
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

is that it is incredible, and Dr. OMAN gives as an example of this, Transubstantiation. It is curious that this point is never referred to by either Father KNOX or Mr. BELLOC. Yet it is probably the one thing in Roman belief that seems wholly beyond belief. Dr. OMAN points out the figurative nature of our Lord's teaching, and says that even as late as Tertullian it was assumed that Jesus was speaking figuratively when He said, 'This is my body.' The development of the simple rite into the mystery of Transubstantiation has been traced with extraordinary clarity by Harnack. And it is well known that the Roman view was based on a philosophy of substance and accidents which has long since been given up. Probably Roman apologists are wise in saying nothing of this. If any soul can accept the Roman claim, no demand presented to him will seem too hard, because he has already done what Mr. BELLOC has done, submitted his intellect on religious matters entirely and utterly to Roman domination.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

X. Great Britain's Recent Contribution to New Testament Study.

BY THE REVEREND N. P. WILLIAMS, D.D., LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

IN the continuous flux of human affairs it rarely happens that the end of a century in our conventional system of measuring time coincides with the end of a natural epoch in history and a fresh start in the spiritual or intellectual activities of a nation. Nevertheless, the beginning of the present century may be deemed to have marked such a turning-point in the history of the British people, not least in respect of the restricted, though to the Christian and the student supremely interesting and important, field of New Testament studies; for the same year, 1901, which saw the death of the great Queen who has given her name to the 'Victorian' era, with its monumental achievements in all departments of human thought and endeavour, witnessed also the passing away of Westcott, the last survivor of the illustrious constellation of Cambridge scholars of which the other two luminaries were Lightfoot and Hort, and which for more than a generation had dominated this particular era. The last thirty years, more or less, seem therefore to constitute for our purposes a chronological whole, and the adjective 'recent' will be deemed to be applicable to any works produced within this period. It should further be premised that in this article the expression 'Great Britain' will be interpreted quite literally, no account being taken of work produced by American or Colonial scholars. Finally, by the word 'contribution' we shall understand what may be regarded as positive, massive, and relatively lasting achievements, though we shall not consider ourselves debarred from making mention of isolated works which have notably stimulated or assisted thought and research, even though their conclusions may not have so far attained to general acceptance.

A large element of subjectivity must necessarily enter into the attempt to decide what recent intellectual constructions are likely to be permanent. Nevertheless, the present writer is bold to believe that posterity, when it comes to review the period of New Testament study in Great Britain with which we are concerned, will single out the progress which during this time has been made in the elucidation of the Synoptic Problem as its most valuable and abiding legacy. I do not forget the works of Professor F. C. Burkitt and of the late Professor V. H. Stanton; but, if the writings of these scholars be momentarily left aside, it is perhaps not too presumptuous to claim the chief credit in respect of advance in this field for Oxford, and more particularly for the 'seminar' which for many years met in the house of the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, its best known members being Professor Sanday himself, the late Sir John Hawkins, and Canon Streeter.

Three books stand out as the products of the labours of this group—Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* (first edition, 1898; second, 1909), the

collective volume known as *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (1911), and Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels* (1924). A single movement of thought may be traced in orderly development through these three works, a movement which may be here briefly indicated, though space does not allow of its detailed description. Broadly speaking, Hawkins' book represents the spade-work involved in clearing a site and excavating trenches for foundations; the *Studies* are the foundations themselves, and Streeter's work is the imposing edifice which a skilled architect has erected thereon. The main contents of the *Horae Synopticae* consist of statistical tables, compiled with amazing minuteness and laboriousness, of words and phrases peculiar to each of the Synoptists, and catalogues of (*a*) coincidences in language of two or three of the authors, both those which are striking and extensive, and those which are subtle and almost imperceptible, (*b*) differences of order within the same saying as recorded by the different authors or different contexts in which identical sayings are enshrined, and (*c*) of doublets. The author modestly disclaims any ambition beyond that of collecting material for others to work upon, but does not feel debarred from indicating the directions in which his massed observations seem to point. The catalogues of differences and identities may be deemed to have disposed, more thoroughly than had ever been the case before, of the old Oral Hypothesis, and to have established documentary inter-relationship between the Synoptists. Nevertheless, certain differences of order and phrasing seem to be best explained as relics of a fluid, oral, and pre-documentary stage of transmission; the first sixty years of Christianity are thus subdivided (though Hawkins himself does not explicitly draw this conclusion) into a generation (more or less) of oral transmission and a generation of written Gospel-production, a result which both clears up our chronological ideas and assigns its proper field (? A.D. 29–65) to the 'form-criticism' which is now claiming to go behind even the earliest documentary sources which the literary criticism of the Synoptists can disclose. In Hawkins' opinion, the existence of doublets constitutes impressive testimony to the existence of two main sources, but the absence of triplets or quadruplets suggests that there were not more than two—an observation which now only appears to be well founded if by 'main sources' we understand documents used by both Matthew and Luke. The work contains a provisional draft of Q, which has formed the basis of subsequent discussion of the non-Marcan discourse source. Hawkins' minute linguistic study of the parts of Mark not embodied in Matthew and Luke, which clearly shows their complete literary homogeneity with the parts which are so embodied, ought to have at once laid—though in fact it did not—the trouble, some spectre of *Urmarcus*; and his similar comparison of the style and characteristic phraseology of St. Luke's Gospel with that of the Acts (particularly of the 'We'-sections) and of St. Paul's Epistles seems to have permanently vindicated both the Lucan authorship of the Acts and the traditional belief that St. Luke was a disciple and travelling companion of the Apostle of the Gentiles. A further important result may be expressed in the author's own words: 'Mark shows the smallest (if any) traces, and Matthew shows the most decided traces . . . of adaptation for the purposes of catechetical or other teaching, Luke holding an intermediate position in this respect, but nearer to Matthew than to Mark. This seems to correspond remarkably to the degree of familiarity with the language of the three Gospels respectively which appears to have existed among Christians in the following decades, so far as we can judge from the references to the evangelical history in the writings of the sub-apostolic age and in Justin. Thus the Gospels which were most used bear most traces of adaptation for use' (*op. cit.*, 2nd ed. p. 218).

