *aionios* are: (i.) to keep up a close connection with the word “age” as the translation, in this New Testament, of the cognate noun *aion*; and (ii.) to avoid, as too restricted, the confinement of the idea to any particular, limited age. It is true that *aion* does not of itself mean absolute eternity, otherwise it would not submit to be multiplied by itself, as in the familiar phrase “aions of aions,” which would then be equivalent to “eternities of eternities”; and it is further true that, in the history of divine revelation, *aion* sometimes puts a dispensational limit upon itself, so far as that the dawn of a new *aion* or “age” serves to close and exclude an old *aion* or “age,” the end of which was aforesaid concealed in the mists of an undefined futurity (cp. note on “Age,” above). But, with all this, it is most important to remember that “age” is not the primary meaning of *aion* rather, “duration indefinitely extended.” Moreover, it seems to be as clothed with this more primitive significance, that the qualifying word *aionios* comes into use. The noun *aion* itself clings to this fundamental notion in the well-known idiomatic phrase *eis ton aiona* (lit. “into” or “unto the age”); in the interpretation of which, if the force of idiom be ignored, and each word be pressed on its individual merits, the reader will be continually teased by feeling that he is being referred to some particular and pre-eminent age, which ought to be well known, while all the time it is unknown. He may say: “‘Unto the age’—unto what age?” and there will be nothing in context or circumstance to tell him; whereas, once assume the existence of an idiom, and then all perplexity is at an end—*l’olâm*, *aionios* and *eis ton aiona* become very nearly equivalent expressions, the essence of which is “indefinite continuance.” The Hebrew servant’s bondage, for example, is to be indefinitely prolonged: it is to be for life—the end of which cannot be seen (Exo. xxi. 6). So also the Hebrew priesthood was appointed for indefinite continuance, when as yet it could not be foreseen that a change in the priesthood would necessitate a change in the law (Exo. xl. 15; He. vii. 12). The surrender of Samuel, by his mother, to the priestly service is to be taken as equally undefined (1 S. i. 22). To the barrenness of the fig-tree no limit can be assigned (Mt. xxi. 19). The son does not cease to be welcome in his father’s house, save by externally induced bounds to possibility (Jn. viii. 35). Upon the “aionion correction” (Mt. xxv. 46) no arbitrary limit can be laid,—unless indeed the essential nature of “correction” implies it—*aionios* of itself utterly refuses to settle the dread question. If the equally “aionion life” is to be endless, that is best made out from the mighty negatives of Scripture (“immortal,” “incorruptible,” “unfading”: 1 Co. xv. 51-54; 1 P. i. 4), and from the correlative promise. “Because I live ye also shall live” (Jn. xiv. 19; He. vii. 16).

ANGEL. *See* MESSENGER.

ASSEMBLY.

It is well-known that the Greek word for “Church” is *ecclesia*; and that *ecclesia* strictly and fully means “called-out-assembly;” but inasmuch as a phrase only very awkwardly represents a single word, and by frequent repetition may become wearisome, not to say even misleading (by forcing one element of the significance into unnatural prominence), it has been deemed sufficient in this version to let “assembly” uniformly

stand for the original *ecclesia*, and to leave the reader to invest the word with that accession of ideas which the known facts gather about it. The “call” of the glad-message can be read by everyone who cares to inform himself; the separateness of the standing and life to which the summons invites can be readily ascertained; and so the lofty ideal set before the assembly of the Son of God may soon disclose itself to the humble and ardent inquirer. It must be left for each reader to judge how far existing ecclesiastical organisations help or hinder the attainment of that ideal. Only let no one presume to dim the divinely given image.

BAPTISM. *See* IMMERSION.

BEELZEBUL (BEELZEOUL).

This and not “Beelzebub” is the form ordinarily found in Greek New Testaments; but Westcott and Hort print the name as “Beezeboul,” after the Sinai and Vatican MSS., and think there is “no sufficient reason for discarding this form of an obscure name, unknown except from the N.T.” They go on to say that “In the N.T. *Beelzebub* has no Greek authority.” (Appendix to Introduction, p. 159.) “Baal-zebub,” we may observe, however, is found in 2 K. i. 2, 3, 6, and signifies “Lord of flies.” Baal-zebul, according to Fuerst, means “Lord of the heavenly dwelling.” Cp. 2 Co. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2. Dr. Davies, however, in his Heb. Lex. gives a different account of the word Beelzeboul. He says: “The proper name baalzeboul, beelzeboul, Mt. x. 25, prob. means *lord of dung*, *zeboul* being here akin to Chal. *zebel*, *dung*; the slight change from *zebul* serving perh. to express contempt for the Philistine god, and perh. alluding to the connection between flies and dung or putrid things.” Heb. Lex. p. 176.

