

# *The Journal* *of* *Theological Studies*

JANUARY, 1910

## THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLICAL ESSAYS.<sup>1</sup>

THE sixteen essays which make up this volume are presented as a sequel to the volume of *Cambridge Theological Essays* published in 1905. The only structural difference (if so we should call it) between the two books is that the later of the two rests upon a wider basis of co-operation. We are told that 'all the contributors to the Theological Essays were members of the English Church, and all but one were of the clergy; the present book, on the other hand, contains Essays by members of several religious bodies, and among the Essayists are five laymen'. The satisfaction which the editor evidently felt in this will be shared by the readers.

It fell to me to review the previous volume in the pages of the JOURNAL (January 1906). One cannot always quite trust an impression recalled after such an interval; but, so far as I can do so, I should be inclined to say that the present book certainly shews no falling off, but is rather at an even higher level than its predecessor. It seems to me, if I may say so, richer in content, marked by more individuality of treatment, and in most of its parts by a higher degree of penetration. A considerable time has been spent over the production of the book, and the effects of this are seen to its advantage. There are, no doubt, degrees of thoroughness and closeness, as well as of freshness and originality, but the characteristic Cambridge sobriety and care are conspicuous everywhere. It is deeply interesting to see so many minds at work within a single university, dealing each after its manner with the problems which arise out of the modern study of the Bible.

<sup>1</sup> *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day*, by Members of the University of Cambridge. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. (Macmillan, 1909).

If there are degrees of excellence in the book, there are also degrees in the extent to which the critic is familiar with the different subjects discussed in it. It will therefore be well for him to disclaim from the first any idea of speaking with objective authority. All that he will attempt to do will be to say frankly, as well as he can, how the particular essays strike him. The reader will see what deductions he ought to make on the score of individual taste and sympathy.

The only criticism that I can make on the first essay is that it *seems* at least to come to an end too soon and perhaps a little abruptly. The opening is admirable; our interest is enlisted so quickly and so warmly that we are apt to be disappointed that it is not more sustained. The title of the essay is 'Historical Methods in the Old Testament'; but the chief point in it is the analogy presented by the Arabian historians. A substantial specimen is given of the way in which these historians treated the materials before them. But when we are told 'that our information respecting the literary history of the Arabs is vastly superior, both in abundance and in accuracy, to the information which we possess concerning the literary history of the ancient Hebrews' (p. 19), one is tempted to wish that the nature of this information, from the comparative point of view, was put before us rather more fully. A bare seventeen pages is hardly adequate to the occasion.

Speaking quite subjectively, I may say that the second essay, by Dr Johns, on 'The Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament' is one of those that have a special attraction for me. We have heard a great deal of late of this subject, and Dr Johns treats it with excellent judgement, comprehensiveness, and impartiality. But the most interesting feature in the essay is, to my mind, the sympathetic, and therefore (as I conceive) really intelligent treatment of the early mythologies.

'There are yet some considerations on the subject of mythology which appear not to have been sufficiently weighed. The term myth is not very definite. Mythology in the Bible is a very shocking idea to some accustomed to regard myths as essentially stories about the pagan gods. Others seem to consider any narrative as mythical which introduces supernatural beings. It might be well to devise a more exact term to connote what we have to deal with here. *For many so-called myths are*