The Two-Document Hypothesis thus adumbrated, though not formally enunciated, in *Horae Synopticae* was systematically expounded in the volume of *Oxford Studies*. To this Dr. Sanday, the editor of the book and the inspirer of the whole group, contributed an essay which disposed of a good deal of the supposed evidence for *Urmarcus*, by showing that many of the minute variations as between the text of our Mark and the copies of it in Matthew and Luke could easily be accounted for by the physical difficulties attending the reproduction of texts in the time of the ancients, who possessed no tables (or, if they did, did not think of using them for this purpose) of such a size that several books and papers could be displayed set out upon them, and who usually wrote on their knees, only taking an occasional glance at the manuscript roll which they were copying and which ordinarily stood in a canister on the ground by their sides. I must confess that I myself in this volume, though defending the integrity of the Marcan text against attempts to separate it into sections attributable to more authors than one, made what I now think a vain effort to revive a modified form of *Urmarcus*, by appealing to Luke's 'Great Omission' of Mark

6^{15}–8^{26}; but Sir John Hawkins convincingly reinforces the demonstration contained in *Horae Synopticae* of the literary homogeneity of the omitted with the non-omitted sections of Mark, by pointing out that there are ample reasons why St. Luke should have omitted these sections, assuming them to have stood in his copy of Mark. It is likely that Luke would have wished to omit something, as papyrus rolls were sold in standard sizes, and he had all the valuable matter contained in the so-called 'Peræan section' to work in; and Hawkins shows, by a careful study of each, that the omitted sections would for one reason or another have been unsuitable for Luke's purpose. But the most characteristic feature of the book is its thorough and extended discussion of Q, which receives ample consideration from four authors, Hawkins and Streeter (on the whole) elucidating and defending what may be called the 'orthodox' Q sketched in *Horae Synopticae*, whilst Allen and Bartlet submit minority reports taking different views. The former wishes to omit the narratives of the Baptism and Temptation from his Discourse-Document, whilst the latter doubts even the existence of a written Q, postulating instead a basic Apostolic tradition, originally purely oral, which he labels Q, but which had already become embodied in three different written versions (QMk, QM, QL) before it reached the Evangelists whom we know. Neither of these minority views seems to have won much acceptance; but the importance of Bartlet's work lies in its revolt against the only just formulated Two-Document Hypothesis, and the great importance which he attaches to Luke's special source (S), which for the Third Gospel at any rate involves the expansion of the Two-Document into a Three-Document Hypothesis, an expansion which points forward to the Four-Document Hypothesis as expounded in Streeter's *Four Gospels*, which is the culmination of the series.

This great book is still only seven years old, so that it is too early to pronounce dogmatically as to the place which it will occupy in the history of the study of the Gospels; and its argument is so elaborate and extensive as to defy compression. We cannot therefore do more here than draw attention to some of its more salient and original features. First of these is its insistence upon the importance of textual criticism as an indispensable prolegomenon to literary criticism; hitherto, the 'lower' and the 'higher' criticisms of the texts had been kept too much in watertight compartments. The section of the book which deals with textual criticism assigns their true weight to many interesting facts which had only been known to specialists. Full account is taken of the Freer MS. W and the Koridethi MS. Θ, which, with its 'family' is shown to represent the local text of Cæsarea. The exclusive supremacy attributed by Westcott and Hort to ℵB is broken down, and the claim of other local texts, Eastern and Western, to play a part in the final fixation of the autographs is fully admitted, though Streeter still thinks that the Alexandrine text represented by ℵB, though not infallible, is nevertheless better than any other local text. These studies are meant to provide the literary critic with an instrument for evaluating the textual variants on which weighty questions of source-criticism may hinge. The use of this instrument, combined with the ordinary methods of literary criticism, leads eventually to the discovery of four primordial documents connected with four principal centres of Christianity—the Matthæan sources connected with Jerusalem, Mark with Rome, Q with Antioch, and L (St. Luke's special source) with Cæsarea. The most original feature of the work is, perhaps, Streeter's theory of the genesis of our present Third Gospel which regards the Evangelist, or his authority, as having first fused Q and L so as to produce a primitive Gospel named by Streeter 'Proto-Luke,' and St. Luke himself as having subsequently come across Mark, and having accordingly enlarged 'Proto-Luke' by the incorporation into it of large sections of Mark, so as to produce the Third Gospel which we know. If Streeter's dates for his four fundamental documents (M A.D. 65, Mark 60, Q 50, and L 60) be accepted, and if his whole construction stands the test of time and criticism, the result ought to be a very considerable enhancement of the confidence which Christians can feel in the general reliability of the earliest records of the life of their Master.

