

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

favour of a sane and serious criticism has set in, and of this there is welcome evidence in the important and convincing volume by Dr. Salmon<sup>1</sup> of Dublin, a volume which makes one ashamed of having ever been influenced, even in the slightest degree, by the theory of Baur.

It were mere affectation and pedantry to speak of Dr. Salmon's volume in any other terms than those of unqualified praise. It was to be expected that one of the most accomplished and original of living scholars, after devoting the best years of his life to the studies compendiously known as "Introduction," would produce a book of importance. And no one who appreciates accuracy and vigour, and who can discriminate between what is fanciful and what is real, will be disappointed with the outcome of the reading and thinking of a life. This volume abounds in the results of original observation, and in fresh and forcible argument. Its conclusions, whether they be accepted or not, are supported by reasons so substantial, that the competence of those who in future handle these questions will be determined by the manner in which they deal with what is adduced by Dr. Salmon. It is in fact the first defence of the New Testament writings which is at once very strong and very full. It is bold, fully informed, and very convincing. Any one who makes himself familiar with the facts and arguments contained in this volume will have made solid attainment in the knowledge of the New Testament books, and of the present state of opinion regarding them. Actually delivered in great part to theological students, there is yet nothing of diffuseness in these lectures; and the circumstance that they were produced for the practical purpose of teaching, while it has certainly not admitted the slightest abatement in scientific accuracy, has allowed to the writer's wit an agreeable freedom, and imparted to the style unusual perspicacity and ease.

Although entitled "an Introduction," Dr. Salmon's work does not embrace all the topics commonly included under that title. As he himself says: "I do not enter on the criticism of the text, nor do I make any analysis of the contents of the books. My main purpose has been to discuss their date and authorship on purely historical grounds; and to examine, with sufficient completeness for a practical decision, the various theories on the subject

<sup>1</sup> *An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament.* By George Salmon, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, University of Dublin. (London, John Murray, 1885.)

advanced by modern schools of criticism." This method has naturally its disadvantages; e.g. no account is given of the uncontroverted Epistles of Paul. Thanks to the audacity of modern criticism, this does not indeed greatly contract the range of Dr. Salmon's apologetic; still it is a disappointment to find that the four great Epistles are by their very eminence excluded from the scope of a writer who could have thrown on them the light of ascertained historical and linguistic knowledge. It will also be understood that Dr. Salmon's aim and method prevent him from giving some of the details which are found in books of the nature of Dr. Davidson's Introduction. But the task to which he has confined himself he has accomplished with a thoroughness which adverse critics cannot affect to despise and dare not overlook. Where all is good, it is perhaps needless to particularize; but special attention will, I think, be given to Dr. Salmon's admirable exposition of the origin of the Gospels, to his defence of the historicity of the Acts, and to his rehabilitation of 2 Peter in reply to the clever theory of Dr. Abbott. He would be very simple who should imagine that this or any other volume will end all controversy, and make it as impossible to doubt that the Epistles to Timothy are from the hand of Paul as that "Christmas Eve" is the work of Robert Browning. There is much to be done before such certainty is even approached. The genesis and growth of Gnosticism must be more accurately ascertained; the principles which govern the determination of authorship require to be more definitely settled; and perhaps as needful as any other requisite is the conviction under which Dr. Salmon writes, that "a man is just as bad a critic who rejects what is genuine as who accepts what is spurious." This volume then does not pronounce the final word; but one lays it down with the impression that, while no doubt learning and liberty are most precious boons, Baur and his disciples are actually further from objective truth than the blindest traditionalists, that for biassed manipulation of documents their treatment of the New Testament writings is unexampled, and that none but closet-critics could have propagated theories so flagrantly in violation of the ordinary actings of human nature.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.—No one who is interested in the study of the New Testament will omit to read two contributions to the recently issued volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* which bear the signature of Dr. Edwin Hatch. The article on Paul is a model of

