

with more than one intervening wady—it is difficult to understand how it could be at all on the natural route between Rabba and Zoar, at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea.

I do not pretend to be able to explain the discrepancies between De Saulcy and Musil; I shall be satisfied if I have written enough to lead the next commentator on Is 15 to pause before he identifies Şarfa with Luḥith. Buhl, writing in 1896 (the date of his *Geographie*), was justified, on the strength of De Saulcy's statements, in accepting Şarfa as a possible site for Luḥith (notice his 'perhaps'); but whether it can still be maintained, in face of the positions and measurements given by Musil, is the question which will now have to be considered. Musil himself (p. 75) remarks that Râs el-Fâs, or el-Râs (*ibid.* p. 72), $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.E. of the S.E. corner of the Dead Sea, might, so far as the situation goes, be Luḥith. If the *Onomasticon* is to be trusted, Luḥith will have been on an ascent¹ somewhere on the road between Rabba

¹ The context in Is. seems to show that we want an ascent that would be climbed by those leaving Moab. Conversely, Ḥoronaim (Is 15⁵) would be at the bottom of some declivity (see Jer 48³) leading down on the S. or S.W. from the

and the Zoar known to Eusebius. With our present knowledge, it must be obvious, nothing more definite can be said. As the name does not appear to have been preserved, we must, even to fix conjecturally its position, more closely ascertain first what would be the natural route between those two places, and then what are the principal ascents on that route.² The northern site, considered above, must, of course, be unconditionally abandoned.³

high Moabite plateau. Cf. Mesha's inscription, l. 32, where Chemosh says to Mesha, 'Go down, fight against Ḥoronên.'

² Whether the Luḥith mentioned in a Nabataean inscription from Mèdebah is the Luḥith of Is 15 is uncertain. See Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 248.

³ If Musil's measurements are correct, both Rabba and W. Beni-Hamid (Ḥammād) are, in the P.E.F. map and G. A. Smith's map, too far to the N., and the latter on these maps, leading up to Mejdelaïn, really corresponds to Musil's Seil Miḥka'a (leading up to Mejdelaïn); and in the map in *D.B.* Rabba is slightly, and Şarfa is a good deal, too far to the south. In Musil's map, Rabba is very slightly south of the south end of the bay formed by the north projection (ending at Point Costigan) of the promontory el-Lisân; and Şarfa is very slightly S. of the latitude of Point Costigan. The map in *E.B.* (*s.v.* MOAB) rightly omits Luḥith altogether.

(To be continued.)

In the Study.

Gospel.

IN his *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (2nd ed. 1884), Skeat derives the English word 'gospel' from the Anglo-Saxon *gód*, 'God,' and *spell*, 'a story,' 'history,' 'narrative.' Thus the literal sense, he says, is the 'narrative of God,' that is, the life of Christ. Then, he says, 'It is constantly derived from A.S. *gód*, 'good,' and *spell*, 'story,' as though *gód spell* were a translation of Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*.' But Skeat himself proceeds to show that in the *Ormulum* (Introd. 157), written when Anglo-Saxon was not yet forgotten, the word is used in the sense of the Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*, 'good news.' The words are 'Godspell onn: Enngliss nemmnedd iss god word and god tithennde,' i.e. 'Gospel is named in English good word and good tiding.' Marsh had already pointed this out, and had quoted another example from the *Ormulum* (Introd. 175) and one from Layamon

(iii. 182). The example from Layamon is, *And beode ther godes godd-spel*, i.e. 'and preach there God's gospel,' a phrase, says Marsh, not likely to be employed if 'gospel' had been understood to mean of itself 'God's story,' or the life of Christ. On the other hand, Marsh points out that in Continental Old Saxon 'gospel' undoubtedly meant the life of Christ, and only the life of Christ (see *Student's English Language*, 2nd ed. 1863, p. 26).

Murray has settled the question.¹ The word, he says, doubtless originally was *gód spell*, that is, 'good tidings,' being a rendering of the Lat. *bona adnuntiatio*, which was current, as an explanation of Lat. *evangelium*, Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*. But when the word passed into the languages of the Teutonic peoples evangelized from England, it was adopted as the translation of *evangelium*, which at the time meant chiefly one of the first four books of the New Testament, or a portion of the liturgy.

¹ In his new edition (1910) Skeat agrees.

We must therefore take the word as originally meaning 'good news,' like the Lat. *evangelium* and the Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*. And when Emerson (*Brief History of the English Language*) compares *gospel*, 'God's story,' with *gossip*, i.e. *god sib*, 'related to God,' 'sponsor,' and with *goodbye*, 'God be wi' ye,' he is taking *gospel* in its secondary meaning. This secondary meaning probably arose from contracting the title 'the Gospel according to St. Matthew' into 'the Gospel of St. Matthew.'

