

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

RECENT AMERICAN LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE most recent general work on the topics of New Testament Introduction, that has appeared in America, is Mr. Houghton's translation of the veteran Reuss' *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*,¹ an appreciative estimate of which was given to the readers of THE EXPOSITOR by Dr. Marcus Dods, in the number for February. Parts of this broad field have been worked also in separate treatises. Dr. Schaff, for instance, has given us an admirable brief treatise on textual criticism, which he has (unfortunately, in our opinion) bound up with an account of the Authorized and Revised English Versions.² His purpose was to supply what may be called primary instruction in this imperfect science. The result, however, is probably the most accurate and careful, as well as the most concise account of the matter of criticism in English, and may be recommended to students as more trustworthy than even Dr. Scrivener's comprehensive and valuable *Plain Introduction*, and far in advance of anything else in the language. One of its useful features is a list of the printed editions of the Greek New Testament based on Reuss' *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Græci*, with corrections and additions,—enough additions to bring up the total to 923 items. This is the most complete bibliography in existence; it is the contribution of Prof. Isaac H. Hall, who has printed as another fruit of his bibliographical studies a separate work on American Greek Testaments.³ The first American Greek Testament was a duodecimo of 478 pages, printed by Isaiah Thomas, at Worcester, Mass., in 1800. Its title-page declared that it was "juxta exemplar Joannis Millii accuratissime impressum," though with no more truth than is usual in such

¹ *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*, by Edouard (Wilhelm Eugen) Reuss; translated from the fifth, revised and enlarged, German edition, with numerous bibliographical additions, by Edward L. Houghton, A.M. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1884. 2 vols. pp. x. 639, 8vo.)

² *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version*, by Philip Schaff, D.D., with facsimile illustrations of new and standard editions of the New Testament. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1883. Pp. xi. 626, sm. 8vo.)

³ *A Critical Bibliography of the Greek New Testament as published in America*, by Isaac H. Hall, A.M., LL.B., Ph.D.; with two facsimile illustrations. (Philadelphia: Pickwick & Co., 1883. Pp. 82, 8vo.)

cases. Some one of Bowyer's many issues appears to have furnished the basis of the text, but it bears the mark of an independent editorial hand and exactly follows no known edition. From 1880 to 1883, Prof. Hall catalogues no less than 259 American issues of the whole or a part of the Greek Testament, which he believes to be within thirty or forty of the actual number. Some twenty-eight of these, though bearing an American imprint, were actually printed abroad. Besides them, a vast number of foreign copies have been imported. "The American consumption of the home and foreign product can scarcely fall short of half a million copies; and even that number,—enormous as it is, all things considered, in its ratio to the supply of other countries,—may be an underestimate" (p. 74). Perhaps the total world-issue of the Greek Testament has been in the neighbourhood of a million and a half, scarcely two million copies; and of these America has absorbed no less than from a quarter to a third.

It will not be possible to catalogue here the numerous contributions which Prof. Hall is continually making to our knowledge of the Syriac versions, and which are generally buried in our periodicals. His most important discovery has been a MS. containing a Pre-Harkleusian version of the Gospels,—perhaps the unaltered Philoxenian itself. A full account of this Codex, which he calls the Beirût Codex, was given in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, for 1882. And now he has issued three beautiful phototyped pages of the MS. with descriptive letterpress.¹

The most recent American treatise on Hermeneutics is Prof. Milton S. Terry's comprehensive work,²—too comprehensive, in that it owes its inconvenient bulk to not strictly confining itself to its proper subject. More recent, and therefore more demanding notice from us, is [an interesting paper by Prof. George T. Ladd (*Andover Review*, ii. pp. 18–34, July, 1884), on "The Interpretation of the Bible and the Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," the purpose of which is to show that the two are mutually dependent. Sug-

¹ *Syriac Manuscript Gospels of a Pre-Harkleusian version; Acts and Epistles of the Peshitto Version*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1884. 4to, pp. 3, with 3 phototyped plates by Gutekunst.)

² *Biblical Hermeneutics; a Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*, by Milton S. Terry, S.T.D. (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1883. Pp. 781, 8vo.)

gestive as the paper is, in our judgment it applies its idea too rigidly. So far as the contention is, either that we cannot interpret the Bible without gradually arriving at a doctrine—that is a grounded opinion—concerning it, or that no well-grounded doctrine of Sacred Scripture can be obtained apart from an exegetical study of its claims and phenomena, it is well-nigh self-evident. Must, however, our doctrine of Scripture always sway our interpretation? especially need it sway us in every process of interpretation? For Dr. Ladd asserts even this. We cannot see that text-criticism, for instance, in spite of Dr. Ladd's remarks upon it, need at all depend upon our opinion of what Scripture is. We do not need to know the nature of the Bible, nor anything, beyond its mechanical side, of its origin, in order to reconstruct the text, and the knowledge that we need have of the habits and train of thought and style of the writers is wholly apart from anything that may be justly described as a doctrine of Sacred Scripture. We owe Dr. Ladd much, however, for his fine characterization of the business of the interpreter: "The final purpose of the art of hermeneutics is the communion of souls."

