

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## MEYER.

AUTHORS fare variously at the hands of the editors of Encyclopædias. Obscure names are at times rescued from oblivion, while men of mark are forgotten. In the great book of Dr. Herzog, we look in vain for any article commemorative of Bishop Butler, although in the index we find one or two references to "Butler, *John*, Bishop of Durham;" nor is the omission supplied even in the new "improved and enlarged" edition. The recently published volume of the Encyclopædia Britannica in like manner presents no notice of the greatest of modern expositors, whose place and influence over New Testament exegesis in the nineteenth century can only be compared—amidst whatever differences—to those of Calvin, Grotius, and Bengel in the centuries preceding, and whose name has achieved so unique an eminence, that it continues to be prefixed to editions of his Commentaries which speak of him in the third person, discuss his opinions, and even set aside or controvert his views.

The life of Meyer was essentially devoted to the faithful discharge of his duties as a pastor, and to the ceaseless pursuit of the studies that bore their fruit in the preparation and continuous revision of his great work. We learn the chief turning points of his career and some interesting particulars as to his habits from a brief sketch drawn up by his son, Dr. Gustav Meyer,<sup>1</sup> supplemented by some reminiscences of his friend and colleague, Dr. Düsterdieck, in the new edition of Herzog's *Encyklopädie*.

Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer was born at Gotha, on 10th Jan., 1800. His father, Johann Nicolaus Meyer, was shoemaker to the petty ducal court; his mother, whose

<sup>1</sup> A translation of which I prefixed to the First Volume of the English edition of the Commentary on the New Testament.

maiden name was Leinhoff, and who possessed much shrewdness and force of character, survived for fifty years to see the distinction reached by her son. A portrait at the age of seven depicted him as "pale and delicate, but with large earnest-looking eyes betokening an active mind." He was wont in after years to recall the deep impression made on him by the sight of the churches of his native town filled with prisoners by order of Napoleon after the battle of Jena (1806), as well as, at a later date (1813), by the retreat of the French pursued by the Cossacks after the three days' "battle of nations" at Leipzig. The Gymnasium at Gotha was a school of much celebrity under Doering, the editor of Catullus and Horace, as its director, and with Rost, the Greek grammarian and lexicographer—whose memory Meyer tells us that he gratefully revered, though he came eventually to regard his Grammar as inadequate—on its staff of masters. Here he received that thorough training in the Greek and Latin languages—a training of which, in his own words, the classical tongues were *prora et puppis*—that formed the sure groundwork of his future career. While he regretted the neglect of the modern languages in the school-culture of his youth—in a letter in my possession he laments especially his imperfect knowledge of English—we learn from his son that he was wont favourably to contrast the freedom for self-development according to aptitudes and tastes under the older system with the more stringent requirements of the later Gymnasial instruction. On the tercentenary of the Reformation, in 1817, he composed and publicly recited an elegant Latin poem in honour of Luther; and on leaving school in the spring of 1818 his certificate bore that he held the foremost place, that he excelled in several branches of study, especially in his accurate knowledge of Latin, and that the modest and sterling character associated with his attainments made it easy to forecast *quælis ille olim extiturus sit*.

During his last two years at school he came under the religious instruction and personal influence of Bretschneider, the acute and vigorous representative of the middle course which was termed "Rational Supernaturalism," who had become Superintendent and Chief Pastor at Gotha in 1816, and who several years afterwards originated, by his "Probabilia," the controversy as to the genuineness of the Gospel of John. But while Meyer speaks of him as his "great teacher," and doubtless drew from him in some measure the spirit of Rationalism that marked his earlier efforts, there are no means of tracing the extent of the influence thus exercised.

In 1818 Meyer entered on the study of Theology at Jena, and spent five successive semesters there. At first he threw himself with zeal into the student-life of the time, and shared in the aspirations of the *Burschenschaft*, or "Young-Germany-League," until the assassination of Kotzebue led to the suppression of the system, and released the energies of the youthful student for other work. He attended the lectures of Gabler, Schott, Danz, and Baumgarten-Crusius on different branches of theology; studied Arabic under Kosegarten; listened with less interest to the lectures of Fries on philosophy; but engaged with ardour in historical and philological studies under the guidance of Luden, Eichstädt, and Reising. He often spoke afterwards, his son tells us, of the lectures of Schott delivered in Latin, and of the theological discussions conducted in the same language, with which the students occupied themselves in their walks. For the sixth semester his studies were pursued at home, as his father, who had sustained loss of means by becoming a surety, was no longer able to meet the cost, small as it was, of residence at Jena. He underwent his theological trials at Easter, 1821, and Michaelmas, 1822, to the entire satisfaction of the examiners; and during the interval he acted as tutor in the house of Pastor Oppermann of Grone, near