*primitive attempts to put an hypothesis into words before language has become sufficiently developed for scientific terms to be available. Recourse is invariably had to metaphor.* It is impertinent in the highest degree to attempt to take these metaphors literally. If a dragon mythologically devours the sun, that is not the same as to say that primitive men regarded the orb of day as edible. It was an attempt to account for an eclipse. There is good reason to suppose that the Babylonians knew what caused the eclipse though they may not have known just how the moon got between us and the sun. *They could not then have believed in the actual existence of a dragon, even if their fathers and some ignorant folk among them still did so.* Whether the inventor of this myth took it literally is hard to decide. Anyway, the actual event was accurately observed and early reasoned about, and expressed as best could be. . . . A myth is usually, however, something more than the record of a fact in metaphorical terms. It may embody a scientific hypothesis. The science may now be out of date, but the theory that all was once water is as really scientific as the opinion that all was once gaseous matter. The latter only carries the analysis one step further. Water consists of two gases. . . . Now water in the form of an ocean is such a restless, fierce monster to early man that to speak of it as a dragon was natural. But in the cosmogony the writer does not speak of a dragon at all, only of water, *tiamat*. Only when he enters upon the mythological part proper, in order to carry out the purpose of his poem and glorify the deeds of Marduk, does he personify this chaos water and speak of it as *Tiamat*. Then he treats this personified cosmical force as a dragon. . . . The first few lines of the poem *Enuma elish* are a cosmogony, as is the nebular hypothesis. It is only a myth in that elsewhere the words here used in a cosmological sense, i. e. as scientific terms, are used as proper names and enter into mythological relations. *Even these relations may be founded on hypotheses as to the causes of things.* . . . For the greater glory of Marduk, god after god is represented as attempting the conquest of Tiamat, and failing or only partially succeeding, till he comes to triumph. It is beyond doubt that the poet more or less skilfully transfers the achievements once ascribed to other gods to Marduk. We have therefore to seek below the surface for the elements of the cosmogony. . . . When some 550 lines later Marduk has slain the dragon and split her in twain like a fish, he makes the firmament above and the earth below of the two halves of her. The glittering sky at night might well be compared to a scaly dragon, but we can only compare with Genesis the cosmological idea that lies behind the myth. The firmament that divides the waters from the waters is the same as the covering for the heavens that kept back the waters above. The fragmentary condition of the poem, despite its great

length, allows us no point for comparison with some details in Genesis, but when Marduk makes men of clay mixed with his own blood, we again discern a resemblance in thought. The Hebrew writer could not speak of the blood of God, but blood was life to him, and so was breath. We may praise the change of metaphor, but can we say honestly that the idea is different?' (pp. 33-6).

I have quoted at some length and I have italicized some passages, because I was anxious to bring home as effectually as possible the characteristic features in this method which I desire to commend. One is a little curious to know how much the Babylonians really understood about eclipses. But it is evident that their astronomy included a great amount of accurate and sound observation. It should not be thought that Dr Johns presses too far the analogies which may be found to modern science. He is doubtless well aware of the caution that needs to be exercised under this head. But he permits himself the boldness of language which is almost inevitable where new ideas and a new attitude are inculcated. A certain amount of what may seem to be over-statement is inherent in the process of education.

The tendency to make the best of these primitive ideas may be said to be the keynote of the whole essay; and a very delightful note it is. There is one more passage that I cannot resist quoting.

'There is abundant evidence that the Babylonians said of their deities that they made the dead to live. It is true that such a phrase could be used of a king who had by his pardon granted a fresh lease of life to his erring subject, or of a doctor who had brought back a sick man from the bed of death to his former life. It would be contrary to the whole tone of many religious writings, even if it had not been in conflict with the evidence of burial customs, to suppose that the phrase could not refer to a life beyond the grave. That a courtier uses the phrase in the lower sense in a letter to his king does not exclude the strong probability that to most minds it implied a belief in the resurrection of the dead. . . . Setting aside the formal polytheism, such names as "May I see the face of God", "Let me go forth to the light of God", &c., such euphemisms for death as "God took to Himself", "He went up the mount to God", suggest a belief in a continuance of life in blessedness and in the presence of God. The penitential psalms and prayers, with their searching into sincerity of heart and lofty ethical

tone, forbid us to indulge the modern suspicion that every metaphor was understood in its bald literal meaning' (p. 40 f).

I suppose we are to understand that the expressions in inverted commas are all Babylonian. But if that is so, we are at once reminded of the parallels to them in the literature of Israel. And we ask ourselves whether we do not after all make too much of the presence or absence of a deliberate theory of Immortality. Israel was comparatively late in formulating such a theory. But does that mean more than that the pious Israelite was so intent upon the life and walk with God on this side the grave that his thoughts had hardly begun to dwell upon the question as to what fate awaited him on the other side of it? The main point really was the attitude of the soul towards God. When once the Israelite had reached that strong sense of communion with God which breathes in so many passages of the Psalter, it was but a small step to transfer it from one side of the grave to the other. (Compare some happy remarks, as it seems to me, in Dr Burney's *Israel's Hope of Immortality* pp. 43-47.)