So large an amount of valuable critical material is found in Prof. Fisher's latest volume,¹ that although its purpose is apologetical, it merits mention here. An interesting, though not satisfying, chapter is given to the Canon of the New Testament. And the character of Jesus, and the origin and trustworthiness of the evangelical narrative and of our Gospels are discussed very ingeniously and satisfactorily. It is convincingly shown that the supernatural claims, the sinlessness, and the miracle-working of Jesus can be established apart from any question of Gospel-criticism; and then the faithfulness of the Gospel-records themselves is vindicated—an important chapter being devoted to the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

The value for practical use of Prof. Toy's painstaking work on the New Testament quotations,² is greatly lessened by the vigour and rigour with which he has applied in its preparation some very vigorous and rigorous personal theories. It is designed not as a treatise on the hermeneutical principles of the New Testament writers or their attitude towards the Old Testa-

¹ *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, by George P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1884. Pp. xviii. 488, 8vo.)

² *Quotations in the New Testament*, by Crawford Howell Toy. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1884. Pp. xlv. 32, 18mo.)

ment, but simply as a collection of the passages drawn by them from the Old Testament, with such discussion as will elucidate only the *manner* and the *justice* of their quotation. In the former matter, Prof. Toy starts with the presupposition that "the quotations in the New Testament from the Old Testament are never made immediately from the Hebrew, but always from the Greek or Aramaic version" (p. ix.), and applies it throughout, though not without visible effort at times,—and this, although it forces him to assume the existence of an oral Targum not only somewhat earlier than there is any historical trace of one, or probably there was any need of one,¹ but of a sort wholly unlike, or rather opposite to all known Targums. The latter matter depends on the exegesis of the passages involved, both in their Old and New settings,—and Prof. Toy's exegesis on the New Testament side at least, is sometimes mechanical, external and inadequate, while on the Old Testament side it is deeply affected, first by his reconstruction of Israel's history and the evolution of its literature in accordance with the findings of the school of Reuss, and secondly by his definite persuasion that "there is no room in the Old Testament thought for a double sense" (p. xxvi.), by which he apparently intends to exclude all typology as well as allegory. A book constructed in such a manner, however painstaking and however full of just and suggestive remarks (Prof. Toy's book is both), cannot but be in many parts useless to all who do not share in all its primal presumptions. When we add that the arrangement is not very convenient to the eye, and that the original texts are not in every case given, it will be seen why we do not expect this work to supersede the other current collections of Old Testament quotations in the New.

In exegesis proper, the American press has not been very prolific recently. A revision of the Edinburgh translation of Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament² has been in progress since

¹ We cannot go so far as Delitzsch, who, as is well-known, asserts that Hebrew and not Aramaic was the folk-tongue of the time. Nevertheless, Hebrew was not yet a dead language, as Prof. Toy asserts. Hebrew was the school-tongue, Aramaic the folk-tongue, and both were understood. Nothing else will satisfy the hints of the New Testament. As Oort justly expresses it (*Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1884, p. 276), Hebrew was the school-tongue, the tongue of the learned, which the Rabbins spoke and the devout everywhere understood; yet a preacher who by choice addressed himself to the poor, would be much better understood if he spoke in Aramaic.

² *Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament*, etc. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884.)

the beginning of 1884, and the four Gospels and Paul's Epistles, from Romans to Ephesians, have already appeared. Each volume has been put into the hands of a competent scholar, who has revised the rendering, prefixed prefaces, and added here and there a note. The work has been well done. A somewhat different undertaking has given us a new edition of Adam Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament,¹ "condensed and supplemented from the best modern authorities." The result is a sort of semi-catena. Dr. Samuel T. Lowrie has the pre-eminence of having produced the single, important, original commentary of the year,²—a work of high value, quite in the spirit and manner of Von Hofmann. In reading it, one feels all the subtlety and *finesse* that he has been accustomed to think the peculiar property of the German author,—all of whose acuteness and originality and strength seem to have passed over to his old pupil across the seas. Those who dislike Von Hofmann, are not likely to admire this explanation of Hebrews; but students of the Epistle cannot afford to neglect it any more than New Testament students in general can afford to forget Von Hofmann himself. They may find much to disagree with in it,—provokingly much; but they will find much more that is admirably conceived and strongly said, and everywhere they will enjoy and learn and feel the hand of a master.

