

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

its text became fixed." Such assertions would be disquieting only if some proof were adduced in support of them.

Because of Mr. Weir's lack of acquaintance with many aspects of the subject-matter with which he undertakes to deal, and because of his unsystematic way of going to work and his propensity for neglecting what is plain in the interests of what is obscure, his book does not in itself bring us any nearer to a solution of the synoptic problem. But some of the phenomena to which he has called attention are interesting, and it may be that subsequent investigators may make such use of his materials that after sifting they may become valuable. Even if the theory of an original Semitic Gospel lying back of Matthew, Mark and Luke be untenable—as no doubt it is—still it must be borne in mind that the words of Jesus, at least, were originally in Aramaic, so that the treatment of them by Mr. Weir may prove here and there to be useful. Also, as Professor Milligan intimates in the introduction, Mr. Weir's book may serve to correct the present underestimation of the Semitic element in the New Testament. But if it does accomplish this useful result, it will do so, not by a revelation of the truth, but by setting up one exaggeration against another.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus. Edited with Introduction. Critical Apparatus and Commentary by HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE, M.A., Member of the New York Metropolitan Museum Expedition in Egypt and Formerly Scholar of Wadham College, Oxford. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1920. Pp. lxxvi, 48.

Since the discovery by Grenfell and Hunt of the two papyrus fragments, Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1 and 654, the former in 1897 and the latter in 1903, there has been a great deal of discussion about the origin and value of the Sayings of Jesus which these fragments contain. The discussion is now reviewed, and further independent study of the Sayings undertaken, in the comprehensive edition provided by Mr. White.

According to Mr. White, who follows the discoverers, Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, the two papyrus fragments themselves are to be dated in the third century—the more important fragment, Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, being placed early in the century. The formation of the collection of sayings of Jesus from which the two fragments are thought to have been taken is placed by Mr. White at A.D. 140 or earlier (p. lxix). The extant Sayings, Mr. White believes, are dependent upon the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and display also a slight Johannine influence which however is thought not to involve literary dependence upon the Gospel of John. After an examination of alternative views, Mr. White comes to the conclusion that the Sayings were derived from the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," which is mentioned and cited by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. In this connection, it is unfortunate that the work of Schmidtke (*Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien*, 1911) came into our editor's hands too late to be

of use (p. liv, note 2). For through that work the investigation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews entered upon a new phase, even though Schmidtke's conclusions may prove to be incorrect. See "The Virgin Birth in the Second Century," in this REVIEW, x, 1912, pp. 555-580, especially pp. 574-580.

One of the two fragments (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 654) has been so badly preserved that the restoration of the sayings contained in it is largely a matter of guesswork. Mr. White undertakes the work of restoration with the help of the sources which the writer is supposed to have used, and perhaps does as well as could be expected. At any rate, he reproduces in a critical apparatus the previous restorations, and thus enables the reader either to choose for himself or to avoid a choice altogether.

The other fragment (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1) is much better preserved, so that here the work of interpretation rather than that of restoration assumes the place of chief importance. Perhaps the most striking utterance in the collection is that which is found at the end of Saying X:

"Lift up the stone, and there thou shalt find me;
Cleave the wood, and there I am."

Mr. White rejects any pantheistic interpretation of this utterance, and supposes that it means, "No matter . . . that you are at your daily task, hard, common work;—God is present with you there" (p. 40).

The results of Mr. White's investigation are such that the authenticity of any of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the Collection, except so far as the sayings are derived from the canonical Gospels, becomes exceedingly unlikely or at any rate quite incapable of demonstration. This conclusion may perhaps be accepted, though certainly Saying X remains very interesting. No doubt it is also true that the Collection is dependent upon Matthew and Luke. But Mr. White's whole treatment of the development of the tradition about the life of Jesus is vitiated by his low view of the historical value of the canonical Gospels. He believes, for instance, that the Collection shows the influence of "incipient Johannism," and the entrance of this incipient Johannism into the Church is apparently put at a late time. But his low estimate of the Gospels extends to the Synoptics as well as to the Gospel of John. An instructive example of the unsympathetic and mechanical kind of interpretation by which elaborate theories of the development of the Gospel tradition have been built up in recent years is to be found on pp. 36 f. Mr. White is there discussing the former half of Saying X, which on the basis of the restoration which he adopts reads as follows:

"Wheresoever there be two, they are not without God,
And where there is one alone, I say, I am with him,"

There is an obvious parallel with Matt. xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them." And

Mr. White believes that the saying in the Collection is probably a "conscious correction or amplification" of the verse in Matthew intended to remove the "frigid ceremonial condition" there imposed. Matthew, in other words, makes the presence of Christ "conditional on a formal gathering or congregation," and Saying X is intended to remove this condition. But could any interpretation be more unnatural? Where is the "frigid ceremonial condition" in the gracious words contained in Matthew? With what possible right can the "two or three" gathered in Christ's name be represented as "a formal gathering or congregation"? And why should it be supposed that because Christ's presence is promised to a gathering of two or three disciples, it is denied to the individual man? Yet it is by such employment of the argument from silence, such discovery of contradictions where no contradictions exist, that elaborate chronological schemes as to the growth of the Gospel material are being constructed today.

Mr. White has given us a very useful work, which is indispensable to every earnest student of the recently discovered "Sayings." But his work would have been made more useful still if he had attained to a sounder view of the life of the early Church and especially of those documents, contained in the New Testament, which must always remain the primary sources of our information about Jesus.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament. By J. M. HARDEN, B.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Dublin. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921. Pp. xv, 126.

This useful little book, with the admirable small edition of the Wordsworth and White text published at Oxford, ought to encourage a large number of students to read the Vulgate New Testament. The practice will be beneficial in various ways. Reading of the Bible in a variety of languages always throws new light upon the sacred text. The Latin Bible in particular has had such an enormous influence upon the Western Church that the student will profit by familiarizing himself with it. And finally the reading of the Latin Bible is a convenient way of beginning acquaintance with ecclesiastical Latin in general.

The Dictionary omits "pronouns, prepositions, numerals, etc., whose meaning is best learned from the grammar." This omission is to be regretted, in view of the interests of the beginner. On the other hand, the listing of the verses where a word is found, "except in the case of the most frequently occurring words," is an admirable feature, which, as Dr. Harden correctly remarks, will make the dictionary serve some of the purposes of a concordance.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.