CHRIST.

Or, “Anointed”—a term to be understood by the types and prophecies found in Exo. xxx. 22-33; 1 S. x. i; xvi. 13; xxiv. 6; Ps. ii. 2; xlv. 7; Is. xi. 2-5; lxi. 1-3; Dan. ix, 25, 26; and by the great fact stated in Mt. iii. 16; Acts iv. 27; x. 38. Sometimes the word is used as a simple appellative, or descriptive epithet, in which cases the *meaning* comes to the front, and the word should be *translated*; more commonly, however, the word is an official title approaching a proper name: hence, in the majority of its occurrences, it is here merely *transferred*. It is impossible to be absolutely sure in all cases whether it should be translated or whether it should be transferred. W. and H. say: “We doubt whether the appellative force, with its various associations and implications, is ever entirely lost in the New Testament, and are convinced that the number of passages is small in which Messiahship, of course in the enlarged apostolic sense, is not the principal intention of the word.” (Intro. p. 317.) When we reflect that proper names themselves are now and again used with an evident reference to their meaning, and yet that to insist on always translating proper names would work such havoc in literature as to make intelligible history well-nigh impossible, we may become tolerant with a translator even if he should occasionally err in dealing with significant titles,—sometimes (it may be thought) translating where he should transfer, and at other times transferring where he should rather translate. Something, moreover, may be left to the expositor, who will do well to remind his hearers of the meaning of titles and even proper names whenever he feels that so to do will add to the luminousness and force of the text before him.—For the intimate relation between the anointing of the Head and that of the Body, see Ps. cxxxiii. 2; 2 Co. i. 21, and 1 Jn. ii. 20, 27.

COVENANT.

The N.T. word *diathēkē* signifies “covenant,” because it is the Sep. rendering of the Heb. *b'rēth* which everywhere in the O.T. means covenant and covenant only. This

argument from Septuagintal usage is immensely strengthened by observing along what a highway of Divine dealing the word *diathēkē* passes into the N.T. Let us look at these two points in succession. That “covenant” is the meaning of *b’rēth* is sufficiently attested by the fact that the Oxford “Gesenius” assigns to it no other. If, however, we pass from lexical authority to actual usage, we discover the most abundant and varied evidence that “covenant” is indeed the one meaning of *b’rēth*. It is a word in common use to denote all sorts of covenants between all sorts of persons: *e.g.* between Abraham and Amorites (Gen. xiv. 13), Jacob and Laban (xxxix. 44), Joshua and Gibeonites (Jos. ix. 6-16). Solomon and Hiram (1 K. v. 12)—to instance only a few examples out of many. In some cases, moreover, there is such a passing from the human to the divine, or from the divine to the human, as to fix the sense in the higher application by the undeniable force of the lower reference: “I will never break my covenant (*b’rēth, diathēkē*) with you; and ye shall make no covenant (*b’rēth, diathēkē*) with the inhabitants of this land” (Jdg. ii 1, 2). And it should be observed that never once, as between man and man, does *b’rēth* mean a “testament” or “will,” to come into force when the testator is dead. Advancing now to the second point. The word *diathēkē* first appears in the N.T. over the Lord’s table, from the lips of the Lord himself: “This is my blood of the *diathēkē*” (Mt. xxvi. 28; Mk. xiv. 24); The words “blood of the *diathēkē*” are from Exo. xxiv. 8; from which passage we learn that there was a *diathēkē* entered into at Sinai—was it a “testament” or a “covenant”? According to Lu. xxii. 20 and 1 Co. xi. 25, the word “new” was prefixed to *diathēkē*; and this at once sends us to Jer. xxxi. 31, where old and new are brought into contrast (cp. He. viii. 13). This then is the highway by which the word *diathēkē* comes into our Christian Scriptures—from Moses by way of Jeremiah into the upper room at Jerusalem. Under these circumstances it is confidently submitted that the same meaning must hold good throughout: if it was a “testament” at the Last Supper, then it must have been a “testament” in Jeremiah, and a “testament” in Exodus—which even the A.V. does not affirm; whereas, working in the opposite direction, if it was a “covenant” in Exodus and a “covenant” in Jeremiah, as even the A.V. has it, then the word must have meant “covenant” and not “testament” on the lips of our Lord and in the letter of his Apostle. It is granted that *diathēkē* in the classics sometimes means “will,” but heathen writings can be of no avail to darken the line of light which shines through our *sacred* classics. The only legitimate doubt is whether the writer to the Hebrews does or does not for just a moment (chap. ix. 16, 17) step aside from the sacred usage to the profane. Even if he does, it is only for a moment; it being clear, for reasons given above, that the word “covenant” certainly ought to stand in verses 15 and 20. In this N.T. the one word has been carried through the whole passage, not even excepting verses 16 and 17; since it was felt that it may have been assumed by the sacred writer that no covenant between man and man was at any time regarded as final and binding until in some way a solemnising death had been interposed; not the actual death, of course, of the covenanting parties, but a representative death: as if to proclaim once for all that each party was as good as dead to any further change of mind, and as if to invoke the penalty of death on the violator of the compact. There was this further apprehension also: that even as between God and man, it may have been a part of the Divine condescension to freely accept the suggestion that the ever-Living One could as soon die as break his word. This is ground upon which the reverent mind would fain tread with the utmost caution; but when once the horror of a great darkness has come upon us for our sins, the stricken soul may be glad to see in the smoking hearth and torch of fire by which the patriarch Abraham was conducted into covenant relationship with God an impressive symbol of the Mystery of the Cross. As surely as God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself (2 Co. v. 19), so surely does God himself lead the way into an abiding covenant of life and peace. Will the reader, before altogether declining this suggestion, very carefully consider the following three passages: namely, Gen. xv. 7-21; Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19; and Heb. xiii. 20, 21? In any case, the

