

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

difficult for us to see Him aright even now. And we shall never really understand Him until we realize that what happened at His temptation was the secret of His whole life—everything of God, God and His ways the one sole object of faith and acceptance as life and guidance, as end and means.

Such is Jesus at His temptation as this writer 'sees Him.' The same truth was once put in a

memorable way by a preacher of exceptional insight and gifts. He put the three temptations in three pithy phrases. The first: 'Necessity knows no law.' The second: 'Faith knows no law.' The third: 'Success knows no law.' To the first Jesus said: 'The one necessity is God's law.' To the second He said: 'Faith accepts God's way.' To the third He said: 'The real success is to be at one with God.'

Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments.¹

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

IV.

EDUARD MEYER has recently emphasized the view that Luke and Acts are not two distinct works by the same author, but the first and second parts of a single work. This position has been strongly enforced by Cadbury in his *Making of Luke-Acts*. It is accordingly interesting that the two have been constantly treated apart and by different writers. If Luke is taken in combination with other books it is with Mark and Matthew, not with Acts. For this their place in the Canon is partly responsible. It was natural that the force of gravitation should detach Luke from Acts and bring it into the corpus of the Gospels. It is regrettable that the long-promised edition of Acts in ICC by C. H. Turner, with whom Bate has since been associated, has not yet appeared. Our most comprehensive commentary is by Knowling (*EGT*), now nearly thirty years old. It was, indeed, too full, taking account of many things of an ephemeral character. But it was a very thorough piece of work. Rackham's contribution to *West. C.*, which occupies a distinct place of its own, was also fuller than the normal limits of the series permitted. A

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*.

new edition in *CGT* has been for many years overdue. I might mention a rather more elementary school edition by Burnside. It displays a fairly good knowledge of modern literature in English or Latin. Bartlet (*Cent. B.*) is fresh and suggestive; a new edition of this brought up to date would be welcome. In the new series entitled *The Clarendon Bible*, A. W. F. Blunt has written an interesting volume on Acts which is attractively produced and copiously illustrated. He has done Galatians in the same series. A larger commentary on the English text of Acts by Furneaux may also be mentioned.

A very comprehensive work on Acts is designed when complete to form the first part of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, edited by Foakes-Jackson and Lake. The first volume dealt with the background and does not concern us. The second volume consisted of a considerable number of studies, dealing specially with the criticism of Acts, contributed by various writers. The third volume contained a most comprehensive and very important study of the text by Ropes. The fourth volume, which is in the press, is to contain a translation and commentary.

There are several important German works. Wendt (*Mey.*) is learned and sober, one of the best expositions available. Preuschen (*HNT*) appeared almost simultaneously with the last edition of Wendt. It also was a solid contribution, though more extreme. Norden's *Agnostos Theos* could be taken account of in the preface to both commentaries; had it appeared earlier it would presumably

have influenced them more deeply. Zahn wrote a massive commentary in his own series. No recent edition of Holtzmann (*HC*) has been produced. Knopf, who gained his reputation by an excellent work on the Post-Apostolic Age, and who completed J. Weiss's *Urchristentum* and wrote a serviceable *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, contributed the commentary to *SNT*. A notable Latin commentary was written by Blass, the famous Greek scholar, in 1895. This attracted a great deal of attention not only from the freshness and independence of the notes, but by its theory that Luke himself prepared two editions of his work.