But the Greek and Latin words were both used in the secondary sense. Trench says that the earliest occurrence of the Greek word as applied to the four inspired records of the ministry of our Lord is in Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 66). Yet how easily the one meaning could slip into the other is seen in *Peres the Ploughman* (343):

'Lere me to som man my crede for to lerne,
That lyveth in lel lyf and loveth no synne,
And glosseth nought the godspell';

or in Shakespeare (*Twelfth Night*, v. i. 295):

'A madman's epistles are no gospels.'

Becon says: 'The Greek word *evangelion*, which we call *gospel* in English, soundeth in our common tongue a good, joyful, and merry message' (*Works*, p. 113, Parker Soc.). But Becon's contemporary, Thomas Elyot, says: 'Nowe be we comen to the newe testament, and principally the bokes of the Euangelistes, vulgarely called the gospels' (*The Governour*, ii. 391); for both meanings have been in use throughout the history of the word.

Besides being translated into the purely English word 'gospel,' the Lat. *evangelium* was itself taken into English (through the French) in the form 'evangel.' The oldest example in Murray is from Hampole's *Psalter*, about 1340. Murray says that in England the word was, in the seventeenth century, already archaic and purely literary, but in Scotland remained in current use as a synonym for 'gospel' until a still later period. In addition to the examples in the *Oxford Dictionary*, and perhaps better than any of them, take this from Taverner's *Postils*, of date 1540 (Oxford ed. p. 248): 'The euangell or glad tydynges of oure saluation (whyche thyng we call commonly in Englyshe a gossell).'

Evangel has the advantage of being easily turned into a verb, 'evangelize,' and a personal subst. 'evangelist.' But 'gospel' itself could once be used as a verb, and there was a subst. 'gospeller.'

Sir John Cheke in Mt. 11⁵ has simply 'gospeld' for A.V., 'have the gospel preached to them'—'ye deed be raised, and ye beggars be gospeld.' 'Gospeller' was used for a preacher of the gospel, as well as for one of the four Evangelists. Wyclif's translation in Is 41²⁷ is 'to Jerusalem an evangelist I shal gyue,' which in Purvey's version becomes 'y schal gyue a gossellere to Jerusalem'; while in the preface to Matthew's Gospel, Wyclif says: 'Matheu that was of Judee, as he is set first in ordre of the gosselleris, so he wroot first the gospel in Judee.' In the old rubrics the gosseller is the reader of the gospel in the Communion Office.

In one of his sermons Thomas Adams tells this story (*Works*, i. 33). What does 'gospel' mean in it? 'A boy was molested with a dog; the friar taught him to say a gospel by heart, and warranted this to allay the dog's fury. The mastiff spying the boy, flies at him; he begins, as it were, to conjure him with his gospel. The dog, not capable of religion, approacheth more violently. A neighbour passing by bids the boy take up a stone; he did so, and throwing at the dog, escaped. The friar demands of the lad how he sped with his charm. "Sir," quoth he, "your gospel was good, but a stone with the gospel did the deed." The curs of Antichrist are not afraid of our gospel, but of our stones: let us fight, and they will fly.'

Not Ashamed.

I.

God not Ashamed.

He 11¹⁶, 'God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God.'

He was called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and we are told that He was not ashamed to be called their God. When He appeared to Moses in Midian, He introduced Himself in this way—'I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' And when He sent him down into Egypt, 'Thus,' He told him, 'shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you.'

Why was He not ashamed to be called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob? Because

they walked by faith, and not by sight. He is never called the God of Lot, the God of Ishmael, the God of Esau. He would have been ashamed to be called their God. For they walked by sight, and not by faith. Lot lifted up his eyes and saw all the Plain of Jordan that it was well watered everywhere, chose that, and settled there. And when Chedorlaomer and his allies harried the land, there was nothing left of all that Lot set his heart upon. Abraham became rich also. But he did not give his whole soul to the heaping up of wealth. When disappointed in one expectation, he found refuge in some more spiritual promise. When at last he discovered that the land of promise was not to be his, he looked for a City which had foundations, whose builder and maker was God. Esau had a choice between the birthright and the pottage. He chose the pottage. A bird in the hand, he would say, is worth two in the bush.