Göttingen, who boarded and educated with his family a number of boys of the upper class. There he met his future wife, the daughter of the pastor, and conceived such a liking for Hanover, that he resolved a few years later to have himself formally naturalised, so that he might be at liberty to receive an appointment in the Hanoverian Church.

At the end of 1822 he entered on his first pastorate at Osthausen, in Thuringia, a parish of about 400 inhabitants; and in July, 1823, he married. His pastoral duties, though performed with assiduous care, left leisure for special study; and it was here that he prepared his text and translation of the New Testament, issued in 1829. Towards the end of 1830 he became permanently settled in his adopted country of Hanover, having been nominated as pastor at Harste, a rural parish with an income estimated at 529 thalers (about £78), the cure of which he served with much acceptance, and which he valued highly for its nearness to the resources of the University Library at Göttingen. After seven years spent at Harste, he was promoted to the office of Pastor-Superintendent at Hoya, which afforded fuller scope for the exercise of his skill and promptitude in practical affairs as well as of his gifts as a preacher. It was then the custom for a newly appointed Superintendent to deliver a Latin thesis before the Consistory, as it is still the usage in the University of Glasgow for a new Professor to read a Latin thesis before the Senate. Meyer chose as his subject, *De fundamento ecclesiæ*, asserting, on the basis of 1 Cor. iii. 11, the person of Christ rather than His doctrine as this foundation; urging in opposition to Strauss, whose book had lately appeared, the importance of seeking to reach with historical fidelity the true sense of the apostolic words apart from philosophic assumptions; and pointing out how befitting, in accordance with that eternal foundation, it was, that the Christian pastor should search for Christ

in Scripture, preach the Gospel of Christ without human addition or alteration, and make it his constant aim "*ut Jesus Christus animos impleat, mentes illuminet, vitam regat.*"

After four years' stay at Hoya, Meyer, who had now become well known and had received an invitation to a Professorship at Giessen, entered on wider and more varied duties to which he was called in the capital of his adopted country, having been, on the suggestion of the Consistory, nominated to the threefold office of Consistorialrath, Superintendent, and Chief Pastor of the Johanniskirche, where he had 5000 souls under his charge and received but slight help from a court-chaplain associated with him, who took indeed the afternoon service, but was often unable to share the pastoral work from having to eke out his scanty income by giving private lessons. Meyer preached every Sunday forenoon, beginning his preparation with a view to it even on the Monday; and, in addition to other duties devolving on him, took a prominent part in the theological examinations before the Consistory, pursuing all the while with zeal his exegetical labours. In 1845 these labours were specially recognised by the University of Göttingen bestowing on him the degree of Th.D.

Hitherto Meyer had enjoyed remarkable health and vigour, and had not hesitated to make the fullest use of his time and energies; he might be seen at his writing-table as early as 5 or even 4 a.m. But in the spring of 1846 he was prostrated by a severe affection of the liver, which threatened his life and left him far from capable, even after his recovery, of the old unsparing exertions. He found it necessary to change his habits, to walk for an hour every morning in all weathers, and to lighten his work by resigning in 1848 his office as Superintendent and Pastor, and confining himself to the Consistorial duties for which he was signally fitted. In 1861 he was raised to the rank of Oberconsistorialrath.

