

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1922

DARIUS THE MEDE

It is about six years since my first volume of *Studies in the Book of Daniel* was published; and now that the second volume is about to appear, it seems like an opportune time to reply to some of the criticisms of the reviewers of the first. The most elaborate of the criticisms was one by Professor Kemper Fullerton of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology which appeared in the Bulletin of my alma mater, the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa., for October 1918. Had Professor Fullerton's criticism been confined to myself, I would have forever held my peace; but inasmuch as I am merely the occasion for a violent onslaught on the veracity of the book of Daniel, I shall be excused for referring at length to his strictures. It is high praise, though intended as blame, to be spoken of by him as a "bringer-up-to-date" of the work of such men as Hengstenberg, Keil, Pusey and Green, with whom I am classed as a belated example of the same anti-critical animus and unscientific method.

And, first, let me say, that I do not deem it a reproach to have produced "a typical example of the harmonistic method," which is one of the most serious charges brought against me by Professor Fullerton; but that I fail to see that I have used this method as distinct from the "historical" method, whatever that means. Words break no bones, it may be; but since Professor Fullerton evidently aims to put me in the wrong at the very start and, by necessary implication, all through my studies, by affirming that in my method I am harmonistic as distinct from historical, it is well to pause just here in order to come to an understanding

of the creeds. The consequence is that "Jesus and the Christian Church are religious opposites" (p. 290).

What should now be done, according to Mr. Chamberlain, is to return from degrading definitions to the pure, "formless" religion of Jesus. The finest instrument to lead men to such a formless religion will be art, particularly music. Pure religion will, indeed, it is maintained, have to be found outside the existing churches, and should form a new religious community of its own.

In placing a creedless church thus altogether in the future, Mr. Chamberlain is apparently unaware that the thing has been tried—for example, in the Unitarian Church in America. But in the first place, the creedless churches display a singular lack of power, and in the second place the church which Mr. Chamberlain advocates is not really creedless, but differs from the Christian Church only in having a false creed, chiefly negative, instead of a true one.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

The Style and Literary Method of Luke. By HENRY J. CADBURY, Lecturer in the New Testament, Andover Theological Seminary. Harvard Theological Studies, VI. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1920. Pp. xi, 205. Price \$3.

In the former part of Dr. Cadbury's extensive monograph, which deals with "the diction of Luke and Acts," the author discusses the size and literary standard of Luke's vocabulary and the alleged medical language. In the first section, on the basis of the count undertaken by Professor J. Ritchie Smith in 1891 ("The Vocabulary of the New Testament," in *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* II, 1891, pp. 647-658), Dr. Cadbury points out the comparative richness of the vocabulary of Luke-Acts. With regard to the literary standard of the double work, the conclusion, on the basis of very extensive researches, is that "the vocabulary of Luke [of course the name is used for convenience to designate the author of Luke-Acts without settling the question whether he is to be identified with the Luke mentioned in the Pauline Epistles], while it has its natural affiliations with the Greek of the Bible, is not so far removed from the literary style of the Atticists as to be beyond comparison with them." The author says further: "The question may be pertinently asked whether the gulf between New Testament Greek in general and Attic or Atticistic Greek is not being exaggerated in our day owing to our fresh knowledge of the vernacular Greek through the papyri." With regard to "the alleged medical language of Luke," Dr. Cadbury comes to a negative conclusion. The style of Luke-Acts, he believes, does not show that a physician wrote the double work, but on the other hand it does not show that a physician did not write it.

In the second part of the monograph, the author stands altogether upon the basis of the two-document theory—use by Matthew and Luke (1) of Mark and (2) of a lost source usually called Q—and supposes that the "Mark" which Matthew and Luke used was of essentially the same form as our Second Gospel. The differences between Luke and

Mark and between Luke and Q are then explained as due to changes effected by Luke for a variety of reasons, some of which are thought to have led the Evangelist into serious historical errors.

Dr. Cadbury has collected a large amount of interesting material. But, in company with many investigators, he has closed the way, we believe, to any full solution of the synoptic problem by rejecting the influence of oral tradition or personal recollection in the formation of the First and Third Gospels. If Matthew and Luke wrote at an early time, when the current of authentic information about Jesus' life was still running full and free, then their supposed changes in Mark and in the alleged second source might conceivably be explained. But those changes have never been satisfactorily explained as due to mere editing or to the anti-historical desire to avoid running counter to the beliefs of the Church. No matter what the literary relationships between the Synoptic Gospels may be, these Gospels cannot be understood unless all three of them be put within the period of the primitive tradition.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

The New Testament Today. By ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT, D.D. Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1921. Pp. 92.

Professor Scott's little book is to be placed among the large number of popular treatises which have recently been written to show that the New Testament still possesses some value even for those who have accepted the principles of modern naturalism; and the skill of its author makes the book a good representative of its class. The whole supernaturalistic content of the New Testament is here given up, and of course also the uniqueness of its authority; yet the author believes that the books which compose the New Testament, because of their helpfulness, should still be given a preëminent place in the Church.

This *modus vivendi* between the New Testament and the modern world is established partly by a modernizing interpretation of the New Testament. But it is admitted, of course, that much of the New Testament is no longer useful. Even Jesus, it is admitted, employed forms of thought which are now obsolete—particularly apocalyptic ideas about the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man—and these forms, Professor Scott insists, can no longer be kept in the background in a presentation of Jesus' life and teaching or interpreted in any merely metaphorical sense. On the contrary, our author, somewhat after the manner of the "consistent eschatologists," connects even the ethic of Jesus with these obsolete notions. And if Jesus thus employed obsolete forms of thought, the same thing may of course be said about the New Testament writers.

Yet Professor Scott is nothing daunted by facts such as these. Even if Jesus did employ obsolete forms, he says, yet the forms may be distinguished from the content; and even if the New Testament is a product of its time, employing freely even elements derived from paganism, yet at the centre of the New Testament there is an "essential gospel" which is a permanent possession of the human race.