This most interesting essay by Dr Johns has a neighbour worthy of it in Mr Stanley A. Cook's survey of 'The Present Stage of Old Testament Research'. This seems to me to be exactly the type of essay that is suited to a volume such as that before us. It is full of close-packed matter; the writer has complete command of all the literature that his subject embraces; he is in the midst of enquiries in which he has himself taken an active part; and yet he is able to take up a position of sufficient detachment not to impair the even-handed justice of his survey. His judgements always make upon us the impression of being sober, weighty, and well considered. At the same time he does not in any way try to conceal his own standpoint, which I take to be that of a follower of Wellhausen qualified in the direction of a 'more conservative attitude towards Israelite development *previous to the middle of the eighth century B.C.*' (I quote his own words on p. 88). Perhaps it is not too great an impertinence, on the part of one who cannot claim to be more than an interested spectator of Old Testament studies, to express the opinion that this is just the line of advance that seems to him most hopeful. He has been, if he may say so, especially attracted by the conservative (rather than the negative) side of Gunkel's more

recent researches, e.g. as these, with kindred views, are summarized in the second paragraph on p. 77 and on p. 81 I venture to hope that the essayist will not allow any critical purism to stand in the way of his own full recognition of work done on these lines. He seems to me to be in a little danger of this when he insists that 'the logical inference is not that the narratives [of Genesis] are *pre*-prophetic, but that they are *non*-prophetic'. If they are non-prophetic, they are also pre-prophetic; and they deserve the credit that accrues to them from that fact.

I fully appreciate the efforts that are being made, on lines first opened out by Robertson Smith, to get at a true conception of the common basis of Semitic—or rather perhaps Oriental—religion.

'An instinctively inherited and unconscious tradition formed the ground upon which the great religious innovators raised their faiths. The inveterate religious features regularly underlie the religions of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt, of Israel, and of modern Palestine. Comparative Biblical research has a range of nearly 4,000 years, from the age of Khammurabi to the present day, and it seeks to recover a background upon which to place the Old Testament—in the light of criticism' (p. 84).

But I do not want to see this common background allowed in any degree to absorb or obscure the higher and more distinctive features in the religions, either of Egypt or of Babylon or of Israel.

The next essay (IV) is a brightly written sketch by Professor Kennett of the 'History of the Jewish Church from Nebuchadnezzar to Alexander the Great'. Professor Kennett's narrative style is easy and flowing, and we owe him many picturesque and happy expressions. But he will forgive me if I say that, in reading his essay, I should prefer to have a pinch—or rather several pinches—of salt in my pocket—to be used perhaps especially at the points at which he speaks of the sequence and dating of the Pentateuchal documents. He makes fit use of the Papyri recently discovered at Elephantine. Among the suggestions thrown out to which I should be inclined to put a substantial query, is the idea that the three greater prophets may have been at first included in the Book of the Twelve.

Did not that book rather originate in the fact that the writings of which it was composed could be all included in a single roll?

Dr W. E. Barnes, in the next essay (V), keeps within rather narrower limits than the writers who immediately precede him. He begins, indeed, with a useful reminder that we may speak of the Psalms as the 'Hymn Book of the Second Temple', only if we realize that but a few of the 'Hymns' were regularly sung in public worship. We may call the Psalter the 'Praises of Israel', only if we realize that it is also a book of meditations for individuals, the *Sacra privata* of the Israelite as well as the Praise Book of the Temple (p. 139). But his real thesis is the extent to which the interpretation of the Psalms may be regarded as historical. He contends that the attempts which have been made to carry out systematically the principles of historical interpretation must be considered to have broken down. It would not follow that these attempts were not justified in the first instance. The method deserved to have a full trial. But now it has been tried, and the results obtained amount to a confession of failure. No agreement has been reached as to the background of history which lies behind particular Psalms; for this the data are too vague and general. And they are also too vague to allow us to draw out a scheme of the development of religious ideas into which particular Psalms can be fitted.

