

tutors would do better work if they had fewer subjects to teach. I agree with this, and plead that they be relieved. But I feel that a word of defence and explanation ought to be said in all fairness both to tutors and students. To say "that the present Baptist College system is rotten" is saying too much, unless you would underline "system." Many of our tutors are doing splendid work, and this should be recognised; and our students now leaving college are not so illiterate, not so far behind the age, as the article would lead men to suppose.

The writer, in his well-known enthusiasm for reform and in his love of learning, has been carried away, and has not weighed well his words. It seems to me that, unintentionally, he is unjust and unfair to our tutors, himself included. He does not take enough into consideration the im-

provement which has taken place during recent years. We have men in our colleges, and others who have just entered the ministry, who will by and by give a good account of themselves; both as scholars and preachers.

I know that Principal Davies had a difficult task to perform. I admire his courage in consenting even to write on such a subject; especially when others had refused: but more so in performing his task so boldly. I am glad no attempt was made to conceal the weak points in our college system, and that attention has been called to it. I trust the Baptist denomination will lay the matter to heart, and do what it can to make the colleges worthy of itself. But nothing is gained by overstating the truth, which I think has been done. I fear we must read Principal Davies's paper *cum grano salis*.

Jesus Crowned with the Glory of Sonship.

HEBREWS II. 9.

BY THE REV. R. A. MITCHELL, M.A., ABERDEEN.

THE interpretation of this difficult and much disputed passage which I venture to propose agrees with those of Hofmann, Professor Bruce, Dr. Matheson, and Professor Findlay, in referring the clause "crowned with glory and honour" to our Lord's earthly life. Its peculiarity lies in this, that the "glory" to which I suppose the apostolic writer to refer is specifically *the glory of Divine Sonship*. It cannot be objected to this view that it attributes to the writer "a fine modern idea," to which he could hardly be supposed to have advanced.

None of the attempts which have been made to explain the passage by those expositors who refer the words "crowned with glory and honour" to our Lord's present state of exaltation, seem to have been very successful. They are obliged to assign a meaning to the clause about "tasting death" which it will not strictly bear, for it is manifestly preposterous to say that Christ was exalted in order that He might taste death. Professor A. B. Davidson escapes the difficulty by saying that the clause "does not depend upon the immediately preceding words 'crowned with glory'; it either takes

up the words 'for the suffering of death'—suffering which He underwent that He might taste death for every one—or it gives by way of resumption the general meaning of the history of Jesus as stated in verse 9." But this explanation requires us to ascribe to the writer an amount of awkwardness in the constructing of his sentence which one would be slow to ascribe to so skilful a writer as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Bleek, whose view is the same as Dr. Davidson's, is obliged to admit that the writer's mode of expression is here harsh and inexact, though he thinks there is no sufficient ground for the suspicion of Schulz that the text is corrupt. He thinks that to bring out the author's meaning the arrangement of the words in the preceding clause should be altered thus: "*crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death,*" and then the idea supplied, "*which He suffered,*" ὃ ἔπαθεν, "in order that by the grace of God," etc. If, however, we connect the final clause, as we should naturally do, with the words immediately preceding it ("crowned with glory and honour"), we shall be obliged to adopt some such interpretation as that of Principal

Edwards, "That He *may have* tasted death for every man," or that of Mr. G. Milligan, "In order that He might thus in His risen and glorified state *apply the benefits of His death* to every man." But this surely is to force a meaning on the words which, according to the rules of grammatical exegesis, they will not bear. And yet some desperate resource of this kind seems unavoidable if we refer the words "crowned with glory and honour" to our Lord's present state of exaltation.

But is this reference necessary? Do we not see Jesus crowned with glory and honour in His life on earth? Does not the Apostle John say expressly with regard to what he and his fellow-apostles had *seen* with their eyes when the Incarnate Word dwelt among them, "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father"? Professor Findlay, writing upon this subject in the *Expositor* for March 1889, calls attention to the use of the word *see* in the present passage as being applicable rather to the earthly life of Jesus than to His heavenly reign, and remarks: "If there is a word in the New Testament that denotes *sight as opposed to faith*, it is just this verb βλέπω." Is it not the fact that *we see Jesus*, as He moves before us in the gospel records, *crowned with the glory of Divine Sonship*? The moral and spiritual glory with which He there appears invested is what marks Him out as the only-begotten Son. He was crowned with glory and honour on the Mount of Transfiguration; but *how*? "He received from God the Father honour and glory, *when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*" This expression of the complacency with which the Father regarded the Son of His love was just the recognition of the spiritual glory with which He was invested throughout His earthly life, and which shone forth in all its lustre on the holy Mount, when He consecrated Himself anew to the great work of self-sacrificing love which was soon to be consummated in the decease He was to accomplish at Jerusalem. It is possible, as Professor Findlay suggests, that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews may have had this scene specifically before his mind. However that may be, it is certainly a scriptural idea that Christ was invested with the glory of Divine Sonship during His life on earth.

