

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

the Judgment Day. As usual in such studies the supernatural element is kept well in the background, and the Resurrection as an historical event is ignored. It is a purely human Jesus who is here presented, a genius of the highest order, not a Divine Saviour.

However interesting and instructive such studies are—and there is much here to interest and instruct—this is not the Christ whom the apostles preached and in whom the Church of all ages has believed.

Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments.¹

BY PROFESSOR ARTHUR S. PEAKE, D.D., MANCHESTER.

III.

I PASS on now to speak of commentaries on the New Testament. We have several commentaries which cover the whole of the Synoptic Gospels. In English we have Bruce (*EGT*) and Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, second edition; in German, Holtzmann (*HC*), E. Klostermann (*HNT*), J. Wellhausen, J. Weiss (*SNT*); and in French, Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. It is curious that some recent British commentators do not mention Bruce at all in their bibliographies. It is quite true that the problems are before us in an altered form, but Bruce had devoted much time and thought to the Synoptic Gospels, and he had the sympathetic insight so precious to the interpreter—much more fully, I think, in his study of the Synoptists than in his study of Paul. There was a largeness about his treatment which was always refreshing, though students whose attention is concentrated on the minutæ of philology and textual criticism will have their needs much better met elsewhere. It would have been a great improvement if Bruce could have reversed the order of the commentaries on Matthew and Mark. As it is, Mark is frequently treated by reference to what has been said on the corresponding passages in Matthew. The reversed order has been followed by Montefiore. His commentary is notable as the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels by a

liberal Jew, who, while exceptionally sympathetic, remains a Jew. As a contribution to the interpretation of the Gospels from the Jewish side, it is disappointing; but this was to have been supplied by I. Abrahams. He was unable to fulfil the task he had undertaken; but he did succeed in publishing his valuable *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* in two volumes. Montefiore's work is specially full in quotations from continental scholars, in particular, the more extreme. Wellhausen and Loisy were most prominent in the first edition, in the second much attention is paid to Bultmann.

Holtzmann was among the most learned of New Testament scholars, equipped with exceptional knowledge of the relevant literature. He was the master of a very condensed style, and his work is not always easy to read. His standpoint was more advanced than we are accustomed to in Britain, but his work was that of a master of the first rank. J. Weiss also belonged to the more liberal school, but he took his own line, and on some points, and those not unimportant, displayed a welcome freedom from convention. As an exegete I count him among the very foremost of his time. His work on the Synoptic Gospels is popular but firmly grounded on wide knowledge and finished scholarship. It may be convenient to add at this point that he prepared the commentary on the Gospel of Luke in the eighth edition of Meyer. This was replaced in the next edition by a commentary from the pen of his father, B. Weiss. The older scholar thus completed the Synoptists for that series, to which he also contributed the commentaries on John, Romans, and Hebrews. I may accordingly speak about his work in general here. He was a learned and laborious scholar, eminent alike in lower and in higher criticism; a painstaking com-

¹ I use ICC for *International Critical Commentary*, CB for *Cambridge Bible*, Cent. B. for *Century Bible*, West. C. for *Westminster Commentaries*, EGT for *Expositor's Greek Testament*, HC for *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, HK for *Handkommentar zum alten Testament*, HNT for *Lietzmann's Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, KHC for *Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, Mey. for *Meyer's Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, SNT for *J. Weiss's Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ZK for *Zahn's Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*.

mentator who rarely failed to reach a decision on an exegetical problem, and as rarely failed to regard it as unquestionably right. I am so conscious myself of the even balance of argument in numerous cases and the absence of warrant for any confident decision, that I am constantly amazed at the assurance with which B. Weiss gives his dogmatic judgments. Of the higher exegetical genius such as his gifted son displayed I find little if any trace; but what can be done by unshrinking labour and width of knowledge, that he succeeded in doing.

Wellhausen's commentaries, with which his Introduction to the first three Gospels might be taken, were of quite a different order. These slim volumes, closely packed with matter, fresh and independent, speaking where the author felt he had something of his own to say, silent where he had nothing to add, were everywhere recognized as of the first importance. The most eminent master in the field of Old Testament scholarship, he had much to contribute from his store of Semitic learning, and the skill in critical analysis displayed in his studies of the Hexateuch, Judges, Samuel, and Kings raised high expectations for his critical operations on the Gospels. His radicalism, however, was extreme. Accepting the Two-document theory, he made Q later than Mark and dependent upon it. He regarded its material as the creation of the Jerusalem Church, and believed that Mark had left extremely little authentic matter for his successors to glean. Even in Mark not a little was dismissed as legendary. One whole section was regarded as composed of duplicate narratives. Another section had been 'Christianized' and was therefore largely non-authentic. Thus the genuine tradition was reduced to very slender proportions. Critics generally have failed to follow his lead; but he has given great stimulus to the study of the Gospels and made valuable contributions to the exegesis. I should add that 'Mark,' 'Matthew,' and the 'Introduction' appeared in second editions.