Meanwhile he had been visited by various trials; by the loss of a son of seven years of age in 1847; by the death of his venerable mother in 1851; by the removal, in 1858, of another son, Emil, aged 23, of whom he speaks as "rich in gifts and theological attainments;" by the decease of his publisher Ruprecht, to whose friendliness, and interest in the Commentary from a higher point of view than that of a bookseller's speculation, he makes graceful reference in a Preface of 1861; and lastly, by the crowning bereavement which befel him in 1864—and is sorrowfully reflected in a Preface of that date—through the death of her who had been his partner for forty years. Soon after the latter event he took up his abode and spent his nine remaining years under the roof of his son, Dr. Gustav Meyer, who gives us a pleasing picture of his quiet life, of his regularity of early rising, of his daily morning walks with his two grandchildren, of the varied play of instruction, earnest and jest in his conversation, of his warm interest in the more stirring events of the outer world, above all, of his unfailing devotion to his favourite exegetical science and of his continuous labours on its behalf. Towards the close of 1865 he retired from his Consistorial office, though he continued for a time to share in the theological examinations. "*Deus nobis hæc otia fecit*," he says in a Preface of 1866, with reference to the fact that he could now give his leisure wholly to the one work of revising the several portions of his Commentary, as new editions were called for.

His son tells us that those who were in close intercourse with him for the last two years of his life could not but discern the signs of gradually declining strength and advancing age—symptoms which he himself attributed to the effects of a fall that, about a year before his death, made it necessary for him to curtail his walks. His last illness was comparatively short. On the 15th of June, 1873, he still followed his ordinary routine of life, and went to rest, as

was his habit, at eight o'clock. Shortly after midnight he was seized with severe abdominal pains, the signs—as it proved—of an incurable ailment connected with his earlier illness twenty-seven years before, and too surely foreboding the nearness of the end, which came after a few days' severe suffering borne with Christian resignation. Once, when there seemed a gleam of hope, he said, "Willingly would I still remain with you; but willingly am I also ready to depart, if God calls me." His son mentions that "during the state of half slumber into which he fell, the most diversified images flitted in chequered succession before his mind. Now he saw himself seated before a large page from the New Testament, on which he was employed in commenting, while he fancied that he held the pipe in his mouth. In this way had he devoted many a quiet morning hour to his favourite study, when his window had been the only one lighted up in the street. Then, again, he busied himself with the Fatherland; 'Germany, Germany above all,' we heard him distinctly say. Was it that the recollections of his student-days full of fervour and enthusiasm became interwoven with the mighty events of his latter years? Soon afterwards he saw clearly the cross, of which he had so often during his long life experienced and diffused the blessing. Shortly before 10 p.m., on the 21st June, he entered without struggle upon his rest." On the cross at his tomb are inscribed the words: "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's."

We learn from his friend, Dr. Düsterdieck, that Meyer was a man "of a thoroughly pure and simple nature, and of genuinely evangelical piety; humble in heart, modest in all the ordering of his life; calm, clear, and true. He led a comparatively retired life, concentrating his energies on the duties to which he was directly called, and on the great task of his life. He took little part in public affairs. In 1846.

he attended the Church Conference at Berlin; in 1857 he was nominated by the king among the 'evangelical clergymen of repute' called to the deliberations of the First Chamber of the Hanoverian Estates, and took an active part in its legislation as to schools; in 1863 he rendered valuable service in the consultations which led to the ordinance of 1864 regarding the Hanoverian Church; and on his retirement in 1865 it was specially arranged that he should continue to act as a member of the conference for revising the text of Luther's translation of the New Testament, in which capacity he went twice to Halle. His preaching was simple, clear and fervid, firmly based on the given text and on Scripture as a whole. He excelled in catechetical instruction, and won the affection of those whom he prepared for confirmation. He was scrupulously careful in the discharge of his functions as a Church administrator, with due regard to the requirements of the Confession and the rules of the Church. He was distinguished as an examiner, putting his questions with a precision that left no doubt as to his meaning, and out of a knowledge so full and sure that, while he was never at a loss himself, any candidate who had been working with diligence and to good purpose might rest assured of the fact being brought out and cordially recognised. On the other hand he had no toleration for phrases meant merely to cover ignorance."

The only book issued by Meyer apart from his Commentary was an edition in Latin of the "Symbolic Books of the Lutheran Church," which he published in 1830 on occasion of the tercentenary of the Confession of Augsburg, and which he indicated as not alien to the other work on which he had already entered. He had observed and deplored the fact, that many a young theologian of the Lutheran Church knew merely the names, and some slight particulars as to the history, of the Symbolic books of the Church, without being sufficiently acquainted with their

contents, which yet—historically viewed—formed the very doctrine of their Church. He strongly urged such a critical and historical study of them as should distinguish these from later additions; and expressed the hope that the approaching commemoration might call forth a renewed affection for, and interest in, those venerable writings.