In the French Roman Catholic series Jacquier wrote an enormous volume of more than eleven hundred pages in rather small print (1926). It naturally contains a large mass of valuable matter. At the other extreme we have Loisy's nine hundred and fifty pages. Loisy's theory is that Luke wrote a history which went down to the death of Paul. The date was about A.D. 80. Some forty years later a Roman Presbyter took this work, which was as honest as one could expect such a book to be, and by extensive mutilation, distortion, and invention of innumerable fictions created our present book. This extreme scepticism, which has gone from bad to worse in later volumes, especially in his commentary on Luke, greatly reduces the value of his work. The reasons alleged for his negative results are often so flimsy, arbitrary, and subjective that they could be dictated only by the resolute will to disbelieve. How flimsy they are may be illustrated by his statement that 1 Co 13 has every chance of not being the authentic work of Paul. There is no reason for this except that it seems to interrupt the connexion between chs. 12 and 14; but this would only warrant the suspicion that it was out of place (so J. Weiss). But it must have been written in connexion with the topic of spiritual gifts which Paul is discussing in chs. 12 and 14, and therefore must have been written for that discussion. No one writing an independent panegyric on love would begin, 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,' and proceed to speak of gifts of prophecy and knowledge, and revert to this theme later in the chapter if the subject in connexion with which it was written had not been that of spiritual gifts. In other words, the chapter arises directly out of the discussion in which it is found and is indissolubly connected with it. This wantonness of hypercriticism is abundantly illustrated in most of Loisy's recent work. It is a real tragedy that

knowledge so wide and intellect so acute should be controlled by a scepticism so unreasonable.

I pass on now to the commentaries on the Pauline Epistles. For Romans we have Sanday and Headlam (*ICC*). This is valuable for its philology and textual criticism; the exegesis takes account of the best literature, ancient and modern, British and foreign. I doubt, however, whether a partnership is in the nature of the case suitable for the exposition of a work like the Epistle to the Romans, and the special qualifications of Sanday would, I think, have found a more appropriate field for exercise in the Acts of the Apostles than the Romans. Sanday's gift lay much more in the critical and historical than in the speculative and theological field. For this, Denney, who edited the Epistle for the *EGT*, had much more natural aptitude, and he was also an excellent scholar. While his work had admirable qualities, it was marred, in my judgment, by certain limitations, on which my own controversy with him turned. He had a strong dislike and deep distrust of mysticism. This led him to deny that Paul affirmed a mystical union of the believer with Christ, and intended only a moral union. Nor could he attach any meaning to racial acts, as predicated of Adam and Christ. What Denney saw he saw clearly and sharply and expressed with pungency and power. What he could not see did not exist, and he listened rather disrespectfully if you reported that you had really seen it. Good Paulinist though he was over a large part of the field, one part of it, and that which for Paul himself was central, lay outside the range of his vision.

In the *Cambridge Greek Testament* the general editor, St. John Parry, has produced a volume which will be found very serviceable by those who do not possess the larger commentaries, but which should not be neglected by those who have access to them. Garvie, in the *Century Bible*, is in close agreement with Sanday and Headlam in its exegesis, and the interest of the author in the philosophic aspects of theology is an additional qualification for a writer on Romans. I should like to mention an older book, Liddon's *Explanatory Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans*; its exegesis, where theological questions did not intervene, was substantially that of Meyer, but the author's skill in presentation is seen to advantage in the notes, which constitute the main part of the work. The Commentary by Pallis is written from an eccentric standpoint. The author regards the Epistle as not genuine and as greatly interpolated, but there are interesting suggestions on the text and inter-

pretation, and on questions of philology the author has a right to be heard. He has also issued notes on Mark and Matthew, on John and the Apocalypse, and on Luke and Acts.

Of foreign commentaries I need not linger on B. Weiss and Zahn. One of the best is Lipsius in *HC*. The author was not only a very accomplished New Testament and patristic scholar, he was also a distinguished theologian. An untechnical treatment of great merit is given by Jülicher, one of our foremost New Testament scholars in *SNT*. Lietzmann has reserved for himself the commentaries in *HNT* on Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. New editions of these valuable works would be welcome. An independent commentary by Kühl is of unusual excellence. Barth's famous exposition scarcely falls within the scope of these articles.

