

highest flavour, as thrilling as a Stables or a Henty, his book is nevertheless not a romance, but a story of the bearing of the Cross. There is no boy or girl who will call this tame, and it cannot fail to carry something of the love of Christ home to the hearts of those who read it.

THE CHILDREN'S SUNBEAM. (*Longley*. Large 8vo, pp. 100.)

The claims of this Children's Annual rest upon its realistic pictures of Bible scenes and other scenery, its abundant and fine-toned reading, and its earnest advocacy of Children's Homes and Missions.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### New Testament Greek.

G. ADOLF DEISSMANN'S two treatises (*Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895; *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897) will afford much spoil to students of New Testament Greek. He sets himself to illustrate from the great collections of inscriptions and papyrus records published at Berlin and Vienna in 1895 the orthography, grammatical forms, and especially the meanings and idioms, of the N.T. text. It is, indeed, almost a sin in Deissmann's eyes to speak of 'New Testament Greek,' for his one object is to prove that the Greek of the N.T. is just the vernacular of the day, examples of which he finds in the above inscriptions, comparing them with N.T. phrases and forms. His work assumes somewhat of a polemical aspect against Cremer's, Grimm's, and Thayer's great lexicons, which are constantly pointing out the peculiarities of the N.T. text. But it should be remembered that their point of comparison is classical or literary Greek, whereas Deissmann's appeal is to a vernacular or colloquial form of the language. These collections of inscriptions were not available for comparison to the lexicographers named. In any case, Deissmann's comparisons are full of instruction and interest. They are intended, we are told, to lead, some day,—*sub conditione Jacobeæ*,—to a N.T. lexicon, which will be a welcome addition to the works of worthy predecessors. We may give a few specimens from the second work.

First of all, under the head of 'Lexicon and Syntax,' our author names five words, which are said by former lexicographers to be Hebraisms, but which are found with the same meaning in the inscriptions named.

The second class contains quite a number of words and constructions usually supposed to be peculiar to biblical or ecclesiastical Greek. Deiss-

mann points out (against Grimm and Cremer) that an instance of ἀγάπη, usually regarded as peculiarly biblical, is found in Philo, where there is no proof that he borrowed from the LXX. Thayer, however, notices the instance. The unusual word ἀκατάγνωστος (Tit 2<sup>8</sup>) is found in epitaphs. Ἐνώπιον is generally said to be borrowed from the LXX, and to have a Hebrew colouring. Two cases of its use adverbially are quoted from the papyri, showing its use in Egypt. 'It seems to me not impossible that this adverbial ἐνώπιον was first used with the genitive by the LXX; it was as if created to be the closest possible rendering of the common Hebrew phrase.' Cremer says that καθάρζω occurs only in biblical and (though rarely) ecclesiastical Greek. Grimm, however, notes its use in Josephus. And still more important is its use, 'in the ritual sense,' in the inscriptions. The construction with ἀπό also occurs, as in 2 Co 7<sup>1</sup>, He 9<sup>14</sup>. Κυριακός (1 Co 11<sup>20</sup>, Rev 1<sup>10</sup>) is often applied in the papyri and inscriptions to the imperial treasury. A curious analogy is also pointed out in the fact that both in Asia Minor and Egypt, according to Mommsen and Lightfoot, Σεβαστή (the Emperor's Day) was used as the name of the first day of the month. There need not, of course, have been any conscious reference to this in the name given by Christians to the first day of the week. Νεόφυτος (1 Ti 3<sup>6</sup>) is often described as a new word (a novice of a word) peculiar to the Bible and Church writers. It is applied in the papyri to newly planted palm trees.