Two reasons are given why God was not ashamed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to be called their God. The first is that they looked for a City; the second, that He prepared for them a City. He would have been ashamed of them, if they had not looked for a City: He would have been ashamed of Himself, if He had not had a city prepared for them. He was not ashamed to be called their God, because to that spiritual Deep in them there was a corresponding spiritual Deep in Himself.

'Deep calls to deep':—man's depth would be despair

But for God's deeper depth: we sow to reap.
Have patience, wait, betake ourselves to prayer:
Deep answereth deep.

II.

Christ not Ashamed.

He 2¹¹, 'He is not ashamed to call them brethren.'

If God is not ashamed to be called their God, Christ will not be ashamed to call them brethren. We should expect that. For they are the same persons. They are those who walk by faith, and not by sight, the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of all time. He is not ashamed. 'Behold my mother and my brethren,' He said; 'for whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.'

Still it is a further revelation. For we are told that God is bringing many sons to glory, and for that end has provided a Captain of their salvation. He is no longer waiting, if we may say so, to receive them when they come. He has provided a passport, and furnished them with a guide.

And it is a further revelation in another way. For now we see the kind of City which God has prepared for them. It is a home. It is a family hearth. He is not only their God, but their Father. And the Son of His love is not ashamed to call them brethren.

But there are three reasons given why Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren. The first reason is that He and they are of one God and Father. There is a certain distinction yet, it is true. He teaches them to say 'Our Father'; but He does not yet say 'Our Father' with them. He says 'My Father and your Father.' For they have not reached home yet. They do not yet know the might of the power of the Father's love. It is His will—'Father, I will,' He says, 'that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory—for thou lovedst me from the foundation of the world.' When they understand the glory of a love like that and respond to it, then perhaps He will be able to say 'Our Father' with them. But meanwhile He is not ashamed to call them brethren, because He can say 'My Father and your Father.'

The next reason is that He and they have the same experience in life. He is made like unto His brethren in this. He is tempted in all points like as they are. He takes up His cross, saying, 'Not my will, but thine be done.' They take up their cross and follow Him. They are even crucified with Him. And being crucified with Him, they rise with Him into a new life. There is nothing that makes good fellows like misfortune. The experience of life for Him and for them is a series of disappointments. If they were rich and He poor, He might be ashamed to call them brethren. But they wear the garb of the mendicant together. For He who was rich, for their sakes became poor, and He is not ashamed to call them brethren.

The third reason is that they reach the same home at last. Dale tells us in his *Life* that he never dared to call Jesus brother until he lost his own only brother. When his brother reached

the Home; he dared to call the other 'Brother.' 'I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there ye may be also.' Both at home. In the Father's House. He has willed it, and He has won it, and He is not ashamed to call them brethren.

III.

Paul not Ashamed.

Ro 1¹⁶, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel.'

It is rather amusing to hear the Apostle say this. It is almost as if he had said, I am not ashamed of Christ. It is almost as if he had said, I am not ashamed of God. Still it is not quite the same. For what is the gospel? It is not simply the bringing of many sons to glory; it is the effort to persuade men to become sons. It is not the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of this world walking majestically by faith and being received into the prepared City. It is the despised and the degraded, the earthly, the sensual, the devilish; it is the Lots, the Ishmaels, the Esaus of this world under earnest appeal to abandon their earthliness, and seek those things which are above. Now in Paul's day any appeal to these was looked upon with suspicion or contempt. The bottom dog was left at the bottom, 'This people that knoweth not the law is cursed.' If Paul had been visiting those cities where the Jews had planted themselves to encourage their Abrahams, their Isaacs, and Jacobs to walk by faith, and not by sight, he would have been well received. But he brings a crucified Messiah for the salvation of the outcast. And when we see the situation, we see that there is less room for laughter than for tears.

He gives three reasons for not being ashamed. First, the gospel is the power of God. Now, as he says elsewhere, even the weakness of God is stronger than men. How much stronger, then, must His power be. We are not ashamed of power. It is of weakness that we are ashamed. If Paul can prove that the gospel is really the power of God, he has certainly no reason to be ashamed of it.

The second reason is that it is the power of God unto salvation. This is not so evident a reason for not being ashamed of the gospel. For salvation is not so universally admired as power is. His countrymen had very clear ideas about salvation. There were just two classes of people in

the world—the righteous and the sinners. The righteous were saved already, by the keeping of the law. They did not need salvation. The sinners needed it very much, but they did not deserve it, and they would never get it. Paul said he was not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, because it was the power of God unto salvation. Salvation for whom? they asked. Then he gave his third reason.

The third reason is that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. And that there might be no mistake he added, 'To the Jew first, and also to the Greek.' He meant to say that there is no Jew that does not need it, and no Greek. He meant to say that there is no Jew that may not have it, and no Greek. He may well say, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.'