On 1 Corinthians, A. Robertson had promised to write in *ICC*, but the greater part of the work was done by Plummer. It is a solid contribution to the subject, but on it and the commentary on the Second Epistle wholly written by Plummer, who edited it also for *CGT*, more need not be said. G. G. Findlay in *EGT* is marked by real distinction and is one of our best English commentaries. Massie (*Cent. B.*) is chiefly notable for its exegetical paraphrases which seem to me models of their kind. He deals with both Epistles, and his Introduction to the second is a good guide through the tangled critical and historical problems. Goudge has commented on both Epistles in *West. C.* I have not yet seen the second volume. The first is a careful work, but written with definite presuppositions as to the type of Christianity which the apostle takes for granted.

In German, Schmiedel has written on both Epistles in *HC*, a work of exceptional ability. Bachmann's treatment of both in *ZK* is also very thorough. Bousset's exposition in *SNT* is a worthy companion of Jülicher's Romans. But the outstanding Commentary on 1 Corinthians is J. Weiss (*Mey.*), in no sense a revision of the old Meyer, but an entirely new work, one of the very best commentaries that New Testament exegesis has produced in our time. It is distressing that he could not prepare for publication his commentary on the Second Epistle.

On 2 Corinthians, Bernard (*EGT*) is good so far as it goes, but disappointing in its brevity. Menzies has written an independent commentary, fresh and valuable, like his work on Mark. Both scholars hold to the unity of the Epistle, a view which to many scholars, Harnack now included, seems more than dubious. The place left vacant by the death

of J. Weiss has been filled by Windisch, a competent and widely read scholar.

With Galatians we come to Lightfoot. It is convenient to mention at this point that in 1895 Lightfoot's trustees published a substantial volume containing notes on the whole of Thessalonians, on 1 Co 1-7 and Ro 1-7. These were based upon his lecture notes and contribute much of value. In addition there is a commentary on Eph 1¹⁻¹⁴, which he had prepared for publication as part of his projected edition of that Epistle. The commentaries which Lightfoot published were on Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. There is a well-known verdict of Hort's that the commentaries are characterized by masculine good sense, without the insight or delusion of subtlety. They are learned, lucid, and balanced. The paraphrases are exceptionally good. There are valuable studies of words; they are strong on the historical side, and there is a welcome sanity in the criticism. But the defect at which Hort gently hinted was there, as any one would discover, who worked through Lightfoot's *Colossians*, side by side with Erich Haupt's edition. The commentaries contain valuable dissertations later collected in a convenient form in *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*. When these and the introductions are subtracted, the space actually allotted to the exegesis is not excessive, sometimes perhaps, scarcely adequate.

On Galatians our most comprehensive work is Burton (*ICC*). A valuable appendix dealing with special terms covers about a hundred and sixty pages. Rendall (*EGT*) is characterized by finished scholarship and freshness, but it is a drawback that the editor gives no reference to other expositors. Lukyn Williams in *CGT* is compact and excellent; and Adeney has a useful little work in *Cent. B.* Emmet in *The Reader's Commentary* is brief but very good; and there is a fresh and able brief commentary by Bacon. Ramsay's *Historical Commentary* is half devoted to a valuable historic introduction, and the rest of the book is not a commentary in the usual sense, but it is indispensable to the student of the Epistle.

In German I believe there has been nothing to replace Sieffert, in *Meyer*. On Schmiedel (*HC*), Bousset (*SNT*), Lietzmann (*HNT*), and Zahn (*ZK*) I need add nothing. In French, commentaries have been written by Loisy and Lagrange.

The imprisonment Epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians) are not generally taken together in British series, the attractive little volume, by Currie Martin (*Cent. B.*), forming an exception. In German series it is more usual.

The outstanding commentary here is that by Erich Haupt, alike for its close grappling with the thought, the tenacity with which it follows up the development of the argument, and the subtlety and skill which it displays in the detailed exposition. P. Ewald (*ZK*) is an excellent work of the same type, but scarcely, I think, of the same calibre. Lueken (*SNT*) is a useful popular exposition. He contributes the section on Thessalonians also. Martin Dibelius, one of the ablest of the younger scholars, has done Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles, in addition to the imprisonment Epistles, for *HNT*. For *HC*, Lipsius commented on Philippians, leaving Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon for Von Soden, whose work reaches a high level, here and elsewhere, though scarcely, I think, equal to that of some of his colleagues.