It is no doubt true that no consensus has as yet been reached. The direct comparison of the Psalms with the events, so far as they are known, of external history has not led to results that carry conviction. Dr Barnes does not, I think, discuss the method of arriving at an (approximate) history of the Psalter by tracing out (approximately) the history of the collections of which it is made up, and determining their sequence and relations to each other. I suppose that for many people a cautious book like Dr Driver's *Introduction* will represent about the degree of precision attainable. And, although this goes much more into detail, I do not gather that the general position would differ materially from that of Dr Barnes.

The chief advantage of this critical self-restraint is that it allows full weight to be given to the religious value of some of the Psalms (especially to some of those which have been

commonly regarded as Messianic), without yielding to the temptation to rewrite the texts in deference to the supposed requirements of the historical situation.

I do not doubt that the next essay (VI) on 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis' will be generally pronounced to be one of the most interesting and valuable in the book. It marks a real advance in the branch of study which it commends. Until a comparatively recent date prejudice has been too much at work on both sides. Christian scholars have either unduly ignored the assistance which Rabbinic literature might have given them, or else they have collected such data as they could chiefly for polemical purposes. And, on the other hand, Jewish scholars have retaliated in the same polemical spirit. This, however, has not always been the case; for some time past there has been a tendency towards better relations. And this essay by the Reader in Rabbinic at Cambridge is just what one would wish such an essay to be. With such help it will be much easier to strike a true balance in the estimate at once of Christianity and of the contemporary and later Judaism. Christian writers need not be so pedantically scrupulous as they sometimes are in insisting upon the verification of dates for every parallel that is produced from Judaism. Many years ago a monograph by Ritter on Philo and the Palestinian *Halacha* brought home to me how much older a great deal of the Rabbinic material was than it might easily seem to be. If the writings of Philo had not survived, we should have had to place many a usage and many a *dictum* centuries later than it really was. Of course I do not mean that parallels of verified date and those of which the date cannot be verified are on the same footing. But I do mean that it is often unsafe to reject a parallel altogether only on the ground that early evidence for it is not forthcoming. The absence of evidence may be a mere accident. We have reason to be most grateful to Mr Abrahams for his contribution.

Prof. Burkitt comes next, with an essay (VII) which is really a beautiful piece of writing. Indeed, as I read further in the volume I am more and more impressed with its excellence simply as literature. Such writers as Dr Burkitt and Dr Inge are not easily surpassed. And the excellence in Dr Burkitt's case is of thought as well as of style. He succeeds in blending,

as if by a natural gift, ancient and modern, the real and the ideal, with perfect flexibility and ease. The style is just suited to the subject, 'The Eschatological Idea in the Gospel'. It is most important that this idea should be made really intelligible to the modern mind; and if any one can do this, it is Dr Burkitt. His essay is really a plea for taking the Eschatology as it stands, and looking at it in the light of the historical conditions to which it belongs. We live in times of comparatively stable equilibrium; the Gospels were written in an age when everything seemed unstable. To live through such a time an unconquerable hope was needed. The root of that hope was an intense belief in the power and goodness of God. The form given to it was shaped partly by circumstances, and partly by ideas inherited from the Prophets. The clothing of the idea is symbol, but its essence transcends symbol. In the last resort we all have need of it; and the more troubled the age, the greater the need.

A different type of essay is represented by the next (VIII), Dr A. H. McNeile on 'Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament'. Where Prof. Burkitt gives a bird's-eye view of his subject, this essay is rather a close discussion of detail. In its general character as seen in the great amount of definite material embodied in it, it reminds us somewhat of No. III. I do not think that I know anywhere a treatment of the subject which comes so near to being exhaustive. And the spirit of the essay—a kind of *pietas* that breathes through it—is to me very attractive. On this side it has affinities to Nos. II and X.

Dr Inge, on 'The Theology of the Fourth Gospel', does not seem to me to strike so happy a note. I desire to make allowance for my own difference of opinion, which is larger in the case of this essay than in any of the others. I should wish also to recognize the moderation with which in many ways Dr Inge states his position. And I would frankly admit that the position itself has a considerable vogue at the present time. But to have a vogue is one thing, to be hailed as offering 'a solution' of a difficult problem or series of problems is another. I am afraid that as a solution the point of view from which the essay is written must be regarded as premature. I at least could not assent—I am a long way from assenting—to many of the propositions, laid down somewhat categorically, on the first page and

a half of the essay.<sup>1</sup> As between the point of view represented in this essay and that which follows it on 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel', I should have no hesitation in choosing. My mind also goes back to a welcome sentence in Essay VI.

