

literations from the Aramaic, and indicate that this was the dialect normally spoken by our Lord; and forms such as καλόν . . . ἤ (= טוב מן) for expressing a comparison, ἀποκριθεις . . . εἶπεν (= רצן וראמד), καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ (= הנה יהי), οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων and οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ συμφῶνος (= בני חסם and בני החסם), and τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί; (= מה לנו וךך) all bespeak a definite Hebraistic influence. Then, too, there are the solecisms of the New Testament, and in particular of the Apocalypse, which call for some explanation. J. H. Moulton firmly denies that the Greek of the Apocalypse owes any of its barbarisms to "Hebraism," and in general, assuming the role of debunker of the view which favours a Semitic basis or origin of the New Testament, he maintains that "what we can assert with assurance is that the papyri have finally destroyed the figment of the N.T. Greek which in any material respect differed from that spoken by ordinary people in daily life throughout the Roman world." C. C. Torrey on the other hand, unconvinced by the pleading of Moulton, earnestly puts forward a case for both the Apocalypse and the Gospels as being careful translations from Aramaic originals. The whole matter can be studied in his three books, *Documents of the Primitive Church, Our Translated Gospels*, and *The Four Gospels, A New Translation*.

Well, the student of the New Testament must choose, or perhaps steer a middle course, between these two views. At any rate, I trust that what has been so cursorily put forward within the compass of this brief article may serve to demonstrate to the Christian minister what an absorbingly interesting and profitable field of study lies open before him in the pages of his Greek Testament. Only let him ever eschew the snares of pedantry and pontification!

American Theological Literature 1947-8

BY THE REV. F. W. DILLISTONE, D.D.

During the past months I have sought from time to time to give brief reports in the columns of *The Record* on new books which have been published in this country, and I will not attempt to repeat what I have written there. Looking back over the past 12 to 18 months, I gain the impression that it has been a rather lean period in the world of theological literature. Good books have appeared, but few could be called standard works, and I doubt if any have attained a very wide circulation.

Of the larger books, Wolfson's *Philo* is now available in England. The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament has had an enormous circulation on this side and is also reasonably well known in England. A standard work on *The Lutheran Liturgy* by Luther D. Reed has been well received by liturgical experts. It runs to nearly 700 pages, and has been beautifully produced. Roughly one-third is devoted to an historical survey and the remainder to detailed commentary on the Service. In his Preface, Dr. Reed compares the Lutheran Liturgy with the Roman and the Anglican, and remarks: "As one of the three great liturgies of the Western Church, the

Lutheran Liturgy merits close comparison with the other two, and this book employs a comparative method of study throughout. Such study shows the Lutheran rite to be purer than the Roman, simpler and yet more complete and unified than the Anglican, and as truly in the historic churchly tradition as either. Its distinctive qualities, in addition to historical continuity and simplicity, are doctrinal clarity and consistency, objective emphasis, encouragement of congregational participation, and complete liturgical texts (Introits, Graduals, Antiphons, Responsories) for choir use." I imagine that this book will remain the standard treatment for a very long time and will demand the attention of all those concerned with ideals and patterns of worship in Reformed Christendom.

Another large book, which contains a vast amount of material, is the composite volume, *The Study of the Bible To-day and To-morrow*, edited for the Chicago Society for Biblical Research by Professor H. R. Willoughby. An interesting appraisal of the book by Professor H. H. Rowley appeared in the April number of *Theology To-day*, and I would commend his review to any who desire to know about the range and contents of the book. A considerable proportion of America's Biblical scholars have had connections with the Chicago Society at one time or another, and this means that among the twenty-five authors are included experts now teaching in other parts of the country. Amongst English books the nearest parallels to this symposium that I can think of are the two volumes of essays produced by the Society of Old Testament Study—*The People and the Book* and *Record and Revelation*. A good deal of the material tends to be rather technical, but it does show clearly what are the dominant issues in the present day Biblical scholarship and what are likely to be the developments in the immediate future.

By the time this article is in print, the long expected Westminster Study Bible should be on the market (publication date is Sept. 1st). The Westminster Bible Dictionary and the Atlas preceded it, and now this will be the third in the series of Helps to the Study of the Bible which the Westminster Press is sponsoring. Unfortunately the price is much larger than had originally been hoped: when the project was launched \$5 was the figure; instead, to-day the book must sell for \$10. Yet it will be a beautiful piece of work. Though containing over 2,000 pages it will be easy to handle. The text of the A.V. is printed in full, there are general articles, introductions to the individual books, foot-notes, maps, concordance—in fact, most of the ordinary aids which a Bible student needs. There is little doubt that copies of the Study Bible will become available in England—though I almost tremble to think what the price will have to be. The other major Biblical enterprise in the U.S.A.—the *Interpreter's Bible* under the editorship of Dr. John Knox at Union Seminary—is going steadily forward and the first volume will probably appear next year. It is being designed on a very large scale to include a full exegesis of each book of the Bible, together with an interpretation and application of a homiletical kind.