compressed information and weighty thinking imparted in exact and lucid language. It was not to be expected that in an article of this kind much new light would be shed on a biography which has already attracted so constant and searching a scrutiny as that of Paul. The interest and value of Dr. Hatch's contribution arise rather from his apprehension of the points of vital importance, his maintenance of proportion in the treatment of these, and his judicious and delicate handling of much-debated matters. In every paragraph there occur phrases which quicken the imagination and suggest the wealth of information out of which the seemingly easy narrative is formed. Occasionally a difficulty in the story is over-leapt by the help of a not wholly intelligible expression of Luke or of Paul; but on the whole it is probably the last complaint a reader is likely to make, that difficulties have been minimized or evaded. It is more likely that some will complain that difficulties have been magnified; and that caution, not the most conspicuous of Dr. Hatch's qualifications as a critic, is somewhat unevenly applied in an article which at once declines to admit more than a "general probability" that Paul suffered martyrdom, and accepts it as a probable conjecture that he was affected with some nervous disorder allied to epilepsy. Scrupulous readers will also demur to his citing the name of Simon Peter in support of his extremely probable suggestion that Saul was called Paul "from the first"; as well as to his idea that Paul derived his notion of faith from the Old Testament—a supposition which is rendered wholly needless by Paul's own experience of conversion. But such scarcely perceptible blemishes are easily forgiven to an article which is fresh from the first word to the last, and in which the illuminating ray of cultured intelligence gives continuity and significance to a mass of details.

The latter half of the article is devoted to an exposition of the theology of Paul. Necessarily brief, this summary is yet based on so complete and exact a comparison of passages, and is so studiously careful in statement, so full of insight, and so alive with thought, that it cannot fail to expand to ampler knowledge in the reader's mind. Confidence in the writer is inspired at the outset by his eminently suggestive statement of the difficulties attaching to any attempt to systematize the ideas of Paul; and this confidence is upheld by the accuracy, candour, and fairness which characterize his own attempt. Naturally, where ideas of so much importance

and so much questioned are touched upon, disappointment will be felt that the limits and nature of the article prevented the writer from saying more. On p. 427 occur these significant sentences: "To most of the philosophical questions which have since been raised in connexion with [the soteriology of Paul] he neither gives nor implies an answer. It is possible that many of these questions did not even suggest themselves to him. The chief of all of them, that of the necessity of sacrifice, was probably axiomatic to a Jewish mind, and its place in Paul's system must be accepted, with all the difficulties which such an acceptance involves." That is a most reasonable and fair statement; and yet it leaves the reader desiderating a clearer exhibition of the process of thought by which Paul was led to transfer, apparently, the sacrificial idea entire to the death of Christ. Very possibly nothing more can be said than that the idea of sacrifice was axiomatic to the Jewish mind; but did not the revolution through which Paul's mind passed dismiss from it other ideas which to all appearance were as axiomatic to the Jew? and is it not certain that Paul retained the sacrificial idea because he found for it its realization in the death of Christ, and could give to his own mind an intelligible account of its retention? At the same time, it is by no means easy to say what that intelligible account was. In fact, it is one of the hardest problems in Biblical theology to trace the history of the transference of the complete sacrificial idea to the death of Christ, to show the grounds of this transference in the actual events preceding and accompanying the crucifixion, and in His relations to His disciples; and to distinguish between the symbolic and the real in the arrangements and language of sacrifice. In the most peculiarly Jewish, and possibly the earliest, of the Epistles, that of James, there is no mention of sacrifice. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, though distinctly Jewish, it is absent. And although in the writings of Peter it is prominent, yet so far as can be gathered from the records of his earliest preaching, it was to Jesus as Prince rather than as sacrifice that he pointed men.