foregoing considerations have influenced the present translator in declining to think it likely that the eloquent writer to the Hebrews would suddenly start aside from the sacred associations of the ancient Divine Covenants to strengthen his argument by an altogether unlooked-for and rather inconsequent allusion to ordinary testamentary dispositions. So much towards the settlement of the correct rendering. Once that is settled, there remains scope for the exercise of sweet reasonableness; since, even among men, contracts are entered into with varying degrees of freedom. There may be, and often is, more authority to impose terms on the one side than there is liberty on the other to decline them; and yet the advantages of a truly covenanting transaction may by no means be lost.

DEMON.

Without entering upon the much-debated question as to who or what the demons of the N.T. were, the following points, if carefully observed, may prepare the reader for fuller investigation: *first* that demons are ranged under Satan as their ruler (Mt. xii. 24-28); *second* that they, or some of them, were “impure” (Mk. iii. 30; v. 8; Lu. iv. 33); *third* that they had an earlier perception of the truth that Jesus was the Son of God than had the men around him (Mk. i. 24; Lu. viii. 28); *fourth* that they had a dread of torment and a desire to avoid premature consignment thereto (Mt. viii. 29); *fifth* that they shrank from the “abyss” (Lu. viii. 31: see above. “Abyss”); *sixth* that demon worship is noted as a fact in the Holy Scriptures (1 Co. x. 20; Rev. ix. 20); *seventh* that their knowledge of God causes them to “shudder” (Jas. ii. 19); and *eighth* that the Apostle Paul (in 1 Tim. iv. 1-3) makes a remarkable allusion to them, as the authors of seductive teaching, in which passage it is clear from the Greek that they are the demons who speak falsely, are cauterised in their own consciences, forbid to marry, etc. Before dismissing this phase of the question, it should be observed in the following O.T. passages the word “demon” should appear: Lev. xvii. 7; Deu. xxxii. 17; 2 Ch. xi. 15; Ps. cvi. 37. At the same time it is right to remember the latitude with which the word was employed among heathen nations; among whom “demons” were sometimes regarded as deities not necessarily evil; else we may fail to see that the Apostle Paul was far from needlessly offending the Athenians, whom, of course, he wished to conciliate (Ac. xvii. 22).—In this version demons are never termed “devils.”

EVIL ONE.

The Greek *ponērou* may be either masculine or neuter; and therefore mean either “evil one” or “evil.” “But,” says Trench (Parables, p. 469), “the analogy of Mat. xiii. 19, 39; Ep. vi. 16; 2 Thess. iii. 3 would lead us to translate in the Lord’s prayer *ponērou* as a masculine. It was always so interpreted in the Greek Church.”

GEHENNA.