The periodical press furnishes us with two important papers on the Epistle to the Romans:—One is by the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, on "Recent Discussions of Romans ix. 5" (*Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis for 1883* [published in 1884], pp. 90–112), supplementing his paper on the same subject in the *Journal for 1881*, and criticizing somewhat severely Dr. Gifford's pamphlet: "A letter to Rev. Benj. Hall Kennedy, D.D., in reply to criticisms on the interpretation of Romans ix. 5, in *The Speaker's Commentary*." The other is an attempt to trace the train of thought in Romans ix.–xi. by Prof. E. P. Gould (same *Journal*, pp. 22–41). The difficult verse, 2 Peter i. 20, receives a full and very interesting treatment from Mr. Owen Street (*Biblio-*

¹ *The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, etc.*, by Adam Clarke, LL.D., etc. A new edition, condensed and supplemented from the best modern authorities, by Daniel Curry, LL.D. (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884. 2 vols. 8vo).

² *An Explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by the Rev. Samuel Lowrie, D.D. (New York: Robert Carter & Bros. [1884], pp. 540, 8vo.)

theca Sacra, January, 1885, pp. 168–173), the hinge of which is the close paralleling of its ἐπιλυσι with the λύσι of John x. 35: “The one declares the Scripture *cannot* be broken; the other says it is a first truth that *it is not to be* loosed.” We are on the confines of Biblical Theology in Mr. John Greene’s spirited paper on “Life and Death in the New Testament” (*Baptist Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1884, vi. 24, pp. 411–431), the first part of which moves in the purely exegetical sphere. He arranges the words ψυχή [πνεῦμα], βίος, ἀναστροφή, ζωή, in this order,—the gradation being partly from inner to outward, partly from lower to higher. Ψυχή is the vital principle, or the bundle of experiences belonging to man as a conscious being. Βίος is the sum of the activities resulting from the ψυχή,—life as made up of phenomena. Ἀναστροφή introduces the moral aspect and relations. While ζωή is the life that is life indeed! The law of rank is so far observed that the lower do not intrude into the sphere of the higher; though ζωή sometimes, not frequently, invades the province of the lower words. “Death” has but one term to express it,—a negative term, the exact sense of which in each case is determined by the sense of “life” to which it is explicitly or implicitly opposed.

Finally, there are a few papers on points of New Testament grammar which are worth calling attention to. Dr. Henry A. Batty (*The Methodist Review*, March, 1885, pp. 215–233) discusses the Greek article in admirable style, arriving at the sound principle that its function is to particularize, while its absence leaves the qualitative idea of the word prominent. He illustrates chiefly from νόμος and ὁ νόμος, taking his stand in his treatment of the distinction by the side of Drs. Lightfoot, Vaughan, Goodwin, etc. The same writer has a paper in an earlier number of the same *Review* (April, 1884, pp. 337–348), attempting to prove the presence of the Gnostic aorist in the New Testament,—and successfully as we think, although we cannot admit all of the examples that he adduces. Prof. F. B. Denio attempts to reduce to rule (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1884, pp. 384–389), the translation into English of the Greek aorist as follows: (1) When the fact of occurrence is prominent and there is no adverbial limitation of time, use the preterite, e.g. Luke xix. 21. (2) Where mere occurrence is indicated, although there are adverbial limitations or contextual indications of time, use the preterite, e.g. John xvii. 1. (3) When the contextual reference is to present time and no

adverbial limitation dates the action specifically, usually use the perfect, *e.g.* Acts xii. 11. More unsuccessfully in our judgment, Prof. Wm. G. Ballantine (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1884, pp. 787-799) investigates the usage of the aorist, predicative participle, in the New Testament; he is evidently, however, on the right track, and grammarians will do well to consult his paper.

Alleghany.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

SURVEY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—The criticism of the last fifty years has been for the New Testament a veritable Medea's caldron, out of which, to the surprise of its foes, and possibly also of some of its friends, it has emerged in the freshness of youth, with a new lease of life. Time was when reverence for the New Testament kept criticism silent, and one would as soon have "botanized upon a mother's grave" as have critically investigated the origin of those sacred writings. But in these last days, the supremacy of the New Testament has exposed it in a marked degree to "that fierce light which beats upon a throne." This light has not revealed any reasons for our discrediting the New Testament writings, but it has not been wholly without result. It has given us very much clearer ideas of the real nature and actual origin of these writings, and has compelled us to adopt new methods of defending them. The higher criticism, formidable in its equipment with all the destructive appliances of modern science, has taught us to replace our wooden walls with armoured engines of war, and to prove that science is available for defence as well as for attack. Many of the theories which a few years ago excited some trepidation are now as antiquated and harmless as a sailing frigate of the extinct type. This rapid superannuation of critical theories arises in great part from the lack of seriousness and reality, which has characterized much German criticism. The levity which aims at "such a display of ingenuity as makes people clap their hands and cry *Well done!* but does not seriously persuade them" has been scourged not too severely or contemptuously by Mr. Matthew Arnold, and is, as he says, "not much worth a wise man's ambitioning." A reaction in