'Most remarkable of all has been the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, especially in relation to the circumstances under which they are reported to have been spoken' (p. 181).

This sentence, with Essay X, seems to me to supply most of what is needed by way of corrective.

I ought not perhaps to express surprise at the element which I should deprecate in Dr Inge's essay, because so much has been written of late to a similar effect both in this country and abroad—and in a more exaggerated form. Still I associate Dr Inge so much with the wholesome resistance to the ideas that culminate in Abbé Loisy that I should have thought there would be—and, reading between the lines, I think we can see from time to time that there is—some difficulty in reconciling the two lines of thought with each other.

I would be far from saying that there are not many points of value in the essay; if there were not, it would hardly be by Dr Inge. But I do not like to see him crossing over to the other benches, and on the way catching so much of the temper that seems to haunt them.

I ought perhaps in fairness to point out that Schmiedel has more than once explicitly disclaimed the construction put upon his famous language about the 'pillar-passages' on p. 281.<sup>2</sup> He did not mean to imply that they are the only part of the record that could be accepted.

I have already said incidentally most of what I should desire to say about Mr Brooke's essay (X). Its attitude, as well as the details of its treatment, appeal greatly to me.

Essay XI, by Mr Anderson Scott, on 'Jesus and Paul', is a really helpful contribution, grappling with the subject at closer

<sup>1</sup> There is a delightful page (p. 132 f) by Canon Scott Holland in the volume *Jesus or Christ?* to which I gladly refer as evidence that I do not stand alone; and I may also point to Dr Gwatkin *Early Ch. Hist.* pp. 109 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, *Jesus or Christ?* p. 80.

quarters and more along its whole breadth than anything that I remember to have seen upon it in English. It seems to me both judicious and satisfactory. One might have expected to find some reference to the writings of Dr Knowling.

Prof. Percy Gardner deals with 'The Speeches of St Paul in Acts' (XII), also in a judicious spirit. The only considerable point on which I should be inclined to differ, would be in assigning a higher historical value to the reports of the speeches at Lystra and at Athens. I should do this chiefly because of the narrative context in which the speeches are embedded. Sir W. M. Ramsay, in particular, has brought out the excellent local colour in these narratives. They both go into considerable detail which has every appearance of authenticity. The speech at Athens links on remarkably well to the surroundings. The existence of an altar with the inscription 'To an unknown God' is of course verified fact; and nothing could be more natural than that the Apostle should take a text from it. If Pauline expressions in the speech itself cannot be so easily verified, it has to be remembered that these two speeches at Lystra and at Athens stand alone as addresses delivered directly to Gentile audiences. But, even so, there is not a little in common (e. g.) with such a passage as Rom. i. 18-32.

Acts xvii 23 As I . . . observed the objects of your worship (σεβάσματα).

What therefore ye worship in ignorance (ἀγνοοῦντες), this set I forth unto you.

2 Thess. ii 4 all that is called God or that is worshipped (σέβασμα).

1 Cor. i 21 seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.

Gal. iv 8 Howbeit at that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods, but now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God (observe the play on 'knowing' and 'not knowing').

Cf. 1 Cor. ii 1, ix 14, xi 26; Phil. i 17, 18; Col. i 28.

Acts xvii 24 dwelleth not in the temples made with hands.

Acts xvii 26 He made of one blood every nation of men . . . that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him.

Acts xvii 27 though He is not far from each one of us.

Acts xvii 28 as certain even of your own poets have said.

Acts xvii 29 We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone.

Acts xvii 30 The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now . . .

Acts xvii 30 He commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent.

Acts xvii 31 He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance

2 Cor. v 1 we have . . . a house not made with hands.

1 Cor. viii 6 There is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him.

Rom. i 19 that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God manifested it unto them.

Col. i 16 all things have been created through Him, and unto Him.

'Cf. Rom. i 19, 20.

1 Cor. ix 20, 21 To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews . . . to them that are without law, as without law . . . that I might gain them that are without law.