But, while he thus signally did homage to the standards of the Church, and was in all his ecclesiastical action loyal to them, he did not conceal his regret that the Church had not been content to abide by the comparative simplicity of the Confession of 1530, but had subsequently in the Formula Concordiæ taken up, and with theological subtlety affirmed as elements of her doctrine, so many definitions belonging to the domain of science and, as such, more fitly left to the free handling of the schools.<sup>1</sup> “The science of the Church,” he says elsewhere, “will know how to magnify Christ; but it needs not for that purpose the doctrinal definitions of Chalcedon; what it aims at is not Chemnitz, but Paul and the whole New Testament.”<sup>2</sup> Often does he recur to the truth that Scripture is the “*norma normans*” for the Confessions themselves. “In laying down the principle of an appeal to Scripture, the Confession points to an authority transcending its own, to which the Church herself with her doctrine as well as the individual must bow. If a thorough and conscientious searching of the Scriptures should arrive, on one or another point of doctrine, at results not in keeping with Confessional definitions, its duty at the bidding of the exegetical conscience is not, after an un-Lutheran and unprincipled fashion, to disguise such results or to cloak them with a misty phraseology, but, with faith in the sifting and conquering power of truth, openly and honestly to hand them over to the judgment of science and the Church.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Preface to second edition of Comm. on Rom. (1834).

<sup>2</sup> Preface to fourth edition of Comm. on Rom. (1868).

<sup>3</sup> Preface to 1 Cor., 5th ed. (1869).

It was in this spirit that Meyer addressed himself to the preparation of the one great work that has made his name known to the world and constitutes his abiding title to be held in honour wherever the New Testament is studied. On this he seems to have early resolved to concentrate his strength. To that peculiar form of literary effort in which the Germans delight to dissipate much of their energy—a form so tempting to the youthful student eager to try his wings, so troublesome to the subsequent inquirer in his search, but often happily so effective in consigning its contents to speedy oblivion—the writing of academic programmes, disquisitions, or reviews, Meyer contributed almost nothing. He laboured in but the one field of exegesis; but there, as it has been said, he was thoroughly at home, and applied all his powers without allowing them to be drawn off or distracted by other pursuits.

Meyer, writing in 1872, and looking back with thankfulness on the forty years that had passed since the first part of his work was published, remarks that “a scientific work, which has passed through a long course of development and still continues that course, has always a history—a biography of its own—intimately connected with that of its author.” Far more important and interesting than the outward life of the author in this case is the history of the book which mainly engaged his thoughts for fifty years—a period, of which the first half was occupied in the preparation and publication of its parts, and the second half in the unwearied revising, correcting, and enlarging of the successive editions<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The following are the dates of the successive editions of the Commentary proper, exclusive of “unchanged reprints” issued in the interval between the first and second editions: I. 1, Matthew, 1832 (with Mark and Luke), 1844, 1853, 1858, 1864. I. 2, Mark and Luke, 1832, 1846, 1855, 1860, 1867. II. John, 1834, 1852, 1856, 1862, 1869. III. Acts, 1835, 1854, 1861, 1870. IV. Romans, 1836, 1854, 1859, 1865, 1872. V. 1 Corinthians, 1840, 1849, 1855, 1861, 1870. VI. 2 Corinthians, 1840, 1849, 1856, 1862, 1870. VII. Galatians, 1841, 1851, 1857, 1862, 1870. VIII. Ephesians, 1843, 1853, 1859, 1867. IX. Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, 1847–8, 1859, 1865.

that were called for with increasing frequency as years rolled on. The number of volumes prepared by Meyer in person was ten; but, as each of these appeared in four or five editions largely recast during his lifetime, his literary labour may be more fitly expressed in terms of forty volumes than of ten; and some idea may be formed of the magnitude of his task of research in preparing for each revision, when we consider that he deemed it his duty to read, digest, and turn to account—whether by accepting or rejecting the results—all the copious literature accumulating during the interval. Almost every one of these editions is ushered in by a more or less considerable preface; and these Prefaces are of deep interest and value, not merely on account of their frequent personal and polemical references, but also because they furnish the only means—apart from Meyer's original draft—of learning the principles by which he was guided and the methods which he followed. These may be gathered, doubtless, from their practical application in the work itself; but it is in the Prefaces only, where he often re-asserts and emphasises particular points, that we find some approach to that formal statement of his processes and aims, which he proposed to give at the close, but in point of fact never drew up.<sup>1</sup>