Many interesting cases occur under the head of 'Technical Expressions.' Ἀθήρησις (He 7<sup>18</sup> 9<sup>26</sup>) in a technical legal sense is often found in the papyri from Fayûm, along with ἀκύρωσις, and in antithesis to βεβαίωσις; ἀναπέμπω (Lk 23<sup>7</sup>, Ac 25<sup>21</sup>) also occurs in the sense of 'to send back to a

superior authority.' In two Fayûm receipts, dated respectively 29th December 44 A.D., and 6th September 57 A.D., the word ἀπέχω is used, giving an ironical turn to Mt 6<sup>2.5.16</sup>, Lk 6<sup>24</sup>: they can give a discharge for the amount; see also Ph 4<sup>18</sup>. The inscriptions not only mention ἐπίσκοποι among other civil functionaries in Rhodos in the first century B.C. and A.D., but also mention an ἐπίσκοπος among other officials in the Apollo temple there. In reference to the title θεολόγος, given to the writer of the Apocalypse, it is noted that the inscriptions mention θεολόγοι as sacred officials in several cities of Asia Minor,—in Pergamos, Ephesus, Smyrna; in Smyrna there are female θεολόγοι of the mysteries of Demeter; the *theologoi* are sometimes associated with *hymnodoi*. In his former work the author gave evidence of πρεσβύτερος as applied to civil functionaries in Egypt and Asia Minor in the imperial age. He has since met with instances in the Fayûm papyri of the term used of temple officials in Egypt in the second century A.D. The same is held by some to apply to Asia Minor. If this fact should be fully established, it would help to explain the momentous change of the Christian presbyter into a sacrificing priest. The προφήτης also occurs in the papyri of the same period as an order of the Egyptian priesthood. In Ro 15<sup>28</sup> σφραγίζω is used peculiarly: 'When I have sealed this fruit (alms) to them.' Lipsius explains: 'To deliver to their possession correctly.' In a papyrus of the second century A.D. we read: 'Seal the wheat and the barley,' *i.e.* certify by a seal the amount as correct. The apostle's conduct in his charitable work had not escaped suspicion. Of νιοθεσία Cremer says: 'Rarely in literature, more common in inscriptions.' Many instances occur in pre-Christian days in inscriptions from the isles of the Ægean. The form runs: 'A, son of B, καθ' νιοθεσίαν'; in the case of females the form is κατὰ θυγατροποιάν. The number of inscriptions evinces the frequency of adoption.

Many interesting parallels are supplied to N.T. idioms. The phrase ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ (Col 1<sup>10</sup>, 3 Jn v.<sup>6</sup>, 1 Th 2<sup>12</sup>) occurs in inscriptions of the first and second centuries, in reference to heathen priests and priestesses. Several examples are given of τοῦ Θεοῦ θέλωντος, etc. (Ac 18<sup>21</sup>) occurring in private letters in papyri of the first Christian centuries, showing that the phrase was current among lower circles of the heathen. The collocation φιλανδρος

καὶ φιλότεκνος (Tit 2<sup>4</sup>) seems to have been common; the author quotes a lovely inscription on a woman's grave in Pergamos, about Hadrian's time, in which both words occur. The same is true of another Pauline phrase, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν. On the grave of a man and his wife in Rhodos, of the second century B.C., we read the touching inscription: ταῦτὰ λέγοντες ταῦτὰ φρονούντες ἤλθομεν τὰν ἀμέτρητον ὁδὸν εἰς Ἄϊδαν.

Several rare words occur in the new find. The unusual word ἀμετανόητος (Ro 2<sup>5</sup>) is found in a papyrus record of a sale. Ἀπόκριμα (2 Co 1<sup>2</sup>) occurs in a Rhodos inscription of 51 A.D., in the sense of 'decision.' Cremer thinks that βιάζομαι (Mt 11<sup>12</sup>) can only be passive. Our author quotes a Lycian inscription, in which it is used as a deponent (p. 85). A long note on the difficult word δοκίμιος (Ja 1<sup>8</sup>, 1 P 1<sup>7</sup>), which has given expositors much trouble, seems to assign to it the sense of 'approved, genuine' (p. 86). Taking the word as a neuter adjective, the phrase in both passages would run, 'What is genuine in your faith': not an unusual construction in Paul (see 2 Co 8<sup>8</sup>).

J. S. BANKS.

Headingley College, Leeds.

