

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

PAUL'S epistles will be left over, this month, owing to lack of space. But attention may be drawn to one general point in regard to the New Testament epistles. The epistolary form of address, ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν, occurs only twice in the New Testament, viz., in Acts xv. 23 (xxiii. 26) and James i. 1. In the latter case it is linked on to the opening counsel, πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἠγάσασθε, by a literary device which occurs in two of the Platonic epistles (the third and the eighth). But it is curious to observe that the earliest occurrence of this formula in Greek literature is associated with the term εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. As Herr G. A. Gerhard points out in the first of a series of studies upon the history of the Greek epistle (*Philologus*, 1905, pp. 27 f.), tradition ascribes the origin of this address to Cleon, who employed it in announcing the news of the victory of Sphacteria in 425 B.C. : Ἐν ἐπιστολῆς δὲ ἀρχῇ Κλέων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος δημαγωγὸς ἀπὸ Σφακτηρίας πρῶτον χαίρειν προὔθηκεν εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν νίκην τὴν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τὴν Σπαρτιατῶν ἄλωσιν (*Lucian, De lapsu in salutando*, § 3). It was thus an echo of the famous cry, χαίρετε, νικῶμεν, which Phidippides died shouting as he told the news of Marathon. The joy of χαίρειν would thus be joy in a triumph, and the news conveyed by the message would be a veritable εὐαγγέλιον. Such, at any rate, was the association of the words which Greek tradition loved to preserve. The alternative and more Oriental opening of a letter—τάδε λέγει—occurs in Jewish epistles only, so far as Gerhard is aware, in the Apocalypse of Baruch.

The keen controversy over the ascription of the Magnificat to Elizabeth instead of Mary, which agitated many circles in 1902-1904, has been echoing faintly during 1905.

Dr. Bardenhewer's elaborate defence of the canonical text and tradition of the Virgin birth (*Mariä Verkündigung. Ein Kommentar zu Lukas i. 26-28*) synchronizes with an English discussion of the problem between Mr. F. C. Burkitt (pp. cliii.-cliv.) and the Bishop of Salisbury (clv.-clviii.) in Mr. A. E. Burn's volume on *Niceta of Remesiana* (1905), an author who, in his *de Psalmodiæ Bono* (9, 11), assumes that Elizabeth spoke the Magnificat. This, together with the well known occurrence of Elizabeth for Mary in Luke i. 46 in some old Latin MSS. (the reading being also familiar to Origen), will show how widely spread the tradition must have been. Now, as it is extremely difficult to suppose that Elizabeth could have been substituted for Mary, or *vice versâ*, Mr. Burkitt plausibly suggests that the original text ran, *καὶ εἶπεν Μεγαλύνει κτλ.* The bishop agrees that both names are "glosses intended to clear up the sense of a phrase which some readers or scribes found ambiguous," but he inclines (as against critics like Loisy and Völter) to think, on the internal evidence of the context, that it was really Mary who uttered the song, *Μαριάμ* being written in *v.* 56 in order to mark *vv.* 39-56 as a Mary-section.

The origin as well as the meaning of the proverb in Matthew vii. 6 has been a constant puzzle to readers of the Gospel. In a recent number of the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1905, pp. 155 f.), Herr J. Oestrup shows that the idea of pearls as food for animals or birds was not unknown to Oriental folk-lore. In Turkish fairy tales particularly, as well as in Arabian, to fling pearls thus for food was equivalent to extravagant generosity or to something utterly incredible. The author does not pretend to explain how this curious idea penetrated Northern Palestine; but, he adds, it is quite compatible with A. Meyer's conjecture that behind the enigmatic text

lies an original reference to the ring of pearls (נשך) as a metaphorical term for the Law. The Turkish parallels are noted in G. Jacob's *Türk. Volkslitteratur* (Berlin, 1901, p. 22 note).