It is a further revelation. We have seen Abraham on the way to the City which hath foundations, and God is not ashamed to be called his God. We have seen God bringing many sons to glory, and for that end making the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. And the Captain is not ashamed to call the rank and file His brethren. But now we hear of a gospel for the waif and the stray, a gospel that goes into the byways to find the abandoned and the abominable, a gospel with a power of appeal that is called compelling them to come in. It is not that Lydia is to be neglected; it is that the keeper of the prison in the same city is to be remembered.

IV.

Little Children not Ashamed.

1 Jn 2²⁸, 'And now, my little children, abide in him; that if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.'

Who are these 'little children'? They are not those who always kept the commandments and did not need salvation. They are those who needed it, who did not deserve it, and were supposed never to find it. They were once 'far off'; now they are 'made nigh.' From being sinners of the Jews, from being aliens of the Greeks, they have become 'little children.' The gospel has been to them the power of God unto salvation.

And now what wait they for? Simply for His manifestation. They wait for the triumphal entrance into the City. And although God is not

ashamed to be called their God; although Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren; although by the power of God they are now enjoying salvation: still their salvation is not yet complete, there is the possibility that even yet they may be ashamed at His coming.

For in all the intercourse of God with man, He uses no compulsion except the compulsion of love.

If one who has tasted and seen that the Lord is gracious feels constraint, it is the love of Christ that constrains him. And he must will to abide within the constraint of that love. He must, in the Apostle's words, 'abide in him,' in close conscious contact, that he may not be ashamed at His coming, but may have an abundant entrance into His eternal kingdom and glory.

Two Old Testament Commentaries.¹

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

I. EXACT scholarship, a scientific temper of mind, and the reverence of a believer in Divine revelation combine to render Principal Skinner an ideal commentator on the Book of Genesis. The work before us will unquestionably take its place in the very front rank of modern O.T. commentaries. We can award it no higher praise than to say that it need not shrink from comparison with what has hitherto been *facile princeps* in the series to which it belongs—Driver's *Deuteronomy*. Before proceeding to deal with other features of this great work, we may note two respects in which even our acquaintance with Dr. Skinner had hardly prepared us to expect him to reach such excellence—namely, the literary style, which is not only clear and lucid but frequently reaches true eloquence; and the consummate skill and unfailing courtesy with which he treats opponents. We confess we had looked for a little more of that 'impatience with stupid people' which used to be attributed to the late Professor Robertson Smith. But Dr. Skinner's is no doubt the more excellent way. Not, indeed, that he cannot, when necessary, give play to a mild sarcasm. What, for instance, could be more charming than this touch?: 'What with Winckler and Jeremias, and Cheyne, and now Eerdmans, O.T. scholars have a good many "new eras" dawning on them just now. Whether any of them will shine unto the perfect day, time will show' (p. xliii).

Hitherto the best commentaries on *Genesis* at the disposal of the English-speaking student have been the translation of Dillmann's great work (T. & T. Clark, 1897), and the admirable *Westminster Commentary* of Driver. Our debt to Dillmann we should find it hard to estimate, but a considerable change has passed on the situation since his day; while Dr. Driver would be the first to admit that the 'Westminster' series denied him that scope of which Dr. Skinner has been able to avail himself in the 'International Critical' series. As for recent German commentaries, with all their excellence, we confess to have missed precisely what we find in the pages of Dr. Skinner's work. Take even the great work of Gunkel. In spite of its brilliance and suggestiveness, is there not a good deal of the wildly erratic in its theories and combinations, and is not an uneasy suspicion at times awakened in the mind of the cautious student that the ingenious author of *Schöpfung und Chaos* has discovered a mare's nest?

Most readers will be heartily glad that Dr. Skinner passes over so lightly the controversies as to the compatibility of the earlier chapters of *Genesis* with the conclusions of modern science. All such questions will soon cease, if they have not already ceased, to possess any living interest. Far more importance attaches to the question of the historical or legendary character of the book, or the relation of one of these elements to the other. Here Dr. Skinner is seen at his best, and we shall be sorely disappointed if his carefully weighed words fail to reassure some timid souls. For instance, in contrasting history with legend,

¹ THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY.—I. *Genesis*, by Principal Skinner, D.D., Westminster College, Cambridge, 1910. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; price 12s. 6d. 2. *Chronicles*, by Professor E. L. Curtis, D.D., Yale, with the assistance of Rev. A. A. Madsen, Ph.D., Newburgh, N.Y.; price 12s.