

*Jesus and Nicodemus: A Study in Spiritual Life*, by the Rev. JOHN REID, M.A. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906), is a thoughtful and occasionally eloquent monograph of a homiletic nature, embellished with apt illustration from a wide range of literature. The author adopts generally the traditional point of view, regarding the conversation as historical. He has no reference to Dr E. A. Abbott's theory that the original Nicodemus was the official provider of water for the purposes of purification in Jerusalem, and hence a very appropriate character in a dialogue setting forth the doctrine of regeneration through something more than water. Mr Reid interprets the very difficult phrase ἐξ ὕδατος in ver. 5, as referring to the baptism of John the Baptist, on the ground that it must refer to something already known to Nicodemus. Our Lord is only repeating the words of John (Matt. iii 11) in another form, and recalling to Nicodemus the Fore-runner's words about repentance which the typical Pharisee had rejected. The word 'water', therefore, has not a universal but only a particular reference to the case of Nicodemus.

Mr Reid renders John iii 8: 'The Spirit breathes where He wills, and thou hearest His voice, but knowest not whence He comes or whither He goes: so is every one that has been born of the Spirit.'

He argues that πνεῦμα must have the same sense throughout the passage, *vv.* 3-8, that in no other passage in the New Testament is it translated 'wind', unless it be in Heb. i 7, where it is a quotation from the Old Testament. Had the translator understood the Aramaic word in the original as 'wind', he would have used ἀνεμος. By the use of the perfect tense ὁ γεγεννημένος the evangelist indicated a comparison between the Spirit and the Spirit-born. If it be somewhat forced to render πνέω 'breathe', it is still more forced to render πνεῦμα 'wind'. οὕτως indicates a comparison of manner and not of substance or character.

On this interpretation Mr Reid bases a commentary of much spiritual power and insight.

Homiletically the book is edifying in the best sense of the word; critically it is careful and thoughtful and the outcome of earnest study.

JOHN HUNTER SMITH.

The book of most permanent value which has been published since our last CHRONICLE is the first volume of Dr Hastings's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906). The book abundantly justifies itself, covering, as it does, a much wider range of ground than the *Dictionary of the Bible*, including many subjects

which do not properly come into a dictionary of the Bible and treating those that do from a different point of view. Especially valuable, in this way, are the articles that trace the history of variations in the manner in which Christ and the Gospels, and the ideas presented in them, have been interpreted in later times. Merely as examples of these articles I would mention Dr Knowling's 'Criticism' (A. Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* has been published since and will not be generally accessible) and Mr R. S. Franks's 'Justification'.

To Dr Nestle and the Bible Society of Württemberg (Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1906) we owe two attractive pocket volumes. The one volume is the New Testament in Latin according to the Clementine text of 1592, with *apparatus criticus* giving the variants in later editions and collations of the text of Wordsworth-White to the end of Acts, and beyond Acts of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and codd. Amiatinus and Fuldensis. An explanatory preface, the Eusebian sections, the Letter to the Laodicenes, and Jerome's letter to Damasus are prefixed. We have in this volume, accordingly, what has long been wanted, with the guarantee of Dr Nestle's name, and we gladly acknowledge a further debt of gratitude to him. The other volume is the same Latin text interleaved with Dr Nestle's Greek text. That a few of the Latin pages are unpleasantly crowded is an inevitable result of exact correspondence of the two texts page for page, and had the paper used been thicker the volume would have been too large for the pocket. The type and the binding are excellent, and a careful selection of biblical references is given in the margin.

*The Fourfold portrait of the heavenly King as presented in the Gospels*, by Interpreter (Elliot Stock, London, 1907), is a new translation into modern English of the four Gospels, with, on the opposite page, the Authorized Version (to which notes shewing the changes made by the Revisers are appended), references to the Old Testament (the passages being usually given in full), and parallel passages in the other Gospels. The translation is divided into sections with explanatory headings and analyses, and there are tables of contents, Old Testament quotations, various charts, and a complete index of incidents in the life of Jesus shewing the Gospels in which they are narrated. Much that is given here can of course be found elsewhere, though not, as far as I know, in so convenient a form, especially the Old Testament references and the headings to the sections, which seem to me to be peculiarly valuable. The new translation, so far as I have tested it, has the merit of being scholarly and dignified, though the translator sometimes invades the

province of the commentator, as, for example, when he renders *καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν θεόν* (John v 18) 'was also calling God his father in a peculiar and exclusive sense'.