In the field of systematic theology, the outstanding event of the year so far (at least in my judgment) has been the publication of a collection of the papers and articles of Paul Tillich under the title

The Protestant Era. A good many would be inclined to rank Tillich as America's No.1 theologian at the present time. He may not be always orthodox (he has certain affinities with Gnosticism), he may at times seem over-philosophical (he speaks with real authority on the German philosophers of the 19th century), but he always seems to be dealing with important questions at a really deep level. There is a good hope that before too long his own System will appear in print: meanwhile *The Protestant Era* gives the fullest account available in English of Tillich's thought.

The editor of the book is Professor J. L. Adams of the University of Chicago, and besides arranging the chapters skilfully he has added a final interpretative chapter himself. Moreover, the editor has been responsible for translating a number of chapters which originally appeared in German. There are five main sections: (1) Religion and History (in one chapter of which the author deals fully with this concept of Kairos); (2) Religion and Culture (one chapter of which outlines a Protestant approach to Sacramental Theology). (3) Religion and Ethics. (4) Protestantism (one chapter of which contains Tillich's answer to his own question as to whether we are at the end of the Protestant Era). (5) The Present Crisis, dealing with such themes as "Marxism and Christian Socialism" and "Spiritual Problems of Post-war Reconstruction." The exciting thing about Tillich is that he can speak with authority in the realms of Art, of Philosophy, of Sociology, of Theology. So in his writings there is an approach to that synthetic view of human existence which is so desperately needed at the present time.

It would obviously be impossible to give a synopsis of the eighteen chapters which make up this book. Let me however give a few quotations from the Author's own Introduction. Perhaps his major distinction is between Protestantism as an actual historical phenomenon and the Protestant principle which is, he says, everlasting. "The Protestant principle is not the Protestant reality; and the question had to be asked as to how they are related to one another, how the life of the Protestant churches is possible under the criterion of the Protestant principle, and how a culture can be influenced and transformed by Protestantism. These questions are asked, in one way or another, in every article of the present book. And in every answer suggested, the need for a profound transformation of religious and cultural Protestantism is indicated. It is not impossible that at some future time people will call the sum total of these transformations the end of the Protestant era. But the end of the Protestant era is not the end of Protestantism. On the contrary it may be the way in which the Protestant principle must affirm itself in the present situation. The end of the Protestant era is not the return to the Catholic era and not even, although much more so, the return to early Christianity; nor is it the step to a new form of secularism. It is something beyond all these forms, a new form of Christianity, to be expected and prepared for, but not yet to be named. Elements of it can be described but not the new structure that must and will grow; for Christianity is final only in so far as it has the power of criticising and transforming each of its "historical manifestations; and just this power is the Protestant principle" (italics mine). But, Tillich goes

on, that might appear to be mere negativity. By the power of what reality does the Protestant principle exercise its criticism? The answer is: The power of the New Being that is manifest in Jesus as the Christ. "Here the Protestant protest comes to an end. Here is the bedrock on which it stands and which is not subjected to its criticism. Here is the sacramental foundation of Protestantism, of the Protestant principle and of the Protestant reality."

In concluding his introduction, Tillich has some intensely interesting things to say about his own relationship to the two main trends in present day theology, "the one called 'dialectical' in Europe, 'neo-orthodox' in America, the other called 'liberal' in Europe (and America) and sometimes 'humanist' in America. My theology can be understood as an attempt to overcome the conflict between these two types of theology." For instance, he continues, the Protestant principle gave liberal theology the right to approach Holy Scripture with the critical methods of historical research: it was the Protestant principle that enabled liberal theology to realize that Christianity cannot be considered in isolation from the general religious and cultural, psychological and sociological, development of humanity; it was the Protestant principle that destroyed the supra-naturalism of the Roman Catholic system, the dualism between nature and grace. In these respects, Protestant theology must ever be regarded as liberal theology. On the other hand it was the Protestant principle that induced orthodox theologians to look at Scripture as the original document of the event which is called 'Jesus the Christ' and therefore as Holy Scripture; it was the Protestant principle that showed orthodox theologians "that the history of religion and culture is a history of permanent demonic distortions of revelation and idolatrous confusions of God and man"; it was the Protestant principle that forced the orthodox theologians "to acknowledge that man in his very existence is estranged from God, that a distorted humanity is our heritage and that no human endeavour and no law of progress can conquer this situation, but only the paradoxical and reconciling act of the divine self-giving." In these respects Protestant theology must ever be orthodox. So, Tillich concludes, his theology is both liberal and orthodox: if any one wants to give it a technical term he prefers to call it neo-dialectical.

If the editor can find room for one more paragraph, let me quote this, the concluding paragraph of his introduction. "May I conclude," Tillich writes, "with a personal remark. It was the 'ecstatic' experience of the belief in a kairos which, after the first World War, created, or at least initiated, most of the ideas presented in this book. There is no such ecstatic experience after the second World War, but a general feeling that more darkness than light is lying ahead of us. An element of cynical realism is prevailing to-day as an element of Utopian hope was prevailing at that earlier time. The Protestant principle judges both of them. It justifies the hope, though destroying its Utopian form; it justifies the realism, though destroying its cynical form. In the spirit of such a realism of hope, Protestantism must enter the new era, whether this era will be described by later historians as a post-Protestant, or as a Protestant era; for, not the Protestant era, but the Protestant principle is everlasting."