Rom. i 22, 23 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

Rom. iii 21, 25, 26 But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested . . . to shew His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season. . . .

1 Thess. i 9 how ye turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God.

Rom. ii 16 in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ.

1 Thess. i 10 to wait for His

unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead.

Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus which delivereth us from the wrath to come.

Eph. i 19, 20 according to that working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead.

It will be seen that in the above there is not a little that is distinctively Pauline. The parts of the speech which cannot be so described are of the nature of commonplaces in the controversy between Jew and Gentile; and we may be pretty sure that St Paul made use of these, when the occasion called for them, though he may have given them a turn of his own.

On the whole I am afraid that I could not describe this essay as 'closely studied' in the sense in which the words would be conspicuously true of some other essays in the volume. Too much use seems to me to be made of vague impressions and probabilities, some of which I cannot recognize as probabilities at all. For instance, in a note on the 'bishops and deacons' of Phil. i 1, we are left with a choice between supposing that the words are an 'early insertion' or that what was admissible in A.D. 63 was not admissible in A.D. 58.

By far the most important thing in the whole essay is an incidental paragraph on the subject of Inspiration. It will be well to give this as it stands.

'From the present point of view the question of the inspiration or non-inspiration of a book is not primary. For how does divine inspiration act upon a writer? In two ways: first by strengthening and intensifying his natural powers, and second, by producing in him what W. James has called an uprush of the sub-conscious. I should prefer to call the last an inrush of the super-conscious. It makes a man a vehicle of deep-lying forces, so that he builds better than he knows. He may think that he is writing for a society, or even for an individual, when he is really writing for future ages, and to meet needs of which he is unconscious' (p. 417).

The appeal to the subconscious is, I venture to think, fraught with great promise, not only in this but in many other directions. It happens, by a coincidence, that I am myself having recourse to

it for another purpose at the present time. But on this subject of inspiration, I fully believe with Dr Gardner that it opens out new vistas ; and I am very grateful to him for the form which he has given to his statement. The essay would have been well worth publishing, if it had contained nothing else.

My impression is that the author of the next essay (XIII), on 'The Present State of the Synoptic Problem', is rather burdened—and even perhaps a little overburdened—by the extent of his own learning. He knows all the ins and outs of this most intricate problem, especially in the forms which it has assumed on the continent, though not quite so completely (I am inclined to think) in its ramifications nearer home. However this may be, his knowledge is exceedingly great, and it has the great merit of being both sound and exact. Neither is his presentation of it really wanting in lucidity. And yet there are, as it seems to me, some drawbacks to the essay. I will specify three.

1. In the first place, I cannot help regretting the decision, to which the author explains that he has come, to dispense entirely with footnotes. No doubt to give them would have added no slight labour to a task that was already very laborious. But the value of the essay would have been at least doubled; in the case of one like myself it would have been more than doubled.

I suppose that I have on the whole a fair knowledge of the work that has been done upon the Synoptic Problem. But, unfortunately, I have not the art of making notes or keeping references. The consequence is that, although in reading Mr Latimer Jackson's essay I distinctly remember to have seen somewhere the statements to which he refers, I cannot lay my finger upon the reference, and I know that to find it would take a great deal of time and trouble and that the search would perhaps be baffled altogether in the end. All the struggle would have been saved if Mr Jackson had only set down the reference while he had it under his hand.

Here is a case in point. After remarking that the titles (*κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον*) were prefixed by others, and do not proceed from the Evangelists themselves, Mr Jackson goes on to say,

'We remark an ambiguity; the word might mean "as used by", might point to the work based on the teaching of him whose name was associated with it, or might imply direct authorship. This last interpretation must be adopted; those who prefixed the titles regarded, and

meant to indicate, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as authors of the works which set forth the one Gospel. Whether they were right in their opinion is quite another matter' (p. 427).