## Among the Periodicals.

### The 'Higher Criticism.'

THE *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 22nd January last is of special interest to the Old Testament student. *Inter alia* it contains a careful review of Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition* by Professor SIEGFRIED. The reviewer remarks at the outset that it was only to be expected that a great amount of valuable information should be contained in a work by an author who has such a wide acquaintance with Semitic studies. In fact, the author and his readers both get lost at times in the maze of Egyptian, Assyrian, and Arabian inscriptions. We hear a great deal that is worth knowing about the ancient Babylonian method of forming names, about the Minæan and Sabæan dialect, about the state of affairs in the Tel el-Amarna period, etc. But about the subject of which, from the title of Hommel's book we expect to hear most, 'modern pentateuchal criticism,' there is least of all, and the little that is said leaves much to be desired in the matter of clearness and precision.

Leaving out of account the vast mass of matter which, however valuable in itself, is irrelevant to the purpose, there are two main positions contended for. First, the agreement between the compound names of the Priests' Code and those found in the inscriptions of the Khammurabi dynasty and in South Arabia proves indirectly the high antiquity of P. Second, the story contained in Gn 14 is also of high antiquity and historical value.

As to the first of these, Siegfried asks, granting the truth of all that is contended for as to the Arabian origin of the Khammurabi dynasty, what does this prove regarding the literary problem of the redaction of P? At most it would imply merely that very ancient materials were at the disposal of the writer, and that many names which had been set aside as of later coinage, rest upon an ancient and trustworthy tradition. But it is evident that all this does not affect in the least the question of the order of the 'sources' and the process by which they reached their present form. In fact, Hommel himself in some important respects differs from Green and Sayce as much as he does from Wellhausen. On the subject of the development of Israel's religion, Siegfried finds it inconceivable that history followed the course Hommel contends for—first a lofty monotheism, then a falling away from this, and finally a return to it under the guidance of the prophets. Equally fantastic is the picture of an ancient literature of the Hebrews written in Arabic, which was afterwards translated into the language of Canaan.

As to Gn 14, Siegfried passes the same judgment on Hommel's arguments as Wellhausen, whose criticism of them we submitted to our readers last month. *Not one inch* of historical ground has been gained. The whole book, in fact, is vitiated by such a want of real historical methods as cannot be atoned for by the vast stores of knowledge which Hommel undeniably possesses.

The same number of the *Literaturzeitung* contains a notable pronouncement upon the 'higher criticism' by Professor BUDDÉ. It occurs in his review of a brochure by Baentsch. We are accustomed to hear of the 'constructing of history,' the arbitrary methods, the naturalistic theory of development, etc. etc., which characterize Wellhausen and his followers. It is well to be re-

minded by Baentsch and Budde of the long, exhaustive, painful process of investigation which preceded the promulgation of Wellhausen's conclusions, and on which we find the latter based in the *Comp. d. Hex. u. d. hist. B.B. d. A.T.* Budde reasonably declares (and his words need to be pondered in some quarters) that *no one who has not worked out and thoroughly considered Wellhausen's arguments down to the minutest detail has any right to pass judgment upon the correctness or incorrectness of his historical standpoint.* Not many of Wellhausen's critics have done this, and any who have done so, notably Professor Green, show clearly that they can no more appreciate his methods than a blind man can judge of colour. Upon the other hand, not a few, like Budde himself, who had been trained in the Ewald-Hupfeld theory, can testify that it was only after repeated and most laborious study of the positions advanced by Wellhausen that they were constrained, on grounds of conscience, to go over to his camp. Nay more, they can testify that this conception of the history of Israel has deepened their faith, that they have learned in this way to understand better the personality of Jesus Christ and the teaching of the New Testament. Wellhausen's motto is Ro 5<sup>20</sup>, *νόμος δὲ παρειώληθεν*, and in a certain sense St. Paul might be called the first 'Wellhausenian.' The apostle certainly 'constructs history,' but the view of the Law which in his case was due to spiritual intuition and creative genius, has now been brilliantly established by historical criticism.

