

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

them, and to the natural—*i.e.*, the spiritual—development of this fact in themselves and their relations to others.

F. A. LE MESURIER.

“AUTHORITY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF.”

(“*The Churchman*,” September, 1911, p. 673.)

I should like to be permitted to traverse some statements in the paper by the Rev. C. Lisle-Carr, which appears in your current number. His objection to the Bible as a supreme authority is, that so many communities appeal to the Bible, and yet so many of them differ. But this is a mistake. These conflicting communities differ about matters upon which the Bible gives them little or no authority. They differ about forms and forms of service, and Church order and government, about which the Bible says but little. Hence their differences are not owing to the Bible, but to their own conceptions.

On the other hand, when we turn to the matters upon which the Bible speaks freely and clearly, namely, the Christian verities, we have solid and substantial agreement between the leading denominations, as witnessed at the Keswick and the hundred and one Conventions the world over. Yea, more. When we turn to the genuine Roman Catholic saints and mark their authentic utterances, we find ourselves one with them. And in a memorable instance, to which I wish to draw attention, Joan of Arc, in her last hours, was asked if she would appeal to the Church, and she replied: “I appeal to the Scriptures!” And so she died, as many a Protestant has died.

WM. WOODS SMYTH.



Notices of Books.

INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By James Moffatt, B.D., D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s.

A book of this kind defies review. It is easy to lightly commend. For massive learning, for patient research, for careful arrangement, for completeness of detail, the highest commendation is deserved. The writer has certainly succeeded in his effort to know something of what others are thinking. His catena of names is overwhelming. But he makes it clear that his bibliography is not gathered from a library catalogue. The books have been taken down from the shelves and read. But the book is no mere conspectus of authorities; there is a vast amount of independent thinking and independent arrival at conclusions. To some extent, at least, it demands an answer. It often raises serious problems in single sentences: it dismisses them as briefly; no discussion of them can be as brief. The book has already become the text of a series of trenchant articles in the *Expositor* from the pen of Sir William.

Ramsay, and many particular issues will have to be separately dealt with. Perhaps here we can do best if we briefly describe the book, venturing a comment or a question here and there.

The book begins with several chapters of prolegomena. It discusses the collection of the New Testament writings into a canon; their arrangement, sources, and structure; matters concerning their circulation and literary characteristics. The discussion is full, detailed, and illuminating, but somehow it seems to lack the touch of sympathy. We have been reading the newly published Oxford Essays, and Dr. Sanday's opening contribution covers some of the same ground as Dr. Moffatt's Introduction. But with Dr. Sanday there is the critical faculty and sympathy. Here—and it somewhat applies to the whole book—we have criticism, brilliant, able, learned, but cold, calculating, almost unsympathetic. Somehow the book reads as the detailed story of a post-mortem examination, and for us and for Dr. Moffatt we know the subject lives.

After the Introduction we come to the detailed consideration of the books of the New Testament, dealt with under five headings—the Correspondence of Paul, the Historical Literature, Homilies and Pastorals, the Apocalypse of John, the Fourth Gospel, etc. The Correspondence of Paul has no place for Ephesians or the Pastorals which are dealt with in Chapter III. 1 and 2 Thessalonians stand first in order and date, are both by St. Paul, the rather curious theory that because 2 Thessalonians is so like the first epistle in style and language it cannot be Pauline being dealt with as it deserves. A useful paragraph deals with the development of St. Paul's doctrinal teaching, and sums the position up as follows:

Behind him lay the struggle with Jewish Christian traditionalism at Antioch and Jerusalem, which had already compelled him to define his principles and think out the deeper aspects of his gospel. It is therefore historically and psychologically impossible to read the Thessalonian epistles as if they represented a primitive stage in the Apostle's thought, when he had not yet developed dogmatic Paulinism. If his gospel centres here round the Coming rather than the Cross of Christ, and it seems to argue that men were to be sanctified by hope rather than justified by faith, the explanation must be sought in the special circumstances which determined the composition of the letter. There was apparently nothing to call out any discussion of the Law or any theorizing on forgiveness.

