

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

omitted or inserted incorrectly (pp. 30 sq., 97); the rules for the article, the prefixed prepositions, the Hithpael and the verbal suffixes are incomplete. The student must worry out for himself the vowel-changes in the construct stage, and although six pages of heterogeneous examples, alphabetically arranged, illustrate the intricacies, there are many forms quite unknown in biblical Hebrew. These are serious blemishes in an otherwise handy little book.

STANLEY A. COOK.

NEW TESTAMENT.

THE need of a good lexicon to the New Testament and other early Christian literature has long been felt, and Dr E. PREUSCHEN'S *Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (A. Töpelmann, Giessen, 1908-), five parts of which (α - δ μολογία) have already been published, will be warmly welcomed in this country as in his own.

The science of textual criticism may perhaps be simplified for generations of students yet unborn by the new groupings, the new notation of MSS, and the new theories which Prof. VON SODEN and Dr C. R. GREGORY are putting forward (*Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1908); but the immediate result of their enterprise is to add to the complications of the study. Meanwhile we have from Prof. K. Lake a careful description and an acute criticism of von Soden's work, in a pamphlet reprinted from the *Review of Theology and Philosophy* (*Professor H. von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels*, O. Schulze & Co., Edinburgh, 1908), and a fourth edition of his own handbook (*The Text of the New Testament*, Rivingtons, 1908) with an appendix giving a summary account of the new positions. In the pamphlet in particular he propounds a working hypothesis as an alternative to von Soden's theory, to the effect that in the second and third centuries there existed various local texts of the Gospels and that all the existing Greek MSS represent, not various editions diverging from a common original text on which they were all based, but 'the first attempts to standardize the text, and to produce—what had never previously existed—a recognized universal text of the fourfold Gospel, which should supersede the various local texts'.

A smaller piece of work by Dr C. R. GREGORY, which appeals to a larger circle of readers, is *Das Freer-Logion* (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1908).

As the result of a minute examination of the language and ideas of the 'logion', Dr Gregory comes to the conclusion that it is neither a genuine saying of our Lord, nor an original part of the conclusion of Mark. It was probably inserted in it early in the second century, and its thoroughly Pauline character shews how strongly Pauline conceptions had influenced the Christianity of those early times.

A high place of honour must be given in this Chronicle to the English translation, in three stately volumes, of the third German edition of Dr THEODOR ZAHN'S *Introduction to the New Testament* (T. & T. Clark, 1909), by some half-dozen Fellows of Hartford Theological Seminary under the direction of Professors Jacobus and Thayer. The translation seems to be well done and for the most part reads quite easily, though one occasionally finds such curiously un-English expressions as 'belongs in' and 'presupposes on'. Dr Zahn's conservative position and his attitude to many modern critical theories are well known: he does not hesitate to describe some of the arguments of famous scholars as 'trivial'. In his English preface to this edition he thankfully recognizes the beginnings of a 'trend towards betterment' in the literary criticism of the New Testament and of the 'development of the historical sense among theologians'. Should these tendencies become more clearly marked than they are at present, Dr Zahn's book, with its easy command of the vast literature of the subject, is likely to be still more highly valued in the future as an almost inexhaustible mine of learning and collection of the evidence on which a 'correct judgement' can be formed. However this may be, meanwhile any one who would undertake the arduous task of digesting the contents of these three volumes would be in a far better position to estimate the merits of much modern literature on the New Testament, including, I venture to say, some of the books most recently issued by the cosmopolitan firm of publishers who have done so much to make the best foreign theological works accessible to English readers and have now made the study of Dr Zahn's great book so much easier than it has been hitherto.

As a mouse to a mountain is *The Origin of the New Testament*, by the late Dr W. WREDE (Harper & Brothers, 1909), to Dr Zahn's *Introduction*. The little book was originally composed in the form of popular lectures to an educated lay audience, and the translator, the Rev. J. S. Hill, B.D. (London), fairly describes it as a brief and crisp treatise on its subject from the standpoint of the 'advanced' school. He also says, less fairly, that Dr Wrede 'nowhere dogmatically decides where something like certainty is not obtainable'. On the contrary,

the terse crisp sentences in which the book abounds, and its necessarily summary statements, constantly convey the impression of dogmatic certainty in cases where much qualification, to say the least, is needed. For example: the Apostle John 'cannot possibly be' the author of the Fourth Gospel. I do not suppose he was; but it is unfair to claim 'the whole of the scientifically impartial theological world' on that side, and Mr Hill's preface is likely to mislead the lay readers of the book to whom he commends it in the terms I have quoted. (On p. 61 'Mark' is printed once instead of 'Luke'.)

With books on the Gospels and the synoptic problem it is difficult for a chronicler to keep pace, and I can do little more than mention some which have not already been reviewed in the JOURNAL.

Dr HARNACK'S *Die Sprüche Jesu* was reviewed in this JOURNAL on its publication (vol. viii no. 31 pp. 454 f), and attention was called to the very precarious character of the reconstruction of Q which Dr Harnack suggests. Dom Chapman's article in our last number gives further reasons for distrusting some of his conclusions; but the English translation (by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson) of a book which is in many respects valuable and suggestive will be generally welcome (*The Sayings of Jesus*, Williams & Norgate, 1908).

The Four Gospels in the earliest Church History, by T. NICOL, D.D. (W. Blackwood & Sons, 1908), is concerned with the external evidence, which the writer describes as the first line of defence in regard to the credibility of the Gospel history. Dr Nicol makes out, I think, as good a case as can be made out on these lines, but they are not the lines on which the question can be decided. And in his presentation of the evidence he maintains some very disputable theses and cannot quite let go others which he seems to admit to be generally regarded as untenable. 'Let it once be shewn', he writes, 'that the Four Gospels are contemporary records and contain a sober and consistent history of the life, teaching, and work of Christ, and many questions now in dispute will be brought nearer to a settlement, if not finally answered.' But the thesis proposed is just what cannot be shewn.

The author's aim in *The Gospels in the light of modern research* (by the Rev. J. R. COHU: J. Parker & Co., Oxford, 1909) is to give 'a practical working knowledge of the present position of the critical enquiry into the Gospel-story, and to record the main results achieved by Biblical scholarship'. Mr. Cohu writes on broad lines with full acceptance of modern methods of study, and he leaves open many of the questions which literary and historical research raises, though

he usually seems to indicate the orthodox answer as at least a natural conclusion of the long chains of evidence and reasoning which he follows. Sometimes when he commits himself to a definite view of the synoptic problem, as, for example, in the statement that 'nine-tenths of the original document (Q) apparently consisted entirely of "sayings" or discourses', he forgets some of the excellent principles which he lays down as guides to research in this subject. The last word has certainly not yet been said as to the contents of Q; when it has been said, I doubt whether Mr Cohu will be able to retain the 'almost implicit trust' which he says he places in the 'broad, unbiassed judgement' of Dr Harnack. It is indeed very dangerous, as Mr Cohu really knows, to put any kind of implicit trust in any solution of the problems with which he deals; and we may yet find that Q was as much a Gospel as St Mark is. But the book seems to be so useful as a general presentation of its subject, which any one can follow, that I wish only to commend it warmly to the circle of readers for whom it is designed, without attempting criticisms in detail.

In *St John: apostle, evangelist, and prophet* (James Nisbet & Co., 1909) Dr C. E. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF endeavours to shew 'that the objections alleged against St John as the author of the works traditionally ascribed to him are far from conclusive'. The writer's aim, thus modestly stated, is, I think, fairly achieved, and it is no doubt all that the apologist of to-day can venture to claim—that the case against the authorship of the son of Zebedee is not demonstrated. I cannot, however, feel that Dr Scott-Moncrieff really sets at rest any of the doubts as to the historical character of the Gospel which every student of it has to face. He says that to many, with whom he appears to range himself, the position taken up by Wernle, Jülicher, Schmiedel, and even Harnack 'is all but unintelligible'. In reply it must be said that the first task for an apologist is to learn to understand his opponent's position. I think Dr Scott-Moncrieff fails to do justice to its natural strength and therefore fails to undermine it effectively.

In an earlier work, *St Mark and the triple tradition* (J. Nisbet & Co., 1907), notice of which in the JOURNAL is somewhat belated, Dr SCOTT-MONCRIEFF has collected from various sources the chief statistics as to the relations between the three Synoptic Gospels. He gives us also an excellent analysis of the Christology of the Marcan tradition and of the evidence for the life of St Mark and his connexion with St Peter, and his book is a useful *résumé* of much industrious work. His own special contribution to the matter is the suggestion that different imperfect transcripts of the original Mark were the sources of the triple

tradition as found in the first and third Gospels respectively, and that 'the tendencies manifested are not those of the writers of these Gospels, but of the transcribers whose work they used'. Nothing seems to be gained by this new form of the hypothesis of different editorial *strata* in our St Mark, which steals from St Matthew and St Luke some of their recognized characteristics simply in order to bestow them on two imaginary and unknowable transcribers; and though Dr Scott-Moncrieff brings out clearly some of the secondary elements in Mark as well as in Matthew and Luke, he is often prevented by his theory from assigning them to their true cause. There are also notable inconsistencies in parts of his argument.

Mr F. W. WORSLEY is bolder than Dr Scott-Moncrieff and attacks the subject of the Fourth Gospel (*The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists*, T. & T. Clark, 1909) with the positive aim of claiming it definitely as St John's and shewing its relation to the other Gospels. In his own words, he writes to prove 'that the author, taking St Mark in the main as the basis of operations, probably because it embodied most succinctly the synoptic tradition, omits all reference to matters satisfactorily detailed by the synoptists, though he makes occasional slight references to these, as though he would say, "for further details see the other accounts"; only repeats incidents already recounted by the others when he wishes to make deliberate corrections, or to supplement the narratives by introducing points, which the writer considers were essential to a proper understanding of the events': and further that 'the main purpose of the author is to lay special stress upon the Lord's self-manifestation to His disciples'. In the first part of this thesis there is not much that is new, though Mr Worsley sets out the points clearly and well; and he draws the inference that only one who was an eyewitness and an apostle could have presumed to set himself such a task or been able to carry it through. But the author of the Fourth Gospel tells us plainly what his purpose was, and many of the hardest sayings in which 'the Lord's self-manifestation' is embodied are represented as uttered publicly and even, as some affirm, provocatively; and it is useless for Mr Worsley (if I adopted his own style, I should have to say 'ridiculous') to 'maintain that there is nothing added in degree to the conception of the Divine Sonship present in the Synoptic account', and worse than useless to say that if the author 'gives us the gist of what was said by Christ in a phraseology of his own . . . the Fourth Gospel has little or no claim to be recognized as historical'. The path to the true understanding, and therefore the true defence, of the Fourth Gospel does not lie this way.

Written also with an eye to the historical study of the Gospels is *The Creed in the Epistles*, by WILFRID RICHMOND (Methuen & Co., 1909). Here we have a survey of the beliefs of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, Galatian, and Roman Christians which underlie St Paul's letters and are assumed in his argument and general teaching to them. Mr Richmond has carried out admirably a piece of work which all teachers of the Epistles have done, no doubt, partially for themselves, and his book will be widely welcomed. He has special regard to the apparent contrast between St Paul's constant assumption, that the main characteristic of the new religion is the sense of the Divine Indwelling, that it is 'the religion which lives in the faith that God has given Himself to dwell in man', and the almost complete silence of the Gospels on this particular element of religious experience; and that, too, although 'the Gospels come to us as documents written by members of the Church of the Epistles for members of the Church of the Epistles'. Mr Richmond rightly insists that it is to the Epistles that we must look for the background of belief of the authors of the Gospels; and he draws the inferences, first, that the Gospels are very deliberately guarded reminiscences of the past, and secondly, that their authors were explicitly conscious that the teaching of Christ which they record was simply preparatory to the spiritual life in which they themselves then lived, and that their interest in the story was that it led up to what it did not contain. Mr Richmond offers these two considerations as corrective of the popular view that in the Gospels may be found what is called the 'simple' Gospel (instead of the 'incomplete' Gospel, as he would say), and of the feeling that comes over many a modern historical student of the Gospels that he can never arrive at what actually happened.

The Resurrection of our Lord and the narratives dealing with it have been the subject recently of several books and of many articles in theological periodicals. I have only to mention here the books which have been sent to the JOURNAL.

In *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion* (Macmillan & Co., 1907), Dr SWETE brings the refined scholarship and grace of expression which characterize all his work to bear on the task of expounding the biblical narratives of the Resurrection and subsequent appearances of our Lord, and commending them to teachers and students as in the main historically trustworthy as they stand. Dr Swete sees no reason to doubt that actual personal experience at least underlies the chief accounts, and that a coherent and orderly narrative, day by day, can be constructed from them. No one who holds this view could wish for a better exponent and champion of it than Dr Swete, nor for a

more sympathetic process of sifting the narratives than that which he follows. On slighter and more popular lines, and less carefully reasoned, if more 'philosophical', and making more concessions to newer tendencies of thought and study, is Mr C. H. Robinson's *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ* (Longmans, Green, & Co., 1909). In particular he adopts the theory that our Lord after His resurrection 'possessed not a material but a spiritual body'. A more detailed and critical study of the narratives than Mr Robinson undertakes would be found, I believe, considerably to strengthen the evidence which he adduces for this view of the facts, while it would at the same time require some of his pages to be rewritten.¹ We cannot, I think, maintain a 'spiritual' body and the accuracy of the Lucan tradition in the same breath, and as I understand Mr Robinson, this is what he wishes to do.

Of another book dealing with the Resurrection (*La Résurrection du Christ*, by P. LE BRETON, E. Nourry, Paris, 1908) it must suffice to chronicle the author's conclusion, extraordinarily perverse, alike on literary and on historical grounds, that, when allowance is made for interpolations later than apostolic times, all the appearances of Jesus known to the canonical gospels are reduced to four, and the four are those to Mary Magdalene, the women, the two disciples of Emmaus, and a number of the twelve apostles on the mountain of Galilee—all of them the product of the illusions of disordered imaginations.

Nor can I give more space to M. PIERRE CALLUAUD's *Le Problème de la Résurrection du Christ*, which comes from the same publishers (1909), as a volume of their *Bibliothèque de Critique religieuse*, and essays to revive as at least worthy of fresh discussion, freed from some of the arguments of a vulgar rationalism by which it used to be supported, the theory of an apparent death of our Lord—a theory which M. Callaud maintains is in no way incompatible with belief in a living Christ, triumphant over death.

Bearing rather on the true meaning of our Lord's teaching than on the credibility of the Gospel narratives is *The Message of the Son of Man* by Dr E. A. ABBOTT (A. & C. Black, 1909). It is the herald of a larger and more abstruse work already in the press. Dr Abbott's purpose is to shew that the title 'Son of Man' was adopted by our Lord, not from

¹ In a second and enlarged edition Mr Robinson adds a chapter on the Body of Christ in the Holy Communion, a note on the myth of the resurrection of Osiris, and a few words in reply to the criticisms of some correspondents.

apocryphal but solely from Biblical sources, and was intended to indicate the Man made in the image of God and destined to have dominion over the Beast. Dr Abbott seems to me to shew a strange disregard of current critical opinion in treating all the passages in the Gospels in which our Lord is represented as using this title of Himself as alike authentic. Perhaps in his forthcoming volume he will exercise more discrimination and so remove the impression that his evidence requires careful sifting before his argument can be followed. But the chief importance of the book is its denial that 'the Son of Man' was a recognized Messianic title, and I believe that Dr Abbott is not so solitary as he supposes in his desire that the assumption that it was, and that our Lord was largely influenced by the Jewish apocrypha, be put to a much more searching cross-examination than it has yet undergone. Those who make this assumption must meet Dr Abbott's challenge.

The general reader will be grateful to the Dean of Westminster for republishing separately the first portion of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and so putting his masterly analysis and exposition of St Paul's conception of the Christian Society and 'the truth of the corporate life which was revealed to him' before a wider public than editions of the Greek text of the New Testament reach (*St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: an exposition*, Macmillan & Co., 1909). Dr Robinson thinks that this truth is one that 'was never more needed than it is to-day'. A similar practical purpose has led the Bishop of Durham to publish a devotional exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author of which, he says, was in any case, if not an apostle, a prophet, and he 'carries to us a prophet's burthen of unspeakable import' (*Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Elliot Stock, 1909).

The Acts of the Apostles, by Miss E. M. KNOX (Macmillan & Co., 1908), will furnish, as it is designed to furnish, an interesting and useful course of 'Bible Lessons for Schools' on the beginnings of Christianity, but closer study of the works of the scholars who are mentioned in the Preface might have led the author to a clearer treatment of many parts of the narrative and the avoidance of some statements that none of them would have made.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.