### The Credibility of Acts xvi. 25-34.

In the current number of the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, Dr. GIESEKKE discusses various objections that have been taken to the story of St. Paul and the Philippian jailer. Weizsäcker, Wendt, and B. Weiss have all found the episode either mythical or inexplicable. Five objections are brought against its historical character—(1) it is inexplicable how an earthquake could have loosed the bonds of the prisoners; (2) it is astonishing that the prisoners did not take the opportunity of escaping; (3) it is incomprehensible why the jailer was on the point of taking his life, seeing that (a) he was quite without blame, and (b) was as yet unaware whether the prisoners were gone or not; (4) it is inexplicable how, upon the call of St. Paul, the jailer immediately recognized the apostle's connexion with the earthquake; (5) it is incom-

prehensible how the earthquake led him to recognize in the two prisoners heralds of salvation.

It is only in the first of these objections that Giesekke admits any force. It is easy enough to conceive how the prisoners themselves were too much paralysed with terror to make any attempt to escape, even if in the darkness they saw that escape was possible. The conduct of the jailer is also psychologically quite capable of explanation. Only one idea is at first present to his mind—the prisoners are gone, and he is responsible. Hence the suicide of despair. Then when St. Paul's word recalls him from his purpose, is it difficult to comprehend his question, What must I do to be saved? Is it difficult to suppose that he had heard of the cry of the python-possessed girl, 'These men are servants of the most High God, which proclaim unto you the way of salvation'? What if the *πνεῦμα πύθων* had spoken the truth? Then as to the only real difficulty, the loosing of the bonds of the prisoners, Giesekke thinks that the matter is cleared up by keeping in mind the method of fettering practised in Roman prisons. Paul and Silas' feet were fast 'in the stocks' (*ἐν τῷ ξύλλῳ*). These consisted of two beams bolted together and provided with holes for the feet. In addition to this apparatus we hear of fetters for the hands (*manicae*) and feet (*pedicae*), rings for the neck (*nervi*), and chains (*catenae*) being employed. And not only were the prisoner's limbs shackled, but he was fastened with a greater or smaller range of freedom to the floor or the wall of his cell. This circumstance throws light upon the narrative in Acts. An earthquake which could burst open the prison doors, might well loosen beams and split walls, so that the rings to which the chains were attached fell out, or the bolt of the stocks might be burst. In any case, even were this particular incident inexplicable, that would be no reason for calling in question the whole narrative. But, further, Giesekke finds in the difficulty of explaining the episode a psychological proof of its actual occurrence. An inventor would have foreseen and guarded against the scruples of critics. Finally, we are reminded that the marvellous character of the occurrence is not disparaged by seeking to picture how it could have been brought about.

### Israel's Return from Exile.

The questions that have been so keenly debated by Kusters, Meyer, and Wellhausen, still claim a

large share of the attention of Old Testament scholars. The Orientalist, Marquart, recently published a work entitled *Fundamente israel. u. jüd. Geschichte*, in which *inter alia* he sides with Kusters against Meyer on very important points. He agrees with the Leyden professor that the second temple was built by the population that had been left behind in Judæa. The return of a Jewish colony, *c.* 536 B.C., belongs to the realm of fable. Marquart believes that Nehemiah lived under Artaxerxes II. (405–359), that his furlough falls in the years 385–373, and his second journey between 367 (364) and 359. The arrival of Ezra falls between Nehemiah's two visits, in 368 or 365. The representation of the post-exilic community as consisting of Babylonian Jews did not take shape till the time of Ezra. The enmity between Jews and Samaritans goes back to Nehemiah. These positions are examined by Dr. MEINHOLD in the November (1897) issue of the new German periodical, the *Theologische Rundschau* (which, by the way, deserves all that was said in commendation of it by Professor Tasker in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of the month before last). Meinhold considers that Marquart's arguments are far from convincing, and he selects for detailed examination two or three, for which we must refer readers to the pages of the *Rundschau*. (The February number of this periodical contains an important examination of Meyer's positions, by Löhr, of which we hope to give an account next month.)