Dr. Hatch's critical point of view was sufficiently indicated in the *Bampton Lectures*. In those learned and ingenious discussions he appeared as an open-minded scholar, with much sympathy for critical difficulties and hesitations, and considerable willingness to abide in an attitude of philosophical suspense. This accommodation of his own opinions to the scruples of less robust scholars

betrays him at times into apparent inconsistency; while at other times it imparts an Ishmaelitic double-edgedness to his deliverances, which will be relished neither by liberals nor by conservatives. Here is an example. Of the Book of Acts he says: "What colouring of a later time, derived from later controversies, has been spread over the original outline of the history cannot now be told. While on the one hand the difficulties of the narrative as it stands cannot be overlooked, yet on the other hand no faithful historian will undertake, in the absence of all collateral evidence, the task of discriminating that which belongs to a contemporary testimony, and that which belongs to a subsequent recension." Many of the trifling objections to the historicity of the Acts, which have flattered the self-complacency of ingenious critics, Dr. Hatch's robust sense shakes off, "as dewdrops from a lion's mane"; but at times he exhibits an altogether extravagant generosity to fanciful criticism, as in speaking of 1 Thessalonians as "perhaps not beyond dispute."

Those who disliked the conclusions at which Dr. Hatch arrived in his *Bampton Lectures* will no doubt declare that his rejection of the *Pastoral Epistles* was a foregone conclusion; and they may think that their anticipations are verified in the article just published. It will be said that his theory of the organization of the early Church compelled him to set aside these Epistles and refuse to accept their evidence regarding the Apostolic Church. And certainly Dr. Hatch's theory of the growth of ecclesiastical organization will not be generally accepted, until he is able to show that its acceptance is not incompatible with the belief that these are the genuine Epistles of Paul. But regarding their genuineness there is sufficient room for difference of opinion to make the charge of bias unreasonable.

Similar in subject to the articles of Dr. Hatch, but differing widely in method and in results, are the *Hibbert Lectures*, of Prof. Pfeiderer.<sup>1</sup> The substance of these Lectures has already been given to the public in the author's well-known and classical work on Paulinism. But the present volume is far from being a dead abridgment or stiff compilation from his larger work. On the contrary, it is written with all the freshness and force of an original conception; and not only are some positions—

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity*. By Otto Pfeiderer, D.D. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1885.)

possibly out of deference to, or at least with the consciousness of, an English audience—more guardedly defined, but the lecture of greatest permanent value, that on the theology of Paul, introduces some novel and important suggestions not to be found in the former work. And while nothing could surpass the penetration, research, and utility, especially of the first half, of the larger book, these Lectures, while presenting a clear and comprehensive view of the place and influence of Paulinism in the early Church, possess the additional merit of forming a volume of most inviting reading. In fact, if that fiasco of modern criticism, the Tübingen construction of apostolic and sub-apostolic times, is still to be propagated, it could not be more lucidly nor more temperately and persuasively presented than it is in these Lectures. The tone of the lecturer is perfect. It is the tone of the scholar, too much absorbed in his theme to have any mind for personalities, and saved from all that is trivial by his clear apprehension of the central and guiding idea. From beginning to end not one abusive or contemptuous word is cast at any opposing theory. And however firmly the reader may dissent from Pfeleiderer's conception of the relation of Paul to the original Apostles, and of the results of that relation in the post-apostolic Church, he cannot fail to profit by the stimulating suggestiveness of his exposition of the development of Paulinism. For while the Tübingen sense of proportion and perspective in history is truly Chinese, individual events and single momenta of history are depicted with masterly and most instructive insight. The weakness and strength of the Tübingen school are indeed one; it has seized a single factor of primitive history with such intensity of concentration, that it has eyes for no other factor at all. The writers of that school have brought to the defence of their position so vast a wealth of learning, that their works are storehouses of information; and one is continually tempted to adapt the line of Horace, and say of them, "The gods have given them riches, but not the art of using them."