The seven deadly sins of the ecclesiastical catalogue (i. pride, ii. avarice, iii. luxury, iv. anger, v. gula, vi. envy, vii. acedia) are anticipated, as has often been pointed out, in the first book of the Epistles of Horace (i. 33 f.), where the poet shows how philosophy has certain remedies or spells for the various fevers of the human soul :—

Fervet avaritia (ii.) miseroque cupidine pectus :
 Sunt verba et voces quibus hunc lenire dolorem
 Possis et magnam morbi deponere partem.
 Laudis amore (i.) tumes : sunt certa piacula quae te
 Ter pure lecto poterunt recreare libello.
 Invidus (vi.), iracundus (iv.), iners (vii.), vinosus (v.), amator
 (iii),
 Nemo adeo ferus est ut non mitescere possit,
 Si modo culturae patientem commodet aurem.

“ Is your breast fevered with avarice and tortured by craving ? There are spells and strains whereby you can assuage this pain and rid yourself of much of the malady. Do you swell with a passion for praise ? Sure remedies there are for your relief, when purified you have thrice read the precepts. Envious, angry, inert, drunken, licentious—none is so savage that he cannot grow refined, if only he will give heed to culture.” The origin of such a classification, which Horace probably took from Poseidonius, the astrological philosopher, was referred by Reitzenstein to the seven planets. But, in a recent note (*Philologus*, 1905, pp. 21–22), the Russian scholar, Zielinski, proposes to go further and to find in astrological lore the contents as well as the number of the series. He quotes the remark of Servius (on *Aeneid* vi. 714) : Mathematici

fungunt, quod . . . cum descendunt animae, trahunt secum torporem Saturni (vii.), Martis iracundiam (iv.), libidinem Veneris (iii.), Mercurii lucri cupiditatem (ii.), Iovis regni desiderium (i.). Two sins, "gula" and envy, are absent from this list. But Zielinski would identify them with the devouring force of the sun and the pale yearning moon, the sun and moon being, here as elsewhere, employed to make up the seven planets.

The far-reaching influence of the sevenfold planetary symbolism is brought out very vividly by Dr. Alfred Jeremias in his monograph upon *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, 1905), containing a full account of the various Oriental speculations which may be held, more or less reasonably, to have entered into the language and ideas of primitive Christianity. The background of symbols, like those of the seven stars, the seven torches, and the seven angels before the throne in the Apocalypse (iv. 5, i. 12, viii. 12, etc.), has long been recognized to be that of the seven planets in Oriental astrology. But Dr. Jeremias shows further how the current association of the planets with various colours has affected the imagery of passages like vi. 1 f. and viii. 6-9. Such mythological and cosmological parallels as are adduced, in researches of this kind, need to be carefully checked, and, in this connexion, reference must be made to the salutary opening remarks of Dr. L. R. Farnell, in his lectures on *The Evolution of Religion* (Crown Theological Library, 1905), about the dangers of mistaking resemblances for proofs of origin or dependence between two religions. Dr. Farnell's special topics are the ritual of purification and the evolution of prayer. But his general prolegomena (pp. 1-87) are of special value, particularly in view of the somewhat rash speculations which disfigure Dr. Otto Pfeleiderer's volume in the same series

(*The Early Christian Conception of Christ*, 1905). Dr. Jeremias is at once more sober and original than Pfeleiderer. His central thesis may be seen by English readers in 'the *Hibbert Journal* for October (pp. 217 f.). But the untranslated German essay is a mine of wealth for the cautious critic of the New Testament. Mammon, e.g., he identifies (pp. 95-96) with the Babylonian man-man, a surname of Nergal, the god of the underworld. And Babylonian parallels of great interest and appositeness are brought forward to illustrate verses like Matthew x. 35 (pp. 97 f., where family divisions are shown to have been a characteristic of the new era in Babylonian eschatology), Acts xii. 15 (pp. 112 f., the guardian angel), and Apocalypse xii. (pp. 42 f., where the author is careful to add that "the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead has no analogy in the history of religion").