This is excellent, and just now particularly useful. Galatians comes next, and Dr. Moffatt is evidently a thoroughgoing apologist for the Northern theory. He marshals the arguments on both sides, but with a strong leaning to the old view. He finds no difficulty at all in the vexed phrase *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. It can only mean Phrygia and the region of Galatia. He compares it with other phrases where we have the collocation of two countries without the article; but they are not really similar, as *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* is not the name of a country, and if we are to translate with Dr. Moffatt, we need the article. He is not at all sure of the historicity of Acts xv. He regards the Western form of the decree (containing three members only) as secondary, but not later than A.D. 150. He finds serious, almost insoluble, difficulty in the relationship of the epistle to the Acts.

St. Paul's correspondence with Corinth included four letters from him. (a) The earliest, referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9 and 2 Cor. vi. 14 to vii. 7 is probably part of it. (b) 1 Cor. (c) After a visit to Corinth, a short, sharp letter, pre-

served in part in 2 Cor. x. 1 to xiii. 10. (*d*) 2 Cor. i. to ix., omitting vi. 14 to vii. 1. It will be seen from this summary that he believes the second visit (almost certainly accomplished and not merely prospective) was paid after 1 Corinthians, and that he denies the integrity of 2 Corinthians, though regarding it all as Pauline. In the former contention he is surely right, but he hardly seems to have dealt fairly with the arguments against the latter.

Romans i. to xv. represents the original epistle, xvi. being, at least in part, added to a copy of the epistle sent to Ephesus. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Moffatt demands a considerable amount of editing (perhaps even textual) when the epistle came to be incorporated in the Pauline canon. He regards the epistle as doctrinal rather than as controversial or apologetic. Colossians is genuine, and its integrity is clear. Holtzmann held that an epistle was originally written to the Colossians, worked up by some unknown author, first into Ephesians, and then afterwards into the canonical Colossians. Moffatt calls this "filigree" criticism. Has he provided us with a long-needed name for criticism of its kind? Philemon and Philippians need little consideration. In reference to the phrase *σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις* in Phil. i. 1, Dr. Moffatt receives very sympathetically the suggestion that the words are a second-century gloss in the interests of catholicizing. He says, if such glosses are to be admitted anywhere in the New Testament, this is as obvious a place as any. Yes, but where is the evidence? The fact that the words do not accommodate themselves to a particular point of view, does not prove them a gloss, or we shall lose half the New Testament.

The second section deals with the historical literature. Ur-Markus (not our Mark) is one of the two great original sources. The other is Q, which our St. Mark knew. Our St. Mark is earlier than either St. Matthew or St. Luke. St. Matthew's Gospel bears his name because it makes the most systematic use of the Matthæan Logia of Papias; it was not composed by an Apostle nor in Aramaic. St. Matthew used our St. Mark rather than the Ur-Markus. As to dates, Moffatt does not follow Harnack's recently set forth early dating. Our St. Mark is a final version of the Ur-Markus, composed shortly after the events of A.D. 60 to 70. St. Matthew must be later than 70 and earlier than 110. St. Luke does not depend upon Josephus, and may therefore be earlier than 94, but must be later than 70; 75 to 100 roughly represents the period of production. The Diarist in the Acts was also the Historian, and therefore almost certainly St. Luke.

The third section deals with Homilies and Pastorals. It is daringly critical, and calls loudly for lengthy criticism itself. Here we can but summarize decisions. 1 Peter is accepted, though its date is left doubtful. Jude is dated in the early decades of the second century, and it did not borrow from 2 Peter, but *vice versa*. Of course it is by no Jude known to the New Testament. 2 Peter must, perforce, come after it and is dated in the middle of the second century. The author of Ephesians knew 1 Peter, and, obviously, Colossians. If *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is authentic, it cannot have been written by St. Paul. But *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is not authentic. Even then it can hardly be Pauline, and must date between A.D. 75 and 85. Of the Pastorals, 2 Timothy is the earliest, but all are tendency writings, and all from the same pen, but it was not St. Paul's. They are later than 1 Peter—later, of course, than