I know that I have seen the common view on this subject challenged; and it may perhaps be rightly challenged; there may be evidence forthcoming, from the papyri or otherwise, for the use of *κατά* in the sense of authorship. But I cannot lay my hands on the passage. I am not sure that, if I could, I should at once assent entirely to the new view. Even if there are examples of the use of *κατά* of direct authorship, I should still think that the choice of it in this connexion (in preference to *ὑπό*) was determined by a recollection, conscious or unconscious, of the primitive meaning of the word *εὐαγγέλιον*—so that the whole phrase meant, not exactly 'the Gospel as used by Matthew', &c., but the Gospel 'in the version of' Matthew and the rest.

I would not be so unreasonable as to expect a reference for everything. What I should like to see would be a judicious selection. References are not necessary on major points, which are matter of common knowledge. There are many cases which are amply met by the insertion of a name, or names, in a bracket, as is done in the essay. It is really the little, unfamiliar, out of the way statements that the reader should be put in a position to verify and follow up. I must ask to be forgiven if I preach what I do not always practise. When I do not, the reason is usually that which I have given above, the difficulty of laying one's hand upon a reference as one is writing. But I imagine that Mr Latimer Jackson is more methodical than I am. Therefore I shall venture to hope that, in the new edition which I hope will soon be called for, there may be given, not a full array of foot-notes, which would disturb the print too much, but a page or two of references on these smaller points as a kind of appendix at the end.

2. The next drawback of which I seem to be aware in the essay, is that (as I have already hinted) it does not quite do justice to the work that has been done in this country. It is natural enough that the recent brilliant studies by Harnack and Wellhausen have thrown this work somewhat into the shade. But 'it could hardly be said to-day that the foundations of Synoptic study have not yet been laid in England' (p. 434) is at least

a case of the figure *litotes*. It might have been a fair statement fifteen years ago, but scarcely less than that. Mr Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* goes back to the year 1880. Dr Arthur Wright's valuable publications begin (I think) in 1896. The first edition of Sir John Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae* is dated 1899. The second edition of that most admirable work (which I know to be as highly appreciated in Germany as it is here) has just appeared; and the fact that a second edition is called for is a proof that British students have for some time past not been idle. I should admit perhaps that one needs to have a sieve at hand when one is drawing upon the cornucopia of Dr E. A. Abbott's *Diatessarica* (from 1900 onwards, at the present time in seven volumes, the later especially of great value, and still incomplete). But it is indeed a cornucopia. In 1907 Mr W. C. Allen produced his Commentary on St Matthew which is full of close, independent, first-hand criticism. And now within the last few weeks, almost simultaneously with Sir John Hawkins's second edition, we have another very sterling and substantial work in Part II of Dr Stanton's *Gospels as Historical Documents*. Other things might have been mentioned, but these are enough. I would take upon myself to say that for the ten years preceding the first of Harnack's well-known *Beiträge* the work done in this country had not been a whit behind that done in Germany, but even superior to it in sound, cautious, and really progressive method.

3. I would not say that the essay is really deficient in perspective. When it comes to such summings-up as on pp. 451, 454 f, the perspective seems to me to be quite right; the facts are put in their place with proper shades and degrees of gradation. And the results, as stated on these pages, are hopeful and encouraging—perhaps as hopeful and encouraging as I fully believe they should be. But I cannot say as much as this for the essay as a whole. It is in view of this that the writer seems to me to be oppressed by the multiplicity and complexity of the problems to be solved, and the comparatively little way that has been made towards the solution of some of them. One might almost think sometimes that his temperament was naturally rather despondent than sanguine. But I suspect that there is something rather more in it than a matter of temperament. It seems to me that the perspective which is so well observed on the pages I have specified

is not equally observed all through. It is just the greatest and the most fundamental problems that are nearest to their solution; and it is just these which arouse hope and a certain confidence. If we were to treat all questions as of equal value, and all failures to solve them as equally significant, then I admit that the outlook might seem depressing. But I cannot help thinking that the depressing appearance is partly—and even largely—caused by the fact that a good many of the questions that are often put are really insoluble; the data for solving them are insufficient; and it would really be better that they should not be put at all, or only in the way of irresponsible speculation. On the questions that matter most I believe that the progress made, or in process of being made, is really great, and that a few more years will see a large amount of consensus all along the line.

I hope Mr Latimer Jackson will not think me captious in the criticism I have been making. I have a very sincere respect for his essay. I admire both the knowledge and the effort after exactness and due circumspection of statement that have gone towards its making. I value it greatly, and shall hope to derive much instruction from it. But I have thought it right to point out how it might have been more valuable still.