This word occurs only in the following places in the New Testament: Mt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xviii. 9; xxiii. 15, 33; Mk. ix. 43, 45, 47; Lu. xii. 5; Ja. iii. 6. The word itself seems to have been formed by abbreviation from the Hebrew phrase for “the valley of the son or sons of Hinnom” *gey ben (b’ne)hinnom*; then “valley of Hinnom,” *gey hinnom*; and so, at length, simply, *ge-henna*: Jer. vii. 32; 2 K. xxiii. 10; Ja. xv. 8. *Hinnom*, says Dr. Davies (Heb. Lex.), is “probably the proper name masculine of the man to whom the valley on the south side of Jerusalem once belonged, where children were sacrificed to Moloch.” Whether the N.T. use of the word does not point to something beyond the present life, must be left to the solemn consideration of the student. It would seem evident, in the N.T. at least, that a marked distinction exists between hades and gehenna; but whether the O.T. notion of “the lowest hades” did or did not approximate to the N.T. conception of gehenna, might perhaps be worthy of consideration.

GLAD-MESSAGE.

Or “good news;” “joyful-tidings;” but no English word, single or compound, seems equal to the beautiful Greek word *euangelion*. “Glad-message” suits well the appointment of messengers (Mk. xvi. 15; Ro. x. 15); the notion of a trust (Gal. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 11); the purpose of a witness (Mt. xxiv. 14); and the claim for submission (Ro. x. 16; 1 P. iv. 17). But in teaching and preaching, synonyms may be effectively interchanged. *Euangelion* in the N.T. deals with: (1) the kingdom (Mt. iv. 23; ix. 35; xxiv. 14; Mk. i. 14, 15; Lu. iv. 43; viii. 1; xvi. 16; Ac. viii. 12, cp. xx. 25);—(2) “Jesus Christ” (Mk. i. 1; Lu. ii. 10; Ac. v. 42; viii. 12,35; xi. 20; Ro. i. 9; 1 Co. ix. 12; 2 Co. ii. 12; Gal. 1.17, 16; Eph. iii. 8; Ph. i. 27; 1 Th. iii. 2; 2 Th. i. 8);—(3) “God” (Ro. i. 1; xv. 16; 2 Co. xi. 7);—(4) “the favour of God” (Ac. xx. 24);—(5) “the glory of God” (2 Co. iv. 4; 1 Tim. i. 11);—(6) “peace” (Ac. x. 36; Eph. ii. 17; vi. 15);—(7) “salvation” (Eph. i. 13);—(8) “the word” (Ac. viii. 4);—(9) “the faith” (Gal. i. 23). It is described as a “great joy” (Lu. ii. 10); and—either the general message, or a special one for a crisis—as “age-abiding” (Rev. xiv. 6). We also read of the “word” (Ac. xv.7), the “hope” (Col. i. 23), the “truth” (Gal. ii. 14), the “readiness” (Eph. vi. 15), and the “sacred secret” (Eph. vi. 19) of the glad-message; and the Apostle Paul speaks of “my glad-message” (Ro. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8), and of “our glad-message” (1 Th. i. 5; 2 Th. ii. 14). The word in the titles to the four evangelical narratives is understood to be traditional, the most ancient copies having simply “According to Matthew,” etc.; at the same time there is much force in the observation of Westcott and Hort (who head each narrative in the manner just described—KATA MATTHAION, etc.,—but place the one word EUANGELION on a preliminary page by itself) that “In prefixing the name EUANGELION in the singular to the quaternion of ‘Gospels,’ we have wished to supply the antecedent which alone gives an adequate sense to the preposition KATA [“according to”] in the several titles.” Intro. p. 231.

HADES.

This word occurs ten times in the N.T.: viz., Mt. xi. 23; xvi. 18; Lu. x. 15; xvi. 23; Ac. ii. 27, 31; Rev. i. 18; vi. 8; xx. 13, 14. It is the almost uniform Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew *sheōl*, which is found sixty-five times in the O.T. In order to form proper Biblical ideas of Hades it is plainly important that all the Scriptures on the subject should be considered; and it is hoped that THE EMPHASISED BIBLE will materially assist in the prosecution of the enquiry,—especially by its uniform rendering of *sheōl* throughout the O.T. by the term “hades,” which may be regarded as sufficiently naturalised in the English language for this purpose. Whether the O.T. conception of *sheōl* is the same as the N.T. conception of *hades*, the reader can judge for himself; whether even the O.T. characterisation of *hades* or *sheol* is uniformly consistent with itself,—of this also the student can now form his own opinion. Let him only trace the word “hades” throughout, from Genesis to Revelation, and the whole matter will be before him; because, although there may be other words (such as “soul,” “death,” “grave,” etc.) which will have something to say on the subject, yet these other words will be sure to come well into view in the long line of contexts which will be found clustering about the one word “hades.”