St. Paul's death. Between 90, or perhaps a little earlier, and 115 they must have been written. Hebrews was written by a "highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian, a διδάσκαλος of high repute, with speculative gifts and literary culture; but to us he is a voice and no more." He was not a person of commanding genius, and we could have done without his epistle; still, it is good to have "this unique specimen of Alexandrine thought playing upon the primitive gospel." James was written early in the second century, and yet James of Jerusalem may have had something to do with its authorship. Is not this perilously near to "filigree" criticism?

With regard to the Johannine literature, of course, the existence of the Presbyter John is to be taken as historical fact. 2 and 3 John were written by him. The Apocalypse was not written by John the Apostle; that is ruled out by the acceptance of the tradition of his early martyrdom. (Why do we accept some traditions, and reject others, better authenticated, with equal readiness?) Perhaps the book is pseudonymous; perhaps John Mark wrote it, more probably John the Presbyter. The fourth gospel is by an absolutely unknown author—or by John the Presbyter. The beloved disciple was either John, the son of Zebedee, or John a Jerusalemite, or is he simply the picture of the ideal Christian? We should like to ask: If he was John a Jerusalemite, did he perchance come to be later on John the Presbyter, and was his father's name Zebedee? Or is that "filigree"? The gospel was written before 130, probably before 110, and after the other three. The first epistle was written by one who lived in the same circle as the writer of the gospel, but he was not the same person. The book ends with a discussion of the Johannine tradition, and John the Presbyter is clothed with reality.

Such is the book and its critical standpoint. It needs an answer; but much of the answer has already been given. Lightfoot, Sanday, Zahn, Ramsay, and a host of others, have dealt with its positions, and demolished some of them. It is the work of a good scholar, but much of it is, to use his own word, "filigree" work. "Filigree" work is not easily manufactured; this kind has come by patient toil, arduous research, and keen exercise of mind.

But it is not an Introduction to the New Testament we know: it is subversive of well-won positions; it rejects well-substantiated traditions for speculative and ill-based theories. It is "filigree" work, beautiful, but brittle. In the pages of the *Expositor*, Sir William Ramsay has been dealing some vigorous blows, and the delicate fabric has been damaged. It will suffer more damage yet.

F. S. GUY WARMAN.

DIVINE TRANSCENDENCE AND ITS REFLECTION IN RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY.
An Essay by the Rev. J. R. Illingworth, M.A., D.D. Price 4s. 6d. net.
Macmillan and Co.

This essay is a worthy successor of the one dealing with Divine Immanence by the same author, and should be read in connection with it. A book on this subject has been needed—and none is so competent to write it as Dr. Illingworth. In the preface he truly says that the omnipresence of God "has been frequently employed as though it were an exclusive alternative" to His supremacy, whereas, to the Christian, Divine Transcendence is "presupposed, not precluded," by Divine Immanence.

The main thought of the book is that the Transcendence of God is the ultimate source of all authority: and its chief practical teaching is an exhortation—much needed to-day—to practise the virtues of “humility” and “obedience.” The book is carefully written. The argument is close—sometimes almost too close: it must be carefully read to be appreciated. It is marked by the deep learning and thought characteristic of the author, and its felicity of Biblical quotation calls for mention.

The confidence with which the author faces “hostile criticism” should be of value to many unstable in the faith; for it is not the blind enthusiasm of those whose zeal outruns their knowledge, and causes them to shut their eyes to all modern thought and movement, but the assured conviction of one who has studied all sides of the question and finds in the Christian solution the only satisfactory one.