Of Dr Harnack's *Lukas der Arzt* (J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1906), which has not yet been noticed in the JOURNAL, an English translation has already been published (*Luke the Physician, the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles*; Williams & Norgate, London, 1907), and English readers can study for themselves the method by which Dr Harnack, largely helped by the works of Dr Hobart and Sir John Hawkins, maintains the traditional opinion that the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles are the work of the same author, and that he is Luke, the beloved physician and companion of St Paul. They can also see—and it behoves them to mark the fact—that this conclusion does not carry with it, for Dr Harnack, the belief that either work is historically trustworthy. Dr Harnack knows, of course, that many of the scholars and critics with whom he is usually classed will regard him as terribly reactionary; and he writes of those students, who are so wedded to preconceived and arbitrary theories of the origin of the books of the New Testament that they cannot see the plain facts of the case, in terms so scathing, not to say contemptuous, that had any English writer used them of the 'advanced critics' he would have been condemned as sunk in the slough of conservatism and that insularity from which, it is said, Englishmen can never quite extract themselves. It may be noted that Dr Harnack has not converted M. Loisy (*Rev. d'hist. et de litt. rel.* xii 2 p. 150).

*Die Person Jesu im Streite der Meinungen der Gegenwart* (Heinsius, Leipzig, 1906) is the subject of an address given by Dr Schmiedel at the general meeting of the Swiss Society for liberal Christianity last year. The address belongs to the class of fugitive literature, but a short summary of it may be of interest. Dr Schmiedel sets himself to consider three questions: whether Jesus really lived, whether He regarded Himself as the Messiah, and whether His ethical teaching is still suited to the present day. He answers all three questions in the affirmative. The first is decided mainly on the evidence of passages in the Gospels which at least one of the three synoptists has omitted or altered with a view to enhancing the majesty of the person of Jesus—passages which shew Him to have been 'in the full sense *man*'. That He regarded Himself as the Messiah is shewn by His answer to the Baptist (Mt. xi 2-6), the incident at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. viii 29 f), His question about the 110th Psalm (Mk. xii 35-37), His acceptance of Messianic privileges (Mk. x 35-40, Mt. xix 28), His entrance into Jerusalem riding on an ass

(cf. Zech. ix 9), His assent to the question of the High Priest (Mk. xiv 61 f), and the title on the Cross (Mk. xv 26). 'How can any one pronounce all this incredible, and still find anything credible in the first three Gospels?' He also accepts as a genuine saying of our Lord, and so as further proof that He regarded Himself as the Messiah, the prophecy that He would return to earth on the clouds of heaven, and insists with much emphasis that the belief of the disciples in the Resurrection must have been based on our Lord's own prediction. This 'Messianic consciousness' he thinks was a gradual development, in the course of our Lord's public active ministry, from His consciousness of His relation to God as a Son (a child), culminating in His conviction of the need of abrogating the law of Moses, which only the Messiah could change. He was, of course, an idealist, but not a visionary (ein Schwärmer) in any bad sense of the term.

Nearly half the lecture is devoted to the consideration of the third question, and particularly to the decision of the problem how far His belief that the end of the world was near affected the permanent worth of His ethical teaching. Dr Schmiedel answers in effect, though with a good many qualifications, that the fundamental principles of His teaching are capable of application to all conditions and for all times. The qualifications which he makes seem to me to amount often to a denial of the main thesis, as, for example, when he forbids us to found on a single saying, such as the answer about the tribute-money, any theory as to the worth of the State, or to use the parable of the Talents in relation to the business of civic life. Wherever it is possible to grasp an ethical *principle*, it must surely be legitimate to give it the widest application. In this part of the discussion there is a good deal that is arbitrary: e.g. Dr Schmiedel says that 'Jesus cannot have said such things' as Lk. xvi 25, 1-9. The parables, certainly, are not free from difficulties, but other interpretations of them than those which Dr Schmiedel gives are possible.

In *L'Origine du Quatrième Évangile* (Letouzey et Ané, Paris, 1907) M. M. Lepin reviews carefully the theories of Réville and Loisy, compared with those of Holtzmann, Harnack, Jülicher, Abbott, and Schmiedel, and by a gradual exposure of flaws in their arguments, and a progressive narrowing down of the circle in which the author must be looked for, finds him at last triumphantly in the Apostle John. Whether we can accept this conclusion or not, the book has value as a review of previous criticism—on the whole, so far as I can judge, fairly presented, though some of this criticism is so provisional that the statement of Jülicher's position already needs correction from the last edition of his *Einleitung*.