What was meant as the first section of the work appeared at Göttingen in 1829, while Meyer was still in his first charge at Osthause, under the title of "The New Testament in Greek critically revised according to the best helps, with a new German translation," in two volumes probably not much known in this country. The Preface contains what we have called the original draft of the Commentary,

<sup>1</sup> For the opportunity of seeing most of the earlier editions I am indebted to the kindness of my friend and neighbour Dr. Morison—himself a singularly fresh and thoughtful exegete—who has allowed me to draw on the rich stores of his unique exegetical library. I have also to thank Professor Lindsay for some volumes from the library of Tischendorf, now under his charge in the Free Church College.

indicating the motives which led him to undertake his task, and presenting in clear outline the distinctive features of the contemplated work. With much in the phenomena of the times to gladden the friends of pure and genuine Christianity, there was much to make them sad—in the proselytes going over to the Church of Rome; in the prevalence within the Lutheran Church itself partly of the most thoughtless indifference, partly of a rigid and barren attachment to unevangelic dogmas; above all in the spread (as contrasted with the *well-understood* gospel of Christ) of “mysticism supported by a famous philosophy of the day, which knew how to cloak its doctrines in the dress of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, while it concealed behind Christian and Confessional formulæ ideas utterly alien to the simple gospel.” The chief means to counteract this evil was an unbiassed historico-grammatic study of the New Testament, not dominated by any philosophy of the time; and to contribute in some measure to that study was the object of the present work, which the less needed any justification for its appearance, because there was no work of the kind on the whole New Testament meeting adequately, concisely, and at little cost the wants of theological students. He had long felt the need of such a book and resolved to do something towards filling the gap. His first requirement—a critically revised text—was obtained not by an original recension on his own part, nor by a modification of the *textus receptus*, but by a revision of that of Knapp, in which he introduced such changes as commended themselves to his judgment after carefully weighing the evidence and the views of the best critics. His main law in the choice of readings was *caution*. He introduced some new features of punctuation. As to the translation, he held that there is a great difference between a translation meant for popular or church use, which must aim at literal fidelity and exhibit no paraphrase or subjective view of the translator, and one

meant for the use of the theological student, which seeks to elucidate the original even by resorting, where needful, to paraphrase. He sought to supply the latter want. His translation was prepared independently, and only collated afterwards with others so as to improve its expression. For the Apocalypse he adopted the version of Herder. The special aim of the work hardly admits of its being fairly compared with other versions more general in destination, but it is well adapted in clearness and definiteness to its object; and, the better to attain this definiteness, it presents within brackets and in smaller type short explanations deemed needful to bring out the meaning.<sup>1</sup> These explanatory hints are, of course, interpretations; and the reader is asked to take them provisionally, and to suspend his judgment as to their pertinence in individual cases, until the appearance of the Commentary that was to follow.

At the close of the Preface he sketched the leading features of the Commentary thus projected; and the sketch shows how clear and precise from the outset was his grasp of all the elements of the plan that he subsequently filled up. To every book of the New Testament a short historico-critical introduction was to be prefixed. With every chapter there was to be given a suitable selection of variants, accompanied by a statement, in summary or in detail, of the critical evidence, and by a concise specification of the grounds, external or internal, for decision; the more important conjectures were to be added with a note of their authors and their value. The exegetic portion, which was to follow the criticism of the text and was to be worked out according to the principles of the only true interpretation—the historico-grammatic, was to state clearly

<sup>1</sup> Such as Matthew viii. 10, "even in Israel I found not such faith (in my personal healing power);" John xiv. 34, "a new (as regards degree) commandment I give unto you;" Romans i. 17, "For in it is revealed righteousness before God (freedom from the guilt of sin, the good pleasure of God, and hope of eternal life)."