Coming to the work itself, the first part deals with the philosophical aspect of the question. Psychology may explain our mental processes, but “the object” lies beyond. Religion must be rooted in personal spiritual experience if it is to live; but it must also have an absolute objective basis, independent of the feelings of the individuals who from generation to generation successively come under its sway. Men have continually—and with increasing difficulty—tried to locate this ultimate basis of authority. “The authority of reason, the authority of conscience, the authority of the Bible, the authority of the Church, are all phrases which at once raise complex difficulties of thought. They have lost something of the clear-cut character and definite outline which they once possessed. But this need not mean that they have lost their reality” (p. 7). On reflection, this difficulty of location is inevitable, for a living thing is ever changing. Yet “it” is there, even if we cannot exactly reach or define it. There is an absolute element in religion which finally is seen in the Infinite Fact of the Transcendence of God—“the absolute and transcendent ground of all existence.”

The writer then turns to Plato and Aristotle. The perfect is implied in our knowledge of the imperfect, as our knowledge of relative existence presupposes the existence of absolute being. He shows how both thinkers recognize the fact that moral affinity is necessary for knowledge of a person, and of God. What the Greek philosophers thus reasoned over, the Old Testament writers “knew,” and later Christian writers developed. Phrases, such as “impersonal reason,” “unconscious purpose,” or “unconscious will” are meaningless. The doctrine of the Trinity is of the “esse” of the Christian Faith, for “complete in Himself, God transcends the Universe, though He expresses Himself in and through it.”

Thus Divine Immanence and Transcendence are correlative conceptions in Christian Theology. They are seen for all time in the Incarnation, and God’s supremacy is reflected in the authoritative tone of Christianity, first given by its Founder. All authority is thus ultimately based and appeals in the last resort to conscience with its absolute dictation; for God—be it ever borne in mind—is the infinite “Good,” as well as the infinite “Great.”

In what can be called the second part, the author proceeds to show these principles in action. Christ Himself spoke “with authority.” He left no “book,” but trusted Himself and His meaning to men. He founded His

Church to be His witness to the world and delegated authority to it. By reason of human sinfulness and fallibility, divisions that seem to be permanent have arisen, and men ask: "Where is the true Church?" The question of the difficulty of location again arises. But His Church—as a visible fact, and not only as an eclectic society of men with a common spiritual experience—exists. For the law of spirit is that it acts through matter. "Visibility is the Church's keynote." Dr. Illingworth links up this thought essentially with the fact of the episcopate—"the symbol of Christ's authoritative hold upon the world." Here we are on old familiar disputed ground. Can we thus "essentially" link the two *as a theory*—even if we can as a fact—which, with our present knowledge of the state of things in sub-apostolic times, cannot be regarded as *conclusively* proved—though most probable? That the Church, as a Visible Society, was a Divine Idea in the mind of the Christ is accepted as an essential fact and theory by all Churchmen, and is obvious to any careful student, but *the exact form* that it took in episcopal organization is inevitably of the secondary rank, for it is a "method"—albeit divine—rather than a principle. The fact may exist, and probably does, in spite of gaps; but it is a different thing to take it as an exclusive and essential theory, though we hold it as such in practice, and the onus of justifying themselves lies on those who forsake it, not on us who keep it. Even our writer admits that "sacramental ordinances may be normal instruments, but can never be limiting conditions of the Spirit's action" (p. 205).

He writes next on Creeds and Sacraments. Creeds guard apostolic tradition: their dogmatic element is necessary and good. Sacraments are in accordance with the laws of our being, for again "spirit acts through matter." If shadows of them and of an authoritative priesthood are found in the most primitive religious systems, it is what should be expected from human instinct unconsciously obeying the laws of being. They find their substance and reality in Christianity. He goes on to show that Biblical authority in both Testaments has not been, and cannot be, altered in their essential spiritual aspects by external criticism. A good chapter on the Christian life under authority follows. He writes well and truly on the fact of sin and of the Atonement, which meets man on the threshold of all life in touch with God. The need of the practice of the virtues of "humility" and "obedience" is impressively set before us—especially are they needed in an age with "insubordination existing as a prominent evil."

A recapitulatory chapter closes this essay, which we confidently commend, for its stimulating and helpful thoughts, to our readers.

F. G. GODDARD.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. Westminster New Testament. By A. E. Garvie, D.D. London: *Melrose*. Price 2s. net.