IMMERSION.

Early in life the translator became convinced that the meaning of the Greek verb *baptizein* is “to immerse.” He accordingly, in the first and second editions of this work, so rendered the word. Having met with nothing during the past twenty years to convict him of error in the course he then took, nothing is left for him but to continue the same rendering. Without entering upon the usual arguments employed by immersionists, he may mention, as an interesting fact, that the translators of the Hebrew version published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, have rendered *baptizein* by the Hebrew word *tāval*,

which it is well-known signifies “to dip.” Indeed the Oxford Gesenius, edited by Drs. Driver, Briggs and Brown, assigns to that word no other meaning than “dip” and “dye”; and as the latter has no relevancy to the ordinance instituted by Christ, we may take it as indisputable that the Trinitarian Bible Society, through means of this version, plainly teaches all converts from Judaism to Christianity that the duty of such Israelites as believe Jesus to be the promised Messiah is to be immersed into Him as their new leader. Plainly what is true for Jew is true also for Gentile.

JESUS.

It may be worth knowing that the J of this name is undoubtedly due to a combination of “Jehovah” with “salvation.” “Yah is help,” tersely says Dr. Davies, in explanation of the O.T. form of the same name (J = Y = Yah = Yahweh = Jehovah). Alone, this proves nothing, since it cannot mean that Joshua was a divine person; but it is competent to the sacred story to invest the name with a profounder significance than it ever had before the advent of the Messiah (Cp. Nu. xiii. 8, 16; Exo. xvii. 9; He. iv. 8; Mt. i. 21; Ph. ii. 9, 10).

JUDGE.

The biblical terms for “judge” and “judgment” become immensely more interesting when widened out to include the ideas, on the one hand, of vindicating the wronged, and on the other, of ruling in general.

KINGDOM.

The history of the King, is to a large extent the history of the Kingdom: promised, presented, rejected, taken into heaven and reserved there to await a more, glorious revelation (cp. Is. ix. 6, 7; Mt. iii. 2; iv. 17; xxi. 43; Lu. xix. 11-27; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16).

KNOW.

Important shades of meaning are: “get to know” (Jn. xvii. 3, 7, 8, 25), “understand” (1 Jn. ii. 3, 13; iv. 16; v. 20), and “approve,” “acknowledge,” (Ps. i. 6; Mt. vii. 23; Ro. viii. 29; 2 Tim. ii. 19).

MAMMON.

It is well-known that the word “mammon” denotes the Syrian god of riches. As that familiar term has practically become fossilised, and its application to deified wealth has become so blunted as to be scarcely felt, it has been deemed better to use, instead, the word Riches with a capital, so restoring to the Master’s warning something of the force he intended it to wield. The word “mammon” occurs in the following places only; Mt. vi. 24; Lu. xvi. 9, 11, 13.

MARK, END OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO.

After a lengthened examination of the evidence, internal, intrinsic and transcriptional, Westcott and Hort conclude that “there is ... no difficulty ... in supposing (1) that the true intended continuation of vv. 1-8 either was very early lost by the detachment of a leaf or was never written down; and (2) that a scribe or editor, unwilling to change the words of the text before him or to add words of his own, was willing to furnish the Gospel with what seemed a worthy conclusion by incorporating with it unchanged a narrative of Christ’s appearances after the Resurrection which he found in some secondary record then surviving from a preceding generation. If these suppositions are made, the whole tenour of the evidence becomes clear and harmonious. Every other

view is, we believe, untenable. . . . It [the addition, vv. 9-20] manifestly cannot claim any apostolic authority; but is doubtless founded on some tradition of the apostolic age.” (Appendix to Introduction, p. 51.)

MESSENGER.