In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, Klostermann's Mark has appeared in a thoroughly revised and expanded edition. I have already explained the general features of this series, and this volume maintains its reputation. The editor has been greatly influenced by Wellhausen.

In French we have Loisy's *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. This massive work of more than eighteen hundred large pages represented a standpoint less extreme than that since reached by the author, but still very radical. It displays very full knowledge of the most important literature, and the

exegetical discussion is thorough. An independent commentary on Mark came out later, and he has recently published a larger volume on Luke. In the latter the author has been much influenced by the study of literary types ('Formgeschichtliche Methode'), which has recently been prosecuted with much ardour in Germany, and also by the belief that the Christian cultus exercised great influence on the Gospel narrative. Historical scepticism has gone almost as far as it can go without the denial of the historicity of Jesus. I might also call attention to his translation of the New Testament ('Les Livres du Nouveau Testament'), which contains introductions to the separate books and groups of books.

The unfortunate view that Mark was later than Matthew and had drawn largely from him, naturally led to its being the Gospel most neglected by commentators. Now that it is almost universally regarded as the oldest and as the original from which Luke and Matthew largely drew the historical sections they have in common with it, the Second Gospel has attracted the attention of several commentators. Gould in the *ICC* is a serviceable though scarcely a distinguished piece of work, now more than thirty years old. The best commentary in English is Rawlinson (*West. C.*). It is a disadvantage that it is based on the Revised Version and not on the original, and that for a philological treatment it is necessary to go elsewhere. But it is abreast of the critical and exegetical discussion in Germany as well as Great Britain. In particular it is the one commentary on the Gospels which takes full account of the work done on the literary types. It is indeed quite possible that it may be too sympathetic with the exponents of this method, and that the narratives were not originally disconnected stories put together by the author like beads on a string, and therefore not available for any confident reconstruction as to the course of the ministry. But at least the editor tries to bring home the uncertainty of the reconstructions which assume Mark's order to be chronological. And on the exegetical side it is throughout a work of high merit.

In the *Cambridge Greek Testament* we have Plummer. He was a very prolific commentator, writing in the *ICC*, of which he was one of the New Testament editors, on Luke and 2 Corinthians, and completing Robertson's commentary on 1 Corinthians. In the *CGT*, in addition to Mark, he edited John, 2 Corinthians, and the Epistles of John. Early in his career he did Peter and Jude for the *New Testament Commentary for English*

Readers. He contributed the volumes on the Pastoral Epistles, James and Jude to the *Expositor's Bible*. He wrote independent commentaries on Matthew, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. His exegetical output had accordingly a very wide range. He had been a pupil of Döllinger's and translated some of his books, so he was well equipped on the side of German scholarship. And he wrote also on Church history. His books have considerable merits, wide knowledge of the literature of the subject, sound scholarship, and good sense. But industry, sobriety, and learning do not make a commentator of the first rank, and in the higher and deeper qualities of the heaven-sent exegete it would probably be generally admitted that he was deficient. At the same time for general use his books are often excellent.

Bartlet's Mark (*Cent. B.*) is a great improvement on Salmond, in close contact with foreign as well as British discussions, and marked by considerable independence and freshness. It should be remembered that his solution of the Synoptic problem differs somewhat from that generally accepted; but this does not affect the treatment of Mark so much as of the other Synoptists. To the ill-fated *Oxford Church Commentary* Allen contributed the only New Testament issue which was published before the enterprise came to its regrettable end. He had the very great advantage of being a competent Aramaic scholar, and this gave the commentary a distinction all its own among our British works. It includes a translation in which so far as possible the roughness of Mark's style is retained. The notes are often fresh and suggestive; the main defect of the book—and it is rather serious—is that it is not a good deal fuller.

Of commentaries which do not appear in a series the best known is probably Swete. The author was a very learned scholar who had done much for Biblical study by his manual edition of the Septuagint and by his *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. He was also an accomplished patristic scholar. In textual criticism and Greek scholarship his commentaries are admirable. For the purely exegetical qualities one would pass much the same judgment on his work as on Plummer's.