The General Editor of the series has made himself personally responsible for this volume, and it bears the marks of his ripe scholarship. The Introduction deals with Authorship, Date, Sources, and Characteristics, and owes much to Harnack's latest studies. Dr. Garvie has no hesitation in assigning the Third Gospel to St. Luke, and prefers to date it about A.D. 80. The examination of the sources is compressed, but clear, and the now

prevalent two-document theory is adopted. Much is made of the points of contact with the Fourth Gospel, and the author hazards the conjecture that "the Third and Fourth Evangelists had personal intercourse together, and even came to some common understanding as to the way in which each would supplement the existing sources." In the Commentary the text of the A.V. is printed in short sections, and reference is made at the head of each to the parallel or similar sections of the other Synoptics. Dr. Garvie tells us he has tried to give special attention to the difficulties which the life and teaching of Jesus present to a modern reader. Questions of theology are necessarily ruled out by considerations of space, but it is useful to have cross references to discussions of them in the author's "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus."

THE PROBLEM OF DEUTERONOMY. By the Rev. J. S. Griffiths. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s.

We have no hesitation in thoroughly commending this little book. It claims to be written from a scientific standpoint, and to avoid *a priori* arguments; and examination of its contents justifies the claim. The author has read widely in the literature on both sides of the question: he has fairly marshalled and stated the opposing arguments, and his conclusion is a temperate expression of his belief that Deuteronomy, as we have it, is "a contemporary record written by Moses himself, or by some person or persons acting under his direction." There is a very full analysis at the beginning, and a careful list of Scripture passages at the end, both of which add to the usefulness of the book. We noticed one misprint on page 16—"cilivized" for "civilized."

WESTMINSTER ABBEY AND THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CORONATION. By W. R. Lethaby. London: Duckworth. Price 2s. 6d. net.

This very careful and interesting work deserves to be read, and kept, as an historical memorial of a great ceremony. The illustrations are good, the plans useful, and the letterpress most helpful to a right understanding of the complete ritual of the Coronation Service.

Received: THE CONSECRATED LIFE and THE PATHWAY OF VICTORY. By Rev. T. W. Riddle. London: Marshall Brothers. Price 1s. net each. Two useful little devotional books, of which the output is now so happily large. FADS. By Rev. I. W. Charlton. London: Marshall Brothers. The fads are such things as faith-healing and re-baptism, and this little book is, on the whole, a common-sense warning against them. THE JESUIT. By Joseph Hocking. London: Cassell and Co. Price 3s. 6d. A very exciting novel, the plot of which concerns itself with attempts to win perverts to Rome. HELBECK OF BANNISDALE. By Mrs. Humphry Ward. Price 7d. net. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY VIGNETTES. By Austin Dobson. Price 1s. net. THE PICKWICK PAPERS. By Charles Dickens. Price 6d. net. London: T. Nelson and Sons. THE RIGHT WAY. By Sir Gilbert Parker. London: T. Nelson and Sons. Price 7d. net. THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Dr. HEADLAM. Price 12s. per annum. THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. Price 3s. 6d. net. Annual Subscription 12s. net. EPISCOPACY. By Lieut.-Colonel F. S. Terry. Price 2d. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR AFRICA AND THE EAST. Price 2s. net. COMFORTABLE WORDS FOR CHRIST'S LOVERS. By Dundas Harford. London: H. R. Allenson. Price 1s. 6d. net. NICHOLAS NICKLEBY and THE PICKWICK PAPERS. By Charles Dickens. London: T. Nelson and Sons. Price 2s. net each. THE CHRISTIAN PRACTICE OF PRAYER. By K. E. Kirk. THE MISSIONARY PROBLEM AND THE DENIAL OF CHRIST IN CHRISTENDOM. By Malcolm Spencer. THE STUDY OF THE WILL OF GOD FOR MODERN LIFE. By Malcolm Spencer. THE VOCATION OF SCOTLAND. By D. S. Cairns. Price 6d. net. London: Student Christian Movement.