This is confessedly the meaning of the Greek word *angelos*, as it is also of the corresponding Hebrew term *malāk*. When it was that either word was applied to a heavenly messenger and when to an earthly, had always to be learned from context and circumstance, never from the mere word; although perhaps, here and there, a slight presumption may be inferred in favour of a heavenly errand-bearer. How slight that presumption is, may be inferred from a glance at the use of the words. *Angelos* in the N.T. is applied indifferently to John the Immerser (Mt. xi. 10; Mk. i. 2; Lu. vii. 27), to John’s disciples (Lu. vii. 24), to Jesus’ disciples (Lu. ix. 52), to the thorn in the flesh (2 Co. xii. 7), and to the Hebrew spies (Ja. ii. 25). In all these examples the original word is *angelos*. The like use of the Hebrew word *malāk* may be illustrated by a single instance. From Gen. xxxii. 1-3, we learn that, at about the same time that God sent “messengers” to meet Jacob, Jacob sent “messengers” to meet Esau: the simplicity of the grand old history knew nothing of the device of applying a sacred term to God’s messengers and a common one to Jacob’s; it termed both alike *malākim* (as the Septuagint, after it, termed both alike *angeloi*), and left the reader to judge of the rest. To follow this style may cause temporary inconvenience, but will bring gain in the end,—by fixing the mind the more intently upon the errand-work of the messengers of heaven; also by rousing it to perceive that God has other heavenly servants than his “messengers,” even those his attendants, whose peculiar business it is to “stand and wait,” as Ps. ciii. 20, 21 naturally suggests. There are, indeed, still other lessons which the rightful insistence on the word “messenger” is fitted to impart; such as that “the world,” as now constituted, includes “both messengers and men” (1 Co. iv. 9), and that the coming habitable earth will not be, as the earth now is, subject unto messengers, but unto man (He. ii. 5, 6 ff), as though man’s minority, during which he is subject to beings of a foreign race, were to be superseded by his majority, which is to be spent here, in this home, divinely given to him as his inheritance.

MYSTERY. See SACRED SECRET.

PRESENCE.

In this edition the word *parousia* is uniformly rendered “presence” (“coming,” as a representative of this word, being set aside). The original term occurs twenty-four times in the N.T., viz.: Mt. xxiv. 3, 27, 31, 39; 1 Co. xv. 23; xvi. 17; 2 Co. vii. 6, 7; x. 10; Ph. i. 26; ii. 12; 1 Th. ii. 19; iii. 3; iv. 15; v. 23; 2 Th. ii. 1, 8, 9; Ja. v. 7, 8; 2 P. i. 16; iii. 4, 12 and 1 Jn. ii. 28. The sense of “presence” is so plainly shewn by the contrast with “absence” (implied in 2 Co. x. 10, and expressed in Ph. ii. 12) that the question naturally arises,—Why not always so render it? The more so, inasmuch as there is in 2 P. i. 16 also, a peculiar fitness in our English word “presence.” This passage, it will be remembered, relates to our Lord’s transformation upon the Mount. The wonderful manifestation there made was a display and sample of “presence” rather than of “coming.” The Lord was already there; and, being there, he was transformed (cp. Mt. xvii. 2, n.) and the “majesty” of his glorified person was then disclosed. His bodily “presence” was one which implied and exerted “power”; so that “power and presence” go excellently well together—the “power” befitting such a “presence”; and the three favoured disciples were at one and the same moment witnesses of both. The difficulty expressed in the notes to the second edition of this N.T. in the way of so yielding to this weight of evidence as to render *parousia* always by “presence,” lay in the seeming incongruity of regarding “presence” as an event which would happen at a particular time and which would fall into rank as one of a series of events, as 1 Co. xv. 23 especially appeared to require. The translator still

feels the force of this objection, but is withdrawn from taking his stand upon it any longer by the reflection that, after all, the difficulty may be imaginary. The *parousia*, in any case, is still in the future, and may therefore be enshrouded in a measure of obscurity which only fulfilment can clear away: it may, in fine, be both a *period*,—more or less extended, during which certain things shall happen,—and an event coming on and passing away as one of a series of divine interpositions. Christ is raised as a firstfruit—that is one event; He returns and vouchsafes his “presence,” during which he raises his own—that is another event, however large and prolonged; and finally comes another cluster of events constituting “the end.” Hence, after all, “presence” may be the most widely and permanently satisfying translation of the looked-for *parousia* of the Son of Man.

REST. *See* SABBATH.

SABBATH.