From these safe, sober, unadventurous, and rather commonplace interpretations we turn with quickened interest to the volumes of Menzies and Bacon. With them we are right out into the full international stream. One may agree with them or disagree with them, but they bring the student into touch with the living problems and treat them in a very stimulating way. *The Earliest*

Gospel, by the former of these scholars, did bring a new strain into British treatment of the Gospels. Bacon's *The Beginnings of Gospel Story* opened a series of investigations on the Second Gospel which culminated in his large volume, *The Gospel of Mark*. His critical theories may not command assent, and his treatment of the record may seem unduly sceptical; but he shows great freshness and originality, and his discussion of the individual problems has behind it a coherent theory as to the Gospel history and the development of the literature of primitive Christianity.

Of the German commentaries I have already mentioned those by B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Klostermann, Wellhausen. There remains Wohlenberg (*ZK*), a painstaking work but not on the level of Zahn's own work or indeed of some other contributors to the series. But it supplies a useful counterweight to some of the more radical expositions.

In French, besides the small volume by Loisy already mentioned, we have a full and excellent Roman Catholic Commentary by Lagrange (1911). It has a very long and thorough introduction, and the commentary itself is very full. The author is an accomplished Semitic scholar and has written an important work on Semitic religions. I may take this opportunity of adding that the commentaries in the same series (*Études Bibliques*) on Matthew, Luke, John, Romans, and Galatians are all from his hand. As is natural in a French commentary, a good deal of attention is paid to Loisy's views.

On Matthew, Allen (*ICC*) is very thorough so far as the criticism goes, defending a somewhat different theory from that commonly taken. On the exegetical side he is far too meagre, so much so indeed that Plummer wrote his *Exegetical Commentary* in order to make good this deficiency. The volume by B. T. D. Smith (*CB*), just published at last, takes the place of Carr's long, antiquated work. It is within its limits a good piece of work in touch with some of the best recent criticism and exegesis. In view of the Jewish character of the first Gospel it was an excellent idea to entrust the new edition in the *Century Bible* to Box. One could wish that he had had more space, but he has contrived to pack a good deal into it. Micklethorp (*West. C.*) is on a larger scale and contains much useful matter, but it would have been better if reference to other commentaries had not been excluded. Our foremost commentary is that by McNeile, based on the Greek text and in close contact with the best exegetical literature, foreign as well as British. The author

has the advantage of being also an Old Testament scholar. I may take this opportunity of mentioning the Warburton lectures by Dr. Lukyn Williams—*The Hebrew Christian Messiah* (1916). Strictly this is not in place in an article on Commentaries; but the author's Jewish learning is specially valuable for the exposition of the first Gospel, to which the volume is devoted.

Of foreign commentaries on Matthew, I need not say more on B. Weiss (*Mey.*), Holtzmann (*HC*), Zahn (*ZK*), J. Weiss (*SNT*). I should add, however, that Klostermann (*HNT*) has appeared in a second edition, very thoroughly revised and taking account of fresh investigations down to 1926.

Luke has come off rather badly in British exegesis. Plummer (*ICC*) was published nearly a third of a century ago. It is still the fullest of our modern commentaries. Farrar (*CGT*) was published in 1884; an adequate commentary to replace it in that series has been long overdue. Adeney (*Cent. B.*) has been rather slightly revised for the second edition; it is a useful, popular work. Ragg (*West. C.*) is a good specimen of that series and not too technical. The most recent is the commentary by Easton, a distinguished American scholar. I should personally have preferred a different arrangement of the material, and the strictly exegetical notes are often unduly brief. But it is a thorough piece of work, in constant contact with the best and most recent literature. Adequate attention is given to the lower and higher criticism of the book, and we have at present no commentary to place beside it.

Nothing need be added with reference to the commentaries by Holtzmann (*HC*), B. Weiss (*Mey.*), J. Weiss (*SNT*), Zahn (*ZK*), or Lagrange. Wellhausen was not able to prepare a second edition of this commentary (1904). Klostermann's was written in collaboration with Gressmann (1919); a second edition has not yet appeared.

On the Gospel of John we have no good recent commentary. Bernard in the *ICC* is in the press, though it is unfortunate that the author did not live to see it through. It will no doubt contain much valuable matter, but whether it will prove to be the commentary for which we have been waiting to give us a quite satisfactory exposition cannot be said until we have it before us. Dods (*EGT*) and Plummer (*CGT*) are both serviceable expositions; the latter is one of the better specimens of the author's work. M'Clymont (*Cent. B.*) has been issued in a revised edition (1922). It is conservative on the critical and historical problems,

and a useful aid to the understanding of the Gospel for those who cannot study the larger works.