When Dr James H. Moulton writes on 'New Testament Greek' (XIV), we know that we are in the hands of a master of his subject; and the essay is really like that of a master. It is full of points and is thoroughly interesting, though it does not aim at being exhaustive in the same way that some previous essays may be said to do. Of course some subjects admit of this more than others; and a certain relative exhaustiveness is part of the special merit, e. g., of Mr Latimer Jackson, Dr McNeile, and—with due allowance for proportion—we may add, of Mr Stanley A. Cook. But Dr Moulton's treatment of his subject is quite in place, and (so far as I am competent to judge) altogether to be commended. I have no special questions or criticisms to raise; and, as I have taken up a good deal of space and time already, I may be perhaps allowed to pass on. In doing so I may perhaps just say that on personal grounds I am glad to see the opinion of scholars coming round—for it is really a coming round—as to the meaning of *διαθήκη* in Heb. ix 16 f. I always used to be sceptical as to the meaning 'covenant', even when it was most in fashion.

For similar reasons I may also be brief in speaking of Mr Valentine-Richards on 'New Testament Textual Criticism' (XV). This too (but in a rather different way) seems to be a thoroughly workmanlike essay, in which the treatment is appropriate to the subject-matter. The essay does not aim at great fullness. It contains a rapid survey of the history of the subject brought down to the present time. I am glad to see that Mr Valentine-Richards receives the results (so far as they have yet appeared) of Freiherr von Soden's great work with what I should call judicious reserve.

The most notable omission in the essay is rather, I suppose, a misfortune than a fault. There is no mention, so far as I have noticed, of Mr C. H. Turner. I never think it fair to lay stress on things that may have come in at the last moment. I do not doubt that a volume like the present must have been a long time upon the stocks; and I can well believe that, at the time when Mr Valentine-Richards was correcting his proofs, the able article on the Text of the New Testament in Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (published in 1908) had not come in his way. Still less could one expect this of the series that is still coming out in the JOURNAL.

The volume is naturally closed by an essay on 'The Religious Value of the Bible', which breathes all the *mitis sapientia* of Dr Swete. We are led to infer that this essay was added, apparently rather at the last moment, to fill a place unavoidably left vacant by another contributor. The essay is not only characteristic of its author, but it may be said to be also characteristic of the present day and of the book as a whole. It shews that wide tolerance and open-minded recognition of good from all sides which marks the age to which we belong. There is one passage in particular which I should like to quote.

'The Gospels exhibit this pattern, and it is this which gives them a religious value that even in the Bible itself is unique. No criticism, whether of the sources of the Gospels or of their historical details, can greatly affect their value in this respect. It is independent of our acceptance of the miracles. That it can even survive an abandonment of the Catholic Doctrine of the Person of Christ, or a refusal to analyse the impression which the Gospels convey upon that subject, may be seen from the earlier lectures of Adolf Harnack's *What is Christianity?* No

more enthusiastic appreciation of the religious value of the Gospel life of Jesus can be found than in that remarkable book, which is nevertheless written from the standpoint of a Christology that can satisfy no Catholic Christian' (p. 550).

Would that have been written so lately as ten years ago, even by Dr Swete? And is it not a clear gain that it should be written, in a representative volume, now? Dr Swete is the last person in the world to be suspected of disloyalty or reckless concession; and yet the words are his, and I do not doubt that they would be endorsed heartily by his colleagues.

That is the temper of Cambridge; and it is also the temper of Oxford, and (I think I may add) of enlightened opinion in this country generally. We do not intend to let the anchor drag loose from our own moorings; but we do intend to welcome that which is good, from whatever quarter it may come; and we shall judge those who differ from us, not merely on party lines, but on the extent to which the opinions which they express commend themselves to reason and conscience.<sup>1</sup>

W. SANDAY.

<sup>1</sup> In a volume that has passed under so many expert eyes it is rather surprising to come across such forms as 'underly' (p. 78), 'unitie d'esprit' (p. 442). 'Father Hughes Vincent' (for 'Hugues', p. 60) is an accident that might happen to any one.