In the present volume Prof. Pfeleiderer makes one or two admissions of considerable importance. He admits that the distinction between the "false brethren" and the elder Apostles must not be overlooked; and also that we have *no definite information* regarding the part taken by the original Apostles in the persistent opposition of Paul, initiated by the Judaizing party. It is also satisfactory

to find the following statement regarding the reconciliation of the two accounts of the Council of Jerusalem: "I am of opinion that this question has not in reality the great importance which is often attached to it; for whether the removal of this special difference is thought to be possible or not, appears to me to be of quite secondary moment in view of the unquestionable fact, that, with regard to the real meaning and object of the Apostles' agreement, the accounts of Paul and of the Acts conduct to essentially unanimous results." In dealing with the Apocalypse, as with the other New Testament writings, Pfeiderer follows the traditions, if not the necessities, of the Tübingen school. And nowhere does the power of these traditions more distinctly appear than in the compulsion they put upon a man of his independence and discernment to find an anti-Pauline bias in the description of the New Jerusalem, which "had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb"; a description surely in perfect accordance with Paul's idea of the true Israel, and which might indeed have well been written by the very hand that wrote, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." It is also disappointing to find that in common with his school he traces an anti-Pauline bias in the expression (Rev. ii. 2), "them which say they are apostles, and are not," apparently oblivious that Paul himself has occasion to speak of "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." But, carried as Pfeiderer is by the traditions of his school, he does not blind himself to the remarkable agreement in doctrine, and especially in Christology, between the Apocalypse and the Pauline writings. To account at once for the Pauline theology and for the anti-Pauline spirit of the book, he invents the ingenious theory that the Apocalypse proceeded from a man who at one time of his life had come much in contact with Paul and felt his influence, though hostile to him, probably from a leader of that party of which Paul complains in his Epistle to the Philippians, that they preached Christ "of envy."

There are also evidences throughout the volume that even to a man of genius it is an impossible task to construct a thoroughly consistent history of sub-apostolic times on the hypothesis of Baur. To cite but one example: the Epistle to the Ephesians is, according to Pfeiderer, a significant monument of the desire for reconciliation between the two great sections of the Church which



existed in the second century; yet in the Epistle of Clement, which he admits to lie within the first century, he sees Paulinism already becoming Catholicism. But the blemishes in the book are the unavoidable weaknesses of the theory: the lucidity, the thoroughness, the originality, the insight are Prof. Pflleiderer's.

Such volumes as Dr. Fraser's *Metaphors in the Gospels*,<sup>1</sup> help to sustain expository preaching at a high level. The accuracy of its expository matter is commendable, and the applications of our Lord's teaching to modern life are always sensible and in good taste, and sometimes incisive.

Those who interest themselves in forms of Church government and worship, in schemes of alliance and union, in creeds and other ecclesiastical matters, will do well to ponder the seasonable, well-considered, eminently sensible, and fairly liberal volume<sup>2</sup> of Dr. Dykes, of Ayr.

MARCUS DODS.

---

### BREVIA.

**Oltramare on Romans.**—It will be readily admitted that, among many excellent popular commentaries which have placed the results of modern research within reach of the mass of English readers, there have been during the last ten years very few works embodying a real advance in New Testament scholarship. To one such work I wish now to call attention.

This Commentary on Romans is by Dr. Oltramare, Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva, in two volumes similar in size and shape to, but rather larger than, those of his countryman Dr. Godet, and is dated November 1st, 1881. So long ago as 1843 Dr. Oltramare published a commentary on Rom. i.-v. The present work is the result of a lifelong devotion to this great Epistle.

The work lately published is marked by wide knowledge of the literature of the subject, by thorough grammatical accuracy, delicate tact, and patient effort to trace the exact thought of the

<sup>1</sup> *Metaphors in the Gospels*. By Donald Fraser, D.D. (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1885.)

<sup>2</sup> *The Christian Church in Relation to Human Experience*. By Thomas Dykes, D.D. (Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 1885.)