In the *ICC*, T. K. Abbott gave to Ephesians and Colossians a mainly philological treatment, frequently critical of Lightfoot's results. It is disappointing because pre-eminently in these Epistles thought rather than philology demands the first place. Marvin Vincent was responsible for Philippians and Philemon. It is a careful rather than a distinguished piece of work. In *CGT*, Dr. J. O. F. Murray has dealt with Ephesians in a full, thorough, and independent way; and Dr. Lukyn Williams' edition of Colossians and Philemon is a worthy companion to his Galatians. Our fullest exposition of Ephesians is given by Salmond in *EGT*. It takes account of all the preceding exegetical work and is perhaps overburdened with matter. The edition by J. Armitage Robinson follows an unusual arrangement. There is a long continuous exposition based upon an English translation (mainly A.V.), followed by the Greek text with a commentary, largely philological, to which a series of detached notes is added constituting the main contribution made by the volume. British commentaries, apart from Abbott, have been deliberately neglected; but the commentary would have gained if the best foreign work had been taken into account. Westcott's posthumous notes have been edited with great care and competence by J. M. Schulhof. It remains to mention that H. A. A. Kennedy's treatment of Philippians in *EGT* reaches an exceptionally high level, and that a good commentary has been written on it in *West. C.* by Maurice Jones. Colossians in *EGT* was done by myself, and Philemon by Oesterley.

On Thessalonians there are several good commentaries. In addition to Lightfoot's *Notes* already mentioned, we have a full and careful study by Frame (*ICC*); Findlay in *CGT*, compact and

within its limits first-rate; a good popular treatment by Adeney (*Cent. B.*); Moffatt's exposition in *EGT*, which we could wish had been much fuller; and G. Milligan's comprehensive commentary, which is specially rich on the philological side. Of German commentaries Bornemann (*Mey.*) retains its value for its elaborate history of the interpretation of the Epistle, but otherwise it has been superseded by Von Dobschütz's full and valuable edition. Schmiedel has undertaken it for *HC*, and I have already mentioned Lueken and Dibelius for *SNT* and *HNT* respectively. Wohlenberg wrote on the Epistles in *ZK*.

On the Pastoral Epistles we have at last the long-anticipated volume by Lock (*ICC*). Bernard in *CGT* is full and good, and there is a careful and fairly long exposition by N. J. D. White in *EGT*. Brown (*West. C.*) has an interest of its own from the light cast on the Epistles by the editor's work in India. R. F. Horton has contributed an interesting popular exposition to *Cent. B.* R. St. John Parry's *The Pastoral Epistles* consists mainly of an introduction defending the conservative position, but it contains the Greek Text with fairly full annotations at the end. Liddon's explanatory analysis of 1 Timothy might also be mentioned, as for Romans. In German I believe that B. Weiss has not yet been replaced in *Mey.* Von Soden (*HC*) is one of the best German expositions. F. Koehler has written in *SNT*, Wohlenberg in *ZK*, and Dibelius in *HNT*.

Our most recent commentary on Hebrews is Moffatt's (*ICC*). Characteristically full knowledge of the relevant literature, a wide range of reading and first-hand research combine to make it a very important contribution to the interpretation of the Epistle. Nairne's *Epistle of Priesthood* included an exposition of the Epistle, but his commentary proper is to be found in *CGT*. It is written on original lines with a long history of the interpretation and an elaborate discussion of the theology. It is learned and fresh, much too advanced for schoolboys and at times rather intangible. But it is a real and valuable contribution to the literature on the Epistle. Dods contributed to *EGT* a full and thorough commentary exhibiting great width of reading in the exegetical literature. Wickham's *Hebrews* seems to me one of the less favourable specimens of *West. C.* Westcott's has commonly been regarded as our best British commentary, but though I am sorry to dissent from Nairne's weighty judgment, I can only record the very definite impression I formed when writing my own commentary in *Cent. B.*, that Davidson's little book had

behind it a stronger mind and a more penetrating insight into the meaning of the writer.