### The Apocalypse.

The recent copious literature on the Apocalypse is the subject of an exhaustive and very useful historical and critical sketch in the November and December numbers of the *Theol. Rundschau*. The author, Dr. A. Meyer, refers at the outset to the very varied estimates of this book which have prevailed from the first, some readers giving it a wide berth as unedifying if not heretical, others finding in it the climax of Divine revelation. How varied, too, have been the methods of interpreting it, some allegorizing it in whole or in part, others taking everything literally, one school of exegetes finding in it an outline of the history of the last things or even of the whole history of the world and of the kingdom of God, others refusing to find in it any reference beyond the time and the immediate surroundings of its author. Not much of permanent value was accom-

plished in the interpretation of the book until it came to be recognized, not indeed without opposition, that in the Apocalypse we have to do with a work of the same character as the apocalyptic literature, which after the decay of prophecy played so important a part in Judaism, of which the Book of Daniel (168 B.C.) is probably the first, and which continued to be produced till long after the destruction of the Jewish State in 70 A.D.

But the student of Old Testament and other Jewish literature is well acquainted with two other phenomena which have a bearing upon the Apocalypse. One is that books passing current under a single name may be the work of different authors (*e.g.* the Books of Isaiah and Zechariah). The other is the fact of literary personation (we may instance Koheleth and Daniel). As long ago as 1882 Weizsäcker had suggested that the Apocalypse might be a compilation from different sources, but, upon the whole, unity of authorship and an accepting of John the Apostle as the author were the prevailing tendencies till about ten years ago. Völter put forward a complicated theory, in which he distinguished between an *Ur*-Apocalypse (65–66 A.D.) and a variety of subsequent additions and revisions. The question whether the basis of our present Apocalypse was not *Jewish* rather than Christian, was first raised by Spitta (1885), and was answered independently and decidedly in the affirmative by Vischer, a pupil of Harnack (1886), largely upon the ground of the contents of chaps. 11 and 12. In the same year, a Dutch scholar, G. J. Weyland, also independently reached conclusions similar to those of Vischer, differing from him, however, in recognizing *two* Jewish sources, which he denominated א and ב respectively. Weizsäcker, who denies the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse, and ascribes it to a disciple of the apostle, sees no necessity for postulating the use of *purely Jewish* sources. A *Jewish Christian* might have written the passages quoted in support of Vischer's hypothesis. Sabatier and Schön, while admitting the presence of Jewish elements, differ from Vischer and Weyland in making the *basis* Christian. Spitta has carried the distinguishing of sources to a length that has made him the subject of a good deal of adverse criticism, while Erbes

(1891) has revived and improved upon Völter's hypothesis of a diversity of Christian authors. We must refer readers to Dr. Meyer's article for a complete account of the controversies which the above systems have occasioned.

A new element has more recently been introduced in examining our Apocalypse and apocalyptic literature in general. Such figures as the woman with the sun at her head and the moon at her feet, the Messiah snatched up to heaven, the dragon belching forth water, etc., are presented in a new light when viewed from such a standpoint as that of Gunkel, who finds (at least in the dragon) traces of Babylonian myths similar to those which according to him run all through the Old Testament. A somewhat similar result is reached, by a different road, by Bousset (*Der Antichrist*, 1895). The latter, who edits the Apocalypse in the fifth edition of Meyer's *Commentary*, arrives at conclusions regarding the authorship which are worth noting. The John who is introduced as the author of the book, is evidently an authority in Asia Minor. The older tradition, however, knows of only one John there—not the Apostle, but the Presbyter. With the same author the Gospel of John is connected; according to Bousset, the Presbyter is 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' to whom we owe the Jerusalemite tradition of the life and sufferings of Jesus. Gospel and Apocalypse however differ materially from one another, and Bousset does not ascribe either of them directly to the Presbyter, but holds that the Apocalypse was written in his name shortly after his death, and the Gospel composed from the materials supplied by his information. Harnack (*Chronol. d. altchrist. Litteratur*, 1897) declares his adhesion to Vischer's theory of a Jewish groundwork in the Apocalypse. The Christian additions he is inclined to attribute to the Presbyter.

Upon the whole, Meyer considers that the examination to which the Apocalypse has been subjected, shows that different sources, or at least traditions, are represented in it. At the same time justice must be done to the author of the whole in its present form, and we must recognize that manifold thoughts and moods find a meeting-place in him and an expression in his work.

J. A. SELBIE.

*Maryculter.*