I have left myself comparatively little space in which to write of what seems to me the other outstanding achievement of British scholarship during the period under review, which is the vindication by Sir William Ramsay of the 'South Galatian' theory of the geographical situation of the recipients of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. It is strange, in the light of Sir William Ramsay's convincing work, to look back and remember that Lightfoot, on the basis of the purely arbitrary assumption that the terms 'Galatia' and 'Galatians' must have been used by St. Paul in a strictly ethnological rather than a political sense, identified the recipients of this letter with Christians living in or about Ancyra and Pessinus;

thereby making St. Paul take a long and unexplained detour into savage and inhospitable country, creating an insoluble problem out of his silence in the Epistle concerning the Apostolic Decree of Ac 15 (which, on the 'North-Galatian' hypothesis, must have been enacted some time prior to the writing of the Epistle to the Galatians), and presenting us with the embarrassing alternative of throwing over Luke's account of the Council of Jerusalem in Ac 15 as unhistorical or attributing something very much less than ingenuousness to St. Paul in his enumeration of his various visits to Jerusalem in Gal 1 and 2. All these difficulties vanish if, with Sir William Ramsay, we take the simple and easy step of assuming that the word 'Galatian' is used in its political sense, and that the Christians addressed in the Epistle are the converts of the First Missionary journey. St. Paul's own account of his movements, given in it, can then be easily harmonized with the parallel account given in Acts; the Epistle becomes earlier than the Council of Jerusalem, so that silence about this gathering is satisfactorily explained, and becomes, indeed, the earliest of all existing Christian documents, written within fifteen years or so of the Crucifixion—a fact which invests with a deep impressiveness what appear to be its indirect allusions to the pre-existence of Christ, the objectivity of His atonement, and the sacramental efficacy of Baptism.

There are, doubtless, individual works which have been produced during the last thirty years, and which attain to the very highest standard of merit; and I might occupy many pages in discoursing upon the services rendered to international scholarship by such works as Moulton-Milligan's *Vocabulary*, Estlin Carpenter's and Provost Bernard's work on the Fourth Gospel, Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*, and Charles's *Revelation*. Yet, though individual judgments are necessarily subjective, I venture to think that in broad outline the two achievements which I have designated above will stand out in the eyes of posterity as the most valuable legacies of this epoch.

Literature.

JESUS AND JOSEPHUS.

No serious student of Christian origins is likely to neglect the monumental work of Robert Eisler, Ph.D., entitled '*The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, according to Flavius Josephus' recently discovered "Capture of Jerusalem" and the other Jewish and Christian Sources' (Methuen; 42s. net). The original German has been admirably translated by Alexander Haggerty Krappe, Ph.D. Whether we end by agreeing or disagreeing with Eisler's conclusions, we are fortunate in possessing in English a book which has caused considerable stir on the Continent, and which by its vast erudition and superabundant detail brings its readers into touch with tracts of ancient literature which are practically a sealed book to the average student. The chapter 'Ecce Homo,' for example, collects all the allusions to the personal appearance of Jesus. Historically considered, such material is often practically worthless: it may be, for example, late, it may be a pure invention, and the original text, for whatever it was worth, may have been subjected to all kinds of excisions, additions, and transformations at the hands of later interested copyists, and Dr. Eisler shows much ingenuity, if also considerable boldness and arbitrariness, in attempting to recover original texts. Two of many interesting plates bring vividly before the eye the lengths to which Christian censors of Jewish books could go: one page shows Hebrew words, phrases, and occasionally whole lines carefully deleted by thick strokes of the pen, while more than half of another page is defaced by a great smudge of very black ink which has been recklessly spread over it. Indeed, ever since the fourth century, 'Christian censors had power to destroy and consequently also to expurgate books of anti-Christian tendencies.' This fact leaves much scope to an ingenious mind for the reconstruction of history, and Dr. Eisler's ingenuity has an almost incredible knowledge of ancient literature within which to range.

Put very briefly, his view is that Jesus lost His life in an attempted Messianic uprising. 'At each of the places seized by the rebels one of the insurgents must have been in command, and these two leaders are doubtless the two λῃσταί crucified on