Turning to German works, I must break away from my rule, to mention the great commentary by Bleek which introduced a fresh era in New Testament exegesis, has deeply influenced later commentators (e.g. Westcott), and has not lost its value. B. Weiss (*Mey.*) is not, I think, at his best on this Epistle, nor is Von Soden (*HC*). Riggenbach (*ZK*) is probably the best of the recent commentaries, and on a smaller scale Windisch (*HNT*). The Epistle has been undertaken by Hollmann in *SNT*.

The General Epistles are not usually taken together in English series, but W. H. Bennett has treated them excellently in a single volume of *Cent. B.* Windisch has dealt with all in *HNT*. Hollmann and Bousset with all except 1 Peter in *SNT*.

On James we have a very comprehensive and learned treatment by J. B. Mayor. Care should be taken to procure the third edition (1910), along with the pamphlet *Further Studies in the Epistle of St. James*, with special reference to Hort's edition (1-4⁷). Hort also edited 1 P 1¹-2¹⁷. These editions are of exceptional value. In *ICC* we have a recent and admirable commentary by Ropes. Oesterley in *EGT* should not be neglected; the author's Rabbinical studies give a distinctive value to his notes. Knowling, who was unusually well equipped with knowledge of the foreign literature, has written on James in *West. C.* In German we have Beyschlag (*Mey.*), now old but not superseded, Von Soden (*HC*), and, as already mentioned, Hollmann and Windisch.

1 Peter has been combined with 2 Peter and Jude by Bigg in a fresh and original commentary written to some extent from a wrong point of view. J. H. A. Hart edited 1 Peter for *EGT*. The special quality of his commentary is its use of the Septuagint and Jewish literature. In *CGT* G. W. Blenkin has written a useful exposition, and there is a good independent edition by Masterman. In German, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude have been taken by Von Soden in *HC*, by Wohlenberg in *ZK*, and by Knopf, an excellent scholar prematurely taken from us, in *Mey.* Gunkel (*SNT*) is, of course, important. On 2 Peter and Jude, J. B. Mayor has given us a volume which is a worthy companion to his edition of James. Rather curiously he has also edited Jude for *EGT*. 2 Peter has been undertaken for that commentary by R. H. Strachan, who has written a very full Introduction. The two Epistles are edited for *CGT* by the expert hand

of M. R. James. Here, again, the Introduction is elaborate in comparison with the notes.

On the Johannine Epistles, Brooke in *ICC* is excellent. D. Smith in *EGT* reveals, but on too limited a scale, the well-known qualities of his work. Plummer is responsible for the volume in *CGT*. The best-known commentary containing much valuable matter is by Westcott. Of German commentaries, in addition to those already mentioned, I should name Holtzmann-Bauer (*HC*), which is among the best available, and Baumgarten (*SNT*). G. G. Findlay's exposition, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*, though not technically a commentary, calls for mention here.

On the Revelation of John there is a considerable literature. Charles (*ICC*) has behind it the editor's great and fruitful labours on the apocalyptic literature. He has devoted immense pains to establishing the text of the book, and he has made a study of its language of unprecedented thoroughness. He has also spent a great deal of study on the work of his predecessors. His theory of the stupid editor who arranged the closing sections in wrong order and at other points defaced the master's work is suggestive, but so far as I have observed has not met with acceptance. Moffatt in *EGT* is fresh, learned, and generally excellent. Simcox (*CGT*) ought to be replaced as soon as possible. Anderson Scott (*Cent. B.*) now lies in a rather distant past. It was admirable when published, and is still useful; we wish the editor could adjust it to the present situation. Swete is very good on the textual and philological side; his exegesis is marred by his compromise with allegorical interpretations where it is improbable that these were intended by the author. Hort left a valuable fragment on chs. 1-3, with an introduction to the whole book. There is an American commentary of solid merit by Beckwith. The latter half of my Hartley lecture on the Revelation of John is devoted to an exposition of the book. In German the fullest of our recent commentaries is the second edition of Bousset (*Mey.*); though issued more than twenty years ago, it is still valuable. Holtzmann-Bauer (*HC*) is, of course, excellent but briefer. Zahn has recently completed his great commentary (*ZK*) written from a conservative standpoint. J. Weiss had his own views of the literary history of the book which he published in a monograph in the *Forschungen*, edited by Bousset and Gunkel. He contributed the commentary to *SNT*, of which he was the editor, but for the last edition this has been edited by Heitmüller. Heitmüller should have written on Revelation for *SNT*; but owing