Not to enter upon the larger questions which concern the Sabbath or the Lord’s Day, a few critical remarks on the word *sabbath* as it appears in the N.T. may be useful. *First*, this word seems to be sometimes an appellative and sometimes a proper name (“day of rest,” “Sabbath”). *Second*, the term *sabbath* is, in several texts, used in the plural in the Greek, where nevertheless it is evident that only one particular day is intended. Under this head, the following texts are worthy of note: Mt. xii. 1, 11; Mk. i. 21; ii. 23; iii. 2; Lu. iv. 16; xiii. 10; Ac. xiii. 14; xvi. 13. In all these passages the word in the original is in the plural, and yet it is plain that a particular, individual day is intended. Nor is there anything surprising in this for “the Hebrew at times uses plural forms where other languages employ the singular.” (For this, see Gesenius by Davies, p. 243.) *Third*, the word *sabbath* is extended to signify “week.” Even in this there is nothing very far fetched; since the transition from the idea of “rest” to that of “a, rest-bounded period of seven days” is a comparatively natural one. Still the question must be considered mainly as one of fact; although, even so, more demonstrative evidence should not be demanded than the nature of the case admits of; and it often suffices to attach a new meaning to a word, that the ordinary application of it is repeatedly seen to be unnatural, illogical, bewildering, or absurd. Hence the current opinion is probably correct that finds in Lu. xviii. 12 the meaning “I fast twice in the week,” notwithstanding that the word for “week” is here *sabbaton*, in the singular; since it would appear a very paltry boast to say, “I fast twice on the sabbath” when anyone (with more pleasantry than pharisaism) might reply, “I fast three times.” To this example of *sabbaton* in the singular, used in the sense of “week,” may now be added 1 Co. xvi. 2, where not only Westcott and Hort, but the entire board of Revisers find the word in the singular number; and it would seem enough simply to ask the question, Is it credible that the Apostle Paul meant to enjoin on the assemblies of Galatia and on that of Corinth to lay by on “the first [hour] of sabbath” without so much as specifying that it was the first HOUR of the day that he intended? If not, and if “first day of the day” is impossible, what is left but to assume that he meant “first [day] of the week”? “Week” also approves itself in Mt. xxviii. 1; Mk. xvi. 2, Lu. xxiv. 1; Jn. xx. 1, 19; Ac. xx. 7. Does the word in the plural, as it undoubtedly is here, mean “week” or does it allude to a cluster of extraordinary sabbath days on the first of which Jesus arose? There is nothing unnatural in supposing the meaning to be “week”; for, as we have seen (*a*) the word in the plural form may convey a singular idea; (*b*) the word in the singular is twice used in the sense of week. Now let us test the two words “sabbaths” and “week”: “Late in the sabbaths, as it was on the point of dawning into the first of the sabbaths.” Will that stand? Now try “week”: “Late in the week, as it was on the point of dawning into the first of the week.” Here everything is harmonious. With the Hebrews the sabbath closed the week. Late on the sabbath would be late in the week, and the transition is natural from the end of one week to the beginning of the next. Hence the correct rendering here is “week.”

SACRED SECRET.

We have no secrets to hide from the uninitiated. The “sacred secret” of this dispensation has been divulged (Eph. iii. 3-9) and should be blazed abroad (Ro. xvi. 25, 26; Eph. vi. 19); but yet is of a nature unlikely to interest any who are careless of God’s dispensational ways; and of this the Greek *mysterion* aptly reminds us (cp. “Age” above, and 2 Th. ii. 7, n.).

SHEPHERD.

The analogy is obvious between tending a flock and ruling a kingdom; but note, that protecting a flock often calls for force against assailants (cp. 2 S. v. 2. 1 Ch. xi. 2; Ps. xxiii. 1; Is xl. 11; Eze. xxxiv., xxxvii. 24. Mt ii. 6; Rev. ii. 27; vii.17).

SHRINE. *See* TEMPLE.

SOUL.

One cannot but regret the impossibility of making our English word “soul” express just as much as is conveyed by the Greek word *psuchē* and the Hebrew word *nephesh*. The translator may confess that, after a determined endeavour to render the latter term uniformly “soul” throughout the O.T., he was reluctantly constrained to give up the attempt. When, in the book of Esther, it came in at the climax that the Jews were permitted “to stand for their soul.” (*nephesh*—Est. viii. 11), this example proved to be the turning of the scale, and “life” was promptly substituted. It certainly may be worth enquiry, how it comes about that the sacred originals so freely use a concrete word where we sorely feel our need of employing our abstract term “life”; and that this is so, notwithstanding the existence of *chayah* in the Hebrew and *zoē* in the Greek, more exactly answering (as it might have seemed) to the English word “life.” But the fact of stubborn diversity of usage above indicated remains, and it appears necessary to allow “life” to stand in a respectable minority of instances for *nephesh* and *psuchē*. In this edition, therefore, “life” has been admitted into a certain class of passages, of which Mt. xvi. 25, 26 may be named as an example.

SOUL, MAN OF; BODY OF THE.