An altogether admirable statement of the problems connected with the Fourth Gospel is furnished by Mr H. L. Jackson's *The Fourth Gospel and some recent German criticism* (University Press, Cambridge, 1906). Mr Jackson shews a singularly wide and thorough knowledge of the literature of the subject down to the time at which he wrote, and an unusual power of logical arrangement and discrimination of the evidence. To say that he finds it impossible to solve all the problems is only to say that he really knows what they are. There is no book on the subject which I should so confidently put in the hands of any one who desired to understand the present position of the Johannine question.

*An Exposition of the Gospel of Mark*, by the late William Kelly (Elliot Stock, London, 1907), is a reprint of articles published in 1865 and 1866 in the *Bible Treasury*, with introduction and notes mainly drawn from later papers of Mr Kelly in the same periodical, edited and enlarged so as to take account of later work by E. E. Whitfield.

In *The date of St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (University Press, Cambridge, 1906) Mr Douglass Round, accepting all Professor Ramsay's arguments on other points, argues for a date before the Council at Jerusalem. As one who felt, in Mr Round's words, that Dr Ramsay's 'brilliant work illumined what had been before a dark corner', that the 'North Galatian' theory lacked all evidence, and that it was impossible to reconcile the second visit of Galatians with the third visit of Acts, I heartily welcome Mr Round's effort to remove the 'burden' of the later date of the Epistle. He seems to me to have established a very high degree of probability for his contention that the τὸ πρότερον of Gal. iv 13 is covered by the two visits paid to most of the Galatian Churches on the one Missionary Journey—going and returning; and if this explanation be accepted, a chief argument against the early date of the Epistle falls to the ground.

Dr H. J. C. Knight's *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Methuen & Co., London) is an altogether admirable addition to the series 'The Churchman's Bible', alike for scholarship, arrangement, insight into the writer's thought, and powerful and attractive expression of it. The essay on 'Christ and Slavery', with its warnings as to the danger of premature emancipation, with which the little volume concludes, adds greatly to its value.

The same writer's *The Temptation of our Lord, considered as related to the Ministry and as a revelation of His Person* (Longmans, Green, & Co., London, 1907), the Hulsean Lectures 1905-1906, belongs to the

class of books on 'Divinity' in the old English sense of the word, and takes at once a high place among them. In days when scholars are for the most part immersed in the study of the *origines* of Christian literature and institutions, such a book as Dr Knight's is peculiarly welcome and must be warmly recommended to the careful study of all who in any sense hold Christ's commission and believe that the principles underlying our Lord's own Ministry are the principles which His Church must endeavour to follow in all its work in the world. I give the purpose of the book in Dr Knight's own words (p. 64): 'the particular task I have set myself is this: to try so to interpret it [sc. the Temptation] as to shew the connexion between it and the Ministry which followed—a Ministry which is still being carried on by the Lord Ascended and His Body the Church. Or to put it otherwise: accepting the Baptism as the fixing of the great *end*, I seek to consider whether we have not in the Temptation the Lord's final human *sanction of laws* governing His accomplishing it and the *adoption of means* conducive to it and in harmony with those laws.'

*Apologia*, by Dr E. A. Abbott (A. & C. Black, London, 1907), is an explanation and a defence of the author's religious belief, and a summary of his recent works indicating the stages through which he has been led to his present theological position, in relation to some recent criticisms. Everything that Dr Abbott writes has charm and interest, but I do not think that his distinction between 'miraculous' and 'supernatural', or his view that there is no incompatibility between 'ordinary parentage' and 'spiritual uniqueness' is made easier or more generally acceptable by anything in this book. Dr Abbott writes (p. 70): 'the birth of Jesus of Nazareth involved a unique congenital act [viz. on the part of God] whereby there abode in Him all the Fulness of the divine Goodness.' With all respect, and in no eristic spirit, I would ask how such a unique act of God, which overrides all that we know of the course of ethical development, differs from a 'miraculous' act.

*New Light on the New Testament* from records of the Graeco-Roman period, by A. Deissmann, translated by L. R. M. Strachan (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1907), is a reprint of Dr Deissmann's brilliant articles in the *Expository Times*, Oct. 1906—April 1907. Every one will be glad to have them in this more convenient form.

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER.