

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

But, it is sometimes said, the error of modern liberalism—so persuasively represented by Professor Scott—is an error of the head, not of the heart, and in the realm of feeling there can subsist a Christian fellowship even in the midst of doctrinal controversy. Such considerations, however, we are obliged to confess, can bring us no comfort. On the contrary, the sharp separation between thinking and feeling is absolutely impossible. And as a matter of fact it is in the realm of the heart fully as much as in that of the head that Professor Scott seems to us to be wrong. As we read the graceful sentences of modern liberal writers—so calm, so devoid of any sorrow for the guilty soul of man, so unmindful of the stern realities of sin and death—we can only pray to God that there may come not only a change of mind but with it a change of heart. That change of heart may come sooner than we suppose; the times are in God's hand, and His arm is not too short to save. When the change does come, when the world has again been convicted of sin and been led to renounce its present complacent pride, then the hearts of men will melt at the foot of the cross, and the gospel that is really a gospel, the good news of Jesus and His love, will run like wildfire through the earth.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

The Variants in the Gospel Reports. The Alexander Robertson Lectures for 1917. By T. H. WEIR, B.D., M.R.A.S., Lecturer in Arabic in the University of Glasgow. With Prefatory Note by The Rev. Professor Milligan, D.D. Paisley: Alexander Gardner, Publisher by Appointment to the late Queen Victoria, 1920. Pp. 150.

In this little book, Mr. Weir has called attention to certain phenomena which he thinks prove that at least the first three gospels all go back to an original Semitic Gospel. Whether this original Gospel was written in Hebrew or Aramaic he regards as a matter of small consequence. By regarding the variations among the Gospels as due to different translations (or in some cases mistranslations) from the Hebrew or Aramaic he believes that problems which are quite insoluble on the basis of the customary view receive at last a satisfactory solution.

Mr. Weir admits that "in the present ploughing but a few stones have been turned over" and that "much awaits the scholar whose ploughshare will make a deeper furrow" (p. 150). It might have been well if this modesty had been allowed to appear throughout the body of the book. As it is, the most extraordinary assertions are made with a confidence rather surprising in view of the author's lack of familiarity with the apostolic age and with the history of the Church. For example, the author says on p. 30: "It was not until the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century, partly as a result of the Mohammedan conquests of Syria, Persia, and North Africa, that the doctrines of the Church can be said to have taken their final form, and it was about the same time that both the canon of the Bible and

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