Notwithstanding what has been said above, “soul” of course remains our leading representative of *psuchē*; and we greatly need an adjective which holds the same relation to “soul” as “spiritual” holds to “spirit.” “Natural” is evidently not the exact word. We might of course say “psychical man” and “psychical body,” in 1 Co. ii. 14, and xv. 44, 46, if we were in the habit of using “psyche” everywhere instead of “soul.” As that is not the case, and as “soulical” has no recognised place in the English language, it seems to the translator, after much thought upon the subject, that the simple circumlocutions placed at the head of this note may prove a not unhappy solution of the difficulty. The Greek adjective *psuchikos*, here discussed, occurs, in the N.T., only in 1 Co. ii. 14; xv. 44, 46; Ja. iii. 15 and Jude 19.

SPIRIT, PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY.

The reader is requested to observe that the very literal rendering, “Holy Spirit” (with no “the” prefixed— rather frequent in the “Acts”) is in no sense due to any doubt of “the personality of the Holy Spirit.” The translator simply declines to admit that the idea of personality is so dominating and exhaustive as to require, by a species of English forcing, to be kept ever to the front. Over and above those precious conceptions which by consent are couched under the word “person,” there are others (scarcely less important), of pervasive influence, of secret, subtle, interpenetrating and embracing energy, which *by us in our weakness* are sometimes more easily caught when the notion of personality is,

for the time, in abeyance. Moreover, as the authors of *The Unseen Universe* well say (p. 173, third edition) "It ought to be remembered that here the word *person* does not mean the same thing as it does when applied to ourselves, but only denotes some distinction that may be regarded as best expressed by this word. *Our* idea of person or individual is derived solely from our experience of that position which *we* occupy in the universe."

SPIRIT VERSUS "GHOST."

It is satisfactory to find *The Revised English Bible* (Eyre Spottiswoode) substituting the word "Spirit" for the venerable but objectionable word "Ghost." Objectionable, certainly, the latter is; notwithstanding that, in many minds, it is clustered about with sacred associations, and is by some strangely regarded as a very bulwark of orthodoxy. The primary objection to it ranges high above any question of taste; and is derived from the circumstance that it makes, in English, an artificial, unfounded distinction, which separates passages which ought to be closely linked together by uniformity of rendering. For example, we have, in the public Versions of 2 Co. xiii. 14 "the communion of the Holy Ghost"; but, in Phi. ii. 1, the "fellowship of the Spirit," a double break, it will be observed, jerking the reader from "communion" to "fellowship," and from "Ghost" to "Spirit," although in the Greek the one passage is the very echo of the other. And this brings us to a subordinate, though very weighty, objection to "Ghost," namely, the essential incongruity of the word at this time of day. For, mark: should anyone think to restore the broken link by a reverse movement, that is to say, by extending *Ghost* to both passages ("If there be, therefore, any fellowship of the Ghost"), would he not be instantly beaten back by a general cry of dismay? It remains to add this only: Given, devout persons who for years have intelligently-preferred and *used* "Spirit," and *in them* a strong revulsion of feeling unites with a clear decision of judgment to decline, as bordering on profanity, any voluntary application of the term "Ghost" to the mighty and gracious Spirit of the Living God.

TEMPLE.

The attempt has here been made to distinguish between *hieron* (temple, inclusive of courts, precincts) and *naos*, the inner building, marking the latter by a capital initial (Mt. xxiii. 16-21, 35) or rendering it "shrine" (Jn. ii. 19; 1 Co. iii. 16; vi. 19) and "sanctuary" (Rev. iii. 12; xi. 1, 2; xiv.-xvi.; xxi. 22).

TENT.

There is a simple beauty in the word "tent" which "tabernacle," notwithstanding its loftier sound, does not possess; and if the Heb. *mishkân* be rendered "habitation," there is neither need nor ground for further distinction.

TORCH.

"The true Hindu way of lighting up is by torches held by men, who feed the flame from a sort of bottle constructed for the purpose."—*Elphinstone*, quoted by *Trench*. (Cp. vii. 16, 20; xv. 4, 5; Job. xli. 19.)

VIRGINITY.

The example of the translator of an excellent version published by Morrish (understood to have been the late J. N. Darby) has emboldened the present translator to adopt "virginity" in 1 Co. vii. 36-38. The immense relief from difficulty thus obtained, and the fact that the word *parthenos* is "sometimes masculine, an unmarried youth" (Liddell and Scott), have been accepted as a justification of this rendering.