

The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY, 1917

"GOD OUR FATHER AND THE LORD JESUS CHRIST"

In the opening sentence of the very first of Paul's letters which have come down to us—and that is as much as to say, in the very first sentence which, so far as we know, he ever wrote,—he makes use of a phrase in speaking of the Christians' God, which at once attracts our interested attention. According to the generous way he had of thinking and speaking of his readers at the height of their professions, he describes the church at Thessalonica as living and moving and having its being in God. But, as it was a Christian church which he was addressing, he does not content himself, in this description, with the simple term "God". He uses the compound phrase, "God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." The Thessalonians, he says, because they were Christians, lived and moved and had their being "in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

It is quite clear that this compound phrase was not new on Paul's lips, coined for this occasion. It bears on its face the evidence of a long and familiar use, by which it had been worn down to its bare bones. All the articles have been rubbed off, and with them all other accessories; and it stands out in its baldest elements as just "God Father and Lord Jesus Christ." Plainly we have here a mode of speaking of the Christians' God which was customary with Paul.

We are not surprised, therefore, to find this phrase repeated in precisely the same connection in the opening verses of the next letter which Paul wrote—2 Thessalonians—with only the slight variation that an "our" is inserted with "God the Father",—"in God our Father and the Lord

theology of the past (cf. εἰς), quite unsuited as it was to the comprehension of plain first-century Christians." We trust that this sentence does not indicate any tendency on the part of Professor Souter toward the undisciplined enthusiasms of Deissmann. Recognition of the natural and popular character of the language of the New Testament, as distinguished from the artificial literary language of the period, should never be allowed to obscure the fact that the Apostle Paul, for example, was no ordinary man of the people, but a profound thinker, in whose hands the Greek language, despite the modifications that it had undergone since the classical period, became the vehicle of a sublime theology which only superficiality could call "hair-splitting".

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

Paulus en zij Brief aan de Romeinen. Door Dr. A. van Veldhuizen, Hoogleraar vanwege de Ned. Herv. Kerk aan de Rijks-Universiteit te Groningen. Te Groningen bij J. B. Wolters U. M. 1916. Pp. 142.

This little volume represents the third instalment of the series *Tekst en Uitleg* of which the numbers for Matthew and Mark were noticed in our issue for July, 1916. The limited space available for the exposition was bound to create extraordinary difficulties in the case of a document like that of the Epistle to the Romans. A detailed rendering of the articulation of the Apostle's thought with due regard to the interlocking of single sentences and niceties of shades of expression is from the outset excluded when less than sixty small-sized pages are at the writer's disposal. And yet in Paul's Epistles, and especially in Romans, so much depends on this particular process. But discounting this, and having regard exclusively to the larger movement of thought and to the problem of imparting a fairly distinct conception of it to the average reader, we can say that the author has admirably succeeded. A great deal of useful information has been compressed into a small space. Dr. van Veldhuizen has a happy way of illustrating his points by apt comparisons expressed in pithy, snappy terms. He even knows how to make use of contemporary events to enforce a statement as e.g. when the abject enslavement of the nous to the law of the members (Chap. vii) is compared to the impotence of the Greek authorities at Saloniki. There is danger, of course, that this figure, so pertinent at the present moment, may become less self-explanatory in the years to come; we trust the usefulness of the commentary will outlast the present war.

On the great questions at issue in the exegesis of Romans the author on the whole takes the side supported by sound exegetical tradition. The "righteousness of God" is both subjective, an attribute of God, and objective, the result of imputation to man, and in regard to the former the punitive sense of "justice" is upheld for the passage III, 23 ff. The emphasis on the sovereignty of God in Chap. ix is adequately brought out. That faith appears as a gift of God is squarely recognized. The brief exposé of the Pauline Theology

that precedes the exegetical part is both valuable in itself and helpful for the understanding of the commentary. There are points on which we feel bound to differ from the view adopted, as for instance in regard to the subject of Chap. vii, 14 ff. Here the author represents Paul as living over again in a sort of spiritual nightmare, the desperate experience of his pre-Christian state. We do not think the present tenses in contrast with the past tenses of the preceding can be explained on this principle. Referring to a minor point we feel that the translation of *καλεῖν* by "giving a name" in Chap. v, 17 obliterates the evident allusion to Paul's technical conception of "calling". It is incorrect that the contrast in I Cor. xv, 45 ff. between Adam and Christ presupposes the fall (p. 29.) for this is precisely the point in which the passage differs from the comparison in Rom. v, 12 ff. It is also scarcely in keeping with Paul's conception to say, that Christ by his conduct became the Second Adam (p. 31). We could wish that the relation between Paul and Jesus had been somewhat more definitely formulated than is done on p. 18, where Paul is said to have coined the gold furnished by Jesus. The figure is striking, but it fails to express the fundamental fact, so much in need of emphasis, that the relation between the two is not on the whole that between two successive teachers, but that between the interpreted and the interpreter, between author of redemption and the apostle of redemption.

Of *errata* we have noticed the following: on p. 40 the citation II, 14 should be II, 4; on p. 88 (line 6 from the bottom) "beschermen" should be "beschouwen"; on p. 102 (line 12 from the top) "doop" should be "dood"; on p. 107 (line 15 from the top) "menschen" should be "wenschen". The name Mehlkorn in the bibliography on p. 21 is misspelled for Mehlhorn.

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

The Prosecution of Jesus. Its Date, History and Legality. By RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND, Professor of the Classical Languages in Dartmouth College. Princeton University Press, Princeton. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916. Pp. viii, 302. Price \$1.50 net.

Professor Husband's review of the trial of Jesus is made from the point of view of the classical student who approaches the subject with interest in and knowledge of procedure in Roman law courts. Its chief contribution lies in this field of earlier interest and consists in the presentation of information derived from the papyri concerning the organization of courts and legal procedure in the province of Egypt. Prior to the publication of Mitteis and Wilcken's *Papyrusurkunde* knowledge of this and in particular of the difference between procedure in Rome and in the provinces was slight and was derived chiefly from the few cases of which we have reports. The evidence of the papyri shows that in the province of Egypt the legal system of the Romans was well organized, that trial procedure was freer from the delays incident to it in Rome, that this was made