

exists for the promotion of Christian knowledge should resort in its translations to the practice of suppression or alteration of important sentences, and the insertion of expressions which tend to obscure the clear atmosphere in which Truth is best discerned.

The foregoing criticism of Professor Hommel's

argument from Proper Names reached the Editor just too late for insertion in the August number. The postponement, however, enables me to express the pleasure with which I have read Professor Margoliouth's searching criticism of Professor Hommel's general line of argument, with one part of which alone my own note is concerned.

G. B. G.

Recent Foreign Theology.

An Exposure.

THE literary supplement to the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung* of 14th June contains a witty exposure by Professor D. Kaufmann of a pamphlet published anonymously at Crefeld, bearing the title *Das 104 Blatt aus dem Register des Thorschreibers von Jerusalem*, and professing to be an edition of a papyrus leaf of the year 27 A.D. which belonged originally to the visitors' book of the gatekeeper at Jerusalem, and contains, among other important records, a notice of a visit of 'Jesus the man of God,' whom the anonymous editor very naturally identifies with our Lord. The original document is offered for sale in the dealer's list, which occupies the inside of the cover, and only 20,000 marks, or £1000, demanded for it; and if the editor were accurate in his description of its contents, this price could not be called 'sehr teuer,' a phrase which the dealer substitutes for figures in pricing some of his articles. Unfortunately, it is as clear as daylight that the editor has made a mistake of a thousand years in the date of his document; that the leaf belongs not to Jerusalem, but to Cairo; and that the notion that it came from a visitors' book is only due to the editor's absolute ignorance of Arabic, the language in which the leaf is written; so that for the notices 'came,' 'went,' and 'dwelt' we should substitute 'bushels,' 'halves,' and 'quarters.' Professor Kaufmann apologises for calling attention to this pamphlet, on the ground that it is apparently only the first of a series, and that such publications tend to cast discredit on the restoration of ancient literature, in which English workers especially have been so successful. What surprises us most is that the anonymous editor

hints that he consulted Euting, who pointed out one fact about the document as 'bedenklich.'

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

Among the Periodicals.

The Date of the Fourth Gospel.

READERS of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will perhaps recall the attempt of Mr. Halcombe to upset the current opinion as to the relative dates of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. A similar position has been recently maintained in Germany by Lic. Wuttig, whose work is reviewed in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 10th July last by no less an authority than Professor HOLTZMANN. By the way, it is rather singular that neither the author nor his reviewer appear to have heard of Halcombe's *Historical Relation of the Gospels*. The thesis maintained by Wuttig is that the Fourth Gospel was written not after, but before, the Synoptics, that it was the work of John the son of Zebedee, who composed it about A.D. 62 or 63, when he was about sixty years of age, and before he settled at Ephesus. The work was undertaken as the result of an understanding with a large body of apostles and witnesses, hence the plural in John i. 14 and 1 John i. 1-3. The latter passage, according to Wuttig, was originally intended to form the introduction to the Gospel, but was afterwards expanded into the First Epistle, which along with John xxi. 1-23 served as a 'Begleitschreiben' to the Gospel. This last chapter of the Fourth Gospel he holds to have been written shortly after the martyr death of St. Peter (c. 64 or 65 A.D.), and possibly after the composition of the Synoptics. At a still later

date, in addition to the interpolations (John v. 4, vii. 53-viii. 11; 1 John v. 7), there was introduced the certificate of genuineness (John xxi. 24), and then, latest of all, the remark in xxi. 25 (whose characteristic is the sing. *οἶμαι*).

Holtzmann criticises very adversely the arguments of Wuttig from the testimony of early writers, showing how many expressions of the latter need to be rejected as unauthentic or explained away, if an early date for the Fourth Gospel is to be conserved. Equally devoid of force does he find his argument based upon the relation of this Gospel to the Pastoral Epistles, while his exegesis stands on the same level. As a proof that it was not John that meant to supplement the synoptists, but they him, Wuttig actually cites Luke i. 1-4, finding in the *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου* a reference to John i. 1-14, and founds upon the words *πεπληροφορημένα πράγματα* an argument which is impossible from the point of view alike of grammar, history, and logic. And what is to be thought of the argument that the words 'in this book' of John xx. 31 imply the non-existence of any other Gospel literature? Most people would draw the opposite inference. In taking leave of this bizarre production, Holtzmann enters a warm protest against the methods and conceptions of the theological school to which Wuttig belongs. Its adherents, while incapable of grappling with historical problems, yet imagine themselves possessed of a kind of supernatural knowledge, in virtue of which they can reach the goal at a bound, while 'negative criticism' (an expression they take a silly pleasure in using) fails with all its skill to reach it.

Budde's 'Job.'