Westcott published a commentary on the English text in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and for long this was regarded as our standard work. After his death a larger edition was issued, based on the Greek text, and this is much to be preferred. I think it is undeniable, however, that we have drifted a great deal from the attitude towards Westcott which was common thirty years ago. The traditional view as to authorship which Westcott tenaciously held, has been widely abandoned. The Dean of St. Paul's laments Westcott's critical immobility, but speaks of him as 'the one man who among all his contemporaries was best fitted by natural sympathy and understanding to expound the deepest teaching of the Gospel.' He thinks that the more recent commentators, while sounder on the critical problem, had not Westcott's insight into the sublime teaching of John. Other excellent New Testament scholars, however, would demur to this estimate and find much more help for the understanding of the Gospel in some of the recent continental commentaries.

Of these, B. Weiss (*Mey.*) is a favourable specimen of that scholar's work, but the last edition was, I believe, published more than quarter of a century ago. Holtzmann entrusted the revision of his commentary (*HC*) to Walter Bauer, who did the work with great skill and thoroughness. It is one of the best aids from the advanced standpoint to the interpretation of the Gospel. Bauer also did the briefer commentary in *HNT*, which was by no means a mere abbreviation of Holtzmann-Bauer. The second edition of this work which has recently appeared has devoted much attention to Mandæan parallels. I understand that Bultmann is preparing the new edition of John for Meyer. In this we may be sure that great prominence will be given to Mandæan affinities, since the editor has already called special attention to them and put forward a radical theory of primitive Christianity to account for them. The student will be wise to exercise a good deal of caution on this point. Zahn did John as well as Matthew and Luke for his commentary. Heitmüller's contribution to *SNT* is popular and competent.

Wellhausen's *Das Evangelium Johannis* is disappointing when compared with his editions of the Synoptists. It is specially concerned not with the exegesis but with the analysis of the book into its sources. This is a matter for criticism rather than

for interpretation, with which we are specially concerned. This problem has attracted a great deal of attention of late in Great Britain as well as abroad, and of course the documentary analysis has a bearing on the exegesis. In this respect Loisy's career has been of interest. The first edition of his *Le Quatrième Évangile* (1903) was a volume of nine hundred and sixty pages, rather diffusely written and from an advanced standpoint, but a highly competent exposition. The unity of the Gospel was firmly asserted. In 1921 he published a much smaller work devoting about five hundred pages to the Gospel and nearly eighty to

the Johannine Epistles. In this revision of the exposition of the Fourth Gospel he has abandoned the unity, and suggests that an earlier draft of the work was expanded by a redactor. He thus applies here a solution with which readers of his works will be familiar elsewhere. The student would probably find more help from the first edition than from the second. I need only mention that an earlier volume by Calmes in the Roman Catholic series of French commentaries has been replaced by an important commentary from the hand of Lagrange.

(To be continued.)

In the Study.

Virginibus Quærisque.

The Half-way Folk.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
GLASGOW.

'Thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.'—Rev 3¹⁵.

IN the book *When We Were Very Young*, which every boy and girl ought to know, there is this quaint little song:

Half-way down the stairs
Is a stair
Where I sit.
There isn't any
Other stair
Quite like
It.
I'm not at the bottom,
I'm not at the top;
So this is the stair
Where
I always
Stop.
Half-way up the stairs
Isn't up,
And isn't down.
It isn't in the nursery,
It isn't in the town.
And all sorts of funny thoughts
Run round my head:
'It isn't really
Anywhere!
It's somewhere else
Instead!'

There is a delightful picture of the little boy sitting at the turn of the stairs thinking 'all sorts of funny thoughts.'

Now that's all very well for a little boy on the nursery stairs, but it's not well at all for anybody climbing the ladder of life. But the little boy among his funny thoughts had hit on one thing that is very true; and that is that 'half-way up the stairs isn't really anywhere.'

This world is full of half-way people who think they are doing very well; but they aren't really anywhere. They are like the old woman who bowed her head at the name of the devil and who, when she was told it was at the name of Jesus she should bow, replied, 'I know that fine, but it's as well to have friends on both sides.' She wanted to be on good terms with the Saviour and she didn't want to be on bad terms with the devil, so she sat down half-way between and bowed to both.

In the Gospels Jesus talks about people who try to serve God and gold; about half-Christians who say and don't do. They are not very bad and they are not very good. They are betwixt and between. They are middling. They remind one of the Grand Old Duke of York:

When he was up, he was up,
And when he was down, he was down,
And when he was only half-way up,
He was neither up nor down.

They don't want to be sinners, but they don't want to be saints. They are as near the bottom as the top. They are not anywhere. They are colourless. You can't say what they are, or on what side. You