One of Dr. Jeremias' notes is on the expression, *baptism in the name of God* (Matt. xxviii. 19, etc.), which he interprets, on Eastern analogies, to mean incorporation into the glory of God. As the "name" is equivalent (cf. Phil. ii. 9) to the victorious power of Jesus, triumphing over death, baptism into His name implies a share in His divine authority and glory (pp. 104-106). On different lines Dr. F. H. Chase (*Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1905, pp. 481-521), in the course of an elaborate refutation of Mr. Conybeare's hypothesis, while admitting with Ruggenbach the possibility that ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου in the Western text of Matthew xxviii. 19 may be a harmonizing gloss from Luke xxiv. 47, contends that the command to baptize means immersion or incorporation into the divine Name. Jesus, he argues, is not prescribing the use of a formula. He is unfolding the spiritual content of a rite which was already used by His disciples (John iv. 1 f.).

Both Dr. Chase and Professor Goodspeed (*American Journal of Theology*, July 1905) agree that the substance of the lost ending of Mark's Gospel is to be found in Matthew xxviii. 9 f., but the latter scholar rejects the incident of *vv.* 11-15 as unauthentic. Wellhausen, like J. Weiss, objects to this interpretation. He conceives xvi. 8 to have been the natural ending of Mark's Gospel, and pronounces any opinion to the contrary to be based on a misreading of xvi. 4. Of that verse his own interpretation is as follows: " 'The stone was rolled back; for it was very large.' This tells us everything. For it was rolled back by the Risen One, as He broke through the closed door. This visible effect is the only evidence which Mark offers of the resurrection; he does not make the least effort to give a graphic sketch of what nobody saw." This is expanded in the rather unsatisfactory closing section of the short, incisive *Introduction to the First Three Gospels* (Berlin, 1905), with which he has followed up his editions of Mark, Matthew, and Luke. "The very evident reluctance of the earliest Gospel to make Jesus speak of His own advent by no means proves that the faith in that advent was not firmly fixed in the church by this time. Only," he adds, "it seems to me probable that the resurrection or ascension of Jesus was not from the first taken as a mere earnest, nor supplemented originally by His advent, but rather that people were content at the outset with the general advent, i.e., the advent of the kingdom of God" (pp. 97-98). Dr. Arnold Meyer's treatise, *die Auferstehung Christi* (1905), discusses this and the other cognate questions in an exhaustive manner, approximating to the general line taken by Schmiedel, but dealing more adequately, if not successfully, with the wider problems of the resurrection. Wellhausen's editions have elicited at least two excellent notices, one by Jülicher in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for November,

the other by Professor Allan Menzies in his *Review of Theology and Philosophy* for August and September.

The Book of Acts has not received much notice lately, as a whole, but Dr. Carl Clemen's lectures on *die Apostelgeschichte im Lichte der neueren text-, quellen- und historisch-kritischen Forschungen* (1905) serve as a convenient register of contemporary opinion, and present in succinct form the author's own conclusions on the book. Like most recent critics, he sets aside Blass's well-known theory of the two recensions of the text, doubting if even at xii. 10, xix. 9, xx. 15 and xxi. 1 the B-text, with its peculiar readings, is superior. Dr. Clemen undervalues, I think, the extent and weight of the "medical" element in the third Gospel and Acts (pp. 26 f.), which is more serious and continuous than he seems to realize, but he inclines to believe that Luke wrote the we-journal. Simultaneously with his monograph, a large, well illustrated treatise on Paul's voyage to Rome has been published by a former sea-captain, Hans Balmer (*die Romfahrt des Apostels Paulus und die Seefahrtskunde im römischen Kaiserzeitalter*, 1905), who follows Weizsäcker in general, gives a sketch of Paul's career, defends the historicity of the account of the voyage in Acts, and incidentally upholds with vigour the claim of Malta to be the island in which the Apostle was shipwrecked. He contends that Luke must have meant to write a sequel to Acts (p. 493); whether it was ever composed or not we cannot tell.

Weizsäcker's treatise on the apostolic age has now been followed up by a similar monograph on the sub-apostolic age: *das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (1905). Rudolf Knopf, the author of this fluent, careful study, works mainly along Harnack's lines. He, like Weizsäcker, abjures footnotes and literary references, and is content to present the history

of the Christian communities from the Flavian dynasty to Hadrian in a series of admirable sketches, which have the great merit of giving a survey of the general current without undue absorption in details.