Professor Budde recently published as one of Nowack's *Handkommentar* series a work on Job, of which he himself gave an account in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (Dec. 1896, p. 111 f.). The book is reviewed in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 24th July last by Professor SIEGFRIED, who contributes the volume on *Job* to Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*. The reviewer opens with a warm eulogy on Budde's treatment of the language and the text. Even when one does not feel inclined to accept of all his emendations of the latter, these are always stimulating and suggestive. Special weight is also naturally ascribed to the

decisions on metrical questions by one who is so universally recognised as a (if not *the*) leading authority on Hebrew poetry, and to whose investigations we owe our knowledge of the structure of the *Kinah* measure. It will be remembered that Budde rejects all attempts that have been made to restore the text of Job upon the basis of a metrical theory.

When we come, however, to the important question of the aim of the poet, Siegfried cannot assent to Budde's conception of this. The latter finds in the original 'popular' book (contained in the Prologue and Epilogue) simply a testing of Job which issued in the complete vindication of the latter and the victory of God over the Satan. While the poet retained this framework, he emphasises the *sin* of Job, his pride and self-righteousness, which, latent before, come out in his argument with his friends. These had been detected by God, who sent suffering upon the patriarch to purify him from them. This comes out in the Elihu-speeches, which it is one of the leading characteristics of Budde's commentary to defend as an original, nay, as the most essential, part of the poet's work. To all this Siegfried objects that, if the poet's aim was that stated above, he has done his best to conceal it from his readers. Why did he retain the framework of the 'popular' book whose conceptions were so different from his own? How could he allow God in 1⁸ and 2⁸ to pronounce Job perfectly upright, when he himself is about to exhibit him as more guilty than the Satan had alleged? Moreover, upon Budde's theory of the aim of the poet, the three friends of Job were right, and did not deserve the censure pronounced upon them in 42⁷, so far at least as Job was concerned. Siegfried maintains, further, that Budde's conception of the person of Job is out of harmony, not only with the poem, but with the whole spirit of the Old Testament. Job's language, although to us it may savour of self-righteousness, reflects exactly the stage of spiritual development we find in the post-exilic writings (e.g. Ezek. 18⁵⁻⁹). There was a definite enough understanding of what was the whole duty of a pious Israelite, and, when this duty had been fulfilled, one was not slow to claim his reward, and even to reproach God if it were not bestowed (e.g. Ps. 7⁸, 44^{17ff.}, etc.). It is by this standard that Job must be tried, and, when we apply it, all his language in

chap. 31 finds its vindication. No doubt he defends himself here, as throughout the poem, with passion, but the language of passion, like the language of poetry, must have due allowance made for it. According to Siegfried, then, 'the Elihu-speeches remain a wedge which splits up the whole poem; and to seek in these for the solution of the problem, appears to lead to the destruction of the whole creation of the poet.'

Miracles.

In the July number of the *Revue de Théologie*, M. Bois handles the notion of miracle from the point of view of the theory of knowledge. With all their respect for Kant, it is well known that neo-Kantians like Bois have no hesitation in rejecting a good deal of the teaching of the great philosopher of Königsberg. In particular, the doctrine of the latter concerning the noumenon, or thing in itself, is pronounced to be a tissue of contradictions and impossibilities. Kant's theory of the determinism of phenomena is held to be as false as his conception of noumenal liberty is chimerical and incapable of defence. It appears that recently a work was published by Albert Schinz, in which, upon Kantian principles, the impossibility of miracle was triumphantly demonstrated. This work is subjected by Bois to a good-natured but none the less destructive criticism. For Schinz the word miracle is capable of three applications: (1) the miracle in itself, occurring in the world of noumena, of which no account need be taken, since this world is unknown and inaccessible; (2) the miracle for us (*i.e.* for all men, and, above all, for God), occurring in the world of phenomena, which is impossible owing to the determinism of natural law, which has exclusive sway in this world; (3) the illusory miracle, which the individual imagines he discovers, but which has no existence for his fellow-men or for God.

Bois rejects the miracle in itself more decidedly even than Schinz, holding as he does that the noumenon is not only unknowable, but non-existent. But as he does not believe in the absolute determinism of phenomena, he has no reason for refusing to admit the possibility of the phenomenal miracle—the miracle not only for us, but for God. With all his flourish of trumpets and parade of logic, Schinz is, according to Bois, chargeable with several logical fallacies. For instance, he argues that a miracle is, or is not, a

violation of physical laws. If it is, it is impossible; if it is not, it ceases to be a miracle! But there are surely intermediary positions between a scientific law in the sense of Descartes, and absolute disorder and chaos. It is possible to distinguish between such a law and the ordinary course of phenomena which unfolds itself to the eyes of all men, learned and unlearned alike. Or, again, we may conceive of a fatalistic chain of phenomena due to the spontaneous action of laws without the intervention of liberty, human or divine. A phenomenon may violate the course of events supposed by either of these last two positions, without violating the laws of nature. For another reason, it is a vicious argument to say that every phenomenon must be in conformity with or contrary to the laws of nature, and that if it is in conformity with these it is no miracle, while if it is contrary to them, it is a miracle, but an absurdity. An effect due to the intervention of man's will is not contrary to the laws of nature, yet the latter would not have produced that effect but for that intervention. All that we have to postulate in the case of a miracle is a similar *Divine* intervention. This brings us to the last fallacy in Schinz' arguments. It is easy enough to demonstrate the impossibility of miracle when the latter is viewed simply in relation to nature, and without taking into account the personality and the free will of God. Schinz, in fact, denies free will to man as well, and with such a postulate his task is made easy enough. But Bois and those who occupy his standpoint find it difficult to take seriously a writer whose work is full of gratuitous assertions and defective reasoning, and which with all its subtlety is only a *telum imbellè sine ictu*.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