and precisely the different explanations worthy of note, along with the names of their authors and leading supporters, and the grounds on which they were based; to prove that the explanation selected, or proposed on his own part, was the true one, or, if that should not be possible, to commend it as the most probable; and to add the reasons for setting aside or postponing others. The connection of ideas was to be shown with the utmost clearness; the explanation of words was to receive philological illustration; and the historical element was to be set forth clearly and on its proper grounds, but so as to avoid undue prolixity. What might fairly be taken for granted in the case of men who had had a classical culture at school was to be omitted or confined to hints; but all the more attention was to be given to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament itself, of the LXX., of the Apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings, and of Josephus and Philo as well as of the Rabbins. The Commentary, on the other hand, was not to trench on the domain of dogmatics or philosophy. To bring out with entire impartiality by the method prescribed the meaning which the author *thought of* in his words—that is the duty of the exegete; but in what relation the sense thus brought out stands to the doctrines of philosophy, or how it accords with the doctrines of the Church or with the views of her theologians, or how the dogmatic writer is to manipulate it for his science—these are matters which do not concern the exegete as such.

The Commentary as projected was to consist of *two* divisions; it extended ultimately to *sixteen*—the last six, with which we are not here concerned, being entrusted by Meyer—who found enough to do in revising his previous volumes—to scholars in whose powers and kindred spirit of working he had confidence, Lünemann, Huther, and Düsterdieck. As it grew under his hand and assumed an independent place and value, he soon abandoned the link

(appearing in the title of some of the earlier parts) that attached it to the preliminary Text and Translation; to these he made little reference afterwards, doubtless as deeming them practically superseded. And he never carried out his intention of giving, by way of appendix, a full specification of the critical and exegetical literature of the several books and leading passages, and of the New Testament as a whole, accompanied with some estimate of their value.<sup>1</sup> But in every other respect he accomplished (as concerns the major part of the New Testament) all that he had purposed and promised.

It is impossible here to do more than to indicate briefly the salient characteristics of the work. The introductions prefixed to the several volumes, and dealing with their authorship, readers, date, occasion and aim, are models of their kind, exhibiting the most assured results of research with a condensed statement of their grounds, happily seizing and aptly describing the outward surroundings as well as the motives, tone and spirit of the writers. Calm in temper and sober in judgment, they often blunt the edge of an argument by the simple insertion of a parenthetical clause or appending of a pointed question. Especially effective is the criticism bestowed on the positions of the Tübingen school, of which Meyer freely acknowledged the ingenuity, the dexterity of dialectic, and the valuable services in the cause of historical research, but which he regarded as essentially a morbid outcome of philosophical theory and as containing in itself the seeds of its own dissolution. He deeply regretted the mistaken application of "so great an aggregate of good powers" to the quest of visionary hypotheses.<sup>2</sup> At the same time he could not but regret that, in controversy with the method of Baur, people should

<sup>1</sup> In the English edition I have endeavoured partially to supply the defect by lists of the exegetical literature, prefixed to each volume.

<sup>2</sup> See the Prefaces to Acts, 3rd ed. (1861), and 4th ed. (1867).

speak of "believing" and of "critical" theology as of things necessarily contrasted and mutually exclusive, as if faith were of necessity uncritical and criticism necessarily unbelieving; and he pointed out that Luther himself—whose racy words he is fond of quoting—combined a majestic power of faith with all freedom, nay boldness of criticism. He draws a striking picture of the changing currents of opinion which his own time had witnessed. "We older men have seen the day when Dr. Paulus and his devices were in vogue; he died without leaving a disciple behind him. We passed through the tempest raised by Strauss some thirty years ago; and with what a sense of solitariness might its author now celebrate his jubilee! We saw the constellation of Tübingen arise; and, even before Baur departed, its lustre had waned. A fresh and firmer basis for the truth which had been assailed, and a more complete apprehension of that truth—these were the blessings that the waves left behind."<sup>1</sup>

WILLIAM P. DICKSON

(To be concluded.)

---

## RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—The Bishop of Durham in his published writings has shown us what an ideal Introduction to the New Testament would be. We can scarcely hope that an ideal so truly conceived and requiring so much original research can be realized by any one scholar. It is to Archdeacon Farrar we have looked for an Introduction, readable and trustworthy, English in character and practically serviceable. His previous studies have naturally led up to such a volume, and in the *Messages of the Books*<sup>2</sup> he has given us, if not quite what we hoped for, yet by far the best book of the kind. It gathers into one volume material which has hitherto

<sup>1</sup> Pref. to Rom. 4th ed. (1864).

<sup>2</sup> *The Messages of the Books, being Discourses and Notes on the Books of the New Testament*, by F. W. Farrar, D.D., etc. (London: Macmillan, 1884.)