to his premature death the task was undertaken by Lohmeyer, whose commentary is among the most striking contributions made to the study of the book. He takes it to be a unity constructed with the highest art. While denying the apostolic authorship, he believes that it and the Fourth Gospel may possibly be from the same hand. Above all, he breaks away from the reference to the contemporary situation. That these positions will be finally made good may well be doubted; but it is salutary to have the problems raised again by so competent a scholar. In French we have a recent commentary by Loisy. I have found

myself in much fuller agreement with it than with any other of his commentaries.

I ought to mention in conclusion Field's *Notes on the Translation of the Old Testament* (a posthumous expansion of *Otium Norvicense*, Pars tertia). It contains a wealth of suggestion on philology and interpretation by a scholar whose erudition was of exceptional range.

I need hardly repeat that much precious exegetical material is to be found in the literature on the New Testament outside the commentaries; but this has been rigidly excluded in order to keep the articles within due limits.

A Plea for the Study of Theology.

BY THE REVEREND S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, D.D., SALISBURY THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

AT the recent annual Conference of the Principals of Theological Colleges held at Cambridge, allusion was made to a still prevailing prejudice against Theology as a subject of educational value. It is felt that Theology is narrow and technical, possibly obscurantist, unable to provide either valuable knowledge or mental stimulus and exercise, and in particular that candidates for the Sacred Ministry are far better advised to study arts or history or one other of the regular subjects for their degree, as likely to obtain thereby both a better grounding in knowledge and a better discipline for their mental faculties.

Let it be admitted at the outset that there is justification for this attitude. In the past the teaching of Theology has been academic, unintelligent, and unrelated to the problems of everyday life. So much is evident to any student of Church history, and it is even within the recollection of many who are still living. But there is no reason why the teaching of Theology should be so mismanaged any more than that of any other subject, and as a matter of fact as a subject Theology covers far more ground, penetrates deeper, and is ultimately more practical in its bearings than any subject in the educational curriculum, so that this prejudice is like many others, mistaken and erroneous.

What are the subjects covered by the word Theology? They include the Bible, the history of the Christian Church and its beliefs (or doctrines), its practice (or ethics), and its worship. To these

should be added the comparative study of other religions as providing the necessary background and contrast to that religion which is specially in view. It is a short list, but its implications and requisites are indeed many.

Consider first the range which is covered by the word 'Bible.' The study of the Bible involves much that is required of the student of classical literature. It requires the knowledge of at least two languages, Hebrew and Greek, and to these Latin is a desirable if not a necessary addition (Latin is certainly required later, and one or more modern languages are of great assistance, not to say indispensable). The study of these languages carries with it grammar and some philology, and the mental gymnastic and the acquisition of exactness and accuracy incidental thereto. (Accuracy and clearness of thought will be demanded later on by the need of distinguishing between *homoousion* and *homoiousion*, of apprehending the purport and intention of 'transubstantiation,' of realizing the essential difference between Christianity and other religions, and so forth.) Having mastered the languages of the Bible, the student proceeds to its contents, and the subject-matter of Holy Scripture alone is a university curriculum in itself. It begins with a theory of the origin of the universe and of men; and it proceeds to an account of the development of the human race and of a particular people, which it traces for at least two thousand years, and through many stages and vicissitudes. That the Old Testament presents a philosophy of history