The numerous important discoveries, within the last few years, of early Christian works, have necessitated the issue by Messrs. T. & T. Clark of an additional volume to the series of Ante-Nicene works (twenty-four volumes), published by them some twenty-five years ago. Such works as the Gospel of Peter, the Diatessaron of Tatian, the Apocalypse of Peter, etc., are thus easily accessible to the theological student. The volume forms the subject of a most appreciative notice in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 10th July, by Professor Krüger of Giessen, who laments the fact that for some of the work done in this volume

the necessary encouragement has to be sought in England or America, but cannot be found in Germany. Special commendation is bestowed upon Hogg's translation of and introduction to the Diatessaron. The only real want Krüger finds in the publication is its omission of the *Didache*. The latter was indeed contained in the American reprint of the Ante-Nicene Library (1886), but possessors of the English edition were not helped by that circumstance. It would have been better to choose the less of two evils, and offer the *Didache* twice over to the American public. In the event of a second edition, Krüger hopes that Messrs. Clark will act upon this hint.

Hebrew Proper Names.

Mr. G. Buchanan Gray's recent work on this subject is reviewed in the July number of the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, by Professor OORT, who praises warmly the thoroughness of the author's methods, and does full justice to the importance of his conclusions. Although Mr. Gray modestly entitles the book '*Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*,' his work is a notable contribution to the final solution of many of the knotty problems that abound in this obscure field. Oort indicates one direction in which he thinks these *Studies* might be continued with advantage. In the Hebrew Bible we have proper names according to the Massoretic pronunciation, which we know to be in some instances wrong, as in the case of יהוה, and which there is often reason to suspect does not represent the original pronunciation. The Septuagint, as is well known, frequently exhibits a divergent form, and this is sometimes likely enough to be correct, or more nearly so than the Massoretic form. Take, for instance, the name of the first king of the northern kingdom—ירבעם. This appears to be a compound with the imperfect of a root רב, 'strive,' or with a noun with *god* preformative derived from the same root. Hence the meaning of the name would be 'the people strives' or 'the people's warrior,' parallel with ירבעל = ירבעל, 'Baal's warrior,' 'God's warrior,' or, according to the derivation adopted in Judges vi. 31, 'Let Baal plead,' or 'Baal shall plead.' But, according to the Septuagint, the name of Israel's king was pronounced Ἰεροβοάμ. Are we to conclude that 'jerobo' was the old pronunciation of the imperfect of רב, or of a noun derived from it, or does

another conception altogether of the meaning of the name underlie the Septuagint form? The same questions arise in connexion with the name ררהבעם, Ἰεροβοάμ, whose meaning, according to Gray, was probably 'The people is enlarged.' Again, what conception underlies the Massoretic ירמיהו (Jeremiah)? The Greek pronunciation Ἰερεμία is intelligible, the Hebrew is not. A fruitful field thus remains, Oort thinks, to be reaped. Redpath's Concordance to the Proper Names of the Septuagint should be of great service in the work. Meanwhile, our best thanks are due to Mr. Gray for the aid and the impulse he has given to such studies.

Historical Theology.

The *Theologischer Jahresbericht* (C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn) is always welcome. The second part for the present year has just been issued, containing catalogue and notice of works in Historical Theology that appeared during the year 1896. The editors commence with the remark that since 1893, when the high-water mark seems to have been reached, an ebb has set in, and still runs strongly in this department of theology. It is, they are convinced, a real ebb, and not an apparent one due (mark the passing hit) to the ill-advised niggardliness of publishers who fail to send books for review. All the same, we observe that the present part, which extends to 321 pages, is nearly 100 pages longer than the corresponding one last year. If there are fewer books noticed, the notices are fuller, and some of these notices are extremely valuable. The material is distributed as follows:—(1) The Ante-Nicene Period, by Professor Lüdemann of Bern. (2) From the Council of Nicæa to the Middle Ages, by Professor Krüger of Giessen. (3) The Middle Ages (excluding the Byzantine literature), by Dr. Ficker of Halle. (4) From the beginning of the Reformation to 1648, by Professor Loesche of Vienna. (5) From 1648 onwards, by Professor Hegler of Tübingen. Then come two supplements—one on Interconfessional Theology, by Dr. Kohlschmidt of Magdeburg, and the other on the History of Religions, by Professor Furrer of Zürich. The whole work, like its predecessors, is an invaluable mine for reference.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.