But it may be objected: If this be the glory referred to in the passage before us, how does it

contain no allusion to *sonship*? If the verse *had* contained an *express* allusion to sonship, there would not have been such difficulty as there has been in interpreting it. But surely the idea of sonship is *suggested* by the context. The contrast between the *angels* and the *Son* runs throughout the whole preceding portion of the Epistle. And when we find it said in chap. ii. ver. 5, "Unto the angels hath He not put in subjection the world to come," does not the idea naturally occur, It is to the *Son* that God *has* put the world to come in subjection? Then follows the argument from the 8th Psalm, in which the *dignity* of man is exhibited under these three particulars, his being made a little lower than the angels, his being crowned with glory and honour, and his having all things put in subjection to him. The ideal pictured in this Psalm is realised, first, in Jesus, *the Son*, and secondarily, in the "many sons" whom God will bring to glory by Jesus, and who will share with Jesus, the author of their salvation, in the glory and honour of sonship. The Son and the "many sons," "He that sanctifieth" and "they who are sanctified," "are all of one," that is, of God, the one Father; "wherefore He is not ashamed to call them brethren." The idea of sonship, then, is very prominent throughout the whole context, while it is agreeable to Scripture usage to connect it with the expression "crowned with glory and honour."

It is in the historical person Jesus that the Psalm finds its proper fulfilment. In the view of the writer it is this Jesus of whom the Psalm speaks as "Him who hath been made a little lower than the angels." But this Jesus is *the Son*, and although in assuming the nature of man He has assumed a nature in some respect inferior to the angels, who are immortal spirits, yet we see Him crowned even in His earthly life with a glory and honour greater than that of the angels, the glory of Divine Sonship. This is a glory which, as shown in the previous chapter, no angel could ever claim. But this glory of sonship the Son designs to communicate to those whose nature He has assumed; they are thus to be in very truth His *brethren*. But in order to accomplish this He must *suffer* and *die*. The "suffering of death" on the part of an ordinary man could not accomplish the object desired; it is only *the Incarnate Son* who can "taste death for every man," and destroy him that had the power

of death, and deliver those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

One advantage of the view now stated is that it does not require us to assume that the writer misunderstood or altered the meaning of the *Βραχύ τι* of the Psalm, taking it in a temporal sense = "for a little while," while it is properly an adverb of degree = "only a little." According to our view, the two clauses, "made lower than the angels," and "crowned with glory," do not refer to two successive states through which our Lord is regarded as passing, the states of humiliation and exaltation, but to two aspects of His earthly life.

The view now stated seems to do more justice to the expression "We see Jesus crowned," than that so ably advocated by Professor Bruce (*Expositor* for November 1888), who refers the "glory and honour" with which Jesus is crowned to "His appointment to the honourable and glorious office of Apostle and High Priest of our

profession." The glory which belongs to Him in virtue of His filial relation to the Father is, according to the statement of John, a thing which we see; the glory which we see reveals the relationship. But can it be said in the same sense that we see the glory which belongs to Him in His official character as Apostle and High Priest? Moreover, the glory of which the 8th Psalm speaks, the glory to which man as man is destined, is certainly the glory of Divine Sonship, a glory which can be attained by sinful men only through the suffering and death of the Incarnate Son.

There would have been no difficulty about the passage if the writer had said: We see in Jesus the Son of God become man, that He might taste death for every man. But he puts the same thing in a different form: We see in Jesus man crowned with the glory of Divine Sonship, that the man who is thus crowned might taste death for every man, and so by the grace of God bring "many sons" to glory.

The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

THE TWO ARGUMENTS.

WE have now before us the two theories as to the composition of the Old Testament and its appearance in its present form. Both theories relate more particularly to the historical portions, and of these pre-eminently to the earlier books,—as it is upon these books, and the inferences that appear deducible from their structure, that controversy assumes its most emphasised form.

Into this controversy we must now enter; but it can only be on general and broad issues, the critical discussion of details being out of place in addresses of the nature of the present. All we can hope to do is to obtain a clear view of the two estimates that have been formed of the nature of the Old Testament; to weigh carefully the general arguments which may be advanced on either side; and finally, to set forth clearly the reasons which may appear to justify us in accepting one, and rejecting the other of the two views of the Old Testament

that have now been placed circumstantially before us. This is a case, it will be observed, in which there can be no compromise in any real sense of the word. Each view may derive some useful details from the mode of development adopted in the view to which it is opposed; some results arrived at by the one may be accepted by the other, but there is clearly no common ground. On one side we have historical tradition, on the other literary criticism and analysis. Each must justify itself by its appeal to the facts and circumstances of the case, and by its claim to give a more reasonable and probable account of them than can be given by the other, and reason and common sense must be the arbiters. It is, however, by no means easy in such intricate and complicated questions so to state the matter that issue may fairly be joined upon it, and the argument conducted in a manner that will be intelligible to the general reader. Still the attempt must be made.

Perhaps, then, the simplest mode of conducting