In the tenth volume (pp. 390-396) of the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, issued this year, Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, President of the Hebrew Union College in Ohio, writes the article upon the Book of Revelation, which he regards as the Christian embodiment and edition of two Jewish apocalypses. The first of these is to be traced in i. 1, 8, 12-19, iv.-vi. 17, viii. 1-13, ix., xi. 14 f., with the exception of passages like those referring to the Lamb (v. 9-14, vii. 9-10, etc.). This apocalypse the writer ascribes to a period of persecution before the destruction of Jerusalem, "when many Jews died as martyrs, though some yielded; hence only 12,000 of each tribe are to be selected." The "hence" is not very obvious. To this source, it is possible, Dr. Kohler thinks, that even xiv. 1-5, 6-7, and xi. 16-18, 19 originally belonged. As for the rest of the Apocalypse, i.e. x. 2-xi. 13, xii. 1-xiii. 18, xiv. 6-xxii. 6, this represents a second Jewish source, written in Hebrew during the siege and after the destruction of Jerusalem, though xiii. 11-17, xvi. 8-11, etc., are Christian interpolations. These two Apocalypses Dr. Kohler opines must have been, like that in Matthew xxiv. and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, in the possession of Essenes, who joined the Jewish-Christian Church after the destruction of the Temple (cf. xxi. 22). The seer of Patmos he regards as John the Presbyter. Apart from this contribution to the Apocalypse, the outstanding feature of the year's output in this line has been, of course, the publication, in book form, of Professor Ramsay's studies on *The Seven Letters* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1905), containing a wealth of material for the student of the book in general.

Indirectly the question of the authorship of Revelation has emerged in connexion with the discussion of another New Testament problem, viz., that of the Johannine tradition. In the dialogue between Jesus and the two sons of Zebedee (Mark x. 38 f.), the words, "Ye shall drink the cup that I drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized," have been held by some scholars to imply that both John and James suffered martyrdom. The patristic support for this view, which is not strong, was presented by Dr. Schmiedel in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (2509–2510), adversely discussed by Dr. James Drummond in his exhaustive work on the Fourth Gospel (p. 228), and Dr. V. H. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historic Documents*, i. pp. 166 f.), and more favourably viewed by Mr. Badham in the *American Journal of Theology* (1904, pp. 539 f.). Wellhausen's recent adherence to this interpretation of this synoptic passage, however, has started fresh interest in the theory, and an elaborate, if somewhat multifarious, essay is now published by Dr. Schwartz (*über den Tod der Söhne Zebedæi*) in the Proceedings of the Royal Scientific Society of Göttingen. To this, reference must be made again. Meantime, it must be enough to say that as Dr. Schwartz assumes the martyrdom of the two disciples was simultaneous, he is led into a number of forced answers and arbitrary constructions of history, not the least of which is an attempt to show that the John of Acts xv. = Galatians ii. was not the son of Zebedee.

The whole problem is discussed not only by von Soden in his fresh little *Urchristliche Literatur* (1905), pp. 213 f., which is now translated into English, but in the *Theologische Rundschau* (1905), by Professor Bousset, who adhere strongly to the hypothesis of a Jerusalemite disciple, and attempts to explain the origin of the later Johannine tradition

by means of a confusion between the great John of Asia Minor, who was not an apostle, and the apostle of the same name who had suffered martyrdom much earlier. Hilgenfeld's animadversions on this view, in his own journal (*Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1905), insist that if the author of the Fourth Gospel wrote only a few years after the death of John of Asia Minor, it is hardly possible that he should have blended and confused that figure with the Apostle John. In the course of his argument he takes occasion to recall his former very curious explanation of the number 153 in John xxi. 11. It is a cryptic allusion, he alleges, to Nathanael (*v.* 2), "in whom I have found the apostolus suffectus, Matthias." There are three disciples to whom the Risen Jesus in the Fourth Gospel reveals Himself: (i.) Peter, (ii.) Thomas, and (iii.) Nathanael. (i.) John xx. 19-23 (*a*), (ii.) xx. 26-29 (*β*), (iii.) xxi. *NAΘANAHA Γ=153.*

JAMES MOFFATT.